

Pollock
Pomerene
Ransdell
Robinson
Saulsbury

Shafroth
Sheppard
Shields
Simmons
Smith, Ga.

Smith, S. C.
Swanson
Thomas
Thompson
Trammell

Underwood
Walsh
Williams

YAYS—47.

Baird
Borah
Brandegee
Calder
Calt
Curtis
Fernald
France
Frelinghuysen
Gore
Gronna

Hale
Harding
Hardwick
Johnson, Cal.
Jones, Wash.
Kellogg
Kenyon
Knox
La Follette
Lenroot
Lodge
McCumber

McKellar
McLean
McNary
Moses
New
Norris
Nugent
Page
Penrose
Poindexter
Reed
Sherman

Smith, Mich.
Smoot
Spencer
Sterling
Sutherland
Vardaman
Wadsworth
Warren
Watson
Weeks
Wolcott

NOT VOTING—11

Ashurst
Dillingham
Fall

Goff
Hollis
Johnson, S. Dak.
Owen
Phelan
Smith, Ariz.

Smith, Md.
Townsend

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment so as to make it provide that the soldiers shall be demobilized within 60 days.

I think that the demobilization has been entirely too much retarded. I believe that a great many of our soldiers who have been drafted into the service are yet in the camps when by all right and sense of justice they ought to be at home carrying on their own private business affairs. At the same time I believe that to restrict the demobilization within a period of 30 days would possibly not allow sufficient time. For that reason I offer an amendment to make it 60 days.

I do not believe that our soldiers should be retained for the purpose of performing chores around the camps. I do not believe that they should be retained for the purpose of acting as the man Friday or the lackey for some officers who may desire to keep them around at different camps throughout the country. I do not believe that they should be retained for the purpose of acting as chauffeurs and lackeys for officers in other localities for running their cars. They were not drafted into the service for this purpose. A great many of those that are retained are being used there for other purposes than military purposes. Therefore I offer this amendment and hope it will be adopted.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I think it would be very unfortunate for the Senate of the United States to express its assent to this proposition. The Army appropriation bill has not passed. The amendments which were made to the Army appropriation bill fixed the number of men of the enlisted and commissioned personnel. That bill has not passed, and has not been acted on at all, although I have tried to have it taken up. In the meantime, to undertake now to demobilize the Army within 30 or 60 days, it seems to me, would be a very great mistake.

I am thoroughly in accord with the Senator from Florida with reference to the improper uses that have been made of the enlisted personnel of the Army; but, notwithstanding that, there is a high duty that the United States has to perform in the emergency which confronts us. Until the Army has been reorganized on the basis of a force appropriate to insist upon the rights of the United States, and until the Senate and the Congress have had an opportunity to act upon the whole subject, there ought not to be any change in present conditions.

I therefore express the hope that the amendment of the Senator may not be adopted, but that the whole subject may be deferred until the Army has been reorganized either upon the plan suggested in the Army appropriation bill or upon some other basis yet to be agreed upon.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. He understands that this amendment does not relate to the troops that are in Europe but is confined to the troops that are in the United States? It seems to me that the contingency which he describes could be met by the troops returning from Europe.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am not so sure that that is true. The entire Army is a whole; and in order to make it coordinate and fit with the troops abroad, it ought to remain in its present state until the whole subject has been disposed of.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask to perfect the amendment by inserting the word "now" before the words "within the United States," so as to meet that situation, although, as I have said before, I favor the early and the speedy demobilization of all the troops in the United States and as many of the troops in Europe as is consistent with the public interest. This is a high and solemn duty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] to the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the amendment of the Senator from Florida be laid on the table; and upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is a motion to lay on the table and is not debatable. The yeas and nays are requested. Is the request seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If this amendment is laid on the table, does that carry the whole proposition with it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and withhold my vote.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I make the same transfer as before, and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when Mr. TOWNSEND's name was called). I desire the RECORD to show that my colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is unavoidably detained from the Senate on account of serious illness in his family.

The roll call resulted—yeas 44, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Baird
Borah
Brandegee
Calder
Calt
Curtis
Fernald
France
Frelinghuysen
Gore
Gronna

Hale
Harding
Hardwick
Johnson, Cal.
Jones, Wash.
Kellogg
Kenyon
Knox
La Follette
Lenroot
Lodge

McNary
Martin, Va.
Moses
Nelson
New
Norris
Page
Penrose
Poindexter
Reed
Sherman

Shields
Smith, Mich.
Smoot
Spencer
Sutherland
Underwood
Vardaman
Warren
Watson
Weeks
Williams

NAYS—42.

Bankhead
Beckham
Chamberlain
Culberson
Cummins
Fletcher
Gay
Gerry
Henderson
Hitchcock
Jones, N. Mex.

Kendrick
King
Kirby
Lewis
McCumber
McKellar
McLean
Martin, Ky.
Myers
Nugent
Overman

Pittman
Pollock
Pomerene
Ransdell
Robinson
Saulsbury
Shafroth
Sheppard
Simmons
Smith, Ariz.
Smith, Ga.

Smith, S. C.
Sterling
Swanson
Thomas
Thompson
Trammell
Wadsworth
Walsh
Wolcott

NOT VOTING—10.

Ashurst
Dillingham
Fall

Goff
Hollis
Johnson, S. Dak.
Owen
Phelan
Smith, Md.

Townsend

So the amendment to the amendment was laid on the table.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 12 o'clock of this the 4th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1919, having arrived, and by virtue of the Constitution and laws of the United States the Sixty-fifth Congress of the United States having expired, by virtue of the authority vested in me as the Presiding Officer of the Senate I declare the Senate now adjourned sine die.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 4, 1919.

(Continuation of proceedings of Monday, March 3, 1919.)

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this resolution is, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY] has said, one of some importance. It has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I trust will be adopted, to relieve the situation which has been described.

Since this bill comes from the Ways and Means Committee I want to make some reference to the fact that certain members of that committee are about to pass out with this Congress. The pleasant exercises that characterized the earlier part of the evening, including the presentation to the chairman of the Ways and Means [Mr. KITCHIN] of a testimonial of the regard of the House, induces me to say that the committee is obliged to sever association with five of its members, who will retire temporarily to private life to-morrow.

Mr. LINCOLN DIXON, of Indiana, is one of these. He was the third member in rank on the Democratic side, and by virtue of his rank had been a conferee on all the important revenue bills prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means during this

session of Congress. I think perhaps no higher honor has come to any legislator during this critical period of American and world history than to have been in conference on the great revenue bills that were prepared by this body to furnish ways and means for the conduct of the great war.

Two other members of the committee on the Democratic side will also retire from Congress to-morrow. One of them is GUY T. HELVERING, of Kansas, an active, energetic, useful Member, who took a highly intelligent interest in all of the affairs of the committee. Our co-Member, GEORGE F. O'SHAUNESSY, of Rhode Island, also goes out.

He was chosen to make the fight for Senator in his State and has accepted the fortunes of war in good grace. All we can do now is to bid him an affectionate farewell. Two Republicans, members of the committee, go out with this Congress. One of them is our distinguished colleague from Nebraska, Mr. CHARLES H. SLOAN. I do not know any member of the committee who worked more industriously nor with more patriotic fervor throughout the whole of his membership than did the gentleman from Nebraska. Upon the Republican side of the House, where his services were noted and where his patriotic efforts were appreciated, I am sure his departure will be very much regretted. He had many friends upon the other side. If I might be permitted to say outside of the committee that he had the warm and cordial friendship of all the members of the committee I would very cheerfully make that statement, because it is a fact. Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD, of New York, was another Republican member of the committee who of his own volition severed his connection with the House. Mr. FAIRCHILD was a man of large means and large business experience, whose career was marked by success from the beginning. He was what might be called a self-made man, whose advice in the committee was of great value, especially during the war period, when the assistance of such men was needed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having said this much about some of my colleagues upon the Ways and Means Committee, I desire to say a few words on the subject of aviation.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present. I think a quorum ought to be here to hear this speech.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I hope the gentleman will not; I think we have a quorum here.

Mr. SNYDER. I will withdraw the point.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It will be very difficult now, as Congress is about to adjourn, and the voice of the people as expressed by its representatives will be temporarily hushed, to obtain much information about possible malfeasance in any department. While Congress is in session Members are privileged to say what they please about great generals or little lieutenants [laughter] who may offend against public taste. It is possible to criticize the head of a department who might be overreaching himself or who might be grasping for power. While Congress is in session it is possible for the representatives of the people to listen to complaints as they come up from various districts from every section of the country and to give them vent. While Congress is in session it is possible even to discuss the league of nations when the President is abroad, or even when he is on a temporary visit to Washington.

All these things may be considered when Congress is in session, and I say to you, gentlemen, my colleagues upon both sides of the House, though there are some privileges vouchsafed to a Member of Congress as a representative of the people while Congress is in session, when Congress closes the congressional privileges close with it and our lips are sealed to a certain extent, except as we may go abroad and cautiously inform the people of some of the things we know. I think there are many matters coming up from all the departments about which we should inform the people. I regret that we can not get them all in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, by the same token, I regret that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not have a larger and wider circulation, in order that everything that is done here may be conveyed through that medium to the vast population of the country.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Can the gentleman give us a few remarks about the intracoastal canal?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, if the gentleman from Maryland, who is so well posted and who believes in that project, will take a little time after I am through, he can get an hour in his own right, just as I have done, and he may discuss the question fully. When the gentleman from Maryland is posted as to the rules of the House and knows how to do it, he can get time to discuss the intracoastal canal.

Mr. DECKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to my outgoing friend from Missouri, the eloquent and fiery gentleman from Missouri, who, if I had noticed him before, would have received a tribute at my hands. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. DECKER. Thank you for the tribute. I wondered if you would give me 10 minutes of that hour in which to make a speech.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. After I get through, if the gentleman will get recognition, he can have an hour, and if he can beat the carpet and the air with his accustomed eloquence we shall all be pleased. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Are we now in recess? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We are now discussing the Rainey bill, which I favor.

Mr. CANNON. If we are in recess—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is the last opportunity to discuss wet goods this session or any other.

Mr. CANNON. If we are in recess, I want to say to the gentleman, first, that he is making a good speech, and ask him, second, whether he has quoted to our colleagues and friends this evening that original couplet:

Peace and righteousness have kissed each other?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have not said that in so many words, nor have I the faculty of quoting so well as the gentleman from Illinois; but I have seen the lion and the lamb lie down together; to-night I have seen the Democrats and the Republicans fraternize; I have heard them compliment each other and pass gifts to each other, and I feel as though—

This is a day we long have sought
And mourned because we found it not.

[Applause.]

Mr. DECKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To the gentleman from Missouri, who is to leave us, I would say that I think if he did remain he would insist on a duty on zinc, a proposition I am inclined to approve.

Mr. DECKER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question now?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. DECKER. I just wondered how the gentleman got that hour's time if he is in opposition to the bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I got it on merit. [Laughter.] And I am not in opposition to the bill. When my distinguished friend and colleague on the Ways and Means Committee rose and presented his bill as a matter of privilege, coming, as it did, from the highest committee in this House, I, being a member of the committee, desired to fortify the argument he had made. I rose in my place, addressed the Chair, said "Mr. Speaker," and, upon obtaining recognition, proceeded with my speech. And now I have arrived at the aviation stage. [Laughter.] Having arrived there I hope the gentleman will not go up in the air.

Mr. DECKER. I will not do it under any circumstances.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can not yield to any more interruptions.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DECKER. It is this: Being about to leave you, and not being a good parliamentarian, there is a question that I wish to propound to the Chairman. There is an important bill before the House, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY] spoke in favor of it, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania also speaks an hour in favor of it. He claims he has an hour. I ask the parliamentary question—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is referring to me as "he," which is out of order. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is employing unparliamentary language. [Laughter.]

Mr. DECKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Illinois, both of whom are in favor of the bill, are demanding an hour on each side. I want to know when Members who are opposed to this bill will have time to speak?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. After I get through.

Mr. MANN. To-morrow afternoon. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. At the expiration of the time of the gentleman, if the previous question is not ordered.

Mr. STAFFORD. The previous question has nothing to do with the Committee of the Whole. We are proceeding under general debate.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I wish to proceed with this speech, if I may. If the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DECKER], who apparently did not hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HENRY T. RAINY] who presented this bill, will listen to me carefully, I think there will be no opposition to the bill. There will be no occasion for his opposing it.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in exercising the prerogatives of the House. It seems to me that sometimes they are invaded by another body. That accounts for some of us objecting to some of the amendments that come in on conference reports. They are thrown at us without an opportunity to fairly discuss them or analyze them or find out what they mean. I believe the House ought to discuss these questions.

Mr. MADDEN. What questions?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Questions that come back in conference reports, questions that affect the integrity of the departments, questions that relate to the expenditure of public moneys. Why, during this administration we have poured millions and billions of dollars into the hands of small bureau chiefs, as well as great department heads, and those millions and billions have been expended lavishly, and yet we have had no accounting. The public believes that these moneys have been well spent, and yet in the matter of aviation it developed, after we had promptly appropriated \$640,000,000 to establish aircraft production in the United States, that though the money was spent we had not produced a single fighting airplane that could be used in France.

These are things that we ought to tell the people. If we can not get them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and if the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has not sufficient circulation to enable the people to learn these things about which Congress has information—

Mr. MADDEN. Then let us start a paper of our own—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then it might be well for the Members of Congress, good Democrats and good Republicans alike, after this session is over, to go about their districts and tell the people the truth. Let us show that Congress is not responsible for waste and extravagance, although the Congress has assumed the responsibility of aiding the President in the prosecution of the war.

I refer to aircraft, because to-day I introduced a certain resolution asking for certain papers and information from the War Department, from the Secretary of War, about certain reports concerning extravagance and alleged malfeasance, which seem to have been suppressed. I think the Congress ought to have this kind of information.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman has referred to the difficulty experienced in bringing this information to the public. Here is the reason: In every big newspaper in the United States the Packard Co. has a full-page advertisement, talking about the forerunner of the Liberty engine and what it accomplished in the air. That is why we can not get the information before the people.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may account for the expenditure of a large part of \$640,000,000, which did not get us a single fighting plane in France. Now, I will ask the gentleman from New York, who is a well-informed and accomplished aviator, if the Packard Co. is the company that patriotically gave up the manufacture of all its automobiles in order to make Liberty motors?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman give us any idea as to the storage capacity of the cellars of Philadelphia to hold all the liquor that he is trying to get in this country?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why, the gentleman is talking like an intoxicated man. [Laughter.] He knows more about the cellars of Philadelphia than I do. I believe if the people of Texas ever got onto the fact that the gentleman has been going over there, and that he knows about these cellars of Philadelphia, he would have a hard time getting back to Congress. Texas is a very dry State. [Laughter.]

But I was talking about aviation. What I wanted to do was to lay a few facts before the House before we adjourn, so that the Members may go back to their districts and tell the people something about aviation.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. TILSON. I know the gentleman wishes to be accurate in his statements, and usually he is very accurate. The gentleman has repeated two or three times the statement that we

spent \$640,000,000 for aeroplanes. Does not the gentleman know that that does not cover the entire bill? Our total appropriations for that purpose amounted to about a billion and a half dollars. Under the Sherley bill, covering a portion of that huge sum back into the Treasury, there was something like \$487,000,000 covered back into the Treasury, so that as a matter of fact instead of \$640,000,000 there was a little more than \$1,000,000,000 expended.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the kind of information we ought to let out. The gentleman is doing just what I wanted to have done. I started with \$640,000,000, mostly wasted in this aircraft business without any accounting, and nobody court-martialed, although a court-martial was recommended for some of them, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], who is a member of the Military Affairs Committee and who knows about these things, stands up like a man and tells us the amount is over a billion dollars. The people ought to know about it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Ought not the Committee on Public Information to let the people know these things?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; but about the time the Committee on Public Information and Mr. Creel were getting ready to tell the people about it, they were put out of business.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman mean to say that Mr. Creel has stopped creeling?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He has not ceased to put them on the reel, even the Secretary of War.

With these few prefatory words I shall read a letter that was forwarded to the Acting Director of the Bureau of Aircraft Production by Capt. H. L. Scaife, a lawyer and mining engineer, who lives at Clinton, S. C. This man was selected by President Wilson to be one of the Naval Advisory Board and assisted Mr. Secretary Daniels in preparing the Navy for the war. He came up from South Carolina, put on the shoulder straps of a captain, and was assigned to the Aircraft Production Service. When this gentleman told me his story and laid his letter before me, I said, "That is the kind of information the people of South Carolina ought to have."

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Did he not go out to California to induce people there to raise castor beans?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I believe he was sent West; but the gentleman referred to as having been sent to California was another officer of the same service, who made certain reports which were suppressed. After those reports had been made he was transferred from his field of activity in Washington and given a remote position in California. Our colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of Washington] introduced a resolution the other day to obtain those reports, and it was up before the House, but we have not yet got the details. I rather think we ought to get them, and for that reason I want to read this letter, addressed by Capt. Scaife, of South Carolina, to the Acting Director of the Bureau of Aircraft Production. If gentlemen will listen to this, they will learn something. Here is an ex-officer of the Aircraft Production Service. He has gone out of the service now, and therefore is free to speak. While he was in the service he could not.

Now, let us see what he says:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 24, 1919.

Col. JAMES A. MARS,

Acting Director Bureau of Aircraft Production,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I personally placed in your hands a communication, dated January 23, 1919, definitely and precisely informing you of concrete facts of maladministration in connection with the castor-bean-growing section of the Bureau of Aircraft Production, and that you would be sure to have personal knowledge of the details and evidence of the shameful conditions your attention was called to three specific reports which were officially filed by me in the proper office of the bureau, dated, respectively, March 21, 1918, May 25, 1918, and a memorandum directed to Mr. Potter, prepared for the signature of Mr. Edmund Leigh, on or about October 1, 1918.

These reports were prepared by me in pursuance of my duty as an inspecting officer, and they give in detail the history of the castor-bean undertaking and the acts and doings of the castor-bean growing section from the time of its organization until it had become a stench in the nostrils of people who are familiar with its policy—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield? I hope it will not divert the gentleman in his argument, for I do not desire to embarrass him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am reading now.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think it would be pertinent to inquire of the gentleman, as he is an eminent tariff expert, what is the present duty on castor beans?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In the Committee on Ways and Means I will say that the gentleman from Ohio is considered as the castor-bean expert, and I refer that question to him. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURNETT. Did the gentleman say castor beans or castor oil? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Alabama is the expert on castor oil. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman from Cincinnati knows more about castor oil.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania (reading)—

The first report sets forth the facts that were necessary to be known to prevent a disastrous ending of the enterprise. The second report was filed when the undertaking was beginning to fall down, and it called for the immediate application of remedies to avert the disaster which has since happened. The memorandum directed to Mr. Potter, prepared by me for the signature of Mr. Leigh, presented the evidence necessary to fix the responsibility and prevent the escape of guilty persons—

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order. This is a very interesting letter.

Mr. MADDEN. I didn't know they raised castor beans in Kansas.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The farmers who undertook to raise castor beans apparently were deceived.

Mr. MADDEN. Was not the seed any good?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to know whether there is a protective tariff on castor beans such as there is on peanuts?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will come to that in due course. I read:

The castor-bean undertaking was laid out as a vital part of the program for the winning of the war, and its signal failure, with the squandering of an enormous sum of money, together with willfully false reports transmitted to higher authorities and unconscionable representations made to farmers, are a few of the things for which responsibility must sooner or later be fixed. My reports will show that the Castor Oil Board, which was charged with the supervision of the undertaking, was not consulted, and that it held no meetings for over a year; that the amount of production which might be expected was willfully misrepresented to the farmers, and, for fear that they might be discouraged from planting if they knew the truth, the original bulletin showing an average yield of about 10 bushels per acre was altered so as to indicate that a production of from 20 to 40 bushels per acre might be expected under favorable conditions—

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. The truth is the yield is only 4½ bushels per acre down in my district.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is all explained in the letter, and the gentleman verifies it—

that the seed distributed by the Government were represented to be of a certain variety which promised the best yield when it was well known that they consisted of a mixture of inferior and unacclimated seed, which experts and former growers advised would result in a failure the first year; that opportunities to obtain acclimated Bombay seed were neglected; that recommendations were made to plant the beans in sections of the country and in soil where previous attempts at cultivation had been a failure, while contracts were refused in the sections of the Middle West where the castor bean had been most successfully grown; that, regardless of repeated warnings as to the necessity, no adequate efforts were made to procure an efficient hulling machine until the crop was getting ripe for harvest, and, after an efficient hulling machine was finally discovered, a machine which had been demonstrated as worthless was recommended—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. Several gentlemen are listening to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, while those that are not listening are equally disturbed in their deliberations by the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think the whole assemblage should be in order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for the interruption. If gentlemen will interrupt me at the end of a paragraph instead of the middle of a sentence, I would appreciate it—

protests from the county agents of the Department of Agriculture were ignored; and recommendations unanimously adopted by a joint conference of the field men of the Department of Agriculture and the field men of the Signal Corps were ignored.

The part which has been performed by the castor-bean growing section is now history; and in the State where the bulk of the acreage was planted, instead of 30 to 40 bushels per acre, the average yield is about 1 bushel per acre, and in many sections the amount of seed planted will not be recovered, aside from the loss in time, labor, and fertilizer. The farmers were advised to soak the seed in hot water before planting, which in many instances resulted in poor stands. Notwithstanding the literature then available to the contrary, they were advised that castor beans were singularly free from diseases and pests, and it is now history that in this enterprise thousands of acres of castor-bean plants were destroyed by cut worms, blights, fungus, and various kinds of diseases—

Mr. LINTHICUM. Has the gentleman come to the end of a paragraph?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I wish the gentleman would hold up his thumb when he comes to the end of a paragraph. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is late and the gentleman is tired, but I read:

But for the vigilance of a person not connected with the Bureau of Aircraft Production, a barge of seed which had been sunk in salt water would have been sent to the farmers to plant.

The growers are now clamoring for recompense. A contract is a contract, and the only theory on which they may now be given an award is on the ground that they suffered loss because of fraudulent misrepresentations. To adjust the losses of from 15,000 to 25,000 growers will require an investigation ab initio—

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. What does that mean?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. From the beginning. The gentleman is lawyer enough to know that. I read—

since a record and history of the individual growings have not been kept, and when I prepared the blanks for such a record in consultation with representatives of the Department of Agriculture the use of such blanks were forbidden. My reports and the innumerable letters and telegrams of complaint from every section of the country where the castor beans were being planted were ignored and suppressed and official memorandums of the most optimistic tint were transmitted to the higher authorities and to our allies long after any reasonable person might easily deduct that the castor-bean section had hopelessly fallen down and would result in chaos—

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BAER. I have been unable to get the cost of production of any product that is gambled or speculated in on the market, and I want to know if the gentleman can give us any information on the cost of the production of castor beans.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the resolution on the castor bean that I have offered is passed, I have an idea that the aviation section will give the gentleman that information. [Reading:]

The innocent have suffered and the fate of the Government's success in the prosecution of the war was jeopardized by a fiasco which is an insult to the most commonplace intelligence, and there should be no further temporizing in placing the responsibility. Early in the season I telegraphed to the head of the castor-bean growing section that such conditions as were then being discovered could not have just happened. Whether the chaotic conditions resulted from flagitious scheming undertaken with crafty pretense and cool impudence by arch traitors or whether they resulted from stupid inefficiency and criminal negligence, the results are the same and public decency demands that the guilty should be called by a voice sufficiently powerful to administer a rebuke that will deter others for years to come—

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not believe they raise castor beans in the gentleman's district.

Mr. SABATH. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They may raise them on the fire escapes or the back window sills, but they are not farmers.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. What I desire to ask the gentleman is whether he is reading this long letter for the purpose of defeating the Irish resolution, because I know there is a great deal of interest on the Republican side—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman ask me that question?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I am for the Irish resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Then the gentleman ought not to be taking up one hour with this nonsense.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Illinois is the last man on earth who should interfere with the exposure of graft under this administration. He stands there deliberately endeavoring to suppress free speech.

Mr. SABATH. I know the gentleman is an expert on beans.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to get the information before the public. Does the gentleman want to suppress it?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman has the right to print. I ask unanimous consent that the letter might be printed, so as to save time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is satisfactory to me. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be extended in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting the letter referred to. Is there objection?

There was objection; but subsequently Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania obtained permission to extend his remarks by inserting the remainder of the letter of Capt. Scaife, as follows:

The handing out of several millions of dollars to the farmers from the Public Treasury to stifle their criticisms and complaint without sufficient investigation into the merits of their claims would be a finale which would be in keeping with the acts and doings which sooner or later will shock the conscience of the American people. So complete has been the failure of those responsible for this outrageous debacle that the Government does not even know who planted castor beans, where they were planted, and it has no other definite records from which to estimate losses or make adjustments even if such adjustments are

allowed by law. To allow the guilty to escape under such conditions, where thousands of citizens, some of them poor and needy, are financially injured, would be a travesty without parallel in public annals. If the whole scheme had been definitely planned for turning the farmers of the country into Bolsheviks it is hard to conceive how affairs could have been more effectively conducted. When you have carefully considered the evidence the question will inevitably arise: Is all this chaos the result of incompetency and inefficiency or was the outcome skillfully planned by some architect?

In justice to the reputations and good names of the officers who are innocent of wrongdoing, common justice demands immediate investigation and the fixing of the responsibility. This is a case where the "buck" must be passed upward as far as necessary and not downward to some "buck private." The reports which have been suppressed not only detail the facts but cite documentary evidence and name the witnesses necessary to sustain charges before a court-martial or in criminal courts. Before the Government is asked to pay out millions of dollars as a gratuity to those who have suffered, it is a pertinent question to ask, Who is responsible?

In response to Bulletin No. 30, from The Adjutant General of the Army, calling upon the officers of the Bureau of Aircraft Production to volunteer for the fighting line, I have the distinction of being one of the seven out of the 350 officers in the bureau who responded to the call and on October 4, 1918, I was transferred to the Infantry. The fact that some one else is charged with protecting the interests of the Government in the premises and however much I would care to be relieved from the presentation of facts which have already been disclosed to officials in authority will not deter me, as an American citizen, from guarding the Government's interests and honor until some responsible official has acted.

In my private professional life it has been a fixed policy that, when mala fides is discovered, to leave no stone unturned until the truth had been brought to light. In this case, where a high officer of the Army who was informed of the truth attempted to hold over me the fear of a court-martial because of my efforts in the line of duty and in keeping with my oath of office, and where an officer of the military intelligence branch attached to the proposition until some one in authority has acted in behalf of the Government will not be diminished.

If the men charged with the handling of the funds to be used in this enterprise had been turned into the Treasury with shovels and had been ordered to throw away the taxpayers' money, the waste would not have been greater than was actually squandered, to say nothing of the fraud and deceit which were practiced on the contractors and farmers. Almost from the time the undertaking was launched letters and telegrams of warning and protests were received by the castor-bean section. Complaints were received from every section where the castor beans were being planted. Protests from the field forces of the Department of Agriculture and the recommendations unanimously adopted at a joint conference of the field men of the Department of Agriculture and the field men of the Signal Corps were ignored. Bitter controversies arose with the heads of the college-extension branch of the Department of Agriculture in different States where the beans were being planted, and a serious four-sided controversy arose in California between the castor-bean section, the Department of Agriculture, the University of California, and the contractors, until patriotic citizens of that State responded and planted a larger acreage than was requested, regardless of financial consequences.

As already pointed out, the bulk of the acreage was planted in a State where reports showed experiments in the cultivation of castor beans had proven a failure, and contracts in Oklahoma and the Middle West, where castor beans had been successfully raised, were refused; and it was only after frequent protests and late in the season that small acreages were assigned to this section. The shipment of seed to one of the contractors in Texas was delayed for weeks after tractors had been wired, and, in spite of warnings that such might happen, these seed were not delivered until the season for successful planting had passed. "Blue-sky" literature, instead of the conservative information in hand, was circulated in official bulletins and authorized interviews. Although it was patent that the enterprise would result in a failure which would prove disastrous to the growers and to the Government, regardless of advice that a detailed record of the growings was necessary as economic history and for the protection of the Government in the event claims should later be filed against it by the growers, inspectors in the field were directed not to make a detailed report of the growings they inspected, with the result that the physical evidence to support the claims now being filed by the growers is lost.

The complete failure of the enterprise is evidenced by the fact that the growers are now filing claims against the Government, and, although the cost of the crop to the Government is already fabulous, the Treasury will be called upon to contribute to losses which were not only preventable but to guard against which there was timely warning. The conditions were such as would not have been tolerated in private business by the laws of the land, and surely there is ample law to protect the Government, and every responsible officer who was familiar with the conditions or whose duty it was to be familiar with them is guilty of neglect of duty and criminal negligence and should be called to account.

Finding that my reports were being suppressed and that false and misleading reports were being transmitted to higher authorities and to our allies, even to the extent of reporting large acreages planted where the ground had not been broken or the seed distributed, I complied with the conditions prescribed by the one hundred and twenty-first article of war, a law of the land which gives an officer or an enlisted man the inviolable right of appeal to the commanding general. On or about July 1, 1918, I sent a telegram to Mr. John D. Ryan, director of the Bureau of Aircraft Production, setting forth my compliance with the one hundred and twenty-first article of war and requesting that the reports and telegrams I had sent to the castor-bean section be investigated. I was promptly ordered to report to Washington and transferred to another department of the bureau, and, although I held the rank of captain, I was placed under the command of a lieutenant of the military intelligence section and formerly a police officer. An executive officer of the bureau, formerly a captain and now a lieutenant colonel, informed me that an attempt to go around a superior officer, no matter what was happening, would not be tolerated even to the extent of allowing me a hearing, and that I could get nowhere under the one hundred and twenty-first article of war in the bureau; that he had been in the Army six years, and that he had never heard of an officer attempting to take advantage of it. However, this officer was furnished with sufficient facts to remedy the conditions if he had so desired.

This officer of the military intelligence branch informed me that the Hughes investigation would accomplish nothing, and about the same

time an order was issued in the Bureau of Aircraft Production which would forbid officers from giving information to the Hughes committee except through military channels, one of the executive officers of the bureau being named as the liaison officer. I was told by the military intelligence officer that conditions in the Bureau of Aircraft Production could not be remedied; that Borglum had tried and he had failed; that President Wilson had been appealed to, and he could not correct them; that Judge Hughes would accomplish nothing; and that I was "batty" if I attempted to go any further about the castor-bean situation.

However, my nominal attachment to the military intelligence branch afforded me a military channel, and I prepared a résumé of the situation for the signature of Mr. Edmund Leigh, chief of the plant-protection section, military intelligence branch, and directed to Mr. W. C. Potter, acting director, and to this letter documentary evidence was attached and in the letter witnesses were named. The military intelligence officer to whom I have referred, and who had full charge of military intelligence work in the Bureau of Aircraft Production, attempted various methods of intimidation to prevent this report from being made, and, although I was his superior officer, he directed that no communication prepared by me would be sent out without his signature. Having been placed under the orders of a junior officer by the executive authorities of the bureau, I placed the report in a sealed envelope, marked "Confidential," and directed to Mr. Edmund Leigh, whom I personally informed as to the nature and contents of the report and where it would be found. Whether or not the telegram I have mentioned ever reached the hands of Mr. Ryan and whether or not my report intended for Mr. Potter finally reached him I have no means of knowing.

As a result of my activities to prevent disaster to the Government and the castor-bean growers and to our Army and to our allies, who were depending on the castor-bean section for castor oil had the war lasted, which disaster was forecasted in my reports, and which disaster has happened so far as the castor-bean section is concerned, my rating as an officer was marked down from 75 per cent to 70 per cent and the annotation made on my military record: "This officer lacks vision." And while it may have been merely incidental, and while I do not state it as a fact, my final rating when I left the service was not made by my commanding officer, as prescribed, but I was informed that this rating was made by an officer who was at one time an officer in the Prussian Army and who had been turned back from France after he had gotten that far in command of American troops. This rating card is now on file in the office of The Adjutant General of the Army and the facts may be investigated and the results of the inquiry may speak for themselves.

In matters that affect the very-life of the Nation the personal equation is of small moment and is cited only for the purpose of showing the difficulties which conscientious men sometimes encounter. I was 45 years old when the war started, and my services, therefore, were purely voluntary. The statement has been frequently made that officers in the Bureau of Aircraft Production deplored the fact that young officers who had been in training camps could not get to the firing line. As I have already stated, when the public was criticizing the situation Bulletin No. 30, dated August 16, 1918, was issued by The Adjutant General of the Army and promulgated in the Bureau of Aircraft Production, formally and officially offering all officers the privilege of making application for transfer to the Infantry. I make no criticism of any man who did not take advantage of the opportunity of placing himself on record by filing an application, but in justification of my military record, if it needs any justification, I will say that the record in that particular is made up, and it is a historical fact that I was one of the seven of some three hundred and fifty officers in the bureau who accepted the transfer.

Aside from the high-handed use of power to smother and stifle the truth, there is a specific case cited in my reports, where the names and witnesses are mentioned, in which the castor-bean-growing section procured the arrest of a Mississippi farmer who refused further entry upon his lands on the heinous charge of violating the espionage laws. This was the first and only time that the acts and doings of the castor-bean-growing section have stood before the bar of justice, and there the indictment against this helpless farmer, with the power of the Government in the hands of the castor-bean-growing section arrayed against him, was quashed, and before the same court the men acting under the direction of the castor-bean-growing section were themselves arrested, tried, convicted, and fined.

The oath of an Army officer is to defend the Constitution and laws of the United States, and it is not a question for argument that the Articles of War are laws enacted by Congress for the guidance of the Army. The one hundred and twenty-first article of war provides a method for direct appeal to the commanding general by an enlisted man or officer when military channels fail to function, and if officers of the Army can with impunity take upon themselves the authority to abrogate the laws of the Nation and treat the acts of Congress with contempt, those in power who fail to correct the evil will be defending in Washington a militarism which the overseas men gave their lives to destroy, and unless such a spirit and such a system have been destroyed in the American Army the world war will have been fought in vain.

I offer no apology for the length of this letter, since formal reports, with cold facts and burning statistics, are seemingly pigeonholed. The allegations contained in my reports are facts, and if they are questioned in any particular I am prepared to cite documentary evidence or name witnesses. My first report was filed March 21, 1918, and other reports have been filed as often as necessary. They have been in the Bureau of Aircraft Production to prove that some one has been guilty of neglect of duty in not questioning them, if they could be questioned. For the honor of the Government and for the sake of the reputations of men who are innocent, I insist that these reports be acted upon; and while I have no objection to anything I have written being shown to any person, nothing can be accomplished by referring the matter to those whose conduct is involved, unless it be for a reply by indorsement.

Things that concern the Government concern every American citizen, and the truth must be brought out. Are the enemies of truth so strongly entrenched as to allow to go unchallenged the statement of a military intelligence officer that conditions in the Bureau of Aircraft Production can not be remedied, that Borglum had tried and he had failed, that President Wilson had been appealed to and he could not correct them, that Judge Hughes could accomplish nothing?

I will say further that if the truth about the Bureau of Aircraft Production is desired, when an investigation is on record the order appointing a high military official of the bureau as liaison officer between the bureau and the investigating body and send a questionnaire to each member of the present and past personnel of the bureau, assuring them of immunity and inviting them to give information.

With the end in view of finding some one to whom incompetency, stupid inefficiency, willful misrepresentations, suppression of the truth, and Prussian methods are hateful, I brought the situation to your attention in my letter of the 23d ultimo, and I again request that action be taken.

Very respectfully,

H. L. SCAIFE.

Mr. WINGO and Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY addressed the Chair. Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to the floor, am I not?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserved the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Illinois reserved the balance of his time.

Mr. WINGO. Yes; but I addressed the Chair and was recognized, and under the rules I am entitled to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman; the Chair recognized him for the purpose of inquiring for what purpose he was addressing the Chair. The time of the gentleman from Illinois is reserved.

Mr. WINGO. I did not hear the Chair put any limitation on my recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman for the purpose of inquiring his purpose.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Illinois having yielded the floor when no time is allotted, is not the gentleman from Arkansas entitled to the floor?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I reserved the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What difference does that make? The time was not allotted under any agreement.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. A motion to rise at any time is in order.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chairman stated that he was in doubt.

The committee divided; and there were—98 ayes and 114 noes.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 96 ayes and 98 noes.

So the committee refused to rise.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] three minutes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I was quite sure that my distinguished friend from Illinois would never take part in the filibuster in the House at this hour which is seeking to prevent consideration by the American Congress of a most important resolution that has been reported favorably by two committees of Congress and for which 90 per cent of the membership of this House has been waiting all day long to vote. I refer to the so-called Irish resolution. I here and now desire to advise the political party which is attempting to throttle that resolution that the party, mayhap, is fooling with dynamite. Shame on the men who would juggle with liberty and justice for Ireland! I appeal to this House to stop its nonsense on the last day of the session, get down to business, and consider the resolution in favor of freedom for a people that has suffered for seven centuries [applause], and let the word go forth to the world that the American Congress believed in its President when he said we entered the war to make the small nations free.

Remember, sir, that the whole country is awaiting the action of Congress on this resolution, and that the long suffering, liberty loving sons of the Gael, whether they still abide in the land of their birth or are here in our own America enjoying the privileges of citizenship and breathing the air of freedom, are in prayer even at this hour that Ireland may be released from British thralldom. [Applause.]

I ask you, sir, why can not Ireland, as well as other maltreated lands, have a fair hearing and fair play at Paris? I am glad to raise my voice here in the Congress of the United States in emphatic protest against ruthless and unceremonious discrimination toward Ireland's appeal. Let us get busy now and pass the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I can not quite understand the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] when he seeks to place upon this side of the Chamber the responsibility for the delay in voting on what we have hoped to vote upon for the last year, the resolution known as the Irish resolution.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I have only three minutes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I never mentioned which party I had in mind.

Mr. KNUTSON. He did not mean the Republican Party.

Mr. MASON. All I want to say is that that resolution has been pending before the House for a year, ever since the President announced his 14 points and ever since he spoke in favor of self-determination. I had the honor of introducing one of the resolutions. The gentleman's own party has control of the committee that has slept and slept. We were informed through grapevine sources that as soon as the President paid his social visit to the United States [laughter] that possibly we would be permitted to vote upon this question. It has slumbered not in a Republican committee, and I now ask unanimous consent to take that resolution from the Committee on Rules and put it on its passage, and let the man object who wants to.

Mr. MANN. I did not yield to the gentleman for that purpose, but if I had it would not do any good, for we are in Committee of the Whole and can not in committee take things from other committees.

Mr. MASON. The people are ready to vote on the question. It does not reflect upon the honor or the integrity of our ally. It is merely an expression of opinion of one branch of Congress, such as has been indulged in for a hundred years, and it has never been a cause of war. It has not been a suggestion of unfriendliness. It was used years ago as an expression in the interest of Greece. It has been used eight or ten times as an expression of hope of independence for South Africa, for the different States of South America, as they came out from under the yoke of Spain. All I want to say is that I thought from the gesture that the gentleman made he was looking upon this side of the Chamber, and I simply ask him to put his own house in order before he dusts the front chamber in mine.

Mr. KNUTSON. He was looking over here for assistance.

Mr. MASON. I will give it to him if he can get up the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Will not the gentleman ask his colleague [Mr. MANN] for unanimous consent to make a motion that the committee rise so that we can get into the House, so that we can take the resolution up in the House?

Mr. MASON. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], my friend and colleague, a Democrat, and I a Republican, if he had been anxious to get this up, being in the majority, should have been able to do it. Why has he not procured from his committee some action?

Mr. SABATH. I have secured the action from the committee.

Mr. MASON. I have just now asked unanimous consent—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] yield to me?

Mr. MANN. Wait until I make a suggestion. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask purely for the purpose of information when the program was shifted?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman please state when the program was arranged?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That I do not know. The gentleman understands that I am for this resolution.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield? He is speaking about a program. What program? Is there some secret program that the House is not aware of?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Not that I know of, except what was published in the newspapers. I understood that the first resolution that was to be called up, as a report from the Committee on Rules, was the bill making in order the Lane land bill.

Mr. RIORDAN. Who has charge of that bill in committee?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The chairman of the committee, of course.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. The gentleman and I are both members of that committee and I am sure we have the

same impression as to the program, that the soldiers' land bill was the first to come up, that the second was the retirement bill, and the third was the Irish resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No; the third was the deportation bill.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I will say the chairman of the committee was taken sick in the early hours of the night and left, requesting me to present two of these resolutions. The gentleman from New York has the rule on the Irish resolution. I have been trying to get recognition and will continue throughout the night to try to get recognition for these other two rules in the order named. The soldiers' land bill first—

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman talks about a program. I will say that I went to the Speaker and asked for recognition to suspend the rules when the time arrived at which that could be done, and the Speaker agreed to recognize me to move to suspend the rules and take up a measure and move its passage, and I determined to make the motion to suspend the rules and take up the Irish resolution that we have been here all evening trying to bring before the House, and to urge this House to suspend the rules. We have been kept from doing it by a foolish filibuster that has been going on over on the Republican side for the last two or three hours.

Mr. MANN. I do not know about that.

Mr. MASON. Has the filibuster kept you for a year?

Mr. FLOOD. This measure could be passed now. If the Republican side wants this to pass it can pass to-night.

Mr. BAER. We want some time to discuss it.

Mr. FLOOD. You have 40 minutes to discuss it.

Mr. MASON. It does not need discussion.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. My own personal attitude toward this resolution is that I am favorable to it. The gentleman says he will move to suspend the rules. The Committee on Rules has nothing to do with that, but I do not wish after a program has been arranged by the Committee on Rules and after an agreement has been entered into as to which resolution shall be presented first, although the first two rules that are to be presented are rules to which I am opposed—

Mr. RIORDAN. Will the gentleman yield to me? I am in control of the rule for the Irish question, and I have kept my agreement to the letter. I do not think some of the other gentlemen who have been parties to the agreement have been on the square with the agreement. I have kept my agreement to the letter, as I keep every agreement I make. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not believe that the gentleman from New York ever violated an agreement in his life, knowing him as I do.

Mr. RIORDAN. No; he is trying to hold to this one, and I will hold to it up to the breaking point, but it is pretty close to that point now.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. RIORDAN. Just precisely what I say, that this question has not been treated fairly. Every subterfuge has been used here to-night for the purpose of keeping this rule out of a position where it could be considered. This and the retirement rule have been kept out by a subterfuge. There is no question, as it is fairly apparent to everybody.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am not a party.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course the gentleman from Tennessee is not a party to it. All we have to do is to have an opportunity to move to suspend the rules and take this Irish resolution up under suspension of the rules and pass it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. With that the Committee on Rules has absolutely nothing to do.

Mr. FLOOD. If you will vote that this committee rise it can be done inside of 45 minutes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield me further time.

Mr. MANN. How much time did I yield the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Three minutes.

Mr. MANN. I yield him three minutes more.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman from Tennessee to remind the membership here that the first rule to be taken up is the Lane reclamation bill, upon which there was three hours of general debate.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. There is no doubt about that; everybody agrees to that.

Mr. GALLIVAN. The House has often overturned the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Committee on Rules is peculiarly the servant of the House, and the House may certainly, if it

desires, overturn and very properly disregard the program arranged by it and pass this Irish resolution. But I do not like to be deceived about the program. I told those gentlemen who have talked to me the order in which the rules were to be called up. I have told them the rules to which I was opposed. Mr. GALLIVAN. The gentleman never told me about any program.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I told the gentleman about the Irish resolution. I told the gentleman fully about the order the Committee on Rules had arranged.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If it was the program to take up the reclamation bill and the civil-service retirement bill, what chance has the Irish resolution for going through this session?

Mr. RIORDAN. It was done orderly through the committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. FLOOD. I want to say to the members of the committee that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY] is going to once more move that the committee rise. Those who are in favor of the Irish resolution will vote to rise. Those who are opposed to it will vote that the committee stay in session. We are willing to put it to that test.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let me ask the gentleman—

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There is no doubt about my going on record, but I would like to ask, after this is over, what is coming up next?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We will take a chance on that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is all right, but I would like to be able to give somebody some information when I am asked as to what is coming up next.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the noble old warrior, Mr. McLAUGHLIN.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to blame either side of this House—

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania. I do not yield. I have not started yet. I do not desire to yield until I start, at least.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania. Indeed, I do.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in this Irish question since July 25, 1917. I introduced a resolution then. It was not all that I would like to have for Ireland, but it was asking for the same measure of justice for Ireland that Canada, Australia, and South Africa had then and now have. It was introduced as a war measure and not as a final settlement of the Irish question. I believe that Ireland would reap great and immediate advantages from it, and that these advantages would be reflected in greatly increased enthusiasm by Ireland's sons in the cause for which we went to war, for the right of weak peoples and small nations. I would like to ask if Ireland is not one of the small nations that has been persecuted for 700 years? [Applause.] The party in power is in a great hurry now. I have been in the same kind of a hurry that they are trying to manifest now for over a year. This resolution was reported out of committee sometime about four weeks ago.

I asked to-night for one minute of whatever time was allowed on the Irish resolution, and I could not get it. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs said it was all gone. Such an important question as that will, to my mind, make for the peace of the world, because there will be no peace if Ireland is not included in this agreement with other countries. [Applause.] Therefore, gentlemen, I trust that this resolution will have the unanimous vote of the American Congress, which speaks for all free people. And I trust also that Ireland will get what the other small countries have succeeded in getting by the sword. We have paid our debt to France; let us now pay our debt to Ireland [applause], for Ireland has done so much for America.

Mr. Speaker, at this turning of the tide in human affairs this House can make no decision more vital to the happiness of millions—even of millions yet unborn—than a favorable decision on the right of Ireland to inclusion among those nations now granted, through the power of the sword, the right of self-determination.

The right of Ireland to liberty does not rest upon the power of the sword. Through 800 years of defeat and slander, through wars and famines, through the long blight of illiteracy enforced by statutes, through the darkness of an exile which scattered its children as are the leaves of the forest and dispersed them as that other race was dispersed which fled from

the task of making bricks without straw, the Irish have followed the ark of their liberties through the wilderness of denial and have clung fast to their faith that one day their Zion of freedom, too, would be restored to their keeping.

THE CLAIM OF IRELAND THE OLDEST.

The claim of Ireland to self-determination is not of yesterday. Its right reaches back beyond the dawn of history. It is written in the annals of every nation in northern and western Europe that from the seventh to the ninth centuries the schools of Ireland sent forth missionaries, teachers, lawyers, physicians, philosophers. Alfred the Great was educated in an Irish school, and the foremost names in European scholarship in those dark ages were Irish names.

The Anglo-Normans came to Ireland upon the invitation of an Irish prince, upon the pretense of establishing his right to the throne, and until the reign of Elizabeth all relations between Ireland and the English Government were justified by treaties between independent princes, or Irish kings, and English ambassadors or agents. The nationality of Ireland was recognized during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by both the French and Spanish Governments. A treaty was made by the Spanish Government with the Irish Government, established in Kilkenny in 1641, and as late as the opening of the nineteenth century Napoleon treated with the agents of the Irish people as with an independent nation.

In fact, I can find no record of any nation acknowledging the overlordship of England in any question linking Irish affairs with foreign policy. During our own Revolution communications were exchanged between the representatives of the Irish people and the Continental Congress. Congress, through Benjamin Franklin, officially thanked the people of Ireland for their sympathy, and the foremost leaders of the Irish people on the floor of the Irish Parliament boldly declared that the heart of Ireland was with the Colonies in their fight for self-determination.

The existence of an Irish Parliament until 1801 is in itself an irrefutable constitutional and statutory acknowledgment by England of the distinct national entity of Ireland.

The Republic of Poland—now formed—has had no legislative assembly to keep distinct its national form since its partition from Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The Republic of Bohemia—now shaping itself as a result of the war—has been submerged, without a semblance of representative symbols, for more than two centuries. The Jugo-Slavs—arising like a Phoenix from the ashes of destruction, only emerging from the rule of the Turk within the lifetime of men still living—have yet to lift their nation from its cradle. The Jews—whose dream of returning to the ancient land as sovereign citizens, whose aspirations have been deemed mystical—have been given the promise of the great nations—even the pledged word of Great Britain—that they shall be restored to the promised land and be granted, too, the right of self-determination.

Shall Ireland, the oldest of the small nations, be denied this right? For Ireland is not only the oldest of the small nations, she is the largest geographically, and, excepting Belgium, the largest in population. Ireland pays more taxes than either Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, or Greece. Her influence on the course of civilization has been more powerful than that of any of the small nations except Greece, and her power to-day, socially, intellectually, industrially, and spiritually—even though deprived of her political sovereignty—is without parallel in the history of nations, large or small.

THE IRISH QUESTION AN AMERICAN ISSUE.

Great Britain has habitually, consistently, and often vigorously offered her suggestions to other nations regarding their internal administration. It would accord with the policy of all great States were America to offer friendly counsel in the endeavor to secure self-determination for Ireland. For the Irish question is now a world question, as it has been for generations an American question.

The maladies that have afflicted the world are about to be remedied in a great council of statesmen—physicians of the body politic. It is a truth of all curative statesmanship, as well as of all remedial science, that the affliction of pain in the remotest part affects the health of the whole structure. America can be neither healthy nor happy until Ireland is restored to full vigor of national health, because the blood of millions in America is Irish blood; myriad hearts that beat faithfully and strongly in every hour of our national peril were Irish hearts, and the very soul of countless deeds in our history were reflections or inspirations of an Irish soul.

It is needless to dwell on the commingling of the Irish race with the other elements of American citizenship; on the early Irish emigrants; on the Irish soldiers in our Revolution, in our

Civil War; on the man-made Irish famine, which saw nearly the whole population of Ireland turned into toilers; and it was these toilers who built our railroads across the continent, peopled our waste places, and gave brains and brawn to that vast industrial system which made America wealthy, and which has prompted her to extend her freedom to the oppressed peoples of the world.

There is a deep meaning in this exhibition of Irish character in the creation of America's power and in the formation and administration of America's institutions. Can any just mind deny that a race which has done so much for its adopted country could do less for its cradle land?

The public opinion of America has agreed with that of many of the wisest Englishmen, such as Lord Byron, Rev. Sydney Smith, Charles James Fox, and Mr. Gladstone, that the union of Ireland and England is that of the "shark with his prey." This opinion has been officially recognized in state papers of American statesmen, in the platforms of our national parties, and on the floor of Congress, Charles Stewart Parnell in 1879, receiving an official tribute to the justice of the cause of his country.

It has been written by investigators who derive their conclusions from the census figures, that every fourth person in the United States can trace the source of his origin, either direct or remote, to Ireland. It is incontestably true that the majority of the Irish race are Americans, with no divided allegiance, but with an imperishable loyalty to that freedom for which their fathers have toiled, and hoped, and died. Here they have received the citizenship they have been denied there. The broken promises—the bitter misfortunes—which have closed the door of hope just as their feet have trod the threshold—have fixed the conviction of the Irish people, in whatever country they may dwell, that only the hand of America can unlock the gates of Irish liberty.

The sentiment of the American Republic is entitled to find expression, not only on the floor of this Congress, but wherever the laws of justice are broken and the rules of humanity are defied. The continued binding of the chains of servitude upon the spirit of Irish freedom would outrage the public opinion of the world, and would perpetuate that animosity which must ever exist where any race or any nation persists in trampling upon the rights of another.

No leader of public opinion, no member of any legislative body, no thinking American, can ignore the effect that the settlement of the Irish question would have, not only upon the relations between England and America, but upon the tranquillity and confidence which must exist within any nation which desires to preserve friendship with another.

OUR DEBT TO IRELAND.

We have paid our debt to France. Our soldiers and our fleets have steadied the wavering lines of England in the most perilous hour in her history. Indeed, it is declared by some that we have saved the British Empire.

Let us now pay our debt to Ireland. What is that debt? It is too vast to comprehend, for wherever the eye may look, wherever the thought may wander, wherever the foot may tread or the hand touch in America, wherever the imagination may take its flight—there will be present something to show that an Irishman lived or an Irishman died.

There are material and physical reasons why our debt to Ireland is so vast. But the reasons that should guide the course of America are those of an immortal similarity of sentiment, which has bound the spirit, the intellect, and the aspirations of the two countries in kindly friendship.

The debt that we owe to the political thinkers of Ireland would justify every sacrifice we could make for its payment. Did not Jefferson receive from Molyneux, an Irishman, the ideas, the principles, the very words, of the Declaration of Independence?

Did not Burke, an Irishman, thunder against the taxing of the Colonies? What we call English literature blazes with the fire of Irish genius. Have not the people which inhabit all the nations speaking our language been called the Anglo-Celtic race, because of the immense admixture of Irish elements? Does not every legislative assembly owe a debt to the dauntless championship of just laws, to the eloquent enlightenment of Irish leadership, and to the ideas and progressive boldness which characterize the Irish vision? Does not every battle field of America speak with silent appeal for gratitude to Irish valor? Does not the contribution in this war, the instant and loyal eagerness of the Irish in America to die for the Republic, merit this token of appreciation?

But above all it is the duty of America to lift up fallen freedom wherever it may be prostrate in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I will conclude with the same request I made in my talk before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I appeal for your favorable action on this resolution—appeal to your high sense of justice and real Americanism—that the call of Ireland may be answered—that she may enjoy the realization of a deathless ideal—Ireland a nation!

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Virginia [Mr. Flood], who reported the Irish resolution sometime ago, never said anything about it on the floor of the House. So far as I know, no one else over there had said anything about it until I took the floor and gave them the opportunity. [Applause.] They have had the power but lacked the nerve to even talk on the subject until to-night.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. MANN. And then I yielded them the time. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask the gentleman if he knows whether anything was said about this question at the White House dinner the other evening?

Mr. MANN. I was not there. I only know what I have been told, and I never repeat a private conversation under any circumstances.

Now, the program for the evening was, first, to take care of some conference reports and the wheat bill, and two or three private omnibus pension bills of the House with Senate amendments. I have been in this House a good while and never have seen and never propose to see, if I can prevent it, in the last 24 hours of a session an occasion when the opposite side, if they are in a majority, shall bring up what they please without any consultation with the minority side of the House. [Applause.] People wait, and wait, and wait all during a session of Congress, and then they think, perhaps, they can arrange a program and put it through as they please. They can not do it in the last 24 hours of a session unless the minority is taken into their confidence and made a part of the program.

Now, I was told through the newspapers that the Committee on Rules had agreed to report four rules, in the following order: First, on the reclamation bill, with three hours' general debate, and unlimited debate under the five-minute rule, and under a rule which would throw the House into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on anybody's demand for the regular order. If that rule had been adopted or should be adopted I do not think you could even make a motion to suspend the rules.

It is a rule that the House shall automatically resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, and it is a long-enough bill to take a long time on under the five-minute rule after you use up three hours in general debate, and I question very much whether there could be three hours' general debate on that with a quorum present between now and to-morrow at 12 o'clock. This is the legislative day of the 3d of March, and 12 o'clock to-morrow is 12 o'clock on the 4th, when the 3d ends legislatively.

I have seen so often, both when the Republicans and when the Democrats have been in the majority, a buffer bill introduced to become the regular order, with no expectation or intention to pass it, but solely for the purpose of keeping the House from considering anything else. I remember once—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman mention the other bills?

Mr. MANN. Well, another bill was the retirement bill, and another was the alien-deportation bill, and the fourth in order was the Irish bill. I am not sure, but that is my recollection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. With an hour and a half on the retirement bill, I think. I want to say to the gentleman—

Mr. MANN. It would not make any difference how much time was allowed on any except the first, because the first would still be pending when the gavel comes down and the Speaker declares that the Congress is adjourned sine die.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman says that he had his information from the newspapers. I want to say to the gentleman that I am surprised at the accuracy of the information given the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Well, evidently the Committee on Rules—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is absolutely correct.

