By Mr. SHELTON: A bill (H. R. 5568) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of St. James, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5569) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Buffalo, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5570) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rolla, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 5571) for the relief of Charles Hatch, alias Charles H. Lord; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

386. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition in the case of east Galicia and northern Bukovina, as to their political status; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

387. By Mr. BURROUGHS: Resolution of Concord Lodge, No. 537, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, opposing the repeal of the excess-profits tax and the enactment of a sales or turnover tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

388. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition of women of the diocese of Ohio, Toledo district, urging favorable action on House bill 13334, which aims to prohibit fishing for salmon in the Yukon River; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

389. Also, petition of the Buckeye Producing Co., Toledo, Ohio, to repeal the internal revenue tax now levied on cereal beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

390. By Mr. CRAMTON: Resolution of Knights of Columbus Council, No. 744, Mount Clemens, Mich., indorsing the program of legislation asked by the American Legion of the Sixty-seventh Congress in the interest of disabled veterans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

391. By Mr. CRISP: Petition of citizens of Smithville, Fitzgerald, Montezuma, and Marshallville, in the State of Georgia, protesting against the excessive freight rates, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

392. By Mr. DENISON: Petition of the Cairo Products Co., Cairo, Ill., protesting against the 15 per cent tax levied on cereal beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

393. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petitions of E. F. Kakas & Sons, N. E. Music Trade Association, and A. M. McPhail Piano Co., all of Boston, Mass., relative to taxation matters; also, petition of George Hoyt, of Dorchester, Mass., relative to tax on athletic and sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

394. By Mr. KENNEDY: Memorial of Americans of Ukrainian ancestry residing in Woonsocket, R. I., urging recognition of east Galicia as an independent State, the west Ukrainian republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

395. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Kathleen Byrne, of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

396. Also, petition of Liberty Textile Corporation, of New York, opposing the excess-profits tax and favoring the sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

397. Also, petition of Leroy T. Wells, of Wantagh, N. Y., favoring retirement for emergency officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps the same as the regular officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

398. Also, petition of M. Crowe, of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

399. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, favoring tariff on wood products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

400. Also, petition of Lackawanna Council, No. 2243, Knights of Columbus, Lackawanna, N. Y., favoring relief for disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

401. Also, petition of Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, favoring a duty on all lumber imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

402. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, petitioning the United States Congress to take the necessary steps looking toward the recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

403. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Oneida Brewing Co., of Utica, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the tax on cereal beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

404. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Edison Electric Appliance Co. (Inc.), Chicago, Ill., by Thomas E. Noonan, protesting against sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *April 30, 1921.*

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 28, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Gooding	Lenroot	Sutherland
Broussard	Hale	Lodge	Trammell
Cameron	Harris	McKellar	Underwood
Capper	Harrison	McKinley	Wadsworth
Caraway	Johnson	McNary	Walsh, Mont.
Colt	Kellogg	New	Watson, Ga.
Curtis	Kendrick	Norris	Willis
Dial	Keyes	Robinson	
Fernald	King	Sheppard	
France	Ladd	Spencer	

Mr. KELLOGG. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], who are engaged on a hearing before a subcommittee.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. NICHOLSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] are detained at a committee meeting.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The reading clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. HARRELD, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. SIMMONS answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the instructions of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT, Mr. WATSON of Indiana, Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. SHORTRIDGE, Mr. MCCUMBER, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. ASHURST, Mr. ODDIE, Mr. NORBECK, Mr. NICHOLSON, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. WARREN, Mr. STERLING, Mr. ELKINS, Mr. SHIELDS, Mr. BURSUM, and Mr. CULBERSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. A quorum having appeared, I move that the order to the Sergeant at Arms be rescinded.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 407) granting the consent of Congress to the Trumbull Steel Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of the Sweetwater Beverage Co., of Green River, Wyo., praying for the repeal of tax now levied upon cereal beverages, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ASHURST presented a memorial signed by W. S. Crowe and 102 other citizens of Globe, Ariz., remonstrating against any further suspension of the laws requiring annual labor or assessment work on unpatented mining claims, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. HARRIS presented a telegram of Aaron Holt Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Ware County Post, No. 10, American Legion, both of Waycross, Ga., protesting against the conclusion of any peace treaty with Germany until the return of Grover Cleveland Bergdoll, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Alonzo Richardson, chairman, and Mrs. Irving Thomas, president, representing 1,200 women of the Atlanta Woman's Club, of Atlanta, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for wounded ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Kansas Oil and Gas Producers' Association, held at Independence, Kans., April 11, 1921, favoring a tariff of $1.25 per barrel on foreign crude petroleum and a proportionate duty on foreign refined products of foreign crude petroleum, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 674) to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 9) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills and joint resolution, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1018) to amend an act entitled "An act to give indemnity for damages caused by American forces abroad," approved April 18, 1918 (Rept. No. 10);

A bill (S. 1019) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish free transportation and subsistence from Europe to the United States for certain destitute discharged soldiers and their wives and children (Rept. No. 11);

A bill (S. 1020) for the relief of dependents of Lieuts. Jean Jagou and Fernand Herbert, French military mission to the United States (Rept. No. 12);

A bill (S. 1021) to provide for the exchange of Government lands for privately owned lands in the Territory of Hawaii (Rept. No. 13); and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) authorizing the sale of foodstuffs in the possession of the War Department to any foreign State or Government (Rept. No. 14).

DES MOINES RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I report back favorably with amendments from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 1154) for the construction of a bridge across the Des Moines River at or near the city of Dumas, Mo., and I submit a report (No. 15) thereon. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] is very anxious to have the bill passed. He states that its early passage is imperative. It will take only a few moments to pass it, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were, at the end of line 5, to strike out "double-track" before "bridge," and, in line 6, after the words "Des Moines River," to insert a comma and the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., its successors and assigns, be, and the same is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto, across the Des Moines River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Dumas, Mo., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 1362) granting an increase of pension to George W. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1363) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Helena, Ark., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1364) to amend section 5 of the act approved March 2, 1919, entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 1365) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Forrest City, in the State of Arkansas; and

A bill (S. 1366) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Monticello, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 1367) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Arthur E. Colgate, administrator of the estate of Clinton G. Colgate, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 1368) for the relief of George B. Todd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1369) to appropriate $100,000 for the survey of public lands in Utah; and

A bill (S. 1370) granting to the State of Utah 2,000,000 acres of public land to aid in the maintenance of a system of public roads; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 1371) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the claims of the Omaha Tribe of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 1372) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Haller Nutt, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 1373) to protect the name and insignia of the World War organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 1374) authorizing and directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to provide for the granting of reduced passenger rates by all railroad companies doing an interstate business through the sale of interchangeable mileage books of not less than 1,000 miles; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 1375) to prohibit and punish certain seditious acts against the Government of the United States and to prohibit the use of the mails for the purpose of promoting such acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1376) providing for the placing of Government employees engaged in the enforcement of national prohibition under the civil service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 1377) to amend section 300 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 1378) granting a pension to G. F. Hudson;

A bill (S. 1379) granting an increase of pension to Wade H. Pyle;

A bill (S. 1380) granting a pension to Zania Seal Trent;

A bill (S. 1381) granting a pension to James M. Gibson;

A bill (S. 1382) granting an increase of pension to John B. Haley;

A bill (S. 1383) granting a pension to Fred W. McMeen;

A bill (S. 1384) granting an increase of pension to John F. Haynes;

A bill (S. 1385) granting an increase of pension to C. F. Boyer;

A bill (S. 1386) granting a pension to William D. Davis;

A bill (S. 1387) granting an increase of pension to Delia B. Zell;

A bill (S. 1388) granting a pension to Alfred C. Williams;

A bill (S. 1389) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Chambers;

A bill (S. 1390) granting an increase of pension to John T. Phillips;

A bill (S. 1391) granting an increase of pension to Alexander B. Tadlock;

A bill (S. 1392) granting an increase of pension to Jesse S. Baldwin;

A bill (S. 1393) granting a pension to Israel W. Bennett;

A bill (S. 1394) granting an increase of pension to Eugene E. Scherrer;

A bill (S. 1395) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Brewer;

A bill (S. 1396) granting a pension to Otto Greenlee;

A bill (S. 1397) granting a pension to Minta Jones;

A bill (S. 1398) granting a pension to Vian Bennett;

A bill (S. 1399) granting a pension to D. J. Owens;

A bill (S. 1400) granting an increase of pension to John L. Johnson; and

A bill (S. 1401) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Owen Dennison; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1402) for the relief of Charles M. Gourley; and

A bill (S. 1403) for the relief of Barneybass Eastridge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GERRY:

A bill (S. 1404) for the relief of Philias Cauchon and Zelia Cauchon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 43) to grant authority to continue the use of the temporary buildings of the American Red Cross headquarters in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

MONTAUK TRIBE OF INDIANS.

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 61), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, requested to report to the Senate where the Montauk Tribe of Indians, once in possession of the land known as Long Island, a part of the present State of New York, now reside; whether tribal relations and a tribal organization are still maintained by them; whether, and if so, to what extent any of them are citizens of the United States; whether the tribe, if still existing as such, owns lands within the limits of the United States to which the Indian title has not been extinguished by cession, or otherwise; where such lands, if any, are situate, the extent of the same, by whom they are occupied and by what tenure held, and whether the tribe, or any of its members, are now under the care or custody or are subject to the control of the Interior Department, in any respect, in a manner similar to that of other Indians within the United States.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR WEST VIRGINIA.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I ask unanimous consent to call up and to have considered immediately the bill (S. 694) providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern judicial district of the State of West Virginia. It is an emergency bill, and was reported yesterday unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill read.

The bill was read by title.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from West Virginia say that it is an emergency bill?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will say to the Senator that it is strictly an emergency measure, for the reason that the sitting judge in that district has been paralyzed for a year or more and is absolutely incapacitated for the performance of his duties. As a consequence the business of the district is in very bad shape. The former Attorney General and the present one have strongly recommended the passage of the bill. I repeat, it is an emergency matter in the strictest sense of the word, and I hope the Senator will not object to the consideration of the bill. A similar bill was passed through the Senate the last session, and the measure has been recommended unanimously by the former Judiciary Committee and by the present one.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, section 1, line 9, after the word "district," to insert the words "and the judge so appointed shall be held and treated as the senior judge and shall exercise such powers and perform such duties in that judicial district as may be incident to seniority," so as to make the section read:

That the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the southern judicial district of the State of West Virginia, who shall possess the same powers, perform the same duties, and receive the same compensation and allowance as the present judge of said district, and the judge so appointed shall be held and treated as the senior judge and shall exercise such powers and perform such duties in that judicial district as may be incident to seniority.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from West Virginia whether there is in the bill a provision that upon the demise of the present judge no additional judge shall be appointed?

Mr. OVERMAN. That is covered by the bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is such a provision embodied in section 2 of the bill. That section reads as follows:

SEC. 2. That whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of the district judge for the southern district of West Virginia senior in commission such vacancy shall not be filled, and thereafter there shall be but one district judge in said district.

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

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

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall not long detain the Senate by what I have to say in regard to the pending joint resolution. I can see no reason for consuming much time upon the subject. The question is so simple and so direct that I have been surprised at the vehemence that has been shown and the wide range of the discussion embarked upon in the last day or two by those who are opposed to the measure.

The pending resolution is a joint resolution. It is not a treaty. It is a law. It is to repeal a joint resolution passed by Congress declaring that a state of war existed between the United States and the Imperial Government of Germany and the United States and the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria-Hungary.

There have been intimations here in the debate that Congress was exceeding its powers in the pending resolution. Mr. President, there could be no more complete truism than that that which a legislative body can enact it can also repeal. If we had the power to pass that declaration that a state of war existed—and no one questions that power—we have an equal power to repeal it. The theory that peace can be made only by a treaty has no support in the Constitution that I am aware of, and no support in international law.

The fact that we repeal the declaration of the two Houses in April, 1917, simply is a repeal of an act which we passed, and leaves the situation so that instead of a status of war existing with Germany a status of peace exists. Whatever is to be done in completing that work by treaty must rest with the Executive power, to which belongs the right to initiate and negotiate treaties.

The war with Germany no longer exists as a fact and has not existed since the 11th of November, 1918. This joint resolution simply declares the fact, and that is all it does. The other provisions are also statutory enactments, giving notice to Germany that we shall insist upon all the rights we have under the Versailles treaty and shall hold the alien property funds until all claims against Germany are settled, and incidentally repeals the old treaty with Prussia. The right of Congress to abrogate a treaty directly or indirectly by statute is also unquestioned and has been sustained by the Supreme Court.

With Austria we take the same action. We simply repeal the declaration of a status of war against the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Empire, and that restores the status of peace.

The passage of this law invades no Executive power. It simply declares the law of the United States, which undoubtedly would be considered by the negotiators of any treaty that may follow.

It has been suggested here that we are invading the Executive authority. Mr. President, the cases are many in which Presidents have asked the opinion of the Senate before entering upon negotiations, asked their opinion as to the terms of a treaty before it has been made, and the recognition by the Executive of the share of the Senate in making treaties has been established by many precedents.

The President, in his speech of acceptance last July, declared that he would sign a resolution of this character whenever sent to him. I need not go into any elaborate discussion of the President's attitude. That was very fully covered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] yesterday, but I will read once more what he said in his message of April 12 last:

The United States alone among the allied and associated powers continues in a technical state of war against the Central Powers of Europe. This anomalous condition ought not to be permitted to continue. To establish the state of technical peace without further delay I should approve a declaratory resolution by Congress to that effect, with the qualifications essential to protect all our rights. Such action would be the simplest keeping of faith with ourselves and could in no sense be construed as a desertion of those with whom we shared our sacrifices in war, for these powers are already at peace.

This joint resolution is in exact accord with the policies there laid down and the request there made by the President of the United States. I realize that Senators on the other side have fallen so much into the habit of standing by the rights of the Executive, were they well founded or not, that they are naturally very sensitive if anything seems to intimate that the Senate must not first consult the Executive about any action the Senate chooses to take; but they may rest quite easy on this point. We are invading no right of the Executive. We are acting in accordance with his expressed wishes.

As to our attitude to those powers with which we were associated in the Great War, they have every one of them made peace with Germany. They made peace with Germany on the

28th of June, 1919. They so arranged the treaty and so provided that it came into effect when agreed to by three of the principal allied and associated powers. They have been at peace with Germany, therefore, for nearly two years. Is it to be supposed that we are to continue to remain in a condition of technical war with Germany when all the countries we were associated with in the war have made peace?

They did not ask our leave to make that peace effective. They provided specifically that they could make it without our association or consent. I have no fault to find with their doing so, and no desire to interfere with the terms of the peace which they made; but surely it does not debar us from making peace. They can not expect us to remain at war while they have all made peace; and if we choose to make peace with Germany by a treaty, which will probably follow this joint resolution, surely we are not betraying them. They do not expect it, Mr. President. They do not expect us to remain in a state of technical war with Germany. They know that that is an impossible situation and can not continue. The President made it entirely clear in his message, and it is also made evident by the notes that have been written by the Secretary of State in connection with these matters that we have no thought of abandoning the interests of those who were associated with us in the Great War against Germany.

In fact, treaties with Germany alone would be inadequate, as the President has stated; but the passage of this resolution unties our hands. England has been trading with Germany, has been represented in Berlin, has been represented in Vienna, and I suppose in the other fragments of the Austrian Empire which have been set up as independent States. Are we to remain unrepresented while all the other countries are represented? Are we to have our trade hampered, without official representation, without consuls, operating I believe through Spain, which represented our interests in Germany during the war?

We ought to put this country on the same basis of trade and commerce that France and Italy and England and all the other nations have had for two years. That is one of the practical results which make this joint resolution of immediate importance; but the most important thing of all is to get rid of the totally abnormal and anomalous situation in which we now are.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question at that point?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am somewhat disturbed over a proposition which possibly the Senator can make clear to me. I am in hearty accord with him in his desire to bring the technical state of war to an end. But in this resolution he proposes to repeal the act of April 6, 1917, which does create some difficulties in my mind. Why should it not be sufficient to say that the state of war declared by Congress on April 6, 1917, to exist between the Imperial German Government and the Government and people of the United States is hereby declared at an end?

Mr. LODGE. That is what it does say, in those terms.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But it says more. It repeals the act. I have omitted the declaration that the act declaring that a state of war existed on that date is repealed, because that is a fact, and have suggested what we are all trying to get, as I understand it, namely, that the condition declared on April 6 to exist is now at an end.

Mr. LODGE. That is a fact, unquestionably. But, of course, I think the Senator will admit that Congress has a right to repeal what it has enacted.

Mr. TOWNSEND. There is no doubt about that. But do we want to do it?

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that is the most direct way of doing what we want to do. The Senator's suggested change brings the same result; but I think it is better to repeal it directly, rather than indirectly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That necessarily carries embarrassments which may have occurred between April 6 and this hour. We are making our repeal date back as of April 6—that is, that the condition which existed when that resolution was passed is at an end, whereas if we said directly that the condition declared on April 6 to exist, namely, a state of war, is at an end now, and leave it there, it would be better.

Mr. LODGE. The language of the resolution is—

> That the joint resolution of Congress passed April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist * * * and making provisions to prosecute the same, be, and the same is hereby, repealed, and said state of war is hereby declared at an end.

It seems to me that is the most direct way of doing it. Our laws are not like the traditional laws of Lycurgus and Solon—never to be repealed at any time. They are, of course, open to repeal at any time. A treaty of peace in substance repeals any declaration of war that has been made. But this is wholly within the power of Congress, and the purpose is, of course, to get rid of the technical state of war. It has seemed to me all along that this is the most direct way of doing it.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. It seems to me the point that is troubling the Senator from Michigan can be easily explained. We declared a state of war existing, and we prosecuted the war for nearly two years. The fact that we repeal the act does not invalidate or affect in the slightest degree all that was done.

Mr. LODGE. Of course not.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is debatable ground as to what it does. What is the use of repealing it if you declare directly that the state of war is at an end?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not say that would not be sufficient. But how can the repeal of the statute affect all the acts of the Government done under the declaration of war?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, the repeal of a law of any kind does not affect the acts done under the law while it was law. We simply declare the fact that the state of war declared to exist on April 6, 1917, no longer exists. That is all we say, and we put an end to it in that way, by this form of repeal.

Mr. President, I have stated why I think practically it is of value to our trade and commerce, that I think the present condition anomalous. It is in contradiction of the existing fact, and however we do it, we ought to come to the true status, the status of fact; that is, that there is no war, and has not been for two years, between this country and the Government of Germany.

I am sure that further negotiations will follow, probably, with those countries who were our associates in the war, as well as with Germany. That is the work, necessarily, of the Executive. This clears the ground, and I have been at a loss to understand the apparent intensity of the opposition to the passage of this resolution, but as I listened to speeches yesterday I came to the conclusion that what causes the feeling about it is that Senators think now that declaring a state of peace with Germany in some way severs the last connection with the league.

Mr. President, the existence of a technical state of war with Germany does not put us back into the league, and we are never going to climb back into it in that way or any other. That league, brought back by Mr. Wilson from Paris, as snarled up with the treaty of peace of Versailles, has been passed upon by the Senate and by the people, and that league, I venture to state, is dead. It is dead for the time being, anyway. It will stay dead, I think, at least four years, and I do not believe that any change of party in this country will ever restore life to that unhappy instrument.

Why should we cling to this beaten, discarded league? Why should we hesitate to clear the ground of one of the remaining obstacles so that we can do something with a free hand to improve the general condition of the world economically and in every other way?

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SPENCER. Will the Senator be good enough to tell me as to whether it is not his understanding that some such resolution as this is not only quite expected by our allies but is viewed with entire complacence by them?

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator came in I stated that was a fact, and I know they all expect that such a resolution will be passed. What they are concerned with is what we do subsequently, how we go out, as a very distinguished representative of France said. "Of course," he said, "we know you can not remain in this technical state of war." Nobody expects it. Nobody thinks that, so far as I know, except the distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle, and not all of them, because some of them are Republicans.

But we might as well dismiss it and get rid of this encumbrance. This is too slender a thread to permit us to think that it will draw us back into the league. But I think it is wiser to accept the decision of the people, which certainly was plain enough. The President made this precise issue in his speech of acceptance. It was used as a foundation of argument throughout the campaign and on every stump. The people of the country absolutely understood the proposition, and when they voted by over 7,000,000 majority for Senator Harding they approved the position he had taken, if votes mean anything, and I think the time has come to clear away this remaining

piece of wreckage of the unhappy attempt to negotiate a peace in Paris.

If that peace satisfies Europe, we are content. We do not desire to interfere with what they want. But we are not going into that league, and this fact has been officially declared. Now, let us get rid of the ruins that remain, make a fresh start, and try to do something in our own way to help the condition of the world as it is at this moment.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat will he yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has just stated that by practically 7,000,000 majority the American people passed on this proposition. Did I understand that he thought that issue was the separate treaty with Germany?

Mr. LODGE. That was one of the issues. It was an issue specifically made by our candidate for the Presidency, and by all our speakers on the stump.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator will recall that there were many very prominent gentlemen, leaders in the Republican Party, who were for the league. I think there were 31 at one time who signed a petition to the proleague Republicans in the country and the independent people in the country, stating that the best way to adopt the treaty of Versailles and to get into the League of Nations was through the election of Harding and Coolidge, and among those numbers who signed, and who made speeches, none was more prominent and none expressed himself stronger as to that proposition than the present Secretary of State.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I have in mind the same letter to which the Senator from Mississippi refers, which was headed by Mr. Root——

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. And I think drafted by him, it did not state just what the Senator from Mississippi states. If the Senator will get it and read it, I think he will find it is a different proposition.

Mr. HARRISON. I have it in my possession, and I shall read it before this debate is over.

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator will. It is very good reading, especially in its conclusion.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not understand the remark of the Senator a moment ago, and I do not know how the Senator feels toward the other statement I made, that the present Secretary of State, in his speeches to the people in that campaign, did state that one of the best ways to get the treaty of Versailles ratified and the United States into the League of Nations was through the election of Harding and Coolidge.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I remember most conspicuously in the statements and speeches of the distinguished Secretary of State that he more completely destroyed article 10 and the body of the league than anyone else, I think, who spoke.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, well, the Senator has not answered my question yet.

Mr. LODGE. I have not the speech here, but I shall be very glad to get it and read it.

Mr. HARRISON. I have it, and I will get it and have it read to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator will have all the reading done in his own time.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SHIELDS. Did I understand the Senator to assert that the treaty was the issue in the campaign upon which the people passed? As I understood the proposition, the question was whether the United States should become a member of the League of Nations as contained in the German treaty.

Mr. LODGE. That was the question, of course.

Mr. SHIELDS. That we should agree to part 1 of the treaty, which contained the covenant of the league.

Mr. LODGE. It was absolutely that.

Mr. SHIELDS. That, I understand, was the proposition proposed by the then Chief Executive at the Jackson Day dinner here in Washington, to be decided in a great and solemn referendum.

Mr. LODGE. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. SHIELDS. That I understood to be the paramount issue presented by the Democratic platform, and also the issue which was presented in the interview of President Wilson to the New York World, and subsequently delivered in a statement to some 15 Republicans and nondescripts who favored the league who went to the White House to hear and give it publicity.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. SHIELDS. I did not hear any of his speeches, but that was made the chief issue by the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, Gov. Cox, as reported in the public press.

Mr. LODGE. So I understood. I did not read all of his speeches.

Mr. SHIELDS. The issue was whether or not we should become a member of the league. I remember on one occasion reading with some interest a speech Gov. Cox made at Youngstown, Ohio, or rather a remark in a speech there, when heckled by some one in the crowd as to his opinion of those Democratic Senators who opposed the League of Nations or favored reservations to it, in which he is reported to have said, "If one of them was a candidate for the United States Senate against a Republican who was for the league, I would vote for the Republican and make speeches for him." I thought that was presenting the issue in a pretty clear-cut manner. That issue was settled by a majority of about 7,000,000 out of about 27,000,000 ballots that were cast in the solemn referendum. The people have spoken, and their voice is the law and should be obeyed.

Now, that was the covenant of the League of Nations as I understand it, but that inevitably carries with it the Versailles treaty. Our President when negotiating that treaty, while on a visit to America pending those negotiations, announced that when that treaty came to America the covenant of the League of Nations would be so intertwined and interwoven with it that it would be impossible to dissect one from the other. That statement was carried out literally, ingeniously, and forcefully. The authority of the League of Nations so permeates and honeycombs the Versailles treaty that it is impossible for it to exist and be executed without the League of Nations. Thus the infirmities of the covenant of the League of Nations affect the treaty to such an extent and so inextricably as to make the document, the treaty proper, hopelessly and incurably bad, and the only possible thing to do is to scrap the entire document, in my opinion. As to apprehension that the resolution will have that effect, I have understood that that is the object of it, and that is why I am going to vote for it.

I can see no objection to giving the peace, which is conceded to exist in fact, a legal status. I can see no bad faith to our allies in the war in doing what they have done nearly two years ago. I can see no wrong in giving our nationals the commercial advantages in trading with Germany which our recent allies have engaged in and profited by for more than a year to our injury.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind whatever that the one great central issue of the last campaign was the League of Nations and whether we should enter it or not. This is a resolution subsidiary to the decision made by the people of the United States. There can be no question, I think, as to how they voted and that they voted against the covenant of the League of Nations. That covenant, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, is so intertwined and involved—I wish to give President Wilson the credit of saying that he had involved it knowingly with the treaty of Versailles—that it will require, on the best calculation I have been able to make, at least 72 amendments to the treaty of Versailles to get the League of Nations out of it, and when we have got it out nothing but a shell remains.

I hope we shall do the obvious thing, complete the clearance of the ground and declare the fact that a state of war no longer exists between this country and the Austrian Empire.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Massachusetts has been long in the public service and has broad experience in dealing with matters pertaining to our foreign relations. Does the Senator from Massachusetts recall any other incident in which the Congress of the United States has repealed a declaration of a state of war?

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. ROBINSON On yesterday I submitted some observations and inquiries addressed to the same point as was embraced to-day in the remarks and inquiries of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. The custom prevails of repealing acts of Congress, resolutions, or statutes that have a continuing application. I do not myself know of any instance where Congress has repealed an act or resolution that has performed its functions, as is the case at issue here.

The declaration of war was made as to Germany on the 6th of April and as to Austria-Hungary on the 7th of December, 1917, and the war was brought to a successful conclusion, actual hostilities ceasing, with the signing of the armistice. I am utterly unable to understand the legal effect which the proponents of the joint resolution intend to accomplish by re-

pealing the declaration of war. Many measures passed by Congress of a somewhat extraordinary character, including the espionage act, acts respecting the custody of property belonging to aliens, and other far-reaching measures, were based solely on the existence of a state of war. They were justified by the emergency recognized by the resolution which we are now seeking to repeal.

Is it, in the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts, calculated to strengthen the power of Congress to declare the existence of a state of peace to pass a resolution repealing the resolution under which we recognized the existence of a state of war?

Mr. LODGE. I do not see that the repeal of an act of any kind or of a declaration of war or a state of war has the slightest effect upon what was done under the repealed act.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has Congress the power to declare a state of peace independently of its power to repeal the resolution declaring a state of war?

Mr. LODGE. Congress undoubtedly has the power to repeal anything that it has ever enacted.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then will the Senator from Massachusetts tell the Senate what is the object, what is the motive, what is the inspiring cause of this extraordinary action by which in violation of every precedent of our history we propose to repeal the provision by which we sent millions of American soldiers into battle and expended billions of American dollars?

Mr. LODGE. It has nothing on earth to do with what we did under that resolution of course. The declaration that the existing state of war has come to an end is a matter of fact and we recognize the matter of fact just as we recognized the existence of the state of war. Of course we can repeal anything that we can enact. If we did not have the power to enact it, then we could not repeal it, but we had the power to enact it.

Hitherto in a few cases where we have been at war of course the peace made by treaty has necessarily repealed the act declaring war. The mere form of repealing it does not change anything that has been done under it of course. We are continually repealing acts, and every time we revise the code or the statutes many are declared obsolete and are repealed by Congress, but what was done under them when they were in existence is not repealed or changed in any way.

Mr. ROBINSON. But what, I inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts again, is the legal effect of a repeal of the declaration of war after the war has already been ended?

Mr. LODGE. It will not have the slightest legal effect on anything that has been done.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then why insist upon the passage of the pending joint resolution?

Mr. LODGE. Because we desire to recognize the existing state and put ourselves on a level with the other nations that have already made peace and who did not wait for us. The argument always leads to one thing, that we must stay in a technical state of war because other countries have made peace in another way. It is the old international view that we are having pushed at us again.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Massachusetts has at last admitted that the proposal to repeal the declaration of war can have no legal effect. Now, let me inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts what will be its inevitable moral effect?

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me—and I believe I still have the floor—I said no legal effect on what happened before it was repealed. Of course, it will have a legal effect on the future.

Mr. ROBINSON. The inevitable moral effect of the joint resolution, whatever may be its purpose, repealing the declaration of war when it can have no relation, as the Senator from Massachusetts admits, to anything that has passed, is to encourage our former enemies and to discourage our former allies in their efforts to settle the reparations dispute.

Mr. LODGE. I yielded for a question, and not for a speech, able as it is. I had not intended to hold the floor so long. I have held it much longer than I desired. I recognize that there are many other Senators who desire to speak.

Mr. COLT. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. COLT. We passed the act declaring the United States in a state of war on April 6, 1917.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I stated so—that is, as to Germany.

Mr. COLT. That is all I am talking about.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator had not said so. As to Austria-Hungary, we passed it on December 7.

Mr. COLT. I wish to ask the Senator when, in his view, was the state of war created by that act, and when did it cease?

Mr. ROBINSON. The state of war existed at the time we passed the declaration of war.

Mr. COLT. When did it cease?

Mr. ROBINSON. The nominal state of war continues to exist, in the legal sense, I think.

Mr. COLT. The armistice only suspended the state of war.

Mr. ROBINSON. The armistice terminated actual hostilities.

Mr. COLT. Then, does the Senator concede that the legal state of war still exists?

Mr. ROBINSON. I think perhaps it does.

Mr. COLT. If the legal state of war still exists by virtue of the resolution of April 6, 1917, can not the United States, by repeal of that resolution, put itself into a legal state of peace, so far as the United States is concerned?

Mr. ROBINSON. Why, Mr. President, if the Congress has the power to declare a state of peace, the repeal of the resolution declaring a state of war is not necessary and we ought not to make it, for the simple reason that the repeal of a statute that has been executed is usually based upon the ground that the passage of the statute was wrong in the first instance.

Mr. COLT. Oh, no. Now, the Senator from Arkansas knows that we are dealing with very technical questions.

Mr. ROBINSON. We are also dealing with practical questions.

Mr. COLT. A de facto peace and a legal peace are two different propositions. We are in a de facto peace. Now we want to create, if you please, a legal peace. The Senator from Massachusetts——

Mr. ROBINSON. One moment. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. COLT. One moment, if the Senator please. As the Senator from Massachusetts said, and as we all know, we can not create a complete legal peace until Germany by some act, so far as we are concerned, puts herself in a condition of legal peace. Of course, we all know that Congress can repeal any act or resolution that it has passed, and therefore by the repeal of the resolution of April 6, 1917, Congress can place the United States in a condition of legal peace, so far as this country is concerned.

Mr. ROBINSON. I stated that yesterday, as the Senator would know if he had done me the honor to listen to my remarks. I said the Congress could repeal the resolution. But I now ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question. If Congress has the power to declare a state of peace, and thus accomplish all that is intended by the proponents of the resolution to be accomplished, why repeal the resolution declaring the existence of a state of war?

Mr. COLT. Because the repeal of the resolution declaring a state of war is the simplest and most effective way to reach, technically, a legal state of peace.

Mr. ROBINSON. But you also declare the state of peace. Why repeal the declaration if you have the power to declare a state of peace?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Of course, we have the power to declare peace. We have the power to pass any resolution we choose. We are not forbidden from doing that.

Mr. ROBINSON. If you have the votes you can humiliate the men who made sacrifices in the Great War, you can dishonor the memory of the men who fell in battle, you can bring the name of this Nation into disrepute among the nations of the world, if you have the votes to do it, but I intend that the country shall know what you are doing. You are doing a futile, feeble, and foolish thing, in my opinion, when you repeal the resolution declaring the existence of a state of war after the war has ended.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it has nothing whatever to do with the men who were in the war or anything done under the declaration of war—nothing whatever. It simply recognizes a fact. The trouble on the other side of the aisle is that they still will not recognize facts. They will not recognize that the war is over and that the country is at peace practically, and that their league and their treaty have been beaten, and beaten by the people. Recognize the facts, and let us go on.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I yield now to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator be kind enough——

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, who spoke first.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts be kind enough——

Mr. LODGE. I have yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin, who first rose.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the Senator from Massachusetts about a remark that he made in speaking of the treaty proper, that if the provisions referring to the League of Nations were eliminated from the treaty proper only a shell would be left. That must have been an inadvertent statement on the part of the Senator. I think the Senator will agree that there are three principal parts to the treaty of Versailles other than the League of Nations—the fixing of boundaries, the reparations, and the right of occupation. All those provisions would still be left if the league covenant were eliminated.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. LENROOT. And those provisions comprise the major part of the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. I have doubt about that. I intended to say, and I thought I did say, that to eliminate the League of Nations, I found, as I think the Senator will find if he examines the treaty of Versailles, would require about 72 amendments.

Mr. LENROOT. That might be.

Mr. LODGE. It would be necessary to tear the treaty very much to pieces when it came to making the treaty over.

Mr. LENROOT. That might be so, too; but I want to ask the Senator this question: A modification of the treaty proper, excluding the League of Nations from any power to enforce the treaty, would not be a very difficult proposition, would it?

Mr. LODGE. Perhaps not. I once tried to disentangle the treaty from the League of Nations, and I found it a pretty difficult undertaking; but, of course, if the treaty of Versailles is going to be made over, that is only a small part of what has got to be done. There is part 13; there is the Shantung provision, and taking us out of all the commissions in which we are included and in which we do not want to be and in which nobody wants us to be. I think the Senator would find when he got through that there would not be much left.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the Senator has referred to the action of the country. Is it not true that the action of the country was upon the covenant of the League of Nations in the treaty and not upon the provisions of the treaty proper?

Mr. LODGE. The central question, of course, was that of entering into the covenant of the League of Nations; that overshadowed everything else. The treaty of Versailles proper is another question which was but little discussed here.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator a moment ago suggested this side of the Chamber was not able to recognize facts. I think I do, and if the Senator will permit me, I want to call his attention to several of these facts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no desire to hold the floor any longer. I have tried to relinquish the floor several times.

Mr. POMERENE. I think this will be interesting, if the Senator will indulge me.

Mr. LODGE. Would it not be better for the Senator to make his statement in his own time?

Mr. POMERENE. I want the benefit of the Senator's answer to the question I am about to ask, if I may have it.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. The Alien Property Custodian, according to his report, seized about 33,000 estates. Most of those were seized during the first year or, perhaps, during the first six months of his official action. They were valued at $700,000,000. That property is still in the hands of the Government, at least most of it. Our Government also seized a very large number of ships which had sought refuge in our ports from the British and the French fleets. I think that there can be no doubt about the fact that that property, including the ships, was seized by our Army and Navy and civilian authorities pursuant to the joint resolution declaring a state of war to exist. We are now seeking to repeal that joint resolution. My question is this——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio must know that there was an elaborate act passed authorizing all those seizures.

Mr. POMERENE. I realize that very fully.

Mr. LODGE. The trading with the enemy act covers the matter.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; but that act was passed in pursuance of the first step which we had taken.

Mr. LODGE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. POMERENE. Namely, declaring a state of war.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator suggest that repealing the act declaring a state of war alters anything that was done while that act was in effect?

Mr. POMERENE. My question is a little bit long, but the Senator has not waited until I have completed my thought.

Mr. LODGE. I thought it was approaching an end. [Laughter.]

Mr. POMERENE. Perhaps I am a little bit long in my statement, but nevertheless it interests me.

Mr. LODGE. I am sure it interests everybody, I will say to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I thank the Senator.

In 1799 we entered into a treaty with Prussia. That treaty expired, but later it was revived by the treaty of 1828, and it is still in full force and effect.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will pardon an interruption, that is one reason for passing the pending joint resolution, which abrogates it.

Mr. POMERENE. Still the Senator has not waited until I have completed my inquiry.

Mr. LODGE. I was trying to help the Senator make his statement.

Mr. POMERENE. I think I can make my own statement without any help in that respect.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Ohio is helping me make my speech.

Mr. POMERENE. I am quite sure that the Senator from Massachusetts has had so much experience that he needs no help; and we all respect his great ability, even if we do not concur in his conclusions. However, this is one of the provisions of the treaty with Prussia to which I refer:

> If war should arise between the two contracting parties, the merchants of either country then residing in the other shall be allowed to remain nine months to collect their debts, settle their affairs, and may depart freely, carrying off all their effects without molestation or hindrance.

That means, if it is given the effect which was intended, the Germans in this country, when war broke out, had the right to carry off all their goods, including all their ships. That treaty also provides that it shall be in force both "in time of war and in time of peace." I think the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will agree with me that the German Government took the position that these seizures were illegal. On the other hand, we contended that we had the right to make them because we passed the resolution declaring a state of war to exist, and because of the subsequent legislation; but the foundation for all of that legislation was the war resolution. Now, when we repeal the resolution declaring a state of war to exist, are we not at least giving color to the German claim; namely, that these seizures were illegal? Will the repeal not go further, and jeopardize our title to the property thus seized by our forces?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the pending joint resolution, as I read it and as it is intended, covers entirely and absolutely the question of the property seized and in the possession of the Alien Property Custodian. We did not get anything under the treaty of Versailles except a bill of indemnity for Mr. Palmer. We got all his acts validated; that is the only substantial thing we got out of it. I do not think the joint resolution before us at all affects that situation. The fact that we repeal the joint resolution declaring a state of war to exist does not change or invalidate anything that was done under that act. That certainly is true.

As to the treaty with Prussia, I have always believed that treaties of that character—and that is not the only one; we had one with Mexico, which somehow or other we did not seem to follow very closely, and which was to take effect both in peace and in war—follow the general rule that war abrogates all treaties, just as our War with Spain abrogated all our treaties with Spain, and we had to negotiate new treaties. But, however that may be, the pending joint resolution disposes specifically of the Prussian treaty.

Mr. HARRISON. If before the Senator takes his seat he will allow me to interrupt him, I desire to suggest that a few moments ago we were discussing what 31 prominent Republican leaders had stated in their appeal to the country for votes for Harding and Coolidge in the last campaign. I did not have the document in my possession at that time, but I have it now, and I desire to refresh the memory of the Senator concerning certain passages of it.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me to take my seat and yield the floor to him, I shall be delighted to have him read it.

Mr. HARRISON. I want it to appear in the Senator's time, so as to show the inconsistency of his position or to controvert what he so plainly stated.

Mr. LODGE. That is unimportant.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand it is unimportant to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. But I should like to have a correct version of it and not the version which the Senator from Mississippi gave us. I will be very glad to have the correct version printed.

Mr. HARRISON. It is a very correct version which I have before me.

Mr. LODGE. I hope so.

Mr. HARRISON. And it is signed by very distinguished Republican leaders, the list being headed by Charles Evans Hughes, the present Secretary of State, and including Herbert Hoover, the present Secretary of Commerce; Elihu Root, a very distinguished Republican and ex-Secretary of State; Henry W. Taft; Oscar S. Straus; George W. Wickersham, ex-Attorney General; Henry L. Stimson, ex-Secretary of War; and many others whose names will appear in the RECORD when the document is printed. I am not going to read it all.

Mr. BORAH. Not so very many others.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, 31 of them.

Mr. BORAH. Out of 7,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Those who signed the paper are pretty prominent gentlemen, and they influenced about all on the other side of the aisle except the distinguished Senator from Idaho and 11 others to their view. I shall merely read part of the document, and will ask that the remainder of it be included in the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have it all printed.

Mr. HARRISON. All of it will be printed in the RECORD; but I do not want to trespass too much on the time of the Senate, so I will not read it all.

The question—

Say Charles Evans Hughes, Herbert Hoover, George W. Wickersham, et al.—

The question between the candidates—

This appeal was issued on October 15, 1920, right in the heat of the campaign—

The question between the candidates is not whether our country shall join in such an association. It is whether we shall join under an agreement containing the exact provisions negotiated by President Wilson at Paris or under an agreement which omits or modifies some of those provisions that are very objectionable to great numbers of the American people. * * *

The question, accordingly, is not between a league and no league, but is whether certain provisions of the proposed league agreement shall be accepted unchanged or shall be changed. * * *

We can not regard such a provision as necessary or useful for a league to preserve peace.

We have reached the conclusion that the true course to bring America into an effective league to preserve peace is not by insisting with Mr. Cox upon the acceptance of such a provision as article 10, thus prolonging the unfortunate situation created by Mr. Wilson's insistence upon that article, but by frankly calling upon the other nations—

"By frankly calling upon the other nations"—

to agree to changes in the proposed agreement which will obviate this vital objection and other objections less the subject of dispute, but by frankly calling upon the other nations to agree to changes in the proposed agreement which will obviate this vital objection and other objections less the subject of dispute. The Republican Party is bound by every consideration of good faith to pursue such a course until the declared object is attained.

They say nothing here about any separate peace.

For this course we can look only to the Republican Party and its candidate; the Democratic Party and Mr. Cox are bound not to follow it.

We have reached the conclusion—

Say these distinguished Republican leaders, two of whom have been honored by the President with high places in the Cabinet—

We have reached the conclusion that the true course to bring America into an effective league to preserve peace is not by insisting with Mr. Cox upon the acceptance of such a provision as article 10, thus prolonging the unfortunate situation created by Mr. Wilson's insistence upon that article, but by frankly calling upon the other nations to agree to changes in the proposed agreement which will obviate this vital objection and other objections less the subject of dispute. The Republican Party is bound by every consideration of good faith to pursue such a course until the declared object is attained.

For this course we can look only to the Republican Party and its candidate. * * *

The conditions of Europe make it essential that the stabilizing effect of the treaty already made between the European powers shall not be lost by them and that the necessary changes be made by changing the terms of the treaty rather than by beginning entirely anew.

So different from what the Senator says. Continuing:

That course Mr. Harding is willing to follow, for he said in his speech of August 28—

Quoted by these distinguished men—

"I would take and combine all that is good and excise all that is bad from both organizations (the court and the league)."

This statement is broad enough to include the suggestion that if the league which has heretofore riveted our consideration and apprehensions has been so entwined and interwoven into the peace of Europe that its good must be preserved in order to stabilize the peace of that continent, then it can be amended or revised so that we may still have a remnant of the world's aspirations in 1918 builded into the world's highest conception of helpful cooperation in the ultimate realization.

We therefore believe that we can most effectively advance the cause of international cooperation to promote peace by supporting Mr. Harding for election to the Presidency.

And then follows the list of 31 Republicans who signed the manifesto. I ask that it all be incorporated in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CELEBRATED STATEMENT OF THE 31 PROLEAGUE REPUBLICANS WHO URGED THE ELECTION OF SENATOR HARDING AS THE SUREST WAY TO GET THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

[From the New York World, Oct. 15, 1920, p. 1.]

"The undersigned, who desire that the United States shall do her full part in association with the other civilized nations to prevent war, have earnestly considered how we may contribute most effectively to that end by our votes in the coming election.

"The question between the candidates is not whether our country shall join in such an association. It is whether we shall join under an agreement containing the exact provisions negotiated by President Wilson at Paris or under an agreement which omits or modifies some of those provisions that are very objectionable to great numbers of the American people.

"The paper signed by 38 Republican Senators in March, 1919, before the league covenant was adopted at Paris, advised the President that the signers could not approve a treaty in the form then proposed, although it was 'their sincere desire that the nations of the world should unite to promote peace and general disarmament.'

"A majority of the Senate voted to ratify the league agreement with modifications, which there is good evidence to show would have been accepted by the other nations; but Mr. Wilson refused to accept these modifications and insisted upon the agreement absolutely unchanged, and Democratic Senators sufficient in number to defeat the treaty as modified followed Mr. Wilson by voting against ratification.

"That is substantially the difference between the parties now. The Democratic platform and candidate stand unqualifiedly for the agreement negotiated at Paris without substantive modification.

"On the other hand, the Republican platform says:

"The Republican Party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe that such an international association must be based upon international justice and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by the development of law and the decision of impartial courts, and which shall secure instant and general international conference whenever peace shall be threatened by political action, so that the nations pledged to do and insist upon what is just and fair may exercise their influence and power for the prevention of war.

"Mr. Harding said in his speech of August 28:

"There are distinctly two types of international relationship. One is an offensive and defensive alliance of great powers. * * * The other type is a society of free nations or an association of free nations or a league of free nations, animated by considerations of right and justice instead of might and self-interest, and not merely proclaimed an agency in pursuit of peace but so organized and participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility. Such an association I favor with all my heart, and I would make no fine distinctions as to whom credit is due. One need not care what it is called. Let it be an association, a society, or a league, or what not. Our concern is solely with the substance, not the form thereof.

"Mr. Harding has since repeatedly reaffirmed the declarations of this speech in the most positive terms.

"The question accordingly is not between a league and no league, but is whether certain provisions in the proposed league agreement shall be accepted unchanged or shall be changed.

"The contest is not about the principle of a league of nations, but it is about the method of most effectively applying that principle to preserve peace.

"If the proposed changes in the Paris agreement were captious or without substantial ground one might question the sincerity of their advocates. This, however, is not the case.

"The principal change proposed concerns article 10 of the league covenant as negotiated at Paris. Mr. Wilson declares this to be 'the heart of the league,' and the chief controversy is about this.

"Article 10 provides that the nations agreeing to the treaty shall 'preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity, existing political independence of all members of the league.'

"That is an obligation of the most vital importance and certainly binds every nation entering into it to go to war whenever war may be necessary to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any member of the league against external aggression.

"It is idle to say that Congress has power to refuse to authorize such a war, for whenever the treaty calls for war a refusal by Congress to pass the necessary resolution would be a refusal by our Government to keep the obligation of the

treaty. The alternative would be war or a breach of the solemnly pledged faith of the United States.

"We can not regard such a provision as necessary or useful for a league to preserve peace.

"We have reached the conclusion that the true course to bring America into an effective league to preserve peace is not by insisting with Mr. Cox upon the acceptance of such a provision as article 10, thus prolonging the unfortunate situation created by Mr. Wilson's insistence upon that article, but by frankly calling upon the other nations to agree to changes in the proposed agreement which will obviate this vital objection and other objections less the subject of dispute. The Republican Party is bound by every consideration of good faith to pursue such a course until the declared object is attained.

"For this course we can look only to the Republican Party and its candidate; the Democratic Party and Mr. Cox are bound not to follow it.

"The conditions of Europe make it essential that the stabilizing effect of the treaty already made between the European powers shall not be lost by them and that the necessary changes be made by changing the terms of the treaty rather than by beginning entirely anew.

"That course Mr. Harding is willing to follow, for he said in his speech of August 28:

"I would take and combine all that is good and excise all that is bad from both organizations (the court and the league). This statement is broad enough to include the suggestion that if the league which has heretofore riveted our considerations and apprehensions has been so entwined and interwoven into the peace of Europe that its good must be preserved in order to stabilize the peace of that continent, then it can be amended or revised so that we may still have a remnant of the world's aspirations in 1918 builded into the world's highest conception of helpful cooperation in the ultimate realization.

"We therefore believe that we can most effectively advance the cause of international cooperation to promote peace by supporting Mr. Harding for election to the Presidency.

"List of the 31 Republicans who signed the manifesto: Charles Evans Hughes; Herbert Hoover; Elihu Root; Henry W. Taft, member executive committee, League to Enforce Peace; Oscar S. Straus, member executive committee, League to Enforce Peace; George W. Wickersham, member executive committee, League to Enforce Peace; Henry L. Stimson; Lyman Abbott; Paul D. Cravath; Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University; Samuel McCune Lindsay, president of Academy of Political Science, University of Columbia; A. Lawrence Lowell, president of Harvard University, chairman executive committee, League to Enforce Peace; John Grier Hibben, president Princeton University; Frank J. Goodnow, Johns Hopkins University; William H. P. Faunce, president of Brown University; William Lawrence, bishop of Massachusetts; John Henry McCracken, president Lafayette College; Henry S. Prichett, president Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching; Jacob Gould Schurman, former president Cornell University; Charles A. Richmond, president Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.; William Allen White, editor, Emporia, Kans.; W. W. Willoughby, professor of political science, Johns Hopkins University; George A. Plimpton, president board of trustees Amherst College; Robert Brookings, president of Washington University; Alexander C. Humphries, president Stevens Institute of Technology; Ernest M. Hopkins, president of Dartmouth College; Charles W. Dabney, University of Cincinnati; Isaac M. Ullman, New Haven, member executive committee, League to Enforce Peace; Samuel Mather, Cleveland, Ohio; Ray Lyman Wilbur, president Leland Stanford University; and Warren Gregory, San Francisco.

"* * * Two of the above list—Paul D. Cravath and George W. Wickersham—joined in an appeal sent in June, 1919, to Senators WADSWORTH and CALDER urging prompt ratification of the Versailles treaty, which embodied the league covenant."