Mr. MANN. Evidently the Committee on Rules furnished the information directly to the newspapers, although I had not heard anyone in the House say anything to me which contradicted the idea that I gathered from the newspapers.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. I want to ask the gentleman if the minority members of the committee could not have notified the leader of the minority concerning the program?

Mr. MANN. Well, they usually notify me of what takes place. I do not think that in this case they notified me of the order, because I already knew it from the newspapers before I had a chance to see the minority members of the Committee on Rules. The minority members of the Committee on Rules usually undertake to keep the minority leader acquainted with what takes place in the Committee on Rules. I knew enough from long experience here to know that if that rule was adopted you could write over the door—

Abandon hope, all ye who enter here—

and I am frank to say that under such circumstances I have not endeavored to expedite the unusual business of the House until I knew what was going to come up.

What is the situation now? What we are really waiting for here is the general deficiency bill. It ought to be passed. I do not know whether it is going to pass the Senate or not. So far as I can learn, nobody else knows. If it does not pass the Senate pretty soon, it probably will not pass and become a law.

Now, gentlemen, I think we have a little time while we are waiting. There are two or three men in this House who are going out, whom I am very anxious to hear from. There are some as to whom I am not so particular whether I hear from them, although they all have my good wishes. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. I yield 10 minutes to our fine, splendid Member from Missouri [Mr. DECKER].

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the leader of the Republican Party both in title and in fact, for his kindness in yielding me some time. It is true that I am going out of Congress, and I am not like some of those who would have people believe that they are going out without regret.

Since my entrance into this great body it has been my desire to be of service. It is my desire to-night to be of service. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] took up an hour of the time of this body to-night in talking about castor beans and about the mistakes made in the great war for human liberty that has been triumphantly won. While he was consuming that hour in finding fault about matters not concerned with the measure before the House, which was the bill called up by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], I did ask for 10 minutes to speak against that bill.

But I have learned, what everybody knows, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was not consuming an hour of the time of this House for the purpose of throwing light upon the bill which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] had called up, but for some other purpose which I did not then understand. Until the gavel falls to-day at noon I have the desire to be of service to my country, and in an humble way to be of service to my fellow citizens and to the people of this world, and I would be derelict in my duty if I consumed a moment's time at this hour of the night and prevented, as other gentlemen are trying to prevent, the consideration of the great question of human liberty involved in the Irish resolution. [Applause.] Whatever rule has been adopted or whatever the program is, the representatives of a free people still have the power here to-night to change the rule and to talk upon the Irish resolution here and now, and then if we have any time left we should consider the great question involved in the bill fathered by the great Secretary of the Interior, Secretary Lane.

You may not agree with it, you may not believe in its provisions, but you can not deny that the purpose of the bill is noble, for it is to do something for the brave boys who bade good-by to home and native land and crossed the rolling sea to fight for humanity, for human liberty, for the self-determination of little peoples in this world. These boys are coming back. They are coming back to find themselves without employment. We may not have time to pass the bill, but for my part what I have to say between now and the time when the gavel falls will be on the Irish resolution and the Lane bill for the American soldiers who fought for human liberty. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back four minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished soldier, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HEINTZ]. [Applause.]

Mr. HEINTZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words about America. [Applause.]

Upon my return from the battle line in France it was expected by many that I should make a long speech and by others it was hoped that I would make a sensational one. Not only have I no desire to do either, but the inarticulate language of the trenches does not particularly qualify one for speech making. What is more, the problems that I have in mind must be settled by the next Congress, and it would be but an extravagant waste of valuable time for me to lay them fully before this House. There are too many unfinished matters already pending before this session.

But having been in the Army 18 months and in France over 6 months, and in some of the most difficult fighting over there, I think it my duty to offer at least a few of the observations I have made. I wish to say at the start that all the officers with whom I have spoken have agreed to lay aside any personal disappointments and grievances as well as feelings that injustice has been done them, wherever such feelings existed, and, striving for the good of the Nation as a whole, to see that valuable permanent lessons are learned from our very expensive experience; and, indeed, the experience was most costly—more so than most of us think. Later on, when the full realization of the tremendous cost comes upon our citizens, there will be a great clamoring for explanations and investigations, but I fear it will then be too late.

The time to investigate is now, and those who do the investigating should not be members of the Regular Army nor members of this House. They should be civilian soldiers who have had wide experience in business and other affairs of life, who have been in touch with the war situation from its beginning, through the fighting in France and right up to the present time. And if I were called upon for suggestions, I would name three men who, were they able to give sufficient time to it, could investigate the whole war business, both in munitions, in preparation, and in the field, and give an unbiased report that would be of incalculable permanent value to the Nation. Those three men are Col. Frederick Galbraith, of Cincinnati, Lieut. Col. John Greenway, of Arizona, and Maj. David Goodrich, of New York.

Each of these men had a far wider experience with men and affairs than any officer in the Regular Army, with the possible exception of one, and certainly than the Secretary of War. They entered the Army with open minds, have learned more about modern warfare than the vast majority of Regular Army officers, have dealt with and commanded men all their lives, have earning capacities many times greater than that of any officer in the Regular Army or the Secretary of War, and know business and business methods thoroughly. All of them were exempt from the draft, and all of them, at great personal sacrifice, entered the Army at the outbreak of the war.

The various complaints that we hear from officers and soldiers that are voiced on the floor of this House and in the press are not only a waste of time but do a decided harm. There should be one investigation, and one only, and it should be without limit or sympathy. The investigators should be given all the time, money, and resources necessary to glean from the vast mass of chaos the indisputable facts which we must perpetuate as a duty not only to posterity but to those whom we buried in a foreign land and those who come back home broken and shattered.

But there are a few things so patent that no investigation is necessary to prove them, and the one most outstanding is the failure of the Regular Army. It has been repeatedly said that only about 30 per cent of the Regular Army officers were in the zone of the advance. Those who were not, have learned practically nothing of modern warfare. Of those who were in the zone of advance, a great many of them have learned nothing and never will. Their minds too long ago, by reason of years of freedom from competition, indolence, and inactivity, became closed to new ideas. When a civilian officer at the front failed to make good, he was sent to the rear and will go out of the service. What is to happen to the Regular Army officer who failed to make good and to those who never reached the zone of the advance?

Of course I know there are capable men among them, but they are the exception. They should be retained in the service. But is this vast percentage of officers, absolutely unschooled in modern warfare and entirely lacking in front-line experience, to be retained in the Army as the teaching nucleus for our future forces and as the leaders of our future divisions in the field? The very thought is outrageous! [Applause.] Many bright young civilian officers who have made good at the front and who desire to remain in the Regular Army will be denied because of lack of vacancies. The places that they would otherwise be called upon to fill are now occupied by the 70 per cent

of Regular Army officers, most of whom have proved to be "duds."

A particularly progressive brigadier general of the Regular Army told me that when the war broke out there was not a single officer in the American Army, "not one," he said, "who was equal to his job." Now, is it not apparent that if another war should break out to-morrow there would be about 70 per cent of our Regular Army officers about whom the same criticism would apply right now? And the officers themselves are not so much responsible for this condition as many others. Probably nobody is so much to blame as the Members of Congress, unless it be the "peace at any price," "too proud to fight," "peace without victory" elements, that effectively prevented our officers from learning the methods of modern warfare before it was thrust upon them.

There is only one solution, and that is universal service [applause], not only military service but vocational training as well. Our first purpose should be not to develop a nation in arms, but to develop our citizenship. The physical condition of many of the enlisted men that came to us was simply appalling. Worse still, they did not know what their physical condition was. These men have been practically made over and will come back strong in body, healthy in mind, with their productivity and usefulness increased many per cent. One of the greatest compensations that we will have obtained from the war will be the improved citizenship of the returned soldiers.

But many of the returned soldiers have been square pegs in round holes in civilian life, and some will continue to be. It is because they never have had a fair chance. Most young men's life vocations are chosen purely by circumstances or by accident. They have no opportunity to know whether they are fitted for their life's work or whether they will like it, and many of them go through life dissatisfied, disgruntled men, for whom their daily vocations are irksome and compulsory drudgery. The plan of universal service which I shall advocate before the next Congress will be one in which every man, both rich and poor, will be subject to a course of universal service for possibly one year, during which time he will not only be made physically strong and confident and be given a proper amount of military training, but he will learn the work he is best suited for and the work he likes, and will go away with a love of that which he has chosen for his life's work and with the desire to learn more about it. [Applause.]

Officers of the Regular Army will be chosen from this class, just like other vocations are adopted, by reason of aptitude and competition and not by reason of congressional appointment. I am not sure whether the failure of Regular Army officers is due to the method by which they are originally chosen or by the fact that promotions come, and come surely, by reason of seniority instead of by competitive tests. Most of our present brigadier generals in the Regular Army never commanded more than 65 men before the war broke out and never were in a battle. In peace there was no particular need of their studying or working to keep abreast of the times, because they were not subject to competition. Their promotions were assured. Suddenly they had to learn a new business. A major general, for instance, was placed at the head of a business that practically represented over a hundred million dollars in cash, outside the unmeasurable personal value of human life. How could he, who probably never had commanded more than several hundred men at a time, be expected to succeed in this new business except after tremendous and needless loss and sacrifice?

I would like to go into details here, but I cannot. It is a subject that can be properly thrashed out only before the Military Committee of the next Congress, or preferably before an investigating board such as I have suggested. Nothing can be gained by now going into it piecemeal and by citing particular cases. It is not my purpose to blast reputations, however cheap and unworthy a great many of them may prove to be. All we can hope to do now is to arouse public interest in the situation to a sufficient degree that it will demand and be given a thorough investigation of the whole subject, with the idea of bringing about lasting results.

We accomplished a great work. There is no doubt of that, and it was accomplished almost solely by the great fighting spirit of our enlisted man, in spite of the tremendous handicap and unnecessary burdens that he bore. Now, are we going to let this slide and leave in responsible places this 70 per cent of officers who can not possibly render the service that will be required of them in any war that may follow?

In the first place, they will not have the confidence of the men, and that is one thing that was woefully lacking in this war. I think that Gen. Pershing did have their confidence and that he did splendid work. But the men were deprived of the leadership

of one other who enjoyed their confidence and devotion to a remarkable degree, a general whom I have never met and, indeed, have never seen, but in whom I have the utmost confidence. It means at least 50 per cent of the battle—Napoleon says more—that the men have the feeling that they are being led by an able, courageous, red-blooded, fighting commander. After talking with many officers and men, I am convinced that those qualities existed in a superlative degree in one commanding general of our Regular Army, and yet we were denied his leadership. Just who was responsible for the men being cheated of their strongest weapon and the reasons for it should be one of the most important subjects for the investigation that I propose.

Naturally all the fighting men wanted Roosevelt in the field. [Applause.] On that whole front, both British, French, and American, there was not a single eye that would not have brightened nor a pulse that would not have quickened had they been told "T. R. is out here with us." [Applause.] The reasons for our having been deprived of him are, of course, patent. There can be nothing, to my mind, so selfish, so mean, and so unworthy, as politics being allowed to deprive fighting men of the comfort, support, and inspiration they so hungered for while out on the front fighting for their country.

Because Roosevelt was a magnetic leader and an inspiration to fighting men, because he could make the rank and file understand what they were fighting for and that he was fighting with them, was possibly no more to his credit than it is to the discredit of those who have not the same genius. But the fact remains that Roosevelt had it, just the same as Napoleon, Wellington, and Stonewall Jackson had it. It was the one great thing our men yearned for and Congress had granted it to them; yet it was coldly snatched from them and they were given "14 points" and making "the world safe for democracy" instead. Had they only been able to realize that they were fighting with Roosevelt for America, it would have added a new and priceless spirit to their enthusiasm and hitting ability and to their desire to go to the very gates of Berlin.

So I say that I do not endeavor to go into details as to the Army, although many details are available. And the time is all too short; but I beseech every mother, every father, and every relative and friend of our fighting men to help us see to it that if he is ever again sent out to fight for his country, he will not only know what he is fighting for but will have the strength of every weapon that can be furnished him, whether it be material or moral, and that he will not again be left to carry through on his own grit and gameness and upon his own fighting spirit alone. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining? The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 16 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I yield 10 minutes to a gentleman whom we all love to hear, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dies]. [Applause.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I will be as brief as I can in 10 minutes, because I know you have been kept already too long. I am indeed very thankful to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] for this great privilege, and to you, gentlemen, for your courtesy.

I am just about to become a farmer again. You know, Mr. Chairman, I was raised on a farm, and all my life, whether as a newspaper printer's devil or a country editor or a struggling young lawyer or an officeholder, my dream has been that I might amass a competency and go back to the country and follow the plow, feed the pigs, pick up the fresh eggs, and live in the fresh air of the open country in which I was born. [Applause.]

You know my recent experience as a Member of Congress has more nearly endeared me to that country I love than ever before. Now I am positively homesick for Turkey Creek. Now I want to go back, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Congress, more than I ever did before. That wonderfully beautiful stream winds through my pasture its limpid waters to the Gulf, and along its banks are the wonderful woods of that native forest—the beech, the birch, the elm, the oak, the pine, and the dogwood. I want to go back there. I had dreams that some day I might become a Member of Congress and stand where Clay and Randolph stood, that I might serve my country by so doing. But, you know, I never had much ambition to be a rubber stamp. [Laughter and applause.]

Departing, my friends, in these brief moments from pleasant things, and these are pleasant to me, you know nothing in this world will ever give me so much pride as to have served in the Congress of the United States for 10 years. I have met many brainy men here, many lovable characters I have known here, and something tugs at my heartstrings with the thought that to-morrow I take my leave.

But I can not talk 10 minutes without saying some serious words, because there are serious times ahead for this great Republic.

Just now men are clamoring for the consideration of the Irish question, as though the Republic of the United States had not enough to do without the Irish question. Men are clamoring to have the country entangle itself with what? With the integrity of the British Empire. We have no more right to consider the Irish question than the Irish have to consider the American question, or the British have to consider the Philippine question, or Japan has to consider the question of Lower California.

Well, Mr. Chairman, as I have said often on this floor, so often that I am almost ashamed to say it again, this wonderful Republic, with this magnificent territory of America with its millions of hopeful, prosperous sons, God has placed us apart from the enemies that might assault us, with the ocean rolling between us and the wars of destruction in Europe, that we might live here, and our children after us for ages yet unborn, in happiness, peace, and liberty on this hemisphere. We are wonderfully anxious now to mix up with Europe, Asia, and Africa; we are wonderfully anxious to entangle ourselves in the hopes and destiny, with the broils, distractions, and feuds of the animosities of Europe.

You know, as God shall judge me when I stand before Him, and I believe He lives, the best hope of this great Government, the best hope of this great people, and the children yet to be born from the loins of men and the wombs of women, is to live on this hemisphere and attend to our own business, and not mix up in European politics. [Applause.]

When Washington wrote his farewell address he spoke of the feuds and broils of Europe. They are a million times more accentuated to-day than then. How soon will the Frenchman forget his despoiled villages and ruined cathedrals, overrun by the brutal foe? How soon will the Serbians forget the ravages of the Bulgarians? How soon will the rankling hatred in Europe cease? Yet we sit here to-day anxious that we may embroil ourselves in the affairs of Europe!

They say this is provincialism. In my judgment, when the history of this world shall be written in the years yet to come, it may be said truly, as it is said now, that the best example of free Government the world has ever known was between the signing of the Constitution of the United States and the good year 1912. A hundred years, two hundred, and history will write it down that this Republic, these United States, afforded the best opportunity to mankind for liberty, for hope, opened widest the door of opportunity, of any Government that ever existed in the world from the day the Constitution was made to the fateful days of the present.

The future is not given to mortal man to know. That we are departing rapidly from all of the spirit and traditions of this Republic is apparent to every man with an iota of sense. The very proposition here to-night, for the Congress of the United States to take up the Irish question, is no less meddlesome on the part of this Republic than for the Diet of Japan to take up the question of the war between the States, or for the British Empire to take up the question as to whether Japan should release Korea. I only wish, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Congress, that we might have a return to the spirit of democracy, and republicanism. I only wish that the truly great men who have lived on this earth might send their spirits to guide us now. He is a great man who is content to abide the law, who is not so concerned with his own egotism and self-importance that he wants to change the law in order that he may make the change. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Cleveland, Taft, were willing to live under the Constitution and bow in obedience to its mandates and its precepts. A wonderfully good thing it would be for this country, a wonderfully good thing it would be for the parties on both sides of the aisle if they might learn to respect the ancient landmarks which our fathers have set.

Gentlemen, these are my sentiments. They are as deep in my heart as the very blood that flows through it. I love this Republic. I love it because I am familiar with the history of other governments in this world. It is the best that ever existed. I believe yet the old ship of state will right herself, but these be big times in this world, these be times when men ought to be brave. I am almost tempted to say something now that will displease you. You will send your boys out to fight for the flag, you will send your boys to die in France for the flag of your country, and they will die for the flag of their country, on the fields of France, but you Congressmen, will you die politically for your convictions? [Applause.] What sort of courage is it in this America, what is the article of men's courage who will send their sons to the trenches to have their bodies mangled with shells of the enemy, and yet who are not

willing to vote their honest convictions as Members of Congress? That is what is the matter with the Congress of the United States to-day. It is not that you are not intelligent, for you are; it is not that you do not love your country, for you do. The great bane of this body to-day is the want of that courage to take your political lives in your hands and do your duty as God Almighty gives you the vision to see it. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in a speech delivered in the House on February 27, 1919, attacking the present court-martial system of the Army, I stated that the commander in chief of the Expeditionary Forces in France was ignoring and refusing to follow General Order No. 84, issued by his military superior, directing him to refer the records of general courts-martial originating in the Expeditionary Forces to the Acting Judge Advocate General in France, who shall review such records and return to the proper commanding officer such as are incomplete, and to report any defect or irregularity which renders the finding or sentence illegal or void, in whole or in part; to suspend the execution of all sentences involving both dismissal or dishonorable discharge pending such review; to disapprove, modify, or set aside in accordance with the recommendation of the Acting Judge Advocate General any sentence or part thereof found by him to be illegal, defective, or void in whole or in part.

I further stated that he had not complied with a recent order to the same effect. This has evoked a denial from the Secretary of War.

In the report of my speech my remarks concerning these two orders were confused. I admit it. General Order No. 84 was issued September 11, 1918, following Gen. Pershing's refusal in a number of cases to refer the records of courts-martial to the Acting Judge Advocate General in France for review upon the ground that he, as the military commander, had the power to carry the sentences into execution without and regardless of any review by the law officers of the Army. The general order in effect commanded him to carry the sentences of court-martial into execution only after the record of those cases had been received by the law officers and findings modified in accordance with the latter's recommendation. This general order was issued by the military superior of Gen. Pershing, and it was his duty to obey the same without question or delay. But in a number of cases he has refused either to refer the record of cases to the law officer or to follow the latter's recommendation, or to suspend the execution of sentences pending review. His position was shown in the recent case of Corpl. Ivy, which involved a death penalty, where the law officer recommended to him that the record be referred to the President, as Commander in Chief, under Article of War 51, which provided that cases imposing sentences of death must be confirmed by the President before the finding is executed. His attitude in refusing to forward the record of this case led to a recent specific order, cabled by the Secretary of War to him, directing that the record be sent to the President. This was the recent order to which I referred.

To show that the commander in chief and his subordinate military commander are not following in other cases General Order No. 84, I cite—

1. The case of Frederick Huff: The law officer advised the commander in chief to disapprove a finding and sentence because they were illegal, which advice he refused to follow. In this case the law officer held that the accused charged with and tried for the violation of one article of war can not be convicted of the violation of another and wholly different article of war.

2. The case of Pvt. E. J. Mullen: The law officer advised one of the subordinate military commanders that the finding and sentence were illegal because the facts did not show a violation of the article of war under which the man was tried.

In other words, the attitude of the military commanders in France is one of defiance to their military superiors and one of apparent disregard of military justice. They refuse to follow a general order which, in effect, is an order from the President, the Commander in Chief, and they are determined to sentence men regardless of whether the men were legally or justly tried and without appeal.

I have no desire to accuse Gen. Pershing of insubordination, and I do not do so. He is too good a soldier to disobey an order, and he has a right to stand up for his own views, whether right or wrong, and ask for an interpretation of any order.

You will be told, as everybody else will be told, that General Order No. 7 was a remedy for the great wrongs of court-martial injustice. General Order No. 7 is a makeshift. It simply stayed a few sentences until the Judge Advocate General could "advise" with the officer appointing the court-martial in an effort to induce him to preserve the legal rights of an accused.

It is predicated upon the theory that the commanding officer is the sole judge of what is and what is not legal error in the trial of a case before a court-martial. This is the sole contention in Europe right now. Gen. Pershing and the other commanding generals over there contend that they are by law the final authority to determine whether a soldier gets his rights on trial or not, and they contend that it is not even within the power of the President to say that the Judge Advocate General of the Army shall decide such a question.

General Order No. 7 at the time it was adopted was known to be not a remedy but a makeshift and a palliative. This order was drafted by Gen. Crowder, and his own words will best show what he thought of it and why he adopted it. You will find what he thought of it and why he adopted it expressed in paragraph K of Gen. Ansell's letter to Congressman BURNETT, (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 19, 1919, p. 3810). He said it was necessary to adopt this order to head off a "threatened congressional investigation," which was about to come because of agitation and the concurrent happening of the hanging of those negroes in Texas, without review of any kind whatsoever. He said it was "to silence criticism" and also "to prevent talk about the establishment of courts of appeal," and, further, to make it "apparent that an accused did get some kind of revision of his proceedings other than the revision at field headquarters."

In God's name, could a man who could so describe his motive and purpose in getting out such an order believe in the order itself, or believe that anybody would get justice under it?

The question of veracity should never come up between real men, and I hope that in my capacity as a Member of Congress it will never again have to be met, even inferentially. Heretofore in the infrequent cases where anyone has accused me of direct untruth, the statement has brought forth direct action, and I have followed the motto of the marines, "Treat 'em rough."

Every latitude of expression is given on the floor of this House in cases where the veracity of Members has been questioned, but as I do not yet feel that there is any direct issue between the Secretary of War and Gen. Crowder and myself, I shall content myself with a statement of the facts as I believe them to exist. I have hoped that we could be done with wars, arrive at a common foundation of justice, and feel yet that we can achieve that goal. If we can not, the war has given us little vision and little knowledge, and I refuse to accept a challenge which I do not believe has been given, because the question of human rights is involved, and the personal fortunes of any of us should be little considered. This attitude is taken because I have watched the Secretary of War when he was fighting the battle of human rights. He was courageous and I hope will continue to be so.

In the closing days of this Congress, where there is much politics, in which by inclination and choice I shall take little part, I hope the Secretary of War will not be blinded and will not believe that the questions which we have been discussing are political or personal. That can be demonstrated by the fact that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], and many others on the Democratic side of the House have joined with the gentlemen from New York [Messrs. GOULD and SIEGEL] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and other Republicans in a fight for correction of the law.

If the Secretary of War should be blinded to the rights involved, I would say that the life of one of his intimate friends has been wasted and lived in vain. At heart the Secretary of War and I agree, and there is no reason that we should become involved in a controversy affecting the inherent rights of men.

It is not a question which concerns the league of nations, the matter of revenue, and will not be made a party question unless it is made so by the Secretary of War and his advisers. "May I," as heretofore somebody has said, express the hope that there will be no hand grenades thrown, no rifle grenades fired, no extra supply of ammunition used, no S. I. W.'s brought into the controversy either at home or abroad. The Secretary of War will, in my opinion, live up to his heritage, his traditions, and his environment and do the fair and just thing. I say that because I hope to assist him in the choice he is now making. His advisers wish him to demote Gen. Ansell to the rank of lieutenant colonel and degrade him. The Secretary in his heart wishes to put him at the head of his department, because he knows Ansell is right in his contention. I have been informed by newspaper men that demotion has been decided upon. Otherwise I should not now be discussing the question. What will occur if the Secretary of War will not be his own man, a man's man, and a "he" man will be the recall of some officer from France who will outrank Ansell. The plan will be proposed by those who advocated the demotion of Ansell. He is either right

or wrong. If wrong, court-martial him. If right, give him his rights. I can only say that if he is demoted or outranked or court-martialed, he has our respect. If when his children go to school to-morrow they are slurred, because of the demotion of their father, they should know that it took greater courage to fight the moral fight than the physical; more nerve to fight for the rights of humanity than to fight against the bullets of the Hun. And will they always remember that there is no American soldier who wears on his breast the Victoria Cross, the Croix de Guerre, or the Distinguished Service Cross who would not willingly surrender it for merit and courage to their father. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY].

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, this world's history is a chainlike succession of ages descriptive of man's tendencies, activities, and progress at various times.

We have since 1914 witnessed and we have since 1917 gone through a war whose importance and magnitude, to me, are not measured so much by the flagrant atrocities which have been committed in its name, not so much by the number of lives which have been mercilessly sacrificed, not so much by the number of men who have become infirm and crippled thereby, not so much by the injustices which have been perpetrated on womanhood and tender youth, not so much by the extensive and intensive advancement in the machinery of war and in the engines of destruction; no, though all these may be most lamentable, for wars prior to that of the world's war have been atrocious, calamitous, cruel, and wasteful, both of life and property, just as the last, but the vastness, the stupendousness, the immensity, I might say, of the world's war is to be measured by its result to generations, both present and to come, by the force with which it has shaken the world's pillars and undermined the world's foundations.

Useless it is for me to review or depict for you a mental picture or outline the panorama of the past war, because it has been related, painted, and brought out in the boldest of relief, time and time again and by tongues more eloquent and knowing than mine; but what I would draw your attention to is the present period or age, already and properly termed the "age of reconstruction." I will refrain from a discussion of the material, industrial, economic, or commercial reconstruction and will dwell solely on that of political reconstruction—a part of the plan of the drama that is being played at the peace conference table to-day.

By that I mean to identify the phrase "political reconstruction" with the phrase "making the world safe for democracy." I wish to impress upon you the import of the idea of "giving equal opportunities and liberty to all nations, great and small"; I wish to draw conclusions from the principles found in the word "self-determination."

During recent months these terms have been bandied about so much that they seem to have become trite and their meaning has been dimmed by a gossamer web of international sophistries and racial prejudices—or is it by that diplomacy which we have been condemning? But remember, gentlemen of this House, that our stand as a Nation, our position in this war, our pledge to our people and to those of all the world, our status at the conference table—all these rest on those principles enunciated by our Chief Executive, to which we all have given assent, which we all have approved, and of which we have demanded of our enemies, the central powers, recognition of the right of small nations to independent existence as a basis for a lasting peace. These are and have been our principles and with them we stand or fall as a Nation before the eyes of the world in their practical application. They must not become in their application, if not a "scrap of paper," a subterfuge for hypocrisy and high-flung rhetorical statements and embellishments. I say this fearlessly, because I have the firm belief that those principles are well founded in point of history, humanity, right, and justice, and I have the utmost confidence that he who had the stamina to stand forth before the self-destroying world to enunciate those principles as the only basis upon which peace could be considered by the friends of democracy, will also have the honesty of conviction, the firmness of will to see that they are properly applied at Versailles; but a duty half performed is ill performed, a principle which can not be universal in its application is vicious or those applying the same are unjust. Justice and honesty must have both hands turned palms up and outward.

It has been for me food for thought to notice the little activity toward applying these principles of equality, liberty, self-determination, and free democracy in reference to certain peoples and, on the other hand, the enthusiasm and untiring activity toward other peoples. I am not speaking with the

hate of centuries in my heart; I am speaking according to the existing facts and the present conditions of the world. I am not blind or prejudiced in this matter, for I am first and above all and entirely an American, with American thoughts and feelings, but I am willing to be guided and to see the light if I am groping in darkness. I have tried to explain the situation to myself and I have been attempting to solve in my own mind and to reason out the procedure of the ruling nations of to-day in reference to the application of those principles already mentioned. Could the answer be as follows? Is it because certain peoples are or were either with or against us during the past conflict? Is our silence and inactivity toward the application of the principle of self-determination and self-government regarding nations heretofore allied either with England or France or Italy so explained by the fact that they are our friends, that therefore we have no reason to fear them, and that, further, they can wait for another day? And is our enthusiasm and hurried perseverance in applying those principles to other peoples explained by the fact that said peoples were at one time part and parcel of the central powers, that due to the enunciation and propaganda of our principles of democracy as an antidote to those of kultur these nations arose and overthrew the imperialists who lorded it over them? And is it that we feel that it is our sense of justice, righteousness, fair play, and squareness to these people to make our word good with them which makes the allies direct their first efforts to secure for such peoples the freedom, the liberty, and the well-being that we had showed them from afar? If so, good and well. We are all anxious to see Poland rule itself and to see that nation again occupy the place it is entitled to in the sun of nations. Indeed, we long for the day when the Czechoslovaks and the Jugo-Slovaks shall be reunited under their respective banners. Indeed, it would be a blessing to the world to see the races of the Balkans united and living peacefully under their respective rightful colors. Indeed, we owe these peoples a debt of gratitude for the loyalty they have manifested by adhering to the principles and laws of humanity and for having been such very effective forces—if not military, at least moral and political—in the overthrow of the régime of the alleged God State, advocating the dastard principles of imperialism.

But notwithstanding all this and approving both the procedure and the measures, why such slackness, such silence, such fearfulness in advocating the same principles toward peoples who have always been friendly to right government, and who also are entitled to liberty, self-government, and self-determination, and who are entitled by every right, justice, and law to be free and to strive to attain the realization of their natural and national idealism? I have in mind the land to which the consideration of the present resolution refers, the land to which we owe much, the land which has always considered America its second home, even from its island habitation. I refer to the land of "poets and saints"—Ireland. Ireland—is this word a national euphemism? There is no ire natural to that land and there is no reason why ire should come from it. There may be ire in the Irishman's breast, but ire never came from Ireland; it was placed there by foreign hands.

In 1917 we spoke and we enthused our people with the idea of repaying a national honor debt to a sister Republic in her hour of trial, a debt which we acknowledged and which we, thank God, have repaid a thousandfold when our marvelous and spirited boys at Chateau-Thierry, at the Marne, in the Argonne Forest anointed with their blood the land first to see the light of democracy in Europe. Washington and Lafayette in reverence and admiration bowed as the paling lines of horizon blue and khaki brown advanced steadily against the hordes of hell's kultur. If our desire of gratitude to France was so intense and so unreservedly repaid, what ought we not to do to encourage and to assist that land to recover its freedom, that land which sent us her most valiant sons at all times to help us found and establish our democratic institutions? If France deserved well of us for assisting us in 1776, what do we not owe to that land from whose bosom came those to whom France came with assistance? Read the annals of American history; its pages are filled with Irish names. Read the names of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and you will find names that would make you think that a new Ireland was to be founded on Columbia's shore. I say it is only right, just, and worthy of American honor to at least voice our sentiments in behalf of Erin's freedom and to pass this resolution, so that the people of the world may know that we stand unreservedly and impartially behind the principles of democracy to which we have recently reconsecrated ourselves in the last war.

Is it necessary for me to advance arguments to prove to you that Ireland is entitled to self-government? Is it necessary for

me to show that there is nothing preventing or barring her appeal for liberty and that her perennial cry for freedom is only just, right, lawful, and honest? Historically, geographically, and politically Ireland is entitled to self-government. Historically Ireland has always been a nation, *sui generis*, has always held to its racial differences, its national life, customs, and usages, and Ireland has never consented to be bartered, to be subjected, has never been submissive under the rule of her sister island. By what right has one of these islands the power to lord it over the other one? History fails to show. There is no intrinsic reason why Ireland should not govern her sister island, as the latter has from time immemorial. If oppression, cruelty, and injustice confer rights and authority, yes; but if otherwise, never.

From the day that Hugh O'Neill, the Earl of Tyrone, in 1594, rebelled against unwarranted and unlawful oppression, through all succeeding ages Ireland has asserted her right to self-government and has repudiated the rule of England. Follow the long corridor of time and see that continually such has been the stand of Ireland. She has never given up her right to govern herself. And pray where does the right to rule arise? Must I repeat age-old laws to make clear that Ireland's fight is just? Is society simply a conglomeration of beings held together by force and might, or is it a well-ordered union of rational beings trying to make the most of life and attain their life's goal? And, therefore, if authority there must be in society, as the word "well-ordered" presupposes, where does this authority come from? We draw away from the idea of the divine right of kings, but where does this power to rule peoples come from? This power to rule, to administer the law, is of the essence of society, and if of the essence of society it comes from the Almighty. But does Providence confer this power to rule, does He vest authority in whomsoever subjects his neighbor by force, might, oppression, cruelty, dishonesty, and secret diplomacy? God forbid! In whom, then, does this power to rule vest? There is no other alternative—it is vested in him or them whom the people themselves have signified or determined by a free selection and by a choice of their own. Then, I ask, is Ireland's right to govern itself unrighteous and is her present subjection just? Not if there is a God in heaven, not if men live as they were ordained to live. Where in history do you find the Irish people have signified their assent to be ruled by England? Was it during the days of James I, in 1610, the days termed the Plantation of Ulster, the attempt to Anglicize and Protestantize Ireland? Was it during the Irish rebellion of 1641, a result of the acts of James I?

Was it during 1649 to 1652, when England warred upon Ireland, during which period there was attempted the "Cromwellian settlement," now called the "Curse of Cromwell"? Was it under William's reign in 1690, when the Irish again manifested their detestation of England's rule and when was fought the now famous battle of the Boyne? Was it in 1782, during our war for independence, when England, fearful of an Irish upheaval, again showed her guilty hand of unlawful tenure by granting Ireland a pseudo legislative independence which was afterwards handily recalled? Was it in 1869 when England enacted the disestablishment of the Irish Church, which in itself might be overlooked, but which act forced the Irish to maintain the Anglican Church against their wishes, against their right to adore their God according to their free volition? Finally, and particularly, was it in 1800, "when Napoleon coming to the head of affairs in France, there was apprehension on the part of English statesmen lest he should utilize Irish discontent to secure a foothold in the islands, and they resolved to get rid of the Irish Parliament," established in 1782, which resulted in the act of the union, under which England to-day claims the right to rule Ireland? But does not history record the fact that it was only by wholesale bribery that the members of the Irish Parliament were induced to pass a sort of self-denying ordinance whereby the parliament was abolished or rather merged with that of Great Britain? Is this act of the union the Irish people's will? Did they exercise their right of self-determination? I have recited history, permit me to explain, for no other purpose than to prove my contention. "England, of course, has her faults and Ireland has her good points, but reconciliation will never come between two races through writings of a George Bernard Shaw" and certain other writers "when such writings are steeped deep in the hatred of centuries." The application refers as well to English as to Irish writers and enthusiasts. If narrow-minded ideas are going to rule the thoughts of those higher up, what can they expect from those in the ordinary walks of life? I bear no one malice, but I believe in excoriating injustice and unwarranted oppression wheresoever it may be found. But the fact remains that Ireland has demonstrated to the world at all times her desire

to govern itself, and at no time did she ever consent to barter her state rights to England.

Geographically Ireland, lashed by the wild waves on the north and kissed by the Gulf Stream on the south, presents no objection as to territorial boundaries, as to rival claims of neighboring peoples. Her boundaries are by God and nature fixed and not contrived by man's ingenuity. She stands alone in the ocean's blue, as she should stand alone in the world's nations.

Politically the times are ripe. The war has brought it about, and there is no use denying it. The principles we have been advancing of late have simply emphasized Ireland's lifelong cry for freedom. Objections which heretofore might have been offered in reference to Ireland's political and religious complexion are a matter of the past. Some have attempted to say that the Irish question is not a religious or political one, but rather an economic question. At one time it was, I say, threefold—religious, political, and economic; that in time the religious phase has been wiped out, the economic one is fast dwindling, and now the political only remains to be settled. And in this regard I would ask you but one question and let it rest at that. If in 1776 the colonies were justified in declaring their independence and fighting for it, where does the iniquity arise for Irishmen to do the same, especially now that by their last election they have manifested their desire in that direction by electing representatives who stand openly for self-government?

I understand that mandates are necessary to rule the southwest Africans, the Hottentots, the Fiji Islanders, until they have reached that rung in the ladder of civilization which will warrant the nations of the world to grant them self-control. But if the Slavs, the Poles, the Balkan peoples are capable to rule themselves, why can not the Irish? The question may appear puerile; but, believe me, it is to the point. And if certain Anglophiles will kindly peruse the world of letters, art, science, philosophy, commerce, and industries they will come across an Irish name just as often as they do that of any other nationality. Summing it all up, there is nothing plainer than this: If any subject European nation has the right to be free, Ireland has the right.

Therefore the Irish people have manifested, in conformity with the principles heretofore propounded, their desire to govern themselves, "which derives its power from the consent of the governed." Otherwise our own independence is simply words and no more, and our national tenets are simply pretensions. I might go on and ask by what sophistry do we deny the central powers and Russia the right to oppress and rule the Poles, the Czechs, the Finns, and admit the same right regarding England toward the Irish? If the reasoning is sound, then right is not might, as we would have had the world believe, but rather might is right, and the world should have been made safe not for democracy but for despotism and imperialism. But the conclusions drawn are untenable; therefore the premises must fall, and Ireland should be free. Heretofore certain arguments were advanced which the league of nations plan will now render futile.

Remember, my position is not that of asking mercy or craving your support toward an oppressed nation, for the fact that a nation is oppressed does not *ipso facto* right her cause. I speak to you from a standpoint of what is right, just, and lawful. It is the question of the Irish being governed by the English, not to the betterment of the Irish but to further England's purposes. It is that kind of government which we have never approved, which Washington objected to and against which he rebelled, and which Lincoln denounced, and against which America has just recently victoriously fought. Will the fruit of our work be nil? Did not Lincoln state "the world can not live in peace half slave and half free"? Will we, gentlemen of the House, who more closely than any other body of men have witnessed the great effort of America during the past two years, who more than any other American body can realize what it has cost the Nation to be able to stand on the mountain top and say and then to go into the valley of death and die "that democracy must be safe in this world"? Will we suffer the shame that must be our Nation's if we do not assert our firm conviction in the universal and impartial application of that principle? What will generations to come say, after reading the casualty lists and realizing the sacrifice to win this war which it had cost their ancestors, to know that what they fought for was squandered, was bartered? God forbid that such shame should be our country's! Let us stand firm upon the ground we have taken; let us stand firm in the face of cupidity, diplomacy, and false friendship; let us assert our firm convictions, as our boys did on blood-soaked French soil. We have gone over the top as the beacon light of civilization to all oppressed nations; let us not permit any kind of kultur, no matter what its name may be, to dim our light.

Like the boys in Flanders fields, like the boys on the ocean's crest, like the boys in Thierry, like the boys in the Argonne, let us say we know not what retreat or surrender means, either on the fields of battle or in the parliaments of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this Irish resolution may come to a vote before very long because I took the floor on the pending proposition; at least I smoked them out. But, after all, what is it? The House of Representatives can pass a resolution in reference to the freedom of Ireland and transmit it to the President of the United States as an official expression of opinion of the Representatives elect of the American people. But is that the proposition? Oh, not at all. There was a joint resolution introduced which would have required to be passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, however, did not report a joint resolution, I suppose evidently intending to let the President out from signing it. But what did they do? They reported not the House resolution, which the House could pass and officially transmit to the President, but they reported a concurrent resolution which, when it passes this House, is so much waste paper until it has passed the Senate. It has as much chance of passing the Senate now as a snowflake has in hell. [Laughter.] If there is a sincere purpose on the part of the Members of this House or the gentlemen who propose to move to suspend the rules to take any action by the House for the purpose of having it brought to the attention of the President, there is no sense in passing a concurrent resolution such as has been reported without any intention that it should ever pass both bodies. The thing to do is either to pass the House resolution—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. No; I can not. I would like to do so.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania. Just for one question.

Mr. MANN. I would like to do so, but I have not the time. I am trying to force these fellows here to do something. [Cries of "Ah!"]

Mr. MANN. You may say "ah" all you please, but I have got you now where you can not refuse to move to suspend the rules and pass something. [Applause.] You have been delaying it as long as you could. You have had all sorts of schemes cooked up to prevent consideration of the question at all, and now what you have in mind is to pass something which never can get to the President. If you mean business, pass a resolution of the House and send it to the President as an expression of the wishes of the American people shown through their Representatives elect. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration House joint resolution 438 had come to no resolution thereon.

RELIEF OF CLAIMANTS, MISSISSIPPI COUNTY, ARK.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Public Lands from the further consideration of the bill S. 5566, and ask for its immediate consideration by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas moves to discharge the Committee on Public Lands from the further consideration of the bill S. 5566, and asks for the immediate consideration thereof. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Let us have the bill reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 5566) for the relief of the claimants of certain unsurveyed lands in Mississippi County, Ark.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas in the Government survey made in February, 1846, and approved December 23, 1846, an area in sections 19, 20, 29, and 30, in township 11 north, range 10 east, in Mississippi County, Ark., containing 402.45 acres, was erroneously meandered and designated as a lake on the official plat of the survey, which area is known locally as Round Lake; and

Whereas the United States is now asserting title to said area as public land; and

Whereas many years ago the riparian proprietors, R. E. Lee Wilson and J. W. Rhodes, in good faith, believing themselves to be the owners of said area, drained and reclaimed the same by the construction of ditches and canals and cleared every acre of said land, and the same is now in a high state of cultivation; and

Whereas the said claimants are in the actual possession of said area, and tilling and cultivating the same, and are entitled to some equity by reason of such labor, expenses, and improvements, and the great value which they have added to the land: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That said claimants shall have a preference right at any time within one year from the filing of the official plat of corrected survey in the United States land office at Little Rock, Ark., to purchase from the United States the lands within the meander lines of Round Lake, in sections 19, 20, 29, and 30, in township 11 north, range 10 east, Mississippi County, Ark., at the rate of \$12.35 per acre: Provided, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to grant to any person a title to any part of said land which is shown to be within the limits of land previously surveyed and disposed of by the Government: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CARAWAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent a House bill of similar tenor was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit to the House the report for which I have previously had permission and which I have from time to time deferred and now desire recognition to present.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have been recognized.

Mr. WALSH. I have received assurance from the Speaker that when these unanimous-consent matters were taken out of the way I would receive recognition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. What the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] says is true.

Mr. WALSH. If that is true, I ask for recognition.

Mr. FLOOD. I had already received recognition.

The SPEAKER. I know, but the Chair has put the gentleman from Massachusetts off a dozen times to-day to let people in with these other bills.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me?

The SPEAKER. And the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts as soon as he gets through with the report of the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a filibuster.

Mr. WALSH. It is not a filibuster. I have been waiting all the afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The other day the Chair appointed Mr. MCCLINTIC to the Committee on Printing. It ought to have been to the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to serve notice that I shall ask for order during my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is recognized.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, while not disagreeing in toto with the findings of the special committee, because of the omission of important matters and because of certain conclusions drawn, I beg leave to submit the following as individual views:

The undersigned, a member of the special committee appointed under the provisions of House resolution No. 469, hereby submits the following views and conclusions upon the matters referred to said committee. House resolution No. 469 reads as follows:

House resolution 469.

Resolved, That a committee of seven Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House to investigate and make report as to the articles of incorporation, the officers, agents, and employees, membership, financial support and names of contributors, expenditures, general character, activities, and purposes of the National Security League, a corporation of New York, and of any associated organization, that purport to be organized or engaged in or have been directly or indirectly engaged in the nomination, election, or defeat of Representatives in Congress during the year of 1918.

Said committee shall also inquire and ascertain whether charges affecting the loyalty of Representatives in Congress have been made by said organizations; and if so, by whom, and upon what information, testimony, or record; and it shall ascertain whether said organizations have complied with the provisions of law in the filing of expense accounts; and for such purposes it shall have power to send for persons and papers and enforce their appearance before said committee and to administer oaths; and the said committee or any subcommittee thereof shall have the right to sit at such times and places, in or out of the city of Washington, as the committee may deem advisable, and shall have the right to report at any time.

Pursuant to the authority conferred, the committee has held numerous hearings in Washington, New York City, and Chicago, Ill., and has taken the evidence and testimony of very many witnesses, including the officers of the National Security League of New York, and of the officials of its branch organizations in New York, Illinois, and Wisconsin, as well as Members of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

The National Security League (Inc.) on January 7, 1915, received a certificate of incorporation from the State of New York, which certificate or charter is as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE (INC.).

We, the undersigned, all being of full age and citizens of the United States, and at least one of us being a resident of the State of New York, and being desirous of associating ourselves together for the purpose of forming a membership corporation as hereinafter more particularly described, pursuant to and in conformity with an act of the Legislature of the State of New York, entitled "An act relating to membership corporations," being chapter 40 of the Laws of 1909 of the State of New York, constituting chapter 25 of the Consolidated Laws of the State of New York and the several acts of the State legislature amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, do hereby make, sign, and acknowledge this certificate for that purpose, as follows:

1. The proposed corporation is not organized nor to be conducted for profit.

2. The name of the proposed corporation is National Security League (Inc.).

3. The territory in which its operations are to be principally conducted is the United States of America, its Territories and dependencies.

4. The particular objects for which the corporation is to be formed are to secure, through effective investigation, authoritative and complete information in regard to the condition, organization, and methods of administration of our national defenses, naval and military; to ascertain what defects exist therein, and what changes, improvements, and additions thereto are desirable, together with the probable cost thereof; to bring to the attention of the Government and of the people the facts so ascertained, with such recommendations as may seem proper; to bring about such organization of citizens throughout the Nation as may make practicable an intelligent expression of public opinion upon the matters presented; and generally to do all things that lawfully and properly may be done to provide for the United States adequate and efficient defenses by land and sea, and thereby a reasonable assurance against war. Also to aid in research of problems affecting the development, welfare, and economic growth of the United States, and in disseminating the results of investigations, whether made by public bodies or private citizens.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] makes the point of order there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Alexander	Doughton	Kahn	Sanford
Anthony	Drane	Kehoe	Sears
Ashbrook	Drukker	Kennedy, Iowa	Sells
Barnhart	Dupré	Kettner	Shackelford
Blackmon	Eagle	Key, Ohio	Shallenberger
Booher	Elston	Kiess, Pa.	Sherley
Britt	Emerson	Kinkaid	Sherwood
Browning	Essen	Kraus	Shouse
Brumbaugh	Estopinal	Langley	Shoyden
Buchanan	Evans	Lazaro	Slomp
Burroughs	Fairchild, G. W.	Lee, Ga.	Sloan
Caldwell	Ferris	Lever	Small
Candler, Miss.	Flynn	Little	Smith, Mich.
Cannon	Fordney	Longworth	Stafford
Cantrill	Foss	Lunn	Steele
Carlin	Frear	McCormick	Steenerson
Carter, Mass.	Freeman	McKenzie	Stephens, Nebr.
Cary	Fuller, Ill.	McKinley	Stevenson
Chandler, N. Y.	Fuller, Mass.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sumners
Church	Gard	Magee	Swift
Clark, Fla.	Garland	Mondell	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Pa.	Garner	Moon	Temple
Classon	Gillett	Nelson, J. M.	Templeton
Claypool	Godwin, N. C.	Nicholls, S. C.	Thomas
Cleary	Goodall	Osborne	Tilson
Coady	Gordon	Overmyer	Towner
Connelly, Kans.	Graham, Pa.	Paige	Van Dyke
Cooper, Ohio.	Gray, N. J.	Park	Vare
Cooper, Wis.	Gregg	Peters	Venable
Copley	Griest	Platt	Voigt
Costello	Hamilton, Mich.	Porter	Walker
Cox	Hamilton, N. Y.	Pou	Ward
Crago	Hamlin	Powers	Wason
Curry, Cal.	Hardy	Pratt	Webb
Davis	Hayes	Price	White, Ohio
Dempsey	Heintz	Purnell	Williams
Denison	Hensley	Reavis	Wilson, Ill.
Dent	Hood	Roberts	Wilson, Tex.
Denton	Houston	Robinson	Winslow
Dewalt	Howard	Rowland	Wise
Dickinson	Huddleston	Rucker	Woodyard
Dill	Hull, Iowa	Russell	
Doolittle	Jones	Sanders, Ind.	

The SPEAKER. On this vote 258 Members have responded to their names—a quorum. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. RUBEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I was reading the charter of the organization when interrupted by the point of order, and now I will proceed from there:

5. The principal office of the corporation is to be located in the Borough of Manhattan, city, county, and State of New York.

6. The number of its directors shall be nine.

7. The names and places of residence of the persons to be its directors until the first annual meeting of the members of the corporation are as follows:

S. Stanwood Menken, No. 54 West Fifty-second Street, New York City.

Herbert Barry, Llewellyn Park, West Orange, N. J.

Edward H. Clark, Hotel Netherland, New York City.

Franklin Q. Brown, No. 34 East Thirty-eighth Street, New York City.

J. Bernard Walker, No. 22 Pierrepont Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Lawrence F. Abbott, Cornwall, N. Y.

Charles E. Lydecker, No. 11 East Eighty-first Street, New York City.

Frederick H. Allen, Pelham Manor, N. Y.

William T. Hornaday, No. 2186 Loring Place, Bronx, New York City.

They issued a call for a meeting, to be held December 1, 1914, at the Hotel Belmont, New York City, copy of which call is as follows:

52 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.

You are invited to attend a meeting, to be held on Tuesday, December 1, 1914, at the Hotel Belmont, at 5 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of forming a committee to advocate an inquiry, under congressional authority, as to the condition of our Army and Navy and national defenses, to the end that the people of the United States may know the exact facts relative thereto and form with knowledge an opinion as to what should be the proper national policy.

S. STANWOOD MENKEN.
HERBERT BARRY.
GEORGE HAVEN PUTNAM.
LAWRENCE F. ABBOTT.
J. MAYHEW WAINWRIGHT.
CHARLES E. LYDECKER.
FRANKLIN Q. BROWN.

Reply may be sent to Mr. Menken at above address.

This meeting, it will be noticed, was to discuss a resolution which had been introduced by Representative Gardner, calling for an investigation of our national defenses.

The meeting was held, and attended by some 150 men of prominence in various business activities in the city of New York, and a voluntary association was formed, which later was incorporated as the National Security League.

Mr. Menken was the first president of the league and the late Joseph H. Choate was the first honorary president.

Later Robert Bacon, former Cabinet Member, was president, to be succeeded by Mr. Menken, until June 26, 1918, when Charles E. Lydecker was elected president, which office he now holds.

Hon. Elihu Root succeeded Mr. Choate as honorary president on the decease of the latter.

At the time of its incorporation or some period thereafter the organization adopted the following by-laws:

BY-LAWS OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE (INC.).

I. NAME.

This corporation shall be called the National Security League (Inc.).

II. OBJECT.

The league is established to promote patriotic education and national sentiment and service among the people of the United States, and to promote recognition of the fact that the obligation of universal military service requires universal military training, as more at large set forth in its certificate of incorporation.

III. MEMBERSHIP AND DUES.

(a) All those who were enrolled as members of the league prior to its incorporation on January 7, 1915, and have continued in good standing up to the date of adoption of this by-law; and those who shall have been enrolled and remain in good standing in the league or any of its branches heretofore organized are members of this corporation. On and after April 2, 1916, any citizen of the United States may become a member of the league upon election by the executive committee of the league or by any branch and the payment of the dues prescribed for the class of members in which he or she enrolls.

(b) Regular members shall pay annual dues of \$1; regular contributing members shall pay annual dues of \$5; life members shall pay a fee of \$25; and founder members shall pay a fee of \$100, and both shall forever be exempt from annual dues; associate and service members shall pay annual dues in such amount, not less than 10 cents in any branch, as the executive committee of such branch may prescribe.

(c) Branches shall be created and organized by and with the authority of the executive committee. The form of organization, the by-laws, and all proceedings shall be subject to approval of the executive committee. The executive committee shall arrange for the organization of divisions, which shall include the branches in a State or States or other convenient geographical division for the purpose of representation and such other use as such divisions may find to be in the interest of the league, under such names as the branches may give to their divisions. Pending action by the executive committee the branches in each State shall constitute a division.

IV. GOVERNMENT AND ORGANIZATION.

(a) Directors: The directors shall be chosen at the annual meeting of the league by the votes of the delegates at such meeting as herein provided.

The directors shall meet on call of the president, or three or more members of the board may require a meeting to be called by the secretary.

The directors, in addition to their functions as members of the executive committee and elsewhere provided for in these by-laws, shall have the power, by resolution adopted by a majority vote of all their number, to require any decision or action of the executive committee to be submitted to a meeting of the league for approval or disapproval, and in such event no further proceedings shall be had, pursuant to such decision or action of the executive committee, until approved by resolution passed at a meeting of members so to be held.

(b) Officers: The national officers of the league shall be a president, not more than seven vice presidents, a secretary, and a treasurer, all of whom must be members of the league but need not be directors thereof.

At the annual meeting the league may elect an honorary president and one or more honorary vice presidents.

The national officers shall be elected at the annual meeting of the league by the votes of the delegates at such meeting as provided for the election of directors. Officers shall hold office for one year and until their successors are elected and qualify. An executive secretary shall be appointed by and may be removed at any time by the executive committee.

The president may from time to time, with the consent of the executive committee, appoint one or more assistants to the secretary and treasurer, who may respectively perform any part of the duties of the office in the place of said secretary and treasurer. The respective officers shall have such powers and shall perform such duties as are prescribed by law for their respective offices, and in addition they shall perform such other duties as may from time to time be prescribed by the executive committee.

(c) Executive committee: The executive committee of the league shall consist of the president, vice president, secretary and treasurer ex officio, the directors of the league, the members of the executive committee elected by the divisions, and 15 members at large, to be chosen from the league at the annual meeting by the votes of the delegates of the branches as provided by Article V, and one member of each division of the league to be chosen by the branches thereof as provided in Article VI.

A quorum of the executive committee shall consist of seven members thereof.

Pending the appointment of the members at large and the members accredited to the several divisions, the executive committee shall consist of directors and officers above specified.

The executive committee shall generally have power to determine and direct the action to be taken by the league and to do all acts incident to such general powers, subject to any restrictions imposed by law or by the by-laws. A majority of the committee voting for that purpose in person or by proxy shall have power of removal of any officer of the league or of any branch and like power to terminate any membership.

The activities of the league shall be conducted under the immediate direction and responsibility of the executive committee, who shall lay down the lines of organization and appoint the necessary personnel and executives with power to transact the business of the league in compliance with the regulations and general instructions given from time to time by the executive committee: *Provided, however,* That no contracts shall be executed committing the league to expenditure beyond the amount held at the time in the treasury, and provided that all payments, except disbursements out of petty cash, shall be made by check, and that signature and countersignature of two duly appointed officers of the league shall be required on each check. It is further provided that a special committee of the executive committee shall make quarterly audits of the receipts and disbursements of the league and that no officer having the right to sign checks shall act upon said committee.

(d) Other standing committees: There shall be the following standing committees in addition to the executive committee, to wit: A finance committee, a committee on the navy, a committee on the army, a committee on the militia, a committee on transportation, a committee on supplies, a committee on legislation, a committee on extension and branches, a publicity committee, a committee on membership, a committee on receipts and expenditures, and a committee on management, and the executive committee may from time to time create such other standing committees as it may deem advisable and may also terminate the same. Each of the standing committees other than the executive committee shall be appointed by the president, with the advice and consent of the executive committee, and shall consist of as many members as may be so appointed. Each standing committee shall adopt its own rules for the conduct of business not inconsistent with the charter and by-laws of the league. The functions of the respective committees shall be those heretofore authorized and exercised, subject to such modification and direction as the executive committee shall have power at any time to discharge any committee and to appoint other members thereto.