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. In connection with that proposition, I assume that the Senator from Mississippi remembers that the President, when a Member of the Senate, voted twice for the ratification of the treaty embracing the League of Nations with reservations; and I suppose he also recalls that after the acceptance speech referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts, and quoted by the latter in a limited degree, a controversy of very far-reaching significance arose between Republicans as to what he meant. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], whom we have learned to style respectfully as "irreconcilables" in connection with the agitation of treaty subjects, declared that he meant to repudiate the treaty and the League of Nations. The present members of his Cabinet, Mr. Hughes and Mr. Hoover, and other prominent Republicans, including those in the list submitted by the Senator from Mississippi, declared that he meant to approve it, and that the only safe way to secure it was to elect him.

The campaign continued throughout a period of many months, and the public were divided in opinion, I might say, until its conclusion, as to how the President stood upon the matter. They knew his record. They knew that as a Senator he had voted to ratify the treaty with reservations. They knew that one powerful faction of the Republican Party, if I may so term the element, led by the Senator from California and the Senator from Idaho, was opposed to the treaty in any form; they wanted the United States to stand alone and independent of any relationship with other nations so far as it was affected by the proposed League of Nations; and they knew that there were millions of men and women in the United States who believed that this Government ought to cooperate with the other civilized nations in an effort to promote the permanent peace of the world, and that the League of Nations was a more or less instrumental agency calculated to accomplish that effect.

And so the election came. Mr. Hoover expressed his opinion very clearly on the subject in an address before Leland Stanford Junior University, on October 2, 1919; and I do wish my very dear friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] could hear this statement. The Senator from Missouri, you know, is always so interested, if not inspired, by anything that emanates from that very authoritative source. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. Hoover said, in the address to which I have referred, if the Senator from Mississippi will permit me to read it:

The treaties can not be carried out without the league. If the league falls, the treaties also fall. In that even civilization will be taken back to the Middle Ages. If we attempt to revise the treaty we shall tread a road through European chaos.

Even if we manage to keep our soldiers out of it, we will not escape fearful economic losses. * * * A peace without us means more army and navy for us, with the old treadmill of taxes. * * * For us to refuse to enter into a joint attempt with the well-thinking sections of a large part of the world to establish a continuing moral conscience against war is the utmost folly in our own interest.

So that the attitude of Mr. Hoover, the present Secretary of Commerce, was defined not only by his statement, in conjunction with other great and leading Republicans of this Nation, but by a carefully prepared address delivered before a college in the State of California, in which he declared that the course now being insisted upon by the Senator from Massachusetts and those who follow him would carry the world back to the Middle Ages.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. Just a moment, please.

Mr. JOHNSON. I merely wanted to inquire the date of the address from which the Senator has quoted.

Mr. ROBINSON. The date of the address was October 2, 1919.

Mr. JOHNSON. Why, that was a long time before the election, and so much time has elapsed that Mr. Hoover has had the opportunity to change his mind many times since. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, yes; that statement is entirely correct. Mr. Hoover has had ample opportunity to change his mind, and so has the President of the United States, and so has the Senator from California, but the two men who do not seem to change their minds are the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, there was a good deal of wiggling and wabbling by Republican leaders during that campaign.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not think there is any doubt about it.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the Senator for the encomium he has paid to the consistency of the Senator from Idaho and myself. I rose to call his attention to the fact that Mr. Hoover has changed his mind completely since then.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, nothing that the Senator from California thinks about himself can exceed what I would say about him if I had the requisite power of expression. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rules of the Senate require the occupants of the galleries to refrain from all demonstrations.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, another member of the Cabinet who I think signed that statement—did Mr. Hughes sign that statement?

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, yes; yes, he headed it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Hughes is a great international lawyer, as everybody knows, and a great statesman, and his opinion is entitled to respect. While this subject was under deliberation in the Senate he proposed a method of bringing about peace within the ranks of our friends on the majority side by cer-

tain reservations which he thought would make this treaty and the League of Nations entirely acceptable to the United States and make it conform to the interests of the people of this country. Here is what he proposed on July 28, 1919. The Senator from California may interpolate here, if he desires to do so, the observation that Mr. Hughes has had many opportunities to change his mind since that time.

In a letter dated July 28, 1919, he made the following specific proposals:

The Senate of the United States of America advises and consents to the ratification of said treaty with the following reservations and understandings as to its interpretation and effect to be made a part of the instrument of ratification:

First. That whenever two years' notice of withdrawal from the League of Nations shall have been given, as provided in article 1 of the covenant, the power giving the notice shall cease to be a member of the league, or subject to the obligations of the covenant of the league, at the time specified in the notice, notwithstanding any claim, charge or finding of the nonfulfillment of any international obligation or of any obligation under said covenant: *Provided, however,* That such withdrawal shall not release the power from any debt or liability theretofore incurred.

Second. That questions relating to immigration, or the imposition of duties on imports, where such questions do not arise out of any international engagement, are questions of domestic policy, and these and any other questions which, according to international law, are solely within the domestic jurisdiction are not to be submitted for the consideration or action of the League of Nations or of any of its agencies.

Third. That the meaning of article 21 of the covenant of the League of Nations is that the United States of America does not relinquish its traditional attitude toward purely American questions, and is not required by said covenant to submit its policies regarding questions which it deems to be purely American questions to the League of Nations or any of its agencies, and that the United States of America may oppose and prevent any acquisition by any non-American power by conquest, purchase, or in any other manner of any territory, possession, or control in the Western Hemisphere.

Fourth. That the meaning of article 10 of the covenant of the League of Nations is that the members of the league are not under any obligation to act in pursuance of said article except as they may decide to act upon the advice of the council of the league. The United States of America assumes no obligation under said article to undertake any military expedition or to employ its armed forces on land or sea unless such action is authorized by the Congress of the United States of America, which has exclusive authority to declare war or to determine for the United States of America whether there is any obligation on its part under said article and the means or action by which any such obligation shall be fulfilled.

So, Mr. President, the statement made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], which was challenged by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], seems to be established conclusively by the record. From the proposal to combine with other nations in an orderly and well-directed attempt to conserve and maintain the peace of the world, we have degenerated to a proposition to declare the existence of a state of peace, and while repudiating the treaty and all obligations under it if it carries obligations to the United States, we are insisting upon securing every benefit that that treaty gives to us without assuming any obligation that it seeks to impose.

We are not only doing the unusual thing of declaring the existence of a state of peace, but it is proposed to repeal the resolution declaring the existence of a state of war. I have asked, and I ask again, if the Congress has the power, the unquestioned power, as is asserted by the leaders of the majority, to declare a state of peace, then what is the necessity or the justification for repealing the resolution under which we took up arms? What is the legal effect of that repeal? What is intended to be accomplished by it? If it can have no legal effect, if it is merely to do in another way what is to be done by declaring a state of peace, then ought we to repeal this declaration, and thus make an implied apology to Germany for having passed it in April, 1917?

This resolution, Mr. President, is not intended to make peace. It accomplishes nothing whatever except to recognize what already exists. I ask again, are you not content with declaring the existence of a state of peace if Congress has that unquestioned power? Then why do you insist upon repealing, in violation of every precedent in the history of the United States, the resolution under which we went to war?

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the Senator, Mr. President, for his question and the splendid contribution he has made to the history of to-day.

The Senator will recall, and the Senate remembers, that during the month of October, 1920, the Republican candidate for President was changing his position so often on the League of Nations that no one knew exactly how he stood on that proposition. From the time of the Des Moines speech on he was constantly shifting his position, and, if I recall correctly, there was a time in that campaign when the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in speaking, threatened to leave the campaign, I know not why. I recall that that was a few days before the Des Moines speech of the now President Harding, and rumor had it that certain Republican leaders did not very much relish the speeches being made and the influence that was being exerted by the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from California. So the Republican leadership was divided throughout that campaign, and I want to say, Mr. President, that none rendered greater service to the Republican Party than the two distinguished Senators I have named; they drew the biggest crowds, won more applause, and took more votes away from the Democratic Party, in my opinion, than any other two men who were speaking for the Republican Party.

But about that time the distinguished leader of the majority in the Senate [Mr. LODGE] made a speech in New York City, and in that speech he was trying to pour oil upon the troubled waters. He was not trying to advocate at that time, and to have the country and the people believe, that he was for a separate peace with Germany and against any understanding or League of Nations that might preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I voted for the resolution.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course the Senator did. None of us were surprised that the Senator voted for it. The Senator from Pennsylvania with his powerful influence forced many of the Senators on the other side to accept his views on it. I do not think the Senator came to it very enthusiastically, but he did, and he voted for it. But here is what the distinguished leader of the majority said in his speech in New York City, in the Hotel Commodore, on October 18, 1920:

Senator Harding is as anxious to promote the world's peace as any man who lives.

Of course.

He is utterly against the Wilson league as Mr. Wilson brought it back from Paris.

That was the impression that Republican leadership was trying to create in the country, that you were opposed to that league, but that you favored some other kind of a league; and that is what caused the disruption between the wing of the party led by the distinguished leader of the majority and that wing led by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

The Senator from Massachusetts went further. It was a very eloquent speech he made that night in the Hotel Commodore. He said:

Senator Harding's plan is to bring about, under the leadership of the United States, an agreement among the nations which will truly promote the peace of the world.

That was a sop to get Republican proleaguers in line, and that was the kind of argument that was being used by the standard bearer of the party and the Republican leaders on the stump throughout the country. That is what won the election, as the Senator said.

Now, let me read something else. Here is a speech that was made by a distinguished citizen of Massachusetts, a man who has been honored by the Republican Party in that great old State, a State to-day that has in Congress men in high places—the Vice President, the leader of the majority in the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and I might go on down the line.

Mr. POMERENE. The Secretary of War.

Mr. HARRISON. And the Secretary of War; yes. I have already mentioned him. I am about to read from the Baltimore Sun of April 16, 1920, from a speech by a Congressman from Massachusetts in that city.

Mr. LODGE. From my speech?

Mr. HARRISON. No; not from the Senator's speech.

Mr. LODGE. I did not make a speech in Baltimore; but that is a mere detail.

Mr. HARRISON. I said this was a distinguished Republican Congressman of Massachusetts who spoke.

Mr. LODGE. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HARRISON. I quote:

The peace resolution—

That is, the resolution that is before us—

The peace resolution is a sugar-coated pill prescribed by Dr. LODGE to be taken as a regular Republican dose before thinking. It is painless as well as senseless and will in effect put the stamp of approval of the House of Representatives on the action of the treaty wreckers.

Mr. LODGE. Did the Senator say that was in a speech made by a Republican Congressman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; by Congressman Alvan T. Fuller.

Mr. LODGE. Oh.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator knows him well. He is a great friend of the Senator. So I want to read it. The Senator did not catch this. This Congressman said:

The peace resolution is a sugar-coated pill prescribed by Dr. LODGE to be taken as a Republican dose before thinking. It is painless, as well as senseless, and will in effect put the stamp of approval of the House of Representatives on the action of the treaty wreckers in the Senate.

If you are a Republican and you are sick, it will make you well, and if you are well it will make you better. Would to God it might cure the Republican Party of the sleeping sickness that has kept it from doing anything constructive since they captured control of the House and Senate, except to criticize the President. How about the promises that the Republicans made, that they were to put into effect when they came into control? What have they done about the taxes? How have they reduced the high cost of living?

Those are the words of a Republican Congressman from the great State of Massachusetts.

Now, let me read what another distinguished Republican leader has said about this peace resolution. This is from a man who has been honored by your party, was President of the United States. It is from an article published in the Washington Post June 19, 1919, from the pen of William Howard Taft.

The article reads:

* * * It must give those Republicans who now find themselves supporting the Knox resolution a "cat in a strange garret" feeling when they think of the great traditions of their party and of its historical attitude toward every critical step forward in the history of this country under the Constitution. They must feel uneasy as those Federalists who fought the Louisiana Purchase as unconstitutional because it was made by Jefferson. For the Republicans are the legitimate heirs of Washington, Hamilton, and Marshall.

* * * When he (President Wilson) reflected on the patriotism of Republicans as "prowar but antiadministration," a most remarkable popular rebuke followed instantly. Do not Republicans in the Senate, after their most patriotic course in the fighting of this war and their fine standing before the people on that account, run the risk of dulling the fine edge of that course by present action, which many will contend gives support to the ungracious words of the President?

* * * Those Republicans in the Senate—not now committed—should therefore avoid being hurried into embarrassing commitment by the Knox resolution and should wait until the treaty is presented and until they can, after a full discussion, not in anger, but after a calm, courageous, self-restrained consideration of their responsibility to their country, the world, and their party, decide what the situation demands of them.

* * * Meantime the Republicans of the Senate should not pass the Knox resolution. The reasons for not doing so are clear, and they will be clearer as the inexorable order of events proceeds.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. That was the statement of William Howard Taft?

Mr. HARRISON. This is the statement of your former President.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator said a moment ago that it was the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] who drew the crowds and made the votes in the last campaign.

Mr. HARRISON. I beg the Senator's pardon. I know what is the matter with the Senator—I did not include him in the list with those two.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to call the Senate's attention to what another distinguished and much-beloved member of the Republican Party has but recently said. I refer to the statement of that splendid old gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. NELSON. Only the day before yesterday this is what he said in reference to this resolution:

The course pursued in establishing final peace by the Knox resolution, as is now proposed, is unusual, halting, equivocating, and only a partial and piecemeal work, omitting some of the most important essentials for a just, permanent, and lasting peace.

* * * * * * *

Two of the most important and vital matters pertaining to a just and permanent world peace, to wit, disarmament and reparation, are entirely omitted in this resolution. It places our country in an attitude of total indifference in regard to these vital subjects. Germany has heretofore been most reluctant to comply with the reparation and disarmament provisions of the Versailles treaty. Will not the passage of this resolution tend to increase and fortify such reluctance?

By this resolution we insist upon full reparation for ourselves, but are wholly oblivious as to whether our allies, by whose side and aid we vanquished the common enemy, secure any reparation at all. We are also by this resolution wholly oblivious as to the disarmament of Germany—a matter most vital to the future peace of the world. One of the lessons impressed upon the civilized world is that Germany, armed and equipped as she was in July, 1914, would be a constant and continuing menace to her neighbors and to a world peace. It seems to me that our country is vitally interested in removing this menace. Under this peace resolution we have no ground for insisting on the removal of this menace.

* * * * * * *

Such is the tenor and spirit of the Knox resolution. I am not a diplomat, and have no gifts of diplomacy, and it is perhaps on that account that I am unable to concur in this resolution, the passage of which will encourage Germany to continue with her reluctance to comply with the treaty of Versailles as to disarmament and reparation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, when the resolution of like import to that now before the Senate was under consideration a year ago I said:

This resolution, if the expression be parliamentary, is economic idiocy. We give everything and get nothing. We abolish all restrictions on the importation into this country of goods bearing the "made in Germany" trade-mark without any agreement with that country that she will admit all or any of ours into her territory. We invite the representatives of the commercial houses of Germany again to overrun our cities, while she is at liberty to shut her gates on any American merchant, manufacturer, or banker, on our growers of cotton, corn, and live stock, our producers of copper, who may desire to deal with her people. We permit the reestablishment in our midst of the industrial plants that prior to the war enriched so many of her war-mad minions and that became centers of sedition and disloyalty after we entered it, without any assurance that an American firm may even set up an agency in the city of Hamburg. We throw open our ports to emigrants from her impoverished States and Provinces and admit them to citizenship on exactly the same terms as are accorded to the citizens of our faithful allies or the liberated people of the new republics we have aided in creating within her former territory without any guaranty that an American may remain overnight in a hotel in Munich, Dresden, or Berlin.

At that time some effort was made to justify the resolution upon the ground that it was necessary to the restoration of commercial relations with Germany. But it was shown that not only would it accomplish nothing in that direction, except to throw down the bars as to her nationals while she remained at liberty to keep them up as to ours, but that, pursuant to the law, the President had, by Executive order, as early as July, 1919, removed all barriers to commercial intercourse with that country occasioned by our laws save that the importation of dyes, dyestuffs, potash, drugs, and chemicals produced in Germany remained interdicted, and it was further shown that commerce had been carried on to such an extent as that from the time of the armistice to March 20, 1919, she had admitted of goods exported from this country nearly $150,000,000 and we had received from her over $25,000,000 worth. Our exports and imports from Germany for the calendar year 1920 were, respectively, $311,437,377 and $88,836,280, the total value of our exports mounting almost to the figure reached in 1913, never before exceeded, when they aggregated $331,684,212. She is not yet selling to us within $100,000,000 of what we took from her in 1913, one of the penalties she is paying for precipitating the war, a circumstance which reflects the paralysis of her industrial organization and ominously tells of her lessened ability to absorb our products.

It would be a valuable contribution to this debate if some supporter of this resolution would arise and disclose in plain terms just how this country is to profit in any measure by it, what change will ensue upon its passage and approval, except such as I have enumerated to the advantage of our late enemy in the field, in no respect whatever to our advantage.

It is necessarily implied in the resolution that if Germany chooses to send an ambassador to this country he would be received. The President could scarcely decline to receive an accredited representative from a country with which our Government has, in conformity with the Constitution, solemnly declared we are at peace. That of itself is a declaration that we desire to sustain with it amicable relations. But when has Germany made an equivalent declaration that she will receive an ambassador from this country? She has not ventured to send one heretofore, lacking a treaty of amity or some such formal declaration as that made by the resolution before us. She did not care to take the chances of a rebuff. Shall we risk such by sending an ambassador to Berlin? We can not safely do so until by some reciprocal legislation on the part of Germany, or in the usual form by a treaty, she signifies that he will be welcomed and received. So with respect to consular representatives. The resolution under consideration must be regarded as an invitation to Germany to send consuls to such of our cities as she may choose, for the purpose of promoting the trade of her nationals, generally to safeguard and promote their interests, and to discharge such other functions in aid of the fiscal laws and policy of the country they represent as may be by it intrusted to or imposed upon them. But have we any intimation from Germany that she is ready to extend like privileges to our consular agents? She may be quite willing to do so without the formality of the adoption of the resolution before us. In either case, we get whatever she concedes us, not by right, as something due to us by express agreement or pursuant to the law of nations, but by grace of Germany. Why should we stand in the attitude of a suppliant for her favor? Why should we court her good will? Was this country the offender in connection with the severance of the friendly relations which had subsisted between the two countries since our Nation came into being?

I am as anxious as any Senator can possibly be to see that cordiality which is so agreeable and so profitable to both parties immediately restored, but I am unwilling to concede to Germany the very substantial rights and privileges accorded her as incidents of this resolution without, at least, an agreement or undertaking on her part to make reciprocal concessions to us.

Again, I challenge any Senator to show how any advantage whatever is to accrue to the United States by this resolution. As I said on a former occasion, it should be entitled "A measure for the relief of the German people." That title is pecul-

iarly appropriate at this time, for the moral effect of its passage at this particular juncture will be to afford no small measure of support to Germany in the pending controversy with the Allies over the satisfaction by her of the obligations she undertook under the treaty of Versailles. She is insisting upon radical modifications of features of that treaty, especially those dealing with the reparation it exacts of her. She insists that the terms are severe beyond her ability to meet. She pleads for further time; she begs the intervention as mediator of our Government. France threatens the invasion of her territory unless she complies. It will not be forgotten that the author of this resolution, the distinguished Senator by whose name it is known, once Secretary of State, and thus properly regarded as particularly influential with his party, now in power, in all matters of the foreign policy of our Government, made a speech in the Senate on August 29, 1919, in which he vigorously assailed the treaty of Versailles, charging that it was unreasonable in the demands made by it on Germany in satisfaction of the losses suffered by the Allies, and generally taking the position now asserted by Germany in her effort to escape its exactions or to secure amelioration of the terms imposed upon her.

In that speech, after reviewing at length in a highly critical spirit the provisions of the treaty in so far as they imposed burdens on Germany, he summarized them in the following language:

I regret, sir, that this has been a long and tedious process, but its importance could be satisfied in no other way. It has shown us the treaty takes Germany's territory, European and foreign, without compensation; that it takes from her practically all of her ocean shipping and a large portion of her inland vessels; that it deprives her of all special benefits of treaties and conventions; that it takes her cables; that it compels her to supply large quantities of raw materials; that it internationalizes her great river systems and throws them open to traffic of all nations on a national basis, as if they were the high seas; that it opens her coastwise shipping to all nations; that it compels her to grant exceptional import and export privileges and to accept important restrictions; that it lays down far-reaching principles governing her internal commerce and transportation; that it closes out German interests in practically the whole civilized world outside the territories of her late allies—including those areas which have been taken from her and given to others; that it closes out the interests of that same world in Germany. It has shown that having done all this it assesses against her provisionally, with a stipulation permitting an increase, a debt of 120,000,000,000 gold marks, which is in addition to the property restored in kind and to the value of the boats, gold, and securities delivered; that it makes her responsible for these damages inflicted not only by herself but by her allies, and even by the allied and associated powers themselves, with a list of items which includes some admittedly contrary to the rules of international law hitherto existing; and that finally and in addition she is compelled to answer to her own nationals for the value of the property taken by the allied and associated powers.

The passage of this resolution at this time would very naturally and very justly be interpreted by both sides of the unfortunate controversy now raging in Europe, threatening a resumption of hostilities, as signifying that the very able junior Senator from Pennsylvania had become the dominating character in respect to our foreign affairs, that he had succeeded in constraining his party associates and the administration to accept his views, and that Germany would have the moral support of the United States in her insistence on a revision of the Versailles treaty. It was not without reason, considering the public announcement of the purpose to put through at the earliest practicable moment the Knox resolution, that Germany presumed to solicit the interposition of the United States as mediator in her present quarrel with France, or that the eloquent Viviani was hurried to this country by our ancient ally, bound to us by the most sacred of ties, to dissuade us from the course so advertised.

The late Vice President of the United States brought a tender response from the breast of every American citizen familiar with his country's history when he said, on the occasion of the presentation to the United States Senate by the Republic of France of the beautiful vases which adorn the corridor of this Chamber—

Since far-off 1776 we have grown rich and powerful, and many seek our favors and many are our friends, but none can get closer to our hearts than France, for she believed in us when all men despised us.

In this her time of trial she barely asks of us that we refrain from an act that can do us no good, but which gives aid and comfort to her enemy. Are we coldly to disregard her modest but anxious appeal?

It is recognized by the resolution before us that a treaty with Germany must be made in order to adjust the only matters in difference between us, now that hostilities have ceased, except in so far as we are interested jointly with our allies in forestalling the recrudescence of the German military power. Again I inquire, inasmuch as we must make a treaty with Germany, what do we get by repealing the declaration of war and making a declaration that meanwhile a state of peace subsists? If German subjects desire to come to this country to enjoy its superior economic advantages, to participate eventually with us in the blessings of American citizenship, including the right to acquire, without cost, our public lands; if German merchants and manufacturers, casting an eager eye upon the rich possibilities afforded by our markets, want the help of consular agents of Germany stationed in our cities to aid them in the peaceful invasion, why not let Germany move to that end by the adoption of some resolution of the Reichstag such as that before us? It is of no consequence to my mind that Germany made no declaration of war against us. We made no declaration of war, strictly speaking, against her, but asserted by formal congressional action that she had made war upon us and had thus established a status in which she must be regarded as the public enemy. If we were right in that declaration—and who is there who doubts it?—it would seem as though, conquered as she was, we might expect the advances to be made by her, not by us. I remind Senators that the resolution before us contemplates a treaty with Germany as essential, notwithstanding its recitals, to the restoration of peace in its essentials. We can not forget that American lives were taken and the property of American citizens, mounting in value into the hundreds of millions, was seized or destroyed by German submarines and German raiders, for the satisfaction of the claims for which the resolution before us makes and can make no provision. On the other hand, property of German nationals in this country to the value of at least three-quarters of a billion was seized and converted by our Government, not including the German ships seized in our harbors, of a value not less than one hundred million more, all or the greater portion of which Germany claims was taken in disregard of our treaty with her or in violation of the more enlightened rules of international law. These reciprocal claims make up practically the sum total of the differences between our Government and that of Germany, and the resolution makes no advance whatever, can make no advance, toward the adjustment of them.

Some impatience is exhibited, even on this side of the Chamber, to end the present anomalous status. In it is reflected, but only feebly reflected, the justifiable impatience of the country at the protracted delay in the restoration of conditions of peace. Gentlemen may cry "Peace, peace," but there is no pease in this resolution.

A treaty with Germany—some kind of a treaty—is essential to the restoration of peace except in name. The resolution, I repeat, contemplates as much and looks to the accomplishment of peace in that manner. But what kind of a treaty is contemplated? We might assent to the Versailles treaty, or we might induce the parties to it to convene and revise it, or we might persuade them to disregard it entirely and negotiate a new treaty, or we might negotiate a separate treaty with Germany. The idea of entering into a separate treaty with Germany is revolting, and commands no support in America except from those whose fidelity to her cause was more or less under suspicion while hostilities were in progress.

We entered the war because German militarism threatened to overrun the world and had in its mad course made war on us in an effort to bar us from the common highway of the seas. It is the quite common belief of the American people that we ought not yet, at least, to abandon our allies in their effort to compel Germany to make adequate reparation and to insure the world against her rebirth as a military power; that our duty as well as our welfare requires that we be something more than an interested observer of her regeneration in a military sense.

To enter upon any one of the four courses conceived as possible, save acceptance of the Versailles treaty, either conditionally or unconditionally, would be hailed with delight in Germany. A proposal to disregard our allies and make a separate treaty with her would doubtless be eagerly embraced as signifying our dissent from the terms imposed by the Versailles treaty on her or the attitude taken by the Allies in respect to the enforcement of the same. So she would be more than pleased could she inveigle us, or should we be deluded into proposing a general revision of that treaty, or the total repudiation of it, to be followed by a new conference to draft a substitute.

It is inconceivable that we should offer any such suggestion to our late allies or that they should entertain it seriously if we did.

Unqualified acceptance of the treaty in view of what has transpired in this country is to be dismissed as a political impossibility. There remains but one course, namely, to propose to the parties thereto acceptance of the Versailles treaty with such modifications of its terms, either absolutely or as they affect us, as will make it on the whole satisfactory to the United States. But what modifications will be insisted upon? Upon what terms is it proposed that the United States shall enter into a treaty jointly with those with whom it fought the war on

the one side against Germany on the other? What is to be the nature of the treaty to be entered into with Germany contemplated by the resolution now under debate? It is now more than a year since the Republican Party entered upon a vigorous campaign to secure control of that department of the Government charged in a special manner with the conduct of our foreign affairs and authorized by the Constitution to take the initial steps in the making of treaties. It is almost six months since the American people called it to the discharge of that high duty. It is all but two months since the party so intrusted with power assumed control of the Government, and as yet the country has had no inkling of what it proposes to do toward bringing order out of the chaos following the war, except as it is disclosed by this resolution that it intends to enter into some kind of a treaty with Germany. Heretofore it has contented itself with criticism. The country eagerly awaits the announcement of some constructive program touching international problems. Meanwhile, industry from one end of the country to the other is well-nigh paralyzed by reason of the collapse of the purchasing power of Europe, due as much to the disturbed condition following as to the exhaustion occasioned by the war. Our foreign commerce is falling off at the rate of $100,000,000 a month. Practically every copper mine in the West is shut down, 60 per cent of our copper product going abroad in normal times. The city of Butte, with a population of 60,000, dependent wholly upon its mines of copper and zinc, stands as idle as a "painted ship upon a painted ocean."

Cotton is similarly affected. It is estimated that the army of the unemployed has risen to the staggering figure of 5,000,000. The pending resolution represents the progress that has been made toward getting the world back to a peace footing, and it, as shown, signifies nothing. The people ask for bread and are given a stone.

The prototype of this resolution before the Senate a year ago contained a provision intended to accomplish the repeal or the demise of what was known as the war legislation, and particularly those acts under which it was loudly and persistently proclaimed the then Chief Executive had exercised and was exercising autocratic and dictatorial powers. Lest the idea may be entertained by some that one of the purposes of the pending resolution is to abrogate war-time acts, I remark that so far as such a result is desirable it has already been accomplished by a direct repeal measure passed in the closing hours of the last session. That measure was the product of a protracted and painstaking study made by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate of the war legislation and represents a prodigious amount of labor on the part of the senior Senator from South Dakota, chairman of the subcommittee to which was referred the repeal bill. A study of the act will astonish by the amount of the legislation it leaves unrepealed and which no member of the committee, however partisan he might be, desired, on reflection, to have repealed. In fact, it is questionable whether a single law valid under the ruling of the Supreme Court in United States versus Cohen not practically dead by the cessation of hostilities was touched, save section 3 of Title I of the espionage act, which, by the way, conferred no power on the President.

I pass to a consideration of some specific features of the pending resolution, and must pray the indulgence of the Senate, as the analysis I propose to make of some of its provisions will necessarily be prosaic and no doubt tedious.

I shall thank those who are endeavoring to follow me in this discussion if they will kindly secure a copy of the joint resolution while I comment upon it. I shall show that without important modifications of the language we shall be to some extent at least committed to a policy to which I am sure even the friends of the measure do not intend to subscribe and to which they have no purpose to pledge the country. It will be noted that if the resolution accomplishes anything at all, the result is achieved by virtue of the initial paragraph, referring to the substitute proposed by the committee, declaring the state of war at an end. What follows as a separate paragraph took the form of a proviso in the resolution as introduced, the language of the original and the substitute in the feature now under consideration being identical. The former—that is, the original resolution—after declaring the state of war at an end, continues, "*Provided, however*," etc. The purpose of a proviso in a law is to limit or restrict the significance or operation of the language which has preceded it. Accordingly the proviso means that the war is not at an end; that is, not wholly at an end; that it is not intended that the necessary consequences of the reestablishment of peace shall ensue, in this that we shall hold all the German property taken by our Government as though we were still at war. But, as heretofore indicated, as there remains no concomitants of war, no danger to be apprehended, no obstacles to peaceful intercourse to be removed, as between us and Germany, save the continual absence of consular and diplomatic representatives heretofore canvassed, except the retention by us, on the one hand, of the German property we seized, and the neglect of Germany to make reparation to our people for the damage suffered by them through her acts of war, what progress have we made by the declaration that the war is at an end? The proviso eats up what preceded it, leaves only a vestige, if it leaves anything, of what has gone before it.

In the draft proposed by the committee the proviso takes the form of a separate paragraph, disassociated syntactically from what precedes it. Whatever consideration may have prompted this change in the form of the resolution it in no wise affects the interpretation to be given to it. The two mean the same thing; they have the same significance. Notwithstanding the unequivocal declaration of the first paragraph, we declare that we do not intend to let the German property go until a treaty is entered into containing provisions as in the resolution set out. That part of it must be considered as an announcement of the policy we intend to pursue with reference to that property, conceded upon our part to be worth three-quarters of a billion and valued at much more by the Germans. It—namely, the recital of the resolution—must be regarded as in the nature of the most solemn instruction to our negotiators, by which they would unquestionably deem themselves bound. Whether Congress can thus bind the Executive, in whom the Constitution vests plenary power to negotiate treaties, or whether he ought to give his assent to a measure purporting to do so, he must determine for himself. A more flagrant attempt to wrest from the Executive his constitutional authority is not, in my judgment, recorded in our annals. The chief vice of this resolution does not consist, in my opinion, in the effort to take out of the hands of the President the duty, if not the authority, to end a state of war by negotiating a treaty of peace, but in directing him as to the terms of the treaty he is to make. However, the resolution declares our purpose to hold the property seized by us until Germany has by treaty with us made suitable provision "for the satisfaction of all claims against the German Government of all persons, wheresoever domiciled, who owe permanent allegiance to the United States of America and who have suffered through the acts of the German Government or its agents since July 31, 1914, loss, damage, or injury to their persons or property, directly or indirectly, whether through the ownership of shares of stock in German, American, or other corporations, or in consequence of hostilities or of any operations of war, or otherwise."

Provision is to be made in the treaty, which the resolution contemplates shall be entered into, for satisfaction by Germany on account of losses by our citizens either in "their persons or their property," "through the acts of the German Government or its agents," "directly or indirectly," either "through stock ownership," or "in consequence of hostilities or of any operations of war." Any one suffering in his person in consequence of hostilities or any operations of war is to be compensated. That means that we propose to make Germany provide compensation to every American soldier wounded or disabled in the war or ta reimburse the United States on account of any expenditures it has made or may make on that account.

Let not the eloquent junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] despair. We are going to make Germany take care of our disabled soldiers, whose plight he so commendably exposed in the address by which he startled the Senate and the country on Wednesday last.

The vexed question as to just what elements should enter into the reparations to be exacted of Germany is to be reopened. This was one of the most perplexing of the many difficult problems with which the peace conference was called upon to deal. The resolution proposes a basis essentially different from that finally agreed to at Versailles, after repeated conferences between the financial experts of all the allied countries, and protracted debates participated in by the foremost statesmen there assembled.

I can not believe that either the committee or the Senate has given sufficient consideration to this feature of the resolution to warrant us in making a declaration of policy in that regard such as it enunciates. The conference at Versailles felt constrained in some degree by the fact that the Germans laid down their arms upon the assurance that a treaty would be entered into in conformity with the famous "fourteen points."

In their acceptance of the proposal made by Germany and transmitted by our Government to the Allies, they said:

Further, in the conditions of peace laid down in his address to Congress on January 8, 1918, the President declared that invaded territory must be restored, as well as evacuated, and made free. The allied Governments feel that no doubt ought to be allowed to exist as to what this provision implies. By it they understand that compensa-

tion will be made by Germany for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allies and to their property by the aggression of Germany by land, by sea, and from the air.

This was a perfectly obvious enlargement of the only mention of the subject in the address of the President, which is as follows:

VIII. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world by nearly 50 years, should be righted in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

However, as the interpretation thus put upon the President's language was communicated to Germany, who without dissent entered into the armistice by which she expressly obligated herself to make "reparation for damage done," she became justly chargeable in the account with "all damage done to the civilian population" of the Allies. France set up the claim that all the cost of the war might and should be exacted of Germany under this language, for, her spokesman said, the cost of the war must be met by taxes laid upon the civilian population damaged to the amount they must thus pay. Great Britain under the constraint to which Lloyd-George was subjected in a hot political campaign in which he yielded to extravagant demands for promises to make Germany pay "shilling for shilling and ton for ton," made similar claims and particularly insisted on being reimbursed for all pensions and separation allowances. For, she said, though the soldier wounded in the field can not recover, being no civilian, yet when he is discharged he becomes a civilian and continues to suffer damage, for which he is compensated by a pension paid by his Government, the amount of which becomes, under the clause referred to, a charge against the enemy.

Against these views the American commissioners made vigorous and repeated protest, the President declaring that they were "clearly inconsistent with what we deliberately led the enemy to expect and can not now honorably alter simply because we have the power." They were evidently induced to yield, however, to some extent, possibly moved by the subtle argument of Gen. Smuts, whose statesmanship the conference revealed to the world and who emerged from it as one of its commanding figures. I ask that it be appended to my remarks as an example of his skill as a dialectitian.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered. [See Appendix.]

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

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. KING. As I understand, Mr. Baruch and our commissioners did not assent and did not yield; but when they saw that they were to be defeated they referred the matter to the supreme council, and there the council decided somewhat adversely to the contention that Mr. Baruch had so splendidly and valiantly made.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have avoided details for economy of time. The Senator has stated the conditions exactly. Our financial representatives positively declined to accept that construction of the prearmistice negotiations and refused to accede to it. The matter was then referred to what is known as the supreme council, or the "big four." They took the matter up while Mr. Wilson was on the ocean, coming to America, and he was advised by wireless of the renewal of the contention. The quotation which I have given was a part of his reply to the communication thus addressed to him by the financial commissioners who were then in Paris; but the fact is that they did yield, as will be disclosed directly.

The upshot of the thing was that the elements to be taken into consideration were to the number of 10 enumerated in the treaty. (Article 232.) I offer a copy as an appendix to my remarks, and, to aid the present discussion, quote the following, deemed to deal with damage to the "civilian population":

(4) Damage caused by any kind of maltreatment of prisoners of war.

(5) As damage caused to the people of the allied and associated powers, all pensions and compensation in the nature of pensions to naval and military victims of war (including members of the air force), whether mutilated, wounded, sick, or invalided, and to the dependents of such victims, the amount due to the allied and associated Governments being calculated for each of them as being the capitalized cost of such pensions and compensation at the date of the coming into force of the present treaty on the basis of the scales in force in France at such date.

(6) The cost of assistance by the Governments of the allied and associated powers to prisoners of war and to their families and dependents.

(7) Allowances by the Governments of the allied and associated powers to the families and dependents of mobilized person or persons serving with the forces, the amount due to them for each calendar year in which hostilities occurred being calculated for each Government on the basis of the average scale for such payments in force in France during that year.

After all the travail here only sketched, pensions and separation allowances were included; but, under the resolution before us, it will not be necessary for our negotiators in framing the new treaty with Germany to indulge in any such refinement as eventually resulted in their inclusion by the Versailles conference, for the Secretary of State is commanded, if this resolution shall be adopted, notwithstanding any previous commitments, to demand full satisfaction for all damage done to any citizen of the United States by the forces of Germany, in his person or property, and he is adjured never to consent to let the seized German property go until such provision is made. That includes soldiers as well as civilians. We propose to go beyond the wildest limit proposed by the jingoes of England and France in our demands upon Germany. It will occasion some surprise to the American people to learn that we are even thinking of making any such claim. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has out-Heroded Herod. He complained bitterly about the terms imposed upon Germany by the treaty, and now proposes, like the rest of them, to wring from her the last farthing, without the slightest consideration of the effect upon her resuscitation industrially and our own future as it depends upon that contingency, and unrestrained in any degree by the prearmistice exchanges between her Government and ours, pursuant to which hostilities ceased and she was disarmed.

But some moderation is shown toward her, evidently inadvertently, for it is only such damage as our nationals sustained in their "person or property" for which compensation is to be made. The dependents of a man killed in battle or who dies of wounds or disease are undoubtedly damaged by his death, but they are damaged through injury neither to their persons nor their property.

For so much of the outlay of the War Risk Insurance Bureau as goes to the disabled soldiers we shall make Germany pay; for so much as is awarded to his dependents upon his death she may claim exemption. Upon what theory do we hold her in the one case and release her in the other? Upon no theory. The subject has had, can have had, no serious consideration by the committee. The resolution should be recommitted and those provisions, at least, which introduce the highly controversial question of the elements entering into the amount Germany should pay should be eliminated. If it is deemed advisable to make any expression whatever concerning the terms of the treaty on that subject, general language, such as that quoted from the reply of the Allies to Germany's proposal for an armistice, should be employed.

There is another reason equally cogent why this resolution should be recommitted.

It is quite likely that the author of the resolution, as well as the committee, had in mind only such property as was taken over by the Alien Property Custodian; but, as pointed out, the language used includes a most important class of property that never did pass into his hands, namely, the German ships. They were seized as prizes, taken over, not pursuant to any statutory enactment but in conformity with international law, under which belligerent ships become subject to capture and confiscation by or upon the adjudication of a prize court of the captor nation of the enemy character of the ship.

Under the laws of nations the property of enemy nationals on land has a status quite different from the property of such on the high seas, whether it be ships or merchandise. The former is free from molestation unless by express legislative act of the enemy country within whose jurisdiction it may be; the latter is subject to capture immediately upon the precipitation of war. It has been persistently maintained by those who seek to make more humane the laws of war that private property on land should be immune from seizure or confiscation. The amelioration sought in that regard has rarely been urged as to ships of a belligerent. Treaties negotiated in modern times have not infrequently applied the principle contended for by making specific provision that in the event of war between the high contracting parties the nationals of either should have a limited time to depart with their effects from the territory of the other or, choosing to abide in the country where domiciled, should not be disturbed in their possessions so long as they observed the law and gave no aid to the nation to which their allegiance was due. Such a provision, or one like it, is found in the treaty with Prussia of 1828, read to the Senate this morning by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], by virtue of which Germany claims we must account for all property taken by the Alien Property Custodian, and, perhaps, not for the amount realized on the sale of the same, but for the value at the time it was taken, as she contends, in violation of the express terms of that treaty.

Let it not be understood that I am urging or even admitting the soundness of that view. I am merely stating the contention being made by Germany with reference to the property

taken over by the Alien Property Custodian as distinguished from the ships which, so far as can be judged in the absence of any authoritative official claim, are regarded by her as being upon an entirely different footing.

Some very unequivocal language would be required to justify the contention that any nation had stipulated not to capture the ships of its enemy upon the high seas or otherwise afloat. The title of the captor accordingly as to ships rests upon quite a different and, generally speaking, a much firmer foundation than nonmaritime property. In our war legislation this distinction was recognized. The ships seized by us were dealt with by the act approved May 12, 1917, which declared the title to the same vested in the United States. The original enemy property act, approved October 1, 1917, contemplated only the sequestration of such property. It was not until the passage of the amendment of March 28, 1918, providing for the sale of the same that any effort was made to pass the title. Evidently Congress was impressed originally with the wisdom or justice of the more liberal rule of international law heretofore adverted to, or felt some constraint by reason of the treaty of 1828 touching the confiscation of the property passing into the hands of the Custodian. It moved without hesitation in the case of the ships.

It is, in view of what has been said, a serious question as to whether we may not legitimately retain the German ships as an offset, small indeed, to the enormous expenditure to which we were put to carry on the war, without according any credit to Germany whatever on account of them in the final adjustment which we must exact of her, at least for the ships and property of our nationals seized or destroyed by her on the high seas.

The resolution ignores the very essential difference pointed out.

I know of no reason why we should, out of a spirit of generosity toward Germany, surrender one hundred million to two hundred millions worth of ships to her or give her credit for their value in balancing our account with her. We ought to do neither, unless constrained to do so by some treaty obligation, or the force of international law which we can not honorably disregard.

I refrain from any extended comment on that part of the resolution which purports to reserve to the United States "rights, powers, privileges, claims, indemnities, reparations, and advantages" to which it or its nationals are or may be entitled under the Versailles treaty, perhaps sufficiently animadverted on in the course of the debate. I remark, however, that I can not understand how Senators can be moved to put the United States in the humiliating position of seeming to assert that we may validly claim and that under certain contingencies we shall claim under that treaty which we have repudiated and to which we have declined to become a party. A treaty is a contract between two or more nations. Its validity and effect are determined by substantially the same rules as govern the execution and interpretation of contracts between individuals, except, of course, that duress can not be pleaded in avoidance of a treaty imposed upon a conquered nation. When was it ever, in any country, under any system of law, held or even maintained that one named as a party to a contract, who declined to execute it or to be bound by its terms, could assert any rights under it, could claim under the provisions deemed by him to be to his advantage and yet escape the obligation of those imposing duties or responsibilities upon him?

This resolution ought not to pass. It was conceived in the midst of the passions aroused by the protracted debate on the treaty to appease the demand of the people for progress toward peace likely to grow so insistent as to sweep away all opposition to ratification. As a piece of political strategy it was a masterpiece. Its value as a contribution to the statesmanship of the times has never been made evident, and a careful study of it demonstrates that it is positively mischievous.

APPENDIX A.

[From "The making of the reparation and economic sections of the treaty," by Bernard M. Baruch. Memorandum submitted by Gen. Smuts, pp. 30–32.]

In this reservation a careful distinction must be made between the quotation from the President, which refers to the evacuation and restoration of the invaded territories, and the implication which the Allies find in that quotation and which they proceed to enunciate as a principle of general applicability. The Allies found in the President's provision for restoration of the invaded territories a general principle implied of far-reaching scope. This principle is that of compensation for all damage to the civilian population of the Allies in their persons or property, which resulted from the German aggression, and whether done on land or sea or from the air. By accepting this comprehensive principle (as the German Government did), they acknowledged their liability to compensation for all damage to the civilian population or their property wherever and however arising, so long as it was the result of German aggression. The President's limitation to restoration of the invaded territories only of some of the Allies was clearly abandoned.

The next question is how to understand the phrase "civilian population" in the above reservation, and it can be most conveniently answered by an illustration. A shopkeeper in a village in northern France lost his shop through enemy bombardment, and was himself badly wounded. He would be entitled as one of the civilian population to compensation for the loss of his property and for his personal disablement. He subsequently recovered completely, was called up for military service, and after being badly wounded and spending some time in the hospitals was discharged as permanently unfit.

The expense he was to the French Government during this period as a soldier (his pay and maintenance, his uniform, rifle, ammunition, his keep in the hospital, etc.) was not damage to a civilian, but military loss to his Government, and it is therefore arguable that the French Government can not recover compensation for such expense under the above reservation. His wife, however, was, during this period, deprived of her breadwinner and she therefore suffered damage as a member of the civilian population, for which she would be entitled to compensation. In other words, the separation allowances paid to her and her children during this period by the French Government would have to be made good by the German Government, as the compensation which the allowances represent was their liability. After the soldier's discharge as unfit, he rejoins the civilian population, and as for the future he can not (in whole or in part) earn his own livelihood, he is suffering damage as a member of the civilian population, for which the German Government are again liable to make compensation. In other words, the pension for disablement which he draws from the French Government is really a liability of the German Government, which they must under the above reservation make good to the French Government. It could not be argued that as he was disabled while a soldier he does not suffer damage as a civilian after his discharge if he is unfit to do his ordinary work. He does literally suffer as civilian after his discharge, and his pension is intended to make good this damage, and is therefore a liability of the German Government. If he had been killed in active service his wife as a civilian would have been totally deprived of her breadwinner and would be entitled to compensation. In other words, the pension she would draw from the French Government would really be a liability of the German Government under the above reservation, and would have to be made good by them to the French Government

The plain, common-sense construction of the reservation therefore leads to the conclusion that, while direct war expenditures (such as the pay and equipment of soldiers, the cost of rifles, guns, and ordnance and all similar expenditures) could perhaps not be recovered from the Germans, yet disablement pensions to discharged soldiers, or pensions to widows and orphans, or separation allowances paid to their wives and children during the period of their military service are all items representing compensation to members of the civilian population for damage sustained by them, for which the German Government are liable. What was spent by the Allied Governments on the soldier himself, or on the mechanical appliances of war, might perhaps not be recoverable from the German Government under the reservation, as not being in any plain and direct sense damage to the civilian population. But what was, or is, spent on the citizen before he became a soldier or after he has ceased to be a soldier or at any time on his family, represents compensation for damages done to civilians and must be made good by the German Government under any fair interpretation of the above reservation. This includes all war pensions and separation allowances, which the German Government are liable to make good, in addition to reparation or compensation for all damage done to property of the Allied peoples.

(Signed) J. C. SMUTS.

PARIS, *March 31, 1919.*

APPENDIX B.

REPARATION.

SECTION 1.

* * * * * * *

Article 232.

The Allied and Associated Governments recognize that the resources of Germany are not adequate, after taking into account permanent diminutions of such resources which will result from other provisions of the present treaty, to make complete reparation for all such loss and damage.

The Allied and Associated Governments, however, require, and Germany undertakes, that she will make compensation for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allied and Associated Powers and to their property during the period of the belligerency of each as an Allied or Associated Power against Germany by such aggression by land, by sea, and from the air, and in general all damage as defined in Annex I hereto.

In accordance with Germany's pledges, already given, as to complete restoration for Belgium, Germany undertakes, in addition to the compensation for damage elsewhere in this Part provided for, as a consequence of the violation of the Treaty of 1839, to make reimbursements of all sums which Belgium has borrowed from the Allied and Associated Governments up to November 11, 1918, together with interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum on such sums.

This amount shall be determined by the Reparation Commission, and the German Government undertakes thereupon forthwith to make a special issue of bearer bonds to an equivalent amount payable in marks gold, on May 1, 1926, or, at the option of the German Government, on the 1st of May in any year up to 1926. Subject to the foregoing, the form of such bonds shall be determined by the Reparation Commission. Such bonds shall be handed over to the Reparation Commission, which has authority to take and acknowledge receipt thereof on behalf of Belgium. (Ibid., pp. 127–129.)

[Mr. KING addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, the listless character of this debate shows how little concerned is the country with the controversy and the differences which formally divide us in this Chamber. The perfidious nation, as it has been called by Senators on the other side of the Senate Chamber, will bear the characterization with equanimity. The perfidious majority of 7,000,000 in the country, so characterized by our friends on the other side, approved the policy of perfidy, so proclaimed by Democratic Senators, a policy declared at the outset of the campaign

by the candidate of the party which, by an overwhelming majority, was intrusted with the responsibility for government at home and our policy abroad.

We held that grand and solemn referendum which was sought by the then spokesman for the Senators on the other side of the Chamber, with a result known to the world. Thus it is that Democratic Senators have attacked the resolution before the Senate and the majority here with amiable violence and perfunctory vehemence. Their ears are deaf to the now faint echoes of those phrases which we all would forget, which led the world to believe that once we were "too proud to fight," that we were "not concerned with the causes" of the European conflict, that we would have "peace without victory"; their ears are thus deaf, but they still speak the language of political anachronism, the sanguinary speech of Mr. Lloyd-George, when he would have hung the Kaiser and squeezed the last drop of blood from the veins of the German people. That language is no more contemporary than the speech on the part of the then principal spokesman for America, which preceded the utterances of the British prime minister in the khaki campaign.

I believe, sir, that if you were to study, in the leisure of your Sunday afternoon, the speeches which have been made on the other side, you would be—I was about to say driven—you would be lulled to the conclusion that they are a compound of contradiction out of the whole pharmacopœia paradox.

They complain—a Senator, whose capacity I so greatly admire complained—because in eight weeks the present administration has been unable to undo the havoc in our foreign affairs wrought during eight years of the preceding administration, or to wipe out in that time the humiliation and the loss of caste in the world which resulted from the policies which preceded those of the present President. It is argued on the other side that the resolution before us is unnecessary, because peace has been established in law, since it has existed in fact for so long. Democratic Senators hold, on the other hand, that because we have not made peace, we are responsible for the economic depression manifest throughout the world. They would have us delay to negotiate a peace now, although nearly two years ago the President was insisting, as he spoke in half of the States of the Union, that peace must immediately be ratified, else the Union would perish.

They then point to the great trade with Germany, under which we have exported to her as much as we did during the last year preceding the war, as evidence that there is no occasion for adopting the resolution before us.

Next, they condemn us for withholding our economic support from Europe. Indeed, to hear some of our opponents, if you were not accustomed to the manners of this Chamber, sir, you would be compelled to believe that the United States is responsible for the fall of the price of silver in the Asiatic markets, for the acrid animosities which have led the Central European States to choke railway traffic and commerce by arbitrary decree, even for that strange statesmanship which in Europe to-day would seek to settle the question of reparations while that of Silesia is still unsettled.

As the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] pointed out, the representation of the President's position by one of the opponents of this resolution was neither candid nor fair. The President, like a very considerable number of Senators on this side of the Chamber, while he advocated the reservation of our commercial and economic rights by the terms of the peace resolution, was unwilling that the resolution should commit us irrevocably to a policy on the other side of the Atlantic. His view has been justified by the event. It was once the fashion in some quarters to cry "traitor," or "pro-German," at the public man who has ventured to challenge the wisdom of our administration or of allied policy on the continent of Europe. Yesterday the Senator from Tennessee deplored the course which will not join our regiments to those of France when they march into the Ruhr, if march they do. He was willing to accept the decision of the Reparations Commission as just, as economic, as realizable, whatever it might actually be. I do not think that the Senator will hold that the London proposals for payment of reparations conform to the letter with part 8 of the treaty. If they did, they must still be measured not alone by the damage wrought by Germany in the war, nor by the wanton devastation of northern France by ruthless German generals, but by the ability of Germany to pay—that Germany whose frontiers have been narrowed and whose resources have been diminished by the Treaty of Versailles.

I had not expected to speak at any length of the question of reparations—now acute—in connection with the resolution to declare the war at an end. The question was raised yesterday by the Senator from Tennessee. During the five years before the outbreak of the war the exports of Germany amounted to some $2,000,000,000 annually, or three hundred million less than the sum of her annual imports. It is difficult to establish an exact comparison between present values or future values and those which obtained before the war, but let us, for argument's sake, assume that in the near future the aggregate annual value of German exports may amount to $4,000,000,000. In 1920 British exports, exclusive of reexports, were worth approximately six billion five hundred million, while the aggregate of American exports for the year was eight billions.

In the simplest terms the fixed indemnity proposed by the Paris conference to be paid by Germany was five hundred million a year for 2 years; an average of a billion a year for 9 years; an average of a billion and a half a year for 31 years.

In short, German exports, competitive with those of America throughout the world, must exceed German imports by that amount annually. Parenthetically, it may be noted that the German proposals submitted to the American State Department suggest an aggregate sum not very different from that of the fixed total contained in the Paris proposals.

If the aggregate of German exports amounts to four billions annually at current value, as against imports of three billion, Germany will be able during the first 11 years to make the fixed payments proposed, but under the terms of the London proposals she is required to pay an additional 12½ per cent tax upon the aggregate value of her exports—that is, an additional half billion a year—which, again, mark you, must be found in the aggregate of German exports—that is, added to them! Considering the vast sums at issue, whatever powers are conferred on the Reparations Commission by article 8 of the treaty, the exaction of maximum possible damages for injuries done by German arms can not be finally determined until we know what are to be the resources, the assets, of the conquered creditor. Mr. President, there is none of us who has read the history of the early duchies in Silesia, of its occupation and government by Polish, Bohemian, Hungarian, Austrian, and German monarchs—there is none of us who has studied the ethnographic and economic charts who would pretend to form a prompt and certain judgment as to its disposition, but this much any Senator, unprejudiced, informed, and intelligent, will say, that although by force you may compel the acceptance of terms of reparations, their total can not be fixed finally, wisely, and yet independently of the future disposition of the industries and resources which cluster about Breslau or are found to the south of it.

The cabled dispatches have it that Mr. Lloyd-George is held back from an invasion of the Ruhr by British public opinion, while M. Briand is harried to make the advance by the pressure of opinion in the French Chamber. Under the providence of God, the Government of the United States is free to exercise and to express its judgment upon the wisdom or unwisdom of the proposed policy, because the treaty of Versailles failed of ratification, because we are at liberty to declare the legal end of the war under the terms of the resolution before us!

German diplomacy has been lacking in candor and understanding. If the allied diplomacy has been disingenuous in pretending to settle the Silesian and reparations questions independently of one another, so also has been the German diplomacy in its delays and omissions. Nevertheless, I hazard the conjecture that the immediate occupation of the Ruhr will be approved neither by official opinion nor by public opinion in America. Since the peace resolution is coming to a vote at the present juncture of affairs in Europe, there have been references here to the legal precedents for the establishment of peace, and complaints that none is found for the presentation of this resolution. There is not to-day, there will not be in the future, a handful of men outside of the Senate concerned in the constitutional metaphysics of making peace thus. We were unable to make peace by treaty because of the character of the league covenant and because of the union of that covenant to the treaty of peace. How providential was that failure on our part! We remained free from the entangling league, but more, we have withheld our assent to the settlement comprised in the treaties of St. Germain, the Trianon, and Versailles, a settlement which can not last, because its political terms violate not only the political principles for which the war was professed to be fought but that supreme political principle of democratic nationality, of national democracy, which has been the disturbing and irresistible force in European international politics since the beginning of the last century.

The Senator from Alabama, the great Senator from Alabama, I am glad to call him, has wisely said that the resolution before us once adopted the treaties which I have named will not come before the Senate for ratification. Their fate will have escaped

the control of Senators or Secretaries of State. The complexity of amendments, the number of reservations necessary to be made, the acceptance of them all by all the powers parties to them, including the former enemy States, the long debate leading into the next campaign which would follow their submission here, all forbid their reconsideration; but, above all, the tide of destiny is carrying them by. We are about to take action which will permit us to accredit ambassadors or ministers to central Europe and to receive ministers or ambassadors from there, even as the Allies have. We shall be able to extend credit to sell and to buy as freely as they, while new treaties of amity and commerce with the former enemy States are in the making. The negotiation of these treaties, like the negotiation of others with the allied States, to facilitate the protection of the economic rights conveyed to us under the Versailles and other treaties, will take time. That can not be otherwise. It is for this reason that we must make an end to the war by declaration, a declaration which surrenders no rights of the United States to any power. Those Senators who have opposed the resolution on the ground that it surrenders commercial or economic rights know very well that the retention of German property by our Government under the terms of the resolution, know that the economic dependence of Europe upon us, whether for new credits or for the refunding of existing debts, all afford us advantages under which an informed and prudent administration may negotiate the treaties to recover and to secure that which the last administration tried to throw away. Although we do not become party to the treaties of Versailles, the Trianon, and St. Germain, we shall not shirk our duty; we shall not shrink from the full measure of responsibility; we shall be free to take that part in the economic reconstruction of Europe which is necessary to the very life of her civilization and the recovery of our own commerce and industry.

Our obligations in effecting European tranquility, because of war's involvements, are not less impelling than our part in the war itself. * * * Helpfulness does not mean entanglement, and participation in economic adjustments does not mean sponsorship for treaty commitments which do not concern us and in which we will have no part. * * * We can be helpful because we are moved by no hatreds and harbor no fears.

Aye, and because with peace declared we shall still be free!

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is rather too late in the afternoon and Senators are too anxious to vote and get away to enter upon an extended discussion of the many other things which have been discussed under the joint resolution and things which might be of interest for discussion had we more time at our disposal.

As I view the joint resolution it does two things in which I am primarily concerned. First, it establishes a technical state of peace, and, secondly, it undertakes to compound and hold the property which we have gathered under the alien custodian law for future disposition, which disposition shall be made by treaty with Germany. There may be a difference of opinion as to just the effect of declaring a technical state of peace when we have actually been at peace for two years, but I think all will concede that some advantage is to be derived from it.

I presume that the difference of opinion in this Chamber over the feasibility and desirability of the joint resolution arises largely out of our difference of view with reference to the question of what we should have done as to the league and what we should do as to the Versailles treaty. I suspect that the discussion is largely colored by our views with reference to those propositions.

The joint resolution is designed to establish a technical state of peace until we can by treaty settle the matters which are yet to be settled by treaty between this Government and Germany. Of course, a treaty must come some time, and anything that we may say in the joint resolution as to our view with reference to what that treaty should contain is only suggestive and, of course, in no way binding upon the treaty-making power.

But I desire to pass by the technical discussion of the joint resolution to make some observations upon some of the things which have been suggested in opposition to it; in other words, rather than discuss the joint resolution, to discuss the discussion which has been going on.

A great deal of time has been taken in attempting to show an inconsistent position with reference to the Republican Party, or rather some of its leaders, on the question of the league, that their position at this time is inconsistent with positions which they have heretofore occupied, and finally as to what the last election really determined. There ought not to be any wide divergence of view as to what the election determined; nevertheless it is a source of constant discussion here in the Chamber. Regardless of what some particular individual who may be a leader or near leader in the Republican Party may have said as to what was the particular issue involved in the campaign, it is very clear to my mind that so far as the voters were concerned those from the Democratic Party who voted the Republican ticket and those in the Republican Party who voted the Republican ticket understood precisely what they were voting on, and that is that they were rejecting not only the League of Nations, but, in so far as they understood it, they were rejecting the Versailles treaty. In other words, both of them meant to the ordinary citizen, the layman, the man upon the street and in the workshop, an entangling of this Government in the affairs of Europe—that they thoroughly understood, and against that they arrayed their votes upon the 2d of November. They were not supremely concerned about reservations. They looked upon them rather as views expressed by international lawyers, the modification of a legal document, concerning which matters they were not going to pass an opinion; but no man stood before an audience during the last campaign and announced his position with reference to being either in favor of or opposed to this Government departing from its established foreign policy or entangling itself in the affairs of Europe that he did not get a response from the audience which indicated precisely how they understood that question.

The voter does not ordinarily take the time and has not the opportunity to go into details, but he grasps easily and firmly the great fundamental, underlying principles of a great question, and upon that understanding he passes his judgment. That, in my opinion, was what happened on the 2d day of November last.

Besides that, Mr. President, I think the issue was made fairly plain to the voters of this country by the discussion in the campaign. I do not think they were permitted to be in doubt as to what they were voting upon. I will trespass upon the patience of the Senate long enough to call attention to some of the statements which were made, and which were the turning points in the campaign. The speech of President Harding at Des Moines, Iowa, has been referred to, and I will read a single paragraph from it. Then I want to read the construction which the opposition party placed upon it. They did not leave us in a position to construe it ourselves; they said to their voters and to their followers, "This is the construction which we, as your leaders of the Democratic Party, place upon the issues as made."

President Harding said in his Des Moines speech:

There is no need of reservations of this character. The obligations are clear enough and specific enough.

That is, the obligations of the treaty.

I oppose the proposed league not because I fail to understand what a former member of the Democratic administration has said we were being "let in for," but because I believe I understand precisely what we are being "let in for." I do not want to clarify these obligations—

That is, the obligations of the treaty or league.

I want to turn my back on them. It is not interpretation but rejection that I am seeking. My position is that the proposed league strikes a deadly blow at our constitutional integrity and surrenders to a dangerous extent our independence of action.

There never was any doubt from the time of the announcement of that doctrine until the close of the campaign that the leader of the Republican Party did not propose to enter into any combination, association, alliance, or league which in any way compromised or militated against the free exercise of the absolute sovereignty or independence of the United States; and, as I said a moment ago, that was the one question which the people understood and on which they were voting.

That speech of the President was construed throughout the country by Republican papers and by Democratic papers as an absolute rejection of any league of nations. The New York Evening Post of October 8, 1920, says:

At Des Moines last night Senator Harding scrapped the league.

And if there is anyone who has been sufficiently informed to speak without possible error concerning the League of Nations it is the New York Evening Post. It continues:

There are to be no more attempts at clarification; there are to be no more attempts at interpretation. It is to be rejection; and in his heart of hearts Senator Harding knows that he is rejecting more than the league. He is rejecting the association of nations to which he still professes adherence. Senator Harding has spoken and his message is an emphatic no to the sacrifices and aspirations for which America entered the war.

The Evening Post of October 7, under the headline "Senator Harding definitely rejects the League of Nations; declares he favors staying out, and accepts the direct issue," says:

Senator Harding no longer seeks interpretative reservations but absolute repudiation.

The New York World of October 8, 1920, editorially says:

Harding scraps the league. In his speech at Des Moines yesterday he declared without qualification or reservation that he favored rejection of the league covenant. To make his objection still more emphatic, he declared that the American troops in the occupied zone of Germany

had no business there. There can be no controversy as to the meaning of these words, "I do not wish to clarify these obligations. I want to turn my back on them. It is not interpretation but rejection that I am seeking." The Senator is entitled to the credit at last as having made himself intelligible. His attitude toward the league is the attitude of JOHNSON, BORAH, MOSES, BRANDEGEE, and PENROSE, and all the bitter enders.

I have here an article from the World-Herald, which is published at Omaha, Nebr., and which has been built up through the industry and ability of the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. The World-Herald of October 8, 1920, in an editorial entitled "The issue clearly joined," says:

Senator Harding at Des Moines made definite his unqualified opposition to the League of Nations and his determination that under his leadership, if elected, the United States shall refuse to enter with any reservations or on any terms whatever. For his frankness he is to be commended. Mr. and Mrs. Nebraska, are you a friend of the league with Cox, or are you its foe with Harding? Are you with Cox for its acceptance with any reasonable reservations, or with Harding and the irreconcilables for its rejection on whatever terms? These questions you must answer at the ballot box next month.

The people of Nebraska, after having that issue placed before them not only by Senator Harding but construed by its leading Democratic organ, voted overwhelmingly for the rejection of any league at all with or without reservations. And the issue was no better understood in Nebraska than it was understood throughout every State in the Union. It was simplified from time to time by editorials, and the people were not permitted to be in doubt upon the subject.

On October 13 the World-Herald said:

Senator Harding is for staying out of the league for peace and Gov. Cox is for going in. There is the issue in its naked simplicity, and the solemn referendum to determine the answer will be held on election day.

I read from an editorial in the New York Times of October 10:

The Republican candidate has removed all doubt about it; he has thrown off all disguise. In his Des Moines speech he has declared himself to be definitely against the league.

It then quotes at length his speech.

Again, on October 14, the same paper editorially said:

"I do not want to clarify these obligations," said Senator Harding in his Des Moines speech. "I want to turn my back on them. It is not interpretation but rejection that I am seeking." Nobody misunderstands that language. So far as the United States is concerned, it means the death of the league if Harding is elected. * * * Friends of the league who still cling to him evidently believe that, if elected, he would still seek to get the treaty ratified. That would expose him to the derision and contempt of the Nation, the world, for it would show that he sought and won the Presidency under false pretenses.

I am not going to take up the time of the Senate by calling attention to a great number of other editorials from leading papers; but while the campaign was in progress and the voters were being appealed to there was not that divergence of view as to what Senator Harding meant that there seems to be at this time in the Senate Chamber. He was charged with being opposed to any association, to any alliance, or to any understanding, or to any interference in European affairs, and upon that issue we went to the ballot box upon the 2d of November.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator state that that was the position of Senator Harding in the campaign?

Mr. BORAH. I say that was the charge which was made by the Democratic papers, and the issue was made in that way.

Mr. HARRISON. But did not the Republican candidate for the Presidency deny that charge and say that he was for an association or a league?

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not understand that he said he was for a league; he said he was for an association.

Mr. HARRISON. Did not the Republican candidate for the Presidency say that he cared nothing about the name; that it might be called by any name desired, but that he was for some organization that might preserve the peace of the world?

Mr. BORAH. I am perfectly aware that Senator Harding said he was for an association and he did not care anything about the name; but after he had declared that he was against any association and any alliance or any league which in any way militated against the absolute independence of this Government to exercise its own judgment in every crisis, there was very little room left for an association, and I was never disturbed after that.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator recalls the statement which was issued by Candidate Harding at that time, after his speech at Des Moines, in which he said he had turned his back upon the league, in which he explained that he was for a league, but that he was against the particular league as written in the Versailles treaty. Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I recall that statement.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator now know what was the correct position of Candidate Harding during the campaign?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I know what it was, because he has now scrapped the league. [Laughter.]

I said when I arose there might have been differences of view among the leaders, but I was undertaking to demonstrate that the voters understood what they were voting upon; and after all, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party are each made up in their strength by the opinions of those who do the voting; that is what constitutes the party and at last shapes the policies. However great a leader may be, he is not the party, as we have found out. Leaders do not make the issue; the people make the issue, as the closing days of every campaign discloses.

With reference to the pending resolution, President Harding was not indefinite upon that question. I think the able Senator from Mississippi will agree with me that, with reference to the particular measure which we now have before the Senate, the Republican candidate for the Presidency was very definite. He stated in his speech of acceptance that he would be very glad, if elected, as soon as a resolution declaring a state of peace could be declared, to attach his signature to it. That statement was never modified, so far as I know, in any respect during the entire campaign. He stated also in his address to Congress a few days ago that a resolution declaratory of a state of peace would receive his approval and his signature. So I do not think that there is any doubt about what the President's view is with reference to this particular joint resolution.

But there was another announcement, Mr. President, during the closing days of the campaign which, it seems to me, ought to be given a great deal of consideration in determining what the real issue was. I refer to an address issued by ex-President Wilson upon the 27th day of October last. As everyone knows, I have not entertained the same view with reference to the League of Nations that the ex-President has, but I have always profoundly respected the unchangeable attitude which he has held toward the league after he became its advocate. He was not willing to surrender any part or parcel of the instrument which he framed, because he had stated that, in his opinion, its adoption involved the peace of the world, and viewing it from that standpoint we must commend him for the attitude which he assumed from the beginning and held to the last in advocacy of this proposition. This man, who more than anyone else in the world represented the League of Nations and what it stood for, stated to the people upon the 27th of October that a vote for the Republican ticket was a vote against the League of Nations; and I doubt not that every citizen of the United States who was preparing to vote within a few days afterwards and who had an opportunity read and pondered the President's statement. So, Mr. President, we need not doubt as to what the judgment of the American people was upon this subject upon the 2d of November. Moreover, the best evidence of that is found in the fact that not only have we formally rejected the League of Nations but in practice almost every nation which signed it has rejected it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STANFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator has just stated that we have rejected the Versailles treaty. Of course that happened when we refused to ratify it. Now, having rejected it, what is the legal effect of the reservation contained in the pending joint resolution of the rights and privileges prescribed and set forth in the League of Nations? In other words, does it have any other effect than simply to serve notice upon Germany as to what we are going to expect when it comes to the negotiation of the terms of peace in a treaty of peace?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think that is one of the effects of it. I think another effect is that it compounds this property and holds it and fixes the rules and the laws which govern this property until it is disposed of by treaty.

Mr. POMERENE. It is already compounded, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know about that. That is where the difficulty arises, and that is the difference of opinion which exists between the very able Senator and me. We passed a declaration of war, and then, by virtue of the fact that we were in a state of war, we passed the alien property custodian law, and under that law certain things were done. Now, if we should simply repeal the declaration of war and say nothing in the act of repeal as to the status of that property which we took possession of solely by reason of the fact that we were in a state of war, I am not by any means clear that we would compound it or hold it as it should be held under that law. We had no right to do what we did under the alien property custodian

law except by reason of the fact that we were in a state of war. If we pass out of that state of war without preserving that property and compounding it, it is a very serious legal proposition, which ought not to be thrown into this proposition at all, as to what becomes of it. We can avoid that by doing what we do here as a matter of abundant precaution, and, in my judgment, that is all there is to it.

Mr. POMERENE. I am quite sure we can do that if Germany agrees to it, but until Germany agrees to it, it is simply a naked proposition.

Mr. BORAH. No, Mr. President; I think upon reflection the Senator will not deem himself bound by that statement. We are fixing the status of property which is in this country, under our control and within our jurisdiction, and Germany has nothing at all to say about it. When we come to make a treaty with Germany the matter can be settled in that way, but so far as our right is concerned to deal with this property and stamp it with a certain status during the time we have jurisdiction of it, Germany has nothing to say about it, and her objection would avail nothing.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to inquire whether that part of this joint resolution could not just as well be passed next week or next month, and be just as effective as if included in this joint resolution? In other words, does the fact that it is connected with the declaration that the war is at an end have anything to do with its efficacy?

Mr. BORAH. As I have just said, if it be true that we could deal with this property only by reason of the fact that we were in a state of war, I should think the orderly procedure would be to fix its status at the time we passed out of a state of war, and it was for that reason that they were both incorporated in this joint resolution.

Now, Mr. President, just a word upon another feature of this discussion.

I said that not only has the United States rejected the league and failed to ratify the treaty, but almost every country which became a party to the Versailles treaty has either disregarded it or has rejected it in practice. A great deal has been said here about the fact that we ought to become parties to or ratify the Versailles treaty. Why, my friends, there is nothing in Europe that is more universally disregarded and despised to-night than the Versailles treaty.

Let me read what the premier of the French Republic said about it only a day or two ago in the assembly:

> I have something to say about the treaty, for I can not permit the country and Parliament to continue in the way of illusion and errors. The treaty of Versailles is ideally perfect. We can find anything we want in that treaty. It has but one fault. Like the celebrated mare of Roland it is not living. In order that it may live there is a piece of mechanism which must work. But this piece of mechanism is a dead letter, because it does not work. I refer to the reparation commission.

There is only one country in the world where the Versailles treaty has any friends, and that is the country in which it has never been permitted to operate. The only place where it is defended is in the Senate of the United States, and we are defending it because we have not sufficiently studied the baneful influence it has had upon the European Continent.

Briand further says:

> This commission should fix the total of Germany's debt. Then it should record and accept payments by Germany. This commission has something to do with nearly every bit of the treaty. But for the last year there has been no accord in the commission. It has not even been able to agree on the amount of damages.
>
> The only treaty we have is in accord with our allies. I have thought it essential to maintain this accord, and therefore I submitted to the reduction of our claims. I could have ended the conference in discord, but it ended in accord.

The only treaty which we have under which to act!

Under what authority are the troops in Germany at this time? Let some Senator who believes in the Versailles treaty point me to the provision which authorizes them to send troops into Germany under present conditions. They are in Germany at this time because the prime ministers, Briand and Lloyd-George, agreed among themselves—not the reparations commission but the two prime ministers agreed—what Germany should pay, and that agreement was not in accord with but in disregard of the terms of the Versailles treaty; and they are entering Germany at this time not to collect an amount fixed by the reparations commission but to collect an amount fixed by a commission unknown to the treaty, to wit, the supreme council. It may be that they are acting the best they can under the circumstances. I only call your attention to the fact that while we eulogize the Versailles treaty it is being utterly disregarded by those who have signed it and are bound by it.

I ask permission to insert in the RECORD some further views from publicists and writers in Europe upon the Versailles treaty and its abandonment and disregard by the nations which are the signers of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[London Daily News, Oct. 30, 1920—A. G. Gardiner.]

The letter is addressed to ex-President Poincare. In it are found these statements:

That if the policy of France since the armistice is pursued it "can not fail to bring our country into grave collision."

It then refers to the fierce attacks of the French press on England.

It declares that one of the reasons for this attack is because England refused to apply private property of Germans in England to the reparation clause of the treaty. He then says:

"When the war ended in the victory of the Allies, two paths were before us. Throughout 1917 and 1918 President Wilson had proclaimed as the object of the Allies the destruction of the institution of war, with its corollaries of armed alliances, secret diplomacy, and competitive armaments, and the substitution of a new world order based on cooperative purpose. The reign of force was to give place to the reign of law, underwritten by the guarantee of all the nations. It was upon these terms, implicit in the armistice conditions, that Germany surrendered and hostilities ceased. It seemed at that moment that the world had at last turned into a new path. To-day we are disillusioned. At the end of two years of peace, we are back in the old path. The Paris policy for which you, perhaps, more than any single person, are responsible, has triumphed over the Washington policy. * * * The main purpose of that policy has been simple. It is the political and economic destruction of Germany. Over the whole field of Europe you have pursued this purpose with a skill, an audacity, and an energy as brilliant as they are sinister and shortsighted. On the one hand, Germany is kept under the menace of an unlimited indemity which makes her financial recovery practically impossible. On the other, she is threatened with deprivation of the sources of economic power which would enable her to make the reasonable reparation that justice demands. Of her three coal fields, one has been taken. In the case of that of Upper Silesia your military agents are working ceaselessly to get it transferred to Poland. In the case of the third, that of the Ruhr, your openly confessed policy is to occupy it with your armies and to use it as an instrument for the political dismemberment of Germany by the secession of a south German confederation under French patronage * * * It was to promote this scheme that you sent the black troops to Frankfort. It is the occupation of the Ruhr which is insisted on as the penalty for any breach, however unavoidable, of the conditions laid down in regard to disarmament and the tribute of coal to France. The German populations of the old Austrian Empire are cut into fragments and doomed to impoverishment and oppression to prevent the union they desire with the people of their own language and race. Concurrently with this purpose of keeping Germany down by force, you are building up what the New Republic has called the most daring scheme of imperialism since Pan Germanism was at its zenith. The Continent is strewn with your military alliances and swarms with your military missions. It is French policy which has encouraged the Poles in a frantic imperialism which has ruined the prospects of that unfortunate country. It is French policy which sustains Wrangel and makes peace with Russia impossible. The great armament works of Skoda are in French control. Hungary is an outpost of your military system and is left with an army of 350,000 men, while Austria is reduced to 30,000, and the force of the whole German Empire is to be reduced to 100,000. Your treaty with Belgium, which you have declined to register with the League of Nations, converts that country into something a little different from a French protectorate. The frankly admitted purpose is to open up the Scheldt. The opening up of the Scheldt would make Antwerp a potential naval base. * * * Toward Germany you remain irreconcilably vindictive, coupling insistence on the whole treaty of Versailles, which the conscience of the world has repudiated, with the threat to occupy the Ruhr coal field, on which the economic life of Germany depends. Toward the Russian people France remains the cruelest of enemies, prepared to subsidize civil war, to institute mercenary armies, and to maintain the blockade, which in its reactions is a blockade of this country as well as of Russia.

—

[Contemporary Review, November, 1920, p. 620—by Huddleston.]

Before the war there were 26 States in Europe. To-day there are 35. * * * The making of new States certainly does not encourage peace. Reports recently prepared for the American Government show that 9 active wars are now in progress, 19 international fronts are strongly held for fear of attack, 4 frontiers are acutely sensitive, while civil war exists, or is likely to exist, in 7 countries. Everybody is arming; every nation has tremendously increased its expenditure on armies and armament. Peace has been signed, but this is the most relative kind of peace that Europe has ever known. The geographical arrangements of the map-making statesmen have produced the most unstable situation that could possibly have been imagined.

In the meantime, disregarding the covenant of the League of Nations, repudiating its spirit as well as ignoring its letter, occult alliances are being made, secret engagements are being entered into. The old diplomatic game begins anew.

The immediate cause of the founding of the little entente between the Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia, and Rumania is precisely the realization by these powers that secret bargains are being made against them, subterranean negotiations are taking place, the cynical sacrifices of friends to former enemies is a favorite device of the great powers, and if they are to live at all within the limits assigned them by the peace conference they must unite for their common protection.

Now, instead of the League of Nations which was proposed being an effective league, the greater part of Europe is left outside the league, and the smaller powers which are nominally in the league are in reality arranging themselves in groups in accordance with their conflicting and entangling interests, while we are totally ignorant of the attitude the Russia of to-morrow and the Germany of to-morrow will take up.

It is certain that Austria can not live by itself. The biggest blunder that was made by the peacemakers in Paris last year was to set up this absurdly incompetent and isolated State. It simply can not live, and every statesman worthy of the name recognizes this fact. Now, according to the treaties, Austria may not attach herself to Germany.

When all is said and done, however, in the confusion and complexity in which the affairs of middle Europe were left by the treaty makers, in the uncertainty of frontiers, the economic disorder, the enigmatic political relations, the conflict of the respective designs of the great powers, the projected formation of the little entente came as the promise of the beginning of stabilization. * * * The truth is that we have all played the game of diamond cut diamond. We have all been seeking special advantages in middle Europe. We have all been treating the smaller States as pawns on a perilous chessboard. There has been, and is, a great struggle going on for the control of these little peoples. We have been seeking to fasten upon them economic and political shackles. That we have not succeeded better is due to our fundamental disagreement. * * * The little entente was born out of fear.

Mr. BORAH. What has the Versailles treaty accomplished, Mr. President? I am perfectly aware that not only able Senators upon the other side but able men within my own party are advocating our ratification of the Versailles treaty. I have always thought that the League of Nations was a very bad instrument, menacing in every respect to this country; but I have not a particle of doubt that as between the two instruments it would be infinitely better for us to be in the League of Nations than to be a party to the Versailles treaty, assuming that the instruments could be separated.

The Versailles treaty has reduced Europe to a state of chaos and chronic revolution. Hundreds and thousands and millions of people have been hungered and made destitute or turned upon the streets to die by reason of the impossible terms of the Versailles treaty; and Europe will never regain its equilibrium or its poise or its economic composure until the Versailles treaty is either abandoned completely and absolutely, or else is revised to such an extent as to make it a new instrument based upon new principles.

Let me read you the words of a distinguished writer, L. P. Jacks, known to all publicists, who writes in the publication known as Land and Water, published in London. He says:

Taking a broad survey of the international situation, as it exists at the present moment, we observe that a confused and highly dangerous struggle is going on between two inconsistent principles, between two opposing groups of forces. On the one hand are the forces which arise from the determination of every nation to assert its political independence, its sovereign right to be master in its own house. On the other hand are the forces, equally insistent, which arise from the economic interdependence of all the nations of the world. Politically every nation claims to be master in its own house. Economically no nation is or can be master in its own house; its fortunes are implicated with the fortunes of all the rest. How can a group of nations which are economically dependent on one another—dependent, that is, for their daily bread—be at the same time politically independent of one another? How, at one and the same time, can the industry of the world be conducted as a partnership (which it plainly is) while the politics of the world are conducted as independent businesses, governed by the sovereign rights of the various nations concerned? This simple question covers the whole mass of international problems which now confront us. The political and the economic forces are in conflict. The crying need of the world to be governed on the lines of economic wisdom is being thwarted by the determination of the powers that be to govern it on the lines of a foreign policy which is a hundred years out of date. On the issue of that conflict the fate of industrial civilization depends. Reduced to its simplest terms it is a struggle between the flag and the loaf. There is not a doubt that the loaf will ultimately win. But unless the rulers of this world are wise in their day and generation immense suffering will have to be endured in the meantime.

When once we have grasped what is involved in the industrial constitution of modern society, the truth that stands out in clear prominence is this: That the economic interests of mankind have now won the primacy over their political interests. There was a time when this was not so. Before the industrial revolution it might fairly be contended that the political relationships between the States of the world were more important than their economic relationships. Compared with the present state of things each nation was then, relatively, self-contained and industrially independent of the others. Since then the fortunes of the nations have become interlocked on economic ground. The effect of this process of interlocking, which has been extraordinarily rapid, has been to create for them all a common economic interest and to increase the importance of the economic factor in international affairs until it has outstripped the importance of the political.

It follows that any right solution of the international problem, as it exists to-day, is bound to begin from the economic end. To erect political order on economic chaos is impossible. If you begin by drawing strategic frontiers, by adjusting a balance of power, by making maps to suit the nationalist ambitions of a score of States, by giving to each of them what the traditions of its flag demand, you will find at every step that you are running across the path of great economic forces which will sweep these political arrangements away as soon as you have completed them or possibly while they are only half complete. The economic needs of the peoples can no longer be forced to dance attendance on the kind of "foreign policy"—the only kind which the statesmen of Europe seem to be acquainted with—whose first object is to maintain the territorial status, the political power, the military prestige, the nationalist pride of the various nations it claims to represent. The world where this sort of thing was possible has ceased to exist and a new world, in which the relative importance of the political and economic factors is reversed, has come into being. I do not mean that the occupation of the statesman is gone. On the contrary, he has, if he would only read the signs of the times, a larger and more promising occupation than any which has fallen to the lot of his predecessors. He is dealing with a world the parts of which have become economically so interlocked that by no possibility can he treat it as a collection of kingdoms and empires, each of which is entitled to play its own political game, under the shallow formula of self-determination, irrespective of whether or not it is playing ducks and drakes with economic realities. His business is to make his "policy" conform to this salient fact instead of trying as heretofore to make the fact conform to his "policy."

As Mr. Keynes has pointed out, it was the misfortune, nay, the tragedy, of the Paris conference that, collectively, it failed to understand the supremacy of the economic factor in the life of modern civilization. Whether one considers the treaty as a whole or in parts the impression received at every point is that economic realities have been sacrificed to political considerations. What most impresses the impartial student of the treaty is not its violations of international morality (though these are evident enough) but its violations of economic law. By the amount and form of the indemnities imposed on the Central Empires, by the powers intrusted to the reparation commission, by the breaking up of territorial areas which are industrial units it first creates economic chaos and then, by setting up a League of Nations, proposes to establish political order on the chaos thus created. Its fundamental vice lies precisely in this, that it tackles the problem from the wrong end, putting first what ought to be second and second what ought to be first.

The constitution of the league itself does little more than perpetuate this fatal inversion. The form in which it has been devised makes it inevitable that the machinery of the league will fall into the hands of the old political gangs and provide them with a new playground and a new game; indeed, the process is going on under our very eyes. When Napoleon surveyed the field of Waterloo he remarked to Soult, "Quel joli échiquier!" (What a pretty chessboard!) One need not be a cynic to apply the same description to the League of Nations as it now exists. It is true the disposition of the pieces has been altered and new rules laid down for keeping order among the spectators, but the sinister fact is that the old players are still seated on either side of the board, and the old backers, in the press and elsewhere, still urging them on to play the old game. That these men will continue to do so, in obedience to habits of mind which dominate them all, is a danger greatly to be feared. "Political considerations," "reasons of foreign policy" will, as before, dominate the feast, and economic necessities will have to be satisfied with the crumbs that fall from their table. On these terms the peace and prosperity of the world will remain in jeopardy, in spite of the league, or perhaps in consequence of it.

In answer to all this I shall be told that the League of Nations is giving close attention to economic problems and that an international commission, under the auspices of the league, is being set on foot. But this only serves to bring into greater prominence the very danger of which I am speaking. If some of the findings of this commission should happen to be of a kind to get the prime ministers who adopt them into trouble with their political parties, if they should happen to conflict, as unquestionably they will, with the supposed interests of some national flag, red, white, blue, black, yellow, or star-spangled, as the case may be, what is their chance of being accepted? The Paris conference was attended by a crowd of economists and, then as now, "close attention" was given to economic problems. The economists gave the politicians some excellent advice. It was not taken. It was overridden at each essential point by the blind determination of the peacemakers to reconstruct Europe on purely political lines. Is this to be repeated? According to present indications there is every reason to believe it will be. Only the other day the supreme council put out its manifesto on the economic condition of the world. It is known that this document in its original form contained a proposal for an international loan to the bankrupt States of central Europe. On economic grounds it was an eminently reasonable proposal. But it did not accord with the political aims of the French foreign office, and it was immediately dropped. What is to prevent a similar fate overtaking the findings of the international commission?

If civilization is to be saved from an irreparable disaster this kind of thing must stop, and stop at once. Europe is on the verge of bankruptcy. Unless the crash is averted—and it can be by prompt action—nothing that diplomacy can accomplish, nothing that Machiavellian arts can contrive, will be of the least avail, and so merely political League of Nations will be worth the paper on which it is described. Whatever measures, financial or economic, may be necessary to prevent this dangerous situation developing to its fatal issue, those measures must be taken irrespective of whether or no they run counter to the nationalist pride, the imperial self-interest, the military ambitions of one or other of the nations concerned.

The outstanding need of this perilous moment is that the great nations should act together on economic ground for the purpose of averting a disaster that threatens to involve them all. It is not Germany alone, but the whole of Europe, treated as an economic unit, that has to be kept on its feet. Whatever be the right means of doing this, and science is able to state what they are, they must be taken without delay. Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that the proposals of Mr. Keynes, or the more limited scheme of Sir George Paish, or any other that expert skill may devise, provides what is required. It must be adopted on its merits. It must not be spoilt nor set aside, as all such schemes have been hitherto—at the Paris conference, for example—by considerations of "high policy." "High policy" must accommodate itself to the economic reality, not vice versa. The alternative is ruin.

This is tantamount to saying that a new type of statesmanship is imperatively demanded for dealing with the perils of the present international situation. If the statesmen of the old order can adapt their minds (I say nothing of their hearts) to the new conditions, if they can be persuaded to put their joli échiquier on the fireback and take sound science instead of "diplomacy" for their guide—so much the better. If not we must look elsewhere—to the bankers, the actuaries, the financial experts, the economists, the men of business, the skilled trustees of labor and trade. From the point of view of science, the only view which a wise man will take in the present crisis, the problem now before the nations is a "business" problem first, and a political problem last. The public must be brought round to the supreme necessity of giving it to men competent to deal with it.

Unless the League of Nations can get to work immediately on economic ground, without being forced, at every step, to yield to the inconsistent demands of this or the other "foreign policy," I confess that my faith in its usefulness comes near to vanishing point. Its ideal aims, which I honor, are of no value unless they are combined with businesslike method, and in this case businesslike method, I would repeat, is economic and not political. As an instrument for giving effect to the essential truth of economic primacy the league may render immense services to mankind. Its first task is to concert common measures for saving a civilization in economic distress. Not until that is accomplished may it go on to lay the foundations of world-wide peace and prosperity.

I quote from another writer who holds diametrically opposite views to the writer whom I have just quoted, but both of whom agree as to the effect of the Versailles treaty upon Europe. He says:

The peace treaties made a European system which could be controlled, if at all, only by a great military alliance, vigilant, permanent, united, and indefatigable. In the world made by these treaties a league of nations can have no moral reality and only the most modest of functions. The need for force in the relationship of peoples is in inverse ratio to their contentment. Where there are unsatisfied ambitions, there will be armaments. When half a continent feels that the terms dictated to it are not merely an offense to its self-respect, but are barely compatible with its physical survival, it is plain that the settlement can in the long run be enforced only by maintaining in the hands of the victors an irresistible police. These treaties, however, are so packed with flagrant injustice, so plainly dictated by strategical ambition and economic greed that they can evoke no more assent. More fatal by far than their remoteness from the moral standards professed by the victors is their disastrous economic effect. Half a continent has been deprived of hope, resources, ambition, and the possibility of work, and confronted with the prospect that it will either fail to maintain its population on the civilized level of comfort, or else acquiesce for generations in devoting all the energy that can be spared from the struggle to win its daily bread, to the task of pouring wealth into the coffers of its conquerors. Treaties which make an impression that is felt in every home, at every family meal, in every school, which reduce millions of men to helpless penury and degradation, can be maintained, if at all, only by overwhelming force. It is idle, while the treaties are maintained, to talk of substituting a league of nations for the alliance of the victors. No league in which neutrals and the vanquished were fairly represented could or would consent to enforce these treaties. The only power which can or will enforce them is an irresistible military alliance of governments which believe that they have an interest in maintaining them.

Austin Harrison, writing in his English Review concerning the Versailles treaty, says:

Yet we can only help France if France helps herself; that is, France must return to sanity. She must understand quickly now that economics control, not "fruits" or pompadours. Will she try to uphold the Clemenceau treaty? Or, realizing that the treaty means European chaos, economic decay, and finally complete breakdown, in which France inevitably will be involved—we can not help her and America will no longer underwrite—will she remember her own great heart, true to her own great reason, and with that fervor that is her glory, will she cry to bleeding Europe, "Debout les morts" (lay out the dead), in the words of her own soldier? It is just possible that such a spirit might save France and Europe, but France can not be saved unless Europe is also saved, and if the French fail to grasp the truth of war, which is that only economics control, she will go down in turmoil and revolution, crushed in her own insensate havoc. * * * What the "big" three have left us with is a European situation very much like that which faced Louis XVI, the heir to "the deluge," only the incidence is universal. * * * There are two immediate steps to be taken. First, we ought to make peace with Russia; secondly, we ought, with France, to make up our minds to call a new peace conference and begin all over again.

Take as an illustration of how the terms of this treaty has ruined a whole people, Mr. President, the present situation in Hungary. Without expressing myself upon the question, I read to you what Mr. Bryce, well known to the American public, says in regard to it. Speaking of the effect of the Versailles treaty upon Hungary, he said:

I need not repeat what has been said by my noble friend about the effect which the treaty would have upon the future of Hungary. It will reduce the Hungarian State to one-third of its former dimensions. It will subject at least three and a quarter millions of Magyars, speaking the Magyar language and inheriting the glorious traditions of the Magyar people, to alien rule, to which they have the strongest possible objection.

It will also ruin the economic cohesion of Hungary, deprive her of all her forests, her mines, and her industries, and it will leave her a mere fraction of her former population, in a purely agricultural area, without that variety of industries and sources of wealth which a great people ought to enjoy. It will break up her system of communications, transfer some of her trunk lines of railways and many of the most important railway junctions to alien States, and destroy the commercial relations which she has had with large parts of her former territory.

* * * * * * *

Take, for instance, the economic losses which Hungary will suffer. Under the treaty Hungary is going to lose 57 per cent of its arable area, 65 per cent of its stocks of cattle, 56 per cent of its horse production, 70 per cent of its sheep, 85 per cent of its forests, the whole of its salt mines and nearly the whole of its mining area, and 65 per cent of its railways, including the most important railway junctions. And on the top of all this it is also going to lose the control of the waterways, upon which the prosperity of the country almost entirely depends. It therefore looks, without exaggeration, as if the country economically will be unable to exist. But the worst feature in all this is the fact that something like three and a half millions of Magyars and something like 1,500,000 German-speaking Hungarians are to be transferred like so many animals from one country to another.

I read from a news dispatch from Budapest, which tells its own sad tale:

5,300 SUICIDES IN 1920 ALARM HUNGARY; 10,000 OTHERS FAIL.

Thirty-two hundred women and 2,100 men committed suicide in Hungary during 1920, police reports for the year show. In addition, there were more than 10,000 unsuccessful attempts at suicide.

The tremendous increase is causing much worry here, inasmuch as the prewar figures were from 50 to 60 suicides yearly. The situation is attributed to the gradual deterioration in living conditions and the fact that the war had the effect of making human life much cheaper.

Government, society, and church circles, realizing the grave danger to the country, have begun a campaign against self-destruction. Sermons on the subject are being preached in all the churches and a special police force has been organized to keep strict watch and prevent suicides. In a number of cases where the police intervened in time the persons attempting suicide protested against what they termed the tyrannous oppression of the authorities.

Take Austria. Austria was isolated, cut off from all sources of raw material, forbidden to trade with Germany, and unable to trade with the adjoining countries because of antipathies existing. The result has been that Austria has been forced into a state of bankruptcy. She has given up, surrendered herself, and asked for a receivership. Is that by reason of the fact that the United States did not join in the Versailles treaty? It was by reason of the fact that there were corralled or impounded about 6,000,000 people in a country of small area, without any resources of any kind upon the face of the earth by means of which they could live.

Permit me to say here, in passing, that I understand that this was all in opposition to the view of the American delegates, and I am proud of the fact that it was.

I read an article from a former editor of the Vienna Fremdenblatt, in which he said:

The Vienna reparations commission has as many sections as countries are represented by them. They took up their quarters in the former war office and have taken more than 300 rooms for their use. All these rooms were suitably and comfortably furnished, and yet they had to be fitted out anew with furniture, carpets, and chandeliers.

COST AUSTRIANS 500,000,000 KRONEN.

More than 300 persons are in the direct employ of the commission—

Administering the affairs of destitute and prostrate Austria. Where people were starving, dying upon the streets, they required 300 employees in that wing of the reparations commission to administer—to their funerals, I suppose.

Mr. REED. On their estates.

Mr. BORAH. This editor continues:

There is also a representative of Greece, although there was no war between that country and Austria. Every section has a manager with a salary of 100,000 gold crowns per year, i. e., more than 6,000,000 kronen; his substitute gets 50,000, his secretary 40,000 gold crowns. Each of the stenographers, typists, and auxiliaries gets at least 25,000 crowns monthly. The finance and judicial experts of the commission have an annual income of about 4,000,000 crowns each. (The value of the Austrian krone is 20.3 cents.)

There are three subexperts on finances, each with a salary of 2,000,000 kronen, approximately; also special experts for industry, trade, traffic, agriculture, food, each obtaining a salary of almost 2,500,000 kronen per year, and each again has substitutes, secretaries, stenographers, typists.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator certainly is in error when he says the value of the krone is 20 cents. It is less than 1 cent.

Mr. SMOOT. This is the gold krone.

Mr. BORAH. I am reading from this article, and I suspect this gentleman knows, as he is an Austrian, and he was there.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The figures the Senator is reading as to salaries are undoubtedly in the present depreciated Austrian money, which is almost valueless and is handed around in bales of paper. It is almost necessary to have a basket to carry it.

Mr. BORAH. The gentlemen on this commission would not take any of the basket money; you need not be uneasy about that. They do not have to take it. This article continues:

Adding light, fire, motor cars to all this, the expenditures for the commission are not less than 500,000,000 kronen, which are taken from the pockets of the Austrians, poor as church mice and dying of hunger. To show what this really means it must be stated that the annual deficit of this country amounts to 29,000,000,000 kronen.

Not long ago the Allies allotted to Austria four river torpedo boats for service on the Danube, which is all that is left to Austria of the big Austro-Hungarian fleet. Not less than five admirals of the Entente are appointed to exercise a control over this fleet of four units. Each of them is to receive a monthly salary of £1,000 sterling.

This is the Versailles treaty, Mr. President, which we are asked to become a member of, disregarded by France and disregarded by England because they say it is unworkable, impossible of execution, pauperizing Hungary, pauperizing Austria, and reducing Europe to a state of chronic revolution. It rests like a blight upon all Europe. Millions of people to-night pray for its utter abandonment. It is enforced only where it helps and disregarded where it hurts. In this way it is forcing all Europe into helpless barbarism. If the United States enters that simoon of misery and ruin, we will share in its disastrous effects.

Let me quote further in regard to Austria.

Mr. Huddleston, in the Contemporary Review, a London publication, writing upon this subject of the treaty and Austria, says:

It is certain that Austria can not live by itself. The biggest blunder that was made by the peacemakers in Paris last year was to set up this absurdly incompetent and isolated State. It simply can not live, and every statesman worthy of the name recognizes this fact. Now, according to the treaties, Austria may not attach herself to Germany.

In the same Review is found an article by Mr. Loch, who says:

By the treaty of St. Germain a State has certainly been constituted which is totally incapable of being self-supporting. As the traveler passes along the railway on his way to Vienna one of the most striking things that he notices is the absence of trains other than his own. At railway stations, which in former times were crowded with tourists and others, there is an almost uncanny calm. Grass grows between the lines; platforms and waiting rooms are deserted.

Mr. Bass, in his book, lately out, entitled "The Peace Tangle," says:

These observations have led me to the conclusion that the execution of the treaties of peace in their present form will lead not only to the permanent economic decadence of Europe but to future wars. As I write, almost two years after the signing of the armistice, the front page of my morning paper is covered with the news of many wars in operation and in preparation. All of these conflicts may be traced to the aftereffects of the Great War, and more especially to the work of the Paris peace conference in drafting terms of peace for the world.

There is no one now attempting to execute the Versailles treaty save where it seems advantageous to those who have the right to execute it. Why should we join it? We have no course to pursue here except to make a separate treaty or to go into the Versailles treaty.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that I took some pride in the fact that the Versailles treaty in its fundamental principles, in its essential and vital terms, was opposed, in my judgment, by every member of the American delegation. The facts which come out from day to day disclose beyond question that while they finally attached their signatures to it, they were opposed to it in principle, and often prophesied in their conversations what would result from it. I therefore have very little doubt that if President Wilson himself was called upon again to execute and sign the Versailles treaty, he would simply say to them, "Its execution is a fulfillment of my prophecy. I refuse to join in any such instrument."

No one contends that it can be executed. One of the first things which they did under the Versailles treaty was to appoint a number of experts to ascertain whether or not it could be executed, and the unanimous report of the experts to the supreme council was that it was unworkable and impossible of execution.

The International Finance Commission, which sat lately in Belgium, came to the same conclusion. I do not know of a single public man in Europe, not a single one, at this time who contends that the Versailles treaty can ever be executed. I do not know of a great economist in Europe who does not hold that its execution means untold misery and indescribable ruin to Europe.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Idaho is the last man who at this juncture should stand here and attack and condemn the manner in which the Versailles treaty is being executed. He admits that when that treaty was framed the United States was the only power participating in the discussion which in a disinterested way endeavored to soften the terms which he now denounces as harsh, that the United States was the only power whose representatives sought so to shape the treaty as not to place upon the Central Powers unbearable burdens. And yet it was by his masterful leadership here on the floor of the Senate that the United States, which had participated in the conference which finally adopted that treaty—that the United States, after having stood for justice, after having stood for moderate terms, after having taken a disinterested position, was taken outside of that treaty and placed in a position where it now stands before the world absolutely helpless to assist in the interpretation of the treaty.