V. MEETINGS.

There shall be an annual meeting of the league on the Wednesday following the 1st day of May in each year and such special meetings as may be called by the directors of the league or the executive committee. Such meetings shall be held on notice of not less than 15 days, sent in writing to each division and branch of the league. The meetings of the National Security League (Inc.) shall be meetings of officers and delegates, and such delegates and their representations shall be as follows: Each division as herein provided shall be entitled to two delegates for each branch in said division and shall be entitled to vote as many votes as there are regular and life members in all the branches in said division, and in case of divided vote the delegates of each branch may vote the votes of their branch, if the delegates of a branch divide each voting half their total vote.

The officers who shall ex officio be delegates to all meetings of the league shall be the national officers of the league, chairman of the executive committee, and the chairman of the advisory council.

At all meetings of the league all delegates may vote in person or by proxy.

VI. BRANCHES.

(a) Organization: The local constituted bodies of the league shall be known as branches and may, under the direction of the executive committee, be organized in any State, Territory, or dependency of the United States or among American citizens living abroad. Each branch shall represent its particular locality and shall bear the name of such locality:

Provided, however, That the executive committee may define or limit in its own discretion the membership and extent of any branch or in any other manner it sees fit.

When chartered by the executive committee the branch shall at once organize, adopt by-laws, elect an executive committee of not less than seven, and elect officers as prescribed.

In any State where the members of the league have already effected an organization upon a plan of branches differing from that hereby provided they may continue such form of organization, if desired, and shall be entitled to representation at the annual and other meetings of the league in proportion to the number of their members through such delegates as they shall appoint pursuant to their respective methods of organization, provided in other respects they conform to the aims, objects, and general provisions of this organization and its by-laws.

When more than one branch has been organized in any State or other convenient geographical division as designated by the executive committee it shall be the duty of the chairmen of the several branches therein to meet together at the call of the president of the league and annually in the month of April thereafter to choose a State or division committee of not less than seven persons to represent all the branches of such State or division, which committee shall be known as the division committee, taking the name of the appropriate State, Territory, or geographical unit it represents. In voting for such division committee the chairman of each branch therein shall be entitled to vote as many votes as there are regular and life members in his branch.

The division committee shall likewise choose officers for the division in the prescribed manner who shall supervise and control the work of the league among the several branches of such division. It shall be the duty of each division committee to create new branches in its division wherever possible and encourage and carry forward the purposes of the league. Such committee shall at all times be subject to the control of the executive committee of the whole league.

Each division committee is entitled to name one member of the executive committee of the whole league to represent the branches of such division in the executive committee, and it shall be the duty of the division committee when organized and annually in the month of April thereafter to choose such members forthwith.

The provisions of Article III, section c, shall be deemed modified in conformity with this provision as to the organization in such States.

(b) Branch officers: The authorized officers of the branches of the league shall be the same as herein prescribed for the national officers, except that the chief officers of branches shall be called chairman and vice chairman instead of president and vice president. They shall be chosen by the executive committee of their respective branches in the prescribed manner. The duties and powers of branch officers shall correspond within their respective jurisdiction with those prescribed for national officers within the whole league.

(c) Apportionment of annual dues: The proper officer of each branch shall pay each month one-fourth its annual, contributing, and life-membership fees when collected to the treasurer of the league for the general purposes of the league, with power to the executive committee to remit dues under their discretion for any period.

VII. ADVISORY COUNCIL.

An advisory council of the league, not to exceed 100 members of the league, may be chosen by the executive committee immediately after the annual meeting of the league. The council shall elect its own officers. Twenty members shall constitute a quorum. The duty of the council shall be to aid the executive committee on matters of policy and to encourage and carry forward the purposes of the league. The executive committee shall have power to make such changes in the advisory council from time to time as they think proper.

VIII. AMENDMENTS.

These by-laws may be amended by the executive committee of the league by a vote of a majority of a total membership thereof voting in person or by proxy or at any annual or special meeting of the league by a vote of two-thirds of those present, provided that in either case seven days' notice in writing of the proposed amendment shall have been given to the members of the executive committee and to all branches of the league. On consideration of any proposed amendment amendments germane thereto may be offered and voted upon at the meeting.

Many committees were selected to conduct its activities, the membership of which embraced men and women of prominence from all parts of the country, but the majority of which were from in or about New York City.

The executive committee was made up of over 40 members, yet many policies were adopted and plans of action approved at meetings of the committee at which only from 5 to 12 members were present.

After its organization and incorporation the National Security League held various meetings in New York, Chicago, Washington, and elsewhere, passed resolutions on many subjects, and engaged in a publicity campaign for the purpose of stimulating public thought on matter of preparedness for war. Literature in the form of circular letters, speeches, pamphlets, and bulletins were distributed throughout the country, and material in the form of news items was furnished to some 1,200 newspapers throughout the land. A list of literature printed and distributed was furnished the committee, and is as follows:

LIST OF PAMPHLETS ISSUED DURING THE LAST TWO YEARS, 1917-18.

America and the Great War. Arthur E. Bestor.
America at War. Albert Bushnell Hart.
America's Present Needs (address). Elihu Root.
Americanization Service.
Americanism and the Americanization Problem. A. S. Somers.
Autocracy v. Democracy. Speakers' Bureau Leaflet.
Before the War, During the War, After the War.
Christianity in International Relations. Herbert Barry.
Concept of National Service. S. Stanwood Menken.
Congress of National Service, Delegates.
Conscientious Objector, The. Dr. George Herbert Mead.
Converted and Secret Americans. Alfred M. Brooks.
Correspondence Course in Patriotism.
Crack in Germany's Armor, The. W. H. Hobbs.

Concurrent resolution submitted to the Senate of the United States.

ROBERT L. OWEN.

Defense Not Offense, The Guard at the Door. Form 10B.
 Defense Not Offense, The Guard at the Door. Form 10F-G.
 Defense of the Republic, The. George Haven Putnam.
 Declaration of Principles of the National Security League.
 Declaration of Principles adopted by the Congress of National Service.
 Declaration of Independence and the World War, Relation Between.

T. J. O'Donnell.

Democracy and Compulsory Service. G. G. Coulton.
 Democracy and World Politics. Shailer Mathews.
 Democracy's Educational Problem. C. H. Van Tyne.
 English-French Handbook.
 Espionage, Some Suggestions of the Perils of. John B. Stanchfield.
 Educational Work, Annual Report upon the.
 Food Administration, The. Frederic C. Woodward.
 Future of the Republic, The (card). Thomas R. Marshall (2d).
 Fight the Next War Now! Dr. Theodore G. Soares.
 Fighting the Dragon. Samuel Harden Church.
 Fifteen Little War Stories. Herbert Myrick.
 Fourth of July Oration. Hon. George W. Wickersham.
 German Tragedy. Dr. Henry W. Farnam.
 Getting Your Audience. Rev. Dr. Sartell Prentice.
 Gibbons for Training, Cardinal.
 Great Emergency, The. J. Bernard Walker.
 Gompers v. Arthur Henderson, Samuel. E. S. Van Zite.
 Gompers, Address by Samuel.
 Germany Self-convicted (from "Out of Their Own Mouths").
 Germany's Guilt Established. Prince Karl Lichnowsky.
 How the War Was Made in Germany. Albert G. Meier.
 How to Pronounce War Names.
 How the German Empire Has Menaced Democracy. Talcott Williams.
 How to Work for Physical Reserve.
 Hurry Up, America! Pomeroy Burton.
 Handbook of the War.
 Handbook, Suggestions for Use of. Hart & Lovejoy.
 Ideals of Our War, The. R. M. McElroy.
 Jewish Pamphlets (Why We Are at War).
 Knowledge by the People True Basis of National Security. S. Stanwood Menken.

Lawrence Plan for Education in Citizenship; a Statement of Aims and Principles.

League and the Teacher, The. Col. C. E. Lydecker.
 Menken, Remarks of S. Stanwood.
 Menken, Address of S. Stanwood.
 Mitchell, Address of John Purroy.
 Make America Safe. Mrs. Linden W. Bates.
 Money, Munitions, and Ships (address). Frederic R. Coudert.
 Naval Policy. Bradley A. Fiske.
 Naval Preparedness, What is Adequate. J. Bernard Walker, 2d.
 Naval Inferiority, Our (address). Charles G. Curtis.
 Navy and the War, The. Franklin D. Roosevelt.
 National Solidarity and International Unity. Oscar S. Straus.
 National Military Training, The Basis for. Henry L. Stimson.
 National Security League, Report of the Army Committee.
 National Security League, Annual Report of President of Committee, May 3, 1916.

Annual Report of the President, May 8, 1918.
 National Security League (card). O. T. Keep.
 National Security League, National Headquarters of (card).
 National Security League (address). Elihu Root.
 National Security League, Report of Director of Branches, Annual Meeting, May 3, 1916.
 National Security League Roster.
 National Security League, Report of the Militia Committee.
 National Security League, Which of the Following Things, etc. (card).
 National Security League, What It Is and Why, etc.
 National Security League Bulletin (February, April, June, September, and November, 1918).
 National Security League, To the Members of the. Col. C. E. Lydecker.

National Security League, By-laws of the, May 15, 1916.
 National Security League, Constitution and By-Laws for Branches of, March 30, 1916.
 National Security League, How to Form a Branch and What to Do.
 National Security as It Involves the Preparation and Use of the Citizenry. H. K. Love (2).
 National Security Congress, Washington, January 20-22, 1916, Proceedings of (2 vols.).
 Our Job. E. K. Hubbard.
 Outlook for Democracy. Dr. William H. Hobbs.
 Pacifism, The Failure of. Francis J. Oppenheimer.
 Policy and Armaments. Frederick Scott Oliver.
 Preparedness, The Necessity of. Rev. William Carter.
 Preparedness, The Spirit of (posters). Edwin H. Blashfield.
 Program, Congress of Constructive Patriotism, January 25, 26, 27, 1917.

Proposed Bill for Physical and Military Training to be Submitted to State Legislature.

Preliminary Plan for a High School Patriotic Legion. Breasted.
 Perils of Autocracy, The. Talcott Williams.
 Pan-Germany Attained To-day (map). The Outlook.
 Pan-Germanism. E. E. Sperry.
 Principles of the Declaration of Independence. W. M. Wiley.
 Physical Exercise, A Manual of.
 Posters: The Meaning of America—Awake and Safeguard America—Belgian Children.

Price of Victory. Dr. Henry W. Farnam.
 President's War Message. Woodrow Wilson.
 Rouse Ye, Freeman! (card). J. A. Browning.
 Root, Address by Elihu, September 14, 1917.
 Representative Idea, The. R. M. McElroy.
 Reamakers, A Mainspring of Armed Force. S. S. Menken.
 Relation Between Declaration of Independence and the World War.

T. J. O'Donnell.
 Straus, Address of Oscar, February 20, 1916.
 Stimson, Remarks of Henry L., January 20-22, 1916.
 Some Neglected Aspects of Public Speaking. Prof. Solomon H. Clark.
 Songs for Patriotic Meetings.
 Song of the Marchers, The, June 14, 1917.
 Speakers' Training Camp, Reasons for and Objects of.

Suggestions for the Organization of a State for Patriotic Education. M. F. Libby.

Stop Malicious Rumors—Help Win the War. National Committee of Patriotic Societies.

Suggestions for Pro-American Propaganda. E. V. Leighton.

Suggestions for Speakers on the United States and the World War. Richard T. Ely.

School Liberty Loan Campaigns, 1918.

Spanish Pamphlet. E. V. Leighton.

Second-Line Trench. E. V. Leighton.

Teaching of Patriotism in Home and School. Mrs. A. J. George.

Ten Fundamental War Principles. Dr. Thomas F. Moran.

Tentacles of the German Octopus in America. E. E. Sperry.

Teacher and the War, The. Dr. F. L. Patton.

This Will Win the War (poem). R. Kipling.

Teachers' Patriotic Leaflets, volume 1, 1-6. E. V. Leighton.

United States and the World War. Richard T. Ely.

Universal Military Training, Now Let's Have (leaflets).

Universal Selective Training, Plan of.

Universal Obligatory Military Training and Service. George R. Conroy.

Universal Military Training. H. L. West.

Vote by States in the Senate and House on Preparedness Measures.

War Points for Americans. M. F. Libby.

Why We Are at War, Why You Must Help, etc.

What Doest Thou Here, America? Sartell Prentice.

War, Issues of the. Henry L. Stimson.

War, the Cause and Meaning of This. F. W. Henshaw.

What Our Country Asks of Its Young Women. Mrs. Percy V. Penny-baker.

What Rutherford Has Done.

Whitnes Articles, The Casper.

What Fight Ye For? Rev. J. R. Cassidy.

Why American Labor Is Back of the War. George W. Perkins.

War, The. Clarence Darrow.

Why British Labor Supports the War. J. S. Seddon.

Woman's Place in Our Cities. Susanna Crockett.

Why the U. S. Is at War. Dr. Shailer Mathews.

Why Do We Fight Germany? Hon. Franklin K. Lane.

Why We Are at War. Josephine Daskam Bacon.

Wisconsin Resolution, May 17, 1918.

Wake Up, Teachers of America. E. V. Leighton.

What Universal Military Training Can Do (leaflet).

What the Kaiser Says.

Why We Are at War with Germany. Charles Robinson Smith.

Work of the National Security League. Henry L. West.

You Will Win the War. George Horace Lorimer.

Your Fellow Citizens Ask You to Do Your Duty (circular).

Its officers solicited funds to carry on the work, and its appropriate committees assisted in the formation of branch organizations in a great many States of the Union. It was particularly interested in the question of military training, and it sent requests of the attitude of Members of the Congress upon the question of universal military training and service. It invited Members of Congress to become members of the league, and many Senators and Representatives joined, and many Members of Congress replied to the questions relative to universal military training and service, a majority of the replies received being favorable to some plan which would provide for this. Branch organizations were established in many States under the auspices of the corporation at New York. The league caused to be printed many thousands of patriotic circulars and pamphlets which were sent throughout the Nation, upon various patriotic topics, and it organized various meetings at which addresses were delivered by many men prominent in the public service and of eminent distinction. Through its committee on patriotism and service it developed a plan of Americanization which was executed on a tremendous scale in many States.

No characterization of the votes was made, nor were any Members charged directly or indirectly with lack of ability, want of patriotism, or loyalty in the 1916 election campaign.

The activity at this time seems to have been inspired by moderation and a desire to be accurate and fair.

Supplementing the issuance and distribution of this circular the National Security League printed and circulated several thousand placards in October, 1916, just before the election, as follows:

Vote for the candidate in Congress in your district, irrespective of party, who believes in these principles of preparedness: Universal obligatory military training, an adequate Army, Navy second in strength, governmental efficiency, industrial preparedness, country above party, patriotism through education, unified national spirit.

Which text was also printed and sent to all members of the organization. This particular activity during the 1916 elections was not conducted along partisan lines, nor was it augmented by any other activity. The records of Members of Congress were compiled from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the executive secretary and Mr. Charles E. Lydecker, the latter at that time being a member of the executive committee of the league. The organization continued its work along its lines of patriotic endeavor to arouse sentiment favorable to increasing of military and naval defenses, and upon the declaration of war in April, 1917, it enlarged its work by seeking, through the medium of addresses, publication of articles, and various other activities for the purpose of stimulating a win-the-war spirit among the people.

During the summer of 1918 one Charles D. Orth, who described himself to be a member of the firm of Hansen & Orth, importers and sellers of rope and binder twine, suggested to certain officers of the league that he desired to offer his services to the organization, and that he had formulated a plan to conduct certain activities in connection with the approaching congressional elections which he thought of importance. After some slight consideration, with no investigation as to the requirement of State or Federal statutes as bearing on activity by the organization in a campaign such as was proposed, and with practically no attention to the question of Mr. Orth's qualifications to conduct such an activity, he was appointed chairman of the league's congressional committee. Shortly thereafter the troubles of the National Security League began. As a result of his management of the congressional activities, differences arose in the executive committee and among members of the league. Mr. Orth was a business man, who had never participated in any particular political activity, and had only followed political matters in the usual manner of a busy citizen engaged in the conduct of a business requiring expert knowledge. He had never made any particular study or investigation of the manner of conducting a campaign of politics or education. He had been a reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for some few years, but with no special object in view other than to secure general information upon the work of Congress. He relied principally upon newspaper accounts for the results of congressional deliberation, and was not informed upon the method or the effect of enactment of resolutions or acts by either branch of Congress.

He apparently was not required to prove any adaptability of the plan he proposed to put into execution, but was selected to do the work, and was given a free hand. He caused to be prepared a chart, which was circulated widely, bearing the caption, "Congressional chart on preparedness." This set forth the votes of Members of the House upon eight matters acted upon in the House of Representatives, and was known as the "acid-test" chart.

It tabulated the votes as "wrong" or "right."

It did not set forth the measures voted upon.

It did not accurately set forth the substance of the measures in three instances.

It did not explain what the vote cast was, nor did it supplement the vote shown with subsequent votes upon the same question.

It set forth an interpretation of the measures under consideration by the House which was not warranted and which was unjust.

It did set forth the votes of Members, but it did not explain accurately the effect of the vote cast.

In witness whereof we have made, signed, and acknowledged this certificate in duplicate.

Dated January 7, 1915.

STANWOOD MENKEN.
HERBERT BARRY.
EDWARD H. CLARK.
FRANKLIN Q. BROWN.
J. BERNARD WALKER.
JOHN H. ISSELIN.

The idea of organizing the league was first conceived by Mr. S. Stanwood Menken, of 34 West Fifty-second Street, New York City, an attorney whose law firm represents many large business interests.

Mr. Menken testified that the idea first came to him while he was in the gallery of the House of Commons of the British Parliament, listening to a debate in which was discussed the condition of the British nation respecting preparedness for war, early in August, 1914.

Mr. Menken upon his return to the United States communicated with the late Augustus P. Gardner, Representative from Massachusetts, on the subject of forming an organization for the purpose of arousing public sentiment with relation to the actual state of unpreparedness in the United States. He discussed the matter with several of his acquaintances, and late in November, 1914, he, together with Messrs. Herbert Barry, George Haven Putnam, Lawrence F. Abbott, J. Mayhew Wainwright, Charles E. Lydecker, and Franklin Q. Brown—

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. No; not at this time.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, how much time has the gentleman got?

The SPEAKER. Enough to read the report in.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I want to know how much time he has.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not tell how much time he has, but he has time enough to read his report.

Mr. OVERSTREET. But it is getting late. We ought to transact business. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, to continue, on the restoration of order in the House—

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WALSH. I do not yield to any parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WALSH. It sought in various ways to arouse public sentiment on the question of preparedness, and in 1916 it issued a tabulated statement of the votes of Members of Congress upon four measures which the league, through a committee, had decided were important preparedness measures.

This table was not in the form of a chart, but in a pamphlet, and it set forth the votes of each Member on the measures indicated as being for or against the pending legislation under consideration. The four measures were as follows:

VOTE IN CONGRESS, BY STATES, ON PREPAREDNESS MEASURES.

House of Representatives: Kahn amendment to the Hay Army bill. Vote by States, March 23, 1916.

United States Senate: Brandegee amendment to the Hay-Chamberlain Army bill; vote by States, April 18, 1916. House of Representatives: Senate's proposal to fix size of Regular Army at 250,000; vote by States in House, May 18, 1916.

United States Senate: Proposition to strike out section 56 of the Chamberlain (Senate) substitute which provided for a Volunteer Reserve Army wholly under Federal control; vote by States, April 18, 1916. House of Representatives: Section 56, Chamberlain (Senate) substitute; vote in House to retain the section, May 8, 1916.

House of Representatives: Vote on motion to recommit naval appropriation bill with instructions for increase, June 2, 1916.

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter, and I think we should have a quorum present.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the gentleman should withdraw that suggestion. The gentleman from Massachusetts ought to be allowed to present his side of the case, notwithstanding the fact that he refused to yield to me. I suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma to withdraw his point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. I do not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Doughton	Huddleston	Rucker
Ashbrook	Drane	Hull, Iowa	Russell
Barnhart	Drukner	Husted	Sanders, Ind.
Birch	Dupré	Jones	Sanders, N. Y.
Blackmon	Eagle	Kahn	Sears
Booher	Elston	Kelhoe	Sells
Bowers	Emerson	Kelley, Mich.	Shackelford
Britt	Essen	Kennedy, Iowa	Shallenberger
Browning	Estopinal	Kettner	Sherley
Brumbaugh	Evans	Key, Ohio	Sherwood
Buchanan	Fairchild, G. W.	Kless, Pa.	Shouse
Caldwell	Ferris	Kinkaid	Slayden
Cantrill	Flynn	Langley	Slemp
Carew	Fordney	Lee, Ga.	Small
Carlin	Foss	Lever	Smith, Mich.
Carter, Mass.	Frear	Little	Stafford
Cary	Freeman	Lunn	Steele
Chandler, N. Y.	Fuller, Ill.	McKinley	Steenserson
Church	Fuller, Mass.	Magee	Stephens, Nebr.
Clark, Fla.	Gard	Mays	Sterling
Clark, Pa.	Garland	Miller, Wash.	Stevenson
Claason	Garner	Mondell	Swift
Claypool	Gillett	Moon	Taylor, Ark.
Cleary	Godwin, N. C.	Mott	Temple
Coady	Goodall	Nelson, John M.	Thomas
Connolly, Kans.	Gordon	Nicholls, S. C.	Towner
Cooper, Ohio	Graham, Pa.	Oldfield	Van Dyke
Cooper, Wis.	Gray, N. J.	Osborne	Vare
Copley	Gregg	Overmyer	Venable
Costello	Hamill	Paige	Voigt
Cox	Hamilton, Mich.	Park	Waldow
Crago	Hamilton, N. Y.	Peters	Walker
Curry, Cal.	Hamlin	Platt	Webb
Davis	Hardy	Porter	Wheeler
Denison	Haugen	Pou	White, Ohio
Dent	Hayes	Powers	Williams
Denton	Helntz	Pratt	Wilson, Ill.
Dewalt	Helvering	Price	Wise
Dickinson	Hensley	Purnell	Woodyard
Dies	Holland	Reavis	Young, Tex.
Dill	Hood	Roberts	Zihlman
Doelling	Houston	Robinson	
Doollittle	Howard	Rowland	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 259 Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KNUTSON. How long is it going to take to whitewash this National Security League?

The SPEAKER. I do not think it is going to be whitewashed if this House knows its own opinion. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the National Security League.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the National Security League. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks previously made by me by including a portion of a letter that was not read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELLING. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing a memorial passed by the legislature of my State.

Mr. KEARNS. On what subject?

Mr. WELLING. On the subject of establishing a national monument in my State.

Mr. KEARNS. I think that ought to be done.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of the leave granted me to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a memorial to the Congress asking for the establishment in Garfield County, in the State of Utah, of a national monument to be known as the "Temple of the Gods."

This region, known locally as Bryce's Canyon, is one of majestic beauty. The grandeur of its mountain scenery can not be excelled in any spot in America, and those of us who know the region and love it are anxious that it should be set apart as a national park before the land passes into the ownership of private interests.

I include with the memorial a letter of indorsement from Gov. Bamberger, of my State, in transmitting the document to the Congress.

STATE OF UTAH, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Salt Lake City, February 27, 1919.

Hon. MILTON H. WELLING,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WELLING: I am sending you herewith for your information a copy of a memorial introduced to-day in the lower house of our State legislature asking that Bryce's Canyon be set aside as "The Temple of the Gods National Monument."

Last summer it was my pleasure to visit this scenic wonder, and I concur most heartily in the appeal that it be protected and preserved for the enjoyment of our people. In my estimation it is one of the most remarkable scenic attractions in our entire western country. I am very anxious that such action be taken as will make it a national monument before it has the opportunity to pass into private control.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely, yours,

SIMON BAMBERGER,
Governor.

A memorial to the Congress of the United States to create the Temple of the Gods National Monument.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the governor and the Legislature of the State of Utah, respectfully represent:

On the public domain within the boundaries of the Sevier National Forest, in the Pink Mountain region, near Tropic, Garfield County,

Utah, there is a canyon popularly referred to as Bryce's Canyon, which has become famed for its wonderful natural beauty. Inasmuch as the State and Federal Governments have indicated a desire that the natural attractions of our State and our country be protected and preserved for the enjoyment of posterity, therefore your memorialists respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States set aside for the use and enjoyment of the people a suitable area embracing Bryce's Canyon as a national monument under the name of "The Temple of the Gods National Monument."

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the use of the mails for the promotion of fraudulent enterprises under the guise of war charities and patriotic organizations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read a telegram which I have received.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to have a telegram read. Is there objection?

Mr. BRITTEN. What is the telegram about?

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. The Irish question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to have read a telegram on the Irish question. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TULSA, OKLA., March 3, 1919.

Congressman CHANDLER,
Washington, D. C.:

At a banquet of the Knights of Columbus and their friends in the city to-night the following resolutions were adopted, with instructions that copies be telegraphed to you:

"Whereas the supreme board of directors of the Knights of Columbus, at a meeting held in New York January 4, adopted resolutions setting forth that Ireland has a right to self-determination 'which can not be denied,' and asking President Wilson to use his great influence at the peace conference in this behalf; and

"Whereas the National Convention of the Friends of Irish Freedom, representing some millions of our citizens and held in Philadelphia recently, urged the claims of the Irish people to self-determination in the name of justice, because 'all governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed'; in the name of America, because no other people have contributed more than those of Irish blood to the creation, upbuilding, development, preservation, and defense of our great country; in the name of Ireland, because she has struggled for freedom for centuries and in the last few months her people have declared by an overwhelming majority their dissatisfaction with their present Government and their determination to be free and independent of any outside power or influence; in the name of humanity and peace and order, because war can not be brought to an end and a just and permanent peace established except by the application of the doctrine of self-determination to Ireland as well as to all the other small nations of the earth; and

"Whereas the mayor and city commissioners of the city of Tulsa, at a recent meeting adopted resolutions in agreement with the same sentiments, and declaring further that the people of Ireland are and have a right to be free and independent, and the delegates of the Irish Constituent Assembly, Count Plunkett Edward Devalera and Arthur Griffith, should be seated at the peace conference; and that this Government should recognize the Irish republic; and

"Whereas we, the members of the Knights of Columbus and their friends of the city of Tulsa, believe that the majority of the people of this community sympathize with the aspirations and demands of the Irish people as set forth in the resolutions above referred to; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we hereby indorse and approve the resolutions of the board of national directors, the friends of Irish freedom, and the mayor and city commissioners of the city of Tulsa; and be it further

"Resolved, That we extend to President Wilson our best wishes for a safe and speedy voyage to Paris, with the hope that his labors for peace be crowned with success, and to quote his own words when making the motion for the appointment of the league of nations committee, that the peace conference 'will not dare to compromise on this principle, that they are the masters of no people, but are there to see that every people in the world shall choose its own masters and govern its own destinies.'"

A. A. DAVIDSON, Toastmaster.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has the floor.

Mr. WALSH. I ask for order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HEFLIN. I was just going to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of cotton.

Mr. WALSH. I do not yield, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will all take their seats. There will be plenty of time. The gentleman from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, to continue, I was speaking about the pamphlet which was circulated by this organization during the elections of 1916 and had enumerated the four measures which were contained in that pamphlet, the vote for and against which had been set forth in the pamphlet by the committee having the matter in charge. The votes were set forth without characterization and without comment, except that those who voted for the measures indicated their preference for preparedness and those voting against the measures were voting against measures which would provide more effectual defense.

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point that no quorum is present, and evidently there is none.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SABATH) there were 71 ayes and 1 no.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Doughton	Hull, Iowa	Russell
Ashbrook	Drane	Johnson, Wash.	Sanders, Ind.
Austin	Drukker	Jones	Saunders, Va.
Barnhart	Dupré	Kahn	Sears
Blackmon	Eagle	Kearns	Sells
Booher	Elston	Kennedy, Iowa	Shackleford
Bowers	Emerson	Kettner	Shallenberger
Brand	Essen	Key, Ohio	Sherley
Britt	Estopinal	Kiess, Pa.	Sherwood
Britten	Evans	Kinkaid	Shouse
Browning	Fairchild, G. W.	Kreider	Slayden
Brumbaugh	Ferris	La Follette	Slemp
Buchanan	Flynn	Lampert	Small
Byrnes, S. C.	Focht	Langley	Smith, Mich.
Caldwell	Fordney	Lee, Ga.	Stafford
Cantrill	Foss	Lever	Steele
Carlin	Frear	Little	Steenerson
Carter, Mass.	Freeman	Lunn	Stephens, Nebr.
Cary	Fuller, Ill.	McKenzie	Sterling
Chandler, N. Y.	Fuller, Mass.	McKinley	Stevenson
Church	Gard	Madden	Swift
Clark, Fla.	Garland	Magee	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Pa.	Garner	Mays	Taylor, Colo.
Classon	Gillett	Mondell	Temple
Claypool	Godwin, N. C.	Moon	Templeton
Cleary	Good	Mott	Thomas
Coady	Goodall	Nelson, J. M.	Tilson
Connelly, Kans.	Gordon	Nicholls, S. C.	Tinkham
Cooper, Ohio.	Gould	Norton	Towner
Cooper, W. Va.	Graham, Pa.	Oliver, Ala.	Van Dyke
Cooper, Wis.	Gray, Ala.	Osborne	Vare
Copley	Gray, N. J.	Overmyer	Venable
Costello	Gregg	Palge	Vinson
Cox	Hamilton, Mich.	Park	Voigt
Crago	Hamilton, N. Y.	Parker, N. J.	Walker
Crisp	Hamlin	Peters	Wason
Crosser	Hardy	Platt	Webb
Curry, Cal.	Haugen	Porter	Wheeler
Davis	Hayes	Pou	White, Ohio
Dempsey	Heaton	Powers	Wilson, Ill.
Denison	Heintz	Pratt	Wise
Dent	Helvering	Price	Wood, Ind.
Denton	Hensley	Purnell	Woodward
Dewalt	Hersey	Reavis	Wright
Dickinson	Hood	Roberts	Young, Tex.
Dies	Houston	Rowland	
Dill	Howard	Rucker	
Doolittle	Huddleston		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 238 Members have answered to their names—a quorum.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, to continue from the point where I was interrupted: In addition to the preparation and circulation of the chart, the league, at his suggestion and with his participation in their preparation, sent out news items, bulletins, and publicity matter, the plain intent of which was to impugn the loyalty of Members of Congress who had been tabulated as voting wrong on the eight test votes or any of them. It compiled a roll of honor consisting of 47 Members of the House of Representatives who had voted right, in the estimation of the league, upon all of the eight measures, and tabulated Members who had voted wrong as not 100 per cent American.

In addition to the chart circulated by the league, Mr. Orth prepared a questionnaire, which was sent to Members of the House asking them to bind themselves to vote in a certain way upon certain measures, and submitting inquiries in such a way that to have answered in any manner except as the league plainly desired would have been to bring down the condemnation of the organization, with attacks upon the Members' loyalty.

It was the purpose of Mr. Orth, according to his testimony, in sending out the questionnaire to furnish to the Members of the House of the Sixty-fifth Congress who might have been candidates for reelection an opportunity to correct any error in the chart or any injustice done them by the chart; and it was Mr. Orth's intention to circulate the replies to the questionnaire and to correct any unfairness "in the closing hours of the campaign."

In one or two instances where an explanation was attempted by Representatives of their vote or of their being recorded as not voting, Mr. Orth immediately engaged in a controversy, seeking to justify his action, and failed or neglected to correct the unfairness and manifest injustice done.

The committee of which Mr. Orth was chairman failed to consider, and he apparently did not appreciate, the many measures of vital importance passed by record votes subsequent to our entry into the war, and no credit was accorded the Members for the votes or work for the enactment of these many vital war measures.

The officials of the league, with three notable exceptions, strenuously contended that the activity of the organization as conducted by Mr. Orth was not engaging in a political activity, the three exceptions being the honorary president, Elihu Root; the honorary vice president, Alton B. Parker; and the executive secretary, Henry L. West, these gentlemen agreeing that such activity was political but not partisan.

While the literature of the league generally proclaimed that its work, as conducted by the congressional committee, was simply a campaign of education, its work was in no wise under the jurisdiction of its educational director, and in several instances its effort was directed against particular candidates in an attempt to defeat them at the election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before presenting my conclusion on all the testimony, and because of the language of the resolution adopted by this House calling for an investigation, I desire to present to the Members present the by-laws of this organization and to ask your careful attention to the language incorporated in these by-laws. But before doing that, Mr. Speaker, I desire here and now to say that my presentation of this report is in no way—

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, no business has been conducted since a quorum was found to be present a short while ago.

The SPEAKER. Oh, yes; the Chair thinks there has been. The Chair will count.

Mr. RIORDAN (interrupting the count). Can the Chair pay attention to Members who are going out of the Hall now? There are many Members leaving the Hall.

The SPEAKER. There is no way of keeping them here if they want to leave. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Dempsey	Hamilton, Mich.	Merritt
Anthony	Denison	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mondell
Ashbrook	Dent	Hamlin	Moon
Austin	Denton	Hardy	Mott
Bacharach	Dewalt	Haugen	Neely
Barnhart	Dickinson	Hayes	Nelson, J. M.
Blackmon	Dies	Heintz	Nicholls, S. C.
Bland, Ind.	Dill	Helm	Oldfield
Booher	Doolittle	Helvering	Olney
Bowers	Doughton	Hensley	Osborne
Brand	Drane	Hicks	Overmyer
Britt	Drukker	Holland	Palge
Britten	Dupré	Hood	Park
Browning	Eagle	Houston	Peters
Brumbaugh	Elliot	Howard	Platt
Buchanan	Elston	Huddleston	Porter
Byrnes, S. C.	Emerson	Hull, Iowa	Pou
Caldwell	Estopinal	Johnson, Wash.	Powers
Cannon	Evans	Jones	Pratt
Cantrill	Fairchild, G. W.	Kahn	Price
Carlin	Ferris	Kelley, Mich.	Purnell
Carter, Mass.	Flynn	Kennedy, Iowa	Reavis
Cary	Fordney	Kettner	Roberts
Chandler, N. Y.	Foss	Key, Ohio	Robinson
Church	Frear	Kiess, Pa.	Rowland
Clark, Fla.	Freeman	Kinkaid	Rucker
Clark, Pa.	Fuller, Ill.	Kreider	Russell
Classon	Fuller, Mass.	La Follette	Sanders, Ind.
Claypool	Gard	Langley	Sanders, N. Y.
Cleary	Garland	Lee, Ga.	Sanford
Coady	Garner	Leshar	Scott, Iowa
Connelly, Kans.	Garrett, Tex.	Levr	Sears
Cooper, Ohio	Gillett	Little	Sells
Cooper, W. Va.	Glynn	Longworth	Shackleford
Cooper, Wis.	Godwin, N. C.	Lunn	Shallenberger
Copley	Goodall	McFadden	Sherley
Costello	Gordon	McKenzie	Sherwood
Cox	Graham, Pa.	McKinley	Shouse
Crago	Gray, Ala.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Slayden
Crisp	Gray, N. J.	Madden	Slemp
Curry, Cal.	Gregg	Magee	Small
Davis	Griest	Mays	Smith, Mich.

Snell	Stevenson	Towner	Williams
Snook	Swift	Vare	Wilson, Ill.
Stafford	Taylor, Ark.	Venable	Wise
Steele	Taylor, Colo.	Voigt	Wood, Ind.
Steenerson	Temple	Waldow	Woods, Va.
Stephens, Miss.	Templeton	Walker	Woodyard
Stephens, Nebr.	Thomas	Webb	Wright
Sterling	Tilson	White, Ohio	Young, Tex.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 228 gentlemen answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD—

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do anything until we get rid of this call.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Not now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, to continue, I desire to read the by-laws of the National Security League.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is reading so fast we can not understand it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a right to read as fast as he pleases.

Mr. WALSH. These articles and the by-laws are all that I shall direct attention to in order to present now the conclusions which I desire to submit. From all the testimony the following conclusions are, in my opinion, fully justified: That the National Security League from its foundation contributed in a large measure to the work of arousing patriotic sentiment in the country, both before and after our entry into the war. Its campaign of patriotism through education was a commendable work. Its funds were secured chiefly from men engaged or interested in business enterprises of vast importance, although the membership fees from its eighty-odd thousand members were no insignificant amount. Its officials were, for the most part, inspired by patriotic purposes, but were in some instances not disposed to be frank in their testimony, and at least one of its officers has not hesitated to express sentiments hardly to be expected from persons directing an organization seeking to inculcate patriotism and love for our Government.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. QUIN. I think the conclusions the gentleman has reached are important, and I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum has just been ascertained to be present only a moment ago and that this is a dilatory motion.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is not well taken.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. I prefer not to yield.

Mr. COLLIER. Then I shall not interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, to continue. Its congressional committee engaged in political activity, and in at least three instances sought directly to defeat a sitting Member of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

It circulated literature that carried the insinuation that Members who had voted upon measures selected by the league, and whose votes had been by it denominated as wrong votes, were not loyal.

It has filed no return or account of the expenditures made by the league in carrying on its activity, and while it is claimed that only \$5,900 or thereabouts was expended in its congressional activity, this does not include salaries of those engaged, nor the cost of printing and circulation of literature other than the chart and questionnaire. This sum expended in the congressional campaign was collected particularly for the purpose, and some \$8,000 was received for this fund.

Its activity through the congressional committee furnished information in such form as to invite most unfavorable and unjust criticism of the records of Members of the House of Representatives, and failed to lay all the facts before the people, whom, it is alleged, an effort was being made to educate. It is not contended that any evidence of malice in any particular instance is shown.

Its honorary officers were not cognizant of the detailed activities of the congressional committee, but freely expressed to your committee their disapproval of certain things done or sought to be accomplished. The honorary vice president expressed emphatically his disapproval of the congressional activity as conducted by Mr. Orth at a meeting of the executive committee.

The branch organizations at Chicago and Milwaukee operated independent of the parent organization at New York.

The Chicago branch sought directly to defeat FRED A. BRITTEN for nomination in the primaries in September, 1918.

The Wisconsin branch did not participate in either the primary or election campaign in Wisconsin.

The Federal statute requiring the filing of expenditures apparently includes within its scope an organization such as the National Security League when it engages in activity such as was conducted by its congressional committee during the national congressional elections in 1918—

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman withdraw the point; I have only two more sentences to read.

Mr. SNELL. I will withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. WALSH. The work conducted by the league through its congressional committee was not such as was contemplated or permitted under the charter granted by the State of New York. The above conclusions are respectfully submitted without recommendation. [Applause.]

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the majority report, and upon that motion I move the previous question.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I understood I was to have recognition.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the gentleman is to be recognized as soon as we get through with this thing. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves the adoption of the majority report, and on that motion he moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BROWNE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the report was agreed to was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENCE OF IRELAND.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass H. J. Res. 357, the Irish resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to suspend the rules and pass the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 357) requesting the commissioners plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the international peace conference to present to the said conference the right of Ireland to freedom, independence, and self-determination.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Illinois is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Texas is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER]. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Illinois proceeds, may we have the resolution read?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the commissioners plenipotentiary of the United States of America representing the United States at the international peace conference soon to assemble at Versailles be, and are hereby, requested to present to and to urge upon the said international peace conference the right to freedom, independence, and self-determination of Ireland, predicated upon the principle laid down by the President in his plea for an international league, that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive, and page 2, lines 1 and 2, inclusive, and insert:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the earnest hope of the Congress of the United States of America that the peace conference, now sitting in Paris, in passing upon the rights of various peoples, will favorably consider the claims of Ireland to the right of self-determination."

And amend the title.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Which resolution is offered, the original or the amendment? We can not amend on a motion to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. The one that is read is the one.

Mr. MANN. He read both. Instead of the original joint resolution the committee reported by striking out and reporting the concurrent resolution. Now, the Clerk read both. I suppose we do not want to pass both.

Mr. FLOOD. We want to pass the substitute for the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the substitute again. The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the earnest hope of the Congress of the United States of America that the peace conference, now sitting in Paris, in passing upon the rights of various peoples, will favorably consider the claims of Ireland to the right of self-determination.

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution expressing the earnest hope of the Congress of the United States that the peace conference will favorably consider self-determination for Ireland."

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this is not a party question. It is a matter that has been brought to the attention of this House by more resolutions than have ever been introduced on any subject we have had to deal with in this House since the breaking out of the war. It is a question that millions of people in America are interested in and a question that liberty-loving people all over the world are anxious to have settled and settled right if we expect to have peace in the world.

We have been given hope by the declarations of our President that the rights of small nations would be considered if we met with success at the termination of the war. Hope, it is true, so far as Ireland is concerned, has been long deferred, but we have been encouraged in the new and widespread movement for the freedom of small nations to believe that Ireland's claims will at last be given consideration.

In his great message to Congress asking for a declaration of war on Germany on April 2, 1917, President Wilson said:

It is a fearful thing to lead this great, peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance.

But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.

It would seem strange, indeed, in view of these facts, if the people of Ireland and men of Irish blood in America did not feel that it was but just to demand for Ireland the same rights as those to be accorded all the other small nations. We have a right to feel, and we do feel, that this Government at least is in honor bound to apply these principles without reservation to Ireland, as well as all the other small nations, demanding liberty, freedom, and independence.

We ask consideration of the resolution that has been favorably reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, expressing the earnest hope of the Congress of the United States that the peace conference will take up the question of self-determination for Ireland.

I introduced in the House some two years ago a resolution quite similar to the one we are called upon to consider, and when the peace commissioners were appointed I changed the resolution:

Requesting the commissioners plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the international peace conference to present to the said conference the right of Ireland to freedom, independence, and self-determination.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, after considering my resolution, reported the same to the House with this substituted, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the earnest hope of the Congress of the United States of America that the peace conference, now sitting in Paris, in passing upon the rights of various peoples, will favorably consider the claims of Ireland to the right of self-determination.

And the resolution is now before this House for action.

I am sure that this Congress will go down in history as perhaps the greatest Congress in the history of the Republic; it will be known as the war Congress; and by passing this resolution giving hope to the suffering people of Ireland, who have been oppressed for centuries, it will only be a fitting finish to our labors here if we pass it. [Applause.] What we who

have labored in the cause of freedom and liberty for Ireland want is an expression from this House; we are anxious to have the resolution passed. It has been said that if we do pass the resolution it will have no influence at the peace conference. Well, it may; I am willing to take the chance. I am satisfied, if we pass it, that we may get action by the Senate before the Senate adjourns. If we do not, it will be an expression by this House that I am sure will cause our commissioners to at least bring our request to the attention of the peace conference in Paris. [Applause.]

Poland has at last been made free; the Czecho-Slovaks are free; and I am sure we all congratulate the people of those countries. Shall we allow it to be said that the people of Ireland must still remain in bondage? I am unwilling to believe it. If the peace conference does not arrange for a permanent peace in the world, then the peace conference will have been a failure.

Only a week ago I attended a convention of the Irish race in America, assembled at Philadelphia, with over 5,000 delegates in attendance from all parts of the United States. They adopted resolutions calling upon the President and Congress of these United States of America to urge the peace conference now in session at Paris to apply to Ireland the great doctrine of national self-determination, and to recognize the right of the people of Ireland to select for themselves, without interference from any other people, the form of government under which in future they shall live, and I want to read to you the last paragraph of those resolutions:

Upon the shoulders of our President and Congress rests, in the last analysis, the responsibility of the peace that shall be made. We urge them to act in accordance with the doctrines laid down on our behalf when we entered the war, and in accordance with the resolution recently adopted, almost unanimously, by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, to the end that autocracy and militarism may be forever destroyed, and that the right of self-determination shall be given to all the people of the earth.

Let me give you a few reasons why we make the claim for freedom and self-determination for the Emerald Isle. I am indebted to the Irish National Bureau, Washington, D. C., for many of these facts and figures.

Ireland is a nation widely different from the English in race, tongue, traditions, and native culture.

In December, 1918, the Irish nation expressed itself in self-determination for an Irish Republic by over two-thirds majority vote of the electorate.

The Irish people gave this striking proof of unanimity—one that challenges the world to duplicate—notwithstanding the presence of a foreign army of over 200,000 men, with all but two of the leaders of the new national party in jail in England without charge or trial, with over 200 election workers and 3 successive campaign directors in jail without charge or trial.

Ireland gave over 275,000 of her sons to the British Army in this war, which was 6½ per cent of her whole population and about 40 per cent of her entire man power of military age (from 18 to 50).

What will the new leaders of Ireland do with the Ulster question?

They might well do as Washington did with his Ulster question in 1776, when 50,000 "loyalist" Americans fought with England against American independence. He ignored it. But the Irish Republicans mean to win over such of their Ulster countrymen as still remain opposed to the idea of an independent Ireland.

Hobson, Blythe, Morrow, and others of the Ulster Protestant leaders of Sinn Fein have every confidence that their neighbors will soon stand where their fathers did in 1783—for a free Ireland.

The Irish election of December last was made on one issue only: "Shall Ireland be independent of Great Britain?"

Over two-thirds of the members returned were of the Sinn Fein or Independence Party.

As their election posters stated: "The supreme and paramount issue is, 'To destroy the last link that keeps Ireland bound to England' (Parnell, Cincinnati, 1880)."

The election returns were:

Sinn Fein, of which one is from University.....	73
Unionists, of which three are from University.....	25
Devlin followers who may sit in Dublin Parliament as an opposition party (their platform was self-determination for Ireland).....	7

105

Before the December elections the Unionists had only 16 seats in Ulster. They have now made three gains owing to three-cornered contests against Republican and Dillon party candidates.

In addition to this, the Unionists have the five new seats that were in 1918 given to Ulster at the expense of southern counties.

This clever piece of gerrymandering enacted last year so added to the seats in Antrim County, of which Belfast is the county seat, that it alone has 14 members and the other 8 counties of Ulster have only 24 between them all.

Over two-thirds of the electoral districts have returned Sinn Fein Republican candidates.

Population of all Ireland is three-fourths Catholic and one-fourth Protestant, of which over one-fifth are Nationalists opposed to English rule.

In other words, over four-fifths of Ireland's population are already opposed to English rule in Ireland.

Ulster is, as a whole, 56 per cent Protestant.

Ulster is 44 per cent Catholic.

In five Ulster counties the Catholics predominate, being 81 per cent, 78 per cent, 74 per cent, 56 per cent, 55 per cent.

In four Ulster counties Protestants predominate, being 80 per cent, 69 per cent, 55 per cent, 55 per cent.

To advocates of the English scheme to cut out Ulster from the rest of Ireland I submit: If an Ulster minority in all Ireland—885,000 in the total for all Ireland of 4,390,000—has the right to demand a separate government, what about the rights of the Catholics of Ulster—695,000 out of the Ulster total of 1,570,000?

I will now cite a few of the reasons that demonstrate there is no impropriety in Congress intervening in favor of Irish freedom:

The precedent-making stand taken by the American Government in refusing to continue a treaty with Russia because of Russia's treatment of the Jews, purely an internal question.

American intervention against her historical friend and associate in the great war, illustrated by President Wilson's opposition to the secret treaties, which has caused their cancellation, notwithstanding the fact that the powerful French party, then and now dominated by Premier Clemenceau, was committed to the policy of annexing the left bank of the Rhine, as arranged by secret treaty with England, Russia, and Italy during the war.

The American Government's declaration of sympathy in favor of Greece during her struggle for independence, and American intervention which secured Cuban independence.

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS, WILL YOU NOT REDEEM THE PLEDGE OF THE CONGRESS OF 1778?

Ireland appeals to-day to the world, and particularly to America, to support her claim for self-determination.

Americans of Irish and Scotch blood, and millions of Americans besides, trust the Congress of to-day will redeem the pledge of the Congress of 1778.

"I am charged to assure you that means will be found to establish your freedom in the fullest and amplest measure," said Franklin in his address to the Irish people on October 4, 1778, writing out of the fullness of the powers delegated to him by Congress.

We appeal to you to pass the resolution unanimously that Ireland may be freed and that it may be forever recorded in history to the lasting honor of America and of you, gentlemen of the Congress.

Ireland has the most ancient continuous nationhood of all the countries of western Europe.

Yet the Irish people to-day are the only Caucasian people held subject by an alien people against their will.

In every generation since 1172 the sons of Ireland have sacrificed their lives for Irish freedom. In every generation they have repeated the protest of Donnell O'Neill, high king of Ireland in 1258, who denounced the invaders and declared that until the day of Ireland's freedom dawned the Irish people would unceasingly struggle "to recover our independence, which is our national right."

A roll of nations will shortly be called in the world-molding conference at Paris.

"America!" "England!" "France!" "Belgium!" and on through the list of peoples, free and being freed.

"Finland!" "Estonia!" "Ukraine!" and the rest. Each of these can answer "Here!"

When Ireland's turn has come, who will reply to the call?

Gentlemen of the House, America's support to-day to the Irish nation, so valiantly enduring, will redeem the pledge of Congress in 1778 and help to free America's first friend and ally.

Were Congress to refuse this support it would not alone break faith with all that is highest in American traditions and with the definite obligations laid upon this country by George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and their glorious associates, but it would break faith with some more near, with the heroes who sleep in Flanders fields, and who now say:

I gave my life for freedom; this I know,
For ye who sent me told me so.

"Lafayette, we are here!" said Pershing at the French hero's tomb, with the thought of America's debt in his mind. * * *

"Ireland, we're standing by, and we'll see you through!"
Can America say anything less now to Ireland in the throes of her final struggle?

IRISH RELIEF FOR AMERICA.

The first trans-Atlantic Hurleys and Hoovers were Dublin men.

In 1675 "King Philip's War" laid New England waste. The only country in the world that sent relief to America then was Ireland.

An Irish relief ship sailed from Dublin for Boston on July 28, 1676, with a generous cargo which gave relief in 500 settlements.

Dublin Corporation sent three commissioners with the ship to attend to the distribution of what is known in New England annals as "the Irish donation."

IRISH MONEY FOR AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

America's Rebellion was prompted by the eternal spirit of Sinn Fein in the hearts of the people, and when the rebels were enduring indescribable hardships and Congress was unable to raise the money it was a group of Philadelphia gentlemen who subscribed the money to supply the Army with provisions and clothing. Of the total amount subscribed, £315,000, close to one-half was subscribed by Philadelphia Sons of St. Patrick and Hibernians.

Much has been said in history of Robert Morris as "financier of the Revolution" and how he later occupied a debtor's prison because of advances made to the Government, but we never hear of Oliver Pollock, a native of Ireland, who settled in Carlisle, Pa., in 1760, who made advances to the sum of \$300,000, over \$100,000 of which had not been returned to him at the time of his death; nor of Edward Fox, a native of Dublin, who was ruined by the large advances made to Robert Morris and associates. In 1797 these gentlemen still owed him \$900,000. (Supreme Court Pa., 2; Norris Repts., 512.) Thomas Fitzsimons also lent large sums to Morris to finance the revolution.

IRISHMEN IN WASHINGTON'S ARMY.

"Gen. Lee informed me that he believed fully one-half of the rebel army was composed of Irish."—Maj. Gen. Robertson to English committee of inquiry, 1779.

"The names and places of their nativity being taken down, I can answer the question with precision. There were scarcely one-fourth natives of America; one-half were Irish, the other fourth English and Scotch."—Ex-Speaker Galloway, of Pennsylvania, testifying before the same committee. (Royal Gazette, Oct. 27, 1779.)

The first troops to sail from France to America's aid were four regiments (all Irish) of the Irish Brigade, under command of Count Dillon.

Irish emigration increased as talk of American independence grew. After Franklin's mission to Ireland emigration leaped to 18,500 yearly, mostly men of every class, whose direct purpose was to bear arms in the Revolution.

While Burke and Barre pleaded in England for America an anti-recruiting society, known as the "White Boys," was organized in Ireland for the purpose of preventing enlistments in the regiments selected for the American campaign, and American privateers were welcomed in Irish ports, where they were supplied with provisions and information as to the whereabouts of the enemy war vessels.

"The most conclusive evidence of the prominence of the Irish race in the accomplishment of America's independence is to be found in the abundance of Irish names in the lists of soldiers of the Revolution."—Maginnis.

George Washington recognized the aid of the Irish in the American Revolution:

I accept with singular pleasure the ensign of so worthy a fraternity as that of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, a society distinguished for the firm adherence of its members to the glorious cause in which we are embarked. (December, 1781, when elected an honorary member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, of Philadelphia.)

Again, in 1790:

I hope ever to see America amongst the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality, and I presume that your fellow citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution and in the establishment of their Government.

George Washington Parke Custis, adopted son of Washington, said in 1828, in an address upon an appeal for aid from Ireland:

And why is this imposing appeal made to our sympathies?

It is an appeal from that very Ireland whose generous sons, alike in the day of gloom and of our glory, shared in our misfortunes and joined in our success; who, with undaunted courage, breasted the storm which, once threatening to overwhelm us, howled with fearful and desolating fury through this now happy land; who, with aspirations deep and fervent for our cause, whether under the walls of the Castle of Dublin, in the shock of our liberty's battles, or in the feeble, expiring accents of famine and misery amidst the horrors of the prison ships, cried from their hearts, "God save America."

Tell me not of the aid which we received from another European nation in the struggle for independence; that aid was most, nay, all, essential to our ultimate success, but remember, years of conflict had rolled away. Of the operatives in war—I mean the soldier—up to the coming of the French, Ireland had furnished in the ratio of 100 for 1 of any foreign nation whatever. Then honored be the old good service of the sons of Erin in the War of Independence. Let the shamrock be entwined with the laurels of the Revolution, and truth and justice guiding the pen of history inscribe upon the tablets of American remembrance "eternal gratitude to Irishmen."

The Marquis de Chastellusi, a major general in Rochambeau's army, wrote in his "Travels" (Paris, 1786):

An Irishman, the instant he sets foot on American ground, becomes, ipso facto, an American. This was uniformly the case during the whole of the late war.

..... Indeed, their conduct during the late Revolution amply justified this favorable opinion, for whilst the Irish emigrant was fighting the battles of America by sea and land the Irish merchants, particularly at Charleston, Baltimore, and Philadelphia, labored with indefatigable zeal and at all hazards to promote the spirit of enterprise, to increase the wealth and maintain the credit of the country.

Their purses were always open and their persons devoted to the common cause. On more than one imminent occasion Congress owed their existence, and America probably her preservation, to the fidelity and firmness of the Irish.

IRISH FRIENDS OF AMERICAN FREEDOM.

Commodore Jack Barry, the dashing sailor hero, who was the founder of the American Navy, was a native of Wexford, Ireland, a Gael of the finest type, keen, resourceful, audacious, and ardent.

The first naval engagement of the American Revolution was off Maine, fought and won under the direction of five sons of Maurice O'Brien, of Cork. The only naval battle on inland waters, in 1812, was won by Commodore Thomas MacDonough, son of an Irishman.

The first American officer to raise the American flag over a fortress in the Old World was Lieut. O'Bannon, of the United States Marines, in the Tripolitan War of 1805.

Gen. Anthony Wayne—Gen. Henry Lee, in his Memoirs (1808) writes of the Irishry of "Mad Anthony Wayne" and "the native temper of the troops he commanded. They were known by the designation of the line of Pennsylvania, whereas they might have with more propriety been called the line of Ireland. Bold and daring, * * * the general and his soldiers were singularly fitted for close and stubborn action, hand to hand, in the center of the Army."

Patrick Henry—Shall Ireland alone of all the civilized nations of the world remain in subjection to a foreign power?

"The thought is tragic—in the light of Ireland's long unceasing struggle for liberty, in the story of Easter, 1916, and in the ardent hopes of 20,000,000 of Irish blood overseas. For in the hearts of each of these is an echo of the ringing call of Patrick Henry, whose Irish blood prompted the cry that was Virginia's tocsin to revolution in 1776: 'As for me, give me liberty or give me death.'"