The Senator from Idaho states here to-day on the floor of the Senate that the terms of that treaty are being violated by France, with the connivance and permission of Great Britain, upon the proposal to invade the Ruhr region. I am not going to discuss that issue with him, but the Senator from Idaho knows that we are not in a position to raise an objection because we refused to ratify that treaty.

Mr. BORAH. I agree with the Senator perfectly. I am simply making the argument I am, to keep us from going into the treaty. I do not contend that we should go over there and interfere with the manner in which they are going to execute it. I wish to stay away from it, save as an independent nation. We may counsel and advise with those in distress, a thing we have always been ready to do. So far as I am individually concerned, my judgment is perfectly clear upon that, but the argument which the Senator made yesterday was that if we had signed the Versailles treaty everything would have been well. Europe would have been in a state of prosperity and the world would have been at peace. What I have undertaken to show, if the Senator will pardon me, is not that we should go over there and attempt to adjust this thing, but that under the Versailles treaty it is impossible to adjust it, and it is not our business to be a member of any such organization. What we do we must do disengaged and free as a friendly power.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What I have undertaken to say now in answer to the Senator's speech is that he is the last one having any right to condemn the nations of Europe for their interpretation or misinterpretation of that treaty, because it was through his leadership that the United States was placed in an impotent position where it could do nothing to see that the treaty was interpreted as the Senator from Idaho says it should be interpreted.

The Senator from Idaho knows that when we failed to go into that treaty and to enter the League of Nations this great Nation lost the leadership of the world. We have not any right as a Nation now to hold these other countries responsible for what they are doing. If we had become a party to the treaty by ratification we would have had that right. The great potential powers of the United States might at least have been sufficient to place such an interpretation upon that treaty as would have avoided the very thing that the Senator condemns now when he criticizes the act of France in invading Germany.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator think that, having been wholly unable to modify the terms of the treaty, to write it in accordance with the principles which the President had announced, wholly unable to protect Austria-Hungary as the President had announced here before he went to Europe he would do, wholly unable to prevent the outrage with reference to Shantung, wholly unable to prevent the treaty being written just exactly as Clemenceau and those with him wanted it—does the Senator think we would have been very effective after we signed the treaty to enforce a construction which was in contradiction of the treaty which we signed?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The spectacle now presented is, as the Senator knows, that Germany is vainly reaching out her hands to the United States asking for protection, and the diplomatic situation is such that our Government can not give any help, can not give any assistance, can not even give counsel to the nations of the world.

The Senator mentions Shantung. How much has the situation in China been improved by our failure to go into the treaty and to hold Japan to the promise which she made to the President of the United States? Japan has Shantung, has Shantung more absolutely now than she would have had Shantung if we had been in the treaty with the promise of Japan.

Mr. BORAH. How did Shantung get into the treaty at all?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is no answer. The Senator has mentioned Shantung, and he gave Shantung as an excuse for our staying out of the treaty. What right has he now to hold Japan to any accountability for holding Shantung? We rejected her promise, we stayed out of the treaty, and Japan has Shantung by more permanent right and by more permanent title than she would have had if we had become a party to that treaty.

Mr. BORAH. I agree with the Senator, if reports be true, that Japan has Shantung more solidly within her grip than she had at the time we were trying to ratify the treaty; and some of us told you then, as you will find by looking at the RECORD, that in six months Japan would have swallowed Shantung whole. All the talk about certain economic rights and reserving her sovereignty was mere sophistry. It misled none but those who were willing to be misled. She has it all now. She has it complete. How did she get it? She got it by reason of the fact that the American delegates, rather than lose the league, consented to that which had been condemned by the civilized world as an outrage upon decency and conscience.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Japan has Shantung absolutely now because the United States was the only nation in the world that held her promise to give it up, and the United States was kept from going into the league and prevented from enforcing their promise by the leadership of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. We do not seem to be able even to make her give up Yap.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yap is in a very similar condition, very similar. I wish to say to the Senator from Idaho that all this attempt to drag the League of Nations into this discussion has nothing to do with the case. It was not raised on this side of the aisle. I have made a number of speeches here and not mentioned the League of Nations. I recognize that the Senator and those who sympathize with him as enemies of the League of Nations are not even willing to let it rest and that they want this resolution passed not for the purpose of promoting peace, but they want the joint resolution passed in order to force the hands of the President of the United States, and when that resolution is presented to him at the White House for his sig-

nature he has to decide whether he will sign it and permit the coterie here in the Senate that have dictated its provisions to control his foreign policy, or whether he will reject it and adhere to the policy which he stated in his message on the 12th of April of this year; that he still viewed the questions as open; that he besought Congress not to force his hand, but to allow him, as the holder of constitutional power to negotiate treaties, either to negotiate a new treaty or to get something out of the existing treaty which he still holds at the White House. That is the issue.

In speaking yesterday, as the Senator from Idaho knows—and he makes no reference to it now—I showed conclusively, as I think, that the joint resolution is not for the purpose of establishing peace. It is for the purpose of dictating to the President of the United States and compelling him to adopt a foreign policy that he has not yet decided on.

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator is speaking out of force of habit. The Senator defended the President here for four years with great ability, and he can not now resist the habit of still defending the President.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is mistaken. I defended the Constitution of the United States, which vests in the Executive, whether he be Democrat or Republican, the sole and only power to negotiate treaties, and I say to the Senator from Idaho now that the people of the United States do not want to have the Senate of the United States arrogate to itself the powers which the Constitution vests in the President. The only right which the Senate has is to consent and advise as to treaties which the President is given the power to negotiate. In the resolution you dictate to the President what he shall do. You cut off the possibility of his doing anything with the Versailles treaty, and that is the reason why the Senator from Idaho supports the joint resolution so gleefully. You dictate to him what shall be put into the separate treaty of peace with Germany. Why not trust him? The Senator from Idaho professes here, in glorious terms, the most absolute conviction that the President of the United States is prepared to scrap the League of Nations and to turn his back on the Versailles treaty in every form. Then why not trust him? Why dictate to him in this resolution what he and his negotiators shall put into a treaty?

Mr. BORAH. I do not think the resolution would have that effect on the President with reference to what he shall do with the Versailles treaty. If I thought it would have the effect which the Senator from Nebraska thinks it will have, I would be very happy.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I reiterate in closing that the joint resolution is not brought here for the purpose of making peace. We have peace. We have had it for years. We have an enormous trade with Germany at the present time. In most of the great products of the United States, Germany at the present stands only second among our great customers. Trade with Germany is growing more rapidly at the present time than our trade with any other country. Our exports to Germany now amount to something like $35,000,000 a month, and the imports from Germany are growing and will continue to grow as fast as they can in the face of legislation which you propose to pass to limit. That is not the purpose.

There has not been a Senator who has stood upon the floor here advocating the joint resolution who has been able to show a single valid reason why the joint resolution should be adopted. He has not been able to show a single benefit to come to the people of the United States as a result of the adoption of the resolution. But anyone can see that the passage of the joint resolution with specifications as to a separate treaty of peace with Germany and with the terms that shall be put into that treaty of peace with Germany is a palpable attempt to force the hands of the President of the United States, to dictate to him as to his foreign policy, and to carry out the threat made in the campaign that from now on the dominant faction of the Republican Party in the Senate proposes to conduct the foreign affairs of the United States.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I do not intend to enter into any lengthy discussion of the question which is now pending before the Senate. To me this is a most solemn occasion. I am not satisfied to cast the vote which I intend to cast upon the joint resolution without making a short statement of the reasons why I expect to take that stand.

There is no one in this body who is more anxious to bring about the peace of the world than am I. At the previous session of Congress, when we were considering the Versailles treaty, including the covenant of the League of Nations, I felt that this country could honorably ratify the Versailles treaty without any changes in it whatsoever. I felt that the honor and the dignity of this country would be maintained; that the pledges which it had made to the boys of the United States who went across the Atlantic would be kept. I did not believe that it would jeopardize any of the interests of our country.

But after a majority of the Senate decided that there should be reservations adopted, I was so anxious to bring about the peace of the world that when those reservations were placed upon the resolution for ratification I voted for ratification with those reservations, although some of them were extremely objectionable to me. So I believe that Senators recognize the position in which I am placed to-day. I wish to bring about peace in the world. I realize that this country needs stabilized conditions abroad. I think the dominant party in this country is making a great mistake in devoting its time and giving its attention to purely domestic affairs until our foreign relations are settled.

I do not believe that it will be possible to bring about business prosperity in the United States until we shall have settled our foreign affairs. I think that just as soon as this administration came into power its first duty to the people of the United States was to consider our relations abroad. Every time one picks up a newspaper he sees that the business depression in this country is increasing by leaps and bounds.

The President the other day appealed for a merchant marine. I want to call the attention of the President to the fact that we have a merchant marine, but that it is idle in the docks of our ports because our foreign relations are unsettled. I repeat that we can not bring about prosperity in this country until we bring about stabilized conditions abroad. The people who are holding their cotton, their wheat, their corn, their copper, and their manufactured products will not find a market until something be done to settle foreign conditions.

There may be some difference of opinion as to what was the issue of the last campaign; but I can not agree with the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that the 31 leading Republicans who declared their belief as to what the issue of the campaign was had no followers throughout the country. I believe that they represented a very material proportion of the voters of this country. If it had been understood that this Nation was to take no part in the restoration of world civilization, I know as firmly as I can know anything resting upon uncertain facts that the result in New Mexico would have been different from what it was. Hundreds of thousands of Republicans expressed it as their opinion that the quickest and the best way to get into some league of nations, to bring about some concert of the nations of the world in order to preserve the peace of the world, was to elect a Republican President because we had a Republican Senate. But, Mr. President, be that as it may, that is a thing in the past. There can be no doubt as to what the issue is before the Senate to-day. It is perfectly plain. On the 6th day of April, 1917, the following resolution was adopted by Congress:

> Whereas the Imperial German Government has committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared—

Declaring a state of war which had been thrust upon the people of the United States—

> and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial German Government; and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

That, Mr. President, was the joint resolution which we adopted on the 6th day of April, 1917. That was then a solemn occasion. In favor of that joint resolution I cast my first recorded vote in this body. I realized the responsibility which I assumed; I could picture the horrors which would necessarily follow the adoption of that resolution; but I believed that there was a great impelling reason for its passage. I felt that civilization was at stake; that there was a great end to be accomplished; that we were justified in marshaling all the forces of this land, as we later did.

Mr. President, while we went into that war inspired by the highest motives which ever inspired any nation on earth, what are we doing to-day? Is there any doubt about the effect of the action which this body is going to take? What are we going to do? You may interpret the resolution now before the Senate as you will, but it unmistakably means one thing. It means that we are ending this war without consummating or securing a single thing for which we went into the war. We are not only doing that, Mr. President, but, in my humble judgment, this resolution is an apology for our ever having entered the war. Its language can have no other reasonable construction, in my judgment.

I have here the report of the Foreign Relations Committee on the pending joint resolution, and the first thing to which I desire to call attention is the following:

Amend the title so as to read as follows:

"Repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, and the joint resolution of December 7, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Government, and for other purposes."

What is the principal purpose? It is to repeal the joint resolution which we adopted on April 6, 1917. Why is it desired to repeal that joint resolution? As has been suggested upon the floor of the Senate, what would be the purpose of repealing the act which authorized the building of the Panama Canal after the canal had been built? What purpose could thereby be served? There can be only one interpretation when it is undertaken to repeal an act of this kind, and that is that it is desired to apologize for ever having enacted it. The only portion of the joint resolution upon which we have to vote to-day which will be effective in any respect whatsoever is paragraph 1, which reads as follows:

That the joint resolution of Congress passed April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the Imperial German Government and the Government and people of the United States of America, and making provisions to prosecute the same, be, and the same is hereby, repealed, and said state of war is hereby declared at an end.

Mr. President, if it were the purpose of the joint resolution to make a technical ending of the war, there is nothing in the first paragraph which is necessary except the few last words which I have read. A simple declaration that the war is at an end would accomplish the entire purpose. The other paragraphs of the joint resolution are noneffective. All that has been claimed for them is that they give us some right to retain possession of the German property which was sequestered during the war. We sequestered that property by virtue of an act of Congress passed during the war. That act of Congress is in force to-day, and I should like for some good lawyer to explain to me how the legal conclusion can be arrived at, if that act would become ineffective by a resolution declaring the war status at an end, how by incorporating such a provision in this resolution it would become effective. I submit there is a distinction there without the slightest difference. It is idle to claim any such purpose.

Moreover, Mr. President, the subsequent clauses in a former resolution were given some efficacy. In the joint resolution which passed Congress in May, 1920, and which was vetoed by the President of the United States, the first paragraph was followed by a proviso which prevented it becoming effective until other things were accomplished; but now by the pending joint resolution we repeal the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, and declare the war at an end without any condition, unreservedly. The war thus ends, and, as I have said, without having consummated or securing a single purpose for which we entered the war and made the great sacrifices which the country has made. That is the situation.

Mr. President, do we want to do this thing? In the construction of any statute or resolution, it is a well-known legal rule that every word in a paragraph must be given some effect, if it is possible so to do.

The last few words declare the war at an end. What is the use of the other words? The main part of the paragraph is that part which repeals the joint resolution of April 6, 1917. What effect are you going to give to those words? They were put in there for some purpose; and, as I say, the only purpose which can be arrived at from the reading of the joint resolution is to apologize in an abject manner for our ever having passed the joint resolution of April 6, 1917.

Mr. President, I am unwilling to do that. I am unwilling to go before the people of this country and the world with the declaration that this war was fought in vain. There is no other purpose to be served by passing this joint resolution now. Why should there be such haste in passing this joint resolution? Why can it not wait until a treaty of peace can be brought about between this country and the Central Powers of Europe?

There is another thing that this joint resolution means. It means that in the near future we shall have a negotiated peace with Germany and Austria. That is what it means. Is that the purpose for which we fought the war? Is there anyone here who expected that this war would end thus abjectly, and make us suppliants at the feet of the Governments of Germany and Austria to bring about peaceful commercial relations for the future? Is that what you want?

I do not believe it, Mr. President. I do not believe that the people of this country are going to ratify the action which I am sure the Senate is going to take to-night. I have no doubt but that this joint resolution will pass, but I want to enter my most earnest and solemn protest against it. I feel that it is dishonor to our country, it is dishonor to those who made the supreme sacrifice at the behest and instance of this great country of ours.

I hope that this joint resolution may not ultimately pass as it is framed. I do not believe that it should be done. I think it is an ignominious attempt to discredit everything that our country did during the war. I do not know that I could state any more clearly than has been done the reasons why this joint resolution should not be passed. When the other joint resolution was passed by the Congress, the then President of the United States vetoed the resolution. I think his language was then expressive in a concise and emphatic way of the objections to such a joint resolution. I believe that those objections are just as potent now as they were then. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them, but I ask that the veto message of the President on the passage of the former joint resolution be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I herewith return, without my signature, House joint resolution 327, intended to repeal the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, and the joint resolution of December 7, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and the Austro-Hungarian Government, and to declare a state of peace. I have not felt at liberty to sign this joint resolution because I can not bring myself to become party to an action which would place an ineffaceable stain upon the gallantry and honor of the United States. The resolution seeks to establish peace with the German Empire without exacting from the German Government any action by way of setting right the infinite wrongs which it did to the peoples whom it attacked and whom we professed it our purpose to assist when we entered the war. Have we sacrificed the lives of more than 100,000 Americans and ruined the lives of thousands of others and brought upon thousands of American families an unhappiness that can never end for purposes which we do not now care to state or take further steps to attain? The attainment of these purposes is provided for in the treaty of Versailles by terms deemed adequate by the leading statesmen and experts of all the great peoples who were associated in the war against Germany. Do we now not care to join in the effort to save them?

We entered the war most reluctantly. Our people were profoundly disinclined to take part in a European war, and at last did so only because they became convinced that it could not in truth be regarded as only a European war, but must be regarded as a war in which civilization itself was involved and human rights of every kind as against a belligerent government. Moreover, when we entered the war we set forth very definitely the purposes for which we entered, partly because we did not wish to be considered as merely taking part in a European contest. This joint resolution which I return does not seek to accomplish any of these objects, but in effect makes a complete surrender of the rights of the United States so far as the German Government is concerned. A treaty of peace was signed at Versailles on the 28th of June last which did seek to accomplish the objects which we had declared to be in our minds, because all the great Governments and peoples which united against Germany had adopted our declarations of purpose as their own and had in solemn form embodied them in communications to the German Government preliminary to the armistice of November 11, 1918. But the treaty as signed at Versailles has been rejected by the Senate of the United States, though it has been ratified by Germany. By that rejection and by its method we have in effect declared that we wish to draw apart and pursue objects and interests of our own, unhampered by any connections of interest or of purpose with other Governments and peoples.

Notwithstanding the fact that upon our entrance into the war we professed to be seeking to assist in the maintenance of common interests, nothing is said in this resolution about the freedom of navigation upon the seas, or the reduction of armaments, or the vindication of the rights of Belgium, or the rectification of wrongs done to France, or the release of the Christian populations of the Ottoman Empire from the intolerable subjugation which they have had for so many generations to endure, or the establishment of an independent Polish State, or the continued maintenance of any kind of understanding among the great powers of the world which would be calculated to prevent in the future such outrages as Germany attempted and in part consummated. We have now in effect declared that we do not care to take any further risks or to assume any further responsibilities with regard to the freedom of nations or the sacredness of international obligation or the safety of independent peoples. Such a peace with Germany—a peace in which none of the essential interests which we had at heart when we entered the war is safeguarded—is, or ought to be, inconceivable, is inconsistent with the dignity of the United States, with the rights and liberties of her citizens, and with the very fundamental conditions of civilization.

I hope that in these statements I have sufficiently set forth the reasons why I have felt it incumbent upon me to withhold my signature.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 27, 1920.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I wish also to call attention to a statement of the leader of the party on the other side of the Chamber. He said that there is no question but that the passage of this joint resolution will lead to a negotiated peace with Germany. I do not know how to characterize a negotiated peace with Germany in language as strong as that used by the leader of the Republican Party in this chamber. It has already been inserted in the RECORD, but I want to

close with repeating his words as my condemnation of this joint resolution:

In June, 1918, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said:

The President who delivered the war message and the Congress who voted for war would be guilty of the blackest crime if they were willing to make a peace on the status quo ante bellum and re-create the situation which existed before the war.

May I interpolate and inquire, if we pass this joint resolution, are we not re-creating the situation which existed prior to the war so far as the relations between the United States and Germany are concerned? Are we not restoring the status before the war? If so, it is a crime, in the language of the great Senator from Massachusetts:

If we sent our armies and our young men abroad to be killed and wounded in northern France and Flanders with no result but this, our entrance into the war with such an intention was a crime which nothing can justify. The intent of Congress and the intent of the President was that there could be no peace until we could create a situation where no such war as this could recur. We can not, in the first place, make peace except in company with our allies. It would brand us with everlasting dishonor, and bring ruin to us also if we undertook to make a separate peace.

That is precisely what this joint resolution means. It means that we are to make a separate peace with Germany. It means that we are to desert the Allies with whom we fought the war. It means the surrender of everything honorable and high in purpose which actuated us to engage in the war.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I shall not occupy the time of the Senate at any great length. I should not now say anything if it had not been for the speech of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the utterance that he made to the effect that the issue before the American people in November and settled in that election was for a league of nations or any association, or against a league of nations or any association. The distinguished Senator stated that those who supported the Republican ticket in that election believed that by so doing they not only would be defeating this League of Nations as incorporated in the treaty of Versailles, but they would be putting an end to any association of nations to promote the peace of the world in the future.

Of course, I can understand how the distinguished Senator from Idaho was led into that belief. He was making speeches over the country, drawing great crowds, and winning tumultuous applause. He was talking against any league. He was consistent in the position then that he had taken from the time the League of Nations was first discussed. He has been one of the few Senators here who have been consistent on this proposition from the beginning, and he was led to believe that the other speakers in that campaign, and those who were promoting the candidacy of the Republican candidate, were taking the same position that he was taking; but they were not.

The Senator will recall that when the standard bearer of his party spoke at Des Moines, Iowa, and said that he had turned his back on the League of Nations, and that he was not only against reservations but against interpretations, I believe the expression was, there went up a howl all over this country, not only from Democratic sources but from Republican as well; and the howl was so great that it forced, as I stated in my remarks to-day, a cessation of argument and eloquence upon the part of the Senator from Idaho, and he remained off the stump a few days, and it was only a few days after that—the Senator will recall it, and I do not want this discussion to end without placing it in the RECORD—that the pressure on the managers of the Republican Party by the thousands of men and women in the Republican Party who believed in the ratification of the treaty of Versailles, with or without reservations in some form or other, was so great that it compelled the Republican candidate for President to issue a public statement to the American people.

Of course, it was quite significant and very fitting in that campaign that beneath the picture of the standard-bearer of the Republican Party on the billboards throughout this country the words "wiggle" and "wobble" should have been written, because certainly no one ever attempted to assert what would be the position of the Republican Party from one day to the other on this very important question. But I want to read from this statement, not because I think many of the Senators on the other side will listen to it—they remember it—but I want to read it especially for the benefit of the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

This ought to be a glorious occasion for him. It is a great triumph for him. Starting out almost single-handed and alone, with but a handful to help him, combating not only this side of the aisle but combating the Republican leadership on the other side of the aisle, and in that leadership at that time was the present President of the United States, they fighting for days and for weeks and for months for a league of nations and for the ratification of the treaty of Versailles, the Senator from Idaho almost single-handed and alone stood there and by his eloquence and his great influence has commanded the whole Republican Party to change front on the proposition.

I should like to have the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of the majority in this Chamber, listen again to what he read on the morning of October 12, the utterance given out in a prepared interview to the American people as to how the candidate of the Republican Party stood on an association or a league of nations. He was forced to do this, and I am not surprised at his action. I really believed that you were going to scrap the League of Nations. I believed, as the editorial that the Senator pointed out that appeared in the New York World said, that you would scrap the League of Nations; but what I object to, what I denounce, is a species of hypocrisy that promised the American people one thing and now you give them another thing. If you were for scrapping the League of Nations, why did not the leadership of the Republican Party, why did not the men who were carrying the banners of that party in October, say not only that you were going to scrap this league but that you were against the idea of a league of nations or any association?

But you did not do that, and here is what the President said in a prepared statement following his Des Moines speech:

It seems to me that there should not remain a shadow of a doubt as to my exact position as regards the proposed League of Nations as drafted at Paris and submitted to the Senate and as regards the great world sentiment for a better understanding among nations to discourage war and generally to advance civilization.

In all of his utterances he was talking about this proposed league as drafted at Paris. Of course, he had voted here for reservations. He had voted to change the league as drafted at Paris, and he could very well afford to tell the American people in this statement that he was opposed to the League of Nations as drafted at Paris and as submitted to the United States Senate. But he goes further. Ah, you can see the Italian hand here, trying to hold in line the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK], so that they might go and talk to certain elements in the country who were opposed to any League of Nations, and arouse them to go out, and not only support, but espouse the cause of the Republican candidates, and still hand out this soft soap to those who really believed in a league of nations. The wonder to me is how he ever fooled a man of such stupendous ability and experience and training as the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

Let me restate—

Says Candidate Harding—

my position as explicitly as my power of words permits.

Now he is going to give it to them. It is just as clear as mud. He said:

First, I am unalterably opposed to going into the League of Nations as that particular proposition now stands.

Of course, he had so voted here in the United States Senate. So had the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from California, and those who were following them.

That proposal is contemptuous of and potentially destructive of the American Constitution. It is not favored by the American people.

Second—

Here is where he expresses himself clearly—

I am in favor of a world association—call it what you will, the name is of slight consequence—that will discourage or tend to prevent war and that will encourage or tend to encourage a better understanding among the nations of the earth.

That was the statement which caught the present Secretary of State, which caught the present Secretary of Commerce, which caught Elihu Root, and Henry Stimson, and all of those thousands and millions of men and women who were for an association of nations to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Do not leave out Taft.

Mr. HARRISON I want to read you what he said in a moment.

The old order of things is done with—

Says Candidate Harding—

not only in America but throughout the world, and the United States, always quick with sympathy, always just and usually led by common sense, must play its part in this new order.

How does that suit the distinguished Senator from Idaho? Oh, he says now that Harding is for scrapping the league. Yes; I think he is. But he was not for scrapping the league when he issued that statement to the American people, when the campaign was at its height, prepared on October 12, 1920.

Mr. WOLCOTT. When he was hunting for votes.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; when he was hunting for votes, as the Senator suggests. Mr. Harding continued:

Third. I believe that such an association can be formulated without wrecking the Constitution, that remains the corner stone of our liberties and of our happiness, without seizing or filching the sovereignty that is our pride and our inspiration to fine living and good works.

* * * * * * *

Fifth. It is my purpose, when elected, to take the whole people into my confidence as regards these matters, to seek their advice, and more importantly, to act consonantly with their advice, and to this end it will be my pleasure as well as my duty to call into conference with me the best minds.

I understand he has called into conference the best minds, including in that number the distinguished Senator from California and the distinguished Senator from Idaho. Am I mistaken in that? The Senator from Idaho answers not. This statement continues:

I thank God that the time has come when I can ask the advice of American women, and especially the mothers of America, too.

The substance of these things has been said in some form or other in every address and I say it all definitely now, because I am not always fully reported, and I want America to understand my thought of cooperation as well as the abiding opposition to the league proposed.

So both understood it then, and both stood with him. I wonder if the Senator from Idaho stood with Candidate Harding on that proposition? The Senator answers not.

Now, one word further touching the understanding of the issue in that campaign. I cited to the Senate only to-day the list of names of those who appealed to the proleaguers of the country to support the Republican ticket, saying that they "believed we can most effectively advance the cause of international cooperation and permanent peace by supporting Mr. Harding for election to the Presidency."

But they were not all. The interview which Candidate Harding gave on the 12th of October satisfied thoroughly ex-President Taft, and so he said, in a telegram to the New York Times August 9, 1920:

I wish to have as many Republican Senators as possible stand by President Harding in the policy to which I believe the circumstances will lead him, of obtaining such an amendment of the present league as will retain the great benefits which the covenant without article 10 will confer on the world.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator, and am glad to. I wonder if he agreed with that statement which appeared on the 12th of October, 1920?

Mr. BORAH. In view of the telegram which the Senator has just read, what does he think of ex-President Taft as a prophet?

Mr. HARRISON. Do I think he is a prophet? A very poor prophet, indeed. I think somebody misled the ex-President of the United States. But it does not seem to have been very hard work to mislead a good many folks in that campaign. The Senator from Idaho was a good prophet.

Here is a statement that was signed, among others, by A. Lawrence Lowell; and to show what the sentiment of the country was, this was signed, among others, by a distinguished Senator, a man of great influence in the western country, one who owns and edits a large number of newspapers, who, with certain classes of our people, is as powerful in his influence as any man I know of. Senator ARTHUR CAPPER is one of the signers of this. Other signers are William Howard Taft, A. Lawrence Lowell, Harry A. Garfield, Oscar M. Straus, Henry W. Taft, George W. Wickersham, and Talcott Williams, all distinguished Republicans. Here is what they said on March 18, 1919:

From constant touch with every part of the United States the officers of the league are confident that the present spasm of opposition—

That was when the Senator from Idaho was afflicted on the floor here—

That the present spasm of opposition to the Paris plan—

The Paris plan—

is due mainly to misrepresentation backed by reactionary elements of our population who fear that a change in our methods of handling international questions will interfere with their vested privileges. This is the real basis of the opposition. It is supported also by some who, under the guise of patriotism—

I do not know whom they had in mind at that time—

seek to advance their personal political fortunes.

I think most of the men who opposed this League of Nations from the very start did it very conscientiously. The men who now oppose it, but who pretended to be for it, are the ones that the American people should condemn, not those who consistently from the beginning thought it was a bad thing and fought it here like men upon the floor of the Senate.

But it is disheartening to think that so many men whose eloquence has been poured forth in this Chamber, whose energies have been exerted in behalf of the treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations, now favor adopting a separate treaty with Germany, scrapping the treaty of Versailles.

But I have some other very interesting reading here. I have what George W. Wickersham said about this Knox resolution. But let me read what Senator LENROOT, a distinguished Republican leader, said about the League of Nations.

He takes issue with the Senator from Idaho. He said:

The country ought to know that with very few exceptions the Members of this body, irrespective of party, are in favor of a League of Nations, and the country ought to know that with very few exceptions the Republican Members of the Senate are in favor of the league now proposed, provided reservations are made protecting the rights and interests of the United States.

* * * I stated then (in a speech made in the Senate on February 28, 1919), and I am convinced now, that we should enter a League of Nations to help preserve the peace of the world, and that the plan proposed is a great forward step in this direction.

I believe the United States can and should be protected by proper reservations, and with such reservations the league may be of great value in preventing future wars and securing a better understanding between nations.

So that the RECORD may show it, I want to read an excerpt from a speech that was delivered by the author of this resolution in June, 1910. Senator KNOX, in a commencement-day address before the University of Pennsylvania, at that time employed these words:

We have reached a point when it is evident the future holds in store a time when wars shall cease; when the nations of the earth shall realize a federation as real and vital as that now subsisting between the component parts of single States; when by deliberate international conjunction the strong shall universally help the weak; and when the corporate righteousness of the world shall compel unrighteousness to disappear and shall destroy the habitations of cruelty lingering in the dark places of the earth.

I want to read what the distinguished Senator from Missouri said about this—not the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] but the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER].

This was in a statement telegraphed to the St. Louis Dispatch in May, 1919:

I believe that the Knox resolution (to separate the peace treaty from the League of Nations) should be so changed that the Senate could go on record as being in sympathy with a League of Nations covenant. I do not intend to vote for a resolution that would put myself and the Senate on record as distinctly hostile to the United States entering such a league.

So, Mr. President and Senators, such were the views of distinguished Republican leaders in the last campaign. Thousands and thousands of votes were cast for the Republican ticket in the belief that the treaty of Versailles would be ratified in one form or another, and the issue was not presented, as I take it, as expressed by the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let us vote!

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I realize that it would be entirely improper for me to make a speech at this time, but I think those who call for a vote and who occupy much more time on the floor than I do will bear witness that I do not occupy much of the time of the Senate. I should like to present some reasons for an amendment which I propose to offer, but the Senate is not in a frame of mind to listen, and I think it would do very little good even if I were to present it.

I am as weary as anyone could be of the political debate which has taken place here and which has held us here for most of the day, without any attempt at all to discuss the real issue before the Senate. I take it that those Senators who indulge in that practice so often must believe that it is of some value to them before their constituents. I can not conceive that it is of value anywhere else, and I have a rather low estimate of a constituency that is controlled by that kind of oratory.

I am not impressed with the great importance of the pending joint resolution taken under any view that may be given. I do think, however, that the country expects us to put an end to this anomalous condition known as war. There is no political speech which can be made that can satisfy the country that it is not an anomalous condition, if not in fact a farce. The rest of the country is aware that the nations of the rest of the world are at peace. We are in fact at peace.

I should like to do the thing that we all are professing to want to do, namely, make that declaration and that alone. I do not mean that it might not be necessary to accompany it with some of the statements or specifications which are attached to the joint resolution, but I am now talking about the first paragraph, paragraph 1 of the joint resolution. What we are after is to say that that state of war which existed on April 6, 1917, is now at an end. I do not think it is necessary to repeal the declaration which was made at that time; we can not repeal the effect of it; yet by saying so we might possibly invite some of the difficulties and the troubles which some Senators have pointed out here to-day. So, without occupying any further

time, I send to the desk the following amendment, which I shall propose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment to the amendment of the committee.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Strike out the first paragraph in the proposed amendment of the committee and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the state of war declared by Congress on April 6, 1917, to exist between the Imperial German Government and the Government and people of the United States of America is hereby declared at an end.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I merely wish to say in reference to the Senator's amendment that, although I am not in favor of the joint resolution even if it is amended, I think it would be in far better keeping with parliamentary practice, and we would know far more what is meant, and we certainly would not be guilty of an apology if we adopted his amendment. I shall therefore vote for his amendment, although even if so amended, I expect to vote against the joint resolution.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the headlines on the front page of the Washington Post this morning said:

France will march alone if allied support fails.

When I read that my mind went back to the time when France, heroic France, pouring out her blood on the battle field, was holding back as best she could the German Army. And I now recall the time when the daily press here at home told us each morning that the French were being pushed back closer and closer to Paris and the British soldiers were being pressed back *nearer and* nearer to the English Channel. I remember the anxious times when we were saying, "If they can only hold the German line until our troops arrive we can save the day."

I recall the time when our boys left their homes in the East and West and North and South, put on the uniform of their country, and carried our flag to the seaside. I saw them embark upon a sea infested with German submarines, the desperadoes of the deep. I recall those dreadful days, Mr. President. No light was permitted upon the decks of our ships at sea. Our boys down in the bodies of the vessels were risking their lives every minute of the time as they went over to France to help put down the German Army, that sought not only to conquer Europe, but, as soon as that task had been accomplished to march with streaming banners through Berlin as it shouted "On to America."

I recall the time when the Congress of the United States in solemn session, speaking for the American people, indicted the German Government; when it recited the crimes committed by that Government against us and the civilized world, and upon the provisions set out in that resolution we went to war with Germany. I recall that the allied nations pledged to each other that we would fight together to the end; that we would not make a separate peace, but that we all together would write the peace treaty.

We have condemned Russia for deserting the Allies during the war. Poor, war-torn, distracted, chaotic Russia, and yet we criticize her for deserting the Allies in time of war. And here we are, right at the very time when Germany is halting and hesitating as to whether or not she will obey the mandates of the victorious allied powers, about to abandon our comrades in arms. We not only do that but we encourage Germany to believe that we are not now in sympathy with the things we fought for in the war with her.

We are asked not only to repeal the joint resolution which indicted her and declared war against her, but we are called upon in this resolution to apologize to Germany for what we did at that time. We are requested to wipe that indictment from the statute books of the United States—to remove it from the pages of our history. We charged in that resolution that Germany was guilty of certain crimes and stood convicted at the judgment bar of the civilized world, and yet here you are ready to do as Germany would have you do, truckle and get on your knees and put yourselves in the attitude of giving Germany the right to say what the terms of peace shall be with our brave boys and the people of the United States.

Senators, 4,000,000 of young men, the bravest and best blood that ever marshaled beneath a flag, went across the sea to put an end to this war commenced by Germany. Germany is dickering in this country to-day with her propaganda. Her spies are here now. They have been working for months trying to alienate us from our brave allies who fought side by side with us on the battle fields of France.

Germany could not accomplish her devilish purpose as she stood before the United States Army on the battle fields of France. Is she now going to accomplish through a certain kind of politics and German diplomacy what she could not accomplish before the upstanding soldiers of our country on the battle field? Is she about to succeed in having this country do now what she wanted it to do a year and more ago? If so, the situation is really alarming.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] in his speech complains that it will take some time to undo the harm done in international affairs by the former administration in eight years' time, and in his powerful and ponderous appeal reminded us that we must not expect the present administration in just a few weeks to correct all of these evils. The step we are taking to-day complicates matters more than ever. I am in favor of a peace treaty with Germany in keeping with our rights and honor in the premises. This shameful makeshift that you propose practically says to Germany, "Go tell our allies that we are no longer interested in a just settlement of your differences and no longer concerned whether you have peace or war in the Old World."

The Senator from Illinois falls out with Lloyd-George and takes a small fling at him. I regard Lloyd-George as one of the greatest statesmen that lives to-day or that has ever lived. He is a very remarkable man. I do not know whether the Senator from Illinois has fallen out with him because of a little controversy that grew out of an interview said to have been had with Lloyd-George that the Senator gave to the press on his return from Europe, when he was reputed from some source to be representing in some capacity the United States, and Lloyd-George felt called upon to explain away the impression made by the published statement of the Senator from Illinois.

I just happened to recall this interesting incident.

The Senator from Illinois, in an interview not long ago, referred to ex-President Wilson in a rather cold and sarcastic way. He said:

The world has forgotten Dr. Wilson; let us do so, too.

Of course, you understand, Senators, that he was referring to ex-President Wilson. I wonder if the Senator really thinks that the world has forgotten ex-President Wilson? The Senator himself, in the magnitude of his own estimation, is a considerable part and parcel of the world, and the Senator from Illinois does not seem to have forgotten him. He refers to him to-day and talks about the harm he has done in his eight years' administration. Mr. President, the good things of the Wilson administration will live long after the political career of the Senator from Illinois has been forgotten. You can not dispose of the former President in any such manner. No man who is willing to hazard his all and die for a cause can be forgotten. In the annals of history those who traduce and slander him will die in a day, but the man who dares to risk his life, his all, in order to prevent the recurrence of another such war can not die in the affections and memories of the people who love peace and hate war.

Senator BORAH, the able, eloquent, and fearless Senator from Idaho, has always opposed the League of Nations. He ought to be happy to-day. His efforts have borne fruit. He has fought this thing from the beginning. When others around him said, "We favor some sort of a league," he said, "I am opposed to any kind of a league." Like Horatius at the bridge and Leonidas at Thermopylæ, the part he played won for him the honors of the occasion. All honor to him.

Mr. President, I remember a great many things in connection with this matter, but I will not punish Senators on the other side by keeping them here at any great length to hear them recited, for I heard two or three Senators over there a while ago cry, "Vote! Vote!" When I listened to the torrents of convincing logic poured into the other side of the Chamber this morning by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], then later on by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and then by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], I could understand why you wanted to end the debate and vote.

Senators on the other side of the Chamber want to get through with this gruesome thing; you want to be done with it. After you have passed it—and you have the votes to pass it—you will go out of this Chamber saying, in a whisper, some of you, "I am glad we are through with the blamed thing." [Laughter.]

Senators on the other side brought this resolution in here and had it pending for a week or 10 days. None of them has said a word about it until to-day. Why? Because they did not want to go on record. They said, "The least that we can say about this thing the better it will be, because some of us have said that we are going to have some sort of a league, while others have said that we were not going to have any kind of a league. If we get this thing up here and go to discussing it, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is liable to get on the warpath and tell the truth about the whole thing. If ever he gets started on it, he will tell the truth, as will the Senator from

California [Mr. JOHNSON]"; and so they did. Now, the resolution is here, poor, disgraceful, shameful thing, and Senators on the other side have had to come to its rescue.

Senators, in conclusion let me say that I know the gun and ammunition makers of the world do not want any understanding between the nations. I know that those who profit by war do not want anything that will stop war. I know there are those who believe in great standing armies, big war equipment, and in universal military training which will take every boy out of the homes of America at tremendous expense to the taxpayers of America. There are those who would have a system of universal military training such as Germany had, and a military autocracy such as Germany had. That is what some of you are hoping to have; you are going to try to force it upon us in this country. Universal military training is going to be a part of your program a little later on. I know that those who want to make money out of guns and munitions do not want any association of nations, any League of Nations, or any international tribunal. I know that we have that influence to fight.

It was all right, Senators, to go into an alliance with European powers to the extent of $10,000,000,000 in loans, and to the extent of more than $10,000,000,000 expended out of our pockets for guns and munitions and war supplies; it was all right to muster 4,000,000 of the bravest, best boys that ever battled, and send 2,000,000 "over there" to stay for nearly two years; but it is all wrong to take a chance of two years' time in a league looking to the prevention of war and the promotion of peace. Senators, you are going to have to answer for this to the American people.

A Senator on the other side has said that there was not any defense of the League of Nations anywhere except in the Senate. I make a patriotic address now and then out in the States, and I always refer to the league, and I pay a tribute to the man who championed the cause of peace, and nowhere East, West, North, or South have I ever spoken and mentioned the league and Woodrow Wilson that the men and women in the audience did not express their approval with applause. So do not get it into your heads that there is no sentiment in the country for an international agreement looking to the promotion of peace and the prevention of war.

Gen. Grant knew what an awful and cruel thing war was, and one of the last things he ever said was that we must have some sort of an international agreement by which disputes between nations may be arbitrated. Senators know why the gun and ammunition makers do not want the covenant of the League of Nations, do they not? It is because that covenant has in it provisions for the arbitration of disputes between nations and a proposal for disarmament. If we arbitrate, there will be no war, and if we cut down war equipment, then the inducement to fight will not be present. So if we do either or both, the gun and ammunition makers will not make the money they have made, and they do not want any such prospect as that to appear in view.

Senators, I think of the boys who sleep this night in France; I think of the boys who are crippled out at Walter Reed Hospital. I have seen them, God bless them! Some of them with both eyes gone; some of them with half their faces torn away; some of them with both legs gone; some with both legs and one arm gone.

These are the remnants of the brave Army, whose troops went out in possession of all their faculties and went over to fight in France for you and for me—to accomplish what? Not only to achieve liberty and preserve our institutions and prevent a foreign foe from coming here, but to prevent the recurrence of another such war.

Here we are, more than two years after the armistice, making no effort at international peace, making no contribution to the readjustment or reconstruction of a world rent and torn by war, passing a resolution that pleases nobody but the military masters of Germany. Why? They said, "When you went to war with us you accused us of high crimes; you wrote that in your resolution; it is a severe indictment against the German Government. We want you not only to say the war is at an end, but take that indictment off your books."

Is that to be done? Is Germany to receive some sort of grateful remembrance for some of the votes you received last fall? Bernstorff said, "We can look for no arrangement with America until a new President is elected. Then we shall have it." It looks as if he were a pretty good prophet, does it not?

Senators, a soldier who served in the World War talked to me this morning on my way to the office and said: "As an American soldier, who served in France, I resent this performance. What did we go to France for? Are we not to set up some sort of an institution looking to the promotion of peace and the prevention of war? Have we made all of our sacrifices in vain? Has all this vast sum of money been expended for nothing? Is all of it to go up in smoke and nothing to be done looking toward protecting us from another such catastrophe in the future?" I replied, "I believe as you do. I am in favor of doing the thing necessary to prevent war."

Mr. President, Senators on the other side of the Chamber have the votes to pass the resolution, and I am going to conclude my remarks and not detain the Senate longer; but this question is not dead; do not believe that it is. The Senator from Mississippi spoke a parable to you when he told you there were millions of people who voted your ticket with the understanding that they were going to work for the establishment of some sort of league or association of nations that would seek to prevent war in the future.

Whenever it is made clear to the American people that the Republican Party of this day is through with trying to establish more cordial relations with the nations of the earth in the effort to establish world peace they are going to be through with you. Every time one of you gets up over there you refer to that 7,000,000 majority you got. I reminded you once before that Mr. Taft went in by a million majority and went out by unanimous consent. [Laughter.] You keep up the steady progress that you are making now in doing nothing of value, and the Lord only knows what we will do to you even in the next election.

The American people are watching you. They are looking in upon the situation here. They are seeing what you are doing and what you are trying to do.

Mr. President, let the vote on the resolution come. I want to see the day come, and come speedily, when this Nation under God shall take her place, her rightful place, in the family of nations. I want to see this great Nation, the richest of all the nations of the earth, take the lead. She is entitled to lead. She was leading. The leaders of the Republican Party threw down that leadership. I am in favor of getting it back and letting America take the place that she should take and hold in the estimation and in the affections of the nations of the earth. I want the power of this Government expressed, not in anything that would alienate us from the nations of the earth, but in those things that will bind us together in the bonds of international peace.

I want the nations of the earth to love the United States as they did when the President left Paris with this treaty, coming home. No leader of any Government ever left a foreign capital so loved and esteemed by the nations of the world as Woodrow Wilson did when he started home. He is broken now; he is lame and halt, but he made his sacrifice. He fought a good fight. He kept the faith. He struggled for peace, and the God of Peace, I believe, will spare him to see the Nation that he loved yet take her place on the side of humanity, on the side of our boys as against the gun and bullet makers of the Nation, on the side of those who love peace and hate war, who shall work for righteousness, the upbuilding and betterment of mankind.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, were I seeking a simple partisan advantage rather than the good of my country I should rejoice at this hour. There is no doubt, no question of doubt, that the great majority of the American people, that the heart of the world, hungrily longs for some concert among the powerful nations of the world for the establishment of peace and the abolition of war. There is no doubt and no question of doubt that the great majority of the American people agreed with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] when he declared that a slacker peace, that a separate peace, that an understanding by this Nation with Germany independent of and disregardful of the rights of our allies, would be a thing of infamy.

To-day, at this hour, we can make a peace with Germany as a victor. Pass this joint resolution and you tie your hands, you gag your mouths, you throw away ruthlessly, blindly, madly, all that a hundred thousand dead have gained, that 200,000 maimed have won, that 2,000,000 across the seas have fought to gain. You have no rights that a neutral would not have. You have no rights that you would not have had had you never spent a dollar and never sacrificed the life of a hero.

This scene, this act, is tragic. It is pathetic. You are drunk with power, gentlemen, upon the other side. Whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad; and this act of separate peace with Germany is political madness. You recant all that your leaders, with a few exceptions, have said. You turn your backs upon the solemn pledges of your own candidate. You destroy the proud position earned by the blood and sacrifice of heroes, and you place yourselves upon the level of conquered

Germany. When you are ready to ask a peace, it will not be as a conqueror but as an equal with the conquered.

As a Democrat, I can rejoice at this act of consummate folly. As a patriot, I could weep for the stained honor of my country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let the amendment be stated, so that the Senate may be advised as to its nature.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the first paragraph in the proposed amendment of the committee and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the state of war declared by Congress on April 6, 1917, to exist between the Imperial German Government and the Government and people of the United States of America is hereby declared at an end.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I only desire to say that that question was very carefully considered by the committee, and the committee decided that the direct method was the best.

With all respect to the Senator from Michigan, for whom I have great regard, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has just expressed a hope that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan shall not be agreed to, and has given for it one reason, and one reason only, to wit, that he and certain other Republican Senators carefully considered it and concluded that it ought not to be adopted.

Mr. LODGE. I gave other reasons this morning when I discussed it, and I am not going to detain the Senate by making a speech at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why! I do not expect the Senator to do it. I do not want him to do it. It would not gratify my feelings if he did; but, Mr. President, I hope I am at liberty to say, in response to what the Senator said, to declare that although we may follow the unprecedented path of making a declaration of peace by congressional assertion or, rather, a recognition of the fact that peace already exists by congressional declaration, we shall not apologize by repeal for the immortal declaration which recited the crimes of Germany and declared that a state of war existed because of them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to the amendment of the committee, on which the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BROUSSARD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], who is absent. I am unable to obtain a transfer, and I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. If he were present, he would vote "nay," and if I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], who has been compelled to leave the Senate. If he were present, he would vote "nay" and I would vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Upon this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. If he were present, he would vote "nay" and I would vote "yea." I regret that I am unable to obtain a transfer.

Mr. DIAL (when Mr. SMITH's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SMITH] is detained on official business. He has a pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. If we were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I can transfer that pair on the resolution itself, when it comes to a vote on that, but as to the pending amendment to the amendment, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. NEW (when the name of Mr. WATSON of Indiana was called). My colleague [Mr. WATSON of Indiana] is absent on official business. If he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], whose absence has been announced. If he were present, as indicated, he would vote "nay." I very much regret my inability to vote because of this pair. If I could vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. KING (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I regret very much that he is absent, but in view of that fact I am compelled to withdraw my vote. If he were present he would vote "nay," and I should vote "yea."

Mr. SHIELDS. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. He was unable to obtain a pair before he left.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea" upon the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the pair of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. He has a pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE]. If the Senator from Oklahoma were present, he would vote "yea" on the amendment to the amendment.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Ashurst	Harrison	Pomerene	Trammell
Broussard	Heflin	Robinson	Underwood
Caraway	Hitchcock	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Jones, N. Mex	Shields	Watson, Ga.
Gerry	Kendrick	Stanley	Williams
Glass	McKellar	Swanson	
Harris	Pittman	Townsend	

NAYS—44.

Ball	Fernald	La Follette	Penrose
Borah	France	Lenroot	Poindexter
Brandegee	Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Shortridge
Bursum	Gooding	McCormick	Smoot
Cameron	Hale	McKinley	Spencer
Capper	Harreld	McNary	Stanfield
Colt	Johnson	New	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Nicholson	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kenyon	Norbeck	Warren
Dillingham	Keyes	Norris	Weller
Elkins	Ladd	Oddie	Willis

NOT VOTING—26.

Calder	Knox	Overman	Smith
Culberson	McCumber	Owen	Sterling
Edge	McLean	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Ernst	Moses	Phipps	Watson, Ind.
Fletcher	Myers	Ransdell	Wolcott
Kellogg	Nelson	Reed	
King	Newberry	Simmons	

So Mr. TOWNSEND's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment to the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 6, line 3, in the proposed amendment of the committee, strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or," so that it will read:

That until by treaty or act or joint resolution of Congress it shall be determined otherwise, the United States of America, although it has not ratified the treaty of Versailles, reserves for itself and its nationals all of the rights, powers, claims, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages to which it and its nationals are or may become entitled, together with the right to enforce the same, under the terms of the armistice signed November 11, 1918, or any extensions or modifications thereof or otherwise, or which under the treaty of Versailles have been stipulated for its benefit, or for the benefit of its nationals, with the same force and effect as if said treaty of Versailles had been ratified by the United States of America, or to which the United States of America is or may become entitled as one of the principal allied and associated powers.