Nineteen generals in the Revolutionary Army were of Irish origin—11 of these born in Ireland—Sullivan, Lewis, Wayne, Montgomery, Conway, Noylan, Thompson, Maxwell, Irvine, Hand, Butler, Stewart, Knox, Clinton, Moore, Reed, Nixon, Cochran, Armstrong.

Ten signers of the Declaration of Independence were of Irish blood—Carroll, McKean, Rutledge, Hart, Thornton, Smith, Taylor, Reed, Paine, and Lynch.

Seven States had as their first governors men of Irish blood—Sullivan, in Massachusetts; Boyle, in Illinois; Clinton, in New York; Houston, in Georgia; Bryan, in Pennsylvania; McKinley, in Delaware; Denver, in Kansas; while Sir William Johnson, first governor of the Indians, was properly a MacShane, a sept of the O'Neill family.

The great majority of the first American teachers were Irish, because the penal laws forbade them teaching in Ireland. Approximately the names of 1,000 of them have been taken from authentic American records. Between 1775 and 1784 few of these teachers were at their desks. They were fighting for American freedom.

John Hancock's first teacher was Peter McLeuth, of Maynooth, Ireland. Daniel Webster's was William Evans, of Sligo, and John Dickinson, of Maryland, "The Penman of the Revolution," owes his forceful style to his Irish teacher, William Killen, who came to America in 1737 as a redemptioner.

Another Irish teacher, John Sullivan, of Limerick, was the father of two governors, one judge, an attorney general, a major general, and four officers in Washington's army.

Charles Thompson, who made the first copy of the Declaration, and John Dunlap, who first printed it, were born in Ireland. Gen. John Nixon, who first publicly read the Declaration, was a son of an Irishman.

Gen. Andrew Lewis was the son of John Lewis, of County Donegal, who killed his landlord in resisting an illegal attempt to eject him from his home, and with three sons he came to Virginia in 1732, being the first white settler in Bellefont, Va.

At a meeting of American citizens held in the City Hall, Washington, D. C., on June 20, 1826, for the purpose of transmitting a consolatory address to the people of Ireland, George Washington Parke Custis, Esq., of Arlington, Washington's adopted son, was invited to the chair, and John Boyle, of Washington, appointed secretary to the meeting, according to the

United States Catholic Miscellany, Charlestown, Saturday, August 12, 1826. As soon as the meeting was organized, the following letter from the Rev. J. W. Fairlough, of Alexandria, was presented by Mr. Charles Murray, and read from the chair. The sentiments contained in the letter were favorably received by the audience:

ALEXANDRIA, June 20, 1826.

To the chairman of the meeting of the friends of civil and religious liberty, in the City Hall, Washington.

SIR: Sorry I am that my manifold occupations prevent me from attending your meeting this evening. I hope the address to the people of Ireland, emanating from the metropolis of the free United States of America, will be consoling to, will be sympathizing with, our suffering brethren in persecuted Erin; will speak in strong, intelligible, and dignified terms, becoming the free citizens of a free country, the fellow kindred feelings which glow in the heart of every exile, of every free-born American. You can not express your feelings too strongly. Ireland demands your sympathy. Sympathize, then, with her as children who love their parents. Let it be known in Erin that Irishmen in America have not forgotten the land of their nativity; that the descendants of Irish emigrants have Irish blood still flowing in their veins; that they are still blessed with Irish feelings. Let Ireland know, from one extremity to the other, that the free citizens of America would be delighted to see the bonds of her slavery broken asunder, and rejoice to see her (in the language of her Curran) disenthralled from the domination of despotism by an act of unqualified, unconditional emancipation. I am, sir, an Englishman by birth, and I boast of having, both in England and America (as far as my poor abilities and opportunities afforded), been the steady advocate of persecuted Ireland. Let our sentiments, our feelings, be known throughout the whole British Empire. Let England feel ashamed of her conduct when she sees the whole world arrayed against her, deprecating her unnatural conduct toward her sister Ireland. I hope your meeting will be numerous and respectable. Present, Mr. Chairman, my most cordial concurrence with the wishes and object of the meeting.

J. W. FAIRLOUGH.

I can not conclude my remarks with any utterance more American than the speech of George Washington Parke Custis, chairman of the meeting:

I COME HERE AS AN AMERICAN.

In the address, which it is your pleasure that I should make from the chair, should I fail in producing that impression which I could hope to produce, and you might perhaps expect, let a failure be attributed to a state of broken health and spirits rather than to any want of zeal for the cause of civil and religious liberty, or want of sympathy for the cause of Ireland.

It is supposed that he, who has now the honor of addressing you, is connected by remote ancestral lineage with the family of Dillon. It may be so, or it may not be so, it is no matter; still, if there be a single drop in the current of my existence which flows from an Irish source it will ever be warm in my heart, while that heart itself is warm.

I came here as an American, I feel as an American, I shall speak as an American; it is not Irishmen alone that have congregated to this interesting bidding, not Catholics alone, for there are many here who worship at other than the Apostolic shrine. 'Tis a millennium of feeling where various tribes of men have assembled in love of one another to express their hatred of oppression and their sympathy for the oppressed.

Thanks to the good feeling which is abroad—and far may it spread—we have a most numerous and respectable assembly; but why are we content with this most spacious hall, why have we not to seek a wider arena? Because, forsooth, there are those who doubt the propriety of interference in the concerns of other people, potentates, or powers. I ask these skeptics, "Quid timetis," do you fear the old lion's growl? From our eagle's eyry, I "laugh to scorn" his rage. But, perhaps, there are Protestants who have scruples of conscience, and decline to interfere, even in opinion, with papal matters. If these are Americans, let me say: When you felt the full force of the lion's merciless fangs, who first gave you the aid, not of words, but deeds? There was a time when Americans were not sticklers in doctrinal matters; it was when to our wasted, war-worn ranks we were glad to receive the religionists of any creed, and found, to our comfort and to our independence, too, that a Catholic arm could drive a bayonet on the foe, and a Catholic heart beat high for the liberties of our country.

When our friendless standard was first unfurled for resistance, who were the strangers that first mustered round its staff, and when it reeled in the fight, who more bravely sustained it than Erin's generous sons? Who led the assault of Quebec and shed that early luster on our arms in the dawn of the Revolution? He who will live in everlasting memory and who rests in heaven—Montgomery. Who led the right wing of liberty's forlorn hope at the passage of the Delaware? An Irishman. Who felt the privations of the camp, the fate of battle, or the horrors of the prison ship more keenly than Irishmen? Look on this picture, Americans, which, though feebly, is faithfully drawn; then talk of interference, and I blush for my country.

Or will you seek further their merits to disclose? I cap the climax of their worth when I say Washington loved them, for they were the companions of his toils, his perils, his glories, in the deliverance of his country.

Nor was the feeling for our cause confined to this hemisphere. In Erin, and in the darkest days of our destiny, whenever it was told that we bore ourselves bravely in the field, though pressed by misfortune, and that liberty's pennon still flew, though shattered by the gale, a thousand—aye, a hundred thousand—times did the poor Irishman take off his hat and cry from his heart, "God save great Washington and the cause of America." And this, Americans, in the very lion's jaws.

And with such revelations as these, can you, will you, dare you, Americans, talk of interference and withhold your voice from a general acclaim, which should thunder in this land till its echoes reach the Emerald Isle, in a prayer for her deliverance? If there is an American who does not feel for the wrongs of that country, which so nobly contributed to the establishment of our rights, I pronounce him recreant to the feelings of virtue, honor, and gratitude. And my country's self, if she decline to give only her poor opinions of the miseries of those

who gave their toll and blood that she might be great, free, and happy when misfortunes next assail her, may she not find the friend she once found in Ireland.

This token will convey our greetings to Erin's distant sons, and when it arrives there they will exclaim, "There is yet a people who remember poor Ireland, and who, rejoicing in their own rights, can feel for the wrongs of others!" Let our scroll be inscribed, "From the land of liberty to the land of Montgomery."

IRELAND MUST NOT LOSE HOPE.

But let not Ireland despair. There is a tide in the affairs of nations, like that of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to glory. The spring source arises in our happy empire, but see, its mighty current already flows to the peaks of the Andes, and, like the blessed Nile, fertilizes and renders plenteous all the regions within its reach. 'Tis the sacred, though restless, stream of liberty. It flows to the land of Leonidas, bearing on its bosom the corpses of her inhuman oppressors.

Behold the genius of Greece, as she towers above the shattered walls of immortal Missolochi; in the one hand she grasps the standard of the cross, the symbol of salvation to man, with the other she wields the avenging sword of her deliverance, bloodstained to the hilt, and cries to her oppressors:

"Now welcome fate,
And, if I perish, I will perish great;
Yet in a mighty deed, I will expire,
Let future ages hear it and admire."

Illustrious Greece, worthy of thine ancient renown, go on in thy proud career, till not a turbaned tyrant remains to pollute thy classic soil. Then, why should Ireland despair? The tree of liberty grows nowhere in a day. Though the soil be genial, its roots must long be moistened with the blood of heroes and of patriots ere its rise to grandeur, and shade and shelter the land.

Has Ireland no qualities to fit her for a better fate? Go to the senate and the bar; go where you will, you'll know her genius by the luster that it sheds around it—or will you rather to the fields of fame? When did Albion entwine a victor's laurel that Erin did not contribute full many a leaf from the plains of Abraham to the plains of Waterloo, from Wolfe to Wellington? And now that England will erect a trophy for the greatest of her triumphs, let it not be of unmeaning iron, let her search well that memorable field, and she will find enough of Irishmen's bones to raise a cenotaph as high as Pompey's pillar.

Permit me to conclude with the Invocation to Ireland, as uttered by the child of Mount Vernon on the day of independence, and under the venerable pretorium of the Revolution:

"Health and success to the Emerald Isle! My country's friend in my country's utmost need. May she soon be relieved from the Lion's grasp, for the Lion is of a kind that fondles ere it kills, whose blandishments lure but to destroy, while the Eagle suffers the smallest bird to wing his wonted way and to warble his hymns of praise in the pure melody of nature, the song of the soul. And when Ireland shall strike her harp to the wild notes of Erin and liberty the ocean breeze will bear to her shores the prayers of Americans, to cheer her in her glorious struggle and hall her regenerate in the rights of mankind."

"Ireland, thou friend of my country, in my country's most friendless days, much injured, much enduring land, accept this poor tribute from one who esteems thy worth and mourns thy desolation. May the God of heaven, in His justice and mercy, grant thee more prosperous fortunes, and in His own good time cause the sun of freedom to shed its benign radiance on the Emerald Isle!"

"Erin and liberty, Erin go bragh."

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. This resolution is reported as a substitute with change of title. The number is still "House joint resolution 357." Now, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] did report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs House concurrent resolution 68, which is the same thing. I think it would look a little better to pass the House concurrent resolution under title of "House concurrent resolution" than to pass it under the title of "House joint resolution."

Mr. FLOOD. The way I happened to introduce it—

Mr. MANN. I do not think anybody would object if the gentleman would do that.

Mr. FLOOD. It was just this—

Mr. MANN. I understand how it occurred.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] had been working on this resolution for some years and had done a great deal of work on it, and it was the desire of this committee to report his resolution, a concurrent resolution, not a joint resolution, and so we agreed on the concurrent resolution as a substitute for a joint resolution. And then we had some question as to what the parliamentary status would be when it got in the House, and while that matter was being considered by the parliamentary clerk, I introduced this other resolution as a joint resolution. But after consultation it was decided that it was in perfect parliamentary form to report a concurrent resolution as a substitute for the joint resolution. Therefore we reported it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman wants it passed under the title of "House joint resolution 357," although it is a concurrent resolution?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; but we amend the title.

Mr. MANN. But you do not amend the number, and you can not.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH. To my mind the Irish question, like that of the world war, is a question of humanity, and the only way to settle it is justice.

When we review our own history and our own struggle for independence, when we consider the principles of liberty that brought forth this Republic and made it great and glorious, and when we proudly remember our time-honored, unchanging attitude as the friend and advocate of liberty-seeking peoples, how can this House think of disregarding an appeal of this kind?

When we study the history of the Emerald Isle and her seven-century struggle for freedom, when we reflect that we went into the war to defend liberty and civilization, to help to establish governments based on democracy and justice, and that we have emerged a potential factor in the readjustment of the world's problems, who in this House fails to hear the voices of consistency and justice urging us to support this resolution.

Now, what is it the Irish people ask Congress to do? Merely to express the hope that when the peace conference is passing upon the claims of the various peoples it will favorably consider the right of Ireland to self-government. Simply that and nothing more.

In considering this resolution let us not forget that 143 years ago our forefathers formed a little group of Colonies and declared them free and independent States and proclaimed these self-evident truths:

That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its power in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

When the fathers of the Republic proclaimed these truths they spoke not only for themselves and for their time but for all men and for all time.

And let us likewise remember that the Continental Congress forwarded an address to the people of Ireland setting forth its motives and objects and asking their sympathy and good will for the American cause, and that the Irish promptly responded and fought shoulder to shoulder with the Revolutionary patriots and poured out their blood as a free offering to American independence. This the Irish have always done whenever and wherever human freedom has been the issue.

And now it comes to pass that nearly a century and a half later, the spirit of 1919 being identical with the spirit of 1776, the Irish people appeal to the American Congress to do that for Ireland which Ireland gladly and willingly did for America when she, too, was struggling to free herself from the yoke of alien rule.

The people of Ireland and millions of men and women of Irish blood all over the world, ever faithful and devoted to the principles and patriotic aspiration of their race, join in the prayer that America will save the Emerald Isle from being excluded from consideration in a league founded on nationhood, at a time when liberty is to be accorded to nations great and small.

In the name of justice, consistency, and humanity how can we Americans disregard so reasonable, so meritorious an appeal? To ignore it at this time would be utterly repugnant to our traditions, to our ideals. And more than that, it would be a stain on our national honor.

Should any country be so unjust and unfair as to deny Ireland's claim to freedom at this time; should any country be willing to thus brand itself as a fraud and a hypocrite, let it not be said that the United States was a party to the perfidy, by declining to do for Ireland that which the American heart, American instincts and justice admonished her to do.

Among us, I know, are those who question the prudence and propriety of bringing up this matter to the peace table just now. To my timid brethren let me say that it is among her proudest distinctions that America has always stood out conspicuously in the family of nations as the friend and sympathizer of the downtrodden; that her concern and compassion over and over again have found expression in deeds as well as in words, and that no consideration has deterred her in taking action when the rights and happiness of several million people are involved, like the case of Ireland.

Washington said to the French minister: "Having devoted the best years of my life to the maintenance of liberty, I rejoice whenever in any country I see a nation unfold the banner of freedom."

And from Washington down to Wilson these glorious sentiments have pervaded this land to the advantage of oppressed peoples.

Nearly a century ago our hearts went out to the South American republics when they were trying, like Ireland, to throw off an alien yoke. Nor was our sympathy limited to the New World. When the holy alliance included Prussia, Russia, Austria, and England, who united to protect all European governments no matter how tyrannical they were to the people they were ruling, and the Greeks rose against the Turks to free from Ottoman rule their land of countless beauties and associations, America did not hesitate to manifest her sympathy for the Greeks. So, too, when the French people rose against the Bourbons, the Poles against the Russians, and the Hungarians against the Austrians, the United States, as always, stood with the oppressed.

And, furthermore, let me remind you that neither our friendly relations with Austria nor her might as a powerful nation checked our country from extending our earnest sympathy and well wishes to the great Hungarian leader Kossuth, and heartily welcoming him when he visited the United States and addressed this House.

May I not remind you that when the Austrian envoy protested against the interest we were showing the Hungarian patriots he intimated that if it continued retaliatory measures, commercial or otherwise, might ensue, and that thereupon Daniel Webster, then Secretary of State, sent his immortal reply, which will always remain as a sound declaration of American policy. It seems particularly fitting to refer to it just now.

Webster said, in substance, that America was the friend and sympathizer of every people fighting for freedom. That this Nation was founded on the rights of men, the equality of all men before the law, the denial of kingly authority, and government of the people and by the people. He said further:

That any people of any power who were trying by every effort and at every sacrifice to enlarge their liberties would always command the earnest and enthusiastic sympathy of the United States.

And, again, neither fear of her mailed hand nor our friendly relations with England restrained us in 1878 from enthusiastically greeting the distinguished Irish leader Charles Stewart Parnell and inviting him to address our Congress on his plans for restoring self-government to Ireland. If I mistake not, the House expressed the hope that Parnell would succeed and home rule be granted to the Irish people.

Many other similar instances could be submitted, but time will not permit me to multiply them.

It was my pleasure to support this resolution in the Committee on Foreign Affairs as it is my gratification to uphold it here.

I support it not because I am of Irish parentage, proud as I am of that, but because I am an American and believe that this is a time when one should not only think and speak like an American, but act like an American.

It is unthinkable that at a time like the present, when liberty seems to be everywhere and freedom is to be accorded nations great and small, that any red-blooded American can find it in his heart to ignore Ireland's plea not to be made the solitary exception in the whole world to the beneficent influence of peace.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas consume some of his time?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have no desire uselessly to consume the time of this House, but I opposed this resolution in the committee, and I feel that I should at least give to the House some of the views of the minority on the committee while this resolution is being considered.

For the Irish and their cause I have the most sincere sympathy. But, gentlemen, I take it that the internal affairs of the British Empire are of no official concern to the people of the United States, especially at this time when at Paris the peace conference is assembled and around the table are gathered our allies, one of which is Great Britain.

The resolution reads:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the earnest hope of the Congress of the United States of America that the peace conference, now sitting in Paris, in passing upon the rights of various peoples, will favorably consider the claims of Ireland to the right of self-determination.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the peace conference at Paris will not entertain any such proposition as is contained in this resolution; and, in the second place, it has no jurisdiction whatever over it, because Ireland is a component part of the United Kingdom, and that Empire is represented around the peace table by Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Balfour, just as our delegates represent all parts of the United States. The peace conference would have neither power nor jurisdiction to take up the claims of Ireland for self-determina-

tion, since the relations of Ireland to Great Britain are not involved in the settlement of peace among the nations at war.

Gentlemen of the Congress, my forbears came from Ireland, but I am not an Irish-American; I am an American [applause]; and I place my country's interests and my country's welfare before the welfare of any other country on the face of this globe, and I am not willing to imperil the success of the peace negotiations at Paris in bringing to a conclusion the most stupendous struggle that ever staggered the world and in which we poured out on the fields of Flanders and France our best blood and billions of dollars of our money, for the sake of gratifying the promptings of a sentiment; no, not even for Ireland.

Gentlemen of the House, all of you do know that whatever action this House may in its wisdom decide to take, it will avail nothing. Nobody on this floor believes that in response to this resolution the peace conference will halt its labors one moment.

Nobody believes or entertains a glimmer of hope that the body sitting in the other end of this Capitol will pass this resolution. So why make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the world simply to gratify a sentiment that all of us do entertain—that the Irish may in their own way and through their own efforts within the law attain independence and self-government?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is there anything more in this resolution than the expression of a desire for the right of petition?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Oh, I take it that there is.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In reading the proceedings of the peace conference it appears that certain of the small countries have asked for certain things. I have read this resolution very carefully, and have reached the conclusion that there is nothing in it except an expression of the right of petition. I want the gentleman's interpretation of that.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber seem to have come to the conclusion, rather tardily, after filibustering here a good portion of the night—they have, for some cause, suddenly become converted to the Irish cause.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will permit, I for one stated that I was in favor of this resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. To be sure. I do recall that the gentleman from Pennsylvania did make such a statement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So that I was not one of those who attempted to filibuster against it.

Mr. DYER. Nobody has filibustered.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I question whether the gentleman from Texas is accurate in his statement that anybody has filibustered. I have read the resolution. I repeat, it seems to me to be merely the expression of a desire for consideration on behalf of a small nation asking for justice. That is the way it impresses me.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will say in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the small countries that are having the question of self-determination applied to them are countries which prior to this war were under the dominion of our enemies. Austria-Hungary fell to pieces, and the German Empire is being broken up, and it is with those peoples that the peace conference is dealing.

So far as I have been advised, the peace conference is not considering, nor will it be called upon to consider, the political separation from Great Britain, Italy, France, the United States, or any other of the allies of any colony, dominion, or dependency of the respective nations.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is it not a fact that they have agreed to take part of Poland away from Russia?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I do not understand they have agreed to anything yet; and as far as Russia is concerned it may be observed that she long ago ceased to be an active participant with the allies in the prosecution of the war and, for all practical purposes, became an ally of the central powers.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If you gentlemen will come at me singly, I will answer first one and then another, if I can.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure the gentleman can answer this.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will if I can.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman mean by the statement he has just made that when we sent our boys to help to fight for self-determination we meant self-determination only for those

nations that were under German rule, and not for all the small nations of the earth?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman from Colorado did not vote for war in order to enable small nations to have self-determination, and I did not vote for it for that purpose, and the resolution for a declaration of war would never have passed this House but for the fact that Germany had violated American rights and had sunk American ships and had taken American lives upon the high seas. [Applause.]

Of course, it was gratifying to me, as it doubtless was to others, that in fighting primarily for American rights we could also fight the battles of the world and civilization and that having triumphed we can impose conditions of peace that will liberate peoples long oppressed and misruled by our enemies and their allies.

Mr. PHELAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHELAN. Does the gentleman mean to assert that America ought to uphold the just cause of a liberty-seeking people against our enemies and not uphold the just cause of a liberty-seeking people simply because they have been under the rule of one of our cobelligerents in this war?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will answer the gentleman's question by asking him one. If I am to take the sentiment implied by his question as being true, the gentleman from Massachusetts would be willing to-morrow to vote for a resolution to declare war against Great Britain in order to establish the independence of Ireland?

Mr. PHELAN. The gentleman has no such proposition here.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. You have this one here, and that is the one I am talking about.

Mr. PHELAN. But I do say that the American people ought to have the courage to express the hope that a people seeking liberty in any part of the world may get that liberty. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman's zeal is very admirable, and I applaud him for it.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman tell me whether, in his opinion, there will be anything left of the peace conference or the peace table if this resolution passes?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I do not know that I caught the exact meaning of the gentleman's question.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will it break up the peace conference for us to pass this resolution?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I do not think it would make a big dent in the peace conference whether we passed it or not.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman will admit that if the United States had not intervened in the war it is likely that the allies would have lost.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am not going afield into a lot of speculation; I am talking about this resolution.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman admits that unless the United States does exert its influence there is not much opportunity for the peace-loving people of Ireland to get independence.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I do not admit that. If the reverse was true, I would take it that when the resolution passed and was signed by the Speaker the Irish would immediately realize their ambition.

Mr. HAMILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAMILL. When the gentleman says that this resolution would have a negligible effect on the peace conference at Paris, does he want us to believe that the peace conference holds this House of Representatives in such contempt as to pay no attention to anything it approved?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I do not think the peace conference would regard this body as ridiculous except as it makes itself so.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman recalls that the House took action on behalf of the Jews, looking to the abrogation of the treaty with Russia?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. We had a treaty with Russia.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman recall the fact that we asked relief for the Roumanian Jews as affected by the Berlin treaty?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I do not remember the details. I was not a Member of the House at that time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is there anything in this except the statement by the House of Representatives—

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. This is a concurrent resolution, and if it is sincerely presented you hope for action by the Senate.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, a request by Congress that the peace conference give careful consideration to the claims of the Irish—

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If the gentleman's contention is true it means nothing.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It could not embarrass the peace conference. They can approve of the suggestion of the House of Representatives or disapprove of it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Of course, it can. The gentleman's suggestion but emphasizes my view that it is not properly our concern.

Mr. HAMILL. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I again yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAMILL. Does the gentleman think that the House of Representatives would render itself ridiculous by asking the peace conference to consider favorably the right of a distinct nation to come under the rule that they be given the right of self-determination?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. In reply to the gentleman from New Jersey, I will say that I have never had any information that there is any Irish question pending before the peace conference, and so I think it would be ridiculous to ask them to take up something that was not before them and which does not directly affect our national interests.

Mr. HAMILL. One more question.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I can not yield any more, because my time is limited.

Mr. HAMILL. Is it not a fact that there are even submerged nationalities in Russia which will very likely be taken up by the peace conference, although there has been no declaration in regard to it?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I do not know of any, and my declarations already made regarding Russia still apply.

Mr. HAMILL. Will the gentleman answer yes or no?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I have yielded to the gentleman several times, but I decline to be cross-examined or badgered in police-court style. I will yield to courteous questions.

Mr. HAMILL. My question is—the gentleman states that the peace conference would not consider any claims that were not published in the program. I say that is not so; that they will very likely take up questions of nations that have been submerged—

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Have they taken up Ireland yet?

Mr. HAMILL. I do not know. I think there would be no more propriety in Congress passing this resolution than the declaration of the President in the Senate before we entered the war for a free and united people.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am not passing on the President's position or what he has said. I am speaking on my own authority and nobody else's. I am responsible to no one but my constituents and my country. I want to say that if the English Parliament to-morrow should pass a resolution suggesting that it would be very much pleased if the United States should relinquish the Philippine Islands or give them independence I, as an American citizen, would bitterly resent any such action on the part of the British Parliament. [Applause.]

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. And on the other hand, if the British Parliament or any other parliament should suggest to the United States that it would view with a great deal of pleasure our setting up an independent Government in Porto Rico, I would resent it from the bottom of my feet to the crown of my head, and so would every other man on the floor of this House. Yet we feel called upon by solemn act of this Congress to suggest to Great Britain that we think we might be able to run her affairs a little better than she is running them herself.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DECKER. What sentiment does the gentleman entertain relative to a man, an Englishman, who once said, "If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, I would never lay down my arms"?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I think the sentiments expressed by the great Pitt during our war for independence, quoted by the gentleman from Missouri, would have made him a much better American than Britisher.

Mr. DECKER. But would it not make him a better man?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a minute?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. MASON. I am for it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will give the gentleman a minute if I have the time.

Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Texas, that under ordinary circumstances it might be deemed a piece of impertinence for us to pass a resolution regarding what would be considered a domestic question from Great Britain, just exactly as we would consider it a piece of impertinence for them to pass a resolution in their Parliament regarding the Philippines; but I ask the gentleman whether under the circumstances when, with the cooperation, if not the initiative, of great Britain we are considering a league of nations, in which we are asked to guarantee territorial integrity of the nations to become a party to the league, that does not open the door and give us the right to express our opinions as to what shall be the territorial boundaries we are supposed to guarantee?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. In the first place, the initiation of questions that affect the foreign relations are no business of the House of Representatives. The negotiation of our foreign affairs, by the Constitution, is placed within the hands of the Executive, except when required to be ratified by the Senate. In reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD] I would say that instead of agreeing to his contention, it seems to me that now would be a most unpropitious time to select for such action. We have now in Paris commissioners seated around the peace table. Around that table are gathered our allies, with whom we fought side by side, and whose blood was mingled with ours, whose treasure was poured out with ours. Yet we say to our commissioners, "We need the cooperation of these allies in order to bring about a satisfactory treaty of peace, we need their assistance in order to maintain and carry out any league of nations, or any other international agreement which we may enter, but the first thing you do when you get there, you must insult our most powerful, our most influential, and our greatest ally by suggesting to her that she permit us to suggest how she shall run her internal affairs."

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I desire to call the gentleman's attention in the one minute I have to the difference between the situation that seems to be in his mind, and the situation as it is in mine. Six months ago our allies were in trouble. Six months ago the President of the United States, when we were at war and when the world was suffering, made a splendid suggestion as terms of peace. Among those terms was one that the little peoples of the world should not be moved from one nationality to another, governed by force, and without their consent. Great Britain and all of her allies and our enemies finally accepted these terms. Great Britain never raised the question. She can not now do it. She consented to those terms when she was in trouble, when she was broken in health, broken in money, broken from every military standpoint. When we made the suggestions through our great President that these were the terms of peace it was to me as sacred as if the men had got around the table and signed them. As the gentleman says, it was sealed with the blood of our boys. Great Britain agreed to that doctrine of self-determination, and she certainly can not complain of it now, after the sacrifice we have made in men and money. We ask her to keep the treaty she made when we asked them to agree to self-determination for the little peoples of the world.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois is always interesting and he is always brilliant. I remember sometime ago listening to him here with rapt attention as he repudiated the doctrine that the United States should enter or fight in any war to settle real estate titles in Europe or anywhere else. [Applause and laughter.] Oh, it seems—

Mr. MASON. We did enter into the war and we agreed to settle real estate titles when the war was settled. Let us keep our agreement.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the doctrine of self-determination of small countries would apply with equal force to Porto Rico, and I know the gentleman too well to believe that he would view with complacency a resolution by the British Parliament suggesting to Uncle Sam what our course should be with regard to that dependency of this Republic. And I know his sentiments too

well to believe that he would look with satisfaction upon a resolution by the British Parliament as to our course with reference to Mexico in North America or the Republics of South America.

Mr. Speaker, I am neither insensible nor indifferent to the aspirations of any people for independence and self-government—from whatever quarter it may come my heart is always deeply sympathetic to any call of a people or nation for liberty and political autonomy, and I fervently hope that the Irish problem may soon be settled in such a manner as to insure the contentment and happiness of that unhappy and distressed island.

But, Mr. Speaker, the issues at stake at Paris are so vital and of so much consequence to the United States, we have so much involved that depends upon the complete harmony of action by our representatives and those of our allies, that I am unwilling to do anything, however slight, that may improperly and needlessly offend an ally or alienate from our President the cordial cooperation and support of an ally.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of our brave soldiers died on foreign battle fields, many others will return maimed and crippled, millions more were under arms ready and willing to fight and die, if need be, and our citizens at home poured out their money freely and lavishly at the country's call—all of these sacrifices have been made in order that a just, a durable, an honorable and righteous peace may be secured to the United States and her citizens, now and hereafter. To that noble ambition America dedicated her resources and her very life. I am unwilling to jeopardize the realization of that accomplishment. I am unwilling, even for a moment, to participate in action that may embarrass or hamper the President of the United States, our great leader at the peace conference, as he struggles with the seasoned diplomats of the Old World, in his labors to bring peace to a distracted and distressed world, weary and worn with war and its hideous horrors.

Mr. Speaker, I am for America first. I can not vote for a resolution that I believe to be inimical to the interests, safety, and peace of my country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for one minute to permit me to ask him a question.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I object. It is 20 minutes to a side and I can not get any time at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. STEDMAN]. [Applause.]

Mr. STEDMAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been interested in the future of the people of Ireland.

I have been attracted to them by their love of liberty, by their attachment to their homes, by their appeals for justice to this Republic, whose friend they have ever been and whose theory of government, whose traditions, and whose declarations forbid the exercise of sovereignty over a weaker nation against their will by armed force.

Gibbon, in reviewing the incidents of ancient times, their effect upon the fortunes of mankind for good or evil and the mighty convulsions which once shook the universe, lamented that the world would never again witness events so fraught with importance to the destiny of the human race.

The tragedy, which during the last few years has had practically the entire world for its theater—events the culmination of which in their importance have had no parallel—show how manifest was his error and mistaken his belief.

There is no era in the world's history which will compare with the present either in interest or importance. It has been signalized by events which will be characterized by future ages as among the most splendid achievements of mankind.

Chief amongst these will be the blessings of liberty vouchsafed to weaker nations long oppressed, filling their homes with a new, a happy, and joyous life.

Among these nations, none—no, not one—will appeal more strongly to the hearts of all mankind than Ireland.

The resolution now being considered expresses the earnest hope of the Congress of the United States of America, that the peace conference at Versailles in adjusting the rights of various peoples will favorably consider the claims of Ireland to self-determination.

I esteem it a high privilege to vote for the resolution, and it is to me a very great pleasure to do so. In the brief space of time to which I must restrict myself it would be impossible for me to give fully the reasons for my cordial support.

Where can be found in this broad Republic an American citizen who will dispute the doctrine that government shall exist only by consent of the governed?

Will some one furnish an argument which has for its basis the inalienable rights of man why Ireland alone should be excepted from this rule?

If gratitude be deemed a virtue among nations as well as individuals, what think you would be the estimate of the civilized world of a Republic which forgets that the blessings of freedom enjoyed by its citizens were won by the aid of a people whose appeal to them for right and justice should prove to be all in vain?

Have we so soon forgotten the unfailing friendship of Ireland for America?

The first decisive victory of the Revolutionary War for the American cause was won at Moore's Creek Bridge, not far from Wilmington, N. C., in February, 1776, when a band of Tories surrendered to Gen. James Moore, a descendant of Roger O'Moore, a leader of the Irish rebellion of 1641. Some of his descendants still live in Wilmington, N. C. Col. Roger Moore, one of them, died there only a few years ago.

The first general officer killed on the American side was Gen. Richard Montgomery, who gloriously fell in front of his men at Quebec, December 31, 1775.

Gen. Montgomery was born in Ireland and settled in the State of New York in 1775.

The first commodore of the American Navy was an Irishman—John Barry, born in County Wexford in 1745.

That the Irish people assisted largely in the formation of this Republic is known to all men conversant with the history of its struggle for independence.

Read, if you will, the names of those who signed the Declaration of Independence. Amongst them will be found John Hancock (President of the Congress), Matthew Thornton, John Hart, James Smith, George Taylor, George Reed, Thomas McKean, Charles Carroll, Edward Rutledge, Thomas Lynch, Robert Treat Paine, names which will never be forgotten; nor should we forget that each one and every one of them was born in Ireland or was of Irish descent.

It is difficult to find a reason or a pretext why we should hesitate to adopt this resolution. It has been suggested that England fought by our side in the war with Germany. Admit that England is the sincere friend of this Republic; the more earnest should be our desire that she should adopt the true and just course toward Ireland, for thereby she will add to the happiness and prosperity of her own people, and embellish with a new and unfading luster the glory of the British Empire.

The unselfish, unchanging, and heroic conduct of the Irish race in behalf of America can never be obliterated from its traditions or history. Their appeal for the right of self-determination should find a cordial welcome in the hearts of American Representatives, and both prompt and decisive action by them without delay.

The adoption of this resolution is demanded by a principle of government recognized wherever freedom dwells and liberty has a home.

It will gratify the people of every land who admire chivalric courage and enduring fortitude.

It is not always the power of the conqueror which exercises a controlling influence upon the destinies of mankind. It is often the heroism of the vanquished which impresses upon the minds of men lessons which never fade.

The glories of the British Empire may be forgotten, but the patriotic heroism of the Irish race through a struggle for liberty of over 700 years will gild the pages of history through all the ages to come and attract the admiration of the brave in every civilized land. [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, speak at this moment as an American Congressman, and I would be ashamed of the blood that is in me if I kept silent when an opportunity is afforded to speak a few words for liberty and justice for the land where my father and my mother first saw the light of day.

Mr. Speaker, if there be any man in this House who maintains that this question is not one of international concern, that man does not know the story of Ireland's seven centuries of suffering. The Irish people and their sons and daughters in America and in other lands are filled with hostility to Great Britain wherever they are found because of the cruel treatment their suffering kinsmen have ever received. This hostility has disturbed, and will continue to disturb, the tranquillity of nations wherever the Irish have settled and their influence is felt. Unless Ireland is given self-determination as a result of this war, it will be the only nation in Europe after the war held in a condition of subjection and England will be the only tyrant.

Ireland's case an internal one? Ireland's case unlike that of Poland or Serbia? Ireland not a nation? Let me remind

my friend that Ireland has never ceased to be a nation. Let me remind this House that away back in the ages even, in the days of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, when all in Greece but her sun had set, when education had become a patent of nobility, and learning the almost invaluable possession of the sifted few, the lamp of learning still burned as brightly in Ireland as ever burned the sanctuary lamp for centuries before the shrine of St. Bridget in Kildare. The arts and sciences fled to her for refuge and found warm welcome and cordial entertainment; poetry found in her a home; the arts of war were not neglected; religion marked the activities of her people; and, wifal, in the tenth century, the Irishman is acknowledged to have been the most complete, the best rounded product of nature to be found among the children of men.

To us to-day the Irishman is known as an immigrant; he is popularly supposed to be restless, to be dissatisfied with his present situation; to be content to fight for the liberties of any land but his own. Nothing can be further from the truth. Read the history of Ireland anew and be convinced. Come with me and tell over again the story of Brian Born, of Clontarf, and the Boyne Water, and then ask yourselves if Irishmen have no love for the soil, no yearning for an abiding city. But this little island could no more contain the enthusiasm for liberty among her people than Macedon confined the ambition of Alexander the Great. Her mission was truly apostolic, and the histories of France and Spain and Chile and Peru are made richer far by the names and deeds of MacMahon, Prendergast, O'Higgins, O'Donnell, and Gen. Lynch.

Irishmen do love their native soil; they left it because her free air had become vitiated by oppression; but as Napoleon, no matter where he might be, whether in the craggy Alps, facing the pyramids in Egypt, with their 40 centuries looking down upon him, bravely enduring the snows of Russia, or sadly peering out from the pitiless rock St. Helena over the more pitiless Atlantic, always kept one eye on the city of Paris, so the Irish immigrant, whether enjoying the rich civilization of America, to which he has made such important contribution, or threading the pathless forests of remote Australia, or endeavoring to wrest from Nature the secret of the North Pole and an open sea, always keeps an eye on his motherland and prays for her deliverance and her restoration to the sisterhood of nations.

You, sir, have read, and read carefully, the history of Ireland, and her sons. You have melted into tears at the story of Patrick Sarsfield, and you have had your pride roused, aye, even to the bursting point, where, as you saw him lying, bleeding and dying, at the battle of Lannes in France he took a handful of his heart's blood, threw it toward heaven, and cried, "Would that I had another life to lose for poor Ireland!" This, then, is the spirit of the Irish immigrant; love and loyalty for the land of his adoption; love, loyalty, consecration for the land of his birth, the land where his fathers died.

Mr. Speaker, during the decades of England's misrule Ireland has mourned the departure of millions of her children as she bade them go forth to enrich other nations, leaving herself poor, indeed. Her misery broke the heart of Charles Stewart Parnell, and then she broke her own over his grave. But out of the heart and oppression, out of the heartbreak, the death, the contradictions, the trials, the tribulations, and the woes, there appears on the horizon the dawn of a new day for Ireland. I see the Ireland of my fathers join hands with my mother America in gratitude for all this Republic has done to create a better sentiment and, I hope, arouse the conscience of Englishmen. I see her bless the name of Washington so dear to-day to Americans, and place it by the side of those of Brian Boru, Sarsfield, Grattan, Wolf Tone, Emmet, O'Connell, and Parnell; and I hail the fulfillment of the prophecy of the great English Cardinal Newman: "I look toward a land both old and young—old in its Christianity, young in its promise of the future; a nation which received grace before the Saxon came to Britain and which has never questioned it; a church which comprehends in its history the rise and fall of Canterbury and York, which Augustine and Paulinus found and Pole and Fisher left behind them. I contemplate a people which has had a long night and will have an inevitable day! I am turning my eyes toward a hundred years to come, and I dimly see the Ireland I am gazing on become the road of passage and union between the two hemispheres and the center of the world. I see its inhabitants rival Belgium in populousness, France in vigor, and Spain in enthusiasm."

Mr. Speaker, with God's help and the continued and convincing efforts of this Republic, I hope for self-determination for this little isle.

Let us tax, torture, and torment invention to find a language rich enough for epitaph for Robert Emmet; burrow into the very bowels of the earth to find a gem of purest ray serene upon which to engrave the story of his life. For the prayer of the

young martyr of the rebellion of 1798 is about to be answered and is to take her place among the nations of the earth.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on the 4th day of March, 1778, just 141 years ago to-day that archetypal son of liberty—Robert Emmet—was born; and while his eyes were first opening upon the light of Old Erin, the American troops from Maine to the Carolinas, fighting for American independence, were actually bristling with Irishmen. What a coincidence that on the anniversary of that Irish patriot the American Congress is considering a resolution in behalf of self-determination for Ireland—the very principle for which Emmet fought and died! [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, one of the brightest ornaments of his age and Nation was Henry Clay, the first and ablest Speaker of this House. No greater champion of the liberties of mankind ever lived upon this earth. In the course of a speech delivered by him in the Senate of the United States on February 2, 1832, is found this remarkable passage concerning Ireland:

In some of the visions which have passed through my imagination I have supposed that Ireland was originally part and parcel of this (American) continent, and that by some extraordinary convulsion of nature it was torn from America and, drifting across the ocean, was placed in the unfortunate vicinity of Great Britain.

Thirty-two years after Henry Clay had made that statement John Bright, a well-known English statesman, while speaking in the British House of Commons against coercion in Ireland, said:

I believe that if to-morrow the people of Ireland had their will they would, had they the power to do so, unmoor that island from its fastenings in the deep, and would moor it at least 2,000 miles to the west of its present position.

It is this unfortunate vicinity to Great Britain which has been the obstacle to Ireland's political and commercial advancement during all the course of her history. In the present state of world affairs I venture to say that if Ireland were to-day a subject nationality upon the Continent of Europe, there would be no need of the pending resolution in this House. Her name would long since have been found on the list of the smaller nationalities whose rights are to be settled upon the principle for which young America fought and won the great war.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are now considering embodies a fundamental principle, based, as it is, upon the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Upon this side of the Atlantic, at least, that doctrine has for a century and a half been an accepted article of political faith. It was hoped that the developments of the recent war would give it a wider and more universal application. Indeed, the doctrine must be universally applied if the civilization of the earth is to be preserved.

A well-known English writer, Gilbert K. Chesterton, recently said:

Civilization will never have saved its soul alive until the hope of Kosciusko is realized and the epitaph of Emmet written.

The hope of Kosciusko was the freedom of his native Poland, and that hope is now being realized, for it is universally conceded that the erection of Poland into a free and independent State will be one of the developments of the peace conference.

But what of the epitaph of Emmet? Will Ireland, too, take her place among the nations of the earth as one of the consequences of the war? That is precisely the question which inspires the pending resolution. Ireland is the only one of the subject nationalities which participated in the war that has been left unmentioned in the catalogue of those already singled out for self-determination.

When America entered the great world war the President of the United States in a single sentence summed up the great principles for which we would participate in the struggle. In the early days of April, 1917, he addressed his memorable war message to the joint session of Congress, during the course of which he said:

We are glad to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberties of its peoples—the German peoples included; for the rights of nations, great and small, and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience.

The utterance of this remarkable sentence brought new hope to the struggling races of the world, for they thought they saw in it the dawn of a new day—the day of their final deliverance. Among the most prominent of them was the Irish race, which for seven and a half centuries has been fighting to regain the liberties they anciently possessed. Their contribution to the success of the struggle is well known and admitted in every quarter of the world. [Applause.]

Now the war is over, the victory is won, and the representatives of the various nations are in conference on the soil of

France, there to formulate the terms upon which the peace of the world is to be settled. While mention has repeatedly been made of the various smaller nationalities whose rights will be determined at the peace conference, thus far, at least, we have not heard that a single word has been uttered by any voice of authority concerning the rights of the Irish people. For this reason millions of advocates of Irish freedom are requesting Congress, the mouthpiece of the American people, to speak, now that freedom and liberty are everywhere in the air, and make known to the world, but particularly to the representatives at the peace table, the hopes and expectations of the American people respecting the case of Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before us will be the expression of America's voice. It is based upon a time-tested American doctrine; it is purely American in spirit; and the principle it seeks to apply is the one in defense of which, we are told, American blood was freely shed on the battle fronts of the Old World. Our young men fought not for any selfish consideration. They had none. "They fought," says the President of the United States, "for the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience," and they believed that when the fight was done that privilege would be everywhere extended. But now in the day of our triumph there seems to be one exception to the privilege: Ireland's case will be side-stepped, notwithstanding the lofty declarations of purpose for which the war has been waged.

But, sir, whatever course others may see fit to take—whether they be Presidents or Parliaments—let this House at least stand upon its high ground of equity and justice and press the program it accepted in April, 1917, so that Ireland, too, may be treated in the liberative spirit of the hour.

For centuries Ireland has been fighting for the exercise of her fundamental right of self-government; and if exception is made of her case in the coming universal reckoning, does anyone believe that the peace of the world will be settled? Anyone who thinks that liberty can be crushed in Ireland has yet to learn the history of that race. Her sons have fought for liberty on a thousand battle fields and they will still fight on until foreign rule forever retires from the soil which covers the ashes of their fathers.

No one, of course, will have the hardihood to maintain that Congress is not acting within its rights in passing the pending resolution. Some, perhaps, may doubt the propriety of this procedure, holding that this resolution concerns the domestic affairs of another nation. If such a position be tenable, then the same line of reasoning must apply to the smaller nationalities on the Continent of Europe unless, forsooth, the rule of action be that a conquering nation may dictate to the enemy it has whipped but must be painfully silent concerning the unjustifiable practices of a cobelligerent. If such is to be the guiding rule of the peace conference, then Kaiserism has not alone taken the count. The avowed ideals in defense of which the war was successfully prosecuted will have suffered mightily in the hour of the final reckoning. The claim is made that the Irish question is a domestic problem; yet British statesmen themselves concede their inability to solve it. You may think as you like and justify your conclusion upon any premise you desire, but you can not deny that the people of Ireland are forced to live under a sovereignty under which they do not wish to live, a thing which the President, our leading figure at the peace conference, said—and we applauded him when he said it—no people should be forced to submit to. It was the President himself who made the issue, and the doctrine he proclaims takes Ireland's case out of the pale of England's domestic concerns and lifts it to a higher level for international consideration. If it is not considered at the peace conference, it will be because righteousness can not be enforced against the stubborn objections of a dominant power.

Self-government, Mr. Speaker, is the natural government of man. This may not be the belief of kings or kaisers or so-called statesmen who offer the claims of minority politics as the rightful solution of the Irish question. But self-government, nevertheless, has always been the post upon which patriots have planted themselves wherever men have been known to strive for political freedom. In this so-called period of universal emancipation Great Britain has her chance to concede to Ireland what she is anxious to bestow upon the smaller nationalities of Europe. Let her release her grasp upon Ireland, for the rightful aspirations of Irishmen to freedom can never be successfully stifled. If England fails to grasp this, her supreme opportunity, it will be the monstrous blunder of the peace conference, and, like the ghost of Banquo, it will come back again to plague her in the future.

Why should not Ireland be given the right of self-determination? Ireland was a nation when England was but a Roman

colony; and, apart from the right of self-government, which for centuries it has not possessed, it is in all other respects substantially a nation to-day. Ireland still has her national traditions, her national culture, her national customs, her national literature, her national poetry, her national eloquence, her national spirit and patriotism; and what is of the highest importance, she has always had the national self-consciousness to preserve them. These are the essence of nationality, but Ireland has even still more; it has a unique position in the physical world—a geographical entity that needs no ethnological experts to circumscribe it. The ocean alone forms its boundary.

Though subdued for centuries, Ireland still breathes forth a national character which she has preserved through all the days of her subjection. She lacks but one element of sovereign nationhood—the right to govern herself. Give her that right, and let her, too, inhale the free air of liberty. Her station in the Atlantic between the Old World and the new makes her the entrepôt of both, where long since her people would have grown powerful and prosperous if the vigilant jealousy of England had not rendered her natural resources and natural advantages nugatory. Her ideas of expansion were never military. They were always moral and intellectual. She is a nation whose sons can say of her:

We have wronged no race, we have robbed no land,
We have never oppressed the weak,
And this, in the face of heaven, is the nobler thing to speak.

[Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the contribution of Irishmen to American independence and the gratitude of early American patriots toward Ireland are shown in the following letters of Rev. Michael Earls, S. J., a fellow student of mine in the early nineties at Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass., where he is now the professor of language and literature:

[From the Worcester Gazette.]

AMERICA'S DEBT TO IRISH WILL NOT BE FORGOTTEN NOW, SAYS FATHER EARLS—QUOTES FROM REVOLUTIONARY DOCUMENTS TO PROVE THAT HALF OF THE AMERICAN ARMY WHICH WON INDEPENDENCE FOR COLONIES WAS MADE UP OF MEN FROM IRELAND AND SAYS HE IS CONFIDENT THAT SERVICE WILL BE REPAID NOW.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GAZETTE:

SIR: In a letter to the Irish-American Historical Society (Nov. 12, 1896), Senator Hoar, whose name honors our country as well as our city, wrote: "The facts in regard to this most important contribution to our national life ought to be collected and preserved. The Irish race has done a great service to America." And it is in the spirit of this recommendation that I send as a supplement to my last letter a few more facts about Ireland's contribution to our country in the dark days of the Revolution. Gratitude is one of the prime marks of American culture. We kept our eyes on France during the early years of the war, and our hearts beat high with sympathy for her when the Hun set upon her in 1914. We had not forgotten France, nor her hand to us in the years of our great war for freedom. And likewise American gratitude manifests itself to-day when Ireland, calmly announcing her declaration of independence, looks to the great Republic in the West. France is witness to our abiding spirit of gratitude. Ireland does not expect us to fail. For Ireland remembers that the scion of Mount Vernon, Washington's adopted son, said with deep sincerity: "The shamrock should be entwined with the laurels of the Revolution. The rank grass had grown over the grave of many a poor Irishman who had died for America ere the flag of the Lillies floated in the field by the Star-Spangled Banner."

Turning then to the facts, which, in the words of Senator Hoar, "ought to be collected and preserved," I wish to recall the first statement made in the previous letter: Our special ambassador, Franklin, and our Continental Congress looked to Ireland for sympathy and help in the Revolution; and, secondly, before we note the extent and worth of this Irish contribution, let us bear in mind, without further insistence on the point, that it was a labor of supreme difficulty for Ireland and her sons to carry into effect the earnest will and heart they had for America's freedom. Here, then, is a partial list of some of the leading names and the testimony of some notable authorities with regard to the efficiency of the Irish assistance. Again, I string in plain line these statistics and facts without any effort at the embellishments of rhetoric.

First. The testimony taken only from Franklin's correspondence, now in the possession of the American Philosophical Society. Glance at a few excerpts from 100 Irish letters to Franklin:

James Shanley, writing from Paris, May 28, 1777, says that "he had left Ireland about seven weeks before to offer his services to the American cause," and "there are many staunch friends of that cause in Ireland, but they dare not declare themselves." A Franco-Irish officer, O'Meara, May 14, 1777, expressed "great desire to serve the American cause." Count O'Donnell, a colonel in a Polish regiment, Baron O'Call, commandant of French troops; and Capt. O'Heguerly, from Nancy, wrote similarly to Franklin in that same year. In 1779 Robert O'Connell wrote from Paris offering to "take care of American consular interests at any of the Spanish ports." Capt. McCarthy More wrote from Boulogne, July 4, 1781, "to enter the service of the United States." Chevalier O'Gorman recommended Dr. John O'Connor, who "desired to serve America either in the Army or in the hospitals." And in the same year Henry O'Neil applied to Franklin for a commission in the American Army. A commission, too, was asked for Capt. James Byrnes, commander of a merchant vessel; and the Black Prince was given to the command of Capt. Patrick Dowlin; and Capt. Luke Ryan wrote Franklin from Dunkirk that "he expects to have a large cutter completed soon, and if his abilities deserve Franklin's protection, begs for a rank in the American Navy, since he regards the American cause as his own."

These are but a few facts gathered from 100 letters of Franklin's Irish sympathizers.

Second. Some notable "firsts" in the American Army and Navy:

Practically the first blow in the Revolution was struck by the son of a Limerick schoolmaster, John Sullivan, who captured the Fort of William and Mary, December 13, 1774. First stroke at British sea power, made by Jeremiah O'Brien off Machias, on the coast of Maine, May, 1775. Montgomery—every American schoolboy knows of his heroism; see what, in the British Parliament, Lord North said of him: "He was brave, he was able, he was humane, he was generous; but still he was only a brave, able, humane, generous rebel. Curse on his virtues; they've undone England." That was Montgomery of Raphoe. Andrew Brown, of Ulster, was muster-master general in the American Army; Stephen Moylan, brother of the Bishop of Cork, was aid-de-camp to Washington; John Barry, of Wexford, was founder of the American Navy; and the famous Pennsylvania line, the bulwark of American defense, was called "the line of Ireland."

Third. The numerical strength of the Irish in the American forces. From the Pennsylvania Gazette, August 11, 1773, we learn that upwards of 18,000 people left Dublin to settle in various parts of America in the first months of that year. The most exacting and conservative estimates made by recent-day research state that between the years 1763 and 1774 the arrivals from Ulster numbered 33,600 and from other parts of Ireland 88,400. It is well to note these figures because of a prevalent platitude that used to have place in certain pages of so-called American history, namely, that these Irish are to be known as "Scotch-Irish," a designation that does not speak true of either end of the hyphen. Now, to these numerous emigrants who joined loyally to the American cause (not "Loyalists" of the kind that sailed out of Dorchester Bay St. Patrick's Day, 1777) must be added the numbers who came as soldiers to the American forces. To name but one, in 1779 Count Arthur Dillon addressed a petition to the French war office on behalf of all the Irish soldiers in France, and he sailed from Brest—Brest, so Americanized during the past year—with 2,300 troops. From the Carolinas to the coast of Maine the American troops "bristled with Irishmen," a clause used in the report about the New Jersey line. Even in Massachusetts our State archives give the names of 147 Irishmen among the minutemen at Lexington, 258 at Bunker Hill, and 78 in the company at the siege of Boston.

AMERICAN ARMY HALF IRISH.

Four. The testimony of the foe about the Irish numbers. In the course of a debate in the Irish House of Commons, April 2, 1784, the Hon. Luke Gardiner stated: "I am assured from the best authority that the major portion of the American Army was composed of Irish, and that the Irish language was as commonly spoken in the American ranks as English. I am also informed that it was their valor determined the contest, so that England had America detached from her by force of Irish emigrants." At an investigation into the causes of the defeat held in the British House of Commons (see British House of Commons Report, vol. xiii, p. 303) Maj. Gen. Robertson, who had served 24 years in America, was asked: "How are the provincial corps composed—mostly of native Americans or of emigrants from various nations of Europe?" He answered, "Some of the corps were mostly natives. I remember Gen. Lee telling me that he believed half the rebel army were from Ireland." Joseph Galloway, who, though a native of Pennsylvania, became a violent Tory in 1778, replied when asked by members of the British House of Commons (ibid., p. 431) about the constituents of the American Army, "The names and places of their nativity being taken down, I can answer the question with precision. There was scarcely one-fourth natives of America, about one-half Irish, the other fourth English and Scotch."

To this testimony from English sources let us add the clear American statement of George Washington Parke Custis, spoken from Mount Vernon: "Of the operations of the war, I mean the soldiers, up to the coming of the French, Ireland had furnished in the ratio of 100 for 1 of any other nation."

Here, then, are some of the facts which "ought to be collected and preserved." They show that America's great petition to Ireland, as manifested by her ambassador, Franklin, and by the Continental Congress, received a generous response. And America, grateful to France, will prove the abiding spirit of her gratitude toward Ireland. It is not men or money that Ireland looks for in this great hour of her declaration of independence; she has reason to expect the voice of America, speaking in her behalf at the peace conference. Justice to small nations was our profession in arms; our gratitude accentuates our profession of justice.

Thanking you again, dear editor,

Sincerely,

FATHER EARLS, S. J.

[From the Worcester Gazette, Jan. 23, 1910.]

FATHER EARLS SHOWS HOW EARLY AMERICAN PATRIOTS FELT TOWARD IRELAND—QUOTES FROM HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS THAT WHEN AMERICA ASSERTED ITS CLAIM FOR SELF-DETERMINATION CONGRESSES, AMBASSADORS, AND PEOPLE LOOKED TO IRELAND FOR SUPPORT OF GREAT PRINCIPLE EMBODIED IN DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GAZETTE.