Mr. LODGE. As far as I have the power to do so, I accept that amendment to the amendment. I think it is a proper and necessary change in the wording.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, during the day and in the course of the discussion of the pending joint resolution I called attention to three substitutes which I stated I might offer for the

resolution now under consideration. One of the proposed substitutes was substantially that offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], and which has just been voted upon.

It is not necessary for me further to discuss the other substitutes which I had to offer. In view of the manifest determination of the majority to support with practical unanimity the resolution as it has been reported by the committee, and in view of the fact that any substitute which might be offered which would cure the manifold errors, blunders, and wrongs, if not crimes, in the pending resolution would be voted down, I shall not offer the amendments but shall content myself by voting against the resolution which has been reported from the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is still as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall vote for the resolution, because it ends the technical state of war existing at the present time between the United States and Germany. We are not making a treaty. Whenever a treaty is made with Germany it will be submitted to the Senate, and the Senate will have its constitutional part in the making of that treaty.

Whatever there may be in this resolution outside of the effective part which ends war I regard as mere surplusage, and I here declare that in any vote I may hereafter be privileged to make of record upon any treaty which may hereafter be submitted I shall hold myself free to exercise my judgment and vote my conscience with respect to its terms and its provisions whenever such treaty may be submitted to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I do not propose to consume any time at all in discussing the resolution. I had not intended to say a single word. I want the RECORD to make note of the fact as prominently as I can make it that I am opposed to this resolution.

I have a permanent or standing pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. In the column of names as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing those who vote yea and those who vote nay, my name, by reason of this pair, will not appear. The inquirer, if he is at all interested in how I voted, will have to examine the little paragraphs after the roll call. I want somewhere in the RECORD to appear, outside of those formal notations, the fact that I am opposed to this resolution. To me it is such a shocking thing; it borders on national disgrace to adopt it, and I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to it, though my name will not appear in the roll call.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I desire to say that I have long been persuaded that when we passed the peace resolution we should also authorize the President to call an international conference of the nations to deal with the great international problems confronting the world, problems which can not be solved by any individual nation. I announced on yesterday that I would offer an amendment which would authorize the President to call an international conference looking to the inauguration of a concert of nations for such cooperation. In view of the lateness of the hour and the impossibility of discussing earlier the amendment which I wanted to offer, I have decided to offer my amendment at another time, when there will be a full opportunity for discussion. Therefore I shall not offer my amendment now.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, when a joint resolution similar to the pending joint resolution was disposed of by the Senate about a year ago, I voted against it. At that time I had some hope and thought that there might yet be a chance for the United States to ratify the treaty of Versailles and enter the League of Nations. But that hope was extinguished in my breast by the result of the election last fall.

I have been from the beginning a very ardent, earnest, sincere, and conscientious supporter of the League of Nations, and have been in favor of the United States entering it. I voted to ratify it without reservations and with reservations. I voted to ratify when the President of the United States sent it to the Senate, and I voted to ratify it with all the Lodge reservations. I think there are few Members of this body who have voted as often as I have voted for the United States to enter the League of Nations. There are probably somewhere between half a dozen and a dozen, but no more.

However, I consider that the verdict of the people of the country last fall was against the ratification of that treaty. I think I know a Gettysburg or a Waterloo when I participate in it on the losing side. I can see no hope of the United States ratifying that treaty and entering the League of Nations for a good many years to come at any rate, if ever at all.

It is said that we can make peace with Germany and Austria by a ratification of a treaty of peace, but it is not in the power of Congress to do that. Congress does not have the power of negotiating peace treaties. That is for the Chief Executive of the United States, and no such proposal has been made to us aside from the one President Wilson sent us, which I am very sorry was not ratified. The present Chief Executive does not seem to have any disposition to place before this body a treaty of peace with Germany or with Austria; but, on the contrary, has recommended this course, and it appears to me it is this course or nothing.

If we reject this joint resolution, how long are we to maintain the absurd and grotesque fiction of being at war with Germany when everyone knows we are not and when it is our duty to return to a status of peace as soon as possible? It seems to me if the joint resolution is not passed we are interminably and indefinitely to keep up the absurd fiction of being at war with Germany, when I believe the world needs peace and I believe the United States needs peace. I believe we need peace right now more than anything else, and I believe it is the duty of the United States to take the lead in making peace. I believe that our export trade would be vastly increased if we passed the pending joint resolution. Our exports for March of this year were $750,000,000 less than they were for March a year ago. If we pass the joint resolution I believe it will improve our export trade and will the sooner enable Germany to get on her feet and pay her reparations to the Entente Allies, and in turn the sooner enable them to pay us what they owe us or to pay the interest on their debt at any rate. Therefore I shall vote for the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I doubt not that right after Christ was crucified some of his disciples or the people who thought they were his disciples gave him up as a lost cause, but I remember that with the resurrection there came the beginning of the real battle between Christianity and the world. I listened with much attention to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], and I think he is disposed to act a little like the early discouraged disciples. If the Senator thinks that the principle of the League of Nations is dead, he has made a mistake.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senator will pardon me, I do not think the principle is dead.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The principle of the League of Nations itself will resurrect itself by the will of God, the God of peace and of humanity, and of God fatherhood and of man brotherhood, and it can not be killed by a little election in the United States of America, a small part of one planet in one great solar system, which itself is a small part of God's providence.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. I do not believe the principle is dead, but I do not believe there is any more prospect of reviving the League of Nations in this country in the next four years than there is of reviving the right of secession in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Soon after Christ was crucified I doubt not that a great many people said, "After all the Sadducees knew what they were doing; the Pharisees have acted wisely"; and I know that the mob in Jerusalem cried, "Thanks to God in the highest" to that conclusion. But, Mr. President, there was a distinguished American admiral who, when his ship was sinking, was asked whether he surrendered or not, and he replied, in ever memorable words, "Pshaw! I have just begun to fight."

No man of wisdom expected a people devoted to national isolation for over 100 years upon the first occasion when the question was argued to decide in favor of taking a commanding part in the politics of the world and in the cause of international brotherhood of man all over the world. I did not expect it. I did not leave my plantation while the campaign was going on, because I knew that the first decision must necessarily be adverse. It was contradicting the history of the people of the United States and seemingly contradicting the factors of their policies; but I also knew then and know now that there will be a League of Nations to keep the peace of the world, and that it will be accompanied and effectually accomplished by something like article 10, with force behind it to make governments and diplomats keep the peace of the world.

I know that the good time is coming when any nation on this earth which dares make war without previously having agreed to leave the controversy concerning which it goes to war to

some consensus of world opinion, being the consensus of the organized civilized nations of the world, will itself become an outlaw, a public enemy to the entire civilized world, and will be trodden under foot like any common criminal in the city of Washington is trodden under foot when he dares defy the law. It will become the law of nations that it shall be, as it is already the law of God, as it was the law and will of Jesus Christ. Every Christian prays for it every night, if he prays at all, when he says, "Thy will be done and Thy kingdom come on earth."

I believe in the resurrection. I am not disturbed by the crucifixion. You crucified Wilson and his world cause, as you thought; and you think now that you crucified the cause, but we have just begun to fight, and the cause will be an issue in American politics until you and I are dead, unless it wins before we die. You can not stamp it out, because you can not stamp out the will of God. You can not fight it down, because you can not tread down the eternal idea of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. You can not make it dead, sure enough, although it is apparently crucified, because you can not extinguish the eternal Word, "Peace on earth, to men good will." It is coming, and it is coming notwithstanding you or anybody else who cry now, as the other mob in Jerusalem cried, "Crucify Him, crucify Him, crucify Him," and after the crucifixion said, "The Sadducees and the Pharisees and the Sanhedrim are right."

There is a "God in history," and all the history of the world proves that His will has been prevailing more and more all the time, and a part of that will is that in a given State there must be a settlement of controversies by courts, and among nations a settlement of controversies by an international tribunal with will and power to enforce its decrees. We have now arrived at the point where we have begun to discuss the question that amongst the States themselves there must be the settlement of controversies by courts or by tribunals or by arbitration or by consensus of public international opinion.

We have just begun the advocacy of a covenant for that purpose. The fight has just begun. America has been isolated for 100 years. Thirty-one nations have said they want to do what we refused to do, because they have not been isolated and their national traditions were not in the teeth of what they wanted to do, while what was proposed to be done *was* in the teeth of our own history. We have to convert the unconverted, but it is coming; it is coming as surely as the sun's rays are coming out some time, no matter how long they may be under the clouds; it is coming as surely as the dawn will come, no matter how long the night.

It is coming in spite of German and Irish and Fiume-Italian and some mistaken real American votes of a foolish and passing generation.

It is coming just as surely as man's impulses are for good and not for bad, as surely as the survival of the fittest amongst men is not the survival of the strongest or most cruel or most poisonous as among beasts; but is the survival of the most humane, the most human, the most manlike, and, therefore, the most godlike—the fittest for men and God.

I scorn the idea that the fight is lost. I scorn every proposition to the effect that there is any good cause in the world which is permanently a lost cause. It can not be. The right element in any cause must be finally gained because God reigns. The right is bound to prevail. I am glad that Hoover and I am glad that Hughes are in the Cabinet. If there is the slightest degree of intellectual honesty or consistency in either one of them; if there be such elements about them—and I hope there are—that they will gradually guide the President of the United States into a course which will be more and more, day by day, in unison with the principles announced in the League of Nations. I do not care what else is in a league of nations to keep peace among men except those two things; that there shall be an international agreement to that effect, and that there shall also be a further agreement that the agreement itself shall be enforced by force—holy and unstinted force—military, naval, economic, whatever is necessary, to make a criminal and outlaw nation keep the peace. It is coming; it must come. I believe it or else instead of being theistical I would become atheistical.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, a few moments ago an amendment to the amendment proposed by me was adopted by unanimous consent. I think it is necessary to have the same amendment in that part of the treaty referring to Austria. Therefore I move to amend, on page 8, in line 12, by striking out the word "and" and inserting the word "or."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to. The question is on concurring in the amendment as amended.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let it be read.

The amendment as amended was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution of Congress passed April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the Imperial German Government and the Government and people of the United States of America, and making provisions to prosecute the same, be, and the same is hereby, repealed, and said state of war is hereby declared at an end.

That all property of the Imperial German Government, or its successor or successors, and of all German nationals which was, on April 6, 1917, in, or has since that date come into, the possession or under control of the Government of the United States of America, or of any of its officers, agents, or employees, from any source or by any agency whatsoever, shall be retained by the United States of America, and no disposition thereof made except as shall have been heretofore or specifically hereafter shall be provided by Congress, until such time as the German Government has, by treaty with the United States of America, ratification whereof is to be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, made suitable provisions for the satisfaction of all claims against the German Government of all persons, wheresoever domiciled, who owe permanent allegiance to the United States of America and who have suffered, through the acts of German Government or its agents since July 31, 1914, loss, damage, or injury to their persons or property, directly or indirectly, whether through the ownership of shares of stock in German, American, or other corporations, or in consequence of hostilities or of any operations of war, or otherwise, and also provisions granting to persons owing permanent allegiance to the United States of America most-favored-nation treatment, whether the same be national or otherwise, in all matters affecting residence, business, profession, trade, navigation, commerce, and industrial property rights, and confirming to the United States of America all fines, forfeitures, penalties, and seizures imposed or made by the United States of America during the war, whether in respect to the property of the German Government or German nationals, and waiving any and all pecuniary claims based on events which occurred at any time before the coming into force of such treaty, any existing treaty between the United States of America and Germany to the contrary notwithstanding.

That until by treaty or act or joint resolution of Congress it shall be determined otherwise, the United States of America, although it has not ratified the treaty of Versailles, reserves for itself and its nationals all of the rights, powers, claims, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages to which it and its nationals are or may become entitled, together with the right to enforce the same, under the terms of the armistice signed November 11, 1918, or any extensions or modifications thereof or otherwise, or which under the treaty of Versailles have been stipulated for its benefit or for the benefit of its nationals, with the same force and effect as if said treaty of Versailles had been ratified by the United States of America, or to which the United States of America is or may become entitled as one of the principal allied and associated powers.

That the joint resolution of Congress approved December 7, 1917, declaring that "a state of war exists between the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Government and the Government and the people of the United States of America, and making provisions to prosecute the same," be, and he same is hereby, repealed, and said state of war is hereby declared at an end.

That all property of the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Government, or its successor or successors, and of all nationals of the Austrian Empire or the Kingdom of Hungary which was on April 6, 1917, in or has since that date come into the possession or under the control of the Government of the United States of America or of any of its officers, agents, or employees from any source or by any agency whatsoever, shall be retained by the United States of America and no disposition thereof made, except as shall have been heretofore or specifically hereafter shall be provided by Congress, until such time as the Austrian Government has by treaty with the United States of America, ratification whereof is to be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, made suitable provisions for the satisfaction of all claims against the Austrian Government of all persons, wheresoever domiciled, who owe permanent allegiance to the United States of America, and who have suffered through the acts of the Austrian Government or its agents since July 31, 1914, loss, damage, or injury to their persons or property, directly or indirectly, whether through the ownership of shares of stock in Austrian, American, or other corporations, or in consequence of hostilities or of any operations of war or otherwise, and also provisions granting to persons owing permanent allegiance to the United States of America most-favored-nation treatment, whether the same be national or otherwise, in all matters affecting residence, business, profession, trade, navigation, commerce, and industrial property rights, and confirming to the United States of America all fines, forfeitures, penalties, and seizures imposed or made by the United States of America during the war, whether in respect to the property of the Austrian Government or nationals of the Austrian Empire, and waiving any and all pecuniary claims based on events which occurred at any time before the coming into force of such treaty, any existing treaty between the United States of America and Austria to the contrary notwithstanding.

That until by treaty or act or joint resolution of Congress it shall be determined otherwise, the United States of America, although it has not ratified the treaty of St. Germain or the treaty of Trianon, reserves for itself and its nationals all of the rights, powers, claims, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages to which it and its nationals are or may become entitled, together with the right to enforce the same under the terms of the armistice signed November 3, 1918, or any extensions or modifications thereof, or otherwise, or which under the treaty of St. Germain or the treaty of Trianon have been stipulated for its benefits or for the benefit of its nationals with the same force and effect as if said treaty of St. Germain and the treaty of Trianon had been ratified by the United States of America, or to which the United States of America is or may become entitled as one of the principal allied and associated powers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was concurred in.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the joint resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BALL (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. BROUSSARD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and vote "nay."

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when Mr. FLETCHER's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. He has a pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN]. I am informed, however, that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. I therefore feel at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. If he were present, he would vote "yea," and if I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). At the earnest solicitation of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], who was obliged to leave the city, I agreed to pair with him on this vote. If he were present, he would vote "yea" and I should vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], who is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea," and if I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. DIAL (when the name of Mr. SMITH was called). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH] is detained on official business. He has a pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Announcing my pair as on the previous vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when the name of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts was called). I am requested to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is unavoidably absent. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. NEW (when the name of Mr. WATSON of Indiana was called). I am requested to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. WATSON of Indiana] on official business. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Wolcott]. If present and permitted to vote, my colleague would vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). As just stated by his colleague, I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], who would vote as announced. Under the obligations of that pair, I am not permitted to vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KING (after having voted in the negative). I very much regret that I am compelled to withdraw my vote. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER]. Being unable to secure a transfer, I am compelled to withdraw my vote.

Mr. STANLEY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], under a transfer, stands paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. If present and at liberty to vote, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am requested to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] on account of important business. He is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE]. If he were present, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

Mr. BROUSSARD. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] requests me to make the announcement that he is unavoidably detained. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST], on account of illness in his family, and that if present he would vote for the joint resolution.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] is necessarily absent, and if present would vote for the joint resolution. He has a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

I desire further to announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] are unavoidably absent. If present, they would vote for the joint resolution.

I desire also to announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote for the joint resolution.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—49.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Spencer
Borah	Gooding	McNary	Stanfield
Brandegee	Hale	Myers	Sterling
Bursum	Harreld	New	Sutherland
Cameron	Johnson	Nicholson	Townsend
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Norbeck	Wadsworth
Colt	Kenyon	Norris	Warren
Cummins	Keyes	Oddie	Watson, Ga.
Curtis	Ladd	Penrose	Weller
Dillingham	La Follette	Poindexter	Willis
Elkins	Lenroot	Shields	
Fernald	Lodge	Shortridge	
France	McCormick	Smoot	

NAYS—23.

Ashurst	Harris	McKellar	Swanson
Broussard	Harrison	Pittman	Trammell
Caraway	Heflin	Pomerene	Underwood
Dial	Hitchcock	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	Jones, N. Mex.	Sheppard	Williams
Glass	Kendrick	Stanley	

NOT VOTING—24.

Calder	King	Newberry	Reed
Culberson	Knox	Overman	Simmons
Edge	McCumber	Owen	Smith
Ernst	McLean	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Moses	Phipps	Watson, Ind.
Kellogg	Nelson	Ransdell	Wolcott

So the joint resolution was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, and the joint resolution of December 7, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Government, and for other purposes."

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I am directed by the Committee on Finance to report back to the Senate with an amendment and with the recommendation that it pass the bill (H. R. 2435) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, and to provide revenue; to regulate commerce with foreign countries; to prevent dumping of foreign merchandise on the markets of the United States; to regulate the value of foreign money; and for other purposes. I also submit a report (No. 16) thereon.

I desire to inform the Senate that I shall endeavor to call the measure up for consideration either on Monday or at the latest on Tuesday of next week, the purpose being to expedite its consideration and passage as rapidly as may be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. DILLINGHAM, from the Committee on Immigration, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4075) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, reported it with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and submitted a report (No. 17) thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 2, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *April 30, 1921.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, all is well: Therefore we lift our hearts to Thee in common thanksgiving, and bless Thee for daily care. Gladden every life, and direct us with a gentle constraint to bear and forbear. Fill our land with peace and contentment, and abide with our President. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 78. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of North Dakota;

S. 1077. An act to authorize the payment of $5,000 to the Government of Japan for the benefit of the family of Torahachi Uratake, a Japanese subject, killed at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, on November 25, 1915; and

S. 1078. An act to authorize the payment of $2,000 to the Government of Japan for the benefit of the family of Tatsuji Saito, a Japanese subject, killed at Camp Geronimo, Mexico, May 25, 1916.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 78. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1077. An act to authorize the payment of $5,000 to the Government of Japan for the benefit of the family of Torahachi Uratake, a Japanese subject, killed at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, on November 25, 1915; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1078. An act to authorize the payment of $2,000 to the Government of Japan for the benefit of the family of Tatsuji Saito, a Japanese subject, killed at Camp Geronimo, Mexico, May 25, 1916; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

BRIDGE ACROSS MAHONING RIVER, OHIO.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 407.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 407, a similar House bill having been reported from the committee. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 407) granting the consent of Congress to the Trumbull Steel Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio.

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Trumbull Steel Co. and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River, near the city of Warren, in the county of Trumbull, in the State of Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Was the House bill reported before the Senate bill came over?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. It was. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the House for just a moment, I wish to say that this seems like an insignificant bill, but it is of very vital importance to one of the great manufacturing industries of my district. This bill is similar to one whch has been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and is the first bill on the House Calendar, No. 2. I will appreciate it very much if the House can consider this bill and pass it at this time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. COOPER of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the similar House bill is laid on the table.

There was no objection.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] will please resume the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the futher consideration of the bill H. R. 5010, the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5010) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

AIR SERVICE.

For creating, maintaining, and operating at established flying schools and balloon schools courses of instruction for officers, students, and enlisted men, including cost of equipment and supplies necessary for instruction, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, instruments, and materials for theoretical and practical instruction; for maintenance, repair, storage, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments, materials, gas plants, hangars, and repair shops, and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft; and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith; for purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs in connection with aerial photography; improvement, equipment, maintenance, and operation of plants for testing and experimental work, and procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, gas and sewerage, including, maintenance, operation, and repair of such utilities at such plants; for the acquisition of land or interest in land by purchase, lease, or condemnation where necessary to explore for, procure, or reserve helium gas, and also for the purchase, manufacture, construction, maintenance, and operation of plants for the production thereof and experimentation therewith; salaries and wages of civilian employees as may be necessary, and payment of their traveling and other necessary expenses as authorized by existing law; experimental investigation and purchase and development of new types of aircraft, accessories thereto, and aviation engines, including patents and other rights thereto, and plans, drawings, and specifications thereof; for the purchase, manufacture, and construction of airships, balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments, gas plants, hangars, and repair shops, and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith; for the purchase, manufacture, and issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes; for all necessary expenses connected with the sale or disposal of surplus or obsolete aeronautical equipment, and the rental of buildings, and other facilities for the handling or storage of such equipment; for the services of such consulting engineers at experimental stations of the Air Service as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, including necessary traveling expenses; purchase of special apparatus and appliances, repairs, and replacements of same used in connection with special scientific medical research in the Air Service; for printing and binding, including supplies, equipment, and repairs for such Air Service printing plants outside of the District of Columbia as may be authorized in accordance with law; for publications, station libraries, special furniture, supplies, and equipment for offices, shops, and laboratories; for special services, including the salvaging of wrecked aircraft, $19,200,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $4,000,000 from this appropriation may be expended for pay and expenses of civilian employees other than those employed in experimental and research work; not exceeding $250,000 may be expended for experimentation conservation, and production of helium; not exceeding $4,300,000 may be expended for experimental and research work with airplanes or lighter-than-air craft and their equipment, including the pay of necessary civilian employees; not exceeding $500,000 may be expended for the production of lighter-than-air equipment; and not exceeding $350,000 may be expended for improvement of stations, hangars, and gas plants: *Provided further*, That not less than $5,500,000 shall be expended for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories: *Provided further*, That claims not exceeding $250 in amount for damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad may be settled out of the funds appropriated hereunder, when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post, and approved by the Chief of Air Service: *Provided further*, That claims so settled and paid from the sum hereby appropriated shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $10,000: *Provided further*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to pay out of funds appropriated for the Air Service of the Army for the fiscal year 1920 the sum of $1,079.02 to Frank D. Kohn for the use and occupation, for the period from July 1, 1919, to January 9, 1920, of the lands upon which the Air Service engine and plane repair depot is now located near the city of Montgomery, Ala.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SISSON. On page 13, line 25, with reference to the payment of claims, after the words "Chief of Air Service," does not the gentleman think the words "and the approval of the Secretary of War" should be added?

Mr. ANTHONY. The sum is so small, $250, that it was not thought necessary. I remember that question came up at the time that section was considered in the committee, but we thought it probably was not worth bothering the Secretary of War about.

Mr. SISSON. My recollection is not distinct as to what action occurred in the committee with reference to the matter, but I recollect that we discussed it, and my indistinct recollection is that we agreed that absolutely no harm would be done to have the approval of the Secretary of War. This would be a special safeguard to the appropriation in the event there were a great many of these claims. Or in the event there was any abuse of the power vested here in the Chief of the Air Service I still think that that at least would be a safeguard, and as long as it is not abused of course it would rarely, if ever, come to the Secretary of War.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman desires to add the words "and the Secretary of War"?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think that would be acceptable.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that after the words "Chief of Air Service," on line 25, page 13, there be added "and the Secretary of War."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SISSON: Page 13, line 25, after the words "Chief of Air Service," add the words "and the Secretary of War."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. HICKS. Can the chairman of the committee give us any information as to the total cost of aviation in the Army? By "total cost" I mean not merely what we have given under this special head of "Aviation," but the total cost, including pay, subsistence, and other items really chargeable to aviation, but included in other appropriations rather than the subhead "Aviation."

Mr. ANTHONY. We have not the total figures, but taking officers and enlisted men who are carried under "Pay of the Army," of course it will amount to very large figures and run the total very much higher than the $19,000,000 apparent in this paragraph.

Mr. HICKS. Does it approximate something like $45,000,000, probably?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; it would not run that high.

Mr. HICKS. It would probably go to $40,000,000?

Mr. ANTHONY. No. It would probably go to $28,000,000 or $30,000,000, in my opinion.

Mr. HICKS. I rather think the gentleman will find, if he puts in all these items that might be charged to aviation, that they will run approximately to $40,000,000. My purpose in asking the question was to find out if possible what aviation is costing the Government. In the Navy we are subdividing those charges in an endeavor to bring together all the items chargeable against aviation, and we have been somewhat surprised at the grand total of that sum. It runs far in excess, of course, of what is carried in the bill under the title of "Aviation." and it will run probably in the Navy for the last year close to $30,000,000; and I imagine in the Army it will run probably five or ten millions higher than that. I want to say, however, that some of the items chargeable to aviation perhaps are really charges that run against the whole naval service and should not be charged against aviation.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does the gentleman think it safe bookkeeping to charge as a part of the special items of expense the overhead carried in the Army in that way, regardless of the particular activity in which the officers and enlisted men are employed, whose employment might be in some other field if it were not in this?

Mr. HICKS. Personally, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE]. I do not think that the pay and subsistence of aviators and ground men whose salaries come out of the pay of the Army should be chargeable to aviation; but in the Navy we are doing that, and I think we ought to have uniform methods of accounting of these expenditures, so that we can arrive at a proper comparison as to costs of both branches of the service.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think I can give the gentleman the figures he asked for. There are 8,000 enlisted men in the Air Service, and estimating their annual average cost at $2,000 each, that would make $16,000,000 for the enlisted personnel. For the commissioned personnel, figuring 1,200 officers at an average of $3,000 would give us $3,600,000, making about $19,600,000, in addition to the amount appropriated in this bill as total cost of Air Service, which would be very nearly the $40,000,000 of which the gentleman spoke.

Mr. HICKS. The cost of subsistence would have to be added.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is included in the $2,000 per man.

Mr. HICKS. I thank the gentleman. Now, one other question. Does this bill contemplate increasing the number of air stations throughout the country?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; it contemplates diminishing them, because under the appropriations for the Air Service they will have to cut off a number of stations that are now being operated.

Mr. HICKS. But there is no limit fixed by the bill to the number of Air Service stations in the United States, is there?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; it is left to the War Department to work out a suitable plan under the amount appropriated in the bill.

Mr. HICKS. As a matter of fact, is the Army reducing its number of air stations in the entire country?

Mr. ANTHONY. They have been cutting off quite a number.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two or three words, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee [Mr. ANTHONY] a question or two.

I desire to ask the gentleman from Kansas whether or not in the consideration of this appropriation for the Air Service it was considered that any part of this appropriation should be expended for aircraft in the National Guard or reserve forces?

Mr. ANTHONY. It was not so intended.

Mr. McKENZIE. And it is not intended that any part of it shall be used for that purpose?

Mr. ANTHONY. We intended that the reserve forces should use the stations and the machines of the Air Service during their 15 days' training, but beyond that we did not figure on any outside use of the aircraft, and I think the sentiment of the committee is rather opposed to equipping the National Guard with air units.

Mr. McKENZIE. My purpose in asking this question was simply to call the attention of Members of the House to what seems to be the entering wedge of a policy of the War Department to launch the National Guard and the reserve forces of our country in the Aircraft Service. In my judgment, which may not be worth much, it would be a very grave mistake. For instance, if we give aircraft to the National Guard of New York, we will have to give aircraft to the National Guard of Wyoming when it is organized, and we will have to give it to Illinois and all of the other States, so that there would be no end to the expenditure of money, but as a practical military asset, in my judgment, it would be worth very little.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that the subcommittee entertained exactly the idea that he is expressing, and I am very glad he is making the statement now, so that it will appear in the RECORD, that it is not the intention of the subcommittee, nor is there anything in this bill which warrants the extending of the Air Service to the National Guard of the various States.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to say further that my question was prompted by some information that has come to the subcommittee, of which I am a member, in trying to get an inventory of the real estate belonging to the Military Establishment, and in a number of instances I find that air fields or flying fields are recommended for retention for use by the National Guard and the reserve forces of the Army, and I hope that the War Department will take notice of the fact that Congress does not feel that it would be wise at this time to engage in that sort of expenditure.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Yesterday, yielding to the seductive charm of my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], the minority leader, I made a concession which I think was too broad, in which he made me to appear to concede that the previous administration was entirely honest and perfectly square. [Laughter.]

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I should think that would take in a good deal of territory.

Mr. MACGREGOR. My mind at that time was directed to the office of the Director of Sales as at present constituted, and my concession was limited to that subject. I have been striving to get at the state of mind of the chairman of the subcommittee on the Army appropriation bill [Mr. ANTHONY] with reference to the disposition of surplus property, and I find in the hearing before the committee the following:

Mr. ANTHONY. You have a military organization in the Quartermaster Department and possibly in other departments selling this surplus?

Secretary BAKER. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Why could they not carry on the work entirely?

Secretary BAKER. It may be they can; I hope they will have gotten it to such a point that they can, but the sale of vast quantities of accumulated supplies does require the consultation of civilian experts.

Mr. ANTHONY. Do you not think it would be possible to clean up the work necessary to be done by your civilian force between now and the end of the present fiscal year, so that all of the work in the future can be done through these departments?

Secretary BAKER. I think it would be a pity for you to put a limitation upon the contingent fund at the disposal of the Secretary of War that would prevent him from employing experts if he needed them. In the report of the Quartermaster General for 1898, I think it is, there is a complaint that the department had not even been able to dispose of the accumulated raincoats which had been bought in 1864.

Recently I saw a report that some wagons and lumber which had been bought for Civil War purposes were still reposing in some yard in the neighborhood of New York City. With this immense amount of property on hand it is impossible to dispose of it effectively and that the vast amount of money tied up in it can be put back into the Treasury without an active, intelligent, energetic business cooperation. The value of the property on hand in the Air Service—and that is why I state it in connection with this particular paragraph—is $451,340,000 plus, and the value of the property declared surplus in the Air Service is $135,000,000. Out of these $3,722,000,000 much more than $500,000,000 should be recovered. I fear that if you leave it to the administration solely of men who are in the military service we will not get as much out of it as if we put a little more money into it and put active business men behind it. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Mississippi, and all gentlemen who have spoken on this subject seem to think that any expenditure made for the Air Service is rather in the nature of a luxury. Mr. Chairman, I devoutly wish that we could look forward to the day when we shall never have to participate in another war. The day probably is far remote when we shall be in no danger of engaging in war.

I predict in this connection that the next great war will be principally waged from the air by the use of airplanes and the use of chemicals. A niggardly policy toward the Air Service and Chemical Warfare Service in the years to come will be an unwise course if we would prepare this country for whatever may confront us. Infantry and Artillery will play a smaller part in the next great war. My judgment is that we should pursue a policy of preparation with respect to the Air Service and Chemical Warfare that will make us able to meet the greatest nations in the world in the use of those instruments of warfare.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. We have a good many men here like our distinguished friend from California and others who represent the Navy. The gentleman from Kansas is representing the Air Service and the Chemical Warfare. In other words, it seems that when we all get through we are going to become the most warlike and aggressive nation on the face of the earth. When are we going to quit?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish we could abandon entirely every activity that looks toward war. But I think it would be very unwise at this time while other great nations are preparing in every way that they can to meet the eventualities of the future, that we should not make preparations for any condition that may arise, and I think these conditions will have to be met in the air and by chemical warfare. It will be far less expensive than any other preparation. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the patience of the committee will indulge me in a few brief suggestions as to the remarks made by the gentleman from Kansas. But I suppose on a Saturday afternoon we can dawdle a little on this bill, because there is no pressing necessity at least for its passage.

The same argument that the gentleman makes with reference to modern inventions, that it is going to put Infantry and Artillery out of business, was probably delivered under the earliest instances of which we have any record when the council that sent Hannibal into Italy suggested that if he take along a few elephants it would annihilate the Roman Army. He did not do it. From that day down to the present time the wit and genius of mankind has been employed trying to invent a mechanical substitute for the lives, intelligence, and the personal morale of the human army, and they can not do it and never have. [Applause.] It can not be done.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Certainly.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. A very great human intelligence is required both in the Air Service and in Chemical Warfare Service; the very highest type of intelligence is required in the exercise of both.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Unquestionably, but that was not the argument I was making. I said that every man that is behind the activities of military matters must by the very nature and circumstances be intelligent enough to direct the agency with which he is intrusted. I am making my reference to the gentleman's suggestion that the battle is to be removed from earth and taken into the air, and I refuse to follow the gentleman into the air in any such argument. The first man who undertook to fly, he and his son——

Mr. ANTHONY. Darius Green?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No; it was before the time of Darius Green, but this man and his son rigged themselves up with wings and the son flew so near the sun that the sun melted the wax from the wings and he had to come back to earth with a splash into the sea.

The same thing is true of all academic statements when they say that the genius of man can invent a machine that will do more than the man can do himself. The gentleman forgets that back of every machine that is created by man must be human intelligences to run it, and those human intelligences again are simply put into combat with other human intelligences who are presumed to have as high a standard of intelligence as their competitors. You do not get anywhere—it is a vicious circle. It means one group inventing a certain machine and trying to overcome the destructive power of other machines, but back of all machines is the same human mind and the same human personnel. Every kind of device ever since, nobody knows how much before, Hannibal's time—but that is a very conspicuous incident or illustration that every sleepy schoolboy on a good fishing afternoon well remembers—has been proposed with the same idea and met the same result. A man could sit down with paper or a blackboard and draw a chart showing the destructive power that resides in an elephant against a certain number of men. Therefore, all you have to do is to divide the number of men by the number of elephants needed to annihilate them, and you can change the pages of history. They undertook to do it, and the only things that were left on the pages of history when they got through were the men. The elephants turned tail and ran. It is the same thing always. You will never get much further. Just as soon as some one invented the rifle to take the place of the old fowling piece, folks said then that only a few men were necessary to annihilate all of the other men on the other side. They forgot that the men on the other side were just as human and had just as much inventive genius, just as high a standardized intelligence as they themselves. They did not propose to stand themselves up in blocks of so many to each rifle to be shot down, just to prove the theory of the enemy.

Mr. MADDEN. And the chances are that they had rifles themselves.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly.

On this question of the air, I am quite as strongly impressed with the wonderful possibilities of the Air Service as is my friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. I share with him in the admiration for the marvelous genius of mankind that has so far so much subdued the air to our employment and use. I share with him the idea that doubtless we have only begun to unfold a little part of the practical usefulness of the Air Service even in time of peace. But I think we would make a great mistake, if I may say so respectfully to my friend, if having become possessed of a new idea we should become so much absorbed in it that we should forget all of the mighty mountains of truth that we learned before we came to that idea. The sense of proportion ought to linger with us still. As long as men are made as they are, submitted to the same physical conditions, human intelligence will be better than any machine that any human intelligence can devise, and we will be fighting in the old three dimensions quite as much as we will in this new fourth that has been found.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain something about the new fourth dimension?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If it were new, I could explain it, because nobody would know anything about it and they would take my word for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. How about the question of relativity?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The Einstein theory?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It is quite as applicable to it as most that I have said.

I only hope that we will not get away from the discussion of a few fundamentals in considering this matter. When you get all through with it, no invention of mankind since the old, old days in the first gray mists of history has ever taken the place of this one fundamental military experience. The real army is the Infantry. [Applause.] All other phases of military agencies and activities are auxiliaries of the Infantry. The man with the gun or the sword and the pistol in his hand is not only the decisive moral equation of combat, but the reason for war itself. It is all combined in him. [Applause.]

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

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a report made by the liquidating committee as to the total cost of the Air Service during the war.

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

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this just a statistical report?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I have not objected to the insertion of statistical matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Reprinted from Aviation and Aircraft Journal of Apr. 25.]

WHAT $598,090,781 BOUGHT IN WAR AVIATION—DETAILS NOW AVAILABLE OF ACHIEVEMENTS OF OUR AVIATORS AND COST OF WAR AIR EFFORT HERE AND ABROAD.

The final official account of the work of our Air Service at home and abroad is now available. In last week's issue a detailed statement was published of the war aviation appropriation showing $582,562,781 has been returned to the United States Treasury. The detailed cost of our war aviation during 1917 and 1918 is also now made public for the first time through the compilation of liquidation reports by Aviation and Aircraft Journal. The official statement follows:

"ACTIVITIES AT THE FRONT.

"American flying officers, with the American armies, with the royal air force, with the independent air force, with the French, and with the Italians, destroyed 781 airplanes and 73 balloons, a total of 854 enemy aircraft, actually confirmed, it being impossible to furnish records of nonconfirmed successes, of which there were many. The American losses in airplanes and balloons to the enemy were 289 airplanes and 48 balloons, a total American loss of 337. The superiority of the American Air Service is shown by the confirmation of almost three times as many enemy airplanes shot down as American airplanes lost to the enemy, and nearly twice as many balloons. The actual battle fatalities of the entire United States Air Service personnel with the American, British, French, and Italian Armies for the entire war was 227. It is not possible, of course, to know the exact number of fatalities of the enemy incurred in their loss to the Americans of 854 airplanes and balloons, but it may be assumed that the majority of these airplane losses represent fatalities.

"American airplane pilots spent 35,747 hours over the lines, participated in 150 bombing raids on the western front, dropping 255,000 pounds of explosives. The 37 squadrons in operation in the first and second American armies, whose flying hours for pilots are given herein, flew 966 hours per squadron, although these units had been at the front periods varying from one day to seven months. The American hours nearly equal the hours flown by the Belgians during the entire war. The British squadrons flew 1,292 hours per squadron on all fronts, active and inactive. One thousand six hundred and forty-two balloon ascensions were made by American flying officers in the zone of advance, with a total of 3,111 hours. These balloons made 316 artillery adjustments and were attacked 89 times by enemy aircraft. One hundred and sixteen parachute drops were made from balloons. The aerial observers employed in photography made 17,854 photographs of enemy positions and distributed for interpretation and other purposes 585,000 prints. The activities of the Air Service in training and at the front were carried on from 73 airdromes in the zone of advance alone. Nearly 600 American and foreign decorations were awarded to Air Service officers and soldiers up to May 1, 1919, and the list has been increased since.

"PERSONNEL WITH THE ARMIES.

"On the day of the armistice there were 45 American squadrons and 23 balloon companies assigned to American armies and to the French, Italian, and British air forces. Twelve of these squadrons had American-made DH-4 airplanes. There had been sent 1,230 pilots and 749 observers to the American zone of advance. There were actually at the American front on armistice day 767 pilots and 481 observers, as well as radio and other specialists, both flying and nonflying, and 172 pilots and 20 observers at the front with the allied air forces, not to mention other personnel. Other flying officers were, of course, in reserve and in training. Thirty-five balloon companies were in the American Expeditionary Forces on November 11, 1918.

"FLYING TRAINING.

"During the war period there were commissioned in the Air Service, both flying and nonflying, a total of 20,708, of which 12,449, over 60 per cent, were trained for flying duty as airplane pilots, balloon pilots, airplane and balloon observers, airplane gunners, bombardiers, etc. In this training for the fiscal year 1917–18 only, not to the end of training even, there were flown in the United States 909.606 airplane hours, with a total of 331 fatalities, a ratio of 1.09, and 0.346 fatalities per 1,000 hours flown in 1917–18, respectively. In the American Expeditionary Forces there were flown a total of 193,193 hours in training, with 169 fatalities for the entire period of training, a ratio of one fatality to 1,143 hours' flying. Of the airplanes received in the American Expeditionary Forces, 2,948 were sent to training centers and 2,925 to the zone of advance to December 31, 1918.

"PRODUCTION AND PURCHASE AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES.

"Of the 45 American squadrons on armistice date, 33 squadrons were equipped with foreign-made airplanes, in addition to which individuals operating with the Italian, French, and British forces used machines of these countries, respectively. Twelve squadrons were operating or equipping with American DH-4's, and equipment was on hand, both foreign and American, for further squadrons as they could complete training, organize, and get to the front. On armistice day there were 740 airplanes actually with the American Armies, of which 196 were American DH-4's, with 502 in reserve. One thousand four hundred and forty-three DH-4's were received in France, sufficient to supply the unit equipment of 24 airplanes, without wastage, for 60 squadrons. Including automobiles, trucks, motor cycles, etc., there were purchased by the Air Service 3,065 pieces of transportation equipment. Of the 802 hangars on hand, 414 were from the United States and 388 from France and England."

"One thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight airplanes had been outfitted with radio equipment; 1,444 airplanes had been armed. There were 9,232 machine guns on hand, besides those installed in airplanes.

"There had been received in France to December 31, 1918, 6,639 airplanes (4,886 from France, 291 from England, 19 from Italy, and 1,443 from the United States). Seventy-seven balloons had been sent to the balloon companies on the front, 57 of which were American made, with others in reserve."

Above is the official record of the achievements of our Air Service with the American Expeditionary Forces and at home. Volumes have been and many more will be written of the heroic work of our pilots. But every time our activities in the air during the war are mentioned the public recalls the oft-repeated statement by uninformed persons "that the United States spent a billion and a quarter dollars for aviation and got nothing for its money."

In last week's Aviation and Aircraft Journal there was presented for the first time the fact that $582,562,781 of the war-time aviation appropriations remained unspent and has been returned to the Treasury. The cost to the taxpayers was, therefore, according to the present figures after the liquidation boards had finally reported, $617,489,977.

It is practically impossible to find out the exact cost of every item that was purchased, as so many different departments bought for the Air Service at such varying prices. What everyone who looks back at our aircraft activities does want to know is what the Government received for the vast sum. It is believed that this information is gathered together in a condensed report and presented for the first time in the following tables.

First are shown the expenditures in the United States. From this tabulation it will be seen that out of $478,489,977 spent in the United States only $113,721,043.39 was spent for airplanes. The engines being ordered in such large quantities have to be considered separately, as so many more were constructed than airplanes. The 61 American fields, schools, and depots are shown in detailed cost. As will be seen from the huge quantities of materials ordered it would be a gigantic accounting task to secure the exact amount spent for each item; therefore they are grouped under the total of $41,817,220.11.

Following is given the cost of our Air Service in the United States in detail from figures compiled by Aviation and Aircraft Journal from official reports:

Air Service expenditures in United States.

9,742 airplanes from aero industry	$84,704,155.13	
2,000 airplanes from auto and kindred industries	19,843,837.39	
2,152 airplanes from miscellaneous	9,173,050.84	
13,894 (Airplanes considered as without engines.)		$113,721,043.39
14,765 engines from aero industry	101,725,369.64	
24,058 engines from auto and kindred industries	132,102,018.63	
3,134 engines from miscellaneous	11,010,774.03	
41,953 (Includes all engines in or out of airplanes.)		244,838,162.30
844 balloons and 1 airship from aero industries	4,754,353.95	
8,968 balloons from auto industry	2,294,760.81	
31,575 balloons from miscellaneous	100,168.25	
41,367 (Includes free and observation passenger balloons and pilot, supply, target, and propaganda balloons and 1 airship.)		7,149,283.01
30 flying schools and fields	55,587,422.74	
5 balloon schools	2,510,496.01	
1 aerial photo school	1,200.00	
1 radio school and laboratory	488,350.00	
1 aerial gunnery school	380,000.00	
1 mechanics school	158,900.00	
8 warehouses and depots	5,114,041.67	
3 engine repair depots	1,962,120.00	
3 concentration camps	2,406,700.00	
5 acceptance parks and experiment station	641,533.50	
3 sundry stations	479,154.55	
61 (Above figures for construction.)		69,727,918.47
Rentals for flying fields, schools, depots, rights of way, buildings, warehouses, wharves, etc. (22,912 acres, not including floor space in offices, etc.)		709,899.72
Helium experiments and plants, Nos. 1, 2, and 3 (Army share)		526,459.09

282,426 air pressure and gasoline gauges, air speed indicators, altimeters, clocks, compasses, etc.		
98,555 machine guns		
19,785 synchronizing devices		
15,122 flexible ring "A" gun mounts		
44,652 gun light parts		
20,078 gun yokes, controls, light mounts		
227,595 dummy and loaded bombs		
11,630 Mark I bomb sights		
249 Barlow heavy bomb releases		
10,213 bomb releases and parts		
14,542 flares and releases		
1,051 cameras		
465 enlarging lanterns		
1,599 camera guns		
1,159 photo cradles		
3,968 steel and canvas hangars		$41,817,220.11
3,429 tons ferrosilicon and caustic soda		
172,800 hydrogen cylinders		
236 balloon winches		
3,310,000 feet balloon cable		
13,673,000 yards airplane fabric		
7,888,000 yards balloon fabric		
7,359,000 yards cotton tape		
676,000 gallons acetate dope		
88,000 gallons nitrate dope		
643,240 miscellaneous clothing		
42,424 propellers		
82,159,751 gallons oil		
249,612,095 gallons gasoline		
36,600,000 cubic feet hydrogen gas		
197,635,000 board feet lumber from manufacturers and other miscellaneous items.		
		478,489,977.00

TOTAL EXPENDITURES IN UNITED STATES, $478,489,977.

The figures showing the purchases abroad for the American Expeditionary Forces are the first that have ever been presented giving costs and items. The $139,000,000 was allotted to so many different projects that it has taken two years to reach a settlement with foreign Governments and companies. As the latest figures show, $19,949,769.28 was spent for 5,229 airplanes. For airplane spare parts, $7,490,114.23 was used. Hangars, tents, and other shelters cost $8,228,116.38.

There were 31 American fields, depots, and parks constructed and equipped overseas. As will be seen in the figures below, it is impossible even now to segregate all the items, as has been done in the United States accounting, as the figures are probably scattered in so many places that only the sums expended by the different offices are yet obtainable.

The miscellaneous expenditures in France, England, Italy, and other countries total over $60,000,000.

Air Service expenditures for American Expeditionary Forces.

4,879 airplanes from France	$18,253,628.82	
283 airplanes from England	1,210,419.30	
68 airplanes from Italy	485,271.16	
5,229 airplanes		$19,949,769.28
6,400 engines from France	18,903,828.11	
215 engines from England	1,304,110.30	
444 engines from Italy	2,361,883.23	
		22,569,821.64
7,059 Airplane spare parts from France	7,297,431.89	
Airplane spare parts from England	162,315.12	
Airplane spare parts from Italy	30,367.22	
		7,490,114.23
Engine spare parts from France	7,547,464.97	
Engine spare parts from England	122,325.21	
Engine spare parts from Italy	51,230.00	
		7,721,020.18
Instruments from France and Italy		459,133.92
Propellers from France and Italy		240,270.10
Squadron equipment from France and Italy		2,210,887.77
20 balloons, 60 winches, equipment and supplies from France		2,100,000.00
Armament from France for 2,051 airplanes	759,980.00	
Armament from Italy, miscellaneous	9,115.15	
		769,095.15
Hangars, tents, abris, canvas, etc.:		
From France	1,881,330.28	
From England	6,406,786.08	
		8,288,116.36
Radio equipment from France		1,062,543.11
Photo equipment and supplies		287,713.22
Photo transportation equipment from France (75 vehicles)		595,550.37
Dope (3,480 gallons) and cellulose, acetate (17.5 tons) from France and England		179,995.55
Special clothing from France and Italy		28,288.66
Signal equipment supplies from France		619,437.19
Castor oil, gasoline, etc., from England		1,329,675.13
Construction of:		
11 flying and balloon schools	$5,256,974.65	
7 airdromes	2,344,236.25	
8 depots	1,977,890.92	
Miscellaneous projects:		
1 warehouse	119,725.49	
1 acceptance park	1,030,469.45	
1 assembly plant	5,147,139.27	
1 replacement and concentration barracks	162,940.18	
1 test field	112,838.26	
		16,152,274.47
31 Miscellaneous (includes motor transportation, small tools, machinery, shop equipment, steel products, miscellaneous supplies and equipment for general operations, shells, tool kits, boxes, cases, etc.):		
France	$23,006,324.22	
England	1,337,176.66	
Miscellaneous—Continued.		
Italy	$18,497,488.88	
Switzerland	147,831.19	
Spain	309,973.71	
		$43,298,794.66
Other miscellaneous items		19,799,773.58
Total expenditures for American Expeditionary Forces		139,000,000.00

RECAPITULATION.

Expenditures in United States	478,489,977.00
Expenditures in American Expeditionary Forces	139,000,000.00
Total war aviation expenditures	617,409,977.00
Actual receipts for materials sold	19,399,196.00
Net cost of war aviation	598,090,781.00

[Reprint from Aviation and Aircraft Journal of Apr. 18.]

COST OF WAR AVIATION ONLY $598,090,781—AUTHENTICATED OFFICIAL REPORT OF LIQUIDATION DIVISION OF UNITED STATES AIR SERVICE ON TOTAL APPROPRIATION CORRECTS MISCONCEPTION OF AIR SERVICE EXPENDITURES AND SHOWS THAT $582,564,781 HAS BEEN RETURNED TO UNITED STATES TREASURY.

The general impression that a "billion dollars was spent for aircraft during the war and that the production program was a failure, not a score of American-built planes reaching the front," is finally refuted by figures compiled by Aviation and Aircraft Journal from liquidation reports on file in the office of the Chief of Air Service in Washington. The truth is that the actual cost of all war contracts for aircraft, aeronautical equipment, landing fields, foreign purchases, in fact, everything connected with the equipment and maintenance of our air force at home and abroad, cost the taxpayers less than $600,000,000.

The actual amounts appropriated for the Army Air Service during the war aggregated $1,687,054,758. From this total amount there were revoked by Congress sums aggregating $487,000,000, making the net amount available for expenditure by the War Department $1,200,054,758.

Until now the charge has been made and the public has been led to believe that most of this money was spent and largely wasted. It is now revealed for the first time by official and authenticated reports made by the Liquidation Division of the Air Service that of the amount available for expenditure $582,564,781 has been returned to the United States Treasury.