SIR: In this day of geographical and historical reconstructions, it is no surprise to find verified the old truism that history repeats itself. A long list of these verifying instances is a matter of easy information for any reader of current journals. I wish to mention only one of these historical coincidences, one which, while it is a point of international interest, is especially arresting the attention of our country during these days of high anticipations. I mean the Irish question—the right of Ireland as of any other nation, small or great, to self-determination. This right in general has been asserted by England in her manifest proclamations during the years of the war, and is the very heart of President Wilson's appeal to the country at our entrance into the war; and in particular, the exercise of this right in Ireland's case is the solemn avowal of vast congresses of men meeting in free assemblies in Australia, Canada, and in every one of these United States. Ireland's case has received an affirmative vote, almost unanimous, throughout the world, and if it does not receive a similar vote at the peace conference millions of America's most devoted sons will feel that the war was in vain—the solemn pledges of unselfish, magnanimous America remaining unfulfilled.

But it is not upon this point that I direct your attention; we can await the issues of the peace conference with American confidence, knowing as a great orator said the other night in Newport, that "God will preside over the destinies of nations, and President Wilson is on the American job." I wish merely to show you a coincidence of history in the present American interest and sympathy toward Ireland. We are aware, I trust, the vast assemblies in the United States have voiced forceful and dignified petitions to President Wilson in Ireland's behalf; petitions that had the strength of the Rocky Mountains in the

West; that caught up the unanimous voices of the South, rippled along the Great Lakes and became a sonorous voice like Niagara's; and had the four-square support of the Atlantic seaboard. In this great chorus from America, Massachusetts played her part: of our State in this regard we can repeat Webster's proud words, "Massachusetts needs no encomium." Our Congress, in both Houses, put the matter deep into consideration for fuller and more determined consideration upon a later day.

Now, this is the page which repeats history. For looking back to our colonial days, when America asserted and won its claim for self-determination, our Congresses and our ambassadors and our people looked to Ireland for support of the great principle embodied in our Declaration of Independence. I shall do no more than string together in a straight line the documented proofs of this assertion, and I can do the more easily do this since I have just now received the proof pages of a new book, "A Hidden Phase of American History," done by the historiographer of the American Historical Society, a book soon to be on the shelves of every American library.

First, Benjamin Franklin, diplomatic agent of the United States, twice visited Ireland and was cordially received everywhere by the people, in 1769 and 1771. He wrote:

"All Ireland is strongly in favor of the American cause. * * * I send you four pamphlets written in Ireland by Irish gentlemen here, in which you will find some excellent well-said things." (Letter to Dr. Samuel Cooper, of Boston, dated London, Apr. 27, 1769.)

"In Ireland among the patriots I dined with Dr. Lucas. They are all friends of America, in which I said everything I could to confirm them." (Letter, London, Jan. 13, 1772.)

"I found them (the Irish) disposed to be friends of America, in which I endeavored to confirm them, with the expectation that our growing weight might in time be thrown into their scale, and by joining our interest with theirs, might be obtained for them, as for us, a more equitable treatment from this nation (England). There are many brave spirits among them. The gentry are a very sensible, polite, friendly, and handsome people. Their parliament makes a most respectable figure, with a number of very good speakers in both parties, and able men of business." Franklin goes on to mention the courtesy of the parliament toward himself. (Letter to Thomas Cushing, Delegate to the Continental Congress.)

These citations, out of a large list that might be given, are sufficient to show that report was made to America by our special envoy. America looked to Ireland for help and sympathy, as Ireland now looks to America in this great hour of her declaration of independence. One liberty-loving people called to another; America summoned the Irish Parliament and the Irish people to the cause of American liberty; Ireland repeats the summons for the cause not merely of Irish liberty but of human rights—the cause for which America went to war.

Second. The address to the people of Ireland, adopted at a meeting of the Continental Congress at Philadelphia, July 28, 1775. Only the following excerpt need be given to show the mutual sympathy existing between the two countries:

"You have ever been friendly to the rights of mankind; and we acknowledge with pleasure and gratitude that your nation has produced patriots who have nobly distinguished themselves in the cause of humanity and America. * * * We sympathize with you in your distress. * * * In the rich pastures of Ireland many hungry partridges have fed and grown strong to labor in its destruction. * * * God grant that the iniquitous schemes of extirpating liberty by the British Empire may soon be defeated."

Again, on October 2, 1775, in a resolution introduced by the Committee on Trade and passed unanimously by the Continental Congress, Ireland is mentioned as "a people who have always manifested a noble regard to the rights of mankind and have been friendly to these much-injured Colonies."

Third. The testimony of a leading American after the Revolution. The adopted son of Washington, George Washington Parke Custis, speaking for the cause of Ireland in City Hall, Washington, D. C., July 20, 1826, said in the course of his notable speech:

"In Erin, and in the darkest days of our destiny, whenever it was told that we bore ourselves bravely in the field though pressed by misfortune, a thousand, aye, a hundred thousand times did the poor Irishman take off his hat and cry his heart, 'God bless great Washington and the cause of America.' And this, Americans, in the very lion's jaws."

Mr. Custis enumerates some of the distinguished sons of Ireland who served under the American command, and then adds:

"Permit me to conclude with the invocation to Ireland as uttered by the child of Mount Vernon on the day of independence, and under the venerable praetorium of the Revolution: 'Health and success to the Emerald Isle! My country's friend in my country's utmost need. May she soon be relieved from the lion's grasp, for the lion is of a kind that fondles ere it kills, while the eagle suffers the smallest bird to wing its wonted way to warble its hymns of praise in the pure melody of nature, the song of the soul. Ireland, thou friend of my country in my country's most friendless days, much injured, much enduring land, accept this poor tribute from one who esteems thy worth and mourns thy desolation. May the God of heaven in His justice cause the sun of freedom to shed its benign radiance on the Emerald Isle.'"

Franklin, the Continental Congress, Mount Vernon, and Washington's son—surely these are a goodly company for Americans of this day who ask for Ireland that boon of liberty which America once asked Ireland to labor for in America's urgent need.

Thanking you, dear editor, for the space given to this letter,
Sincerely,

FATHER EARLS, S. J.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LONERGAN].

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, the session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, which will be remembered as the war Congress, is drawing to a close. The Members of the Congress, who will never forget the memorable night when they declared through their vote that the state of war thrust upon the United States by the Imperial German Government be formally declared, will

also carry away with them the great feeling that within the life of the Congress this war has been ended in peace with victory.

The United States fought for its rights as a Nation; also, the United States voiced the truth that all nations and peoples should of themselves have the right to determine their government.

The principles for which we fought have been secured. Their application should be general, not partial, else they lose their force. The right of Ireland to self-determination is no less pronounced than the right of Poland, of Jugo-Slavia, of Czechoslovakia.

President Wilson, after laying down his 14 conditions of peace, concluded with these words:

An evident principle runs through the whole program I have outlined. It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak.

Previously, at Arlington, Va., Mr. Wilson had stated:

One of the principles which America held dear was that small and weak States had as much right to their sovereignty and independence as large and strong States.

On February 11, 1918, speaking before Congress, the President said:

National aspirations must be respected; peoples may now be dominated and governed only by their consent. "Self-determination" is not a mere phrase.

President Wilson recently set sail to return to the United States from the peace conference, leaving from the port of Brest, the same port from which Count Arthur Dillon sailed in the Revolutionary War to bring military help to the American Colonies in their fight for independence. On being greeted at Boston, President Wilson told his hearers that the world looked to America with hope, because of the disinterestedness of our purposes and our aims.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives has favorably reported out joint resolution 357—

That it is the earnest hope of the Congress of the United States of America that the peace conference now sitting in Paris, in passing upon the rights of various peoples, will favorably consider the claims of Ireland to the right of self-determination.

Neither the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee nor any man on the committee, according to the RECORD, has expressed any doubt of the committee's jurisdiction in the premises. This body, which has the power to declare war and fight it through to a successful conclusion, has the power to suggest to our commissioners.

Whatever the sentiment in the United States at large regarding the Irish question in the past, I think it is patent to-day that the opinion of the United States is, "Why should Ireland be omitted in the application of the principle of self-determination?"

The very history of Ireland is her greatest eulogy. The dying hands of her every generation have thrown to her living children the torch of liberty to be borne sometimes in adversity and travail, at other times in triumph, but always onward and onward. When, in the homeland, oppression became persecution, there went from Ireland to the four corners of the world her emigrants, carrying to America, to Canada, to Australia, to continental Europe the dream of a free country. Irishmen have fought under every flag for liberty. Are they to be denied liberty under their own?

Ireland's flickering lamp of hope is brightened by the prospect of action on her long-deferred claim for self-government at the peace conference. Resolutions have already been adopted by several States, through all of which runs the evident feeling that self-determination should be applied to friend and foe. The British people and the liberal British press favor self-determination for Ireland.

In every democracy majority rule obtains. The majority in Ireland has already expressed itself, and emphatically, for self-determination. The Irish have an aptitude for political government if any people have. With them law and order are paramount. Anarchy finds among them no disciples. Class hatred is foreign to their nature. They have no part in bolshevism. They yield to no race in patriotism and citizenship.

The Irish question has attracted the attention of the world, and those who would pass it by at times do so by stating it is a purely domestic question. If it is a domestic question, it is domestic for Ireland alone. For the rest of the world it is a question of the application to one people of principles recognized by all nations to be just. If it is other than a domestic question, it is an international problem, and therefore the world is concerned. The peace conference will be occupied in the adjustment of world differences.

To America Ireland's cause should appeal more than to any land. In 1776, when our Republic was established; in 1812,

when it was saved from destruction; in 1861, when the Union was threatened, Irishmen in large numbers responded to the call to arms and wrote for themselves undying fame in history. In 1914, when chaos seemed the fate of European civilization, it was the Irish who led Britain's vanguard across the channel and died in large numbers among the first 100,000 in the retreat from the Belgian border, while the French and the rest of the British came up. In 1917, when America threw her weight into the scale of justice, sons of Irishmen, proud to be called American citizens, were among the first to volunteer, and formed no inconsiderable part of the American Expeditionary Force and the United States Navy. These men wrote as indelibly in blood on the fields of France a declaration of independence for the world as did their ancestors in former wars sustain with their blood the Declaration of Independence of the American Colonies.

To an Irishman may be attributed popular form of government in the Colonies, and men of Irish blood were among the framers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

America is the champion of oppressed peoples. Whether we find the rôle a delicate one to perform or not, it is our position in the world to-day.

As such we ask that Ireland be not overlooked in the settlement of the world's problems, but rather specifically included. The question should be presented to the peace conference. The Irish nation is one of the oldest in Europe. Ireland had her own code of laws and her own language. Her vast contribution to the education and civilization of continental Europe long centuries before the English invasion is a historical fact. Ireland never surrendered her national rights. She has fought against forced rule in every century since 1172. The so-called act of union, passed in 1800 by a Parliament in which four-fifths of the Irish people had no representation and to which only a small portion of the 300 members were elected, has been described by Gladstone himself in words that will always condemn it, when he said:

I know of no blacker or fouler transaction in the history of man.

Geographical location or claims to govern should be no barrier to her demands for consideration—with the other dependencies knocking at the door of the peace conference. If when the names of the dependencies are called at the conference no delegate is there to respond for Ireland, then should not the United States request that she be heard, that the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities may be applied? Such a principle to carry force should be universal in its application. A race, like an individual, is entitled to a day in court and a just verdict.

Arabia, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Syria, Armenia have claims for liberty from Turkish domination; Bukowina, Transylvania, and Bessarabia desire again to be associated with Roumania; the Jugo-Slavs are coming into their own; Albania wants its freedom; the Italian Irredenta, Triest, and Trentino find their dreams for consolidation with Rome on the eve of realization; Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia will soon be the Czecho-Slovakian nation; the free government of Poland has already been recognized; Finland desires to set her own house in order; Lithuania yearns for recognition.

Ireland has lived on hopes and promises and visions long enough. It is time for her to take her place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] seems to think that the British Parliament and the British foreign office at this late day would consider it an insult if the House of Representatives passed this resolution which expresses the sentiment of not alone the Congress of the United States but also the sentiment of an overwhelming majority of the people of this country in favor of Irish freedom, and the right of the people of Ireland to determine the form of government under which they shall live.

The President of the United States a year ago last February stood on this rostrum, and the British Government and the British people, and all of our allies, were willing to stand behind his declaration at that time to the effect that the United States of America and her allies were fighting for democracy, and the right of the people of the world to govern themselves, and pledging this Nation and its allies to secure for the small nations the right of self-determination. The President of the United States did not state that this principle applied only to the people of the central empires, but made a positive declaration that it was intended to apply to the people of the world.

If England wanted to object to the application of this principle to her dependencies and colonies that was the time for her statesmen to make known their position, but in the language of

one of her generals she had her back to the wall then fighting and victory was not even in sight. England never protested officially or otherwise against President Wilson's declaration, laying before the world the 14 points as a basis of peace, the right of self-determination of small nations being one of the principal points in that declaration.

Is this Congress and the people of this country going to hold off now and refuse to Ireland the same consideration that we all agree should be given to the Serbs, the Poles, the Czecho-Slovaks, the Belgians, and the Jews?

Why, only the other day the President of the United States received a delegation of the leading Jews of the country, who called to present the claims of the Jews of the world for the establishment of an independent Jewish state in Palestine. The President, without reservation, and rightly so, told them of his sympathy with this movement and offered his assistance as head of our delegation to the peace conference to see that this independent state was established. Because one of our allies in this war might see fit to contend that the Irish question is a domestic question, are we as a Nation to stand idly by and not lift our voice in protest and let it appear to the people of the world that the only people upon which we shall impose our ideals are those nations that we conquer? And are we going to take the position that we will deny to the people in our own dominions, as well as in the dominions of our allies, the fundamental principle of the right to choose their own form of government?

I am in favor at home and abroad, wherever people differ racially and in their national feelings and aspirations, of giving them the right to determine the form of government under which they shall live, and we could find no better time than right now, in the closing hours of the Sixty-fifth Congress, to express ourselves unanimously on the Gallagher resolution, which will give courage to the people of Ireland in their effort to choose their own form of government after a struggle of over 700 years.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would not get started in half a minute, and the only thing I know to do is to ask leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Record on self-determination for Ireland.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania. I do not intend to continue. I might get warm. [Laughter.]

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN].

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I rejoice at this opportunity to give my unqualified support to the resolutions relative to the consideration by the peace conference of the claims of Ireland for self-determination. Quite contrary to the assertion on this floor that this matter is no concern of us, I assert that a liberty-loving American people, who themselves enjoy the blessings of freedom and independence, are always concerned in the struggle of any people seeking their own independence. Moreover, it is not only proper but also imperative for a people who under free institutions have enjoyed a measure of prosperity and happiness beyond that granted any other people in history to express the hope—and this resolution is thus moderate—that the rights of Ireland shall at least be considered at the peace table. What claim has Poland or Bohemia or any other small nation that Ireland has not? If Ireland had been under the domination of one of our enemies—Germany or Austria, for example—there would be no need for resolutions in this House; her independence would have been promised and guaranteed even before the peace conference gathered together. With all the justice of their righteous claims, shall the Irish people alone be denied even their demand for consideration at the conference simply because they are under the sovereignty of one of our cobelligerents in this war? Was this war fought that democracy be bestowed on those nations hitherto ruled over by our enemies, but denied one small nation ruled over by one of our cobelligerents, herself proclaiming the war—a war for democracy?

I am confident that these questions will be answered by us this morning with an emphatic and unequivocal declaration for universal democracy. When I spoke some weeks ago before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House upon the Gallagher resolution I was confident of the favorable action of the committee. This morning I am again confident of favorable action on this resolution by this House. I am profoundly gratified that as one of the last legislative actions of this House before the control of the House passes from us the Democratic Party shall have the honor of putting through this body the

resolution declaring our sympathetic support in behalf of the long-suffering but virtuous and noble people in their struggle for independence. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHELAN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for one minute.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the liberty and the happiness and the peace of the Letts and the Finns and the Ukrainians, but I am much more interested in the liberty and the peace and the happiness of the beautiful Emerald Isle, and I feel that I can say to those people across the seas to-night, "We be of one blood, you and I." And it does seem to me that the least that this great Nation of ours can do, offending no one, is simply to express our opinion that around the table in Paris the claims of Ireland to govern herself shall be considered. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for one minute.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I congratulate the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Sixty-fifth Congress on favorably reporting the Gallagher resolution as amended. I congratulate the Rules Committee on bringing in a rule to make this resolution in order. Let it be known to all men that under a Democratic administration, headed by Woodrow Wilson, who gave those talismanic words to the world, "the right of nations to self-determination," this Congress, by virtue of the action of two Democratic committees, is privileged to raise its voice in behalf of that gallant nation across the sea, which has never given up its nationality, and to express the hope that the peace conference will favorably consider the right of Ireland, the "Poland of the Seas," to self-determination.

I am reminded as I speak that to-morrow will be the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of the birth of Robert Emmet, the youthful Protestant patriot, who gave his life ungrudgingly for the cause of liberty and his country. He expressed the wish that his epitaph should not be written until his native land had taken her place among the nations of the world. And it was a southern statesman, Robert L. Taylor, who eulogized Emmet in these glowing sentences of poetic words:

If I were a sculptor, I would chisel from the marble my ideal of a hero. I would make it the figure of an Irishman sacrificing his hopes and his life on the altar of his country, and I would carve on its pedestal the name of Robert Emmet.

If I were a painter, I would make the canvas eloquent with the deeds of the bravest people who ever lived, whose proud spirit no power can ever conquer, and whose loyalty and devotion to the hopes of free government no tyrant can ever crush. And I would write under the picture "Ireland."

If I were a poet, I would melt the world to tears with the pathos of my song. I would touch the heart of humanity with the mournful threnody of Ireland's wrongs and Erin's woes. I would weave the shamrock and the rose into garlands of glory for the Emerald Isle, the land of martyrs and memories, the cradle of heroes, the nursery of liberty.

Tortured in dungeons and murdered on scaffolds, robbed of the fruits of their sweat and toil, scourged by famine and plundered by the avarice of heartless power, driven like the leaves of autumn before the keen winter winds, this sturdy race of Erin's sons and daughters have been scattered over the face of the earth, homeless only in the land of their nativity, but princes and lords in every other land where merit is the measure of the man.

America entered the great world war after great deliberation. She went into it to maintain her rights, and in making the world safe for democracy to help destroy the power of any nation on earth to jeopardize the peace of the world again. In seeking to bind the world in peace, America is resolved that justice shall be done to the great and powerful and the small and weak alike. When the treaty of peace is signed, America wants no discontent or grumbling. What a mockery it would be to apply the principle of self-determination to one nation and refuse it to another. And so this great House of Representatives to-day will gladly, I am sure, raise its powerful voice in behalf of one of the oldest nations in the world—Ireland. [Applause.]

England must take notice of her own liberal thought, her liberal press, and the powerful expression of labor in Great Britain all crying out in unison for justice to Ireland. To the liberty-loving men and women of Great Britain America adds her voice to-day asking England to proclaim by her action at the peace conference that the era of evasion and broken promise is passed, and that Ireland shall take her place among the nations of the world with her aid and consent.

We are about to put the peoples of the world in charge of their Governments. We are about to discard forms and to seek that substance containing the eternal verities. We are about to right ancient wrongs and by our actions give proof and promise of a better future for all the world. Alsace and Lorraine is to be given back to France. Poland is to be reestablished, and bitter memories are to be softened in the knowledge that once again that land of valor and chivalry will be a nation. The dreams of the Czecho-Slovaks for a national status are to be realized. The boundaries of nations are to be made to conform to racial alignment, and the seeds of antipathy among peoples are to be destroyed.

Let America's voice then, both here and abroad, be lifted up for a nation whose claims to liberty and justice are founded on absolute right and strengthened by the ready sacrifice which her sons and daughters have made in every land when freedom needed champions. Justice to Ireland by the peace conference will prove the reality of earnestness and good faith, and denial of justice will make a laughing stock of the allies' professed sentiments for democracy. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I wish to say that there are as many Republicans desiring to vote for this resolution as there are Democrats. This is not a partisan proposition.

Mr. DYER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Rhode Island extending his remarks?

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have heard a good deal of Irish-American talk here to-night. There is no Irish blood in me, but I am for this resolution. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I fully agree with my colleague from California [Mr. NOLAN] that not only the Irish but also the Jews are entitled to their freedom and independence. [Applause.] I hope that both of these for centuries oppressed and persecuted peoples will secure it. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, knowing what oppression means I have at all times advocated and aided in its elimination wherever possible. It was for this reason that I was impelled to work to secure freedom and independence for the Czecho-Slovak, Jugo-Slav, and Polish peoples, and it is for the same reason that I am in favor of freedom, justice, liberty, and self-determination for Ireland.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I regret that I have not the time.

The people of this nationality have demonstrated their fitness for self-government as well and have proven that they are deserving of our sympathy. To them, in a large measure, credit is due for our great and glorious victory. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that the American people sympathize with the aims and aspirations of the oppressed people of Ireland. We have a right to request, yes, to demand, that Ireland shall be accorded the right of self-determination. We are not appealing to the enemy, but are appealing to one of our allies, our friends, whom we have saved from defeat and destruction, for whom we have made such sacrifices. Have we sacrificed our blood and all to make Great Britain so strong that she could refuse with impunity to consider the pleas of oppressed nations and peoples? There should be no hesitancy on the part of this House to make the request that due consideration be given to the aspirations

of Ireland for self-determination, and I feel that it, as well as all other small nations, are of right entitled to their freedom and liberty. It is for that reason that I have advocated and worked for the passage of this resolution, which I am satisfied, notwithstanding a well-planned filibuster on the part of certain gentlemen on this side, and a still larger number on the other side, will pass. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, owing to the way the time was divided, I could not get time. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, after all, this resolution is not butting into the affairs of Great Britain. It is not seeking to intervene with Great Britain in its domestic affairs. This resolution only expresses the earnest hope of the Congress of the United States that the peace conference may favorably consider the claims of Ireland. That is a hope which we have the right to express, without interfering with Great Britain. [Applause.] I think we ought to express the hope that is in the hearts of Americans and in the heart of America, that Ireland shall have her show at the peace conference and that the peace conference may so work out the terms of peace that when the final terms shall be agreed upon Ireland will be given independence. [Applause.] What is the harm in expressing a hope like that? We are undertaking to do much more than that with the other nations—the little nations now dependent upon the allies. Certainly no harm can come from our putting in concrete form the soulful spirit of America, which swells and rises high on the tide in favor of giving all nations independence, if possible, and expressing the hope that Ireland will achieve her right to govern herself when she now governs the rest of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes on the subject of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I object.

Mr. DECKER. I rise to move that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] have five minutes to address this body.

The SPEAKER. That motion is out of order.

Mr. DYER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York have three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I object.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I ask unanimous consent to speak for three minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Had not the gentleman from New York obtained two minutes in his own right when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] asked three minutes for him?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may have the opportunity now to speak for three minutes. He will soon be away from us—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York have the opportunity to address the House for three minutes.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman from Iowa object?

The SPEAKER. It is the business of the Chair to put that question. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I have lost entirely too much energy in fighting for the chance to speak for three minutes. Still I am grateful, as others have had only one minute each.

Nearly two years ago, during a dreadful and agonizing night, a night which we will never forget, this Congress voted for war by an overwhelming majority. We began our service in the Sixty-fifth Congress by the first act in a tragedy, a declaration of war, and it is a glorious thing that the war Congress ends with a message of love, which will promote the peace of the world. [Applause.] For there can be no peace when a whole people feels aggrieved.

When you deal with nationality you deal with a thing that does not lend itself to rational analysis, a thing that is not subject to the laws of reason, but which is powerful because of that very fact. When you deal with the feeling of nationality

you deal with sentiment, with emotion, with a passion which defies the laws of logic.

The Irishman who wants to be an Irishman and not an Englishman or a Frenchman has a right to live an Irishman as against the rest of the world. [Applause.]

This resolution merely asks for the Irish people the right of self-disposal, the right of self-government. The form of self-government and the extent to which the Irish people will cooperate with the rest of the peoples of the world will depend upon the method of cooperation that will be worked out by the statesmanship of mankind, by the new wisdom of the world in a peace conference. I hope that when Ireland is free she will not use her freedom for hatred and revenge, but that she will be a star added to a constellation of free commonwealths, shedding a kindly and cheering light for the whole of humanity. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD some remarks that I have written on this resolution.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I request that all Members who desire to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this resolution may have leave to do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all who wish to print remarks on this resolution may do so. Is there objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of cotton.

Mr. GOULD. I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD]?

Mr. HEFLIN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman—

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Virginia whether his request to extend remarks on granting the Irish freedom would confine it to the Democratic side of the House?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not think the gentleman so understood my request.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There are a number of Republicans in favor of this resolution and there are many good Irishmen in my district. [Cries of "Regular order!"] I reserved the right to object—and I do not object, but I wanted to have it understood that this is not a partisan proposition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is ample precedent for the action of Congress in the passage of such a resolution as this. For a hundred years we have enacted laws that would be a precedent for this resolution.

I am for this resolution, because it propounds a sound principle and because it is an entirely proper resolution for Congress to pass.

It expresses the hope that the peace conference will tender its friendly advice to England in reference to the Irish problem—a problem which must be settled before we can be assured of an enduring peace; a problem which must be settled before the world will believe that our victory for democracy was complete. [Applause.]

The propriety of Congress to pass such a resolution as this has been questioned. I have thought of this phase of the question very carefully and have reached the conclusion that there is no impropriety in Congress taking the action outlined in this resolution, but that, on the contrary, it is entirely proper and right for Congress to act in this matter. [Applause.]

We went into the great war to protect our rights and to defend our honor, but after we became belligerent the spirit of America broadened the scope of the war, and we not only fought for our country and its rights but we also fought for the future of humanity—for those universal sanctities that mark us as higher than the beasts; for honor, truth, justice, and an enduring peace, and for the principles that will assure such a peace. [Applause.]

The principle of this resolution is redolent with those ideas, full of the spirit which animated our soldiers who did the fighting and who whipped the German armies to their knees.

The Irish people constitute the only distinct branch of the Caucasian race so situated that it could be erected into an independent nation, and asking to have its rights considered, whose liberty or whose right of self-determination is not being considered by the peace conference; and I might add that in point of antiquity, in point of culture, in point of courage, in point of love of liberty, it stands as high as any branch of the Caucasian race and is superior to many of its branches. [Applause.]

While the peace conference is providing for the independence of Poland and Czecho-Slovakia and of other nationalities, let us ask it not to forget the rights of the brave and liberty-loving people of Ireland. [Applause.]

It has been urged as an argument against this resolution that the Irish in Ireland threatened to resist the conscription law. Let me say that out of 750,000 men of military age in Ireland, 275,000 of them volunteered in this war. This was nearly 40 per cent of the men of military age in that country, and the proportion of those who went into the war compares favorably with Scotland, Canada, the United States, and most countries that were engaged in this fight for human rights.

And I am told that after Parliament had passed a conscription act an investigation by the British authorities showed that so many men had volunteered in Ireland that the enforcement of conscription would have added but a few thousand men to the army, and therefore the British Government decided to abandon the enforcement of that law.

Such a showing entitles the splendid people of Ireland to the consideration of the friends of democracy and the right of self-determination everywhere. [Applause.]

Not only do the character and genius of the Irish people appeal to our consideration, but the manner in which they have been misgoverned and oppressed demands our sympathy.

The statement of one fact will demonstrate the misrule of England in Ireland. The population of Ireland 75 years ago was nearly 9,000,000; to-day it is less than four and a half million. Then Ireland was the fifth country in Europe in population; to-day it is not among the first 15. In that period every other country in Europe has increased its population. England's population has increased 150 per cent, while that of Ireland has been cut in half. In that time the decrease of Ireland's population has wiped out one-third of the Episcopalians, one-third of the Presbyterians, and more than one-half of the Catholics.

Despite the large birth rate in Irish families, every section in that country has suffered an amazing depopulation, due to the unhappy economical conditions, the decay of industries, and the unsettled state of the country brought about by English misrule.

Could a stronger argument be advanced by the people of Ireland for discontinuance of English rule? In this great hour, when governments are being reformed and when people long oppressed by tyranny are emerging into the sunlight of liberty, let us urge England to unselfishly and voluntarily discontinue the misrule of Ireland.

It is my profound conviction that the Irish people should constitute a nation with all the attributes, interests, and rights of nationality, and I hope and believe that this House will concur in that conviction.

A willingness on the part of the Government of Great Britain to permit the ascertainment of the will of the Irish people would be a decisive and honorable precedent for governments similarly situated in the future, and would do as much to insure the peace of the world as anything that any nation or group of nations could possibly contribute to this splendid purpose. [Applause.]

The Irish people, whose kindred are woven into the warp and woof of our national life, and who have contributed materially to the downfall of the autocracy of the world, declare, and have long declared, that they are misruled, and have asked for, insisted upon, and fought for the right to determine for themselves their government and its form.

I believe in Ireland's right of self-determination. The Committee on Foreign Affairs believe in it. The Committee on Rules believe in it. And therefore we are here to-day to plead the cause of Ireland's sons and daughters that they may stand erect, redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled on her own sacred soil. [Applause.]

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the battle fronts of Europe and the peace conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask to address the House for one minute on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this resolution. Ireland has struggled long for its independence. Out of the great world war there should surely come to the people of Ireland the right of self-determination. I hope the peace commission will recognize this just and rightful claim of Ireland. We in the United States have every reason to give due consideration to this important question. In every war in

which this country has fought those of Irish descent have been faithful and true. It is said that one-half of the Continental Army were from Ireland; that not less than 40 per cent of the enlisted men in the Union Army were of Irish blood. In the present war it is said that one-third of the Army and over 40 per cent of the Navy are of Irish blood. In view of this splendid record of our own citizens who hail either themselves or their ancestors from Ireland, I feel that it is just and right for this great country to lend its moral influence in asking that the peace commissioners allow the people of Ireland to form the kind of government that they wish. Let us hope that one of the results of this great war will be the republic of Ireland. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute on this resolution.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I object to any further remarks.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the peace conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, before that is put I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Was general leave to print granted on this resolution?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I think not.

The SPEAKER. The recollection of the Chair is that on the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] all gentlemen were permitted to extend their remarks upon this resolution. The Chair does not think he can be mistaken about that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RUBEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds had voted in favor thereof and that the resolution was passed.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. MASON (interrupting the count). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. I understood the Chair to announce the result that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds had voted for the resolution and that it had passed.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my demand for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-seven Members present—a quorum. So the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. GORDON. But a division was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri withdrew his demand for a division, but the Chair will put the division. Those in favor of passing the resolution will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. All those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twenty-five Members—not a sufficient number.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, was not a division pending?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the demand for the yeas and nays superseded the demand for the division.

Mr. MANN. While in a way it does and while the yeas and nays can not now be ordered, having been refused by the House, it seems to me that the Speaker ought to count.

The SPEAKER. In order to establish beyond all question, the Chair will take the division.

The House divided; and there was yeas 216, nays 45.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 10851, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that in a moment.

CLERKS TO MEMBERS.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution 436, providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of one secretary and one clerk, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and paid in monthly installments, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That hereafter each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives shall have for clerical assistance necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties one secretary at \$2,000 per annum and one clerk at \$1,200 per annum, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and who shall be paid in monthly installments by the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Such secretary and clerk shall be appointed by the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner and certified to the Clerk of the House of Representatives at the beginning of his term of office, and shall be subject to removal at any time by such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, with or without cause; and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be entitled to the benefits of this provision.

Sec. 2. That this act shall take effect July 1, 1919, and that the appropriation for clerical assistance for the fiscal year 1920, carried in the act "making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes" shall be applied during said fiscal year in the manner above set forth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to suspend the rules and pass the resolution. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish it to be understood I am not opposed to the resolution, but I would like to have some time—

Mr. MANN. We would like to understand what the resolution is.

Mr. CAREW. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if in drawing his bill he has considered the effect of the language which he will find in volume 31 of the United States Statutes at Large on page 968, where it says:

It shall not be lawful to appoint or employ in any position under the House of Representatives more than one person at any one time, or to require, or permit any such person to divide with another any portion of his salary or compensation while so employed.

Does not the gentleman think that that would forbid a Member from having three persons to do the work of his office? And does it not require to have just two, and no more and no less?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No more, but not less. He can appoint one secretary at \$2,000 a year, and let it go at that.

Mr. CAREW. Then he will have a vacancy in the case of a clerk at \$1,200 a year?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. CAREW. Now, a great many of us have often employed more help at one season of the year than at another. I know that I have had half a dozen girls working in my office at certain seasons of the year, and only had my secretary working at other seasons of the year. Does not the gentleman think that I will be embarrassed if I want to continue that practice if the measure he proposes is enacted?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I think so.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would it not relieve the situation if the gentleman put before "\$2,000" and "\$1,200" the words "at the rate of"?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One secretary "at the rate of."

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I do not think so.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not that enable a Member, if he wanted to shift a secretary and take another, to do so?

He might want to employ two clerks instead of one, and use the money for two clerks instead of for one. That is one of the complications in my office.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I want to ask the gentleman having the bill in charge whether the \$240 that has been allowed additional to the help here in the Government would go to the secretary and the stenographer?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE HELM, OF KENTUCKY.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from North Carolina to withdraw that for a special purpose. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] desires to ask for a recess as a mark of respect to the memory of his late colleague, Mr. HELM.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina withdraws the point of no quorum.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret to have to announce to the House the death of my colleague, Hon. HARVEY HELM, of Kentucky, who died at Columbus, Miss., on Monday. I send to the Clerk's desk the following resolution, which I ask to have adopted.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 623.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HARVEY HELM, a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, before putting the last part of the resolution, I desire to state that it was the request of Mr. HELM that there be no committee of the Congress appointed to attend his funeral, and in obedience to that wish no request is made.

Mr. Speaker, some of us who served with our friend, and who will not be Members of the next Congress, when there can properly and fittingly be paid tribute to his memory and to his public services, would like the privilege of printing in the RECORD remarks in connection with his life and character. I ask unanimous consent that those of his colleagues who desire to do so may have that privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that Members may have the privilege of printing in the RECORD remarks touching the life and character of Mr. HELM. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECESS.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following additional resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now stand in recess until 9 a. m.

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

The resolution was unanimously agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 18 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess until 9 o'clock a. m.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House (at 9 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, March 4, 1919) resumed its session.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 9.30 a. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSTER). The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 9.30 a. m. Is there objection?

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to suggest to the gentleman that there is pending upon the Suspension Calendar a bill that came over from the Senate, which has been reported out by the House Judiciary Committee, extending the time of the going into effect of section 10 of the Clayton amendment to the antitrust act. The purpose of this bill is to give the short-line railroads of this country a better chance to live through the conditions which now obtain. It will take but a few minutes for the House to dispose of it one way or the other. I hope the gentleman will not

insist upon his request, but will give us a chance, at least, to submit this matter to the judgment of the House.

Mr. MANN. Let us see if we can reach an understanding about anything of this sort. It is now 9 o'clock. Probably there will not be a quorum here before—

Mr. KITCHIN. Not before 10 o'clock, anyway.

Mr. MANN. That is, there will not be a full attendance. I will not say that there will not be a quorum. I will assume that there is a quorum here now. There will not be a full attendance before half past 10. There are some things that have to be done at the end of a session of Congress. It is not desirable to get tied up on something. As far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to sit here and let gentlemen ask unanimous consent to pass bills if they will agree not to row about it if they do not get unanimous consent.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield.

Mr. RAKER. There is a little bill here that has passed the Senate, to which I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois, as well as the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina, providing for an additional judicial district in northern California. I do not think there will be any objection to it, and we can consider it while we are waiting. It has passed the Senate.

Mr. MANN. I do not know that there will be any objection to anything; but I am not going to help the House get into a condition where we may get into a row and then have to call the roll, and then probably get along to the point where we can not even offer a resolution, which I want to offer before the session expires, in regard to the Speaker.

Mr. RAKER. I think the suggestion is a wise one; and if we can take up these matters by unanimous consent, then if there is any objection we will not try to argue or make any points of order.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I do not think there are enough people here so that we ought to bring up any bills, even by unanimous consent.

Mr. RAKER. We recessed until 9 o'clock, and Members are all supposed to be here. Let us try it and see what we can do.

Mr. SUMNERS. I do not understand that the gentleman from North Carolina objects.

Mr. KITCHIN. I suggested a recess until 9.30.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think there is a better chance of bringing this matter up after 9.30, if the gentleman does not object to a recess now.

Mr. SUMNERS. Of course I know what that means, and I have no intention of running up against the situation—

Mr. MANN. There is some chicken feed here that might properly be disposed of—probably nothing of great importance.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. We have got this clerk bill, that we might just as well put through while we are waiting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RAKER. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. SUMNERS. I will reserve the right to object just a minute longer.

Mr. RAKER. Here is a matter to which there is no possible objection.

Mr. SUMNERS. If I may have the attention of the gentlemen present for just about a minute additional, I wish to say a word about this resolution dealing with the situation which confronts the short-line railroads, and to put the responsibility upon the House.

Mr. MANN. Do not put the responsibility on me. I refuse to assume it, because I tried my best to beat that proposition when it went into the law.

Mr. SUMNERS. Excepting the gentleman from Illinois. There are about 35,000 miles of these short-line roads. Let me make this informal statement—

Mr. KITCHIN. Go ahead and make your statement.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Speaker, there are about two and a half million dollars tied up in these short lines, of which there are some 800. The big roads are free from the effect of section 10 of the Clayton Act and are being taken care of financially by the Government, while the little roads have to depend largely upon local support, and in order to get necessary local credit it was shown before the Judiciary Committee these short lines must permit the creditor some voice in their management.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. The matter of the short-line roads has been for weeks and months before the Interstate Commerce Commission and considered in every aspect, and I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Sims] or the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch] ought to be here when that matter comes up.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up Senate bill 2910, providing for an additional judge in the northern district of California.

Mr. MANN. That will not go through.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. There is a matter of unanimous consent now pending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. ROGERS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. The situation when the House recessed about 7 o'clock was that we were actually considering a bill presented by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS]; I would like to inquire whether that should not automatically come before the House at this moment, to the exclusion of other matters.

Mr. RAKER. That was temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman desires to take up the bill of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], which never will pass the Senate, and use the time in that way, I will withdraw my request.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass this joint resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has already moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill some hours ago, and I had some time on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Reading Clerk, or some one, made a slight mistake in the legislative appropriation bill about the clerk hire item. As the amendment that is in the bill was first agreed to in the House it read like this:

For clerk hire of each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, for clerk hire necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$3,200 per annum.

I asked unanimous consent to strike out the word "hire" where it appeared the second time, after the amendment was agreed to. That unanimous consent was granted. But the clerk, whoever it was, inadvertently struck out the word "hire" where it first appeared. So that it is now the law reading like this:

For clerk of each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, for clerk hire necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties—

And so forth.

It should read:

For clerk hire of each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, for clerk necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties—

And so forth.

That would still be in the singular, "clerk necessarily employed by him." But the statute provides that where the singular is used the plural shall be considered as imputed, if it is a reasonable conclusion or if it be considered necessary.

I think that language of that provision as it was intended to be passed, and probably as it is passed, will be construed to mean that each Member is entitled to \$3,200 in payment of clerk or clerks employed by him. Then the question arises how that is to be paid.

Well, we have a number of items in this bill. The paragraph just above this provides for four stenographers to committees. The paragraph just above that provides for six official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House without saying anything at all about who shall pay them, and they are not listed under anybody who does pay them. These items come in under a list heading above the official reporters, office of Postmaster, to which they do not relate. My construction of that is—and I think it is the only construction that can be made—that the Clerk of the House will pay these clerks to Members, and that each Member will have the right to certify to the Clerk the name of one clerk, or a dozen clerks if he chooses to, with salaries the total of which will not exceed \$3,200. It seems to me that is the proper and only construction that can be made of the statute.

It is not to be assumed that Congress has made an appropriation here which can not be expended.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. COLLIER. If the gentleman's construction be true, what is the necessity for a change?

Mr. MANN. If that construction be true, there is no necessity for change, save in this one respect, and that probably will not arrive. The provision of the statute is not inactive and, of course, does not take effect until the 1st of July next. It

does not apply to Members elect. The provision of the statute which is now in force as to this fiscal year, which makes the appropriation up to the 1st of July, provides for the payment of clerk hire to Members elect. We are all Members elect, or will be in less than three hours. We will then be no longer Members of Congress. Under the law we are Members elect. If there were not to be a special session of Congress before the 1st of July, a resolution like this would be quite essential.

Mr. COLLIER. That is, like the Humphreys resolution.

Mr. MANN. Yes; to obtain clerk hire at all after the 1st of July—but as it is perfectly certain, owing to the failure of a number of the appropriation bills, in support of the Government, after the 1st of July, that there will be a special session before the 1st of July—Members of Congress will have the same opportunity when the special session is called to provide in reference to this.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. There is this other thought that the gentleman has not yet stated—

Mr. MANN. I have not quite finished.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. About its being permanent law.

Mr. MANN. There is this thought. I may not be correct about the construction of the statute. While I think inevitably that will be the construction of the statute, still I have learned through some experience that it is pretty hard to tell what either an auditor or a comptroller will find about the statute, and probably the Clerk of the House would not feel warranted in paying out the money without consultation with the auditor or the comptroller.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Just for a question. I do not know that I will have the time.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I will give the gentleman what time he wants.

Mr. MANN. The Humphreys resolution provides directly for a salary of \$2,000 and \$1,200, making a total of \$3,200. It would not give to any Member the right to have one clerk at \$2,200 and another at \$1,000. It would not provide for three clerks at \$1,000 each for two and \$1,200 for the third. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WELLING. I have not had an opportunity of hearing all of the gentleman's statement, which is always clear, but I understand there is no difference in the Humphreys provision, which has been presented to the House and the legislation already enacted, so far as the amount of compensation is concerned.

Mr. MANN. There is no difference so far as the total amount is concerned, if it can be drawn.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I hesitate at this late hour to take any of your time with a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MANN. What time does the gentleman think he would want?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Oh, four or five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I understand that I have the right to proceed for one hour without unanimous consent, but I thank the gentleman from Illinois, nevertheless. In September last the papers here in Washington and elsewhere all over the United States published articles in which I was termed a Hun. It was stated that I should be sent back to the Kaiser. The reason for this was that I had voted against the war resolution. It was stated that I was voting against the appropriations for prosecuting the war. I voted for all the bills to prosecute the war. I favored volunteers, having once served during the Spanish-American War as a volunteer myself. I volunteered to go with the Roosevelt volunteer divisions, but the President refused our services.

I have no desire to go into this question at length now. You have heard these questions of personal privilege repeatedly on the floor of this House, but I want to answer these charges, and I ask that I may have the privilege of revising and extending my remarks in the Record upon the subject of loyalty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I want to say that no man ever questioned my loyalty to my face, nor will he ever do that. I received letters questioning my loyalty and abusing me. I replied and said that I would meet the writers on the platform or elsewhere,

but that I did not desire them to question my loyalty in my presence, because it would not be well for them to do so.

This disloyalty business has been carried entirely too far by some people throughout the country. The Nonpartisan League has been termed disloyal. The Socialist Party has been called disloyal; all labor unions have been termed disloyal. The German-American Alliance, 2,000,000 members, all called disloyal. The labor people called business men disloyal profiteers. We have gone too far with this thing. As a matter of fact, the American people are all loyal; the whole people were loyal. There may have been a few men with criminal intent. Those men were punished; but the American people as a whole were loyal and they stood by their country, and I am proud of the fact that the boys from the Northwest, from Minnesota and Wisconsin and Michigan, men who were accused of disloyalty, were the very men who stood the brunt of battle at Chateau-Thierry, a battle where these regiments met the enemy, men of their own flesh and blood, and beat them back. They were true, genuine Americans.

ALL MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FROM MINNESOTA BUT ONE, CALLED DISLOYAL.

The great State of Minnesota has 10 Representatives and 2 Senators in the Congress of the United States. These men, in the exercise of their honest judgment as loyal and patriotic citizens and faithful representatives of the people of their State, cast their votes in Congress to warn Americans against sailing on vessels of foreign belligerents through the war zone.

Because of their vote 11 were denounced as Kaiserites by that large part of the press which was more active in promoting the interests of certain foreign nations than they were in protecting the lives of American citizens. Only one, Senator NELSON, was called a patriotic American, while men whose distinguished service to their State, lasting through many years, like Senator Moses E. Clapp, Representatives Sydney Anderson, Franklin F. Ellsworth, Charles Russell Davis, Carl C. Van Dyke, George R. Smith, Charles A. Lindbergh, Andrew J. Volstead, Clarence B. Miller, Halvor Steenerson, and Thomas D. Schall, equally patriotic, were branded as disloyal and unpatriotic.

As for myself, during the world war, I have voted and will vote all the money and all the supplies necessary for our brave soldiers wherever they may be. They must be loyally supported. Let this be so; nevertheless, we can not and will not yield our right to discuss the conduct of the war, our right to demand terms of an honorable peace, our right of petition, and our right of assembly. Neither will we spare tender-skinned officials from scathing denunciation as to their official acts whenever we feel that they are yielding ground to foreigners and abandoning the sacred and time-honored principles of patriotism established by our forefathers. Autocracy which masquerades in the garments of democracy is as obnoxious to a free people as the variety which openly wears a crown.

THEY WANTED TO INTERN ROOSEVELT.

Men lost their heads in a whirlwind of false accusations. So bitter was the feeling aroused that a large number of people circulated a petition in Oklahoma, if we may believe the daily press, asking that Col. Theodore Roosevelt, world-famous citizen and former President of the United States, be interned during the period of the war because of his criticism of Wilson and the administration. Yet Roosevelt freely denounced many of his fellow citizens as disloyalists and Huns.

The Irish-Americans were, of course, termed disloyal because they sought self-determination for Ireland. There is a man, I believe by the name of McGee, from Minneapolis, autocrat and member of the Public Safety Commission of Minnesota, who appeared before the Senate committee and slandered the patriotism and loyalty of the people of Minnesota. This man talked like some kings of old of jails and of firing squads because men had dared to exercise their constitutional right of free speech; he questioned the loyalty of the Swedish-Americans of the great Northwest whose ancestors discovered America 500 years before Columbus set sail to our shores, forgetting that John Hanson, whose statue was placed in Statuary Hall by the State of Maryland, was the first "President of the United States in Congress" during the Revolutionary War; unmindful of the fact that Swedish emigrants always lay aside their foreign allegiance at once, and become industrious and patriotic citizens. They fought in every war—the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American, and the World War. They have never been found wanting. The Swedish people first of all the nations in the world recognized American independence. No punishment is too severe for this character assassin who so traduces and slanders our very best citizens.

388 MEMBERS OF CONGRESS CALLED DISLOYAL.

When the President of the United States before the election enjoined us to be neutral in thought as well as act he was

denounced as a pacifist and disloyal. The now infamous National Security League, later investigated and denounced by Congress, and whose immense contributions, running into millions, came wholly from Wall Street—with the exception of \$38—accused as disloyal 388 Members of Congress, including Mr. CLARK, Speaker of the House; Majority Leader KIRCHIN; Minority Leader MANN; and other distinguished and famous statesmen were blacklisted by this crowd of political slanderers. This crowd of pretended patriots were found, upon investigation, to be nothing but scheming profiteers. My friends, those who coin gold out of patriotism must be eliminated from our national life.

Mr. Bryan and Mr. Ford and many other distinguished and patriotic citizens were denounced in the most scathing terms. Many of our most prominent citizens were even threatened with death. I myself have been in receipt of the vilest possible letters, breathing threats of insult, injury, and death. During the first months of the special session there came to my office many threats of death; and I want the world to know, and my record shows it, that I could neither be bullied nor threatened into any vote or act contrary to the right as God gave me to see the right.

Many leading college professors, educators, and ministers of the gospel throughout the country were likewise hounded. Unheard-of and cruel punishments were pronounced by the courts. Men and women were sentenced to 20, 30, and even 40 years of imprisonment. In this land of the free the methods of the Spanish inquisition were revived.

The chairman of the Committee of Public Information, Mr. George Creel, now issues a statement to the press: "Never was a country so contraespionaged." He cites a multitude of cases where foreign-born citizens and others were frightfully abused and hounded, though they did all in their power for Uncle Sam, both in men and money. They were continually trailed by secret-service men, and permit me to add that the Government offered them no protection. The war-mad press says Mr. Creel refused to publish the truth about these good citizens, and instead invoked mob law upon their heads. An army of 250,000 officious volunteer sleuths, in addition to all the regular State and city secret-service men, combed the country, and permit me again to say that they committed outrageous invasions upon the liberties of the people.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS SPIED UPON AND HOUNDED.

Every Member of Congress who spoke in favor of the Mc-Lemore resolution warning citizens to keep off the munition ships entering the war zone was denounced as a traitor to his country. Many famous Senators were branded as disloyal and pro-German. Cartoons were common in which the iron cross was hung on our leaders. Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Stone, of Missouri; Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin (three times candidate for the nomination of President); Senator NORRIS; Senator VARDAMAN; and Senator GRONNA, all these branded as disloyal. Senator Lane, of Oregon, was hounded to his grave. Senators on the floor declared that Senator Lane was a martyr to his political convictions, his heart and constitution being broken down by the vicious assaults of his merciless critics.

THE NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE HIRED CHARACTER ASSASSINS.

The National Security League blacklisted me as undesirable for reelection and sent Col. Theodore Roosevelt, world famous citizen and ex-President of the United States, to Minneapolis to denounce me as a Hun who ought to be sent back to the Kaiser.

I do not believe that Roosevelt fully comprehended the pack he was training with. The colonel was very impulsive and very quick spoken. These men knew this and took advantage of it and whispered in his ear words of slander, which he loudly trumpeted abroad. It is enough to know that the now infamous National Security League sent him to Minneapolis to denounce me.

The National Security League has just been investigated by Congress, and in the hearings in part 5, page 398, we find these words by Mr. Menken, president of the organization:

Mr. Roosevelt went twice to Chicago to speak at those meetings. I had the honor of going with him. On another occasion Mr. Roosevelt went across the continent for us.

On page 411 we find that one Emerson McMillan, head of the American Light & Traction Co., with office at 40 Wall Street, New York—

Gave for special purposes always. He wanted the distinction and privilege of meeting the outlay of the league in connection with Mr. Roosevelt's trips, and he always insisted upon paying whatever money we were out of pocket for those trips, and he did it on two occasions. He gave \$4,250.

So that the now infamous National Security League was sending the colonel about the country to denounce LA FOLLETTE,

GRONNA, and myself, as well as others, as Huns and disloyal. It was this organization that accused 388 out of 435 Members of Congress as being disloyal. This was so brazen that Congress investigated these self-anointed and self-appointed patriots and found them to be a pack of profiteers, vultures preying upon patriotism, the very last men qualified to preach patriotism and loyalty to our citizens.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN COL. ROOSEVELT AND CONGRESSMAN ERNEST LUNDEEN.

(Copy of wire of Oct. 2.)

HON. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Oyster Bay, N. Y.:

The newspapers have it that you term me a shadow Hun and that you wish to present me as a free gift to the Kaiser. The malicious prevaricators who have assailed my record have no foundation whatever for their accusations, and I am astounded that without hearing from me you should have denounced me as you did.

As you well know, I am a Spanish War Veteran; have served as private, corporal, sergeant, first sergeant, color sergeant, lieutenant, and captain in the Minnesota National Guard for 10 years; shot on a national championship rifle team in 1909; offered a regiment to protect our border in our recent Mexican trouble.

Further, my record in Congress is as follows: Voted against the war resolution, voted for volunteers, voted against conscription for foreign service. I voted for the Roosevelt volunteer divisions and have no apologies to offer for having done so, unless I should ascertain that you are not the advocate of the square deal that I supposed you were. I voted for national food control, for \$20,000,000,000 in appropriations for war, the largest the world has ever known. I voted for every war measure asked for by the administration, except the war resolution and conscription for foreign service.

I have always advocated an adequate, a sane and sensible program of preparedness in State and Nation, and have so voted. Further, I offered my services in this war and stand ready to join the volunteer divisions which are authorized by Congress.

Do you still question my citizenship? Am I still in your mind a "shadow Hun"? In the belief that my enemies have misled you with twisted and distorted statements, uttering falsehoods to you in my absence, I wire these facts for your further information.

ERNEST LUNDEEN,
Member of Congress.

On October 4 Col. Roosevelt wrote me as follows:

I would be glad to see you and go over the matter in person.

I wired him that my record will stand daylight anywhere; and on October 12 the colonel wired me from Stamford, Conn., making an appointment for the following Sunday afternoon at 2.30 p. m.

On October 14 I met Col. Roosevelt at Stamford, and in the hour I spent with him there he carefully reviewed my record.

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 1, 1917.

HON. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Metropolitan, New York City.

DEAR COLONEL: In the campaign of 1916 Woodrow Wilson went before the people on a plea for peace. His followers everywhere gave out the slogan, "He kept us out of war." It was openly charged that the Republicans would plunge us into the world war. It was loudly proclaimed that Wilson would keep us out of war. This was the Democratic campaign cry in Minneapolis. The President carried our city by a very large majority. Colonel, I considered this a mandate from the people—a command I could not disobey.

An advisory referendum resulted in a heavy majority against war. This referendum was mailed to my district from Washington March 30, seven days before war was declared, and if the postal authorities failed to deliver a portion of those letters until after the declaration of war, that was no fault of mine. Further, you will remember that the President suddenly shifted the date of the special session of Congress from April 16 to April 2, cutting short our time by two weeks. My enemies have stated to you that I conducted a referendum after war was declared. That I brand as an unqualified falsehood.

I stand foursquare for volunteers for foreign service. I believe that the President made one of the greatest mistakes of his life when he refused to accept the tender of your services to America in the world war. Had he done so, a much-needed wave of enthusiasm and support would certainly have swept the country. Should the President change his mind and finally accept your volunteer divisions, already authorized by Congress, I hope to be honored with a place in your command. I am as ready as any man to stand by my country. I can not say that I always stand by the President; he never stands still long enough.

In the summer of 1914, before the world war began, I delivered a chautauqua lecture at Fort Dodge, Iowa, in which I advocated a special session of Congress to bring about an immediate and adequate, a sane and sensible, program of preparedness. This is exactly the policy you set forth in *The Poets of Our Own Household*: "Had we prepared in advance we could have put a couple of million troops in the field last April and the war would have been over now. As it is, we have so far done nothing." From boyhood I have stood strong for preparedness against that evil day when America would be at war. On page 31 of your book you say: "For the last three years our foremost duty, to ourselves and to the world, has been to prepare." During the last three years I have constantly urged my fellow citizens to prepare.

My wire to you of October 2 gives my record as a soldier and veteran and Member of Congress. I carried the slogan "America first" on my campaign literature, and when my term is completed and my record is made up it will show America placed first in every vote given. I can not, however, and will not, yield my right to discuss the conduct of the war. I will enter my protest whenever inefficiency and incompetency lifts its head to trouble the people.

The above is, in substance, the statement I made to you at Stamford, Conn., Sunday, October 14, at which time we discussed my record.

For the future, it is my purpose to advocate preparedness, which you have advocated, single handed and bravely, against those timid and deceitful men who know only the desire for office and render mere "lip service" to their country.

You stand for a square deal, and I know, Colonel, that my record is such that America's greatest citizen will never question my citizenship. Whatever I am able to do for my country will be wholeheartedly given to the end of the road.

Sincerely and respectfully, yours,

ERNEST LUNDEEN.