And there were airplanes produced and delivered to the Government, despite the canard that the United States "got nothing for its money." The total amount spent for Army airplanes in the United States was $113,721,043.39, or 19 per cent of the total Air Service expenditures. For that money the Government received 13,894 American-built airplanes. The Government spent $139,000,000 abroad for training and the purchase of airplanes, engines, construction of cantonments and production centers and received among the other equipment 5,198 complete airplanes, making a total of 19,092 airplanes produced for the United States. These were produced in a period of 21 months. Our production for this period exceeds that of any other country for a like period. It is further substantiation of the belief that the rapidly increasing air power of America forced the war to an early conclusion, for shortly before the armistice the Central Powers had only 3,309 airplanes on the front. At the signing of the armistice, in addition to the 5,198 airplanes purchased abroad, 2,091 American-built airplanes had been shipped to France and 1,040 were at points of embarkation or in transit. One thousand four hundred and forty airplanes had been actually received in France, of which 667 American-made machines were actually in service at the front.

Only within the last few days have these figures been in such form that they could be used in vindication of the war-time Air Service activities of the Government. The Chief of Air Service states that figures "have been published and available for public information for several months, except the important figures showing net expenditures after liquidation and the amount of surplus stocks sold or otherwise disposed of." It is therefore with great satisfaction that Aviation and Aircraft Journal corrects the gross misstatements of the past two years.

After two years of adjusting canceled war contracts, as previously stated, $582,564,781 of the $1,200,054,758 available has been returned to the Treasury.

The amount actually expended from the money appropriated for the War Department for the Air Service in this country and abroad during the war was $617,489,977. From this have been deducted the amounts realized by surplus-material sales since the armistice of $19,399,196, making the net cost of our aeronautical endeavor during the war $598,090,781.

The seemingly unanswerable question before investigating committees, congressional and otherwise, before newspaper writers and the public has been What became of over one and one-half billion dollars appropriated for our Air Service?

The answer is found in the following figures which were secured from the office of the Chief of Air Service. This accounting has been necessarily slow. The magnitude of the aircraft program and the multiplicity of its ramifications, both in production and organization activities, in creating an Air Service from nothing to begin with—and it must be borne in mind that preparations were made for a fight to a finish—have made this task of accounting particularly tedious and of long duration. Further, the final accounting could not be made until suspended and canceled contracts were settled and finally liquidated.

In considering the amount actually spent at home and abroad one must take into account the fact that these expenditures cover all items and that only a comparatively small percentage was spent for airplanes. It is necessary to keep in mind this fact, so that a consideration of future aviation activities may not be warped by prejudice growing out of misconception heretofore circulated about our airplane industry. As will be seen from the figures presented there were expended for Army airplanes and spare parts with the "aeronautic industry" only $84,704,155.16, or 14 per cent of the total Air Service expenditures. Emergency war organizations received orders for $29,016,888.23. The total amount spent for Army airplanes in the United States was $113,721,043.39, or 19 per cent of the total Air Service expenditures.

Looking back over the situation it now is apparent that our airplane industry did not fail during the war. Starting with nothing (as only 142 airplanes had been built for the Army in nine years

previous to 1917) it completed and delivered to the Government, as shown in detail by the following tabulations, 13,894 complete airplanes, together with spare parts.

The problem on our entering the war was to create both an Air Service and an aircraft industry. In both we succeeded, for on November 11, 1918, the Air Service consisted of 20,568 officers and 174,456 enlisted men and civilian personnel, and 48 flying fields in operation.

In addition to airplanes for the Army our aircraft industry during this period manufactured a large number of seaplanes and flying boats for the Navy. It is a significant fact that during all of this period, while there has been almost constant discussion of our "failure in aviation," practically all the criticism has been directed toward the work of the War Department. Most of the Navy's contracts for procurement of seaplanes and flying boats, etc., were placed with the aircraft industry and officers in the Navy Department credit the industry with having met their requirements promptly and regularly.

The production of engines as shown by the final statements is also highly creditable. There was spent for aeronautical engines $244,838,162.30 in this country and 41,953 engines and spare parts were produced and delivered.

From these revised figures it must be conceded that the American airplane industry gave a spendid account of itself during the war. There may be a difference of opinion as to the adaptability of the American-made machines to meet the requirements of the service, but it must be remembered that the airplane manufacturers could make only the machines that they were ordered to make and that during the war period no attempt was made by the War Department to produce planes of American design, the sole effort toward original design and production being centered on the Liberty engine.

It is due perhaps more to the advice of our allies than to our advisers in Washington that more American-made airplanes did not reach the front earlier. When the United States entered the war our allies urged that we first furnish raw material, mechanics, and train aviators. Types of aircraft were changing every few months. A new type on either side with a few miles more speed, greater maneuverability, or greater carrying capacity would render all previous designs obsolete. Under such conditions it was obvious that any American production program should be based on European experience and advice.

That the above facts may be verified from official sources the following statements are printed in original form:

APRIL 6, 1921.

Maj. LESTER D. GARDNER,
Care Aviation and Aircraft Journal,
225 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your inquiry as to the exact amount of aeronautical appropriations made by Congress during the war period, accompanied by an additional statement showing the amount actually expended from these appropriations, and in a general way the purposes for which the expenditures were made, the Chief of Air Service directs me to advise you as follows:

There is inclosed herewith a statement, file number A 00.3/53, showing all aeronautical appropriations for United States Army from 1917 to 1918, inclusive, giving (after revocations made by Congress) a net total of $1,200,054,758.

Of this total amount there has been disbursed or reserved for final settlement of all claims to March 31, 1921, the sum of $617,489,977.

This sum, $617,489,977, is the gross amount expended for all of our aeronautic activities from the appropriations for the war period above mentioned. Your attention is directed to the fact that this includes nearly $2,000,000 that has been reserved to cover three remaining contracts not yet liquidated.

From surplus stocks there has been sold since the war aeronautical property bought under these appropriations on which the War Department has realized a cash return of $19,399,196. In addition to the actual sale of surplus material, there has been transferred, without funds, to other governmental departments property to the value of $5,139,315.33. There remains yet to be disposed of other property declared surplus, to the value of $15,931,930.37. Disregarding any cash returns that may be realized from future sale of the latter, as well as the transfers to other departments, but deducting the sum already received from sales ($19,399,196), it will be seen that the net cost of our aeronautical endeavor during the war, according to the present figure is $598,090,781.

There is also included in the above-mentioned statement a tabulation covering the disbursements for the procurement of airplanes, aeronautical engines, balloons, and airships arranged according to industries. The figures contained in this statement are taken from "Aircraft surveys," House Document No. 621, Sixty-sixth Congress, and show figures as of November 1, 1919. These figures were prepared for Congress one year after the armistice, and after all deliveries had been completed. They have been, in some cases, slightly modified by final liquidation of contracts, but a complete analysis of liquidated figures is not immediately available. All these, however, are included in the final liquidation and covered in the preceding paragraph.

There are also embodied in the same statement, figures showing other items of expenditure from these war aeronautic appropriations. The figures on this statement are taken from the figures submitted to Congress by the Air Service, and published in Part II of "United Air Service hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session." With these figures before you, you will be able to determine the purpose for which the $617,489,977 was spent. These figures, as above indicated, are not in each case final, as they were prepared before liquidation, but they are sufficiently accurate for practical purposes in considering this question.

The subjects of your inquiry can not be properly considered, however, without reference to the further fact that in addition to the stocks declared surplus and sold or offered for sale since the war, we hold, as additional salvage from war expenditures, much other aeronautical equipment constituting a national asset, such as complete airplanes, extra engines, balloons, and other equipment, now in use or reserved for future use of the service. In addition to this equipment, and probably the greatest asset from the war, are the thousands of trained flying officers and mechanics, together with our training fields, hangars, and other ground facilities. All of the figures contained in the above have been published and available for public information for several months, except the important figure showing net expenditures after liquidation and the amount of surplus stocks sold or otherwise disposed of.

Very respectfully,

H. M. HICKHAM,
Major, Air Service, Chief of Information Group.

WAR AERONAUTICAL APPROPRIATIONS UNITED STATES ARMY, 1917–18.

The following information sets forth the appropriations specifically provided by Congress in the various bills listed. The actual total amount for the bills will vary for some of these figures, as the bills included appropriations for the purposes of the Signal Corps proper, as well as for aeronautics in the Signal Corps.

These figures show the allotments made to cover purchases and contracts, and are not figures representing actual disbursements. It is practically impossible to secure figures on the actual disbursements under each and every class of material or service paid for from Air Service records only.

The figures for the allotments and unallotted balances in this tabulation were obtained from the "United Air Service hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session," statement of Lieut. Col. Jacob E. Fickel, Air Service, pages 162 and the following, with the exception of the item of $8,000,000, the allotments under which are not shown in the hearings.

As the statements in the hearings of the date of June 30, 1919, show, the allotments include moneys not only therefore actually disbursed for aircraft material, accessories, and services, but include also funds reserved for settlement of canceled or suspended contracts.

It will be seen from the statements in the hearings that it is practically impossible to arrive at figures which show the actual moneys disbursed for purely aeronautical purposes; e. g., page 168, item 3, some of these telephone systems were installed at Air Service stations. Under paragraph 4, some of this radio equipment was for the Air Service. Paragraph 5 includes also transportation for the Air Service. However, in the attached tabulation there have been included only those allotments specifically named as for the Air Service.

On page 169, the items under "Aviation, seacoast defenses"; "Aviation, seacoast defenses, insular possessions, Hawaii"; or "Aviation, seacoast defenses, insular possessions, Philippines," include moneys appropriated for aeronautics, prior to the declaration of war, which moneys were partially used during the war, and even in 1921.

Other items in these hearings include purely Signal Corps allotments, which have no relation to aeronautics.

Reference is made, in this connection, to the document, "Consolidated List of Aircraft Contracts and Deliveries, April 6, 1917, to November 1, 1919," file No. AI-10.2/22, compiled in the Information Group, O. C. A. S., after making minor corrections in "Aircraft Surveys," House Document No. 621, included as an appendix herein. The figures shown in this statement represent actual disbursements, as of November 1, 1919. The document does not include settlements made subsequently which change the actual final payments to the aeronautical industries and to outside industries for aircraft material. This document is mentioned in order to explain the discrepancy in the figures between those shown therein and the figures shown in the hearings above mentioned.

The allotments under the appropriation of $8,000,000 were supplied by the Liquidation Division, O. C. A. S. The items mentioned in the attached tabulation as unallotted balances were returned to the Treasury.

The concluding statement attached, which purports to show the total actual disbursements, was compiled March 26, 1921, by the Liquidation Division.

So that the items of all war-time Government appropriations may be clearly understood the following official tabulation is furnished:

War aeronautical appropriations, United States Army.

Act of May 12, 1917	$10,800,000
Act of May 6, 1917	40,000,000
Act of June 12, 1917	500,000
Act of June 15, 1917	43,450,000
Act of July 24, 1917	640,000,000
Act of July 8, 1918	8,000,000
Act of July 9, 1918	760,000,000
Act of July 9, 1918	124,304,758
Act of Nov. 4, 1918	60,000,000
	1,687,054,758
Less revocations	487,000,000
	1,200,054,758

Following is a tabulation, appropriation by appropriation, with the allotments for aeronautics, unallotted balances and revocations shown under each:

Appropriations.		Allotments, unallotted balances, revocations.
$10,800,000	Allotments	$8,293,128.73
40,000,000	Used by S. C. proper	40,506,871.27
	Revocation	2,000,000.00
50,800,000	Total	50,800,000.00
500,000	Allotments	480,764.67
	Unallotted balance	19,235.33
500,000	Total	500,000.00
43,450,000	Allotments	32,144,975.49
	Unallotted balance	
	Used for S. C. proper	11,305,024.51
43,450,000	Total	43,450,000.00
640,000,000	Allotments	606,872,404.10
	Unallotted balance	33,127,595.90
640,000,000	Total	640,000,000.00
8,000,000	Allotments	4,858,591.48
	Unallotted balance	3,141,408.52
8,000,000	Total	8,000,000.00

Appropriations.		Allotments, unallotted balances, revocations.
760,000,000	Revocation	$400,000,000.00
	Allotments	288,164,487.41
	Unallotted balance	71,835,512.59
760,000,000	Total	760,000,000.00
60,000,000	Revocations	85,000,000.00
124,304,758	Allotments	91,935,311.81
	Unallotted balance	7,369,446.19
184,304,758	Total	184,304,758.00

Suspension uncompleted portions of contracts at time of armistice	$509,199,915.99
Settled since war to Mar. 25, 1921	93,940,229.30
Balance returned or to be returned to Treasury	415,259,686.69
Total appropriations	1,200,054,758.00
Less amount for suspension contracts	509,199,915.99
	690,854,842.01
Less unallotted balance and suspension contracts proper as above	167,305,094.31
	523,549,747.70
Add disbursements since armistice	93,940,229.30
Grand total disbursements	617,489,977.00
Total appropriations	1,200,054,758.00
Disbursements, including $1,789,000 held for settlement of three contracts outstanding Mar. 31, 1921	617,489,977.00
Savings returned to Treasury	582,564,781.00
Cash received from disposal of property declared surplus	19,399,196.00
Actual cost air endeavor in war	598,090,781.00

APPENDIX I.

Consolidated list of aircraft contracts and deliveries in United States April 6, 1917–November 1, 1919.

AIRPLANES, ENGINES, AIRSHIPS, BALLOONS (SUPPLY, FREE, TOY, OBSERVATION, TARGET, PROPAGANDA, EXPERIMENTAL) ARRANGED BY INDUSTRIES AND BY CONTRACTORS.

Rearranged from corrected copy of "Aircraft Surveys," House Document No. 621, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, on file in office, Chief of Air Service, to show the amounts paid to each contractor, divided between the aeronautical, automobile and kindred, and miscellaneous industries. Only disbursements to November 1, 1919, are shown. Consequently settlements in liquidation of suspended contracts are not included. The above document is public and for all practical purposes shows the amounts expended for flying material.

Those concerns which were producing airplanes, aircraft engines, balloons, or airships prior to the World War and generally accepted as pioneer aeronautical manufacturers, and those other concerns organized during the war period and who are continuing active operations in aeronautics, have been considered in the classification "Aeronautical industry."

Airplanes.

AERONAUTICAL INDUSTRY.

Kind.	Number received.	Amount.
Curtiss	4,014	$29,366,397.24
Standard	1,033	15,589,694.63
Sturtevant	1	11,250.00
Wright	51	329,250.00
L. W. F	131	1,649,377.50
Glenn Martin	10	822,575.27
Thomas-Morse	599	3,106,103.27
Lewis & Vought	7	61,676.00
Heinrich	2	11,328.00
Gallaudet	4	140,013.02
Breese	300	591,325.85
Burgess	1	26,009.50
Aeromarine	.....	
Fowler	50	323,166.90
Dayton-Wright	3,506	31,446,575.88
Packard	25	1,084,670.12
Ordnance	8	144,742.98
Total	.....	84,704,155.16

AUTOMOBILE AND KINDRED INDUSTRIES.

Fisher	2,000	$19,643,837.39
Brewster	.....	200,000.00
Total	2,000	19,843,837.39

MISCELLANEOUS (EMERGENCY WAR ORGANIZATIONS, NEW CONCERNS, MISSIONS, ETC.).

Empire	.....	$15,000.00
Pigeon-Fraser	3	19,075.00
Liberty Iron Works	100	1,002,366.28
Italian War Mission	1	49,227.79
Equipment Holding	2	10,000.00

Airplanes—Continued.

MISCELLANEOUS, ETC.—continued.

Kind.	Number received.	Amount.
Springfield Aircraft Co	588	$3,457,229.52
St. Louis	450	2,137,500.00
United States Aircraft Co	50	326,170.10
Howell & Lesser	75	394,121.41
Schiefer	1	11,720.00
Various manufacturers for Handley-Page parts	100	.....
Canadian Aero Co	680	1,733,136.00
Pacific	2	17,504.74
Total	2,152	9,173,050.84

RECAPITULATION OF AIRPLANES.

Aeronautical industry	9,742	$84,704,155.16
Automobile and kindred industry	2,000	19,843,837.39
Miscellaneous	2,152	9,173,050.84
Total	13,894	113,721,043.39

Engines.

AERONAUTICAL INDUSTRY.

Kind.	Number received.	Amount.
Ordnance	2	(1)
Lawrance	1	$21,000.00
Hall-Scott	1,255	2,944,631.03
Curtiss	750	634,547.23
Standard	41	215,093.14
L. W. F	24	(1)
Sturtevant	73	302,000.00
Burgess	30	133,500.00
Wright	5,816	54,372,268.68
Thomas-Morse	69	321,990.08
Gallaudet	4	(1)
Packard	6,630	42,780,339.50
Total	14,765	101,725,369.64

AUTOMOBILE AND KINDRED INDUSTRIES.

Van Blerck	4	$8,913.04
Sterling	4	11,680.59
Wisconsin	2	2,878.00
Duesenberg	40	4,934,798.62
Pierce-Arrow	.....	1,584,164.81
General Motors	2,543	9,766,499.68
Willys-Overland	8,500	21,030,871.60
General Vehicle	61	43,700.00
Excelsior Motor	451	295,000.00
Nordyke & Marmon	2,000	18,015,240.38
Winton	1	1,485.00
Trego	1	1,145,008.11
Lincoln	6,500	45,859,985.18
Ford	3,950	29,401,393.62
Willys-Morrow	1	400.00
Total	24,058	132,102,018.63

MISCELLANEOUS.

Canadian Aero	400	$252,000.00
Aero Engineering	121	523,723.14
Schiefer	1	(1)
Italian War Mission	4	(1)
British War Mission	8	.....
Union Switch	2,585	10,131,298.89
Murray & Tregurtha	6	103,752.00
Equipment Holding	3	(1)
Pacific	2	(1)
Total	3,130	11,010,774.03

[1] Amounts wholly or partly included in same contracts covering airplanes.

RECAPITULATION OF ENGINES.

Aeronautical industry	14,765	$101,725,369.64
Automobile and kindred industry	24,058	132,102,018.63
Miscellaneous	3,130	11,010,774.03
Total	41,953	244,838,162.30

Balloons and airships.

AERO INDUSTRY.

Kind.	Number received.	Amount.
Connecticut	128	$393,464.10
Knabenshue	28	198,501.66
French-American	1	1,800.00
Goodyear	687	4,160,588.19
Total	844	4,754,353.95

[1] Includes one airship.

Balloons and airships—Continued.

AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY.

Kind.	Number received.	Amount.
Goodrich	249	$1,788,253.94
United States Rubber	6,437	428,252.68
Firestone	7	76,223.56
Revere	2,275	2,030.63
Total	8,968	2,294,760.81

MISCELLANEOUS.

Halsey	3	$1,185.24
Scott	161	18,579.71
Columbia	1	60.00
Pilot balloons (Faultless)	22,866	1,608.30
Navy Department	44	70,000.00
Pilot balloons (Sterling)	8,500	8,735.00
Total	31,575	100,168.25

RECAPITULATION OF BALLOONS.

Total balloons and airships	41,387	
Total expenditure		$7,149,283.01

APPENDIX II.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS MATERIAL.

Following is a statement of aeronautical material declared surplus in the United States Army Air Service and disposed of, as of March 23, 1921. (Memorandum to Information Group from Acting Chief Material, Disposals, and Salvage Division, March 31, 1921.)

Total value declared surplus (cost to Government)			$103,412,028.07
Value of material disposed of (cost to Government):			
Adjustments, wastage, depreciation		$4,403,240.83	
Material absorbed in settlement of claims		6,372,000.00	
Transferred to other Air Service activities		17,205,367.06	
Transferred to other Government departments—no funds		5,139,315.33	
Total sold—			
Government departments	$19,380.52		
Commercial	54,340,893.96		
		54,360,274.48	
			87,480,197.70
Actual receipts for amounts disposed of			19,399,196.00
Value of remainder yet to be disposed of (cost to Government)			15,931,830.37

Percentage of amount disposed of, 84.59.

OTHER EXPENDITURES.

The above figures account for $365,708,485.30 of the total war-time aeronautical expenditures for the Army, as follows:

Airplanes	$113,721,043.39
Engines	244,838,162.30
Balloons	7,149,283.01
	365,708,488.70

This leaves $251,781,488.30 to be accounted for in the expenditures for other purposes.

Below are figures which will show these main expenditures in concrete form:

TRAINING STATIONS.

30 flying schools and fields	$55,587,422.74	
5 balloon schools	2,510,496.01	
1 aerial photo school	1,200.00	
1 radio school and laboratory	486,350.00	
1 aero gunnery school	380,000.00	
1 mechanics' school	158,900.00	
8 warehouses and depots	5,114,041.67	
3 engine repair depots	1,962,120.00	
3 concentration camps	2,406,700.00	
5 acceptance parks and experimental station	641,533.50	
3 Sunday stations	479,154.55	
		$69,727,918.47
Rental for flying fields, schools, depots, rights of way, buildings, warehouses, wharves (acreage owned by United States not included in these figures)		709,899.72
Foreign expenditures (estimated) for airplanes, engines, fields, and other purchases (P. 184, United Air Service hearing, pt. 2.)		139,000,000.00
Miscellaneous:		
Pay of personnel, officers, enlisted men, and civilians, machine guns, ammunition, bombs, cameras, flying clothing, and other purchases		42,343,670.11
		251,781,488.30

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I am hardly able to follow the logic of my good friend from Vermont [Mr. GREENE]. He raises an objection to the plea made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] that we should not neglect the Air Service.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Oh, I know the gentleman is too scrupulously conscientious to put words in my mouth that I did not myself use or intend to use. I took for my text the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], that in the next war the infantry and the artillery would play but a small part.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman's logic went much further than that. For instance, he illustrates the proposition by saying that there was no improvement made; that the same idea was suggested in Hannibal's time that is suggested now; that after all it is the man behind the gun that must be principally considered, and, therefore, that he should not pay very much and very particular attention to the gun. That is the proposition that seems to be implied from the gentleman's argument.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It may be for the purposes of the gentleman's making a speech, but it was not implied in anything that I said.

Mr. TOWNER. I entirely disagree with the gentleman, because if his speech did not have that implication, then it did not have any implication. I want to call attention to this fact, in all seriousness, leaving out of consideration the gentleman from Vermont in this particular. We must not forget—and I think the gentleman from Vermont will agree with this proposition—that there never was a time in the history of civilization when we were making as rapid progress in development with regard to increasing the implements of warfare as we are doing now. If we realize what the other nations of the world are doing with regard to the air service, we would be not only foolish, not only stupid, but criminally negligent if we did not follow up just as far as we possibly can with those developments and meet them as long as we must stand with the other nations of the world in a defensive attitude. We are obliged to do this. In the Argonne when our own forces were not supplied with air machines, and when the enemy was sweeping down on the defenseless lines, killing and maiming thousands of our boys because we could not meet their offensive with a defensive air service, it would not have been a very convincing argument to our soldiers to tell them what the gentleman from Vermont has just said. We must keep track of these developments of warfare and we must meet them as long as we are compelled to meet them. I sincerely hope that the hour is not distant when we may bring the forces of the world to realize that all of this must stop sometime, that all of this increase in the power to kill and maim mankind must cease, and I expect before long, just as soon as it is possible, we shall all take steps to bring that about.

The administration politically, the people of this country generally, the Members of this House without regard to political divisions, I am sure, will aid in this development. But until that time shall come we must keep our powder dry. We must act with the intelligence of the age and with the common sense that has always manifested America's position with regard to the world in seeing that we do not neglect to make our defense at least as strong as the possible offense of any other nation in the world.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] can not more sincerely desire international disarmament than I do. I am ready to do anything and everything possible to bring about an agreement among the nations which will greatly lessen if not put an end to the competitive and wasteful expenditures that are now being made in preparation for future wars—wars that would never occur if reason and justice ruled mankind.

Until a binding and effective agreement to disarm can be made it is undoubtedly the part of wisdom for the United States to accumulate an adequate supply of all the modern implements of warfare. I shall vote for the necessary appropriations for that purpose and for whatever sums that may be needed for experiments in devising even more deadly means of destroying our enemies. But in doing so I shall not deceive myself into the belief that some inventive genius will discover anything which can be substituted for the soldier who marches and fights on foot, armed with a weapon that he can carry in his hands.

It should never be forgotten that the infantry is the "Queen of Battles." Every other branch of the military service is a mere auxiliary which works for the infantry. The infantryman must be fed and clothed, and that is why we have quartermasters and a service of supply. The engineers may make maps and repair the roads; the cavalry may scout ahead; the air service may do even more in locating the enemy; the artillery may prepare the way; but without the infantry no battle could be won. It is that steel-white arm, the bayonet, in the hands of the foot soldier which ultimately decides the course of every conflict and the fate of every nation.

Mr. LITTLE. If the gentleman from Arizona will yield, I once heard a soldier say "the cavalry finds them, the artillery scares them, and the infantry licks them."

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman from Kansas has been a gallant soldier and what he says is true. He will agree with me that one who thinks that any of the auxiliary arms can be so improved as to do away with the American "doughboy" sadly misunderstands the lessons of history. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of officers of the line and staff, $46,000,000.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ascertain how many officers are provided for by this appropriation.

Mr. ANTHONY. We provide here for 14,000. There are 12,900 now in the service.

Mr. STEVENSON. I understood the gentleman from Kansas on yesterday or the day before yesterday to state that this provided for 14,000. Now, the statement was made twice yesterday—I think once by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] and once by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN]—that it provided for 17,000 officers.

Mr. ANTHONY. The act of reorganization itself authorized the appointment of 17,000 officers.

Mr. STEVENSON. I know that statement——

Mr. ANTHONY. But under the limitation of this bill they will only have 14,000.

Mr. STEVENSON. You have a limitation of 14,000 in this?

Mr. ANTHONY. We have.

Mr. STEVENSON. I did not understand the statement of the gentleman from Illinois yesterday that it provided for 17,000 when we only appropriate for 14,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask a question. This provision in this bill is not legislation. It is merely an appropriation providing money for pay of 14,000 officers. The Army reorganization bill is legislation and authorized the appointment by the Secretary of War of 17,000 officers. Gentlemen on this side and some on the other, including myself, criticized the Secretary of War for going beyond our authorization in appropriations, but yet others defended the Secretary of War for going according to law. I want to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, what is there in the law, if the Secretary of War saw fit so to do, to prevent him from complying with the provision of law and appointing 17,000 officers, in which case the Congress of the United States would be forced in deficiency bills to come in and provide pay for the extra men who had been placed there by the Secretary of War?

Mr. ANTHONY. Not if the Congress approved the provision at the top of page 22, which says:

That the Army shall be reduced by the Secretary of War so that the sum herein appropriated shall defray the entire cost of the pay of the officers and enlisted men of the line and staff during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, but the gentleman knows that should the Secretary issue commissions to 17,000 officers we would have to pay them with deficiencies. What I want to ask the gentleman is, whether or not in his opinion the present Secretary of War would consider that provision at the top of page 22 mandatory upon him to such an extent that he would disobey the other statutory law of the land and refuse to go beyond it?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not see how he dare disobey that.

Mr. BLANTON. If there is no question about that, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to make an inquiry of the chairman relative to the question of discharging men now in the service. As I understand it, there are now in the service, a large number enlisted within the last year, about 235,000 men.

Mr. ANTHONY. Two hundred and thirty-two thousand is what they figure it now.

Mr. DOWELL. Under the law, as I understand it, or at least under the interpretation of the War Department, the department has refused to release any of these men from the service notwithstanding we passed legislation in the Congress limiting this number to 175,000. Does the gentleman know that is true?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is true.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that the department is not authorized to release these men upon a showing of dependency, irrespective of the fact that there are now more than necessary in the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is no question, as has been repeatedly stated, that the Secretary of War has the right to discharge any enlisted man at any time.

Mr. DOWELL. Well, now, that is just the question I wanted to ask, as I have a ruling here by the department which I want to submit to the House, and which shows that the department is not in accord with the view of the chairman of the committee and is not releasing men in the Army, notwithstanding the fact that we have now perhaps 60,000 more than desired, as declared by Congress.

As I understand it, it costs about $2,000 per year per man for every one retained in the Army. A short time ago I submitted to the War Department the question of the release of a young man who desired to be released out of the service. He had a contract for a position at $200 per month and was very anxious to secure his release. The young man furnished the department a statement of facts something like this: His father was a blacksmith at a mining camp and was out of employment. The young man's mother had died prior to his enlistment, it is true, and there were some young children who had to be supported, and his father, without employment, was unable to support the family. These affidavits were filed with the department, and I have them here. The department submitted to me, after several weeks of evidently careful consideration, the following letter, which I want to read to the House: It says:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF, OPERATIONS DIVISION,
Washington, April 26, 1921.

Hon. C. C. DOWELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DOWELL: With further reference to your letter of April 4, 1921, I beg to advise you that application for discharge of Pvt. Patrick Dominic has been received. The reason for discharge cited in the accompanying affidavits is dependency of Pvt. Dominic's father, due to the inability of the father to obtain work. Section 29 of the act of June 4, 1920, authorizes discharge on account of dependency only when such disability is "by reason of death or disability of a member of the family of an enlisted man occurring after his enlistment."

Since no death or disability is shown in the accompanying affidavits, the case does not come within the provision of the above act and can not be approved.

Very truly, yours,

HENRY JERVEY,
Brigadier General, Assistant Chief of Staff.

With over 60,000 surplus of men in the Army, the young man in the service who has a contract at $200 per month, his father out of employment, and with little children to support, is unable to secure a favorable sanction of the War Department for his release, though costing this Government $2,000 per annum.

Mr. KEARNS. I would like to ask the gentleman if that quotation in the letter is from the law or a ruling?

Mr. DOWELL. I assume it is a quotation from the law. What I am getting at is this: Either the War Department has given a narrow construction of the law, or the Committee on Military Affairs ought to bring before Congress at once a bill to provide for the release of these men. [Applause.] There is no reason in this world, and no reason given by the War Department, except as they construe the law that they are unable to release them, that this man, who is able to earn $200 a month, in order to support his minor brothers and sisters, should not be given the privilege of helping to support them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Could we not correct that by putting an amendment on this bill, if we were so disposed?

Mr. DOWELL. I am very glad of the suggestion, and I certainly hope, with this situation before the House, this will be done.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the bill does contain a provision that will accomplish just what the gentleman wants.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. In answer to the gentleman, I have examined that clause very carefully. It leaves it in their discretion, but they abused the discretion.

Mr. ANTHONY. Coupled with the Borah amendment, which compels them to reduce the size of the Army, he will avail himself of the men who want discharge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

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

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. HULL. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to this, that I expect, when the section is reached, to offer an amendment to remedy that very thing.

Mr. DOWELL. However that may be, this is a very important matter in view of the fact that we are now undertaking to reduce the Army. By a violation of what the War Department well knew was the will of Congress, they have enlisted 235,000 men, and unless I am mistaken, and unless there is a definite action by Congress, there will be but few released by the War Department unless they are compelled to do so. Now, I believe, as we are going to reduce the Army, we should make provision for the release of these young men who desire to be released. They should not be compelled to stay in the Army during the next two or three years when they can better themselves so much on the outside.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. As the number of privates in the Army are decreased to a certain extent, does it automatically lower the grade of such officers?

Mr. DOWELL. I presume, perhaps, that is true.

Mr. BLANTON. And is not that the reason for part of the great desire of the department to keep the number up?

Mr. DOWELL. I can not answer what is the reason, but I do know that they are holding them in the service.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman permit me to answer that very suggestion?

Mr. DOWELL. I will permit the gentleman to do so.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. You could discharge all the enlisted men in the Army that are there now, and it would not change the grades of a single commissioned officer, except in the Medical Department.

Mr. DOWELL. However that may be, my purpose is, when we have over 60,000 additional men that we do not want, and they are costing the Government $2,000 a year each to keep, and they have better positions offered outside, to have the privilege of retiring them from the service and permitting them to go into private employment, I think we ought to so state in this bill.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. In the course of your investigation, have they refused to reduce on the basis of the case you presented? On what basis are they reducing?

Mr. DOWELL. They can not reduce under this opinion, under the restriction that is placed upon it. I read:

Only by reason of death or disability of a member of the family of an enlisted man occurring after his enlistment.

In this case the young man's mother died before he enlisted and the conditions did not exist then that exist now. Therefore, he can not be discharged, because this did not occur after his enlistment.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. Did he make the allotment to his father?

Mr. DOWELL. I do not know anything about the allotment. I am not discussing that phase of it. I am trying to submit to the Members of this House the actual situation. You are not going to reduce this Army unless you make a provision that will compel the War Department to discharge the men who want to be discharged from the service.

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

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Iowa may have one-half minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit me, answering the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], if the Army should be reduced, say, to 50,000 men, surely the Congress would not permit 14,000 officers to hold commissions.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does the gentleman contend that I should make some reflections on that?

Mr. BLANTON. I admit that the gentleman is capable of making reflections on any subject. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of officers, National Guard, $100.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last ward.

Mr. LANHAM. I do so for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee the purpose of this item and a similar item for a like amount on page 16, with reference to the enlistment of the National Guard?

Mr. ANTHONY. They are not paid directly from the pay of the Army, but we want to keep these items alive. In case the National Guard is ordered out into the Federal service, then we appropriate under that item.

Mr. LANHAM. That accounts for the small sum?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. Otherwise they are paid under the National Guard item.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of the officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, $250,000: *Provided*, That no portion of this appropriation shall be expended for the pay of a reserve officer on active duty for a longer period than 15 days, except such as may be detailed for duty with the War Department General Staff under section 3a and section 5(b) of the Army reorganization act approved June 4, 1920, or who may be detailed for courses of instruction at the general or special service schools of the Army, or who may be detailed for duty as instructors at civilian military training camps appropriated for in this act, or who may be detailed for duty with tactical units of the Air Service, as provided in section 37a of the Army reorganization act approved June 4, 1920, and except one officer of the Medical Reserve Corps.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Page 15, line 12, after the word "service," insert "or who may be detailed for duty in the Judge Advocate General's Department."

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes to explain this amendment. I think it will need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. I shall have to object to more than five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas objects. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered absolutely in the interest of economy in the public service and in the administration of the Army. Some of you know that the Army maintains and did maintain during the war a very large fleet of transports and attendant vessels and other vessels of various sorts. You and I, who have practiced law or those who have employed lawyers, know something about what admiralty lawyers charge when they are employed specially in a case and what we have to pay for them. There is an admiralty board of reserve officers in the Army, there being no admiralty lawyers in the Judge Advocate General's force. During the war a number of cases arose which had to be settled in accordance with the rules of admiralty law, which no lawyer except an admiralty lawyer understands.

There are now pending in the War Department between 400 and 500 of these claims still unadjusted, although the admiralty board is working on them all the time. There are 40 or 50 of these claims which are filed from month to month, or have been this winter. This board of four or five admiralty lawyers, reserve officers—majors, most of them—are employed day after day in adjusting these claims and have saved for the Government millions of dollars.

A provision like the one I am seeking to amend was in the bill which passed the House last winter. Secretary Baker wrote to Mr. WADSWORTH, discovering that he could not keep, under the terms of the bill, his admiralty lawyers in the Judge Advocate General's Department more than 15 days. I have a copy of that letter here, asking an amendment permitting these reserve officers to serve longer than 15 days. I shall not detain the committee by reading that letter. The letter which Mr. Weeks wrote to this subcommittee I have here, and, without objection, I shall read it. It is very brief. This is the letter which Secretary Weeks wrote to the chairman of the committee, and it refers to Mr. Baker's letter.

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

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

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

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Has the gentleman any information as to who these admiralty lawyers are and the number of them?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. There are four or five of them; not over that.

Mr. ANTHONY. Do you know their names?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. No. I do not know the name of a single one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I read:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 9, 1921.

Hon. DANIEL R. ANTHONY, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANTHONY: I am informed that the Army appropriation act, 1922, which failed of enactment at the last session, is about to be reintroduced in the new Congress. That bill, as passed by Congress, was so worded that no reserve officer could be called to active duty in the Judge Advocate General's Department for a longer period than 15 days in any year. (See H. R. 15943. Calendar No. 777. Report No. 609, pp. 15 and 16.)

I am also informed that my predecessor, Secretary Baker, requested that the bill be amended, but that his letter appears to have been received too late for favorable action. Since I also am of opinion that the bill should be amended, and for the same reasons, I take the liberty of quoting with approval the following extract from a letter of Secretary Baker's to Senator WADSWORTH, chairman Senate Committee on Military Affairs, dated February 25, 1921:

"The Judge Advocate General's Department, as reorganized under the Army reorganization act, has among its reserve officers certain highly trained specialists in branches of civil and military law (especially admiralty), whose services during the war were of the greatest value to the Government, and can not at once be dispensed with. They are now engaged upon work which was forced upon this department by the war and which continues to come. They are disposing of it successfully because of their previous civil and military experience. Permanent officers can not be substituted for them and trained to their special work without an expense which must far exceed their pay. They will be relieved from duty whenever their services can be spared without detriment to the best interests of the Government. In asking that provision be made for their temporary retention, I feel that I am still carrying out the War Department policy which I approve, to the effect that reserve officers shall not now be called for ordinary duty.

"If your committee approve of this suggestion, the following slight amendment might be made to the appropriation act, as indicated by the added words in italic:

"For pay of the officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, $750,000: *Provided*, That no portion of this appropriation shall be expended for the pay of a reserve officer on active duty for a longer period than 15 days, except such as may be detailed for duty with the War Department General Staff under section 3a and section 5b of the Army reorganization act approved June 4, 1920, or who may be detailed for courses of instruction at the general or special service schools of the Army, or who may be detailed for duty as instructors at civilian military training camps appropriated for in this act, or who may be detailed for duty with tactical units of the Air Service, *or who may be detailed for duty in the Judge Advocate General's Department*, as provided in section 37a of the Army reorganization act approved June 4, 1920."

I hope that your committee will approve and adopt the amendment.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN W. WEEKS,
Secretary of War.

The words in italic in the above letter are the words I have offered in my amendment. I have simply copied the words of Secretary Baker and of Secretary Weeks, "or who may be detailed for duty in the Judge Advocate General's Department."

It is in the interest of public economy. It is to effect a very great saving through the use of these men who have been successfully handling these claims for the last two or three years, who still have between 400 and 500 of them, which they are now working upon, who know all the facts, who have been specially trained in admiralty practice; and as a lawyer I feel safe in saying to you that even the best lawyer who is not a specialist in admiralty is as unfit to try an admiralty case as is a general lawyer to try a patent case.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KAHN. It is a fact that these lawyers in the Judge Advocate General's Department are frequently called upon to meet the very best admiralty lawyers in the country in the courts, and therefore it is essential that there should be some good admiralty lawyers in the Judge Advocate General's Department.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. They have to meet lawyers of the highest character and standing, men like Wilhelmus Mynderse, the greatest admiralty lawyer this country ever produced.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I thoroughly agree that a lawyer who engages in ordinary practice, no matter how skillful or learned he may be, if he does not pay any attention to admiralty practice, as a rule knows nothing about it; but as I understand the gentleman's amendment it would not prevent their being assigned to the Judge Advocate General's office for any purpose.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I have enough faith in Secretary Baker and Secretary Weeks to believe that they would not ask for one thing and take another, and I have copied the language prepared by the Secretary, because I believe it covers the ground.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Certainly it would be broad enough; but I did not know but that the gentleman might suggest some slight modification that would limit it to cases where they were engaged in admiralty work.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I would be perfectly willing to have that added; but I am afraid it would bungle up the section if we should try to do it now. Perhaps the House would like to know, and I can explain in a sentence the character of this work. We have a great Army fleet of engineer boats, transports, colliers, and various vessels used in war that are not a part of the Navy and have nothing to do with the Navy. There are contracts about these vessels. There are collision cases, there are injuries and actions for negligence. I remember very well a case where two men were scalded to death in a boiler on one of these vessels, and the claim was made and had to be adjusted, and every one of these claims has to be adjusted in accordance with the rules of admiralty law and not in accordance with the rules of the common law.

I submit the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Under what authority of law, where a United States vessel is involved in a collision, does a legal officer of the War Department appear in court in an admiralty suit?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I suppose he appears as specially detailed by the Attorney General, who is not an admiralty lawyer.

Mr. STAFFORD. May we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, under the language of the proposed amendment the entire $250,000 of this sum could be used to pay lawyers who are members of the Judge Advocate's reserve for defending such cases as the Secretary of War chose to assign them to. One of the evils in the War Department in the last few years has been the great number of lawyers who have been hired at large fees to perform all kinds of legal work in connection with various activities. Now, the Judge Advocate General's Department, which is supposed to do all the legal work of the War Department, numbered about 32 officers before the war. We now have increased that corps to 115 officers. We thought that number was ample to take care of the legal work of the War Department, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has just called the attention of the House to the fact that it ought to be the duty of the Department of Justice to defend the United States Government in any suit brought for damages through the operation of its vessels, and the Judge Advocate General's Department in its proper activities should be limited to the giving of legal advice to the Secretary of War on the conduct of military courts and litigation and not to the active trial of such general Government litigation.

If the War Department had come to the committee and stated specifically the number of reserve officers it required and the amount of money that it desired to expend for such purpose we could have acted intelligently upon the proposition, but the committee did not think it wise to throw this whole appropriation wide open to such use.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Did you tell the Secretary of War in answer to his letter that you would make such an amendment if he put it in that form?

Mr. ANTHONY. We did not.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. You simply rejected it when he said it was necessary?

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Is there not a division of the Department of Justice now which has admiralty lawyers in it, whose duty it is to take care of these cases?

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not inform the gentleman as to that, but I presume they are prepared to defend the United States in any form of litigation.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Does the chairman of the committee think it wise to establish divisions of the Attorney General's office in all the various departments?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOORES].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORES of Indiana) there were—ayes 13, noes 49.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For aviation increase, to officers of the Air Service, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That no portion of this appropriation shall be used for pay of reserve officers.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that proviso.

Mr. ANTHONY. It appears to be a limitation.

Mr. HULL. It changes the entire law. It does not reduce the amount at all. It simply says you shall make the payment to the Regular Army and not to the reserve officers, and that is very injudicious. The Chairman understands that these men come in from civilian life and take two weeks of practice. They are worth practically as much as Regular Army officers, and they cost about one-fiftieth as much. Now, if you are going to discriminate against reserve officers you are not going to have any of them. There are very few of them as it is, and they are trying to build up a reserve corps, and we have got to have them.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think the gentleman will say there is a discrimination against the reserve officers. This increase in flying pay is given to officers of the Regular service who participate in flights of not less than four hours a month for a certain number of months. Now, it is very obvious that a reserve officer who comes in and flies for two weeks in the year does not comply with these regulations in accordance with which the Army gives increased pay to flying officers. It would be a mere gratuity to these reserve officers if we gave it to them.

Mr. HULL. If that is true, there is no reason for the provision. If they do not comply with they regulations, they would not be paid. You do not want anything in this appropriation bill that looks like discrimination.

Mr. ANTHONY. It was evidently the intention of the War Department to pay the reserve officers, and in order to prevent it we put this limitation on.

Mr. HULL. Then it is a discrimination against the reserve officers.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa contend that this is not a limitation?

Mr. HULL. I certainly do; the amount is not reduced at all. The money will be paid out just the same; it will be paid out to the officers of the Regular Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call attention to the fact that Congress could make any limitation it pleases; it could say that the money should not be paid to the Regular officers of the Army. The Chair must overrule the point of order.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the proviso which reads, "*Provided*, That no portion of the appropriation shall be used for pay of reserve officers."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the foundation of the military policy, if we have any policy, is that the reserve officers when on duty are equal to Regular Army men. In the reorganization act we provided that the reserve officers shall receive the same pay and allowance as an officer of the Regular Army of the same grade and length of service. Now, in order to keep some flyers in this country so they can fly we call back to the service for two weeks only certain reserve officers of the flying brigade. At this time they should receive the same pay as the Regular Army officers. Even if they get this pay, they cost you less than one-fiftieth of what a Regular Army man does for a year's service. Probably they are not as efficient, but they are good flyers. They have to be or they could not fly. They are men that have seen service, most of them abroad. They go to the flying schools and take two weeks' practice.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Have you not the regular officers, and is not this, in effect, an increase in the number of officers to share in the appropriation?

Mr HULL. We are trying to build up a reserve corps in order to lessen the Regular Army—keep the expenses down. That is the theory of having a reserve corps.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Under this bill you would have the Regular Army officers.

Mr. HULL. We need more than the Regular Army officers in one squadron. We have not any flyers in the Regular Army if war comes; we have a few in the reserve corps, and are trying to build up a reserve corps; but if you get to discriminating, as you are in this proviso, you will have no one in the reserve corps. You will hear from it if you do not strike this out. Men will be brought back in the reserve corps and fly for two weeks, and then they will say that they got in for two weeks but they found the regular man was receiving more pay than they and so they would refuse to come.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does the gentleman think the military can be paid for by a per diem, the same as you pay a bricklayer for the number of cubic yards of masonry?

Mr. HULL. I do not.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does the gentleman think that a man who comes back incidentally for two weeks should be paid on the basis of one who has turned out to be an efficient officer?

Mr. HULL. I think he should receive the same pay for two weeks as the regular man of the same rank.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does he render in the two weeks the same service that the man renders who has been working 52 weeks of the year?

Mr. HULL. He does not receive as much by one-fiftieth.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Again I come back to the question, Would you pay him on the same basis as you pay the bricklayer, a per diem?

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. KAHN. Many of the reserve officers are employed in private enterprises. They get salaries that do not enable them to go back into the reserves without being paid for the time they are doing reserve work. They can not afford to go into the reserves for two weeks without being paid so that their families can get money to live on for those two weeks. There is nothing unusual in doing that. We do it with reference to the militia officers who go to the training camps for a week or two.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—33 ayes and 27 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For additional pay to officers for length of service, $4,000,000.

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to make a statement to the Military Committee. The gentleman from New York called attention to the matter of discharged soldiers, and I agree with him entirely. I want to call attention to this fact: I had a case of a young man who received a dishonorable discharge in the last war. I took it up with the War Department and was informed that they had no authority to change it. I understand that there is another young man whom a Senator told me about who had a dishonorable discharge, but who did not have a black mark against him. The only way to correct this would be by a special bill, and I notice that several such bills have been introduced.

I know a young man who enlisted in the First Division, and who was in all of the great battles in France. When that division was ready to come home he was transferred and placed in the army of occupation. He was from Oklahoma. When they landed in Germany he and a bunch of his Texas friends got together, and you know what a bunch of boys from Oklahoma and Texas will do when they get where there is something to drink, and they went off on a little spree. A bunch of noncommissioned officers was sent out to arrest them. This boy had a little fight with one of the noncommissioned officers. They court-martialed him and sentenced him to serve seven years in the penitentiary. When they came back to New York they chained him to a deserter and took him to Fort Leavenworth and he served seven and a half months. I saw his records. He was rewarded for bravery several times. He was wounded and gassed. I think the Commitee on Military Affairs ought to bring in a bill creating a commission of some kind to hear cases of that nature and determine them and in meritorious cases to make a recommendation, if the man is dishonorably discharged, when he should have been honorably discharged, especially in cases where in a civil court the charge would only amount to assault and battery and the maximum punishment would be a small fine and a little jail sentence. I arose merely to call this to the attention of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAY OF ENLISTED MEN.

For pay of enlisted men of the line and staff, $83,000,000.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: Page 15, line 22, strike out the figures "$83,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$72,678,659."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds will he yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. I have an amendment which I desire to offer increasing this amount. Should that amendment be now offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can offer it at any time before the vote is taken on the amendment.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed amendment be read now for the information of the committee and be considered pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KAHN: Page 15, line 22, after the word "staff" strike out "$83,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$88,519,219."

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the amendment that I have offered provides a sum sufficient to pay 150,000 enlisted men. I use the exact figure that was carried in the bill as it was originally reported to the House in the last session. In addition to the 150,000 men provided for by this amount, in another paragraph we provide for the pay of the Philippine Scouts, so that by the adoption of the amendment we will provide for the 150,000 enlisted men and for the Philippine Scouts. The provision for the 14,000 officers has already been passed.

Mr. Chairman, it is unnecessary to refer to the history of this personnel question in recent months. After the Congress adopted the resolution limiting the Army to 175,000 men, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having this bill in charge made a most careful investigation of the subject. It is clear to all that the number of enlisted men in the Army must be fixed arbitrarily. No man is in a position to say exactly why the peace-time strength should be 185,000, 165,000, or 150,000. No man can speak with absolute authority on that subject, either in the War Department or out of it. This committee, headed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], as well informed on military affairs as any man in the House, with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT], representing the minority, and the other gentlemen of the subcommittee who have familiarized themselves with military affairs and the necessities of the military organizations, decided that 150,000 men was a sufficient force for the next fiscal year. I want you to know not what I say about it, but what the chairman of this subcommittee [Mr. ANTHONY] said about it only a short time ago. When this bill was introduced and Mr. ANTHONY was presenting it to the House, the question was asked by Mr. MILLER, on February 1, 1921, and the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. MILLER. For a question. What was the basis for fixing the number at 150,000 men? Why not 125,000 or 175,000? How did the committee come to arrive at the number of 150,000?

Mr. ANTHONY. The number was fixed after a careful study of the actual requirements of the country. We took into consideration the number of men who would be required to garrison our outlying possessions and the number of men necessary to be maintained in garrisons in this country, including the Coast Artillery for our fortifications, a force on the border, and for the various military posts in this country——

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for another short question?

Mr. ANTHONY. And we concluded that 150,000 was about the right number.

Mr. MILLER. Did the gentleman's committee take into consideration the world's condition, or did it fix it entirely upon conditions within the United States?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; we took into consideration every condition, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, before that request is put, will he permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request for a limitation of time on this paragraph? I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the paragraph be limited to half an hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I shall make it 40 minutes, the time to be equally divided between those favoring a smaller appropriation and those favoring a larger appropriation, 5 minutes of that time to be reserved for the committee.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman make it one hour?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, for the present I am going to object. At the conclusion of my remarks I hope the gentleman from Kansas will renew his request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, again I quote what Mr. ANTHONY said on February 3, 1921, when the bill was under consideration. At that time he spoke as follows:

The committee have made an appropriation for the pay of the enlisted men of the Army calculated on 150,000 men during the next fiscal year. The committee believe it will be entirely practicable to reduce the Army to that size, and the committee furthermore believe that that will be one of the policies of those who will be responsible for the Government after March 4.

I also believe that the amount appropriated will be adequate to take care of the pay of such an enlisted force without any deficiency.

Not wishing that he shall stand by himself, I quote now from the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who on the same day spoke as follows:

A year ago, just out of the war, still within the war shadows, still under the influence of war conditions, we believed we needed 175,000 enlisted men besides the Philippine Scouts and flying cadets. Most of us now believe, and the country believes, that 150,000 enlisted men will be sufficient. We are appropriating for that number. We are trying, partly at least, to realize the hope and expectation of the American people that we shall get back to normal as soon as possible; that we reduce, so far as we can without injury to our Military Establishment, the enormous total of military costs.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Who said that the country believed 150,000 men were sufficient?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the leader of the majority party in this House.

Mr. ANTHONY in presenting this bill to the House has set forth how our forces are distributed, informing you that in Hawaii and at the canal we now have forces larger than normal and forces larger than were necessary, and in Germany we have 15,000 men. Then what change has come over us that necessitates that same committee coming back into the House and asking for an appropriation of 18,000 more men?

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I regret I can not yield unless the gentleman obtains five additional minutes for me, then I would be delighted to yield. The only argument that has been offered anywhere is that the officials of the War Department say to you that it is not feasible to reduce this force so as to have in the organization only 150,000 men during the next year. They take the position they can not discharge men, a position which the gentleman from Kansas says is not tenable. It can not be defended. The enlistment contract does give that permission; discharges have always been granted and can be granted now, and this force can be reduced to an average of 150,000 men for the next fiscal year if the department will cooperate. As the gentleman from Kansas says, whether it be Secretary Baker or Secretary Weeks, Secretaries may come and Secretaries may go but the General Staff stays on forever, and the General Staff says they are going to have 175,000 or 180,000. It is up to the Congress now to say whether it will abrogate its functions or shall fix the number of enlisted men and make them comply with the law. Is there any reason why they can not do it? The only other argument that has been offered is that the Secretary of War came to the committee and said, "If you will increase this force to 182,000 men I will show you where you can save $22,000,000 out of this bill as you passed it." What answer shall we make to it? We know the Army officers showed him where he could save that money, but 60 days ago they complained that the Congress did not appropriate enough, and in two months they come back and say, "We can save $22,000,000 if you will increase the force to 175,000 or 180,000 men." The only thing to do is to take the $22,000,000 and then fix the enlisted force at what Congress says it ought to be fixed. Why, if they had wanted to increase the force to 200,000 men they could easily have gone to the Secretary of War and shown where we could take off $30,000,000 instead of $22,000,000, but when they only needed $22,000,000 they come back to us and say, "Here is a bill passed March 4, and I can show you where you appropriated $22,000,000 more than we need during the next fiscal year." Now what are you going to do? Are you going to let this bill start in this House with 168,000 men? It left here with 150,000 last time. It went to the Senate and was increased there to 180,000, as I remember. Finally they compromised the differences between the Houses, and Congress said that 156,000 should be the enlisted force for the next fiscal year, and in the face of that the department comes now and asks for 182,000, and the committee changes

its view and asks for 168,000, an increase of 18,000 men, for no reason except that the Secretary has shown where we appropriated $22,000,000 more than they actually needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended a quarter of a minute. Did not the gentleman when he stated 158,000 mean 168,000?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I meant 156,000, and if the gentleman will read the bill he will find that it is 156,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to discuss the amendment or his substitute?

Mr. KAHN. I desire to speak on my substitute, and I now desire to offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KAHN offers the following substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]: On page 15, line 22, after the word "staff," strike out $83,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof $88,519,219.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. FISH. And I ask that it remain pending.

Mr. KAHN. Well, I have no objection to having the amendment to the substitute offered at this time, provided it is not taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment to the substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH to the substitute offered by Mr. KAHN: Page 15, line 22, strike out the figures "$83,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$77,800,000."

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Is that an amendment to the substitute offered by Mr. KAHN? Does it say so?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that this is in the form of a substitute——

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. A substitute to a substitute is not permissible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks with a little correction it will be in order.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. An amendment was offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and an amendment to the amendment—that is, by way of a substitute—was offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN]. I do not think any further amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to the substitute of the gentleman from California is now in order. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] desires to offer it as an amendment to the substitute, it will be in order.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest one other thing. I think there is one rule that I have never seen enforced in the House but that is always stated in the manual, namely, that when a succession of figures is proposed the largest is put first and the committee works down from the largest to the smallest without reference to the order in which the amendments are offered. Otherwise Members would have a great deal of difficulty. One would give $1,000,000 and one $800,000 and another $700,000, and all those who would agree to the largest sum would agree to the smaller one. The parliamentary rule was that, without reference to the order in which various figures are proposed, the chairman would name the highest figure first and work down from that.

Mr. KAHN. I understand that this is a parliamentary inquiry, and is not being taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not taken out of the gentleman's time. The Chair wants to know if the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] wants to modify his amendment?

Mr. FISH. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH to the substitute offered by Mr. KAHN: Strike out the figures "$88,519,219" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$77,800,000."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has the floor.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield to permit me to change the figures, in order to get the amendment perfected?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York may correct his amendment.

Mr. FISH. I desire to change my figures to $77,839,300.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as corrected by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH to the substitute offered by Mr. KAHN: Strike out the figures "$88,519,219" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$77,839,300."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is recognized.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, as I stated yesterday, the world is in a very unsettled condition. Nobody can tell from week to week what is going to happen. Therefore, in my opinion, this country ought to have an Army of 175,000 men, as was provided by the last Congress. It may be that in a year world conditions will have changed so materially that a much larger reduction of the force can be made. But while the world is in the unsettled condition it is in now, there is no good reason why this country should reduce its enlisted force below a figure considered safe by the War Department.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I have only five minutes. If the gentleman will allow me, possibly I can answer a question after I have made one or two statements that I desire to make at this time.

The amount that I have offered will take care of an average Army during the fiscal year of about 185,000 men. That means that gradually the Army will be cut down, until by July 1 of next year it will have been reduced so that for some of the concluding months of the next fiscal year it will be 175,000 men. The amount carried in this bill will not allow 168,000 men for the entire year. It is for an average of 168,000 men. And that means that finally——

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. In a moment. It means finally that by the end of the fiscal year the Army will be down to about 140,000 men. I yield now to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ANTHONY. The Army will not be down to 140,000 unless the Secretary of War refuses to discharge down to 168,000 men at the start of July 1. So it is entirely a question of what policy he pursues. Our appropriation will pay for 168,000 men for one year.

Mr. KAHN. Well, the Secretary of War, I assume, is reducing and will continue to reduce the force, so that the 175,000 men provided for by the last Congress will be reached as soon as possible. And I want to say in that connection that I have every sympathy with the attitude of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL], who now occupies the chair. I believe that the War Department officials ought to give discharges in cases similar to that which he mentioned when request for discharge is made, so that the Army can be reduced promptly to 175,000 men.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. No; I can not. I have not the time.

The War Department ought to get down to that figure as soon as possible. I am in favor of cutting it down to that number of men, but not below that number at this time.

Now, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] suggests that we can remedy the situation by adopting some language on page 22—I think it is. Let me call your attention to what that language would do. It would compel the War Department peremptorily to discharge men, and thereby violate the contract that the enlisted man entered into with his Government. If the enlisted man were to attempt to violate his contract by deserting, he would be arrested and sent to prison. The Government itself has no more right to violate its contract with the enlisted man than the enlisted man has a right to violate his contract with the Government.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I have only five minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the gentleman has misinterpreted the contract. If the Secretary of War discharges a soldier to-morrow, who enlisted for three years, he violates no contract in so doing. The contract reserves the right to the Secretary of War to do that.

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

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from California be given five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KAHN. I thank the gentleman and the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. We passed a resolution in the last Congress, as I remember it, practically ordering the War Department to reduce the number of men in the Army to 175,000?

Mr. KAHN. Quite right.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Now, is it not proper for us to consider that that was an expression of Congress of its idea of what size the Army ought to be?

Mr. KAHN. Exactly so.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Has there been any expression now by this body from that time to this that changed that idea?

Mr. KAHN. No; not that I can remember.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Then if that is true, why appropriate for a less number? Why create a deficiency in advance?

Mr. KAHN. The bill provides for a smaller number, and I am trying by my amendment to maintain the number at 175,000.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Why express our opinion one way, and then appropriate for something else?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, in all the history of this country we have constantly lacked vision. We have never looked into the future. We take the situation to-day without regard to surrounding circumstances. That is what cost this Government the enormous sums that have had to be expended whenever we have had trouble.

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

Mr. KAHN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Would the gentleman be willing to support an amendment which would require or direct the Secretary of War to discharge the enlisted men upon their own applications until the number is brought within the number fixed by this bill—say, 175,000 or 168,000?

Mr. KAHN. If this bill will fix the number at 175,000, I would have no objection, but if it has the purpose of cutting below that I certainly object.

But the proposition is this: The country is facing very serious problems—problems, in my opinion, as serious as we have ever faced in our history. There are international questions that are serious. By standing firm at this time for a reasonably defensive Army—175,000 is not a large Army—we shall be upholding the hands of the administration at this time. I think that is a safe and proper thing to do. The amount of the appropriation that I have suggested only increases the amount called for in the bill by $5,500,000. That $5,500,000 may be the means of saving this country many other millions.

Now, no great harm can be done by maintaining the Army at 175,000 men as the minimum, whereas considerable harm may be done the country if we reduce below that number at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has submitted an amendment, and is recognized.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I am reluctant to disagree with the venerable and distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] as to what constitutes adequate preparedness. The question here is simply what constitutes adequate preparedness. It is not a question of disarmament or really a question of taxation. It is purely, to my mind, a question of adequate preparedness, with a view to our national safety and with due regard to the taxpayers' money.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. FISH. I have only five minutes. If you will extend my time I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the power to do that, but I would not object to it. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. What would be the difference in degree of preparedness between $83,000,000 and $77,000,000?

Mr. FISH. The amendment which I have offered provides for an enlisted personnel of 156,000, which was adopted by the conference report and passed overwhelmingly by this House at the last session.

The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] states that we should have an Army of 175,000, because this House at the last session voted for 175,000. Now, I submit that when it came to a vote between 175,000 and 150,000 this House by a vote of exactly 3 to 1 voted for 150,000. And I will also further point out that among those voting for 150,000 on the Republican side were four ex-service men of this war, out of a possible six.

We must consider preparedness as it will exist with an Army of 156,000, as provided by this resolution. We must add to these figures a factor which everyone here overlooks, which no one has mentioned—a federalized National Guard of 89,000, under Government supervision and paid by the Government. Before this war or prior to the Mexican trouble we did not have a federalized National Guard. But this guard—I say it without fear of contradiction, holding no brief whatsoever for the guard—compares favorably with the Regular Army, because young officers who saw combat work on the other side have reenlisted in the guard, and Regular Army officers who have inspected the Artillery units of the National Guard tell me that they compare very favorably with the Artillery units of the Regular Army. An Artillery officer of the Regular Army told me that he disliked to inspect the Artillery units in the National Guard because these young guard officers knew more about modern combat artillery than he did himself.

Another word, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I have but a short time to discuss this amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Added to the guard you have got 20,000 marines, who are as good soldiers as there are in the world. Added to that you have the reserve officers' training camps. You appropriate in this bill $2,000,000 for training camps to train officers during the fiscal year beginning July 1. There are thousands of our citizens taking military courses in colleges and universities, and, back of all that, there are 4,000,000 veterans, the best-trained veterans of the world. [Applause.] They are at the beck and call of this country; and I am going to emphasize a fact that is often lost sight of, and that is that our Army was the best trained, best equipped, and best fighting force at the time of the armistice of any in the world. [Applause.] I make this statement deliberately and advisedly and will prove it to your satisfaction. These men who volunteered and were drafted under that splendid law enacted under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], who, I believe, did more to conclude this war by a victorious armistice than any other civilian in the country [applause], and who deserves, in my opinion, to wear on his breast, more than any other civilian, the distinguished service medal [applause]——

Mr. HILL. He has not got it, though, has he?

Mr. FISH. In response to the selective draft and in response to the call for volunteers we had 4,000,000 men enter our Army. These men were trained, and trained intensively, from one to two years. They had the advantage of all the experience at the command of our allies, and with actual combat and battle training they excelled the troops of the enemy or our allies. We must not overlook the fact that they were between the ages of 18 and 30; that they were younger, stronger, more aggressive, had more endurance to withstand the hardships of offensive warfare, and were equally brave; therefore I submit that these veterans were superior to any soldiers in any of the armies. Most of them could be depended upon to respond again in case of war. The 200,000 reserve and National Guard officers and a half million noncoms are ready and will be for at least the next eight years to train a new Army in an emergency.

Why, the gentleman from California, looking to the sky, says there is no cloud of war there, but it may come at any time. Let any war come now or within the next eight years and you need not worry about the result with 4,000,000 of the best trained soldiers at your command. Mr. KAHN further admits that he sees no war cloud at the present time. We have never in the history of this country entered a war without there being a cloud in the sky as a warning, and as that cloud grew bigger and bigger we had an opportunity to prepare, and we have always declared war when we wanted war ourselves. I submit that we have adequate preparedness, and that 156,000 Regulars, with all our other forces, are in every way adequate for the emergency that exists or any emergency that will exist. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, of course in five minutes I can not discuss this question, involving as much as it does, but I do want to call the attention of the committee to a statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], who has been so long chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. The gentleman ought not to have made that statement, that the Govern-

ment violates its contract when it discharges a man prior to the expiration of his term of enlistment, when in every one of these enlistments you will find written this language—

Unless sooner discharged by the President, the Secretary of War, or the commander of his corps.

In other words, there are three men named in that contract who have the right to discharge him.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN rose.

Mr. SISSON. I have only five minutes, and I do not yield, unless the gentleman from California wishes to interrupt me.

Mr. KAHN. I should like to ask the gentleman whether those words do not relate to conditions entirely different from these?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, no; in every man's enlistment is that provision.

Mr. KAHN. I know; but is it ever carried out?

Mr. SISSON. I do not care whether it is ever carried out or not. The statement made by the gentleman is not sound when he says that the Government violates its contract. That is all there is to it. If that is so, why did they put these words into the enlistment contract? Why does the gentleman bring in a straw man here for the purpose of sustaining a position which he can not sustain under the contract? It is a mere straw man, a bogey man for the purpose of endeavoring to get votes for a proposition which is utterly untenable, as was shown by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] a moment ago.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. KAHN. Is it not a fact that the War Department has never discharged men in this way under that provision?

Mr. SISSON. I do not care anything about that sort of bosh, as to what the War Department has never done. I do not believe the War Department wants to discharge men at all. It wants to keep them. You have got to choke the War Department off, and why have you not helped to choke them off?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, that is not a fair statement.

Mr. SISSON. It is absolutely fair. The statement which the gentleman makes is unfair in every feature of it.

Mr. KAHN. So is the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SISSON. Oh, well, the gentleman comes here with the statement that they have no right to discharge these men, and he makes that statement for the purpose of getting votes for his proposition, when he knows that the contract the Government makes with every one of these soldiers contains that provision.

Mr. KAHN. And they never discharge a man under it.

Mr. SISSON. I agree with the chairman of the committee [Mr. ANTHONY] in his statement that 25 per cent of the men desire to get out of the Army and that 25 per cent of them will make application to get out. Then the natural wastage of the Army, which is from 5,000 to 8,000 a month, will still further reduce the number. Therefore there can be no sort of doubt about the Army being reduced to 150,000 men without in any way bringing about that condition which the Army officers are endeavoring to picture to us. Those of us who have been here a good many years know that our Army officers are endeavoring to fix the size of the Army themselves. When Mr. Hay, of Virginia, occupied the position so long occupied by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], Congress controlled the size of the Army. When he was chairman of the committee the number of men was fixed at a certain figure, and the War Department did not enlist more men, because the chairman of the committee then was virile, and when he told the Army officers and the Secretary of War where to get off, they got off. That is all. When Congress makes up its mind that it wants to reduce this Army down to a certain size, the War Department will follow suit. I do not believe that Army officers are going to put themselves in the position of being violators of the law. I do not believe they themselves want to be lawless, because it is their high purpose to assist in enforcing the law. Up to date they have been left rather up in the air.

When Mr. Dent, of Alabama, offered an amendment to endeavor to get the size of the Army fixed at 175,000, that was voted down, but after that the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] brought in his 175,000 resolution, but that did not command that the Army should reduce down to 175,000 men. But I call attention to this fact: In my judgment nothing is more utterly silly than to say that the world condition is such that we need the difference between 150,000 and 175,000 men.

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

Mr. SISSON. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. If world conditions were such that I had the fears entertained by the gentleman from California, or apparently entertained by him, I would not satisfy myself with the difference between 150,000 and 175,000 men. It is only the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum, except that it costs us about $2,000 a year for every extra man that we keep in the Army; and you gentlemen, who were elected upon a campaign of economy, ought to take that into consideration, because you can make a greater saving in reference to expenses of the Army and Navy than in any other direction. Now, if I felt that we were in great danger or immediate danger of war within the next few months or within the next year, I would not stand up and fix the Army at 175,000 men. The truth is that the fixing of the Army at 175,000 men is desired by Army officers simply because it means the retention of certain positions among the Army officers, because when you reduce the number of enlisted men you reduce the number for these officers to command.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SISSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman state whether the reduction of the enlisted personnel would reduce one Army officer at the present time?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Without further action of Congress?

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman qualifies here every few minutes as an expert, and the gentleman ought to understand that the law specifically provided that when the armistice was signed and when the Army was reduced, these officers of the Regular Army should go back to their prewar status.

Mr. HILL. I want to thank the gentleman for qualifying me as an expert.

Mr. SISSON. I think it is necessary for some of us to do it, therefore I am willing to be the goat. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Then, will the gentleman answer the question?

Mr. SISSON. I have answered the question.

Mr. HILL. Was the gentleman's answer yes or no?

Mr. SISSON. I do not propose to give a categorical answer to any question.

Mr HILL. Then the gentleman declines to answer the question.

Mr. SISSON. I do not know whether my friend is a lawyer or not; is he?

Mr. HILL. I am a Member of Congress at present.

Mr. SISSON. I am sorry the gentleman ceased to be a lawyer when he came to be a Member of Congress, but that is the way with most of them. [Laughter.] In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, the Army ought to be reduced to 150,000 men. It is the opinion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] that 150,000 is the correct number, but in view of the difficulties presented, in view of the pressure brought to bear as a compromise of differences, we brought in this bill with the distinct understanding on the part of the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], who specifically stated on the floor that that number was not the fixed policy of Congress, nor should it be taken as a precedent, but that 150,000 was the limit. I believe, gentlemen of the committee, that if we have well-trained officers for the purpose of training the civilians we do not need a great standing Army. My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], in discussing conditions of the country for war and training failed to mention the fact that we have schools and universities and colleges and military schools for training young men for the Army. I fear more than anything else military despotism within a republic. Nothing will more surely destroy our liberties than a policy of militarism. Nothing would tend so much to destroy the liberties of the people as to be ruled by a great military establishment. Great military establishments have been the cause of destroying the liberties of the people throughout the history of the world. It has not been the standing army that preserved the liberties of the people; it has been the standing army that has destroyed the liberties of the people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has told us that the world is in a most chaotic condition. Unfortunately that is true, but for the life of me I can not see how by adding 17,000 additional men to this Army that will settle the chaotic condition of the world.

Now, there are some things to which I shall invite the attention of the committee and which to my mind are conclusive evidence that it is not so much the condition of the world that gentlemen who are desirous of augmenting the Army are concerned about as it is the fastening of a great Military Establishment on this country. Immediately after the armistice was signed a certain coterie of gentlemen thought they were going to consummate the dream of years by creating a great Military Establishment in this country and proposed that we have an Army of 576,000 men. The psychological condition was better then for such an Army than it ever was before or probably ever will be again. That attempt utterly failed. Then they sought to establish an Army of 250,000 men, in face of the fact that this Congress had fixed it at 175,000 men, and in utter defiance of the will of the people as expressed by Congress they went on with enlistments until they had 235,000 men.

This is the embarrassing situation that the present administration finds itself in, that notwithstanding this Congress fixed the number at 175,000—and it was well understood by the Secretary of War at that time that that was to be the size of the Army, still he yielded to the General Staff and those who had been in favor of fastening on the country a great Military Establishment, and in defiance of the will of the people expressed through its Congress, he enlisted an Army of 235,000 men, and this is the number we have now.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; I have not time. Appreciating the embarrassing conditions in which the Secretary of War finds himself, the committee reluctantly agreed to appropriate for 10,000 additional men, so that he may within the time limited reduce the Army by 68,000 men, so that it will come within the provisions of this appropriation and be reduced to 168,000.

Now, here is the time and place, and this is the most propitious time, at the commencement of this new administration, for the representatives of the people—and I believe we are expressing the will of the people when we vote against increasing this item—to say to the new administration and to this new Secretary of War that you had better pay a little attention to the people of this country and not listen entirely to the General Staff. [Applause.] If I had my way about it I would gladly vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, for I believe that that would meet the wishes of the people. But in order that the embarrassing position that this administration finds itself in may be somewhat alleviated I am willing to vote for the increased pay for 168,000 men.

Much is said about the necessity for a great standing Army. What would 175,000 men amount to if we were again engulfed in war? It would mean nothing. If we had to fight any of the great powers on earth we would again have to raise an emergency Army as we had to raise it before and as we have always had to raise it. The most we can expect of a standing Army is to protect our internal affairs and guard as best we can the border. Twenty-five thousand men were sufficient to do it before we got into the war, and now we have 4,000,000 men trained to the last minute in the profession of war. [Applause.]

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

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I can not see any necessity for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. He wants to hold the Army at as great a number as he can. Before the Spanish-American War we had only 27,000 men in the war establishment, and that was ample for this country. There was no talk of anybody coming over here, no insurrection within the domain of the United States.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I will.

Mr. KAHN. Did not the gentleman from California vote against any proposition to have a standing Army of 578,000 men, and did not he approve of the reduction to 175,000 men?

Mr. QUIN. I will say that the gentleman on the committee did vote for that, but he was trying at the same time to fasten this contemptible system of compulsory military training on the people, and the proposal of the gentleman from California in reality meant a million men in the United States Army under the name of Reserve Army. He always had a string tied to any reduction of the Army. My friend knows that as a member of the Military Committee I stood out and fought Secretary of War Baker and all others who proposed that iniquitous scheme of 578,000 men for a standing Army. We came on the floor and I had to fight the chairman about an amendment which was unjust. The gentleman from California talks about preparedness for war, but if we were in any danger of war what would 175,000 men amount to? He knows that it would take three or four million men to make a good Army to fight a real big nation, and as conditions exist to-day, as suggested by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], we ought to recognize the rights of the people of this country, the taxpayers, and consider their interests. Instead of having all of these young men wearing the uniform and bearing a sword and gun, let us let some of them be in the industrial occupations, making food and raiment for the people, making tools and implements to carry on prosperity in the United States, instead of our thinking all of the time about the condition of the rest of the world. Let us act for the United States a little, let us come home and take care of the people who are working in the fields, the factories, the mines, and on the railroads, in order that we may make the United States stand out as the greatest people on earth, and let our commerce go to all of the corners of the world. Instead of that policy being pursued, it seems that there are certain interests in the United States who want to hamper the interests of the Republic by having a great standing Army with all that it implies. Instead of our Government standing for the benefit of the people of the United States there seem to be some who desire that it shall stand as a military despotism, holding the world in awe and fear. It strikes me that we ought to follow out some of the marks set by our fathers. Let us in some regard respect the Constitution of the United States and respect the will of the people. Where is the man who works for his living, who toils in the sweat of his brow, who believes that you need in this time a great standing Army such as that which the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] would endeavor to increase it to? Why, 175,000 is offered as but a stepping stone to have it 200,000 at the next session of Congress. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] asked how can the present administration accomplish anything along economic lines if this Congress pursues such a policy?

This Congress in reality ought to be the body and the instrumentality to fix the size of the Army instead of allowing the General Staff and those in control of the Army to do it.

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

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in one hour, one-half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] and one-half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is perhaps the most important proposition in this bill. It is a matter that every Member here is apparently vitally interested in. Why undertake to limit the discussion? Why not let the matter go along and let every man who wants to have five minutes have his way? If we do not get through with this bill to-day, we can take it up on Monday.

Mr. ANTHONY. That would mean two hours and a half on one line of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, on the pending proposition there are three sets of figures proposed. Gentlemen are given their choice of leadership in three directions. There is the committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] proposing the middle course, proposing a figure of $83,000,000. The gentleman from South Carolina proposes $72,000,000 and the gentleman from California $88,000,000.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. I really can not yield now.

Mr. STEVENSON. There is also the proposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; that is intermediate also. I have time to discuss only these three, however. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] advocates an Army of 150,000. I do not know what visions of political advantage have charmed him into this proposition. He had an excellent opportunity in the committee to make the very fight which he now proposes and which he failed to make at that time.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am sorry to say that I can not in five minutes. The gentleman had 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman does not desire to create a wrong impression.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is endeavoring to lead us to what he thinks

is an average force of 185,000 men, while he professes that 175,000 men are enough. I recall that the same gentleman from California at the last session of Congress, when this House was demanding a reduction to 150,000 men as the size of the enlisted force, brought in a resolution that the Army be cut to 175,000 men, and he brought it in under a suspension of the rules, when the House could not express its will for a reduction to 150,000 men. That resolution went through, and in results it has been absolutely nil. The gentleman now proposes an appropriation for an average of 185,000 men, holding out to you the alluring hope that it may be so handled by the War Department that at the end of the year it will be a force of only 175,000 men.

Gentlemen, all the Secretary of War has to do in order to have his Army held up to 185,000 up to the end of the year is to make his cut between the time when this bill passes and the 1st of July. Cut it down to 185,000 and at the end of the year he will have 185,000. But if you want a reduction even to 175,000, do not follow the gentleman from California.

Now as to whether we should follow the gentleman from South Carolina. Our subcommittee—I think I can safely say all of them—favor a reduction eventually below 175,000. The bill that we have offered proposes, however, an average of 168,000 without the Philippine Scouts; 175,000 including the Philippine Scouts. The reason we felt obliged to recommend that figure, larger than the figure in our former bill, was this. The bill in the last session, becoming effective by the 4th of March, would have given four months in which to make a reduction of 70,000, and that could have been done without bringing chaos in the Army. This bill will not become a law apparently before June, and if it becomes effective the 1st of June, bringing the Army down July 1 to an average strength of 168,000, means a reduction of 40,000 men in one month. You can not go further in one month with reduction without bringing chaos in your Army, and our committee felt it could not go further than the figure we have recommended. On the other hand, if the Secretary of War will follow the course that is alluringly held out by the gentleman from California and not make the reduction all at once, not resorting to arbitrary discharges, then under our bill, as recommended by the committee, at the end of the year they will have a force of 126,000 men, small enough to suit almost anyone in the House. Therefore, it seems to me that at this time the House can very safely follow the judgment of the gentleman from Kansas and his committee and leave the figure at the $83,000,000 mark. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I think if there is one proposition upon which all Members of the House—Republicans, Democrats, and Socialist—are generally agreed, it is that there must be rigid economy in governmental expenditures. But the trouble is we do not seem to get very far in bringing it about. Since I have been a Member of the House I have observed that our old friend "Economy" has got more friends in debate and less on roll call, especially on the Republican side [applause on Democratic side], than any gentleman of my acquaintance whom I have met. I think that we are reaching that stage of affairs in this country where the people are demanding that we reduce Government expenditures to at least somewhat of a prewar basis. At a time when the cotton farmer is selling his product at from 10 to 15 cents a pound less than it cost him to produce it; when the growers of hogs, sheep, and cattle are selling them on the market at considerably less than they have invested in them; when the farmers who raise oats and wheat and corn are selling these products at prices no greater, and in many instances less, than they sold for in 1916, I say to you that it is time that the Congress of the United States should take note of the conditions and give some consideration to getting the expenditures of Government on a prewar basis. [Applause.] Now, gentlemen of the committee, I am perfectly aware that there are some things on which we can not get back on a prewar basis. For instance, there is more than a billion dollars every year that must be set aside as a sinking fund to pay the principal and the interest on our public debt. There will be at least $500,000,000 that will have to be expended in payment of war risk insurance, hospitalization of the soldiers, in vocational education, and other similar soldier-relief measures, and these are payments which we can not escape; but I do contend that the normal activities of the Government must get back to more normal rate of expenditure. Now, let us see about these Army and Navy appropriation bills. In 1916, the fiscal year preceding the war, we appropriated $153,000,000 for the support and construction of the Navy. In that same year, 1916, the fiscal year before the war, we appropriated $102,000,000 for the support and maintenance of the Army.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Pardon me just a moment and then I will yield—or a total of $255,000,000 for both the Army and the Navy. Now, here two or three days ago we passed the naval bill, which appropriated $396,000,000, and now we have before us an Army appropriation bill that totals $331,000,000, or a total of $727,000,000 for Army and Navy purposes, three years after the signing of the armistice, as against $255,000,000 for the fiscal year before the war, a difference of $470,000,000. In conclusion, let me make this statement, not as a prophecy, because I do not claim to have any gift of prophecy, but simply as an everyday American citizen who is able to discern the perfectly obvious: If farm products, which lie at the base of our Nation's wealth, stay at their present price level, then other things must come down to meet them, or there is going to be a serious situation in this country. And one of the things which must come down is taxes, and before taxes can come down Government expenditures must be reduced. To state that is simply to state an axiom. Therefore I am going to show my faith by my works and vote for the Byrnes amendment, which provides for the support and maintenance of an Army of only 150,000 men. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH].

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York a few moments ago referred to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as "venerable." I think the RECORD ought to be corrected, as the adjective does great violence to the youth of the distinguished gentleman from California. While I can not adopt the adjective, I am sure I can indorse the tribute which he paid——

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOCH. I can not yield in three minutes. And I must speak plainly and to the point. No one in this House has a higher regard than have I for the gentleman from California, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. Americans everywhere honor him for the conspicuous service which he has given in this House to his country, and particularly for the service which he rendered during the war. And while we may disagree with his position as one of the big Army advocates, we do not in the least doubt his sincerity. We are not doubting the sincerity of the professional Army men who form the backbone of the big Army group. War is their business. They breathe the air and imbibe the spirit of things military. In the very nature of things they are in a large measure removed from the ordinary struggle of life, and in very many cases lose the viewpoint of the people who make up the great body of citizenship and upon whose activities rests the burden of Federal taxes. And they can not be permitted to dictate the peace policy of the country. The people of this country are opposed to a great standing Army in peace times, and without any disparagement of the character or services of the General Staff and the men associated with them, I do not believe that the American people intend to have their Army policy fixed by the professional Army influences.

I was concerned by a statement made on the floor by the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. ANTHONY, who, as we all know, has done such splendid work in the preparation of this bill, and who, as we all know, has effectively fought against the big Army influences. He said in effect that while we have a new Secretary of War, there seems as yet to be no great change in the military policy; that Secretaries come and Secretaries go, but that the General Staff goes on forever. We all know what that means. It means that the Regular Army people are just as insistent upon a great Military Establishment as they have always been. Mr. Chairman, the statement is disquieting, but it is early yet, and I refuse to believe that there is to be a surrender to the same forces that have been dominating the War Office. [Applause.] I do not mean anything partisan; since coming here two years ago I have as yet to speak my first partisan word upon this floor. But I simply state a fact, known to all, when I recall, as others have already done here to-day, that Secretary Baker went over body and soul to the militaristic forces and asked not only for a peace-time Army of nearly 600,000 men but asked for universal compulsory military training and service in times of peace. Mr. Chairman, I think it is good time right now, at this first opportunity, for this House, which comes from the people and knows the sentiment of the people, to make it understood that it proposes to fix the policy.

A few months ago this House, by an overwhelming majority, voted to cut the Army to 150,000. The Senate stood for 175,000, and in conference our conferees compromised at 156,000. That was the figure at which the bill went to the President only 60 days ago. That bill was vetoed by President Wilson, who had

also fallen under the grip of the big Army forces. Now, we are asked to go up another 10,000 and fix the Army at 168,000. And one of the amendments proposes to add about 25,000. No emergency has been shown. No convincing reason, in my judgment, has been given. I appreciate the argument made as to the practical difficulties of reducing rapidly. But the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], member of the committee which drafted this bill, stated that the figures of the War Department itself show that without resorting to arbitrary discharges and in due course under expirations of enlistments the Army could be brought down by the end of the fiscal year to 126,000. Much has been said about breaking the "contract." While it has been shown that there would be no breaking of the contract, we do not need to rely upon that fact. There are thousands of men who want to get out of the Army. To let them out certainly would not break any contract. There is no question in my mind but what the War Department can reduce the Army to 158,000, or even to 150,000, within the year if it really wants to do it.

Let the House speak the voice of the country on this question! [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change the RECORD so that the word "venerable" will read "venerated." [Laughter.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if the present administration of the War Department continues to surround itself with the same influences and follows in the same path as the last war administration, it will end in the same disrepute that the last one ended in. That is sure.

I want to present just one proposition, which is this: In the last Congress we passed a resolution declaring our opinion that 175,000 was the proper number of men to have in the Army. From that time to this I have not seen any change in that expression of sentiment. If there has been, I do not know where it has been formally pronounced. Now, we are about, under the leadership of this committee, to appropriate money for a less number than that, when 175,000 is the expression of the size we think the Army ought to be.

I think the Military Affairs Committee of this House ought to bring in a resolution at this time declaring what is manifestly the sentiment of this House for an Army of 150,000 men. [Applause.] But so long as they do not do so, is it not the height of folly to appropriate a less sum of money and invite in advance a deficiency appropriation? I am opposed to deficiency appropriations. [Applause.] I think the department ought to be kept to a rigid exercise of the rule that ought to be established in this country and to spend only what is appropriated for them to spend. And in order to do this thing the first and necessary step is for the Military Affairs Committee of this House to do what I have indicated and express the plain purpose of the House, and I believe of the country, that our Army ought to be reduced to 150,000 men. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would not presume to impose on the House at this time were it not for the fact that it is highly probable, judging from the record made in the last two days, that this is the only opportunity a Member of this House will have to go on record on this measure, especially if men continue the practice of speaking against a bill and voting for it. For unless more men vote the way they talk than did on the Navy bill we will be unable to get a roll call.

Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to a large standing Army. I believe with the Father of his Country that overgrown naval and military establishments in times of peace are detrimental to the welfare of republican institutions, as well as burdensome to those upon whom rests the responsibility of meeting the public expense. For those reasons I shall most heartily support the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], which, if carried to its logical conclusion, will have the ultimate effect of reducing the standing Army to 150,000 men, and thereby saving millions of dollars to the taxpayers of the country. It seems that the only way we can reduce the standing Army, especially just at this time, is to cut down the Army appropriations, for if we appropriate for a larger Army than that of 150,000 men we may rest assured that every dollar of it will be spent, and more will be asked for in the end.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. RANKIN. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. If we were to merely cut the appropriations, that would not carry out the gentleman's idea, because the War Department would go right ahead with its program, and we would be called upon to furnish the money for the men in deficiency bills. It is a matter of legislation by the Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that if this appropriation is cut down, as proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], it will stop recruiting throughout the country almost immediately. Then if the policy now being advocated in this House, and of which I most heartily approve, of releasing from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps those boys who are under age and whose fathers and mothers are begging for their releases, as well as those men who are asking to be discharged on the ground that they are needed at home to support their parents or their families—if this policy is carried out, as it should be, then it will only be a short time until the Army will be reduced to 150,000 men, or less, and the expenses of maintaining it will come within this reduced appropriation.

That does not mean that this is the only way to reduce the size of the Army. It would be much better for Congress to pass a law reducing it to the very smallest possible number, commensurate with the safety and welfare of the American people, which would fix it at a much smaller figure than 150,000. But that question is not before Congress now and this one is, and it behooves every man who favors such a reduction to get behind this amendment and help us to place this limit on our military expenditures, and thereby, by indirection, help to reduce the size of our standing Army. Let us by the adoption of this amendment begin the practice of that economy which we have been so long preaching, and in which the American people are so vitally interested just at this time.

This is the opening wedge, and the vote on this amendment will go far toward determining whether this Congress is really in favor of reducing expenses, and thereby restoring the confidence of the country, as well as lifting this much of the burden from the people, or whether a majority of this House expect to continue to play the hand of Esau and the voice of Jacob by preaching economy and practicing extravagance until the burden becomes too heavy for the American people to bear.

There never was a time in the history of the country when we were confronted by a more serious economic situation than that which prevails among the masses of our people to-day. There has never been a time when it was more imperatively necessary for Congress to curtail every possible expense, or when the American people were pleading more earnestly for economy in public expenditures than they are at the present moment. In a great many sections the people are having serious trouble in raising the money with which to pay their taxes, and in some localities they are appealing to Congress for help. We had an appeal from the Northwest, or the last Congress did, during the last few days of the session, asking for money to buy seed wheat with which to plant their fields, and Congress responded with an appropriation of $2,000,000. Appeals of a similar nature are coming in to-day. I have one myself for funds with which to relieve the storm sufferers of my section, and I have introduced a resolution, as has the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS], asking for small appropriations for the relief of those distressed people, many of whom were rendered homeless, and some of whom have been made penniless by these horrible disasters.

The people are in no condition to have their taxes increased, and they are confidently looking to Congress to save them from the disastrous consequences that are likely to follow as a result of these extravagances in naval and military expenditures.

A distinguished ex-Member of this House, Gen. Sherwood, of Ohio, remarked to me on yesterday that the only way of materially reducing the expenses of the Government was by cutting down the Army and Navy appropriations. He said that the first year after the close of the Civil War the naval appropriation amounted to only about $19,000,000, whereas the bill passed by this House on yesterday carried more than twenty times that amount. I voted against the appropriation of approximately $400,000,000 for the Navy on yesterday, because I thought then, and I think now, that the amount was too large, under the circumstances; and unless this appropriation for the Army is greatly reduced I shall be compelled to vote against it when it is put on final passage. I shall certainly vote for this amendment which is intended to reduce the Army to 150,000 men, and if I had my way I would reduce it to 100,000 men at once [applause], and then make other reductions later on.

I asked one Congressman who was urging the necessity of a large standing army what his reasons were, what country he expected to attack us. He readily admitted that he did not think we were in any danger from a foreign power, but said he wanted it to protect us from the radical elements at home. Is an army of practically 200,000 men necessary in this country to protect us from ourselves? Have we, the American people,

proved ourselves to be so incapable of self-government that it is necessary to maintain an army larger than the combined forces of Lee and Meade at the Battle of Gettysburg in order to intimidate us into submission to law and order? No, gentlemen; that argument is too flimsy; we are maintaining this army in obedience to that spirit of military imperialism which, unfortunately, prevails in this country at this time, and which is dangerously leading us down the beaten path of militarism trod by Germany to her downfall, and which has been the ruin of every country that has ever adopted it.

Some Congressmen say they have no fear of Europe, but intimate, if they do not say, that they want us to spend these enormous sums on the Navy in order to protect us from Japan, a nation with little more than half our population and 10,000 miles removed from our shores. In other words, they want a large standing Army to protect us against a fictitious foe at home and the largest Navy in the world to insure us against an imaginary enemy abroad.

But the real reason a certain element in this country is clamoring for these appropriations became apparent a few days ago, when this House made a most dangerous departure from the time-honored policies of this Government by passing House resolution 4088, known as the "Chinese trade act, 1921," and providing for the incorporation by the Federal Government of certain enterprises to operate in various parts of the Chinese Empire, exempting them from certain taxes, but extending to them the protection of our flag, following the very same policy of imperial expansion as that pursued by Germany in laying the predicate for her future destruction by greedily attempting to extend her dominion over the weaker peoples of the earth; another Berlin-to-Bagdad proposition.

Whenever these enterprises begin to exploit the helpless people of China, it is going to breed trouble for us; which will, in all probability, be done as soon as they are organized and begin doing business in that country. Those unfortunate people may stand it for a while, but when it becomes so intolerable that they rise up against their despoilers, you will hear a great howl go up from these favored corporations, just as you did from those who were engaged in exploiting the Mexicans a few years ago, urging us to send our Army, and especially our Navy, to protect them from the inevitable consequences of their own misconduct. Of course, they want a large Army and a large Navy, especially when the very law under which they are to operate exempts them, in part at least, from the burden of taxation which such a policy will incur.

Some men tell us that if we will raise the largest Army in the world and build the greatest Navy that floats the seas, we can then bluff the rest of the world into a program of disarmament. We have heard that argument advanced in this House in the course of these debates. Suppose other nations should adopt the same attitude and each one attempt to outstrip all the rest in naval and military preparations, with the same object in view; where would it all end? It would end in the ultimate bankruptcy of the world—if it has not already done so.

Oh, they say, "We will reduce the size of the Army in a year or two." Why not reduce it now, while we have more than 4,000,000 trained men who would be fit for duty should an emergency arise? This is the most propitious time we may ever have to begin the reduction of our standing Army. So let us begin now to answer the cry for economy by adopting this amendment, reducing the standing Army, and cutting down public expenses. [Applause.]

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

The amendment was agreed to—ayes 109, noes 82.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE].

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, everybody on the floor who has had any experience with this bill in years past or at any time knows that nobody can express anything very definite on such a subject as this in the limit of three minutes. Therefore I want merely to emphasize the thought that I have every year for many years been trying to express to this good fellowship and just as regularly every year have been bowled over in doing it. And that thought is that the peace-time Army of the United States is not a combat army in the sense in which it is intended by the argument that we hear every year on the floor against a so-called "large standing Army."

The Army of the United States is maintained in peace time for three distinct functions—garrison, domestic police, and for the purpose of training itself and the citizenry of the country against an emergency of war.

Now, we have a great continental area in this country, and we have enormous outlying, far-distant possessions; and when we supply, first, the necessary garrisons, you can see how we whittle away the units of this Army; and then when we consider the disposition of the troops at our disposal for police purposes we see that we disperse still more troops throughout the country; and then, for the third purpose—that of training—we have left only those tactical units in numbers and character that remain after we have scattered the rest of our little Army well-nigh half around the world. Therefore the question of numbers that is raised in the amendment now suggested and those carried in this bill in peace time relates only to a garrison, policing, and training Army, not a combat Army or a war defense Army.

It is true that 175,000 men would amount to nothing in war time. It is true that even 275,000 men would amount to nothing if this were called a war-time Army or a war defense Army. It would be very ridiculous to maintain more men in the field in peace time than we needed for garrison, police purposes, and for training, and the cost of maintaining any number between that comparatively small force and the millions we would have to put in the field in war time would be all waste. I am suggesting now that with about 175,000 men we get just about the minimum necessary for garrison and police purposes and the number that are necessary for the proper training of officers and men and the training of citizens. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, it occurs to me that on this subject the Members of this House ought to cease to be childish and act as men. I have no doubt that if a secret ballot were taken of the membership of this House on the subject of whether the standing Army of the United States should be 150,000 men or 175,000 men, the overwhelming majority on both sides would vote in favor of 150,000 men.

Now, there is no question of politics in this. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] made a very eloquent speech awhile ago in favor of an Army of 150,000 men. However, he spoiled it all by saying that he would be compelled to vote for an Army of 168,000 men, because not to do so would be to embarrass the administration.

There is no one in this House who desires less to embarrass the administration than I. I have not forgotten the indignation with which I observed men on that side of the House embarrass, or try to embarrass, the recent administration. I have no desire to embarrass this administration, but I say that the thing that would least embarrass the administration would be to reduce the Army to 150,000, thereby helping to make it possible to decrease the expenses of this Government. I am unable to see how such a course could embarrass any administration.

I ask members of the committee, including the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY]—both of whom are as well versed in military matters as any other Member of this House—I ask them to point out a specific danger that is now either pending or likely to appear in the next few months, or in the next few years, that demands more than 150,000 men in our standing Army. Are we going to have any trouble with France? Everybody knows that there is not any possibility of it. Is there any probability that we shall be bothered by England? Everybody knows that there is the very slightest probability that any sort of trouble is to arise between the United States and England. Are we in any domestic turmoil that demands an Army of more than 150,000 men? Is there any situation on the Pacific or in the Far East or in the Near East which requires an Army of more than 150,000 men? If there is, let us vote with our eyes open, knowing what we vote for and the reason for it, rather than take counsel of our fears and suspicions and vote for a larger Army than anybody claims we ought to have, and merely because of some remote possibility that in the years to come we may have to call out an Army of more than 150,000 men.

Yesterday the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] delivered a very eloquent speech on this floor, criticizing those who had undertaken to refer to the fact that out of every dollar expended by the United States Government 80 or 90 cents goes for war purposes, and asking if anybody would be willing to repudiate our war debt. Of course, nobody would be willing to repudiate it. He asked also if we were willing to repudiate the interest on the debt. Of course, nobody is willing to repudiate that. He asks whether we are willing to reduce the amount of money that goes to the compensation of our soldiers

who fought to win that war. Of course, the question answers itself. No Member of this House is willing to reduce the amount that our soldiers draw in compensation or insurance, or that their widows and orphans draw. But what the men in this House do desire is to bring about that condition where it will never be necessary to call out those boys or other boys again to give their lives, merely because the Government gives them a meager compensation. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina providing for 150,000 men will be carried, and that we will notify the War Department that that is their limit. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM].

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: As one of the new Members of the House I am greatly interested in all features of this bill, but particularly so in the per capita cost which the measure carries in comparison with that of other years. Thinking that such a comparative statement might be of some interest to the other new Members of the House, who like myself are going through an Army appropriation for the first time, I submit the following table showing the total number of officers and enlisted men, the total appropriation for the Army, and the yearly per capita cost from 1909 up to the end of the present year, and also including the bill now under consideration.

This is not an attempt to show the cost of maintenance, but the total cost per soldier of all items carried in the various Army appropriation bills. It simply puts before us the cost of our Army Establishment in terms of the men involved.

Year.	Officers and enlisted men.	Total yearly Army appropriations.	Yearly per capita cost.
1909	84,133	$94,371,000	$1,121
1910	84,500	100,459,000	1,189
1911	81,363	95,341,000	1,171
1912	87,094	92,587,000	1,063
1913	91,384	90,907,000	994
1914	94,890	94,241,000	993
1915	103,403	101,019,000	976
1916	105,120	101,959,000	969
1917	141,420	267,801,000	1,893
1918	1,358,713	1,358,713,000	3,863
1919	2,516,719	12,271,868,000	4,876
1920	294,015	772,324,000	2,630
1921	187,916	392,558,000	2,088
1922	182,000	331,072,000	1,801

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Is that the per capita for the enlisted men?

Mr. KETCHAM. For enlisted men and officers. Three things should be kept in mind in the study of this comparative statement. First, the pay of enlisted men is now much higher than in 1909; second, the present Army organization plans require a much larger quota of officers; third, the various appropriations carry many items that do not directly affect the number of men involved. Fortifications, arsenals, aeronautics, and chemical warfare service may be cited as examples. When all these factors are considered there is comfort in the study of the table indicating as it does the return to normalcy in Army appropriations as rapidly as unsettled world conditions warrant. [Applause.]

Mr. SISSON. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the amendment that contemplates an enlisted force of 150,000 men. I am in sympathy with the view expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] that we should write into the law a provision insuring that limitation upon the number, and I hope that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] will propose an amendment to accomplish that. The so-called Borah provision is incorporated in the bill, and if we are to go to that extent we should go further and absolutely safeguard the situation by doing what the gentleman suggests. If I belonged to the majority, I should certainly propose such an amendment. The gentleman belongs to the majority, and is an influential member of it, and I trust that he may think proper to do so. If he does so and the committee approves, there will be no further ground for his apprehension that the present Secretary of War may adopt the policy that was observed by the late Secretary of War and keep the enlisted force beyond the amount of money that will take care of it.

One other observation: All last winter this identical matter was the subject of consideration at both ends of the Capitol. It was debated up and down in both branches of Congress, and the final action taken restricted the Army to 150,000 men. That was a deliberate expression of the opinion of Congress. Now, the burden of proof is upon those who wish to increase that number, to show some reason for the increase, and during the course of this debate no reason has been assigned. [Applause.]