NOVEMBER 7, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. LUNDEEN: I thank you for your frank and manly letter. I understand now, as I did not before, the reasons that influenced you in your vote against the war, and while I can not agree with you, I appreciate your point of view, and I do not question your loyalty. In effect, you say that President Wilson won his campaign last year on a plea for peace, on the cry that "he kept us out of war," the charge being that the Republicans would plunge us into the world war; you say that this was the Democratic campaign cry in Minneapolis; that the President carried your city by a very large majority; and that you regarded yourself as bound by a mandate by the people. While, as I have said, I do not agree with you as to your action, I do entirely sympathize with the bewilderment of an honest man under such conditions. As you point out, the election was won under false pretenses, and a very great part of the difficulty that now confronts this Nation in arousing a proper war spirit is due to the fact that for two and a half years preceding our entry into the war our governmental leaders dulled the moral conscience of the people by arguments against our so entering it; arguments which were just as untrue and unjustifiable then as they are now. Naturally, it takes time to get people who have been misled back to the right course, the very course which they have for two and a half years been told was the wrong course.

Of course, you are absolutely within your rights in discussing the conduct of the war. It is exactly as important that there should be truthful criticism of official acts that are wrong as that there should not be untruthful attacks upon acts that are right, and you render a service to the public when you censure the gross unpreparedness of this Nation and point out where the responsibility lies and do all you can to remedy all that is inefficient and incompetent in the handling of the war. The criticism must be truthful and must not be made in a captious spirit; but I believe that in this country during the last three years even more harm has been done by the foolish persons who have protested against truthful criticism of the administration when it was wrong than by the men who have supported it when it went wrong and have opposed it only when it went right.

As for the future, our duty—your duty, the duty of all good Americans—is clear. Every measure that the administration takes for the efficient prosecution of the war we shall heartily support. We must send our troops to fight beside our allies abroad, because if we do not do so, then some time or other we shall have to fight without any allies at home. We ought to introduce at once as our permanent national policy the principle of universal obligatory military training and military service for all our young men. We must back up the liberty loans. We must fearlessly insist upon the utmost efficiency in the handling of the war. We must fearlessly criticize whatever is wrong. Above all, we must insist that there shall be no inconclusive peace; no peace that is not based upon complete and overwhelming victory. We are in this war, and we must put it through. Then we must continue our preparedness, so that never again shall we be put in a position so humiliating as that in which we have been during the last nine months. Never again must we be caught so unprepared as to be obliged to trust to the strength of others and not to our own trained strength for our safety.

Very sincerely, yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

[From the Chicago Tribune.]

FALSE PRETENSE ELECTED WILSON, ROOSEVELT SAYS—"KEPT US OUT OF WAR" STAND REASON, T. R. TELLS CONGRESSMAN.
(By a staff correspondent. Special.)

WASHINGTON, December 18.

The lack of a "proper war spirit" in the United States to-day is attributed by Col. Roosevelt to the "kept-us-out-of-war" propaganda which won President Wilson's reelection.

Col. Roosevelt no longer regards Congressman LUNDEEN, of Minnesota, as a "shadow Hun" because he voted against the resolution declaring war with Germany. Moreover, Mr. Roosevelt, now that he understands how it all happened, sympathizes with Mr. LUNDEEN, who explains that the people of Minneapolis in large numbers had voted for Mr. Wilson in the belief that he would keep them out of war. Mr. LUNDEEN considered their action a "mandate he was bound to obey."

TELLS OF SERVICE TO UNITED STATES.

Roused by what he considered an unjust attack, Mr. LUNDEEN spent an hour with Col. Roosevelt last October and set forth his position in detail. The substance of the interview is contained in letters given out by him to-night, including the fact that he is a Spanish War veteran, has served for 10 years in the Minnesota National Guard, offered a regiment to protect the border in the recent Mexican troubles, voted for every war measure, except the war resolution and conscription for foreign service, has always been an advocate of preparedness, and offered his services in the present war. Mr. LUNDEEN further remarks that he is as ready as any man to stand by his country.

"I can not say," he admits, "that I always stand by the President; he never stands still long enough."

NOW UNDERSTANDS POSITION.

"I thank you for your frank and manly letter," Mr. Roosevelt wrote in reply. "I understand now as I did not before the reasons that influenced you in your vote against the war, and while I can not agree with you, I can appreciate your point of view, and I do not question your loyalty. In effect you say that President Wilson won his campaign last year on a plea for peace on the cry that 'he kept us out of war,' the charge being that the Republicans would plunge us into the world war; you say this was the Democratic campaign cry in Minneapolis; that the President carried your city by a very large majority; and that you regarded yourself as bound by a mandate of the people."

SYMPATHIZES WITH HIM.

"While, as I have said, I do not agree with you as to your action, I do entirely sympathize with the bewilderment of an honest man under such conditions. As you point out, the election was won under false

pretenses, and a very great part of the difficulty that now confronts this Nation in arousing a proper war spirit is due to the fact that for the two and a half years preceding our entry into the war our governmental leaders dulled the moral conscience of the people by arguments against our so entering it, arguments which were just as untrue and unjustifiable then as they are now."

Later, when I voted against war with Austria, the colonel suffered another outburst which was also widely published. In this he did not question my loyalty but severely attacked my vote.

I did vote against war with Austria. The Austro-Italian boundary dispute was no affair of ours. I am not interested in the real estate titles of Europe.

One organization petitioned Congress to bring about my expulsion. I was expelled from a number of organizations, one in particular because I said that I would rather follow in the footsteps of Washington and Jefferson and the giants of the Republic than follow in the footsteps of the two-by-fours who are now leading us into European entanglements.

The following verses from my brother, Corpl. David Lundeen, now serving with the American Expeditionary Forces in France, were received January 2, 1919:

HIS VOTE.

Bright shone the sun upon the hopes of his to-morrow,
Which surely power and fame to him would bring,
And all seemed destined in the course of time to augur
For him the best that gods could give or man could sing,
Then came that hour of awful crisis,
When souls were tried, and all that man holds dear
Was in the scale.
What was the right?
What was the wrong?
No man could tell,
Except by that clear guide
That God has placed in minds of men,
That each may know and feel.

For years we stood upon the brink of war,
Some said that it must be,
While others argued long, and won,
That we must stay at peace, and free
To bind the wounds of a warring world.
The people's voice, the voice of God,
Had chosen men who promised on their faith
To strive and keep the beast of war away.
And so the chief was placed where he had been,
The leader for another day.

Among the leaders of the day was he,
Who wished his Nation well,
Who lived in firm belief the people's will should rule,
And in the school of life
His faith had grown in that belief.
The passions of the hour raged strong,
And brave, indeed, was he
Who dared, in that great hour,
To stand among the few
Who listened not in quiet
To men who whispered;
But bravely asked the common man—the sovereign man—
What was his will.
But such a man was he;
And in that great and dawning hour
He stood among the leaders of his time
And made his maiden speech.
Bravely he spoke, quite unafraid,
The verdict of his people,
The verdict of his heart,
And who shall say, when passion's hour is gone,
He did not play by far the nobler part?

Let not the men to whom we do intrust
The power to act forget
The men who placed them where they are.
We must be fair, and either say
That man is generally not qualified,
Not fit to rule, or, sovereign
In his state and life,
And fit to choose the peace or strife.
No man or group of men must cast the fatal vote,
And place, without the people's choice,
The fatal coat of war
Upon the Nation.
No braver deed was ever done
By any man than he performed
When facing all the scorn and hate
Of selfish, keen, but small-souled men.
He faced them unafraid
And spoke his people's will.

To my big, brave brother, who dared, in the greatest crisis in history, to live true to the pure principles of democracy, and who told those of his colleagues who tried to cow him into deserting his principles and his people that he would see them in hell first.

DAV.

SENATOR DENOUNCES ENTIRE REPUBLICAN PARTY AS DISLOYAL.

During a special election in 1918, held in New Hampshire, Senator J. HAMILTON LEWIS, spokesman for the Wilson administration, made a speech which consigned the entire Republican Party to the traitor class.

He said that if the voters wanted to stand by the President and be loyal they must vote for the Democratic candidate for Congress, and that if they voted for the Republican candidate they would be standing by the Kaiser.

The voters paid slight attention to this appeal, however, and elected the Republican candidate to Congress, no doubt greatly to the consternation of the Senator from Illinois.

It is only one more illustration of the vile tactics adopted by the Wilson administration to bully the public and maintain control; and to boot, the Senator from Illinois himself, in the regular election in 1918, lost his seat in the Senate, and I presume now feels that the entire State of Illinois, the third largest in the Union, is supporting the Kaiser.

Behind much of the professed patriotic loyalty activities of individuals and organizations is an element of selfishness and profiteering. Men who were most vociferous in proclaiming their own patriotism and denouncing an alleged lack of it in others have been proven by the record of the war to have profited from the war to such an enormous extent that their motives can not escape being open to suspicion by all fair-minded people.

THE PHARISEES OF PATRIOTISM.

Loyalty to the United States of America is not a matter of mere lip service. There are Pharisees of patriotism as well as Pharisees of religion, men who praise our Government without stint in public while secretly they plan raids on the National Treasury through profiteering schemes.

The stakes for which war profiteers play are so huge that they can afford to spend, and do spend, enormous sums of money to control and influence every possible instrumentality for shaping public opinion favorably to their ends and purposes.

Their favorite means of molding people's opinion are the press, the pulpit, and the politician. Heavy contributions to the campaign funds of the political parties, liberal donations to church and charities, accompanied by the largest publicity, financial help for friendly newspapers without any publicity at all, are among the most approved methods used by those large financial interests who make the most profits out of war and preparation for war.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE PRESS.

John Swinton, former editor of the New York Herald and New York Sun, in responding to a toast on the "Independence of the Press" at a meeting of newspaper editors and writers in New York said that there was no such thing as independence of the press, that editorial writers sold themselves to the highest bidder; that they were merely mental prostitutes; that everyone present knew that newspaper writers were not hired to tell the truth, but were on the staff to write according to instructions.

THE PURCHASED PRESS.

Representative McLEMORE, in a speech in the House on August 3, 1917, said:

A distinguished Member of the United States Senate, in discussing this highly interesting news item on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, expressed himself as follows:

"This statement is being sent out by Mr. Hoover about himself, in order that he may thereby glorify himself by having it printed in all the papers of the country. It is, I assume, sent out at Government expense."

And no doubt the papers printed it, and which recalls a very interesting item concerning many newspapers published in this country. The item referred to is taken from pages 3320 and 3321 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, and is as follows:

"Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this point a statement showing the newspaper combination, which explains their activity in this war matter, just discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]:

"In March, 1915, the J. P. Morgan interests, the steel, shipbuilding, and powder interests, and their subsidiary organizations, got together 12 men high up in the newspaper world and employed them to select the most influential newspapers in the United States and sufficient number of them to control generally the policy of the daily press of the United States.

"These 12 men worked the problem out by selecting 170 newspapers, and then began, by an elimination process, to retain only those necessary for the purpose of controlling the general policy of the daily press throughout the country. They found it was only necessary to purchase the control of 25 of the greatest papers. The 25 papers were agreed upon; emissaries were sent to purchase the policy, national and international, of these papers; an agreement was reached; the policy of the papers was bought, to be paid for by the month; an editor was furnished for each paper to properly supervise and edit information regarding the questions of preparedness, militarism, financial policies, and other things of national and international nature considered vital to the interests of the purchasers.

"This contract is in existence at the present time, and it accounts for the news columns of the daily press of the country being filled with all sorts of preparedness arguments and misrepresentations as to the present condition of the United States Army and Navy and the possibility and probability of the United States being attacked by foreign foes.

"This policy also included the suppression of everything in opposition to the wishes of the interests served. The effectiveness of this scheme has been conclusively demonstrated by the character of stuff carried in the daily press throughout the country since March, 1915. They have resorted to anything necessary to commercialize public sentiment and sandbag the National Congress into making extravagant and wasteful appropriations for the Army and Navy under the false pretense that it was necessary. Their stock argument is that it is

"patriotism." They are playing on every prejudice and passion of the American people."

From the manner in which the papers are eternally advertising, without charge, the game of Mr. Herbert C. Hoover, of Red House, Horn-ton Street, London, England, and publishing daily boasts of the "Miracle man" written in his own office, they—the newspapers—are evidently doing their best to stand squarely by the contract of the 25 papers alluded to in the item extended to the RECORD by Mr. Callaway and quoted above.

When we have, as at present, an income-tax law which provides for absolute secrecy of the income-tax returns of the men who profit by war, it is not easy to know just who is behind the financing of the vast stream of publicity which fills all the avenues for reaching and influencing the minds of the people favorably toward the policies most profitable to the mighty financial powers who move behind the scenes.

THE TRUE MEANING OF LOYALTY.

Loyalty to one's country means loyalty to the truest and best interests of that country. What, then, are the best and truest interests of our country? "Salus populi suprema est lex." The safety and welfare, the health and deliverance of the people is the supreme law. Safety from what? Safety from all the dangers that menace them, domestic as well as foreign. Their welfare, that all may be well with them; that peace, prosperity, and happiness may be their general condition. Their health, moral and intellectual, as well as physical, and their deliverance from all bondage to old tyrannies, ignorance, and oppression.

What will it profit the people of the United States if we are victorious in our wars against foreign foes and find ourselves an easy prey to the power of the money kings at home?

One of the wisest Americans of the nineteenth century warned us that the gravest dangers to the Republic come not from without but from within.

The United States of America has always been victorious in her wars with other nations. Her people pay no tribute extorted by the arms of any foreign conqueror, yet millions of our soldiers, invincible on the battle fields, own not a foot of their country's soil, for which they have offered their lives and shed their blood.

A hundred million people, one of whose favorite maxims of foreign policy is "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute," are every year meekly surrendering in enforced contribution to the monopolistic trusts and parasites more than one-half of all the wealth their toil produces.

THE ARISTOCRACY OF WEALTH.

By force and cunning this American autocracy of money levies tribute on every pound of food we eat, on every yard of cloth we wear, on every roof that shelters our heads, on every ton of fuel that warms our homes, from the milk that feeds our babes to the shroud that wraps our dead, everything must pay tribute to monopoly. They have seized the great bulk of the machinery of production. They are fast monopolizing our natural resources. These private monopolists have seized the public highways. The railroads, telegraphs, telephones, pipe lines are instruments of their power wherewith to oppress the people. They have profaned the temple of liberty; they seek to corrupt courts, control Congresses, and purchase Presidencies in order that they may give a color of sanction and legality to the most gigantic system of national robbery in the whole record of time, and in so doing have sought to make the people's Government founded solely to protect the public welfare an instrument for oppressing the people.

"That the organization of industry and commerce has come to be the principal factor in modern countries, that political power lies in the control of that organization, and that this control has, in the United States, fallen into the hands of groups of financiers who do not even pretend to use it for the advancement of the public welfare," is a most dangerous situation for any nation to be in.

The greatest curse of the world to-day is the evil alliance of private greed and corrupt government. "The children of this unholy wedlock are war, red ruin, and the breaking up of laws."

Loyalty to the United States requires that a citizen should not only fight for his country, but he should think and speak and write and work and vote for his country as well. Our Government must not only be powerful abroad, it must be just at home. In the very day and hour when the armies of the Roman Republic had conquered every country in the known world, the Government at home fell a prey to a corrupt oligarchy of wealth, and the great Roman historian Pliny mournfully records that—

It was great estates that ruined Italy.

We can not be too watchful lest America may meet a similar fate while we are engaged by the glamour of our present vast adventures in foreign war and secret diplomacy.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND FREEDOM OF THE PRESS.

War should be the very last resort for the adjustment of disputes. For from the moment that nations engage in war they

begin to destroy liberty, not only the liberty of their foes but the liberty of their own people at home. It was well said by a wise New York lawyer at the beginning of the present war—

The first casualties of the war are free speech, free press, and the right to peaceably assemble. Yet article 1 of amendment to the United States Constitution reads: "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." (Harry Weinberger in the New York Evening Post.)

"Liberty is the mother of order, not the daughter." If America and the other nations are to have the blessing of order, peace, and prosperity they must have liberty first. Under the urgency of pretended war necessity we deprived our people of many of their dearest liberties. We apparently adopted the heresy born in the brains of the monarchists and militarists of the Old World, that a free people is not as valiant in war as are the subjects of autocratic rulers.

But all history belies this false doctrine. Everywhere in the records of the human race "the freer nation stands forth like Saul among his brethren, taller and fairer," mightier in arms as well as in arts, and so to-day, as in other days, we may safely follow the principles laid down by the champions of liberty in all ages of the world.

Says Wendell Phillips:

If there is anything that can not bear free thought, let it crack.

Blackstone, the great author of the Commentaries, says:

Every freeman has an undoubted right to lay what sentiments he believes before the public; to forbid this is to destroy the freedom of the press.

Oliver Cromwell said:

No good government has anything to fear from paper shot.

In the famous Virginia Bill of Rights, unanimously adopted June 22, 1776, is this clause:

The freedom of the press is one of the bulwarks of liberty, and can never be restrained but by despotic government.

Cooley, in his Constitutional Limitations (seventh edition, p. 604), said:

The liberty of the press might be rendered a mockery and a delusion and the phrase itself a byword if, while every man was at liberty to publish what he believes, the public authorities might nevertheless punish him for publications. * * * Their purpose has evidently been to protect parties in the free publication of matter of public events and public measures, and to enable every citizen at any time to bring the Government and any person in authority to the bar of public opinion by any just criticism upon their conduct in the exercise of the authority which the people have conferred upon them. * * * The evils to be prevented were not the censorship of the press merely, but any action of the Government by means of which it might prevent such free and general discussion of public matters as seem absolutely essential to prepare the people for an intelligent exercise of their rights as citizens.

Paris Figaro says:

In Madrid I learned that there was complete freedom of the press; that, provided I did not speak about the power of the Government, religion, politics, morals, high officials, or other notables, operas, plays, or anything having to do with anything else, I was perfectly free to print whatever two or three censors nosed through.

The great crime is repression of honest thought. James Russell Lowell expressed well the spirit of the makers of our Government when he said:

Let liars fear,
Let traitors turn away;
Whatever we have dared to think,
That dare we also say.

Milton well said:

Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties.
Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. (Bible.)
Let the people know the truth and the country is safe—

said Lincoln.

Having faith in these eternal principles of liberty and right proclaimed by the founders and preservers of the Republic, and by the friends of freedom everywhere, I voted against the espionage-censorship bill, and at this session I introduced a bill to repeal it.

What constitutes a State?
Not high-raised battlements or labored mound,
Thick wall or moated gate,
Nor cities proud with spires and turrets crowned;
Not bays and broad, armed ports,
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not starred and spangled courts,
Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride.
No! Men, high-minded men,
With powers as far above dull brutes endowed,
In forest, brake, or den,
As beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude;
Men who their duties know,
But know their rights and, knowing, dare maintain,
Prevent the long-aimed blow,
And crush the tyrant while they rend the chain.
These constitute a State.

IF YOU CONSCRIPT MEN CONSCRIPT WEALTH.

The following letter from former United States Senator Pettigrew, of South Dakota, lays down a principle which is a great improvement on the present plan, both of financing and fighting future wars:

AUGUST 24, 1917.

HON. ERNEST LUNDEN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Last February, while I was at Washington and before war was declared on the part of the United States, I published an article in one of the single-tax papers advocating that in case we went to war with Germany we should hire the men to do the fighting and draft the money, instead of drafting the men and hiring the money. This statement attracted considerable attention, and the Socialist papers have been advocating this plan ever since.

The report of the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, has been received and shows that 357,000 persons receive an income of \$1,200,000,000—that is, they paid taxes upon that amount. Of course, that does not include those who did not make a report or swore their income through at less than it was; nor does it include artificial persons, and therefore the income of these 357,000 people was probably nearer \$2,000,000,000 than \$1,200,000,000. The ones who receive this amount of income only include incomes exceeding \$3,000 per year. In other words, from all incomes are deducted \$3,000, leaving a balance of \$1,200,000,000 for 357,000 persons.

Now that the conscription bill has been passed and the Government has conscripted 1,000,000 men to do the fighting, I propose that Congress pass a law conscripting this \$1,200,000,000 a year and pay it to the million men who are conscripted to lay down their lives in order that these people may continue, from year to year, to gather these incomes. This would give each soldier \$100 per month and enable him to decently support his family, if he has one, or send it to his parents who have paid the expense of rearing him and giving him an education.

If we are going to "make the world safe for democracy" wouldn't it be a good idea to commence in the United States and, having drafted a million of our boys to do the fighting, let us draft \$1,200,000,000 from our millionaires? It was the laborers of this country who produced all of this wealth. These 357,000 produced none of it. They exploited the laboring people out of it by cunning, by manipulation, with the assistance of the laws and the lawyers and the courts and the machinery of legislation and the Government.

Why not, then, during the war, appropriate this excess profit and pay the men that do the fighting? Why should we violate the Constitution and issue bonds in order to get money to pay the men who sacrifice their lives? Congress is in session and if the administration has any interest in making the world "safe for democracy" they could order their "rubber stamps" at the Capitol, the House and Senate, to pass this law conscripting wealth and it would go through at once.

I have carefully read some of the legislation that Congress has enacted recently, and, while I do not advise anyone to violate the provisions of the law, I advise everyone who has any interest in democratic institutions to urge the repeal of the law with regard to conscription and the law suppressing freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press. In my opinion these laws and the law declaring war violate the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Ten Commandments, and everyone of those laws should be immediately repealed if we have any interest in the maintenance of democratic institutions.

(Signed) R. F. PETTIGREW.

AMERICA FIRST.

With the thought of "America first" ever before me, I am convinced that while we are supposed to be fighting to establish democracy abroad, we must be on the alert to see that the democracy of our great, free Republic at home is preserved inviolate. The ever-growing tendency since our entry into the war has been, and now is, to more and more abridge the constitutional rights of our own people. Concentration of authority in time of war may be a military necessity.

Responsibility for the successful prosecution of the war should be undivided so far as such singleness of responsibility is consistently possible. But this should not and does not mean that the free people of our great Republic are called upon to renounce, either temporarily or permanently, every constitutional right guaranteed to them by our form of government. It does not mean that the Constitution of the United States is to be regarded as an obsolete scrap of paper.

Many and strenuous efforts have been made in Congress and out to prevent the discussion of our war activities. I for one can not and will not yield my right to discuss the conduct of the war. I shall never vote to abridge the right of my constituents to discuss the conduct of the war. I shall enter my protest by word and vote whenever I see that incompetency and inefficiency are lifting their heads to hinder and trouble the people.

The President's avowed purpose in entering the war was "to make the world safe for democracy." It is inconsistent with our professed aims and not in conformity with our history, our Constitution, our traditions, or our American spirit to allow our rights as a free people to be insidiously curtailed. Our time-honored institutions of a free press and free speech must be maintained. No republic can long endure which does not safeguard these rights.

The abolition of slavery was one of the objects for which the Civil War was fought to a victorious conclusion. The American people must not bow their heads to the yoke of a moral serfdom more degrading in its effects than any chains of physical bondage.

Such slavery is enforced when the people of a free nation are denied the right of assembly and the privilege of discussing freely and frankly the conduct of the war, its objects, and the terms on which an early and an honorable peace may be accepted. Honest constructive criticism is no less helpful than sincere commendation. The right of the people to express either must be maintained. Otherwise our avowed intention to make the world safe for democracy will prove a hollow mockery.

Less than three years ago, on July 10, 1916, Mr. Wilson said in a speech at Detroit, Mich.:

I am one of those who believes, absolutely believes, the Virginia bill of rights, which was the model of the old Bill of Rights, which says that a people has a right to do anything they please with their own country and their own government. I am old-fashioned enough to believe that, and I am going to stand by that belief. (Page 1481, Appendix, 64th Cong., 1st sess.)

These words of President Wilson express in a nutshell the doctrine of self-determination. We must not depart from that doctrine, though Mr. Wilson sidesteps this principle in the case of Ireland. We must not renounce the right of a free people to rule their own country and government.

RUBBER-STAMP CONGRESSMEN.

In my work in Congress I have had ever before me the interests of my constituents and the high ideals for which our Nation stands. I have never voted for any measure opposed to those interests and those ideals, even though it bore the stamp of approval from the party in power. The people of Minnesota are not a "rubber-stamp" people. They want no "rubber-stamp" Congressman to represent them.

I never make the mistake of confounding blind obedience to presidential dictates with patriotism. Servility to any man, however great, is not patriotic service to the Nation. In the future, as in the past, in private or public life, my slogan remains "America first."

"Keep your mouths shut!" That is the command to-day. I challenge that command. We who are Americans will not long permit any one man to seal our lips. When we lose free speech and a free press our liberties are gone. The leaders here have lost their heads—what other conclusion can we draw. The people, and the people alone, can bring them to their senses. The 1918 election has helped in that respect, and there will be more elections in the near future. Congressmen are representatives of the people. The President is their hired man. They have a right to free speech. We are a law-abiding people. The minority are constantly yielding to the laws of the majority; but we have a right to seek their repeal, to strike them from our statute books. These critics will give their lives for our country if need be. They insist on free speech on the conduct of reconstruction. They feel that they are entitled to their opinions and that they should be consulted. And who shall say that they are wrong? The voice of the people is still the voice of God.

La Follette's Magazine says:

In times of peace the war party insists on making preparation for war. As soon as prepared for war, it insists on making war. If there is no sufficient reason for war, the war party will make war on one pretext, then invent another, possibly more effective pretext after war is on.

Before war is declared the war party assumes the divine right to denounce and silence all opposition to war as unpatriotic and cowardly.

After Congress has been bullied into a declaration of war, the politicians, the press, and the mercenaries of the war parties assume authority to deny the right of American citizens to discuss the necessity for the war or the ultimate object and purpose of the declaration of war.

To-day secret service men, United States district attorneys, United States marshals, United States court commissioners, and other Federal officials are rankly abusing their authority on every hand. People are being unlawfully arrested, thrown into jail, denied the right to employ counsel, or to communicate with their friends, or even to inform their families of their whereabouts; subjected to unlawful search; threatened, intimidated, examined and cross-examined, the most sacred constitutional rights guaranteed to every American citizen are violated in the name of democracy.

It appears to be the purpose of those conducting this procedure to throw the country into a state of terror, to coerce public opinion, stifle criticism, suppress discussion of the issues of the war, and put a quietus on all opposition.

As a climax to all this, President Wilson, in his address at Washington, June 14, gave utterance to this threat:

"We be to the man or group of men that seek to stand in our way."

It is time—

Says La Follette's—

for the American people to assert and maintain their rights.

An American citizen has the right to discuss the issues of this war; one citizen may believe it inevitable, another may think it regrettable; each has the same right to express his opinion. An American citizen may state his opinion that we are not justified in prosecuting this war for the purpose of dictating the form of government which shall be maintained by our enemy—or our ally—and not be subject to punishment at law. He may denounce the policy of sending our boys to die on European battle fields for annexation of territory or the payment of war indemnities or the carrying out of trade agreements, and be within his legal rights. He may express the hope that an early peace may be secured on the terms set forth by the new Russia and by President Wilson in his speech of January 22, and he can not be lawfully sent to jail for the expression of this conviction.

THEY LOWER THE AMERICAN FLAG.

For many months I have observed a United States delivery car in the court of the House Office Building carrying a British flag without any American colors. During the recent parade in Washington, while with a party of friends, we observed people carrying British flags along the line of parade. On the same day, in front of the Congress Hall Hotel, a United States Government car marked "For official use only" was flying a large British flag at the head of hood, and below, on either side, two small American flags. My secretary repeatedly took photographs, which are now in my possession, of instances of citizen's subordinating their own flag to flags of other nations, a most unhealthy sentiment in American life.

But what can you expect with a President eating from gold plate in the Buckingham Palace with the King of England and the Emperor of India, sleeping in the many-roomed palace of Prince Murat, and occupying the royal suite of Kaiser Wilhelm the Second on the *George Washington*, formerly a German liner. Evidently some of us have departed from plain democracy. I doubt, however, whether this man who so indulges himself will ever measure up to the great Democrat Thomas Jefferson, who rode horseback to the Capitol in the long ago. There are enough Americans who love their own flag and place it above all others, and who will in the near future sweep all foreign sentiment from America, including foreign officers on our pay rolls. We have large numbers of foreigners on our pay rolls at this very time, when everyone knows there is nothing under the sun that man can do which can not be accomplished by our own business men and officers.

I am in favor of turning these foreigners loose, cutting them off our pay rolls, and showing them the nearest way home.

During the 1916 campaign "America first and absolute neutrality" was my sole and only platform. At this time the Wilson administration was loudly shouting that if the Republicans were elected they would throw the country into war; that if they were elected we would have peace. It will be a long time before the people again put their faith and trust in the leaders who betrayed us. The truth is not in them. If the Republican Party now misuses its opportunity, surrendering the trust of the people to the great monopolies, beware of a third party electing many officials in future elections.

BRING OUR BOYS BACK HOME.

It is now time to bring our boys back home. We have a right to discuss legislation for their welfare.

"There were surely some rough spots in this war for the poor 'doughboy,' and he will never forget them. I can not help but realize that there are but two royal families in the world who never suffered nor appeared in the casualty lists. One was the royal family of Germany and the other the 'royal and reigning' families of the United States. If I am wrong, I wish some one will stop me and set me right." (Congressman (Captain) ROYAL C. JOHNSON, of South Dakota.)

As a matter of fact, the reports show that the German royal family did suffer one casualty in the war. But our own "royal and reigning" families held forth far in the rear of all battle lines. There were more generals who lost their lives during the Battle of Franklin in the Civil War than lost their lives in the entire world war. I have this on authority of the famous soldier and statesman, Gen. SHERWOOD, for many years the oldest Member of Congress. This shows that it is safer to be a general in the world war than a Member of Congress, since we lost one Member through an automobile accident.

It all goes to show that in war the only man who risks his life for his country is the doughboy on the firing line and his immediate superiors. This may have something to do with the fact that so few generals have come out of the war with any great popularity.

PRESIDENT WANTS MEMBERS OF CONGRESS HUNG.

The Washington Post of March 2, 1919, published the following news item:

Nothing serves to emphasize so strikingly the bitter feeling that has been engendered on both sides of the controversy over the league of nations as the address which was made by President Wilson to the members of the Democratic national committee at a luncheon at the White House Friday.

Not until yesterday did the news begin to leak out that the President used violent language in speaking of the opponents of the league. When members of the committee were asked about the President's remarks they at first declined to enter into particulars, several of them saying the President had used language which they did not think he would like to have repeated.

In substance, the President is reported by these informants as declaring that he despised the character of those who are fighting the league of nations, and that he "loathed their pigmy minds." He is reported as having added that he would have to consult a dictionary to adequately express his opinion of these Senators.

In a final outburst of indignation the President is reported as having said that the heads of those who are opposing the league were only fit to serve as "knots to prevent their bodies from unraveling," and

that if he had his way he would hang them on a gibbet as high as heaven, but that the gibbet would not be erected in the direction of heaven.

In the same speech the President urged the Democratic national committeemen to hurry back to their States and call meetings of their State committees for the purpose of getting indorsements of the league. He asked them also to do everything in their power to persuade Republican State committees to join them in nonpartisan indorsements.

This is the most unusual piece of news concerning high officials in both the legislative and executive branches of the United States Government that has been published in many a year. No denial has been made.

Senator SHERMAN on March 10 ably replied, stating that these words constitute a felony, and that men are now in the penitentiary at Leavenworth for saying less than this of officers of the United States Government.

When a President of the United States at a secret conference of the national executive leaders of his faction in the Government declares that if he had his way he would "hang" the Members of Congress who oppose him "on gibbets as high as heaven, but pointing in the opposite direction," it is time for all good citizens to take note of whither this Government is drifting. Not only to take note but to discipline this stiff-necked autocrat.

IMPEACHMENT AND REMOVAL FROM OFFICE.

Members of Congress are gradually reaching the conclusion that the welfare and safety of the country will be best served by the impeachment and removal from office of an autocrat who recognizes neither Congress nor the law; neither Constitution nor the traditions of the Republic.

Gentlemen, I thank you for your attention. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

Gilbert E. Roe, a learned and able member of the New York bar, has contributed the following interesting and instructive analysis of the espionage law, which I believe it would be greatly to the interest of every citizen in the United States to read and study:

REPEAL THE ESPIONAGE LAW.

(An address delivered before the Civic Club of New York, Dec. 3, 1918.)

The President told us yesterday that the moment the armistice was signed he took the harness off from business, but he did not say anything about taking the halter off from free speech. Industry, he tells us, is unshackled; but the embargo on ideas remains, and we may as well acknowledge that it will remain unless the people themselves take whatever steps are necessary to remove it. I venture the opinion that for more than a year past there has not been a member of this club who has dared to say what he or she thought about the most vital policies of the Government of this country in those particulars most intimately affecting the lives of all the people. The President spoke eloquently yesterday concerning the wrongs of the unfortunate people of Belgium and France, but I did not observe that he said anything about the wrongs of our own people. When the President arrives in Europe let us hope that he will learn that political prisoners have been freed over there, and this may perhaps remind him of hundreds of his fellow countrymen who are deprived of their liberty here for political offenses. He may perhaps even learn that, of all the warring countries, this is the only one that treats political offenders like common criminals—except that it treats them more harshly.

But you have asked me to speak on the espionage law. I have the law here—both the act of June 15, 1917, and the amendment of May 16, 1918. But its enumeration of the things you can not say or do or write is so long that if I took time to read the whole law I should not have time to say anything else. So I am just going to read section 3 of Title I, the section under which most, although not all, the prosecutions have been conducted, and the section which, in conjunction with Title XII, is relied upon to give the Post Office Department the right to censor your mail and suppress radical publications.

Section 3 of Title I is as follows:

"Whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully make or convey false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies, and whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully cause or attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of the United States, or shall willfully obstruct the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both."

Now, that is rather a harmless sounding law. But the way it works is this: Some pacifist says he does not believe in war; that all war is murder. Immediately a Federal district attorney is directed to take the case of this malefactor before a grand jury and have him indicted. The indictment is returned almost as a matter of course upon the demand of the law officer of the Government. Then this enemy of the people is haled before the trial jury, and right here is where you become aware of how smoothly the system works. The mind of the jury has been carefully prepared for months in advance by a controlled press to find the defendant guilty. The mails have been closed to radical and independent publications which might suggest that one had the right to opinions even in war time. The vigilante committees have terrorized the community from which the jury is drawn. The officers of the Intelligence Service, so called, of the Army and Navy have raided the homes of citizens, seizing their papers and their effects, and even their persons, without a warrant and without the least legal authority, and have thereby demonstrated that they are above the law. The patriotic organizations and the Creel bureau have flooded the country, at the expense of the people, with fantastic tales calculated to excite the passions and inflame the imagination of the ordinary citizen, until impartial judgment has become impossible on questions relating to the war.

Finally, and not the least important, a Federal judge, who holds his job by appointment of the President, often charges the jury on the law, and sometimes on the facts as well, in such way that conviction is practically certain. When the humble and unsophisticated citizen, whose only offense was that he hated war and abhorred its bloodshed and its cruelties, comes out of the hurly-burly of the trial and has time to catch his breath, he finds himself duly branded as a criminal and sentenced to a punishment more severe than is often inflicted for robbery, rape, or murder.

Again, some Socialist, dreaming of the brotherhood of man, the federation of the world, when the war drums shall throb no longer, ventures to say that he sees no good in the workers of one country killing those of another. Forthwith he is apprehended as a German propagandist, as an agent of the Kaiser, and a tool of autocracy. And he gets very short shrift in the courts, if for no other reason than that he is a Socialist. I will take time here to call your attention to the case of just one Socialist, of which I speak from personal knowledge. Last summer I defended a young man before a court-martial at Camp Dix who was charged with violating the ninety-sixth article of war. The charge was as follows:

"Charge I: Violation of the ninety-sixth article of war.

"Specification 1: In that Americo V. Alexander (No. 1773144), private, Medical Detachment, base hospital, Camp Dix, N. J., did, at New York City, N. Y., on or about the 28th day of May, 1918, with intent to interfere with the successful operation of the military forces of the United States, make the following statements in the presence and hearing of various persons: 'You can get out of active service when drafted by refusing to do any military duty on ground of conscientious scruples. Your failure to register as such on questionnaire would not prevent your now asserting your rights. You might be put in the guardhouse and even court-martialed and sentenced to 20 years, but you would never be forced to serve. You might expect pretty rough treatment, but if you were a true objector and stuck they would do nothing to you. One objector at Camp Dix had been beaten, gagged, kicked, and gassed while in the guardhouse, but, having stuck, he was all right now; this matter was being kept very secret. He got a job in the base hospital, and the Army was very glad to get him to do anything, as the other objectors did not work and were only an expense,' or words to that effect."

"Specification 2: In that Americo V. Alexander (No. 1773144), private, Medical Detachment, base hospital, Camp Dix, N. J., while holding himself out to be a conscientious objector, was at New York City, N. Y., on or about the 28th day of May, 1918, active in propaganda to the prejudice of the successful operations of the military forces of the United States in that he advised, counseled, and attempted to persuade various persons to state that they were conscientious objectors when the said persons would be inducted into the military service of the United States under the provisions of the selective-service act."

This, you see, in military language, charged a violation of the espionage law. We took about a week to try the case, and substantially the entire contest centered about the truth or falsity of those charges. There were some minor charges involving the young man's temporary refusal to work while seeking advice from superior officers immediately following his arrest, thinking that it might interfere with his rights as a conscientious objector. But when reassured upon this point he promptly abandoned that position and thereafter was a model prisoner. I will say also that he accepted noncombatant service upon his induction into the service as a conscientious objector. He had managed the supply department of the base hospital at Camp Dix so effectively as to be complimented by officials at Washington and had been suggested for a commission by his commanding officer, which he had refused because he was a conscientious objector.

Now, the singular, and, so far as I know, unprecedented thing about this trial was that the court-martial found the young man "not guilty" of the charge I have just read to you, and the record which I hold in my hand so shows. But when the record came to me after it had gone to Washington and passed through the hands of a reviewing officer, it showed that the finding of the court-martial in this respect had been reversed. As the members of the court-martial, which consisted of eight officers, heard all the testimony and were the only officers who ever did hear the testimony or any portion of it, I was curious to know who it was that had decided that he could render a better decision on the facts without hearing the testimony than the members of the court-martial could who did hear it. And so I went to Washington, and after a day's inquiry from department to department I was able to locate the record in one of the innumerable offices of the War Department and was allowed even to look at it, although told that it was a private record, and that I could not take a copy of it. I did, however, examine it sufficiently under the eye of the officer, who kept both the record and myself in sight, to find out that the person who discovered that the court-martial had been all wrong in its findings was a first lieutenant named William J. Martin. I have not the remotest idea who Mr. Martin is in private life, but he seems to have signed himself "Judge Advocate" at Camp Dix, although I know he had absolutely nothing to do with the trial of the case, for I know well Capt. Lilly, of the New York bar, the judge advocate who will try it, and who tried it most ably for the prosecution. But this Lieut. Martin wrote the opinion—indorsed by the general, who, like himself, had never heard any of the testimony—which reversed the findings of "not guilty" by the court-martial; and the point of my calling your attention to this is the reason assigned for the reversal. I quote two sentences which I was able to copy from the opinion of Lieut. Martin. They are as follows:

"In view of the fact that this man is a Socialist, and, as such, opposed to all law and order, I can not see how he could have been classed as a conscientious objector. . . . The testimony shows that he is not opposed to war as a conscientious objector but is opposed for the same reason that the Russian government is opposed to it and belongs to an organization that is opposed to all forms of order and systems of government."

The word "organization" has a line lightly drawn through it, done apparently after the opinion had been filed, and the words "radical element" written above. Read either way, the statement is wholly false.

And the finding of "not guilty" of the court-martial on the charge I have read was reversed, and Mr. Alexander, whose crime appears to have been that he is a Socialist, is undergoing 20 years' imprisonment. I wonder how many other men and women are undergoing punishment in this country to-day because they are Socialists. Why, if this had occurred in Belgium during the German occupation and had been perpetrated by a German court-martial, we should dramatize it, and put it in the movies as an illustration of German atrocities. If the Supreme Court of the United States, composed of nine great judges, presumed to reverse the finding of a jury in a criminal case on conflicting testimony, it would be a ground for impeaching the members of that court.

But suppose the worst of all—assume that some citizen, misguided, if you please, had a doubt about this war's being altogether a war for democracy, or even had a suspicion that trade rivalries and ambitions between European nations were at the bottom of the war, and that, perhaps, it might have been just as well if we had kept out of it, and having such doubt or suspicion, had expressed it in a speech or in a publication—you know what would have happened to such a person without my reciting it. Such a one were lucky if he only went to prison for 10 or 20 years. Just to contrast the condition into which we have allowed ourselves to sink with conditions where at least some freedom of speech exists, I am going to read you a few sentences from Prof. Shapiro's *Modern and Contemporary European History* (Houghton Mifflin; \$3.50). It has been off the press only a few weeks. Prof. Shapiro is known to many of you. He is an associate professor of history in the College of the City of New York and one of the foremost historians of the world. At page 338 he says:

"The Boer War was fought during the Salisbury ministry. The war was opposed by the Liberals, but was enthusiastically supported by the overwhelming majority of the English people, and in the general election of 1900 the Conservatives were returned to power on the war issue with a majority of 134."

It is fair to say that the Boer War, in the opinion of many Englishmen, involved the fate of the Empire, for if Great Britain had shown herself unable to crush the Boers it would have been a signal for every colony she had in the world to throw off her rule. But of the opposition to the war by the Liberals, of which Lloyd George was the leader, the author reports:

"They denounced it as an act of aggression against the inoffensive Boers in the interest of South African capitalists."

Think of that, a capitalistic war. I quote again:

"Large mass meetings of pro-Boers were held all over England, at which the conservative ministry was severely criticized for being the tool of interested financiers."

And nobody was prosecuted for sedition. But the author also tells us the result of this freedom of discussion, for he says, referring to a period of two or three years later:

"There was great disgust in England with the Conservative Party because of its conduct of the Boer War, and in the election of 1906 the Liberals were overwhelmingly successful."

If I should read you even a portion of what Lloyd George said about his Government during that war I suppose I might be arrested in this country to-day for slandering Great Britain.

Here is the point I wish to make very clear: The espionage law can just as well be applied in peace as in war, and just as good reasons can be given for its application in peace as in war. Practically we are not at war now, but who of the administration suggests the repeal of the espionage law? Who, when exercising arbitrary power, ever proposes to repeal the law which silences criticism of the manner in which such power is exercised? I am not concerned about the right of the soap-box orator to make a speech because he feels good while he is doing it and feels better after he has done it, although I think that is rather wholesome; but if a people are capable of self-government they must be capable of contributing some ideas of value to the Government if they are allowed free expression. If a people have self-government they must have freedom of expression respecting it, or theirs will become the worst government in the world. Far better take away the vote than take away free speech and a free press; and far better take away free speech and a free press than allow freedom to discuss only one side of a subject.

President Wilson is going abroad to-day discredited—that is, without the support of the Congress—in my opinion, because of the espionage law. Whatever could have been said for his 14 points, in behalf of their making for peace and progress, remained unsaid because of the ruthless suppression by means of the espionage law of all discussion of the causes of the war and of our objects and aims in the war. The Republicans, taking advantage of the suppression of all discussion which could be classed as antiwar, cleverly whipped to frenzy the war sentiment, and by announcing more drastic war aims than the President himself they attracted the support of the war extremists throughout the country, while the hundreds of thousands of citizens whose votes had elected President Wilson because "he kept us out of war" no longer trusted him for any purpose, and voted the Socialist or some other ticket, or did not vote at all. If it is a misfortune that the President stands to-day repudiated by the voters of the country at the recent election, it is a misfortune that has been brought about by the suppression of all discussion of the war, except that which was intended to excite and inflame the people to go to any length in its prosecution.

But, some one says, civil liberties were invaded during the time of our great Civil War and were later recovered. The comparison is entirely fallacious. Civil liberty, so far as it was denied during the Civil War, was not denied because of any espionage law. The Post Office Department never claimed or exercised the power to suppress publications during the Civil War. Indeed, the men in control of the country during that war had taken the position that the exercise of any such power by the Post Office Department would be unconstitutional. The slave-holding States had sought to invoke such power to protect themselves against a flood of antislavery literature, and it had been ably argued and held by the leaders of the North that any such law would be unconstitutional. Every arrest made without warrant during the Civil War was an arrest by the military authorities. Every paper that was suppressed was suppressed by the military authorities, and in most cases President Lincoln immediately ordered the restoration of mailing privileges to such a paper. Every suppression of civil liberty during that war came from the military arm of the Government, and it had to disappear as soon as the army was disbanded. The great Milligan case, following upon the heels of the war, in which the Supreme Court decided that the military arrests had been unlawful, promptly restored the people once more to the full enjoyment of the liberties which the Constitution had been held to guarantee. But now all this is changed. The espionage law is not going to be repealed unless the people resolutely take the matter in hand; instead, it will be skillfully extended to suppress discussion which may be said to be an incitement of war, or to disturbance, or to violence. The Post Office Department will, unless the people are aroused, continue to exercise a censorship more arbitrary and irresponsible than ever existed, either in war or in peace, in any country which made a pretense of being free.

There is just one thing, in my opinion, for the citizens to do who believe in liberty and desire to preserve at least some measure of freedom; that is to organize for the repeal of this obnoxious law, and never to disband their organization or cease their agitation until the law has been discredited and repealed, and until every person convicted under it, and not shown to be guilty of some act in aid of the enemy, has been pardoned, and every fine collected under it repaid by the Government.

GILBERT E. ROE.

THE ESPIONAGE LAW.

If, on the 15th day of June, 1917, some foreign government had passed a law which provided that from and after that date the people of this country should not, for the period of the war, discuss those matters of political policy, the most vital to their welfare and to the welfare of their Government, I suppose such a law would have been opposed by the almost unanimous action of the people of this country. Yet, how do the facts differ from those I have just supposed? On the 15th day of June, 1917, the espionage law was passed. As that law has been used by the Postmaster General and interpreted and applied by the courts in this country it has prevented discussion of political policies, the most vital to the welfare of the Government and the people of this country. The effect of that law has been even worse than I have stated. It has prevented political discussion of one side of political questions, the most vital to the welfare of the people and the Government. As a result of its application falsehoods have run rampant in the press and been preached from platforms and pulpits with no one to contradict them. Half truths, which are far more dangerous than outright falsehoods, have made up the bulk of most of the information the people have been allowed to receive on subjects connected with the war. And the espionage law was passed and has been enforced by a government, as I shall attempt to show, without a shadow of right or authority so to do. It has been an act of despotism.

As a result of the successful rebellion against Great Britain which occurred in this country something more than a century and a quarter ago thirteen independent nations came into existence. Their location and certain interests that they had in common led them to establish a federation by which, for certain purposes, they were to act in concert. As a result of a protracted conference by the representatives of these different nations they finally came together in an agreement and took the name of the United States of America, and the document in which were specified the powers which these different nations delegated to the General Government was called the Constitution of the United States of America. These thirteen independent nations, however, were very jealous of their respective rights and of the rights of their people, and the powers which they gave to the General Government thus created were not very numerous and were only such as they believed necessary to be exercised by the Federal or Federated Government rather than by the several nations independently. Among the rights given to the Federal Government were those of borrowing money, regulating commerce with foreign nations, coining money, establishing post offices and post roads, declaring war, raising and supporting armies, but no appropriation for this last purpose could be made for a longer term than two years. It is readily seen that these powers and a few others which were delegated to the Federal Government were necessary to any federation of these original thirteen States which was to be permanent and effective.

In order to make it perfectly clear, however, that the Federal Government was one of strictly limited powers, powers so limited that they could never be used as an excuse or pretense for interfering with the rights of the States, or with the liberties of the people of the States, the Constitution provided (Article X of the amendments):

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

So that, whenever the Congress of the United States passes any law in order that that law shall be binding upon anyone and shall have any authority as law, it must be possible to turn to the Constitution of the United States and find in it the specific provision which authorizes the particular law. Now, there was a way by which the men who framed the Constitution feared that the powers of the Federal Government might be extended at some time or other so as to interfere with the liberties of the people. The people had just fought a long and hard war to establish their liberties and they did not propose to give up to one government those rights which they had fought so hard to win from another government.

Thomas Jefferson and many other patriots of his day foresaw the danger of an extension of the powers of the Federal Government on the theory that it would be implied that the Federal Government was to have the powers necessary to carry out the express powers delegated to it by the Constitution. That principle of construction was shortly after the adoption of the Constitution put in force by Chief Justice Marshall in *McCulloch v. Maryland* (4 Wheaton, 415, 430), where he said:

"Let the end be legitimate; let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are adapted to that end, and which are not prohibited, but which consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

Now, there were some rights so fundamental, so dear to the hearts of the people, who had just won their independence from the tyrannical Government of Great Britain, that it was determined they should never be drawn within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government at all on the theory of implied powers or any other theory.

The most important of those rights, in the estimation of the people at that time, were freedom of speech and of the press, and freedom of religion. So it came about that before the people would accept the Constitution, which their representatives in the Constitutional Convention had framed, it was found necessary to adopt the first amendment to the Constitution. That amendment reads as follows:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Now, nothing could be plainer than that, or, at least, so it appeared to the people at the time it was adopted. They had given to this Government that they were forming, this federation, the power to borrow money. Well and good. But the method by which the money was to be borrowed, the person from whom it was to be borrowed, the terms upon which it was to be borrowed, and everything about it, in fact, was open to discussion by the people, from their platforms, in their homes, and in the public press, and the same thing is true of every one of the express powers which were given to the Federal Government.

Now, Congress might find it very convenient, perhaps almost necessary in a particular case, in order to borrow money, that public discussion on the subject should be suppressed, but right there is where the people showed their wisdom in demanding and getting the first amendment to the Constitution. The effect of that amendment was to say to the Federal Government: "You have the power to borrow money. You have the power to do that which is reasonably necessary and appropriate for that purpose, but you have not the power, by any device whatsoever, to limit the public in its discussion and condemnation of your plan to borrow money." Now, that is the limitation which attaches absolutely, irrevocably, and for all time under the Constitution to every express power that the Federal Government has or may attempt to exercise.

The Federal Government can raise and support armies, but it can not, by any device or means whatsoever, suppress public discussion of everything connected with the raising and supporting of armies. That means the right to condemn as well as to praise. It means the right to oppose as well as support. It means the right to ridicule as well as to eulogize. It means, in short, what free speech and free press meant at the time the first amendment was adopted. Free speech and free press at the time the first amendment was adopted included this: "The right of every individual to speak or publish his sentiments on all measures of Government without restraint, control, or fear of punishment for so doing."

That is the definition of free speech and of a free press as stated by Madison and by Jefferson, as found in the address of the Continental Congress in 1774, in the Virginia resolution of toleration of 1784, in the resolution of the Virginia convention of 1788, and as found in practically all the well considered discussion of that time. I refer here practically to Prof. Tucker's discussion of the subject as found in the notes to the first edition of Blackstone's Commentaries published in this country in 1804. But that is not all.

The old sedition law of 1798 was less obnoxious to free discussion than the present espionage law. We all know that the passage of that law was the death of the Federalist Party which fathered it, and drove out of power the administration held responsible for it, and when Mr. Jefferson became President, largely upon the issue of the sedition law, he pardoned every man convicted under it. The Congress of the United States from time to time passed measures returning the fines which had been collected under that law to the victims of it, and returned them for the declared reason that the law "was unconstitutional, null, and void." This was the attitude of Congress continuously down to 1850, at least, when the last fine previously collected under the law from Dr. Cooper was paid to his heirs, as a result of the adoption of a report presented by the Judiciary Committee of the House on January 29, 1850, by James Thompson of that committee, which provided that, in the opinion of the committee, the sedition law, "was unconstitutional, null, and void, and passed under the exercise of undelegated power by Congress; that the fine so levied ought to be refunded to the heirs and legal representatives of said Dr. Cooper, with interest thereon until paid."

The resolution passed the House March 15, 1850, the Senate July 18, 1850, and was approved. (See House Journal, 1st sess., 31st Cong., 1849-50, p. 1141; also House Journal, 1st sess., 31st Cong., p. 675.)

So it is established that any interference by the Federal Government of the United States with the people's right to publish their sentiments on measures of government without control or fear of punishment, is as unwarranted and arbitrary and as contrary to the Constitution as though it were an act done by some king or emperor from his throne in a foreign country.

I insist upon freedom of speech and of free press not merely because it is a constitutional right, but because it is a necessity under our form of government. To-day the President of the United States and our other representatives in the peace conference are assuming to act for the people of this country without knowing what the sentiment of the country is upon the most vital matters to be decided at the conference. The result of suppressing, not alone hostile criticism of the administration policies, but even of critical comment concerning them, has not only left political leaders uninformed as to public sentiment, but has prevented the formation of any well defined public opinion concerning the after-war problems. The country is just realizing that we have no policy about anything related to the war.

Our soldiers are daily engaged in bloody battles in the far north of Russia with the armies of that country, although we are not at war with Russia. No one seems to be able to explain why our troops are daily killing Russians and being killed by them. Ordinarily, the unlawful and outrageous policy of the administration in maintaining a hostile army in the midst of a country with which we are at peace could not stand for a day against the storm of protest which our people would raise against it. But for a year and a half, now, the people of this country have learned in the hard school of experience that it is a crime to express opinions which run counter to the administration's purpose, and so they look on silently while this shameful thing in Russia goes on.

The President and Secretary of State are over at the peace conference advocating a league of nations which shall prevent all future wars, while our Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy are at home demanding of Congress increases in the Army and Navy which are utterly inexcusable unless it is believed we are speedily to engage in another war, as appalling as the one from which we are just emerging.

For months we have been told that "freedom of the seas" was one result which would follow from this war, whereby we and all justice-loving nations would benefit. To-day we are informed that the peace conference is not going to question Great Britain's right to dominate the seas precisely as she did before the present war.

"Secret treaties," which it was a crime to discuss, as the espionage law was construed, are now being blandly carried out by the peace conference.

And over all the proceedings of the conference hangs a shroud of mystery which makes the phrase, "open covenants," "openly arrived at," a mockery and a farce.

Our conditions at home are as unhappy as those abroad. Any one who wishes to discuss the proper financing of the present war runs a risk of being prosecuted for violation of the espionage law, since his argument may possibly discourage the purchase of liberty bonds.

The present high prices of the necessities of life, as well as present conditions of unemployment, are largely due to the system of forcing billions and still more billions of bonds upon the public and thus withdrawing money from other enterprises and inflating the currency until normal business and normal employment have become impossible. Yet any man who dares point out the result of this system of bond sales and the manner in which wealth and war profits have been relieved from taxation, is liable to prosecution under the espionage law, as that law has been construed.

The one overshadowing fact emerging from the political and industrial disorganization at the present moment is that, while an empire or a kingdom may operate successfully under a censorship on sedition law, a representative or democratic government can not do so. After all, public opinion is looked to in this country to shape political policies, and without a well-defined public opinion political policies represent only the views of those who happen to be in office at the time. None of the men who have been shaping the political policy of this country were elected upon any issue which involved the war, except that President Wilson was undoubtedly reelected in 1916 on the issue that he had kept us out of the war. There was every reason therefore to allow the freest and fullest discussion of every matter connected with the war in order

that the real will and purpose of the people might be made manifest. This course would undoubtedly have led to some confusion and disorder, but the result would have been that the hundred million people of this country would not to-day be acting the part of mere dummies, or detached spectators, while their destinies for all time are being determined by representatives who have had no opportunity to learn the popular will and who were not elected to office on the issues which they are now deciding.

As a result of the espionage law, representative government has broken down in this country. We are now reaping the first bitter fruits of the policy which has suppressed free speech and free discussion of war issues.

GILBERT E. ROE.

[From La Follette's Magazine, June, 1917.]

THE RIGHT OF THE CITIZEN TO OPPOSE WAR AND THE RIGHT OF CONGRESS TO SHAPE THE WAR POLICY.

I.

In these days whenever an American citizen presumes to question the justification, either in law or morals, of our participation in the European war, he is at once denounced by the war party and the war press as disloyal to the country.

The war party in the United States seeks to justify our entrance into the bloody conflict on the ground that it is in the interest of democracy. But every man and every woman knows that there is a struggle going on to-day in every civilized nation between democracy and autocracy.

Every nation has its war party. It is not the party of democracy. It is the party of autocracy. It seeks to dominate absolutely. It is commercial, imperialistic, ruthless. It tolerates no opposition. It is just as arrogant, just as despotic in London or in Washington as in Berlin. The American Jingo is twin to the German Junker.

In times of peace the war party insists on making preparation for war. As soon as prepared for war it insists on making war. If there is no sufficient reason for war, the war party will make war on one pretext, then invent another, possibly more effective pretext after war is on.

Before war is declared the war party assumes the divine right to denounce and silence all opposition to war as unpatriotic and cowardly. After Congress has been bullied into a declaration of war, the politicians, the press, and the mercenaries of the war party assume authority to deny the right of American citizens to discuss the necessity for the war, or the ultimate object and purpose of the declaration of war.

To-day Secret Service men, United States district attorneys, United States marshals, United States court commissioners, and other Federal officials are rankly abusing their authority on every hand. People are being unlawfully arrested, thrown into jail, denied the right to employ counsel, or to communicate with their friends, or even to inform their families of their whereabouts; subjected to unlawful search, threatened, intimidated, examined, and cross-examined, the most sacred constitutional rights guaranteed to every American citizen are violated in the name of democracy.

It appears to be the purpose of those conducting this procedure to throw the country into a state of terror, to coerce public opinion, stifle criticism, suppress discussion of the issues of the war, and put a quietus on all opposition.

As a climax to all this, President Wilson, in his address at Washington, June 14, gave utterance to this threat:

"Wee be to the man or group of men that seek to stand in our way."

It is time for the American people to assert and maintain their rights.

An American citizen has the right to discuss the issues of this war; one citizen may believe it inevitable, another may think it regrettable; each has the same right to express his opinion. An American citizen may state his opinion that we are not justified in prosecuting this war for the purpose of dictating the form of government which shall be maintained by our enemy—or our ally—and not be subject to punishment at law. He may denounce the policy of sending our boys to die on European battle fields for annexation of territory or the payment of war indemnities or the carrying out of trade agreements and be within his legal rights. He may express the hope that an early peace may be secured on the terms set forth by the new Russia and by President Wilson in his speech of January 22, and he can not be lawfully sent to jail for the expression of his convictions.

II.

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

The citizen who believes the draft law unconstitutional may have the question tried out in the courts, or if he thinks it undemocratic and un-American he may start a campaign to-morrow for its repeal. He may work with his fellow citizens in petitioning Congress to abolish the draft system and in asking that hereafter the war shall be conducted on the volunteer plan. The citizen should begin to work now for the election of Congressmen who represent his views on the war issue. If he would preserve his liberties, his freedom of thought and speech and action, he should not be intimidated by the jeers of the jingoes and the gibes of the newspapers.

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

If, as I have sound reasons for believing, the great masses of the American people are opposed to fighting an enormously burdensome war, for an indefinite time and indefinite ends, then they must assert themselves and, keeping within their constitutional rights, voice their protests in a way that will show the character and power of their inner convictions and give momentum and overwhelming strength to the movement for real democracy.

III.

If the American people are to carry on a foreign war, on foreign soil, for foreign ends, they should work for an expression of public opinion that shall influence and compel Congress to exercise its right and discharge its duty in stating the object and defining the policy of the United States in this war.

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

Gradually, reluctantly, Congress and the country are beginning to perceive that a long and weary and bloody road has been laid out for us.

The sober-minded American citizen was dumbfounded when the President, in his Red Cross speech, in which he admitted that we had no special grievance of our own, announced his belief that the American people hardly yet realized the sacrifices and sufferings before them;

that in comparison with the struggle into which we have now entered the Civil War seemed almost insignificant in its proportions and in its expenditure of treasure and blood.

Then Mr. Hoover was reported as saying in an address on an important occasion that this country faced a war that would probably last from two to five years, and only by the most careful measures could the United States give the allies enough foodstuffs to keep them in war with the force demanded to bring victory.

Secretary of War Baker said at this same meeting that every resource of the allies was near exhaustion when the United States entered the war. There is no way to establish permanent peace, he declared, except through exercise of the superior power of the United States.

IV.

Little by little it has been brought home to the American people that we are in this terrific world conflict not to right our wrongs, not as an aid to the allies, not to share its awful death toll and its fearful tax burden, but to bear the brunt of the war, for which we have no special grievance of our own! And this we are to do—as it now develops and is being disclosed—not for a "peace without victory" but for a "peace with victory"; that is, we are to fight for peace terms satisfactory to the allies.

Lord Derby said the war will not end until America gets into it as though she were fighting alone and that it was likely to last three years yet. And this was the opinion emphatically expressed by the French mission.

Mr. Arthur Balfour, the British foreign secretary, was in this country, it is said, longer than any previous person holding that position has been away from London since the Napoleonic wars. He is an accomplished diplomat. He concluded his important and difficult mission with the utmost smoothness and tact. The only impression he left upon the American public, other than that of an agreeable man of culture, was that he was relying on the United States to prosecute a long, hard war. "Five million men! Fight, fight, fight," were the slogans he left for us.

V.

On his departure Mr. Balfour was said to have realized the dream of his life—that of "a closer sympathy between the two great branches of the English-speaking public."

I have no inside information, but in a work entitled "War and Democracy," published in 1917 by Doubleday, Page & Co., Mr. Balfour says:

"If there is to be any effective sanction behind the desire of the English-speaking peoples to preserve the world's peace and free development of the nations, that sanction must consist largely in the potential use of sea power."

"To me it seems the lesson to be drawn from history by those who love peace, freedom, and security is not that Britain and America should be deprived, or should deprive themselves, of the maritime powers they now possess, but that if possible those powers should be organized in the interests of an ideal common to the two States, an ideal upon whose progressive realization the happiness and peace of the world must largely depend."

From which diplomatic language it may be fairly inferred that it is Mr. Balfour's best judgment that while heretofore Great Britain has ruled the seas and controlled trade as her own special privilege and prerogative, that now when that supremacy is threatened it would be well to enter into an agreement according to which, from now on, Great Britain and the United States should rule the seas together.

The question is, Are we to sacrifice millions of our young men—the very promise of the land—and spend billions and more billions, and pile up the cost of living to the point of starvation, and "fight, fight, fight"—without any special grievance of our own—for objects such as the English foreign secretary seems to have in mind and such as the Paris trade conference appears carefully to have considered?

Shall the already fearfully overburdened people of the United States conduct a war for any objects not openly stated and defined?

VI.

The world would not be at war to-day except for the survival of the despotism and tyranny which permits governments to conduct foreign affairs in secret and leaves the determination of war and of foreign policies generally to diplomacy.

The usurpation on the part of the Executive of the conduct of foreign relations, which results in Congress blindly and ignorantly following the course dictated by the President, instead of itself declaring the war policy, which the best expounders of the Constitution have held that Congress had the right to do, is fundamentally the cause of our being in this war to prolong it, instead of exercising our great power to bring about a just settlement which the people of the United States and of the world are longing for, and have the right to expect.

And so I say if we are not to be dragged through years of war to maintain imperialism and exploitation, the people must unite in a campaign along constitutional lines for the conclusion of the war on a just basis.

VII.

And it is time to end the vague and shifting declaration of our plans and purposes, which under President Wilson ranges from resentment to interference with our trade on the high seas, one day to prescribing the form of government for our enemy the next, and finally vaguely extended to making every part of "the world safe for democracy"—excepting our own country.

In the grave matter of determining whether we shall have a drafted or a volunteer Army, the contradictory plans of the administration have created the greatest confusion in the minds of the millions of young men directly involved, leaving them uncertain as to their future and muddled as to their obligations and duty. The entire Nation has been plunged into a needless state of unrest from which it can be extricated only by a clear and definite declaration of war policy.

Our national situation to-day is like it was in 1848, when Lincoln, then a Member of the House of Representatives, speaking in opposition to the Mexican War then in progress, described President Polk's state of mind as follows:

"All this shows that the President is in no wise satisfied with his own positions. First he takes up one, and in an attempt to argue us into it he argues himself out of it, then seizes another and goes through the same process, and then, confused at being able to think of nothing new, he snatches up the old again, which he has some time before cast off. His mind, taxed beyond its power, is running hither and thither, like some tortured creature on a burning surface, finding no position on which it can settle down and be at ease."

In this same speech Lincoln criticizes President Polk because he does not state in his message when he expects the war to terminate. He said:

"At its beginning Gen. Scott was by this same President driven into disfavor, if not disgrace, for intimating that peace could not be conquered in less than three or four months. But now, at the end of 20 months . . . this same President gives a long message, without showing us that as to the end he himself has even an imaginary conception. As I have said, he knows not where he is. He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man. God grant he may be able to show there is not something about his conscience more painful than his mental perplexity."

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

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

VIII.

Lincoln is not the only high example of American statesmen who opposed their Government in war and who consistently continued their opposition after war was declared, denouncing it until it was ended.

On the 6th of November, 1846, at Faneuil Hall, Boston, Daniel Webster denounced the Mexican War. It had been in progress since April 9, 1846, when the first blood was shed, followed by a declaration by Congress that a state of war existed, which passed on the 11th day of May, 1846.

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

We had not then fallen upon times when the new freedom, as interpreted by Woodrow Wilson, made it an act of treason for an American citizen to declare his convictions upon the acts and policies of a Federal administration in bringing on and prosecuting a war, after that war had been declared and while it was in progress.

Free speech had not then been suppressed. The right of the people to assemble and state their grievances was still an attribute of American freedom.

The war was on, but Daniel Webster did not hesitate to denounce it. He said:

"The Mexican War is universally odious throughout the United States, and we have yet to find any Sempronius who raises his voice for it."

Webster did not regard it as treasonable, after war had been declared, and while our troops were fighting their way toward the Mexican capital, to raise the question as to whether the war was either just or necessary.

He said:

"It is not the habit of the American people, nor natural to their character, to consider the expense of a war which they deem just or necessary; but it is their habit, and belongs to their character, to inquire into the justice and the necessity of a war in which it is proposed to involve them."

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

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

In the course of this address Webster stated that the law of nations required "that the war should not be waged except from necessity, and for just and important rights of the country."

"But war does now exist and what is our duty?" asked Webster. Replying to his own question at length he said he hoped the majority in the next House of Representatives would be opposed to war and that while a high and delicate regard must, of course, be had for the honor and credit of the Nation, that "if the war should become odious to the people, if they shall disapprove the objects for which it appears to be prosecuted, then it will be the bounden duty of their Representatives in Congress to demand of the President a full statement of his objects and purposes, and if those purposes shall appear to them not to be founded in the public good, or not consistent with the honor and character of the country, then it shall be their duty to put an end to it, by the exercise of their constitutional authority."

"If Congress," said Webster in the course of this illuminating address, "in whom the war-making power is expressly made to reside, is to have no voice in the declaration or continuance of war, if it is not to judge of the beginning or carrying it on—then we depart at once from the Constitution."

IX.

Henry Clay came from his voluntary retirement in the seventy-first year of his age to proclaim to the American public his disapproval of the Mexican War. Before a great concourse of people assembled at Lexington, Ky., on the 13th of November, 1847, he characterized it as "an unnatural war."

Every utterance of his noble address is applicable to our national situation in 1917. "Must we blindly continue the conflict," he asked, "without any visible object, or any prospect of a definite termination?" In the course of his argument that Congress must necessarily possess the authority, at any time, to declare for what purposes war shall be further prosecuted, he said:

"If it be contended that war having been once commenced, the President of the United States may direct it to the accomplishment of any object he pleases, without consulting and without any regard to the will of Congress, the convention will have utterly failed in guarding the Nation against the abuses and ambition of a single individual. Either Congress or the President must have the right of determining upon the objects for which a war shall be prosecuted. There is no other alternative. If the President possess it and may prosecute it and may prosecute it for the objects against the will of Congress, where is the difference between our free Government and that of any other nation which may be governed by an absolute czar, emperor, or king?"

Note one other statement by Clay in this address so applicable to our own time:

"Here, fellow citizens, I might pause, having indicated a mode by which the Nation, through its accredited and legitimate Representatives in Congress, can account for what purposes and objects this war shall be longer prosecuted, and can thus let the whole people of the United States know for what end their blood is to be further shed, and their treasure further expended, instead of the knowledge of it

being locked up and concealed in the bosom of one man. We should no longer perceive the objects of the war varying from time to time, according to the changing opinion of the Chief Magistrate charged with its prosecution. But I do not think it right to stop here. It is the privilege of the people in their primary assemblies, and of every private man, however humble, to express an opinion in regard to the purposes for which the war should be continued, and such an expression will receive just so much consideration and consequence as it is entitled to, and no more."

Charles Sumner also opposed the Mexican War with his power and eloquence, and appealed to his fellow countrymen to work for its early conclusion.

X.

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

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

English history offers no less illustrious examples of opposition to war in which the country is engaged. John Bright consistently fought the Crimean War with all the power of his great personality and noble mind. Lloyd George won fame for his aggressive stand against the Boer War. Every American schoolboy knows how Pitt and Fox and Burke opposed the war against the American Colonies.

XI.

The Duke of Grafton, in the House of Lords, October 26, 1775, speaking against voting thanks to British officers and soldiers, after the battles of Lexington and Bunker Hill, declared:

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

On this same occasion Mr. Fox said:

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

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

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

XII.

These are but a few of the many statesmen and eminent publicists whose strong declarations I shall later cite as examples and precedents of the right of free American citizens freely to express their opposition to war and of the right and duty of the lawmaking body to shape the war policy.

In conclusion, let me repeat what I have already suggested that American citizens have the right to begin a campaign to-morrow to elect United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives who will represent them in securing the repeal of obnoxious laws, in declaring the definite objects for which this war is prosecuted and the conditions upon which it can be terminated at an early hour with honor and credit to the Nation.

God reigns and constitutional rights will be maintained. This is still the Government of the people.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE.

IS THE DRAFT LAW CONSTITUTIONAL?—USE OF NATIONAL GUARD ON FOREIGN SOIL RAISES THE ISSUE.

(By Hannis Taylor in an Address to the Congress of the United States.)

[Mr. Hannis Taylor, the author of the address that follows, was formerly United States minister to Spain and served as counsel of United States Government before Spanish Treaty Claims Commission and before Alaskan Boundary Commission. He is the author of works on the "Origin and Growth of the English and American Constitutions" and of a number of works on jurisprudence. He is a recognized authority on international questions. The editor of this magazine differs with the writer's views as to the necessity of the war, but he regards his able discussion of the constitutionality of the draft for the conduct of a foreign war, of very great importance.]

GENTLEMEN: At this critical juncture it is the patriotic duty of every American citizen to do all in his power to promote the success of the registration to take place on June 5, 1917, under the provisions of the wise and constitutional act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the military establishment of the United States."

Despite the fact that that act—whose avowed purpose is "to draft into the military service of the United States, organize, and officer the unorganized militia" of the United States—was passed under that provision of section 8, article I of the Constitution, which declares that "the Congress shall have power * * * to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions," certain ill-informed and ill-disposed persons are circulating the report that the National Militia when so organized for national defense is to be sent out of the country for service abroad, in defiance to the express mandate of the Constitution to the contrary. That report, to which the terms of the act in question give neither color nor countenance, is creating an alarm that will surely reduce the registration unless the erroneous impression is corrected in advance of it. On the other hand, such false impression is

doing a great injustice to our allies, who are looking for military aid to a source from which it can not possibly come under our Constitution as it now stands.

Certainly, every citizen of this country should know, first, that under our Constitution no American soldiers can be sent abroad even by the authority of Congress, except those composing the "Regular Army"; second, that the ranks of the "Regular Army" can only be swelled "by voluntary enlistment." As I have devoted the best years of my life to the study of such questions, I deem it my duty to restate, in a narrow compass and in an humble spirit, the basic constitutional principles underlying our system of military organization, as those principles have been settled for at least 90 years.

ENGLISH MILITARY SYSTEM REPRODUCED BY THE FEDERAL CONVENTION OF 1787.

That convention did all in its power to incorporate into our Federal Constitution the English military system which, in 1787, consisted, first, of a regular or "nonconstitutional force" made up of a standing Army and Navy; second, of an emergency or "constitutional force" called the militia, a force for national defense that had existed for a thousand years. In the words of the Encyclopedia Britannica (ninth edition): "The Militia of the United Kingdom consists of a number of officers and men maintained for the purpose of augmenting the military strength of the country in case of imminent national danger or great emergency. In such a contingency the whole or any part of the militia is liable, by proclamation of the sovereign, to be embodied, that is to say, placed in active service within the confines of the United Kingdom." The county military system, known as the militia, survived the Norman conquest unimpaired. (Stubbs, Select Charters, pp. 153-4.) By the great statute of I Edw., Edw. III, chapter 5, it was provided that the militia should only be used at home for national defense, "as has been used in times past for the defense of the realm." In 1786, the year before the Federal convention met, was passed the statute of 26 Geo. III, chapter 107, section 95, concerning the militia, in which it was specially provided that "neither the whole or any part, shall be ordered out of Great Britain." Mr. Dicey, one of the most eminent of modern English commentators, says: "The militia is the constitutional force existing under the law of the land for the defense of the country. * * * Embodiment, indeed, converts the militia for the time being into a regular army, though an army, which can not be required to serve abroad." (The Law of the Constitution, pp. 287-8.)

REGULAR OR STANDING ARMIES IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

England never had a military force that could be sent abroad until William the Conqueror brought such a force with him in the feudal host of professional soldiers who accompanied him. It was the duty of that host, which simply supplemented the ancient constitutional force known as the militia, "to attend the King in war, within and without the realm, mounted and armed during the regular term of service." But as that regular term of service only lasted for 40 days, it led to the device of shield money, which produced a fund with which the Crown could employ mercenary and professional soldiers who could be kept abroad so long as needed. Out of that purely voluntary system of paid military service was evolved the standing army of England as it existed at the date of the American Revolution; and upon the same general basis vested the standing and professional naval force of England at that time. In order to enable this Republic to maintain a standing army and navy like that of England the convention of 1787, after giving to Congress the power "to declare war," provided that "the Congress shall have power * * * to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." Those three provisions, grouped together as a connected whole, relate solely and exclusively to one subject matter—the creation, maintenance, and government of the Regular Army and Navy of the United States, which has always been maintained "by voluntary enlistment."

THE NATIONAL MILITIA AS DEFINED BY CONGRESS AND THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

It is simply impossible to confuse "the Regular Army" of the United States with that force called by the Supreme Court "the reserved military force or reserve militia of the United States." (Presser v. Illinois, 116 U. S. 252.) In order to enable Congress to create such a force for national purposes it was provided that "The Congress shall have power * * * to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the State, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress." Article II of the amendments provides: "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." These three closely interlinked clauses, all relating to a single subject matter, have been luminously expounded by the Supreme Court in U. S. v. Evans, 3 Wheat., 336; Houston v. Moore, 5 Wheat., 1; Martin v. Mott, 12 Wheat., 19; Luther v. Borden, 7 How., 1; Dyne v. Hoover, 20 How., 65; Crandall v. Nevada, 6 Wall., 35; Texas v. White, 7 Wall., 700; Presser v. Illinois, 116 U. S. 252. The term "militia," a technical term, a term of art with a history, is used four times in the Constitution and always in the same sense. When in the trial of Burr it became necessary for Chief Justice Marshall to define the meaning of the term "levying war" as used in Article III, section 3, he said: "But the term is not for the first time applied to treason by the Constitution of the United States. It is a technical term. It is used in a very old statute of that country whose language is our language, and whose laws form the substratum of our laws. It is scarcely conceivable that the term was not employed by the framers of our Constitution in the sense which had been affixed to it by those from whom we borrowed it." See to the same effect Rhode Island v. Mass., 12 Pet., 657; Income Tax cases, 157 U. S., 429; U. S. v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U. S., 279. Therefore when the framers took from the English constitution the technical term, the term of art, "militia," they took it with its thousand years of history behind it, attesting the fact that it is a force for national defense that can never be "taken out of the realm" for service in a foreign country. In that sense the term "militia" four times repeated, was embodied in our Federal Constitution. And in order to put it forever beyond the power of Congress to impair the ancient constitutional exemption from service abroad the convention, employing the masterful pen of Gouverneur Morris, provided that the new Government, with strictly limited powers, could only organize the national militia for three purposes: "To execute the laws of the Union, sup-

press insurrections, and repel invasions." By those limitations all other uses were expressly excluded with all the force that language can impart. The moment the exemption of the militia from service abroad was thus embodied in the Constitution, Congress was forever deprived of all power over the subject. It is hardly necessary to add here that the fact that the omnipotent Parliament of Great Britain, which changes her constitution every time it passes an act, can take away such an exemption from the militia in that country, has no relevancy whatever to conditions in our own.

In *Presser v. Illinois* (116 U. S. 252) the court went to the heart of the whole matter when, in defining "the reserved military force or reserve militia of the United States," it said: "It is undoubtedly true that all citizens capable of bearing arms constitute the reserved military force or reserve militia of the United States as well as of the States; and, in view of this prerogative of the General Government, as well as of its general powers, the States can not, even laying the constitutional provision in question out of view, prohibit the people from keeping and bearing arms, so as to deprive the United States of their rightful resources for maintaining the public security, and disable the people from performing their duty to the General Government." Thus it has been settled by the Supreme Court that under the clause in question, the "General Government" of the United States, possesses, entirely apart from the States, "the reserved military force or reserve militia of the United States," consisting of "all citizens capable of bearing arms," whose right to bear arms can not be impaired by any law of any State.

The definition of the National Militia given in *Presser v. Illinois*, is closely followed in the national defense act of June 3, 1916, whose section 57 reads as follows:

"Composition of the militia: The militia of the United States shall consist of all able-bodied male citizens of the United States and all other able-bodied males who have or shall have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, who shall be more than 18 years of age and, except as hereinafter provided, not more than 45 years of age, and said militia shall be divided into three classes—the National Guard, the Naval Militia, and the Unorganized Militia."

The act of May 18, 1917, which is simply a supplement or extension of the act of June 3, 1916, amplifies in its section 2 the foregoing definition of the National Militia in this form: "Such draft as herein provided shall be based upon liability to military service of all male citizens or male persons not alien enemies who have declared their intention to become citizens, between the ages of 21 and 30 years, both inclusive, and shall take place and be maintained under such regulations as the President may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of this act. Quotas from the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, or subdivisions thereof, shall be determined in proportion to the population thereof, and credit shall be given to any State, Territory, District, or subdivision thereof, for the number of men who were in the military service of the United States as members of the National Guard on April 1, 1917, or who have since said date entered the military service of the United States from any such State, Territory, District, or subdivision, either as members of the Regular Army or the National Guard." The act of May 18, 1917, takes all possible pains to proclaim, first, that all soldiers drafted and organized under it are absolutely separate and distinct from "the Regular Army" of the United States; that they are in the strictest sense of the term National Militia raised in an emergency for national defense.

THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO DRAFT OR CONSCRIPT THE NATIONAL MILITIA FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE.

When in the great case of *Martin v. Mott* (12 Wheat., 19) a unanimous court, speaking through Mr. Justice Story, was called upon to construe the act of 1795, which first organized the National Militia for national defense, it was said, "For the more clear and exact consideration of the subject it may be necessary to refer to the Constitution of the United States and some of the provisions of the act of 1795. The Constitution declares that Congress shall have power 'to provide for calling forth the militia, to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions'; and also 'to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States.' In pursuance of this authority the act of 1795 has provided 'that whenever the United States shall be invaded or be in imminent danger of invasion from any foreign nation or Indian tribe it shall be lawful for the President of the United States to call forth such number of the militia of the State or States most convenient to the place of danger or scene of action as he may judge necessary to repel such invasion, and to issue his order for that purpose to such officer or officers of the militia as he shall think proper.' And like provisions are made for the other cases stated in the Constitution." After giving in that way all possible emphasis to the fact that the National Militia can never be used except for the specific purposes stated in the Constitution, the court said that "the power to provide for repelling invasions includes the power to provide against the attempt and danger of invasion, as the necessary and proper means to effectuate that object. One of the best means to repel invasion is to provide the requisite force for action before the invader himself has reached the soil." When near the close of the War of 1812 the Secretary of War proposed to compel the service of the National Militia by conscription, there was a strong protest from certain quarters upon the ground that such a procedure would be unconstitutional. See *Dwight's History of the Hartford Convention*, page 359. But when during the Civil War such a measure was again proposed it was acted on and the result accepted without protest as constitutional, as it undoubtedly was.

EXEMPTION OF NATIONAL MILITIA FROM SERVICE ABROAD ABSOLUTE AND INCONTESTABLE.

From what has now been said, it clearly appears that the reserved force of the United States, four times described in the Constitution as the "militia," can be called forth and organized by Congress either upon the volunteer plan or by forcible conscription. But it is equally clear that when so called forth and organized the militia can only be used for one of the three purposes rigidly defined by the Constitution, to wit: "To execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions." Its application to any other purpose—notably service abroad—would be too obviously unconstitutional to justify discussion. The exemption of the National Militia to be drafted under the act in question from service abroad is self-evident and undebatable. If either the President or Congress, one or both, should attempt to ignore such constitutional exemption, any member of the militia threatened with transportation abroad could be immediately discharged from such service by any judge on habeas corpus. And more, any executive magistrate who might dare to ignore the constitutional exemption in question

would be quickly admonished by the House of Representatives that it is ready with that "two-handed engine at the door that smites once and smites no more."

SHALL OUR HANDFUL IN FRANCE FROM THE REGULAR ARMY BE ABANDONED OR STRENGTHENED?

This is not the time for self-deception. We have no right to mislead either our allies or ourselves. The incontestable facts staring us in the face are these: First, that only the Regular Army can be sent abroad; second, that the Regular Army can be augmented only "by voluntary enlistment." The only possible chance of obtaining additional soldiers for service abroad under the draft act of May 18, 1917, is through that part of it which provides that "the President is further authorized to raise and maintain by voluntary enlistment, to organize, and equip not to exceed four Infantry divisions, the officers of which shall be selected in the manner provided by paragraph 3 of section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That the organization of said force shall be the same as that of the corresponding organization of the Regular Army: *And provided further*, That there shall be no enlistments in said force of men under 25 years of age at the time of enlisting: *And provided further*, That no such volunteer force shall be accepted in any unit smaller than a division."

With all possible respect, I earnestly contend that the Congress should not commit that grave subject to the Executive. It is the constitutional function of Congress not only "to declare war," but to direct and control all of its graver operations. No part even of the Regular Army should ever be sent abroad except by its mandate. The Congress should assume the entire responsibility and determine whether the handful of Regular troops now on the way to France should be augmented or practically abandoned. That is the question of questions that should not be delayed for a moment longer. It involves no less than moral dignity the good faith of this Nation.

DARROW MAKES PLEA FOR GENERAL AMNESTY.

(By Clarence S. Darrow.)

The prosecution of the war called forth a large amount of legislation. In the main, these laws were such as are usually passed in times of war. The rules for war are not the same as the rules of peace, and neither with or without the war is the conduct of people the same.

It is perfectly obvious that laws that are meant for the prosecution of war may be the most mischievous in times of peace. This country was formed on the idea of broad religious and political tolerance and a wide freedom of speech and the press. A large part of our progress and welfare in the past is due to this freedom and toleration. If laws passed during the war are to be applied to times of peace, the governing power will be able to make freedom of speech a mockery.

Nothing is perfect, and no thinking person would claim that our Constitution, our laws, or our institutions should not be changed and modified as time goes on. It is of the first importance to progress that there shall be free discussion of all political and social schemes that might result in change. To say that we should take institutions as they are, put on the lid, and refuse to open discussion, would, of course, mean that the present is good enough and the future should be no better. If it were wise to do it now, it would have been equally wise in the Middle Ages or any period of the world's history. Persecution and witchcraft and despotism would then be as common as in the Dark Ages.

When peace is finally declared, the first and most important act of Congress should be to take off the lid, remove the restriction of free speech and a free press.

The policy of organized labor has always been to allow the widest freedom of debate. Organized labor is always looking toward the future. Its effort is to improve the conditions of those who need it most, change laws and institutions wherever needful that the common lot may be easier. This can not be done except by free debate. Of all the people in the world the trade-unions are the last ones that can permit any permanent abridgment of the freedom of speech and the press. Organized labor has always made itself clearly understood upon this issue, which is of the first importance to the development of individuals.

Our present laws, if enforced against labor organizations and those who desire social change, would result either in sending most of the leaders to jail or in revolution. Of course, they were never meant for any such purpose. They were meant for the war and the war only, and the danger is that people may forget their purpose and let them linger to obstruct the world after the need is gone.

If under free open discussion the majority of the people in this country want something, they ought to have it. If the world can not stand up against bolshevism and meet it by free speech and a free press, then bolshevism has the right to rule. It would then be time to try it out and see if it can succeed.

To smother any opinion is at once a confession that it may be true and that it can not be met by open discussion and fair argument. Our institutions have cost too much to permit them to be destroyed on account of the war. It will not do to make a war fought for democracy result in autocracy. There can be no danger from this if the question is understood and the people act promptly to repeal war legislation when the war is done.

If it is right to repeal war legislation, it is also equally just and pressing that a general amnesty should be given to all of those who are now suffering under this sort of legislation. Everyone knows that large numbers of these men are conscientious, and it is intolerable to think that men are in jail on account of their conscience when there is no longer need that they should stay.

The labor unions did their part in this war. Without them it would not have been possible to bring the United States Government that solid support that made victory possible. As they were patriotic in times of war, it is equally certain they will be patriotic in times of peace, and from the nature of things they are the ones who first of all should demand the repeal of this legislation and that amnesty be given to all these prisoners. This does not mean that the laws were wrong or that it was not necessary to send conscientious men to prison during the war, but it does mean that the purpose of the war has been served, and there was no thought or feeling of vengeance in any of these prosecutions, but only the purpose to protect the country when danger threatened it from a foreign foe.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Washington, April 11, 1918.

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUNDEEN: The Civil Service Commission has certified to this bureau the list of eligibles attached hereto for income-tax deputy collectors, inspectors, and agents.

In order that the department may have all information it may properly consider under civil-service rules and regulations in connection with appointments made from this register, I would thank you to give me the benefit of any information in your possession as to the character, fitness, and loyalty of the persons named on this list.

Your early advice will be appreciated.
Sincerely, yours,

DANIEL C. ROPER,
Commissioner.

APRIL 12, 1918.

DANIEL C. ROPER,
Commissioner Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROPER: Your letter of April 11, concerning the list of eligibles for income tax deputy collectors, inspectors, and agents has received my careful attention.

I notice you inquire as to the character, fitness, and loyalty of the persons named. You have underscored the word loyalty with red ink. The people of Minneapolis are all loyal, and I deeply resent any person or department questioning the loyalty of any person or voter in my district. If it has come to pass that a native-born American citizen must pass in review and be scrutinized by department heads to establish his loyalty, then we have certainly come to a sad pass in this country.

As far as I know each one of these men stand well in the community, and are fitted for the position, and I want it strictly understood that the loyalty of every Minneapolis man is unquestioned, at least no one dares to question their loyalty in person.

Yours, very truly,

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, April 15, 1918.

HON. ERNEST LUNDREN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUNDREN: I have your letter of the 12th in reply to mine of the 11th concerning the civil-service list of eligibles for income-tax agents, inspectors, and deputy collectors.

I had hoped that my inquiry of you and other Members would not be received as a reflection on the loyalty of citizens in any community, but would enlist assistance in safeguarding the governmental service against any persons whose views might not make for solidarity in this crucial period of our country's history.

I am sure I can depend upon you to cooperate with me in this regard, and hope that you will promptly transmit to me any information which may come to you reflecting upon officers or employees already in the service or who may be properly considered by me in connection with prospective appointments.

Sincerely, yours,

DANIEL C. ROPER, Commissioner.

APRIL 17, 1918.

MR. DANIEL C. ROPER,
Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROPER: Your letter of April 15 in reply to mine of April 12 received.

We all are willing to safeguard the Government. We are all granting unheard-of powers to Government departments. We are all voting unheard-of sums of money to prosecute this war. But many of us are getting exceedingly tired of 50 per cent of the people calling the other 50 per cent traitors, or looking upon everybody with suspicion until proved innocent, and unless they shouted loudly for war before our entry into the great conflict.

The people in our various districts are loyal to the core, and let no man question their loyalty. Every citizen, as well as every official, will feel it his duty to report any real disloyalty anywhere, but, my dear sir, constructive criticism of the Government is not disloyalty; if so, then easily one-half of the congressional seats will be vacant.

The American people have been very patient with our many shortcomings here at Washington, and the least we can do is to honor them all as true American patriots. I think we understand each other fully now.

Sincerely, yours,

MR. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson.]

MR. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to what this resolution does. In the first place, the bonus of \$240 carried by the legislative bill, if you change that clerk hire from \$3,200 clerk hire to each Member and adopt this resolution, then every clerk and every stenographer provided for in that bill will get \$240 additional pay, making \$480 to each Congressman over and above the \$1,200 which has just been carried. That is not all. It is proposed in the next Congress to pay to every employee of the House and Senate whose names appear upon the roll an extra month's pay. I have always opposed this, because it is unjust and unfair. There is no more reason why this should be done for the House employees than for other employees of the Federal Government. There is no reason why our employees who serve the Congress should be made special pets of, but if the names of these secretaries and stenographers of Congressmen go upon the roll, and the next Congress should go back to the old rule of paying an extra month's pay, under this resolution putting these two employees of each Congressman on the roll would add to each one of these employees one-twelfth of their annual salary. The stenographer would get an extra \$100 and the clerk or secretary would get an extra \$166.66.

If we could get a roll call on this proposition, I do not believe that Congress will pass this resolution. If we do not get a roll call, so that the Congressmen do not have to go on the record, it will unquestionably pass.

This matter was fully discussed in the legislative, executive, and judiciary bill just a few weeks ago, and then the Congress, after that discussion, gave to each Congressman this extra

stenographer at \$1,200. Now, before the ink is dry and within a few days after the bill had been passed and signed by the President, here comes another proposition that will add enormously to the expense of the House and the cost to the people of their Congressmen. In other words, to state the proposition concretely, under the proposed resolution the secretary gets \$2,000, and if placed upon the roll, as proposed in the resolution, the secretary will be paid a bonus of \$240, making the secretary's salary \$2,240. The stenographer's salary is fixed at \$1,200 in this resolution, and if the stenographer goes on the roll you then add \$240 additional, making \$1,440; that is to say, every Congressman in the House will get for his own office clerk services costing the Government \$3,680. Just think, Mr. Speaker, that immediately prior to this present Congress each Congressman received \$1,500 for clerk hire. At the first session of this Congress there was added \$500 to this. Before this session closed we added \$1,200 more for a stenographer. Now comes the final chapter within a few hours before the close of this session, when but little debate, thought, and discussion can be had upon any bill, however important. This resolution proposes to add in addition to the \$500 and the \$1,200 to each and every Congressman \$480 more for his office. This can not be justified in good conscience, and especially when you take into consideration the fact that our Republican friends, who control the next House, say that they are going to give to each of their employees an extra month's pay, which means in addition to the \$3,680 for each Congressman an additional sum of \$266.66, which makes every Congressman get for clerk hire \$3,946.66. In other words, it makes one Congress add over 150 per cent to each and every Congressman for his own office and for his own convenience.

Now, \$480 for 440 Members of Congress, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners will require \$211,200, and an extra month's pay will require \$117,330, or a total of \$228,530 carried in this simple, innocent resolution in the dying moments of Congress, which nowhere appears on the face of the innocent-looking thing that is going to cost as much more as the present law now appropriates.

Now, I do not believe that Congressmen realized that when this resolution came up, and it shows you the danger of so legislating in the closing hours of the Congress. Now, gentlemen of the House, I do not believe that you can justify your own conscience in voting to give \$440 more to each one of us, and in addition to that \$166, plus \$100, making \$266, and add that to the \$480, making \$750 clerk hire by the passage of this resolution.

Now, we debated this at some length on the legislative bill, and that bill has barely been signed by the President of the United States; and yet in the same session of Congress, within less than a week from the time the President signed the bill giving to each of you an additional clerk with a \$1,200 salary, here you are coming now and asking for about \$750 before that becomes a law. Did you gentlemen know that when this legislation first came up, and yet that is exactly what will happen. Now, that is not all. There are many Members of Congress who would like to get a clerk and pay that clerk \$3,200, but under this resolution it can not be done. If you should want to divide your clerk hire so at a certain season of the year you can use more of it than in others, you can not do it because you have to get one at \$2,000 and another at \$1,200, whereas if you had \$3,200 you could distribute it to suit yourself. Now, I have no patience on earth with any intimation that Members of Congress will vote this money and not use it as the law directs, and yet that is the reason urged by these men to place these employees upon the roll.

Mr. Speaker, of course this is not the real reason why they want these names to go on the roll. If a Congressman is worthy to have a seat in this body, he is certainly to be trusted with the clerk hire. When a Congressman got \$1,500 for clerk hire, he could divide it as he saw fit and proper. When he got \$2,000 he could divide it as he saw fit and proper. The present law grants \$3,200 as clerk hire. The Congressman can divide this sum as he sees proper. Under the guise of putting the secretary and stenographer upon the roll, without one word being said about it until I called the attention of the Members on the floor to it, without the bill on its face showing it, there is silently taken out of the Treasury \$480 additional for each Congressman under this resolution by their going on the rolls. If they had not intended that this should be done, why was it called up under suspension of rules when the resolution can not be amended? The only way in which you could amend that resolution would be by unanimous consent. Do not you know there is no chance on earth to get that resolution amended by unanimous consent to prevent the Congressmen getting \$3,200 plus the \$480? Of course not. The real thing accomplished by the resolution is to give the \$480 by putting their names upon the roll. If the Republicans give to each employee an extra month's pay, it will give each Congressman

\$266½ more for their clerk. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is my reason for opposing this resolution at this time, because I am not willing that this \$1,077,530 should be added to the already heavy burden of the taxpayers.

It might be well for me to state to the Members of Congress, so that the people who sent them here may know what you are doing for yourselves and for your own benefit, by stating in money what you have done for yourselves already and what you propose to do now. Up until the last year each Congressman got only \$1,500 for clerk hire, and there are 440 Congressmen, delegates, and resident commissioners, so this item cost the American people only \$660,000. Last session you raised the clerk hire from \$1,500 to \$2,000, which caused this to cost an increase of \$220,000 or \$880,000. Not satisfied with this, this Congress in the legislative bill which has just passed a few days ago added \$528,000 to this \$880,000, making a total increase prior to this resolution in one Congress of \$748,000. Now, if this resolution passes, the 440 Congressmen, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners will get \$211,200 more, making \$960,000 added by this Congress to their clerk hire; and then if they get the extra month's pay under the next Republican House, as the leaders say they are going to get, this adds \$117,330 additional, or a total gross increase to the people of the United States for clerk hire to Congressmen of \$1,077,530 in one session of Congress. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, do you not think this is going too far? Just think, two years ago the total expense was only \$660,000. In two short Congresses we will have added \$1,077,530, so that the American people in the next Congress will be paying to Congressmen for clerk hire \$1,737,530 if an extra month's pay is added by the Republicans.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, when the subject of the increase for clerk hire came up on the legislative bill it will be recalled that I opposed the increase, but this House by a good majority voted the increase for clerk hire, and the fact remains that during the fiscal year 1920 there will be \$3,200 provided for clerk hire for each Member, Resident Commissioner, and Delegate. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson]—

Mr. BLACK rose.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Just a minute—makes the point that if the resolution of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] is adopted it will provide for a \$240 bonus. It seems certain, gentlemen, that if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] be correct, that the \$240 will be paid anyway.

And the reason I say that is this: The legislative bill provides for \$3,200 to be appropriated for each Member, Resident Commissioner, and Delegate for clerk hire, for necessary clerical purposes, and so forth, and it further provides that no part of said sum shall be paid to any Member, Resident Commissioner, or Delegate. Now, that, to all intents and purposes, puts your secretary or your clerks upon the roll; and, if so, then they will get the bonus under the law. The money is not paid to the Member; it is paid to the clerk by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, if the gentleman from Illinois be correct in his statement or in his construction that the clerk will have the power to do it under this ambiguous provision in the legislative bill. Now, what I want to see done is to see that law made plain, so that the country and so that the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Comptroller of the Treasury, and the auditors may know just what Congress intended to do.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does not the gentleman think if the language is ambiguous, and that he, an old Member of this House and a member of the Committee on Appropriations, can not clearly understand its meaning, it is a matter of too much importance to consider here at the closing hours of this session?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say that the gentleman voted for propositions last night and yesterday much more important than this and meaning much more to the country without objection and with less consideration than this will have in the 40 minutes allowed to consider this short resolution.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] complains because the clerks of the Members will get \$240 bonus. I have just said that, in my judgment, they will get it, anyway. But the gentleman and no other Member of this House objected to the Senators increasing the salaries of their secretaries from \$2,200 to \$2,500, with a bonus, making \$2,740 that their secretaries will get the next fiscal year. In addition to that, the Senators increased another one of their clerks from \$1,440 to \$1,600, with a bonus of \$240, making \$1,840. Their other clerks were advanced from \$1,200 to \$1,500, making \$1,740 for those clerks.

Then they provide, in addition, for an entirely new clerk at \$1,200, who will get the bonus also, making the salary \$1,440 for their new clerk. Nobody on the floor of this House raised an objection to that when that proposition came before the House. I have not favored large appropriations in this House, as you all know. I have done all that I could to keep down appropriations. But I say, in all fairness, gentlemen, if it is right for the four clerks to Senators to receive \$240 each as a bonus, then by the same rule of procedure the clerks of the Members of the House ought to receive a similar amount and similar treatment. [Applause.]

In addition to that, gentlemen, I have fought for eight years upon this floor to put the clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners upon the roll. I have not done that because, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] intimates, of any want of confidence in a single Member, Resident Commissioner, or Delegate in this House. But I have believed it was right. I believe our clerks ought to be on the rolls just as the clerks to Senators are upon the roll. For that reason I have consistently done all that I possibly could to put these clerks on the roll, and that is just what the resolution of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] will clearly do if adopted, and that is the reason I favor it. I do not want this question left in doubt. [Applause.]

This resolution does not increase the appropriation for clerk hire one cent. It carries no appropriation whatever, but simply determines just how the amount of money heretofore appropriated shall be expended during the next fiscal year. As I have stated, when the question was up in the House I opposed the proposition to increase the amount for clerk hire, but those who favored it contended that it should be increased in order to allow each Member an additional clerk, and the House adopted it with that idea in view. This resolution simply proposes to carry out the wishes of the House which were expressed at the time. It was not contended by anyone that the secretary to a Member should receive more than \$2,000, nor was the increase allowed for the purpose of increasing the salary of the secretary to any Member, but simply to provide him with an additional clerk. In view of the understanding of the House, I do not think it right that the clerk to any Member should receive more than \$2,000, and I want to see this resolution pass in order to make that certain. Members who favored the increase insisted that an additional clerk was needed for the benefit of their constituents, and a majority of the House voted it with that understanding. What possible objection can there be, therefore, to passing this resolution so as to provide by law for two clerks, especially since it does not cost the Government one single dollar more than the amount which has already been appropriated. If a Member does not need two clerks, then he will not have to appoint them, and the money provided for one of his clerks may remain in the Treasury. In such a case the passage of this resolution will prevent his single clerk demanding the full amount appropriated and thus will save money to the Treasury.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], who has just addressed the House, bases his support of this legislation largely upon the contention that another body has increased the allowance for the clerical help of that body, and that consequently, as a matter of justice, we should go and do likewise.

Now, my friends, it has always been understood here that the other body—the Senate—has never interfered with what arrangements we saw fit to make relating to the amount we paid ourselves or allowed for clerk hire or help in our own offices. And that is the reason I have always heard was why we did not interfere with the amount they allow. Now, if that be true, they have their own matters to attend to so far as the help in their offices and for their work is concerned, and we have the same privilege.

Now, gentlemen of the House, it is only a short time, perhaps a little over a year, when we allowed but \$1,500 per year for clerk hire. Now, in 12 months' time we have increased that by something like 150 per cent, at a time when the Treasury is empty and when the taxpayers of the country are burdened down with necessary taxes. You all know that this increase was granted largely because of the increased duties relating to the war. The war is over. The armistice is signed. Peace will soon be here. Our work before the departments and the work in our offices will shortly diminish, and the excuse for this large increase will have passed away. And, my friends, if we have any regard whatever for the taxpayers of the country, if we have any regard for economy, if we have any regard for those who are already heavily burdened with heavy taxes to pay

necessary expenses, and pay the interest on the national debt, and to defray the expenses of the Government, we will not for our own convenience make this appropriation here in the closing hours of this Congress, when, as we all know, it has not had the consideration it should have had.

Only a few days ago we voted to make this amount \$3,200 a year, and now, without consideration, the proposition is to increase it to \$3,500 or \$3,600 a year. My colleagues, you can not justify it. It is a small item; of course, relatively, but, still, the eyes of the people of the country are upon us, and certainly we can not justify an appropriation of this kind under the prevailing conditions of the country. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, as I understand the legislative bill, it may be interpreted to mean that we are to receive \$3,200 per year, which we can pay out as we like to one or more clerks whom we may employ, and as we need them. That is all we will get under that bill, in my judgment.

Under this bill, if it becomes a law, however, we will get \$3,200, and, in addition, in my judgment, we will get at least \$480 as a bonus or bonuses. I believe that is too much. I do not believe that that burden should be placed on the Treasury at this time.

Besides that, I have another objection to this bill as it is drawn which, I think, is equally important. This resolution provides that you can hire a secretary for \$2,000 and a stenographer or clerk for \$1,200. I want to call attention to the fact that it is very hard now to employ a competent secretary at \$2,000. So far as I am concerned, I know that I have a secretary whose wage I had hoped to increase under the legislative bill, so that he could stay here and keep his family here and live under the existing high prices.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Was it not argued by everyone who favored the \$3,200 proposition to have two clerks, one at \$2,000 and the other at \$1,200? Was not that the theory upon which this House voted?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I do not think so. So far as I was concerned, I did not vote for the raise of wage at all. As I understand it, that is not the meaning of it, and I do not think that is what the law is. I think a man has the right to have one or two or three clerks in the rush session if he wants them, and certify for their payment to the Clerk. He should be allowed to use this \$3,200 as he desires. For instance, a man may want to go to his home town and hire a stenographer out of this fund. Under this resolution he can do nothing of the kind. I do not believe this resolution ought to pass.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have four minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, when this proposition was originally before the House it was my best judgment that we should retain the \$2,000 secretary position and provide also for a session clerk. The judgment of the House, however, was that there should be two annual clerks, one receiving \$2,000 and the other \$1,200. The language adopted by the House is somewhat ambiguous, which in its present form, as pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], will enable a Member to appoint one clerk or any number of clerks and have them placed on the roll of the House of Representatives. If they are placed on the roll of the House of Representatives, then they will receive the bonus allowance which comes to all civilian employees of the Government who receive less than \$2,500. That is, \$240 to each.

The claim made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] that this is adding a burden of several hundred thousand dollars to the Treasury is not well taken, because only if there is one clerk to receive this \$3,200 the bonus of \$240 will not be paid; but if there is more than one and none receive more than \$2,500, then each clerk will receive the \$240 bonus.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Under the plan provided in the bill, how is this fund to be divided?

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the plan contained in the legislative bill it is left to the discretion of the Member to appoint as many clerks as he sees fit at the salaries he sees fit, provided they do not exceed an aggregate of \$3,200.

It was my hope, and the hope of other conferees on the part of the House on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill that this matter would be thrown into conference so that the conferees might submit to the House a well-considered proposition. But the Senate did not in any wise modify it, so that the House could consider it, and now we have before us a definite proposition to carry out virtually the original intentment of the House when the House agreed to increase the clerk hire from \$2,000 to \$3,200, one to receive \$2,000 and the other \$1,200.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Is it true that the \$3,200 now provided for clerk hire has to be paid to one clerk, and then by him in turn paid out to another?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. FERRIS. It has been so asserted here.

Mr. STAFFORD. When the gentleman from Illinois made his argument I thought it was convincing that under this provision a Member may either appoint one clerk, to receive \$3,200, or any number of clerks, to receive a total of \$3,200, all the clerks to be placed on the roll of the House and to be paid by the Clerk of the House.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. And each one to receive \$240 bonus?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; each one to receive \$240 bonus, provided none of them received more than \$2,500.

Mr. FERRIS. What is the object of this resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. The object of this is to carry out virtually the intentment of the House, so as to have one secretary to receive \$2,000 and a clerk to receive \$1,200.

Mr. FERRIS. The second ought to receive \$1,500.

Mr. STAFFORD. The second will receive \$1,440 when you include the bonus.

Now, let me call your attention to what the Senate has done in this legislative bill, which has heretofore been called to the attention of the House by the chairman of the legislative committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. They provide four clerks for each Senator, granting to some Senators one additional clerk. The salary for the principal clerk will be \$2,500 and the next \$1,600 and the next \$1,500 and the lowest-paid clerk \$1,200. They all will receive the \$240 bonus. It is true that the conferees on the part of the House protested strongly against the increases the Senate made in their clerks from \$1,440 to \$1,600, and from \$1,200 to \$1,500, and so on, but the administration of the Senate rests exclusively in their judgment and discretion, and naturally we had to surrender.

The pending resolution seeks to allow each Member two clerks and to have them placed on the roll and made employees of the House. It makes certain the clerical assistance each Member will have.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That, however, is subject to a point of order. That point of order is always made, so that every time we have the legislative bill up here we have this wrangle about our clerks. No other place in the Government is in this situation. Senators have their clerks, who are put on the roll. The departments have clerks, who are put on the roll; but some gentlemen here insist that they must have the \$3,200, and scatter it out, paying it to 1 clerk or 6 or 7 clerks or 15 clerks, to suit their convenience. Now, there can be no sort of justification for that. When this appropriation was increased to \$3,200 the whole argument to the House was that we had the \$2,000 for one clerk and that we needed another clerk at \$1,200.

Now, as to the bonus of \$240, if every other Government clerk is going to get \$240, why should not the clerks to Congressmen get the \$240 bonus? Why make any distinction against them? I think we ought to pass it and make it permanent law and cease this wrangle every time we meet here. I hope that the joint resolution will pass.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Have not a great many of the clerks got the idea that they are going to get the whole \$3,200 to be paid to one clerk?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes; and they are going to insist on it. I ask for a vote.

Mr. RANDALL. The suggestion has been made here that a clerk when put on the roll can not be removed. Is it not a fact that a Member can put a clerk on the roll at the beginning of his term and may remove him within three months if he wishes to do so, and then reappoint him again?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Oh, yes; there is no doubt about that. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Let us vote on this first.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. At the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] I will ask the gentleman from Mississippi to withhold that point, and ask him to move for a recess until 10 o'clock. He requested me to ask that no point of order be made before 10 o'clock. The gentleman from North Carolina has gone over to the Senate to see what arrangements could be made over there.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this being deferred, but I want a quorum here before we begin the roll call on this joint resolution. So I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-seven Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant of Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Baer	Flood	Kraus	Scully
Bland, Ind.	Flynn	Langley	Shackleford
Booher	Foss	Lehlbach	Sherley
Britten	Frear	Longworth	Slayden
Brumbaugh	Freeman	Lunn	Small
Butler	Gallivan	McCulloch	Smith, Mich.
Caldwell	Gard	Miller, Minn.	Smith, C. B.
Carew	Garland	Mondell	Smith, T. F.
Carter, Mass.	Gillett	Mudd	Snell
Carter, Okla.	Goodall	Nelson, J. M.	Steele
Cary	Gordon	Nichols, Mich.	Steenerson
Chandler, N. Y.	Gould	Oldfield	Stephens, Miss.
Chandler, Okla.	Gray, N. J.	Overmyer	Sullivan
Clark, Fla.	Greene, Mass.	Overstreet	Swift
Classon	Gregg	Park	Taylor, Ark.
Costello	Griffin	Parker, N. Y.	Thomas
Cox	Hamill	Peters	Tinkham
Crago	Hamilton, N. Y.	Platt	Treadway
Crisp	Heintz	Pratt	Vare
Curry, Cal.	Hood	Price	Voigt
Davey	Howard	Ramsey	Waldow
Davis	Husted	Riordan	Walker
Dent	Kahn	Roberts	Walton
Dominick	Kearns	Robinson	Wason
Dooling	Kelly, Pa.	Rodenberg	White, Ohio
Eagle	Kennedy, R. I.	Rowland	Williams
Ellsworth	Kless, Pa.	Rucker	Wilson, Ill.
Emerson	Kincheleoe	Russell	Woodyard
Estopinal	King	Sanders, Ind.	
Fairchild, G. W.	Knutson	Sanford	

The SPEAKER. On this call 307 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the resolution relating to clerk hire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request upon the work of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Humphreys resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, as I understood it general consent was given this morning to Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Am I correct?

The SPEAKER. That was on the Irish question.

Mr. WALSH. Was it confined to the Irish question?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of the Humphreys resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the league of nations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request upon the bill H. R. 15993, the reclamation of lands for soldiers, sailors, and marines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request upon the same bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon cotton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request upon the river and harbor bill and on the work of the present Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein an address delivered by my colleague, Mr. CRAMTON, at the Odd Fellows' Grand Lodge meeting at Grand Rapids, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the Military Academy bill and the Army and Navy appropriation bills, and also on the newspaper discussion of them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the presidential primary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I notice that several gentlemen are on their feet with the purpose of making similar requests to extend their remarks in the RECORD upon various subjects. The hour of 12 o'clock is fast approaching, and I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD upon any legislative subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Let us give that permission if it is confined to their own remarks and is within five calendar days.

Mr. COLLIER. Confined to their own remarks, within five calendar days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Reserving the right to object—is that all legislative subjects?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman means on pending bills.

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PAY OF MEMBERS WHO SERVED IN THE ARMY.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I hope I may have the attention of the House, and I want to be perfectly frank with the House about a matter that I shall suggest. When we declared war several Members of the House were members of the National Guard and thought they might go into the Army. At their request, or the request of some of them, I introduced a resolution in the House directing the Committee on the Judiciary to report whether a Member accepting a commission in the Army would lose his seat in the House, or what the effect would be. The Committee on the Judiciary reported to the House that the acceptance of an office in the Army would, in effect, be a vacation of the seat of the Member.

There were still some very patriotic young men and older men in the House who wanted to go into the Army. I conferred with some of the gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House and reached an understanding, so far as I was concerned and so far as they were concerned, individually at least, that if any of the Members of the House on my side of the House went into the Army they would say nothing about it, and if any Democratic Members went into the Army, I would

keep any Republican from mentioning it adversely, as far as the membership was concerned.

The Members on both sides went into the Army. When the armistice was signed and afterwards they came back into the House. Of course, if they had forfeited their seats, they were not entitled to come back and resume them. The question was raised as to their pay. We passed a resolution in the House providing that they would be paid from the time they returned to the House. Of course, if they had lost their seats, they could not regain them by such a resolution, but we could pay them the money and say nothing about whether they had lost their seats or not.

The matter was discussed with the noble gentleman who presides over us, and he was willing to sign the certificate for the time the boys were absent from the House, in order that they might draw their pay. Some of us, in order to give him some protection, signed a request that he should do this. I suppose he is still willing to do it. The Sergeant at Arms, who pays the salaries of Members, is under bond, a bond which runs for a number of years. I think quite properly he hesitated to pay the money which somebody thereafter might charge him with having paid illegally without the direction of the House.

When the deficiency bill was before the House the other day there was an amendment offered which was subject to a point of order, but the point of order was not made, providing for the payment to these Members of the amounts of salary and clerk hire which would be due to them for the time they were in the Army, their clerks having been paid meanwhile by them. The deficiency bill has failed. There are several of these Members who really need the money, who have had no Army pay, who have borrowed the money, and I wondered whether the Speaker would recognize me, and if he did, whether anyone would object to the passage of the following resolution, which, while not a matter of legality, would, I understand, be a sort of protection to the Sergeant at Arms, which he and also the Clerk of the House would be willing to accept:

House resolution 624.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed to immediately pay all arrears of salaries and clerk allowances to Members of the House of Representatives in the Sixty-fifth Congress who have not received their monthly salary and allowances, owing to their absence from the House while in the military service of the United States during the war.

I do not think this would settle the legal question, but I do think it would be proper to pay these boys the money. What do you say? [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, will the Chair recognize me for the immediate consideration of that resolution?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did not your amendment in the deficiency bill deduct from the salaries of the men the amounts they had received as officers in the Army?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does this so deduct it? There is a difference?

Mr. MANN. There is a difference, but I understand the deduction would be made. I think it only exists in one case.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman indulge me for a statement?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will not interpose any objection to paying the salary if I can have one moment to express myself. I do not wish by my silence, which I shall keep after this in respect to this measure, by putting myself in a position of approving the recognition by this House of the legality of the status of these gentlemen, highly as I respect them and regard their services, because I have sworn to support the Constitution of the United States and I do not believe they are constitutional Representatives of the House.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia, on the whole, I agree with him. I do not desire to have the legal question settled in this way. If this House could settle it, which I do not think it can, it already has been settled, because the House has already passed a joint resolution, or a concurrent resolution, which was passed by the Senate and, I suppose, signed by the President, recognizing him from the time he came back. I do not think, however, that either one determines the legal question, but it is frequently the case that we do not raise legal questions as we frequently do not raise points of order.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I do.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I understand similar questions were raised during the Spanish-American War. I recall the

proposition raised in the case of Gen. Wheeler, of Alabama. Is the gentleman familiar with what action the House took in that case?

Mr. MANN. My recollection is that Gen. Wheeler, who left the House to become a general, was paid a salary up to the time, but he never came back to the House at all.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I was on the committee at that time and who disagreed from other members of the committee. I thought while they were away on a temporary service they were not Members of the House, but when they came back they were; but I arose for the purpose, with the gentleman's permission, of asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing the reports, which are in the Record on the matter and perhaps some few remarks in addition as to what took place at the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a minute?

Mr. MANN. Before consent is granted? I will yield to the gentleman any time. I would like, however, before the House—

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Speaker, I am one Member of this House who has seldom craved its attention. I, too, took that oath to support the Constitution of my Government. I have tried to adhere to it. Since I came here my Government has gotten into trouble, and serious trouble. Thousands of our boys are buried in a foreign land. There is a Member of this House, Hon. ROYAL C. JOHNSON, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., who is one of our best Members, a man having great love of country, and in fact a man of destiny, who went to France. He is over on the Republican side of this House, too. He enlisted as a private and worked his way up to the rank of first lieutenant. Though he has said nothing about it to his friends, he, with his men, got in the course of enemy shell fire. A shell burst over his head and tore off nearly 3 pounds of flesh on his shoulder. Men were killed all around him on the battle field. A shell struck one soldier near JOHNSON, and his comrades never found even a piece of his clothing; he was blown to atoms. JOHNSON offered his life upon the altar of his country, but God was with him and saved him for future usefulness to his country. He was as brave as a lion. He said to me before he left, "Adam, I can not stand it; our Government is in trouble, and I am going if I never see my country again." He is an honor to his district, State, and Nation. He was willing, if we so required, to give up his salary here of \$7,500 and went to answer his country's call; and if it is the last vote, as it likely will be, I shall ever cast in the House of Representatives, by the eternal gods, I want to show my appreciation of the men who stood by the Government when it was in serious, awful trouble. [Applause.] And, gentlemen, I almost lost a boy in this trouble. The situation has gotten close to me. The young men who went into this war and who have come home are destined to rule this Republic, if they will but hold their heads up, if after the war is over the War Department will ever let them out so they can get home. I think it is ridiculous that they are held in the camps of this country. [Applause.] And I pray and petition the consciences of men to give these boys their money. They have earned it. They were in hell on earth while we were here doing the best we could. Let us pay the debt the Government owes. Those are my individual sentiments. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution to authorize the payment of salaries to Members of the House of Representatives withheld during their absence in the military service of the United States.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms and Clerk of the House of Representatives are hereby authorized and directed to immediately pay all arrears of salary and clerk allowance to Members of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress who have not received their monthly salary and allowance owing to their absence from the House while in the military service of the United States during the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I understand this item was included in the deficiency appropriation bill which is being killed by a filibuster being carried on by the Republicans of the Senate.

Mr. MANN. I do not know who carried it on; I am sorry indeed that it is.

Mr. McCLINTIC. It is a fact?

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether it is a fact or not. The gentleman may be able to give me some information.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I had some information leading up to this question.

Mr. MANN. It is in the deficiency bill which, I understand, will not be passed, and I am very sorry it will not be passed.

Mr. McCLINTIC. That is the information that I get. If the bill is not passed at this session of Congress, will it be possible to have it passed at the next session of Congress making it retroactive so as to take care of those to whom this money should be paid?

Mr. MANN. It would be a claim to be acted upon as such, I suppose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am opposed to this resolution on constitutional grounds and also upon grounds of public policy, and I can not allow it to be passed when my silence is accepted as an approval.

There is a way by which it can be brought before the House regularly, by a motion to suspend the rules, and in view of that fact I am compelled to object to its consideration.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman wait a second? I have not asked the Speaker for recognition to suspend the rules, and I do not know whether he would be warranted in granting it or not.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. He can not do it right now.

Mr. MANN. Yes; he could. Will not the gentleman be content to have it laid before the House, so that gentlemen can make their statement in opposition to it?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am not content. I do not want to make any statement, and I want to be recorded against it. When this was before the House the other day, a great many Members voted against it, and those men would undoubtedly be recorded against it now. It is not solely for my own benefit I make this objection, but there are a great many Members in the same situation that I am. It is unpleasant for me to make it, but there are men more sensitive and who do not hold to this opinion, and so I am going to stand over them for good policy and for the Constitution of the United States, and therefore am going to do this unpleasant thing and make objections.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand there was something said concerning the record of Gen. Joe Wheeler while he was in the service. The records will show that his salary was not paid to him or to anyone else for him while in the military service.

Mr. MANN. I think that is true. He received the salary of a major general, which was larger.

Mr. ALMON. And he was appointed by a Republican President.

Mr. MANN. I have no criticism of that.

The SPEAKER. As soon as we get through with the Humphreys resolution the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to suspend the rules. [Applause.]

The question now is on suspending the rules on the Humphreys resolution.

CLERK HIRE FOR MEMBERS.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, may we have it again reported, inasmuch as there were many Members not present when it was before the House?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Humphreys resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record expressing some patriotic sentiments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record to express some patriotic sentiments.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask to insert in the Record a short codification of the decisions rendered by Judge SAUNDERS as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I will object for a moment, until we get through with this thing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects to this request. Without objection, the Clerk will report this resolution.

CLERK HIRE FOR MEMBERS.

The resolution (H. J. Res. 436) was again reported.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the Humphreys resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker stated that in the judgment of the Chair two-thirds had voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Forty-one gentleman have arisen; not a sufficient number.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I ask for the other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the other side. Those who are opposed will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-eight Members have risen in the negative. Forty-one is not a sufficient number.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi demands tellers. [After counting.] Twenty-seven gentlemen have risen; not a sufficient number.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

Mr. MANN. After we get through with this.

The SPEAKER. Two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution is passed.

On motion of Mr. HUMPHREYS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to extend my remarks by printing some patriotic sentiments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing some patriotic expressions. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. RAYBURN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to suspend the rules and pass the resolution which the Clerk will report.

PAY OF MEMBERS WHO SERVED IN ARMY.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 624.

House resolution to authorize the payment of salaries to Members of the House of Representatives withheld during their absence in the military service of the United States.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms and Clerk of the House of Representatives are hereby authorized and directed to immediately pay all arrears of salary and clerk allowance to Members of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress who have not received their monthly salary and allowance owing to their absence from the House while in the military service of the United States during the war: *Provided*, That there shall be deducted from such amounts for salary, respectively, any money received by any of the above-named as compensation for service in the Army during the present emergency, and the affidavits of the above-named persons shall be accepted as proof as to whether or not any such payment has been received by them.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules are suspended and the resolution is passed.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks for a division. Those in favor of suspending the rules and passing this resolution will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-eight gentlemen have risen in the affirmative.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirty-five gentlemen have risen for the yeas and nays—not a sufficient number. Those opposed to suspending the rules and passing this resolution will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Forty-nine gentlemen have risen in the negative. On this vote the yeas are 228 and the nays are 49.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida demands tellers. As many as favor taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand

until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirty-five gentlemen have risen, and it takes 44. Two-thirds having voted in the affirmative the rules are suspended and the resolution is passed.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill 5555.

Mr. MANN. That can not be finished in an hour.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second on that.

Mr. RAYBURN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to take up at this time Senate bill 5555.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Minnesota in a minute.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Well, you will have plenty of time to get it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, may we have the bill reported?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. MANN. I will object to that, because within the hour I want to offer a resolution of thanks to the Speaker, the ordinary resolution. If you suspend the rules we shall not finish by 12 o'clock. I am not opposed to it on its merits.

Mr. RAYBURN. The whole conversion of the war-risk insurance from war-time insurance to peace-time insurance depends absolutely on the passage of this bill.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. That is not essential.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it essential that that action be taken now?

Mr. RAYBURN. It is, because the Attorney General has held that this insurance is convertible at this time.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I know that.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman allow me to say that it does not stop the conversion of it. All it does is to change the form of conversion and order a whole lot of things to be done that are unnecessary.

Mr. MADDEN. They do not have to begin to convert for five years, do they?

Mr. RAYBURN. No; they have to convert this insurance within five years.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. But the necessity for this bill at this time is that these men will not keep up the payment of their premiums even for one year where they have to pay a premium every month.

Mr. MADDEN. I presume in many cases that will be true.

Mr. RAYBURN. And then we will be left with all the bad risks on our hands and none of the good risks.

Mr. MADDEN. I should have been very glad to assist the gentleman in the consideration of this bill earlier in the session, when there was time to consider it properly.

Mr. ESCH. If the gentleman will allow me to make the suggestion, the sooner the insurance is converted into old-line insurance the lower the premiums will be, and that will be an inducement for them to convert their term insurance into the old-line insurance.

Mr. RAYBURN. Five years from now the premiums on a converted policy will cost from 10 to 20 per cent more than if converted now.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If a soldier has a policy for \$10,000, he may convert that into a policy for two or three or four or five thousand dollars of insurance, which will make the burden much less on him and will fix the premium.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 402 of the war-risk insurance act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 402. That the director, subject to the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall promptly determine upon and publish the full and exact terms and conditions of such contract of insurance. The insurance until converted shall be payable only to a spouse, child, grandchild, parent, brother, or sister, and also during total and permanent disability to the insured person, or to any or all of them: *Provided*, That in the case of converted insurance, the permitted class of beneficiaries shall include in addition to the foregoing an uncle, aunt, nephew, or niece. The insurance shall be payable in 240 equal monthly installments. Provisions for maturity at certain ages, for continuous installments during the life of the insured, or beneficiaries, or both, for cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values, dividends from gains and savings, and such other provisions for the protection and advantage of and for alternative benefits to the insured and the beneficiaries as may be found to be reasonable and practicable, may be provided for in the contract of insurance, or from time to time by regulations. All calculations shall be based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at 3½ per cent, except that no deduction shall be made for continuous installments during the life of the insured in case

his total and permanent disability continues more than 240 months. Subject to regulations, the insured shall at all times have the right to change the beneficiary or beneficiaries of such insurance without the consent of such beneficiary or beneficiaries, but only within the classes herein provided. If no beneficiary within the permitted class be designated by the insured, either in his lifetime or by his last will and testament, or if the designated beneficiary does not survive the insured, the insurance shall be payable to such person or persons within the permitted class of beneficiaries as would under the laws of the State of the residence of the insured be entitled to his personal property in case of intestacy. In the case of converted insurance, if no person within the permitted class survive the insured, there shall be paid to the estate of the insured an amount equal to the commuted value of the installments remaining unpaid, calculated at the rate of 3½ per cent interest; but if one or more such persons shall survive the insured and shall have died before receiving all of the installments payable there shall be paid to the estate of the last surviving person within the permitted class an amount equal to the commuted value of the installments remaining unpaid, calculated at the rate of 3½ per cent interest."

SEC. 2. That a new section is hereby added to Article IV of such act, to be known as section 405, and to read as follows:

"Sec. 405. That the Bureau of War Risk Insurance is hereby directed to set aside out of the premiums collected on the insurance converted under this article such a reserve fund, calculated on the basis of 3½ per cent interest, as may be required, under accepted actuarial principles, to meet all liabilities under such insurance; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to invest the said reserve fund, or any part thereof, in farm-loan bonds issued by the Federal land banks or in interest-bearing securities of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I demand a second.

Mr. RAYBURN. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey demands a second. The Chair appoints as tellers the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER]. All those in favor of ordering a second will pass between the tellers and be counted.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 116, noes 83.

Accordingly a second was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has 20 minutes and the gentleman from New Jersey has 20 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. I intend to take up the time only long enough to ask that a letter of the Secretary of the Treasury be read in my time, which I think will explain the necessity for this.

The Clerk proceeded to read the letter, which is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 7, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am inclosing herewith a tentative draft of a bill amending the war-risk insurance act. It provides for the enlargement of the permitted class of beneficiaries of converted insurance and directs the setting aside of a reserve fund for such insurance.

In my opinion, the early passage by the Congress of a bill similar in effect to that inclosed is of such vital importance to the success of the bureau in administering the provisions of the war-risk insurance act authorizing the conversion of insurance heretofore granted that I earnestly request that you give it the earliest possible attention. The reasons for requesting the legislation proposed may be thus briefly stated:

1. The setting aside of an insurance reserve: Section 402 of the act authorizes the inclusion in the insurance contract of provisions for "dividends from gains and savings, and such other provisions for the protection and advantage of and for alternative benefits to the insured and the beneficiaries as may be found to be reasonable and practicable." This and other provisions of the act make it clear that Congress expected that the contracts of converted insurance to be issued should make provisions for dividends substantially similar to those usually found in life insurance policies issued by private companies. It is also reasonable to infer that Congress expected that the gains and savings out of which these dividends were to be paid should, as in the case of private insurance companies, be realized from interest on reserve and savings in mortality. Hence, the Secretary of the Treasury should invest the reserve fund obtained from premiums on converted insurance in such a manner as to realize interest in excess of the basic rate of 3½ per cent upon which the reserve is calculated. This action could probably be taken by the Secretary without receiving additional authority from the Congress, but the importance of the proposed action is so great, affecting as it must the work of the bureau through half a century, and the sums involved are so large that it would be unwise to proceed without receiving the express direction of the Congress. I am advised that the success of the plan to continue the insurance of our soldiers in converted form depends largely upon the step proposed to be taken.

The considerations which lead me to think that the Congress should direct the establishment and maintenance of such a reserve fund may be set forth more specifically as follows:

(a) In receiving level-rate premiums for converted insurance from the soldier in the earlier years of the insured's life the Government takes from him more money than necessary to cover the cost of the protection granted to him during those years. This excess or reserve morally and equitably belongs to the insured and is held by the Government for his benefit. It is in a sense a trust fund, which the Government should use not for its own expenses but for the benefit of the insured. Moral obligation, as well as sound insurance practice, requires the Government to invest this reserve fund in such a way as to secure the highest interest obtainable consistent with safety.

(b) By using such a reserve fund for the purchase of farm-loan bonds issued by the Federal land bank an interest return substantially equal to 4½ per cent could be secured with perfect safety. At the same time one of the Government's most admirable economic agencies would be aided.

(c) The history of fraternal insurance organizations which failed to provide in early years a reserve fund shows what would be the effect of a failure on the part of the Government to set aside a reserve to support the converted insurance granted under the war-risk insurance act. If premium receipts should be applied in payment of current claims under matured insurance, with no setting aside of a reserve, the amount of the appropriations that would be required of Congress would at first, relatively speaking, be misleadingly small and would later become inordinately large, in short, sound economic theory, as well as the considerations of simple justice mentioned in (a) above, require the maintenance of a reserve.

2. Enlargement of permitted class of beneficiaries: Section 402 provides that in case the permitted beneficiaries of the insured die before the insured, or before they have received all of the 240 installments payable after his death, the installments remaining unpaid shall be forfeited to the Government, only the reserve value, if any, being payable to the estate of the insured. This was a wise and fair provision in the case of war-time term insurance. As the Government was giving to the insured the extra cost of insurance due to war hazards, there was no unfairness in declaring that it would not pay if the soldier's immediate dependents should have failed, but the same considerations do not apply to the converted insurance carried by the soldier under peace-time conditions, and for which he pays in full. It is only reasonable that the soldier who pays in full for his insurance should be given a wider selection of beneficiaries among his relatives, and it is but simple justice that he should receive in full the insurance he pays for without fear of forfeiture in case no person within the permitted class survives him. The proposed bill attached hereto enlarges the class of permitted beneficiaries so as to include uncles, aunts, nephews, and nieces of the insured. It further provides that if no such person within the enlarged class of beneficiaries survives the insured, the commuted value of the installments remaining unpaid shall become a part of the estate of the insured, but if the surviving beneficiaries within that class die before receiving all of the installments payable, then the commuted value of the unpaid installments shall become payable to the estate of the last surviving member of the permitted class. It is to be noted that the amount payable in such cases to the estate of the insured or of the last surviving beneficiary is the commuted value of the unpaid installments, and not merely the reserve of the policy, which alone is payable under the existing provisions of the act.

I am satisfied that the legislation proposed is entirely consistent with the purpose of the act and essential to the successful administration of those provisions requiring the conversion of the annual term insurance into other forms of insurance suitable to the peace-time needs of insured soldiers and sailors. This opinion is supported by the advice of the best insurance experts in this country, who, after careful study during many weeks of all the problems involved, and having special regard for the best interests of the men in the military and naval service, have incorporated some of the provisions of the proposed legislation in the recently completed policy forms for converted insurance. If these policies are to be issued as drawn and the work of conversion thereunder to begin, it is necessary for the Congress to pass the legislation proposed, and it is respectfully requested that this be done at the earliest possible day.

Sincerely, yours,

CARTER GLASS,
Secretary.

Hon. F. M. SIMMONS,
Chairman Committee on Finance,
United States Senate.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think the Clerk has read far enough to cover the contested points in the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the letter may be printed in the Record.

Some Members have said that this bill has no chance of becoming a law. I am informed that the bill is already enrolled, and that as soon as it is passed it is ready to go to the press. This bill is vitally important to the carrying on the work of the war-risk insurance. It is up to the House whether it will pass it.

Mr. MANN. Is there to be no explanation of the bill at all?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I will explain it.

Mr. RAYBURN. The letter which has been read is a very full statement of the reasons for the passage of the bill. It is presented just as it was written at the War Risk Insurance Bureau for the signature of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman asks to have the letter printed in the Record with only a part of it having been read.

Mr. RAYBURN. I stated that the controverted parts of the bill, as I understood, had been read in the letter; and I ask that the remainder may be printed in the Record.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, which I do not intend to do, I want to call attention to the fact that in the debate on the Diplomatic and Consular bill yesterday I addressed the House and asked leave to revise and extend my remarks. These facts do not appear in the Record this morning. There is no reference to my remarks. The statement that I addressed the House and that my remarks would appear hereafter, which should have been included in the Record, was omitted. I ask that that correction be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas to print the remainder of the letter?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the courtesies of the day and its purpose have demanded that before beginning on the bill, in which I have great interest, I should have the pleasure of yielding four minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress now closing will be written in history as the most notable in the annals of the Republic thus far. Its opening witnessed the declaration which threw the deciding strength of the Republic into the greatest war of all times. That act saved civilization. The progress of the Congress witnessed the most far-reaching grants of Executive war authority ever given by a free people, the most stupendous appropriations, the greatest tax levies in all history. These were the major and dominating notes of the symphony of the Sixty-fifth Congress, through which ran the chords of harmonious and patriotic cooperation. Who shall say that the softening of the note of insistent contention, the substitution of patriotism for partisanship, was not in some measure due to the fact that this Congress was honored and favored above all the Congresses that preceded it by the gracious influence of womanhood in its membership. [Applause.] It was inevitable in the development of a broader and truer democracy that eventually the Congress should number women among its Members. It was remarkable that this demonstration of a truer democracy should occur in the fateful days of this Congress. How fortunate for the country and for womanhood that the first of her sex to occupy a seat in this great legislative body, to become conspicuous in the eyes of the country and the world as a woman legislator, was one so thoroughly womanly, so richly endowed with the charms of feminine grace and modesty, so reasonable, and yet so capable and courageous as the lady from Montana. [Applause.] The lady from Montana leaves the House on her own motion and of her own accord—a proper and ladylike manner of departure—and she leaves it better for her influence. [Applause.] She has performed conspicuous service to her country in proving the wisdom of that broadening of the democracy of representative government which her presence here represents. She has rendered a great and lasting service to her sex in proving that womanly grace is not incompatible with public service. [Applause.] She has made us all her debtor by her gracious influence here. The House parts with its woman Member with sincere regret and unites in best wishes for the future success, health, and happiness of our colleague, the lady from Montana. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, after this very pleasant episode I come to this bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield me five minutes? I want to yield to the gentleman from Colorado, and he will yield to the lady from Montana.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the lady from Montana be recognized for the five minutes yielded to me. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker and fellow colleagues, two years ago you greeted me very cordially, and my thought at that time was the hope that you might feel kindly when I left; that my conduct would be such that you would be glad I was here. No woman has ever received the kindly and gentle treatment that the men in this House have given to me. You have made every step as easy as it was possible for you to make it, so that every moment has been one of pleasure, an opportunity, and, I hope, development.

I am sorry to leave you before the women of this Nation are enfranchised, but I leave to you, the Members of the Sixty-fifth Congress who will be Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress, the great trust of enfranchising the women of this country. I want you to know that I love you, the Sixty-fifth Congress, and I shall never forget you. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 16 minutes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there are two sections in this bill. The first is absolutely unnecessary and wrong and the second one very grievously wrong.

The war-risk insurance act had provided very carefully by section 404 that the soldiers' term insurance, that is only good for a year at a time, can be converted not before the termination of the war and not later than five years thereafter into ordinary insurance, for life, 20 years, and so forth. This first section of this bill provides a modification of section 402 but changes it in very few respects. It adds the words "uncle, aunt, nephew, or niece" to the list of beneficiaries that can be named in case of converted insurance. If the soldier dies leaving no beneficiaries, the old law provided that his estate should get the value of the policy of insurance, whereas this bill provides that all remaining payments shall be commuted and paid to that estate. This is an enlargement of the contracts of war-

risk insurance, which run into thirty or forty billion dollars and is a real drain on the Government.

This is proposed upon the suggestion that the converted insurance will be paid for in full as it would be paid to an insurance company. I do not know how the Secretary of the Treasury came to sign some clerk's certificate that said that, because the Government does not get full payment for this insurance. It does the whole insurance business free of all charge for expenses, which generally amounts to 10 per cent of the annual outgo. It also, besides that, takes the insurance not only at rates below what an insurance company would take, but it insures the life of a man who may have come out of the war broken down in health, and it gives him his insurance without a medical examination. If he outlives the 240 payments it goes on paying him for life without making any calculations on these extra payments.

This contract of insurance is largely a gift, and there is no reason why this gift should be enlarged without necessity. There is no new plan, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] suggests, in this section needed to make it workable. The old section is exactly the same as the new, except adding the uncle, the aunt, or the niece, and also the substitution of the commutation of unpaid allotments for the value of the insurance, which value of the insurance, as they say, is what is always paid by any insurance company. This bill adds to the losses to be paid out, although the soldier had not paid for the original provision. There is no reason for section 1.

Section 2, on the other hand, will work a great and grievous wrong on the United States. By section 402, as above, the United States agrees to a calculation of interest on all premiums and to account for them with $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, which is the usual interest allowed by any insurance company. There may be "dividends from gains and savings"; that is to say, if the death rate happens to be smaller than in the tables of mortality there will be a profit in the hands of the Government, which can be divided. The Secretary of the Treasury forgets this, and says that gains and savings could only be made if the Government invests a reserve fund and gets higher interest than $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

That is not true. There can be a profit without keeping a reserve fund. The calculation is entirely independent of the funds on hand, and if the mortality proves less there is a gain. He also says that a reserve fund is necessary, because friendly companies have failed for want of one. But the Government needs no reserve fund to back it up. The Government can pay death losses when they come. When we need taxes as much as we do for other purposes, it is idle to pile up a fund and invest it in farm-loan bonds or in Government securities. Such reserve is absolutely unnecessary and is absolutely oppressive to the taxpayer, and I protest against this system.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] wants to speak on this subject, but I want to say to the House that this bill does not at all aid the war-insurance act. It only changes the beneficiaries to whom the amount may be paid and the amount to be so paid. The changes put more charge on the United States and are absolutely unnecessary, and to order a reserve fund to be accumulated by the Government is absolutely unjust.

I append a memorandum of the changes made by this bill in the section—matter struck out in parentheses and new matter in italic:

SEC. 402. That the director, subject to the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall promptly determine upon and publish the full and exact terms and conditions of such contract of insurance. The insurance (shall not be assignable and shall not be subject to the claims of creditors of the insured or of the beneficiary. It) *until converted* shall be payable only to a spouse, child, grandchild, parent, brother, or sister, and also during total and permanent disability to the injured person, or to any or all of them: *Provided, That in the case of converted insurance, the permitted class of beneficiaries shall include in addition to the foregoing an uncle, aunt, nephew, or niece.* The insurance shall be payable in 240 equal monthly installments. Provisions for maturity at certain ages, for continuous installments during the life of the insured or beneficiaries, or both, for cash, loan, paid-up and extended values, dividends from gains and savings, and such other provisions for the protection and advantage of and for alternative benefits to the insured and the beneficiaries as may be found to be reasonable and practicable, may be provided for in the contract of insurance, or from time to time by regulations. All calculations shall be based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent (per annum), except that no deduction shall be made for continuous installments during the life of the insured in case his total and permanent disability continues more than 240 months. Subject to regulations, the insured shall at all times have the right to change the beneficiary or beneficiaries of such insurance without the consent of such beneficiary or beneficiaries, but only within the classes herein provided. If no beneficiary within the permitted class be designated by the insured, either in his lifetime or by his last will and testament, or if the designated beneficiary does not survive the insured, the insurance shall be payable to such person or persons within the permitted class of beneficiaries as would under the laws of the State of the residence of the insured be entitled to his personal property in case of intestacy. (If) *In the case of converted insurance, if no (such) person*

within the permitted class survive the insured, (then) there shall be paid to the estate of the insured an amount equal to the (reserve) commuted value (if any of the insurance at the time of his death, calculated on the basis of the American Experience Table of Mortality and $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest in full of all obligation under the contract of insurance.) of the installments remaining unpaid, calculated at the rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest; but, if one or more such persons shall survive the insured and shall have died before receiving all of the installments payable, there shall be paid to the estate of the last surviving person within the permitted class an amount equal to the commuted value of the installments remaining unpaid, calculated at the rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining? The SPEAKER. The gentleman has eight minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to call the attention of the House to the death of a former Member of this House, David Henry Mercer. When a Member of this body dies in the service appropriate resolutions are passed and an adjournment of the day's proceedings is taken out of respect for the distinguished dead. Later a day is set apart when his more intimate colleagues gather and in formal speech recite the history of his life, outstanding elements of his character, and give generous estimate of his reputation left behind.

To those who were called by their people to grace this Chamber with their presence and participate in the deliberations and contentions of this the greatest legislative body on earth, and who survive their service, formal proceedings are not had in their memories and would under the nature of things be impracticable. But when a Member who has served long and with distinction and is called from that private life to the one beyond, I deem it not inappropriate to call attention to the fact of the passing of that one who was once a factor here. These considerations prompt me at this hour in this Congress, soon to expire, to remind my colleagues that Hon. David Henry Mercer, Congressman in the Fifty-third, Fifty-fourth, Fifty-fifth, and Fifty-sixth Congresses—1893 to 1903—from the second district of Nebraska, departed this life in the city of Omaha on the 7th of January, 1919.

Former Congressman Mercer was born at Benton City, Iowa, July 9, 1857. He was a son of Capt. J. J. Mercer, a veteran of the Civil War, and one of Nebraska's prominent Masons. Capt. Mercer brought his family to Brownsville, Nebr., in 1866, where David attended and graduated at the public schools.

He was one of the early students of the Nebraska State University, graduating therefrom in 1880. That great institution has kept pace with the progress of its early graduates. It has now thousands of students where there were then less than hundreds.

He later took a law course at Ann Arbor. He did not long practice law, but, moving to Omaha, the State metropolis, he continued the political activity started by his election when at Brownsville to the secretaryship of the Republican State central committee, of which organization he was twice chairman. He held under President Harrison the assistant United States marshalship and special master in chancery.

His office-holding career really began in 1892, when as the Republican candidate he was elected from the then now second congressional district. Three times he was triumphantly re-elected. In 1902 he was defeated by Hon. GILBERT M. HITCHCOCK, now senior Senator from Nebraska.

Nebraska, as has been the case with most young and developing States, has not favored long incumbency of office. At the time of his retirement his incumbency of this House represented the high tide for Nebraska. It has never been exceeded since except once, and that by the eminent jurist and illustrious and faithful statesman, Hon. M. P. KINKAID, who has represented the sixth district for 16 years and has a reelection to his credit.

Omaha was then, as now, the large factor of the second district, an ambitious, growing city. Governmental activities, always desirable to great cities, were of course in request. Mercer was practical in his representation of a district which demanded practical results. Omaha and other western communities fared well under his chairmanship of the Public Buildings Committee.

He was of those who believed that in every important community of the country there should be a suitable building for the housing of the Government's post office, land office, custom-house, and courts. He believed that the exhibition of the American flag over them was a daily lesson of patriotism, which the youth and others of the land needed. There is less criticism of this principle than we have heretofore heard and properly so.

The Omaha Bee, of January 11, 1919, said, among other things: "While in Congress he obtained recognition and an appropriation for the Trans-Mississippi Exposition at Omaha and was active in furthering the interests of his district. He introduced the first postal savings bill in Congress."

In and out of office, Mercer emphasized the personal factor in the equation of politics and legislation. His personality was always pleasing, conversation whole hearted, and always engaging. He bound friends and colleagues to him so that when friends were needed they were soon in evidence. In this way he did much for his district and State.

After his retirement from Congress, he made Washington his home until a short time before his death. In the summer of 1918 he became an unsuccessful candidate for the Republican nomination for United States Senator.

He leaves one child, a daughter, who with his many friends in Nebraska and throughout the Nation mourn the death of one who in his time was a factor in the large affairs of his State and Nation.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, this bill should be amended or it should fail. So far as the war-risk insurance feature of the bill is concerned, I have no objection to it whatever, but here is a provision in section 405 that these reserve funds must be invested in Federal farm-loan bonds.

I object to this part of section 405, "and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to invest the said reserve fund, or any part thereof, in farm-loan bonds issued by the Federal land banks." That Federal farm-loan act is a farce and has so proven to be. It is the greatest blue-sky scheme ever promoted by a national government.

Congress appropriated about \$9,000,000 to start with to establish the banks, and we appropriated a quarter of a million dollars a short time ago to pay running expenses.

The loans made by the Federal farm-loan banks are such loans generally as prudent bankers and money lenders will not make. The Federal farm-loan banks are only getting such loans as no wise, prudent money lender will take.

Last year Congress appropriated \$200,000,000 from the Treasury of the United States, largely the money obtained from the sale of Liberty bonds, to keep these banks running. The Secretary of the Treasury was authorized then to buy these farm-loan bonds because the public did not buy them.

They have gone into the Treasury of the United States and taken \$200,000,000 of money contrary to law, in my opinion, to place in those banks—money that was raised under the pretense of carrying on this war. It was taken contrary to law, I say, from the purpose for which it was raised and diverted to these banks.

The Government does not guarantee the payment of 1 cent of the farm-loan bonds. An attempt was made to amend the \$200,000,000 bill in January, 1918, to make the Government guarantee the payment of farm-loan bonds, but it was voted down. The promoters of the Federal farm-loan act are now trying to whip the devil around the stump in another way. They can not induce Congress to guarantee the bonds, so they want to require the Government to buy these unguaranteed bonds. When losses occur, the Government then being the owner of bonds, would be compelled to stand the loss just as much as if it had guaranteed them. I denounce such methods as unbusinesslike. Congress ought not to authorize investment of public money in bonds which it had refused to guarantee.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I have only a few minutes. I would like to yield, but I can not. I say, gentlemen, this provision of this law is for the sole purpose of aiding the Federal farm-loan banks to dispose of their bonds which the law says are not guaranteed by the Government, although the brokers of the country are to-day sending out notices offering those bonds for sale with circulars which say that the bonds are guaranteed by the Government. That is not true. That provision of section 405 should be stricken out or the resolution should fail or the Federal farm-loan act repealed. It is a fraud on the taxpayers of this country—

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. Does not the gentleman know that the directors of the Federal Farm Loan Board claim that they would have no trouble at all in selling bonds if the Secretary of the Treasury would permit them to offer them for sale in open market competition with Liberty bonds?

Mr. FORDNEY. The directors of the Federal farm-loan banks say more than their prayers when they make that statement.

Mr. NORTON. They state that the Secretary of the Treasury has directed them not to offer these bonds for sale in competition with Liberty loan bonds, and that is the real reason why the farm-loan bonds have not been sold.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not care what the Secretary of the Treasury or the directors of the Federal Farm Loan Board say about this system. I know that they are offering them for sale and that they have at numerous times offered them for sale within the last month. They do not advertise them in the newspapers, but they send large four-page circulars to investors by mail describing the bonds as "instrumentalities of the Government" and soliciting business. These circulars state that the bonds may be obtained at the Federal land banks. These bonds offered for sale are Federal land bank bonds. I have been particular and specific to show conclusively that the gentleman has been misinformed with regard to the activities of the Farm Loan Board and its attempts to sell bonds. I know that they have loaned money on farms in the country at much above the value of the property, and the Government will never get the money back. It is a fraud. I know a piece of land that sold for \$3 an acre, and the Federal farm-loan bank loaned \$15 an acre on it, and it would not sell to-day for \$5 an acre, and that is the kind of loans they are getting sometimes. I tell you this bill should be defeated. It should not be permitted to be enacted into law with this included.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

Mr. FORDNEY. Has my time expired?

The SPEAKER. No; the Chair thought the gentleman had quit. The gentleman has four minutes.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield.

Mr. DENISON. Under the rule can we offer an amendment to this bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. No, sir; you can not. This prohibition has been prearranged.

Mr. DENISON. We can not offer any amendment?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; you can not. If it were subject to amendment, and an amendment were offered, the gentleman who presents this well knows that provision would go out of the bill. If the facts can be presented to the Members of this House this bill will fail.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The objection the gentleman has to the bill is the direction to invest the funds in the farm-loan bonds?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir; and the only objection I have to the bill is that it directs the Government to invest in these Federal farm-loan bonds; that is, the insurance reserve funds. It should be free, absolutely, from any such direction.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Why the Government should keep a reserve for its own security I do not see.

Mr. FORDNEY. The purpose is to invest this reserve fund and receive some interest upon that money while it is lying there to be used, but there are many other good securities in the country in which that money could be invested and not in a fake proposition.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. And the Government does not need to keep a single dollar of it.

Mr. FORDNEY. No; it is for the sole purpose of continuing in existence this Federal farm-loan law.

Thoughtful and careful people everywhere counsel economy in living and caution about investment in this time of high taxes and inflated prices. The Treasury Department urges us all to save our money to buy thrift stamps and help pay the war debt. The Federal Farm Loan Board takes exactly the opposite course. They urge people to borrow money to place mortgages on their farms. With the aid of traveling lecturers, Chautauqua speakers, special newspaper writers, and others, farmers are told that Federal farm-loan bank mortgages never have to be paid or that they pay themselves off. Many are led into borrowing money for land speculation or to invest in automobiles and nonproductive improvements. One of the popular phrases of these mortgage promoters is "the farmer is learning that the dollar is something to be spent and not a thing to be hoarded."

Mr. Speaker, a period of depression followed the Civil War, when farmers found it a hardship to pay debts incurred during the war period of high prices. It may be that debts contracted when wheat is \$2.26 a bushel will be hard to pay after the prices drop. I think the Federal Farm Loan Board could do a greater service to the country by urging people to refrain from going into debt rather than by inviting reckless borrowing.

There is an endless chain of schemes for reaching the Treasury to keep the farm-loan system going. In addition to the large appropriations made to pay its expenses, a bill was messaged over from the Senate Saturday appropriating \$50,000,000 for a revolving fund to be used at any and all times to buy farm-loan bonds. This section 405 in the war-risk insurance bill is another sample of the activity of the promoters of the system.

The tax exemption of the bonds causes a loss to the National Treasury and it has injured the credit of the country, because farm-loan bonds bear higher rates of interest than Liberty bonds and enjoy greater exemption from taxation. This final attempt at the eve of adjournment to turn over the soldiers' insurance funds to bolster up this impractical plan ought to be defeated by a unanimous vote.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order, and not to be taken out of the time of the gentleman from Michigan, and there will be no clock turning back, either.

Mr. FORDNEY. Gentlemen, the money that I have mentioned, appropriated by Congress and taken out of the Treasury without authorization—

Mr. MANN. If there is an attempt to turn back the clock there will be trouble.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MANN. I do not propose to have the clock turned back to pass a bill. I stopped that once when we wanted to pass a bill.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, what I wished to say when I was interrupted—

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I presume the gentleman is talking for one purpose only, and that is to talk this bill to death. It is a rather long eight minutes, anyhow. Of course, if the gentleman wants to kill this bill—

Mr. FORDNEY. Does the gentleman wish to withdraw the bill? I am told the gentleman wishes to withdraw the bill, is that so?

Mr. RAYBURN. I desire to make a statement. I say it looks—

Mr. FORDNEY. No; not in my time; I do not yield.

Mr. MANN. There is no chance to pass the bill in 15 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentlemen on that side have filibustered against it. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the bill.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman wishes to withdraw the bill—

Mr. RAYBURN. I have.

Mr. MANN. It does not require unanimous consent.

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman time enough for that.

Mr. WELTY. He has already done it.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have withdrawn it about three times.

Mr. WALSH. The Speaker had not announced it.

THANKS TO THE SPEAKER.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Speaker call to the chair the former Speaker of this House, Mr. JOSEPH G. CANNON.

The SPEAKER. Mr. CANNON will please come forward.

Mr. CANNON took the chair amidst loud applause, the Members rising.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a highly privileged resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 625.

Resolved, That the cordial thanks of this House are presented to the Hon. CHAMP CLARK, its honored and distinguished Speaker, for the able, impartial, courteous, and dignified manner in which he has presided over its deliberations and performed the arduous and important duties of the Speakership during the present term of the Congress now about to end.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour there is no time for me to make any remarks, and I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was unanimously agreed to by a rising vote.

Speaker CLARK resumed the chair amid great applause, the Members rising.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, this is four times in succession, at intervals of two years, that Mr. MANN has offered a resolution similar to this one. Four times I have thanked the House for these final resolutions, and three or four times for occasional resolutions of the same sort.

I take infinite pride in the fact that I have been Speaker of this House for eight years. Mr. Speaker CANNON and myself have served longer consecutively than any other two Speakers. [Applause.] Henry Clay was elected six times, resigned twice, and served 10 years and 245 days, but he did not serve as many consecutive years at any one time as Mr. Speaker CANNON and myself. It is a strange historic fact that every day that Henry Clay ever served in the House he was Speaker of it.

I take great pride especially in this Sixty-fifth Congress. No difference what critics say, it has done more important work

than any other two Congresses put together that ever served the United States. I heard Mr. SHERLEY say not long ago that, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for one year, he had been instrumental in appropriating more money than had been appropriated before since the foundation of the Government. That is a remarkable record.

And I want to say, and I want the news to go forth, that in this Congress, with such tremendous burdens to bear, the Republicans acted as patriotically and as faithfully as the Democrats. [Applause.]

The duties of the Speaker are very largely judicial. No man can afford to be unfair in the Speaker's chair. No Speaker can afford to make a ruling for a temporary emergency that he is not willing to stick to and stick by on all similar occasions.

I have not words to express my gratitude for the very handsome, friendly, and pleasant way in which this House has treated me. I hope my successor will have as pleasant a time in the Speaker's chair as I have had for the two years ensuing.

The pendulum swings first one way and then the other. The first House of which I was Speaker had 65 majority; the next one had such a majority that we hardly ever counted it; the third one had 35 majority; and this one had none. [Laughter.]

In separating, as we will in a minute or two, I wish every Member of this House prosperity, happiness, and length of days. And, in the language of Tiny Tim, God bless us everyone. [Applause.]

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 15979. An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9897. An act to authorize the contesting and cancellation of certain homestead entries, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16136. An act to amend the liberty-bond acts and the War Finance Corporation act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11984. An act to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses;

H. R. 13026. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines;

H. R. 15706. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 14894. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 14945. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 15462. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 15796. An act to enable the President to carry out the price guaranties made to producers of wheat of the crops of 1918 and 1919 and to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder;

H. R. 14516. An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; and

H. R. 10891. An act to amend and reenact an act for the establishment of a probation system for the District of Columbia.

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

S. 5236. An act to amend sections 7, 10, and 11 of the Federal reserve act, and section 5172, Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 3797. An act validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes;

S. 5554. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 5566. An act for the relief of the claimants of certain unsurveyed lands in Mississippi County, Ark.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

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

H. R. 9897. An act to authorize the contesting and cancellation of certain homestead entries, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16136. An act to amend the liberty-bond acts and the War Finance Corporation act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 15979. An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11984. An act to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses;

H. R. 13482. An act creating a commission for the maintenance, control, care, etc., of the Perry's victory memorial on Put in Bay Island, Lake Erie, Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 357. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and determine certain claims of the Cherokee Nation against the United States;

H. R. 12860. An act granting to members of the Army Nurse Corps (female) and Navy Nurse Corps (female), Army field clerks, field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, and civil employees of the Army pay and allowances during any period of involuntary captivity by the enemy of the United States;

H. R. 11219. An act providing for the appraisal and sale of the Gig Harbor abandoned military reservation in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13026. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines;

H. R. 13056. An act to grant to citizens of Modoc County, Cal., the right to cut timber in the State of Nevada for agricultural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove such timber to Modoc County, Cal.;

H. R. 13042. An act providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act;

H. R. 12579. An act to grant to citizens of Malheur County, Oreg., the right to cut timber in the State of Idaho for agricultural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove such timber to Malheur County, Oreg.;

H. R. 12082. An act authorizing the sale of certain lands in South Dakota for cemetery purposes;

H. R. 10394. An act to add certain lands to the Minam National Forest, Oreg.;

H. R. 7362. An act to authorize construction of a lock and dam in Old River, in the State of Texas, and the making of improvements enabling the passage of fresh water from a portion of Trinity River above the mouth of Old River into Old River above such lock and dam, and for the protection of rice crops against salt water;

H. R. 5989. An act to grant certain lands to the town of Olathe, Colo., for the protection of its water supply;

H. R. 2012. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Crawford;

H. R. 17. An act to include certain lands in the counties of Modoc and Siskiyou, Cal., in the Modoc National Forest, Cal., and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 358. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the payment of the usual compensation of Representatives in Congress to those Members of the House who have been discharged from their military or naval duties;

H. R. 15495. An act to amend an act to provide for the appointment of a commission to standardize screw threads;

H. R. 11368. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple to the National Lincoln-Douglass Sanatorium and Consumptive Hospital Association (a corporation), of Denver, Colo., for a certain-described tract of land;

H. R. 14894. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 15706. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 14516. An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920;

H. R. 15462. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 15796. An act to enable the President to carry out the price guaranties made to producers of wheat of the crops of 1918 and 1919 and to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder;

H. R. 10891. An act to amend and reenact an act for the establishment of a probation system for the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 14945. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Young, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President, under the requirements of section 9 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 1, 1919, authorizing the appointment of a joint commission on reclassification of salaries, had appointed Mr. JONES, of New Mexico; Mr. HENDERSON, of Nevada; and Mr. SPENCER, of Missouri, as members of the commission on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President, in pursuance of the resolution of the Senate of February 25, 1919, had appointed Mr. REED, of Missouri; Mr. SPENCER, of Missouri; Mr. GORE, of Oklahoma; Mr. HITCHCOCK, of Nebraska; Mr. KENYON, of Iowa; Mr. THOMAS, of Colorado; Mr. SHERMAN, of Illinois; Mr. CURTIS, of Kansas; Mr. KIRBY, of Arkansas; and Mr. NUGENT, of Idaho, as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the Hon. WILLIAM P. BORLAND, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

The message also announced that the Vice President, under the requirements of section 3 of the Post Office appropriation act approved February 28, 1919, authorizing the appointment of a joint commission to investigate the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service with a view to reclassification and readjustment of said salaries on an equitable basis, appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, of Alabama; Mr. MCKELLAR, of Tennessee; Mr. GAY, of Louisiana; Mr. STERLING, of South Dakota; and Mr. McLEAN, of Connecticut, as the members of the commission on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President, under the requirements of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 1, 1919, appointed Mr. SWANSON, of Virginia, and Mr. SMOOR, of Utah, members of the Public Buildings Commission on the part of the Senate.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 5607. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple to the county of Huron, in the State of Michigan, for a certain described tract of land for public-park purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3063. An act for the repair, preservation, care, and future maintenance of the restored historical naval brig *Niagara*, Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry's flagship in the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 4068. An act for the relief of Ella Oliver Richardson and Edmund Richardson, of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 83. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 130. An act to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as the "Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

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

On March 3, 1919:

H. R. 17. An act to include certain lands in the counties of Modoc and Siskiyou, Cal., in the Modoc National Forest, Cal., and for other purposes;

H. R. 357. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and determine certain claims of the Cherokee Nation against the United States;

H. R. 2012. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Crawford;

H. R. 4610. An act to compensate Thomas G. Allen for injuries received while employed in the General Land Office of the United States, and making an appropriation therefor;

H. R. 5989. An act to grant certain lands to the town of Olathe, Colo., for the protection of its water supply;

H. R. 7362. An act to authorize construction of a lock and dam in Old River, in the State of Texas, and the making of improvements enabling the passage of fresh water from a portion of Trinity River above the mouth of Old River into Old River above such lock and dam, and for the protection of rice crops against salt water;

H. R. 9897. An act to authorize the contesting and cancellation of certain homestead entries, and for other purposes.

H. R. 10394. An act to add certain lands to the Minam National Forest, Oreg.;

H. R. 11219. An act providing for the appraisal and sale of the Gig Harbor abandoned military reservation in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11368. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple to the National Lincoln-Douglass Sanatorium and Consumptive Hospital Association (a corporation), of Denver, Colo., for a certain-described tract of land;

H. R. 11984. An act to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses;

H. R. 12082. An act authorizing the sale of certain lands in South Dakota for cemetery purposes;

H. R. 12579. An act to grant to citizens of Malheur County, Oreg., the right to cut timber in the State of Idaho for agricultural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove such timber to Malheur County, Oreg.;

H. R. 12860. An act granting to members of the Army Nurse Corps (female) and Navy Nurse Corps (female), Army field clerks, field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, and civil employees of the Army pay and allowances during any period of involuntary captivity by the enemy of the United States;

H. R. 13026. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines;

H. R. 13034. An act to validate and confirm certain erroneously allowed entries in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 13042. An act providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act;

H. R. 13056. An act to grant to citizens of Modoc County, Cal., the right to cut timber in the State of Nevada for agricultural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove such timber to Modoc County, Cal.;

H. R. 13482. An act creating a commission for the maintenance, control, care, and so forth, of the Perry's victory memorial on Put in Bay Island, Lake Erie, Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 15979. An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16136. An act to amend the liberty-bond acts and the War Finance Corporation act, and for other purposes; and

S. 5236. An act to amend sections 7, 10, and 11 of the Federal reserve act, and section 5172, Revised Statutes of the United States.

On March 4, 1919:

H. R. 14516. An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920;

H. R. 15462. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10891. An act to amend and reenact an act for the establishment of a probation system for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 14894. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 15706. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 14945. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 15796. An act to enable the President to carry out the price guaranties made to producers of wheat of the crops of 1918 and 1919 and to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder;

H. R. 10225. An act striking from the pension roll the name of Jennie M. Heath;

S. 3797. An act validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes; and

S. 5554. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING FACILITIES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints Mr. CLARK of Florida and Mr. LANGLEY on the commission to parcel out the rooms in the new houses that have been built on the Station Plaza and elsewhere.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY.

The SPEAKER. To fill vacancies, the Chair appoints Mr. RIORDAN and Mr. CRISP on the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, at Annapolis.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence, for the remainder of the session, on account of illness in his family.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The hour of 12 o'clock noon having arrived, at which this Congress comes to an end, the Sixty-fifth Congress is declared adjourned without day. [Prolonged applause.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting report of special contract with the Alaskan Engineering Commission, for carrying the mails from Seward to Anchorage, Alaska (H. Doc. No. 1843), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Smiths Creek, Pamlico County, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 1848), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14850) for the relief of John Healy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1185), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11560) for the relief of Warren V. Howard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1186), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAER: A bill (H. R. 16237) granting additional pay to officers, enlisted men, and others serving in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 16238) directing the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge to Daniel B. Stannard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16239) directing the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge to Edson L. Stannard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) expressing the necessity for an extra session to deal with the railroad problem, declaring for the principle of private ownership and operation, urging a generous policy of improvement and betterment by the Railroad Administration, and declaring a principle of operative control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARNER: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Texas, urging the continuation of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MONDELL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, requesting Congress to provide for the immediate construction of a system of Federal highways; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, urging Congress to extend the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, urging Congress to appropriate funds to be used with the State of Wyoming in establishing, equipping, and maintaining a war-veterans' memorial in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, urging Congress to set aside 2,000,000 acres of public lands in

the State of Wyoming, to be known and designated as State lands, to be selected, appraised, and sold or leased by the State and the proceeds to be used in the construction of State highways; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of Burt Bros., Philadelphia, Pa., opposing the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest of the Chestnut Hill Horticultural Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., against the plant-prohibition act, known as quarantine No. 37; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DILL: Petition of Mr. G. H. McNeel and other residents of Wenatchee and Waterville, Wash., urging the immediate release of prisoners now confined for their political, industrial, and religious views; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of R. Hannah, of Hillyard, Wash., and other residents of Hillyard and Spokane, Wash., urging the continued operation of the railroads by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mr. Arthur Miller and other residents of Hillyard, Wash., urging national ownership and Government operation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of Evanston Commercial Association, favoring Federal control of public utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of Marks Arnheim Co., 30 East Forty-second Street; James J. Alexander, 697 Dawson Street; Aitken Sons & Co., 417 Fifth Avenue; American Cyanamid Co.; the Barrett Co.; the Bon Ami Co., 17 Battery Place; A. L. Brown, 68 Nassau Street; Alfred Beyrodt, 759 Hewitt Place; Abraham I. Bluestein, 771 Beck Street; the Brooklyn Trust Co.; the Bronx Board of Trade; Sidney Blumenthal, 395 Fourth Avenue; the Columbia Metal Box Co.; Central Federated Union; the Crockery Board; the Campbell Metzger & Jacobson Co.; M. Cisne, M. D.; the Crowell-Lehnhardt Co.; the Donegal Motor Rug Co.; the E. A. Caldwell Co.; the A. P. Dienst Co.; the Expanded Metal Engineering Co.; the Felt & Tarrant Manufacturing Co.; the Arthur Franstein Co.; the G. B. G. Manufacturing Co.; Rev. J. S. Greenbaum, 764 Beck Street; the Goldwater Co.; B. Hirscherhorn, 749 Beck Street; Robert L. Hooks, 26 East One hundred and twenty-sixth Street; William Hahn; Louis Hemmendinger, 760 Beck Street; C. H. Joyce, 712 Beck Street; Morris Klemberger, 721 Beck Street; the Knickerbocker Ice Co.; I. Kaminsky; the Kohler Industries; Myer Lippmann, 753 Beck Street; B. A. Lee, 753 Beck Street; B. A. Lee, 762 Beck Street; Jacob Leitner, Prospect and Westchester Avenues; Julius Lunn, 750 Beck Street; the Luckenbach Steamship Co.; all of New York City; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of the Merchants' Association; Mrs. Marie MacLean; Max Michaelis; the Metropolitan Tobacco Co.; the

H. Muhlstein Co.; Max Mayer Co.; the Northern Assurance Co.; the New York Business Publishers' Association; the Amsterdam Casualty Co.; the Oil Seeds Co.; the Gardner Binding Co.; B. J. O'Rourke, 76 Lafayette Street; Rodney C. Peterson, 637 East One hundred and seventy-fifth Street; the Periodical Publishers' Association; the Remington Arms Co.; the United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co.; the Gas Engine Power Co.; the Charles L. Seabury Co.; the Sweet-Orr Co.; the Smith-Kaufman Co.; Fred C. Schmidt; the Sargent Co.; the Salant & Salant Co.; the A. Sulka Co.; Olin J. Stephens, One hundred and thirty-sixth Street and Mott Haven Canal; the Tremont Tennis Courts; the United States Casualty Co.; Vought & Williams; E. P. Walker & Co.; West Disinfecting Co., all of New York City; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Downey Shipbuilding Corporation; Babcock & Wilcox Co.; Cowperthwait & Sons; Peter Ferester; the Gas Engine & Power Co.; Capt. W. G. Hawes, 258 Broadway; McKesson & Robbins Co.; Marcus M. Marks, president National Daylight Saving Association; Thomas J. Quinn; S. G. Rosebaum National Cloak & Suit Co.; the Roessler & Hasslacher Chemical Co.; Smith & Kaufman, 19 East Twenty-sixth Street; the Samstag & Hilder Bros.; Mrs. Francis McNeil Bacon, chairman National Civic Federation; A. Duncan Reid; Paul Prager, general secretary the Merchant Ladies' Garment Association; the American Cyanide Co.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolutions of St. Mary's Total Abstinence and Benevolent Society, of Pawtucket, R. I., urging self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Catholic Women's Benevolent Legion of Rhode Island, urging self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Renovo, Pa., favoring Government ownership and operation of all railroads within the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Petition of Bert Warren and four other citizens of Indiana, urging permanent Government ownership of all railways, telegraph, and telephone facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of American citizens of Epirotic extraction, urging consideration of claims of people of northern Epirus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Three Brothers Lodge, No. 235, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging an extension of Government control of railroads of the United States for a period of five years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan: Petition of Detroit, Mich., Republican Club, favoring increase of pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: Petition of Mr. L. L. Ross and 86 other citizens of the State of Indiana, favoring Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The first of these is the fact that the American Medical Association is a voluntary association of physicians. It is not a government agency, nor is it a corporation. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. The second fact is that the American Medical Association is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. The third fact is that the American Medical Association is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public.

The American Medical Association is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public.

The American Medical Association is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public.

The American Medical Association is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public. It is a body of men who are interested in the welfare of the medical profession and the public.