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

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I think it was in the discussion of this Army bill that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] said, possibly yesterday, that if it were as concretely known what the view of the country was upon this subject as it was on the subject of prohibition, that if the people had spoken on this subject as they have upon prohibition, the Congress would be instructed and would know how to act. Gentlemen, I think there is a stronger consensus of opinion on this subject than upon the question of prohibition. [Applause.] Many men are going up and down this country the cry of whose soul is, "I want a drink; I want a drink!" [Laughter.] But I have heard no man say, "I want a war, I want a war; I want a great standing army." [Applause.] The gentleman from Texas on yesterday in discussing this question said that in the incipient war between Panama and Costa Rica men went forth armed with clubs, sticks, and stones, which indicates a strong inclination, or at least a great provocation, to fight. But I think it harks back to the day described by the great bard when he said, in medieval times—

> I see
> The imminent death of 20,000 men,
> That, for a fantasy and trick of fame,
> Go to their graves like beds, fight for a plot
> Whereon the numbers can not try the cause,
> Which is not tomb enough and continent
> To hide the slain?

I have no disposition to discuss this question technically, but I say to you that the spirit of war and of conflict and of aggression and subjugation is disappearing in the spirit of the civilization of this century. [Applause.] Gentlemen may say in their minds, "What about Germany?" But we know that for 50 years the German Government persistently and continuously perverted the philosophy of the social structure of the German nation in order to justify the German proposition that might makes right. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY].

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, there is a story of a little boy who boasted:

> That fellow said my sister was red-headed, and I licked him.
> "And what is the color of your sister's hair?" a gentleman inquired.
> "I ain't got any sister," replied the boy, "I was fighting on the principle of the thing."

The ideal thing to do, Mr. Chairman, is to settle all matters on principle. I think every one of us realizes that the ideal thing to do would be to settle this question of our Army appropriations, and every other political question, on original principles. And yet in matters of legislation we often have to do what Jesus indicated in discussing the marriage and divorce question. He said that Moses allowed certain things because "of the hardness of their hearts." In other words, the inspired Jewish lawgiver permitted things or legislated for things not on the original, best principle always, but on the question of what was best under the circumstances, what could be enforced or made effective under the existing conditions.

I am not sure but this is often necessary in matters of legislation. A very vital question in any matter of legislation is, What will be best for the people? With what will the people be satisfied? What do the people demand? And so, sometimes we adopt what the people may demand even when such is not best from the standpoint of original principles, and it is right for us to do so. We can not afford to forget that one of the vital things in a republic is to have the people in their hearts loyal to the Government, loyal to the laws; to have their minds and hearts approve the things done by their Government. We need protection from the inside as well as from the outside. Governments derive not only their just powers but all their real and permanent powers from the consent of the governed.

The greatest protection that any government can have is a happy, contented, and loyal citizenship. It beats all the standing armies that the world can muster. The greatest menace that any government can face is a disloyal and dissatisfied citizenship—a people feeling that the makers of law and administrators of government have betrayed the confidence and sacrificed the rights of their constituency. Against such a menace no standing army can give protection. But in this case policy and principle run parallel.

I am sure in my heart that the gentleman was right who said here on the floor that there is perhaps no question on which the people are speaking out more definitely than on this question of the reduction of war expenses. We expend annually, so a gentleman stated—I have not looked into it—more money for direct war cost, for war equipment, for maintenance of our war forces, not counting what we are paying on war debts and interest, not counting what we are paying for sick and wounded soldiers, or for pensions, or for vocational education of ex-service men, but for our Navy and Army, for preparedness for possible future war, we expend annually for this more money than we spend in all our States for all our public schools.

The other day when the House was considering the large Navy appropriation, for which I did not vote, I estimated that we are paying for one of these naval vessels—to say nothing of whether the building is wise or unwise—more money than would be required to give $500,000 to every county in my State for educational purposes or for building public roads. I further estimated that the cost of one of these ships, of which there are 16 in our 4-year program, would build graded and gravel highways across my State, one every 15 miles from the Gulf to the Tennessee line, or would build a neat brick schoolhouse in reach of every child in the State. And yet this present War and Navy program is only a small part of the tribute we pay to war.

Away back in 1908, when our Navy was far from what it is to-day, Edmond Vance Cooke wrote:

"War is hell," we cry, being proud of our equipment to make more hell.
This is the song of a thousand men who are multiplied by twelve,
Sorted and sifted, tested and tried, and muscled to dig and delve.
They come from the hum of the city and shop, they come from the farm and field,
They plow the acres of ocean now, but tell me, what is their yield?

This is the song of sixteen ships to buffet the battle and gale,
And in every one we have thrown away a Harvard or a Yale.
Behold here the powers of Pittsburgh, the mills of Lowell and Lynn,
And the furnaces roar and the boilers seethe, but tell me, what do they spin?

Understand me, gentlemen of the House, I do not overlook the fact that a country must have protection as well as production, education, and internal improvements. But a Christian civilization and an intelligent and enlightened statesmanship ought to find a remedy for the present situation. It is monstrous that we should pay 90 per cent of our national expenditures as a tribute either direct or indirect to the god of war.

I believe that the day has come when every really civilized nation is sick of war with its cost and horrors. It seems to me that our country is in position to render beneficent service to humanity such as no other nation in history has ever had the opportunity to render—to lead the world in the great scheme of disarmament. I have faith that if America now leads out in a definite, aggressive way, proving her own faith by her works, the nations will follow. My fear is that we may wait too long and sacrifice the opportunity and thus sacrifice the world. For another great war with the means of destruction now in human hands would sink the world in unspeakable ruin. Our American people know this. They are looking to "the powers" at Washington and will not forgive, and ought not to forgive, if we fail to rise to the situation.

Finally, a definite word as to the present bill. I shall vote to cut the standing Army to a hundred and fifty thousand men, and I believe it ought to be cut to a hundred thousand. It has been argued here that the men who are at present in the Army are enlisted for a definite time, and that to drop them out of the ranks now would be to break faith with the gallant fellows and turn them loose without employment. Yet there is not a Member in this House who is not constantly receiving requests to help boys get out of the Army. Give every boy a chance who wants to get out, and the trouble will be not to reduce the Army sufficiently but to keep from reducing it too much.

Again, gentlemen say that in the present unsettled state of world affairs we may be thrown into war again, and we need to be prepared. I remind these gentlemen, first, that recent world events have brought us to where full and constant preparedness for war would mean the maintenance of an Army of millions, which would bankrupt any nation on earth; and, second, that the same recent history has demonstrated more conclusively than ever the fact that America can depend on her citizen soldiery; and, third, that we have recently disbanded in this country an army of more than 3,000,000 men and officers. In them we have at our command a trained force of "war strength" that will be available for a time far beyond the two-year period for which we legislate.

In consideration of these facts it behooves us to reduce the Army appropriation to the lowest possible figure. Our people are already staggering under a tremendous tax burden. We must make large appropriations to reduce our war debt and to provide for those of our people who already have so freely sacrificed their fortunes and their health at the call of their country. Such appropriations are right and necessary. But in the name of the democracy which we and they have defended let us not add to this burden of past wars the useless and dangerous burden of a huge military establishment.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment and both of the pending amendments will be voted down. The committee has decided that the increase of appropriation for pay of the Army to provide for 10,000 additional men for the next fiscal year, more than the House provided at the last session, is for a very good and substantial reason. Conditions have changed since the last bill was framed. We still believe that 168,000 is ample for our Army in time of peace, but the situation is this: From the time the House considered the last appropriation bill the Secretary of War disregarded the wishes of this House and increased the size of the Army by recruiting it up to 235,000 men. The new Secretary of War has to tackle the problem of reducing that Army. The whole question in a nutshell is, Is it safe to reduce the Army in one month's time by 75,000 men. It was represented to us by competent authorities, and we agreed, that to so arbitrarily reduce the Army by 75,000 men before the beginning of the next fiscal year would be liable to destroy its organization. We did not think it was safe to do it, and so we provided a leeway of 10,000 more men for the department to work upon. It is absolutely along the line of safety so to do.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. Is it the policy of the committee to treat this as a temporary measure and later bring the Army down to 150,000 men?

Mr. ANTHONY. To 168,000 men. We provide for 168,000 men during the next fiscal year. There is a probability that it may be found too drastic to bring it down to 168,000 by the 1st of July. It is a question of adopting a safe and sane way to bring about this reduction. In all fairness to the present Secretary of War we felt that the added number of 35,000 men recruited since we last passed upon this matter necessitated an increased appropriation of $5,000,000 to allow a margin of 10,000 men under which he could safely bring about the reduction we all desire.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Would the chairman be willing to amend the bill so as to make it mandatory on the Secretary of War to discharge men on their application, until the Army was reduced to 168,000 men?

Mr. ANTHONY. We feel that the provisions of the bill are mandatory now and that he will have no alternative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Your bill expressly gives discretion to the Secretary of War and it is not mandatory, it leaves it wholly to his discretion.

Mr. ANTHONY. We feel that it is mandatory on the Secretary of War to bring the size of the Army down to the number that this bill will pay for. Now, Mr. Chairman, one word more, in fixing the number of men and the amount of money which will pay for them the committee adopted that increase with the resolve that in any conference entered into with another body we would not go a cent higher than those figures.

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

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute more to the gentleman from Kansas in order that the gentleman from Kentucky may ask him a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood the gentleman to say that one reason for making this 10,000 increase is because of the difficulty of bringing about a reduction between now and the 1st of July. As a matter of fact, has there been any increase in the Army since the last session of Congress?

Mr. ANTHONY. Not since March 4; no; but during the month that we were considering the bill the Army was increased by over 35,000 men.

Mr. BARKLEY. When was the bill passed through the House, in the last Congress?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I do not remember the date of it. It was the early part of February.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the gentleman think it would facilitate the reduction of this Army very materially if the Committee on Military Affairs would bring in some sort of an amendment to the act of July 29 which would make it not only easier but mandatory upon the War Department to exercise some liberality in discharging men?

Mr. ANTHONY. As I have explained, we think we have fully provided for an absolute change in that respect. They must adopt such a policy.

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

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROSE].

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, when the Sixty-fifth Congress was called in special session I was very much opposed to war. I had just passed through a campaign in which the principal slogan was "He kept us out of war." I had very little sympathy with the slogan that was employed during the campaign of 1916, and thereafter a great deal less. It was dragged into the campaign for political purposes, pure and simple. I listened to the first message of the President in that special session wherein he recited the indignities heaped upon our people and which were repeated, following numerous protests presented by the President to the offending nation, and at the conclusion of the reading of that wonderful message I had no hesitation in voting my approval of the resolution which brought our country into the mighty conflict. I supported every resolution or measure offered to the Congress which had for its purpose the organization of a large Army and Navy, and my support was given to every appropriation sought whereby our Army and Navy would be increased to the number of men required and our boys supplied with necessary munitions of war.

Now the Great War has been brought to an end; at least, hostilities have ceased, and we are asked to provide for what I consider a large Army and Navy in time of peace. I have never favored a large Army in time of peace. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has been credited with being a militarist, hence those who have followed him in the great service he has rendered to the country before and during the Great War have been classed as militarists, and it is said that their sole purpose is to continue to add to the heavy burdens now heaped upon the backs of our people, a charge without the semblance of foundation upon which to base it. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is not a militarist from my viewpoint. He has always advocated the most approved methods of warfare and is now desirous for peace throughout the world.

I favor the smallest Army that will safeguard the rights and privileges of our people, and in my opinion an Army of 150,000 men in time of peace is amply sufficient for all practical purposes, although this view may not meet with the approval of the majority of the House. In this connection I beg to add that at no time have I favored compulsory military service or training in time of peace, although I am in sympathy with voluntary training and have been told by every soldier boy with whom I have conversed that his military training has been of great service to him, and that his physical condition has been bettered thereby. The committee having this measure in charge have had ample opportunity to study the question more in detail than any other Members of the Congress, and I am pleased to learn that they favor a much smaller Army than do some of the high officials of our Government.

I am in full sympathy with many of the statements made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], and I believe that a majority of the people of the United States are in sympathy with the views he has just expressed. It is our duty, wherever possible, to reduce the operating expenses of our Government, and in this bill we are given a splendid opportunity to make a substantial move in that direction. We have been told that "the way to disarm is to disarm." This is but a revival of the time-worn phrase, "The way to resume is to resume," meaning thereby that our Army and Navy can be immediately reduced. The gentlemen contending so earnestly for such a plan realize that it is neither practical nor wise in view of present conditions. The Republican Party will redeem its pledges to the people, and is now working to that end. The bill now under consideration may be regarded as evidence of such purpose.

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SISSON. I am reserving three minutes for the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. I understand that the chairman of the committee has the right to close debate, but this is an amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. My inquiry is as to whether I am compelled to yield the three minutes now?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the practice of the House that the gentleman in charge of the bill has the right to close debate upon any amendment, regardless of who offered it.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] in his remarks stated that I should have made this fight in the committee instead of on the floor of the House. In justice to myself, I want to say that every member of the Committee on Appropriations knows that when this bill was reported to the House—when the vote was taken—I specifically reserved the right to myself to vote for 150,000 men, or any number of men under 168,000 that should be proposed. The gentleman says he does not see what political advantage there could possibly be in my offering this amendment. There is none. It is not offered with any purpose of obtaining any political advantage. I said in my opening remarks in offering the amendment that the administration made no difference. When Congress declared we wanted but 175,000 men in the Army, under Secretary Baker the Army was recruited up until the day they were forced to stop recruiting. When Secretary Weeks came in the influence of the staff was still at work, and to-day not one effort has been made to reduce the Army in accordance with the wishes of Congress.

One argument submitted by my good friend [Mr. ANTHONY] is that while he says 150,000 men are enough, yet it is impossible to reduce the force; it will be disastrous to do so at this time. Under Secretary Baker the department knew the wishes of Congress and refused to comply with the wishes of Congress, but recruited the Army up to 235,000 men, and under Secretary Weeks it has remained at 235,000 men, and absolutely nothing has been done to comply with the expressed will of Congress as contained in the joint resolution and in the bill which was adopted and sent to the President.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I have not the time. No party lines can be drawn in this matter. The question is whether you are going to allow the department to say, "I know you do not want more than 150,000 men; I know that the Republican leader, Mr. MONDELL, has said the country wants only 150,000 men, and that your appropriation bill as passed in March provided for only 156,000 men; but we refuse to discharge a man in order that we may come in here now and say that you have got to allow us 175,000 men, because it is not feasible to discharge them." It is said that they can not discharge the men. Why, the contract of enlistment specifically gives the right of discharge to the President, Secretary of War, and commander of a corps. If they wanted to comply with the wishes of Congress, they could start in and discharge now those who would be glad to be discharged, and by July 1 it would not be so difficult to have the Army down to the requisite size. The gentleman from Kansas yesterday said that 25 per cent of the men in the Army would ask for a discharge if they were granted the right to do so. This bill gives it to them. I intend to offer an amendment making it specific that that legislative provision shall take effect immediately upon the passage of this act, so that men with dependents can have a chance to get out of the Army now.

The gentleman from Kansas is right; 150,000 men are enough. They can reduce that size if you make them do so, and I ask you to vote down both substitutes and vote for the 150,000 men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we all welcome the somewhat belated enthusiasm of the gentlemen on the minority side for a reduction in the size of the Army and in the Army appropriations. During all of the months during which a Democratic Secretary of War, contrary to the expressed wish of Congress, was recruiting an Army from the 175,000 that the Congress had provided for to 235,000, no man on the Democratic side raised his voice in protest against it. On the contrary, when we protested on this side against that action and finally brought in a resolution compelling that recruiting to cease, many gentlemen on the Democratic side not only defended the action of the Secretary but were much opposed to what we were proposing to do.

Mr. BLANTON. And many criticized him on this side.

Mr. MONDELL. A very few criticized him on that side, including the gentleman from Texas, who supported our effort to prevent the Secretary from outrageously violating the will of the Congress in using up public money in unnecessarily recruiting men. What is the situation? We came out of the Great War with 4,000,000 men under the colors. The Republican Sixty-sixth Congress made an earnest effort to reduce

military expenditures, but, do our best, the expenditures were about a billion dollars in 1920. We further reduced the expenditures, but were greatly hampered by the persistent extravagances of the department under Secretary Baker, so that, doing our best, our Military Establishment for the current year will cost us about $500,000,000. We are endeavoring now to still further reduce the size of the Army and the cost of the Military Establishment. But we must do it with due regard to the fact that we are gradually reducing a very great force; that we have certain units organized we can not reduce as rapidly as some of us desire to do it without doing great harm to the service. The situation that confronts us to-day and that necessitates some departure from the action taken when this bill was considered in February grows out of the action of the Democratic Secretary of War in recruiting an Army contrary to the purpose and will of Congress to 235,000 men. He did not desist from recruiting until we had actually passed a resolution compelling him to do so. The day before it became law, by overriding a presidential veto, recruiting was going on all over the country, although the will of the Congress had been well known to the War Department for months. We had hoped when we passed this bill in the last Congress that the voluntary separations from the service would enable us to get the enlisted force of the Regular Establishment low enough that with the appropriation we then proposed to make of $77,000,000 we would have enough to pay the men still remaining in the establishment and maintain a force of approximately 158,000 men, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Let me finish this statement, please. We now find that unless we arbitrarily discharge men who are under contract of enlistment and reduce more rapidly than is consistent with good practice in view of the situation we can not pay the Army with the sum we had proposed. We do not want any deficiency. The present Secretary of War does not intend to expend money in excess of the sum appropriated by the Congress; he expects to keep within the law and within the appropriation, and we want to give him money enough so that he can, without doing violence and harm and injury to the Military Establishment, keep within the law and within the appropriation. In order to do that it was necessary to increase the pay appropriation above the appropriations when the bill was last before the House something like $6,000,000. But in doing that, however, the committee has made other reductions amounting in round numbers to $21,000,000, so we secure an increase in the personnel of the Military Establishment and still have a bill carrying $15,000,000 less than the bill passed in the last Congress. The bill should be supported as it was reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be reported in the order in which they will be voted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments will be again reported. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk again reported the amendment to the substitute, the substitute, and the original amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers—I ask for a division first.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 75, noes 66.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers [Mr. FISH and Mr. KAHN] reported that there were—ayes 97, noes 74.

So the amendment to the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute as amended.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. If the Kahn amendment as amended by the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is now adopted, would we still get a vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the amendment as amended by the substitute would be voted upon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Another parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Kahn amendment as now amended should be defeated and the vote on the Byrnes amendment also should be defeated, will it then be in order to offer the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] as an amendment to the text of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not wish to cross any bridges until he comes to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, it may affect the way some of us will vote on this proposition. The gentleman from New York offered his figures as an amendment to the substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN]. Now, if all those propositions are voted down, would we have another opportunity for a vote upon the same proposition as an amendment to the text of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. There is ample opportunity to amend the bill which can not be taken away.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FISH. Is it in order for me to offer this same amendment to the text of the bill in case it fails at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Not if identical. The question is on agreeing to the substitute as amended.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. FISH. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York demands a division.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FISH. Evidently I do not understand the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. FISH. I do not think I am the only one, though, in the House that does not understand it. For my own benefit, I would like to know what we are voting on.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the Kahn substitute as amended by the gentleman's own amendment.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the Chair has not put the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amended substitute. The Chair has been interrupted, every time that he started to put the motion, by a parliamentary inquiry, and in order to make it clear to everyone the Chair will explain. The question is now on the amended substitute.

The question was taken, and the substitute as amended was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the original amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Whether it is not in order at the present time, and the only time for any Member of the House to offer an amendment to the amendment if he disagrees to the amendment now pending before the committee?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has stated a parliamentary inquiry. It is correct. Now is the only time to amend this particular amendment, if it is agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Any other amendments to the text of the bill would be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. Any proper amendment. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina and Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 79, noes 71.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. ANTHONY and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 109, noes 82.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FISH. Is it in order to offer an amendment to that which has just been adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say, if adopted there is no way of changing it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. All debate has been exhausted.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. I have been a patient listener here for two years, and I believe the committee will allow me to proceed at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I had called to my attention yesterday through a letter from a constituent of mine in Athens County, Ohio, that an anarchistic movement, which we have seen reflected in the daily papers in the last two days, was in progress out there. I have the honor to represent a district in which there are some 18,000 union coal miners—good, patriotic Americans. They have had only about one-fourth work during the last winter. State President Lee Hall states that 305 of the 392 coal mines in southern Ohio are now idle. Many of them have had no work for the past three or four months. I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read, in my time, an anarchistic circular which my constituent sends me, and who states that it has been circulated only in the night season, never in the daytime, among those loyal but unemployed miners, some of whom are almost at the point of hunger. In view of its relation to May day to-morrow, I ask that the Clerk read it, following which I wish to make a few remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MAY DAY OF REVOLUTION.

May day of revolution is here!

May day, when the workers of the world think of liberty! When they form their ranks as a challenge to the masters! When they come out in their millions and demonstrate the solidarity of the workers!

This year the American workers must all demonstrate. They have good reason. The bosses have challenged the millions of workers in the country. They have organized to crush the workers. They want to exploit them more. In their greed they intend to grind out more profit from their bones. They want to know who shall be the masters in America.

Then let us show them who will be the masters! Let us tell them that the system must be changed. Let us tell them we will change it by revolution! That is the only way—there is no other.

In Europe the workers are carrying on their fight. With gun in hand they are fighting their governments, determined to overthrow them and set up workers' governments that shall represent only the workers! In Italy and Germany the workers face the guns of the Government, ready to die to obtain their freedom from the brutal system. In England, France, and Spain they are preparing for the day when the clash with the Government must come.

In India, Egypt, in the Near and Far East the workers and the oppressed people are organizing their ranks to drive out the imperialist robbers and cutthroats, who hold them enslaved. They are learning to use force against force. There is no other way.

Only in soviet Russia the workers may celebrate May day as free men! Only in soviet Russia there is no exploitation! In soviet Russia the workers rule! Attacked by the whole capitalist world, the workers of soviet Russia has stood fast and defended the revolution. The revolution is spreading across the globe. It calls to us. Let us prepare!

Too long have we stood the misery the bosses have forced on us. We have not forgotten the war, which killed and crippled for life millions of workers and filled the bosses' pockets with gold! We have not forgotten the war and all its fake promises! We have not forgotten and we will not forget! The bosses are preparing for a new war. Millions of men are unemployed and the bosses are afraid of them.

And well they may be afraid!

We American workers will no more stand the tyranny of the bosses and of their government. We have had enough. The United States Government stands for the bosses against the workers! It uses the lawmaking bodies, the courts, and its troops against the workers.

THEN WE MUST DESTROY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

We must overthrow it and put in its place a workers' government. We must uphold the workers' government with a strong army to crush the bosses and all who support them!

We must prepare for the revolution—there is no other way!

May day of the revolution is here!

Let us join the ranks of the fighting American workers!

Let us proclaim our solidarity with the revolutionary workers of Germany and Italy!

Let us proclaim our solidarity with the workers of the entire world!

Let us prepare for the revolution!

UNITED COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, since receiving this letter I have been in touch with Mr. John Moore, former president of the United Mine Workers of the State of Ohio, now president of the Ohio Federation of Labor, and now the legislative agent in this city of the United Mine Workers of America. I call the attention of the committee to it at this time partly because of the insistence of Mr. Moore, a loyal American, that there be a disclaimer of any connection therewith entered on the part of the organizations he represents, and those are the organizations among which it is circulated in Ohio. He wishes the public to be assured that they had nothing to do with its preparation or circulation and do not have any sympathy whatever with its un-American purposes. He and I both want it understood that we condemned it from top to bottom. [Applause.]

Gentlemen can readily see its purpose. I noticed in last night's Washington Star accounts from four different States where this same publication was being circulated during the present week. This letter from my constituent, a lady by the way, one of our newly made citizens, says that they have left this circular on porches through these mining communities for three different nights, never in the daytime, the last night being that of April 26.

I am not taking the dastardly circular so seriously as to imagine a revolution is at hand, gentlemen, but I think it is high time that we give public ventilation to and condemnation of these acts of a class of traitors, a class of anarchists, not socialists—I do not propose to disgrace socialists by such a classification—when they are spreading their damnable doctrine broadcast, in an attempt to destroy the Government which affords them their only protection. Such men have not the courage to shoulder a musket. They only work in the dark.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. I gladly yield to my friend.

Mr. FESS. Has the gentleman thought that the printing of this in the RECORD would make it frankable, and had he thought, after having it read to the membership here, whether it would be wise to have it deleted from the RECORD?

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite sure that I shall always be glad to avail myself of the good judgment of my colleague [Mr. FESS].

Mr. TEMPLE. I do not think the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD serves many people who are likely to be influenced improperly by that circular.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to please my colleague from Ohio as well as my genial friend from Pennsylvania. Being compelled to choose between them, I shall leave it the way it is. I do not believe it will injure the country to know what these cutthroats are trying to do, and I am quite willing and resigned to leave it in the RECORD, frank or no frank.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. May I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, for one minute?

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to say that this same circular has been submitted to the Attorney General, and at his request turned over to his Bureau of Investigation, which is now on the job out in Ohio. Let us hope for early and effective results.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I want to say that this identical circular is being sent throughout the United States, or, at least, in Indiana. The same circular—reading exactly, so far as I remember, as this one—was circulated in Terre Haute, Ind., in my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. I have learned of its circulation in five States this week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I believe, though, Mr. Chairman, we have not reached the next paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of War shall discharge from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of each, after enlistment, shall entitle him all enlisted men under the age of 18 on the application of either of their parents or legal guardian, and shall also furnish to each transportation in kind from the place of discharge to the railroad station at or nearest to the place of acceptance for enlistment, or to his home if the distance thereto is no greater than from the place of discharge to the place of acceptance for enlistment, but if the distance be greater he may be furnished with transportation in kind for a distance equal to that from place of discharge to place of acceptance for enlistment; and the Secretary of War is authorized in his discretion to grant applications for discharge of enlisted men without regard to the provisions of existing law respecting discharges.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi rose.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANTHONY: Page 16, line 13, after the word "discharges," insert "The provisions of this paragraph shall take effect immediately upon the approval of this act."

Mr. ANTHONY. I offer that, Mr. Chairman, in order to remove any doubt about when the provisions of the paragraph will go into effect.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WINGO. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order comes too late. The gentleman from Kansas has debated his amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offered his amendment and debated it.

Mr. MADDEN. I make a point of order also against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman can not make a point of order against it until it is reported.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. JOHNSON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ANTHONY: Page 16, line 10, after the word "war," strike out all the remainder of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall grant a discharge to enlisted men upon their application until the number of enlisted men is reduced to 150,000."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I will reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves his point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MADDEN. That it is legislation on an appropriation bill; that is the point of order, and it is a change of existing law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It might be germane and admissible under another theory, Mr. Chairman, which I think it is.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the proposition that the gentleman from Alabama makes?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It seems to me that although it might be in the nature of legislation, certainly on the face of it it tends to reduce the appropriation and the amount of expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been reserved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, if the House of Representatives heeds the advice of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee [Mr. KAHN], it will increase rather than decrease the Army.

We have just passed an amendment providing pay for not more than 150,000 enlisted men, but unless we pass the amendment which I propose, or one similar to it, the amendment just passed will amount to nothing.

Several months ago Congress passed a resolution calling upon the Secretary of War to reduce the Army to 175,000 enlisted men. The Secretary of War ignored the resolution, and although the new Secretary of War has been in office for two months he has not reduced the Army. There are to-day 232,000 enlisted men in the service. How are we to reduce the Army? My amendment provides that upon application of the soldier the Secretary of War shall discharge them until the number of soldiers is reduced to 150,000, the number we have appropriated money to pay. My amendment makes it mandatory on the Secretary of War to discharge these men upon their application.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Yes; I yield gladly to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. Inasmuch as the appropriation is for 150,000 enlisted men and the proviso on page 22 says the Army shall be reduced so that the sum appropriated shall defray the entire cost, why is it necessary to have that further provision?

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I will answer the gentleman to his satisfaction if he is reasonable. On page 16, line 11, you expressly give the Secretary of War full discretion to discharge these men or not, and the Secretary being under the influence of the General Staff, as has been charged on the floor of the House, I say to you the men will not be discharged unless the law is made mandatory.

Unless this amendment is adopted you will find that the Army will not be reduced according to the wishes of the Congress. I do not hold the Secretary of War entirely responsible, because I realize he has to contend with the General Staff. This "war machine," known as the General Staff, is not going to relinquish any of its authority unless the Congress writes a law that will force them to. You know and I know the General Staff has dominated the Army for a long time, and I do not see any difference now under the new administration from the way they dominated the former Secretary of War.

As Mr. ANTHONY, the chairman of the Army appropriation committee, has well said: "Secretaries of War come and Secretaries of War go, but the General Staff goes on as ever."

You Republicans went to the country last November on a platform advocating, among other things, rigid economy. You promised the people you would reduce taxes; that you would reduce the Army; that you would bring about a state of peace in the country. You declared you abhorred war and loved peace and craved an opportunity to bring about peace. Now, instead of reducing the Army, the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee [Mr. KAHN] wants to maintain a large standing Army in violation of your pledges to the American people.

Never before in the history of this country were taxes so high. The American people are to-day groaning beneath the burden of taxation and demanding that they be relieved. The people can not continue carrying these oppressive burdens. They will not continue carrying these oppressive burdens. If you do not relieve them, they will demand a change of administration in order that they may get relief.

Do you realize that we have in this country to-day 4,000,000 trained soldiers, who are ready upon short notice to defend our flag? Do you realize that with 14,000 officers, all well trained and ready for action, that this country can raise an Army within 60 days that can resist successfully the attack of the world? The people realize what standing armies mean. They know that every Government that has maintained large standing armies and depended upon military force has failed. They know that large armies breed war instead of peace. The man who carries a pistol in his pocket carries it for the purpose of shooting some one, and upon the least provocation many times wrecks his own life and destroys others because of having been armed.

I do not mean that we should not be prepared, but I mean this: That where we are too well armed, we are prone to seek something upon which to try out arms. Men have said here to-day that we should have a large Army because we are in danger. What country threatens the peace of America? No one has been able to point out a menace, but by insinuation, for the purpose of frightening Congressmen into supporting a big Army program, men have said the situation is delicate. I do not believe one word of it. With Europe almost bankrupt, with Germany disarmed, who is to attack America? The greatest enemy this country has, so far as bringing on war, is the munitions makers. Those who have made great fortunes by selling guns and munitions to the Government with which to destroy lives are in favor of war. They are in favor of big armies, because they realize that big armies will eventually make use of munitions, thereby bringing about a demand for their products.

Mr. Chairman, I recall that during the war many of us went about over the country speaking to the people and urging them to buy Liberty bonds, war stamps, and to subscribe to the Red Cross and many other patriotic demands. I remember how those people denied themselves of sugar, white bread, and hundreds of other things in order that the soldiers might have the best. I remember how the mothers and fathers accompanied their boys to the trains where they entrained for the training camps, and we all remember how those old parents wept upon the necks of their boys as they were offering them as a living sacrifice in order that peace might be brought about in the world. Those mothers and fathers were promised that this would be the last time they would be called upon to give any of their children in such a cause, that this was to be the last war.

The war has been over two years and a half, and to-day we have nearly a quarter of a million men in arms. Do you realize what it costs to maintain the Army? For every enlisted man in the Army it costs the Government $1,600 a year. The cost of the Army for the next fiscal year will be $331,072,159.80. For fortification, $8,038,017. Directly and indirectly, 90 per cent of the money expended by this Government is for the Army, Navy, pensions, hospitals for soldiers, and other expenses caused by war.

If disarmament could be brought about—and I hope that it soon will be—the taxes of the people could be reduced to a very small sum.

The mothers and fathers of this country demand that we do something to stop war. They demand that we reduce the Army. If you believe the soldiers of the late war want a large standing army, ask them, and they will tell you they do not.

A few days ago I visited Arlington Cemetery and there gazed upon the hundreds of new-made graves marked by little white crosses, the places where now rest the torn bodies of boys who died upon the battlefield in France, and as I looked upon those graves I thought of the mothers and fathers at home who had been robbed of their boys because of militarism.

I visited Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, where I saw poor, blind soldiers being led about. I saw the maimed and wounded soldiers of the late war sitting about the hospital, unhappily whiling away the time. And I said that certainly there can be no one in this Congress, the pulsation of whose heart beats in sympathy with the mothers of these men, who will vote to bring about a condition that will bring on another war.

Mr. Chairman, I have received many pathetic appeals from mothers and fathers, asking me to get their boys out of the Army, but on account of so much "red tape" in the Army Regulations, few of the soldiers are released. Thousands of those boys are needed by their parents. Many of them are anxious to engage in more profitable business, where they may become home builders and taxpayers. This ought not to be a partisan question. Every Democrat and every Republican in this House knows that the people want a small Army. They are opposed to militarism. They demand that this Government adopt a policy of rigid economy and reduce the taxes that burden the people.

If you adopt this amendment or one similar to it, your Army will be reduced to 150,000. I trust the amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. JOHNSON] that his amendment, as it seems to me, ought not to be offered as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY]. There is no relation between the two matters. Now, suppose we want to vote for both. It seems to me there should be some arrangement made whereby the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi will not be pending as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not pending as a substitute. The point of order has been reserved against it.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order against it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. He offered it as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. It clearly is not a substitute. If anybody makes a point of order against it, it will be so held.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I offer it as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. There is already an amendment pending.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, may we not have the substitute pending again?

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute has been ruled out.

Mr. HULL of Iowa rose.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition on the Anthony amendment. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] want to offer an amendment or substitute for it?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I want to offer an amendment to the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Tennessee in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas. Indeed, I am not opposed to it. If this language here becomes a law, I see no reason why the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas should not prevail. But I am just wondering if in our effort here to do a kind thing we are not likely to be doing an injustice by the adoption of this language which has just been read.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. ANTHONY. The only purpose of the amendment was to clear away all doubt that might exist in the minds of some of the Members who have spoken to the committee about it as to when the language of the paragraph was to go into effect. Some contended that it would not go into effect until July 1. Others thought it should go into effect at once.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I agree with the gentleman from Kansas about that, and I think his amendment should prevail; but I simply wanted to call attention to the condition that is going to be created by the adoption of this language.

At present the recruiting officers of the Army are charged with the duty of trying to ascertain the ages of men who offer themselves for enlistment. An officer who knowingly recruits a young man under 18 years of age is subject to court-martial and severe penalty. Nevertheless they get by. Young men will misrepresent their ages and state that they are over 18. Under the practice now they are discharged for fraudulent enlistment and their fares are not paid to their homes. Their parents have to arrange for the payment of the fare of the discharged soldier to his home or wherever he may wish to go. This is designed to correct that. This will give to the boy an honorable discharge and will provide for paying his way home.

Mr. PARRISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. PARRISH. I do not understand that this bill provides for paying his fare home.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. To the place of enlistment.

Mr. PARRISH. Only to the place of enlistment?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. To the place of enlistment, or to his home if it is near the place of enlistment.

Mr. PARRISH. Does not the gentleman think the bill should provide for paying his way to his home if he is under 18?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have the very gravest doubt, notwithstanding the sympathy I feel about the matter. Like all other Members of Congress I have had many of these minority cases. Yet I have the very gravest doubt whether from a sound military standpoint we are not making a mistake in putting that provision in this bill. [Applause.] In my opinion it will result in the development of carelessness on the part of the recruiting officers. It will encourage young men under 18 to misrepresent their ages and enlist, and then their parents will file applications for their discharge and upon proof made will get them out. It will result in the Government paying out a tremendous amount of money for enlisting men who will be under age and who will suffer no penalty whatever. I sympathize with the feeling of Members. I have had many cases that have torn my heart; yet I doubt whether as a sound military proposition this ought to be adopted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, for its bearing upon the matter now under discussion, I wish to state that a little later I shall offer an amendment which will follow the so-called Borah amendment. The Borah amendment now in the bill provides that the Secretary of War shall not expend more in compensating officers or enlisted men than the sums specified in the bill. I call the attention of my friend from Mississippi [Mr. JOHNSON] to the amendment I shall offer, which I will now read. It is to follow the Borah amendment on page 22, line 5:

> The process of reduction shall be put in effect immediately upon the passage of this act, so that the number of officers during the next fiscal year shall not exceed 14,000 and the number of enlisted men shall not exceed 150,000.

The purpose is to make the act speak with reference to the time of its passage, so far as the matter of reduction is concerned, with a direction to the Secretary of War to begin the process of reduction at once, without compelling him to grant or refuse any individual application for discharge. If my proposal is adopted, the Secretary of War will at once begin the work of effecting the reduction on the basis provided by the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I wish to say that all I am interested in is to have these men discharged when they are anxious to be discharged. As it is now, the Army officers are not going to discharge them as long as you Congressmen allow them to hold them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi, Mr. HULL, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Dakota rise?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. JOHNSON] should be entitled to recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Not necessarily. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Dakota rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi was ruled out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I offered it again, and it was pending at the time——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman sent an amendment to the desk, and in due time the Chair will recognize him to offer his amendment; but the Chair feels under no constraint to recognize the gentleman at this moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I only wanted to know the parliamentary status.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will allow me, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], as I understand, has a substantive amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That would have precedence.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from South Dakota has only a pro forma amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman from South Dakota has already been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand that the gentleman had only a pro forma amendment when the Chair recognized him.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, every Member of Congress occasionally has the painful duty imposed upon him of criticizing organizations or individuals, and it is my duty at this time to call the attention of this House to the National Disabled Soldiers' League, an organization of alleged service men that is taking from the wounded men of the late war thousands of dollars and using that money for purposes foreign to that for which it was contributed. This organization does not work in harmony with any soldiers' organization. It ought to be investigated by Congress, unless when the facts are given to the Congress and to the administration it ceases to ask contributions and ceases its alleged work.

Members of Congress will find that there are branches of this organization in practically every State in the Union to-day, and that their own constituents—men who have been wounded—are suffering by reason of its activities.

This National Disabled Soldiers' League first came to my attention in 1920, when it was in the early stages of its organization. The men who were responsible for the league and who occupied the executive positions were George Gillin, chairman; Sidney Marks, vice chairman; and Arthur T. Schmidt, secretary and treasurer. In addition, there was an executive committee composed of men who are said at this time to be still in the Fox Hills Hospital.

The league claimed to represent an organized effort on the part of disabled veterans throughout the country to secure proper legislation in their own interest. Some of the points for which they claimed to be working were immediate vocational training for all disabled soldiers, with pay; the Darrow bill which provides for $20 a month added compensation for every disabled soldier; preferential legislation for disabled soldiers in regard to civil service; permanent employment bureaus for placing disabled soldiers; and adequate legislation covering needs of ex-service men whose disabilities are now appearing and resulting from the Army service.

Membership was solicited among the disabled at $1 a year. Acting on the assumption that there were 614,900 disabled veterans in the United States, a figure they can not verify, the officers estimated that the league would soon become self-supporting. Membership was slow in coming in, however, and appeals were issued to the public for financial support.

About this time an advisory council was formed, including Thomas L. Chadbourne, the chairman; Marshall Field; Herbert Hoover; Prof. R. D. Fisher, of the Rehabilitation Division of the Vocational Board; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise; Mrs. Wendell Phillips; and Edward T. Moore, counsel. It was found on investigation that several of these members had agreed to serve through sympathy with the professed cause of the league, though knowing practically nothing of the organization of the men connected with it. This advisory council never met, the chairman refused to call a meeting, though requested to by council members. After investigation Mr. Hoover, Mrs. Phillips, Prof. Fisher, and Rabbi Wise resigned from the council. No information can be secured at Mr. Chadbourne's office beyond the statement that he was much interested in the league and supported it substantially. He now refuses to give information.

Early in October there were rumors to the effect that the league had been formed primarily for political purposes. A representative of the bureau called at the office of the Republican national committee and informed the committee that Gillin and Marks, if suitable salaries were paid, would swing the vote of the disabled men of the country, whom they claimed to represent, to the Republican nominee. This was refused consideration, whereupon they threatened to affiliate with the Democratic Party and fight the Republican Party to a finish. Shortly after that disabled men receiving the literature of the league also received propaganda in the form of extracts from the speeches of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency touching upon his interest in the cause of the disabled men. To quote their own literature, "We are going into politics with a splash—we indorse the candidate, we will not indorse parties, but only those men who pledge themselves to aid us." In addition to this the same men received strong Democratic propaganda from the Under Fire Veterans' Association, George H. Gillin, president, Arthur T. Schmidt, vice president, with headquarters at the same address as that of the league. The financial statement shows thousands of dollars of anonymous contributions and a salary pay roll yearly of about $60,000.

Another interesting fact is that a few days before election the records in the office of the league disappeared, executives claiming that they had been stolen. However, they reappeared shortly afterwards. This same thing happened when the secretary of the league was called to testify before the New York district attorney. Now, since that time it has been proven that prior to the election a contribution of $5,000 was made to this disabled men's league by Thomas L. Chapman, Bernard Baruch, and Cyrus H. McCormick. I have no objection to their contributions, whether to Republicans or Democrats, but when an organization does take money from men for political purposes it has no right to go to the disabled men and mulct them for a dollar apiece. That is what the organization is doing, but whether or not it is necessary for Congress to investigate it and make public all the facts, of which I have given only a very few, I do not know. I would suggest to these men who have been running this organization which refuses to cooperate with the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the World War Veterans, or any other bona fide legitimate organization of ex-service men, that they ought to demand a congressional investigation if these facts are not true, and I would suggest to them also that if they do not demand that investigation, if they do not cease their propaganda, if they do not cease demanding money from wounded men to be used for political purposes, it will be necessary for some of the ex-service men in this House to introduce such a resolution so that their books can be brought before a committee and all of the facts can be given to the American public.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Is this league composed of disabled veterans?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. There are many disabled veterans in it. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. FLOOD. Does the gentleman know the number?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I think they have quite a number at the present time.

Mr. FLOOD. It is a veterans' organization?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It is an organization brought into existence purely for political purposes in the late campaign, which was willing to sell out to the Republican or to the Democratic Party. Either party might have been justified in contributing to these men. I have no objection to that. That is a matter of politics. My objection is to these men going out to-day and collecting $1 or $2 each from disabled men, and of each dollar that is contributed 90 cents goes to these alleged officers, who hold the offices, and who make no report to their men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL: Page 16, line 10, after the word "is," strike out the words "authorized in his discretion" and insert "directed under such reasonable regulations as he may prescribe"; in line 12, after the word "men," insert "serving in the continental United States"; line 13, after the word "discharges," insert the words "until the number in the Army has been reduced to 150,000 enlisted men, not including the Philippine Scouts."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, or I reserve it for five minutes.

Mr. HULL. I ask the gentleman to reserve it.

Mr. MADDEN. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I might say that I do not think it is subject to the point of order. It simply changes the language that is in the bill, and it changes it in a constructive way, in a way to which I think no Member of this House should object.

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

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I want to say to the gentleman that it covers my amendment, and I have no desire to press mine further.

Mr. HULL. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi. It not only covers his amendment but it clears the matter up. There are no discharges to be made in the Army unless in continental United States. To discharge a man in the foreign service on his application might cause confusion. It also does not include the Philippine Scouts. It is practically in conformity to the present bill, except in this, that it directs the discharge of a man by the Secretary of War and does not allow him to have the discretion to hold that man in. That is all the change there is. I do not think any objection can be made to that.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Will the amendment prohibit the discharge by the Secretary of men outside of continental United States?

Mr. HULL. Certainly not. The section will read in this manner:

And the Secretary of War is directed under such reasonable regulations as he may prescribe to grant applications for discharge of enlisted men serving in the continental United States, without regard to the provisions of existing law respecting discharges until the number in the Army has been reduced to 150,000, not including the Philippine Scouts.

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

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I did not catch the reason the gentleman assigns for the words "in continental United States."

Mr. HULL. Simply because we have troops in the Philippines, in the Hawaiian Islands, in Europe, and other places. To discharge a man there on his own application might cause confusion, as men might ask to be discharged who ought not to be discharged. I do not want to interfere with our foreign service, and I do not think any Member of the House should.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. I have a case of an appeal by a mother in straightened circumstances for the discharge of a boy in Germany. Would not the gentleman's amendment by implication prevent the Secretary from discharging him?

Mr. HULL. Certainly not. He should discharge him if he can, but we should not compel him to discharge him. That man is on foreign soil.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I wish to ask the gentleman if he does not feel that perhaps his amendment might result in the crippling of the force in continental United States, considering the fact we have 15,000 men in Germany, 18,000 in the Philippines, and with the forces we have in Hawaii and the Canal Zone?

Mr. HULL. Certainly not. This is a whole lot better than to do the other way. This simply allows them to get out on their own request, but the Army is not forced to discharge the men unless the men ask to be discharged. You are going to bring the Army down to 150,000. Let the men select themselves—those who want to get out and let them go out; that is all.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I will.

Mr. FESS. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the language is not contradictory in this where it says the Secretary of War is directed and then leaves it to the Secretary of War to prescribe such regulations——

Mr. HULL. Such reasonable regulations for the carrying out of these provisions. You could not take away every discretion from the Secretary of War.

Mr. FESS. But could not he under the regulations——

Mr. HULL. I suppose that is barely possible, but I have faith in our Secretary of War that he will carry that out properly.

Mr. LAYTON. I understand it is mandatory as far as the continental United States is concerned and discretionary as far as the foreign possessions are concerned?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. 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. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5010, the Army appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, May 2, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HICKS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5219) to create a bureau of aeronautics in the Department of the Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 35), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 5573) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lima, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUSTED: A bill (H. R. 5574) to authorize an issue of bonds in exchange for bonds of the first, second, third, and fourth Liberty loan issues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 5575) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases," approved April 22, 1908; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 5576) to provide relief for certain employees of the Government who were retired under the provisions of the act of May 22, 1920, commonly known as the retirement act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 5577) to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 5578) to relieve the Territory of Alaska, its officers and municipalities, from the necessity of filing bonds or security in legal proceedings in which such Territory, its officers or municipalities, shall be parties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5579) to authorize the extension and widening of Fourteenth Street from Montague Street to its southern terminus south of Dahlia Street, Nicholson Street from Thirteenth Street to Sixteenth Street, Colorado Avenue from Montague Street to Thirteenth Street, Concord Avenue from Sixteenth Street to its western terminus west of Eighth Street west, Thirteenth Street from Nicholson Street to Piney Branch Road, and Piney Branch Road from Thirteenth Street to Blair Road, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5580) to authorize the widening of Georgia Avenue between Fairmont Street and Gresham Place NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5581) to amend section 24b of an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice," approved June 4, 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 5582) to provide compensation for persons suffering injuries while engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and for the dependents of such persons in case of death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 5583) providing a temporary loan of $50,000,000 by the Federal Reserve Board to the Federal Farm Loan Board for the purpose of expediting the loan of money to farmers upon their applications therefor now pending; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 5584) to acquire a site and erect a building thereon at Springfield, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 5585) relating to execution of pension papers in foreign countries; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 5586) to provide for the erection of a public building on ground already acquired at Fairfield, in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 5587) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building at Tryon, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 5588) to repeal section 5 of an act entitled "An act to establish the Lassen Volcanic National Park in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, in the State of California, and for other purposes," approved August 9, 1916; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5589) for the protection and improvement of the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 5590) to authorize the issuance of Victory medals and bronze service lapel buttons to certain persons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5591) to classify employees in the motor-vehicle service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 5592) to revive the right of action under the act of March 12, 1863 (12 Stat. L., p. 820); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 98) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer certain buildings and equipment located at Camp Dodge, Iowa, to the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IRELAND: Resolution (H. Res. 77) authorizing the Doorkeeper of the House to appoint an additional page; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5593) granting a pension to Martha Ousley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 5594) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the claims of the Omaha Tribe of Indians of Nebraska against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5595) granting a pension to Martin Cuthbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 5596) granting a pension to Myra C. Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 5597) granting a pension to Nettie May Jernegan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 5598) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of East Aurora, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5599) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hamburg, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5600) granting an increase of pension to George Plewacki; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 5601) for the examination and survey of Bayou Bienvenue, State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 5602) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William E. Woodruff; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5603) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Daniel F. Griffin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5604) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of George W. Barth; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5605) granting an increase of pension to Cora E. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 5606) granting a pension to Harry Elkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 5607) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Baltimore, State of Maryland, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 5608) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. A. Baumgarner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 5609) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Piercefield, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 5610) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Kilcullen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 5611) granting a pension to William H. Linnabary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5612) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fayette, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 5613) granting a pension to Joseph S. Penland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5614) for the relief of Mrs. Cary B. Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 5615) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Roy; to the Committee on Pensions.

MOTIONS TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEES.

Under clause 4 of Rule XXVII, motions to discharge committees were filed as follows:

By Mr. WALSH: Motion to discharge the Committee on Revision of the Laws from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12) to consolidate, codify, revise, and reenact the general and permanent laws of the United States in force March 4, 1919.

Also, motion to discharge the Committee on Education from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 25) to create a national university at the seat of the Federal Government.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

405. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Stanislaus County (Calif.) Farmers' Educational and Cooperation Union, favoring excess-profits tax until full cost of the war is paid, and opposed to the sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

406. By Mr. BURTON: Petition of the city council of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, urging legislation for the consolidation for telephone lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

407. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Savin Hill Yacht Club, Dorchester, Mass., protesting against tax on pleasure boats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

408. By Mr. GORMAN: Petition of Council Notre Dame de Loudres (Chicago, Ill.), No. 117, urging the defeat of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

409. By Mr. KING: Petition of Mrs. Gus Keller and 125 other citizens of Quincy, Ill., urging the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

410. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of S. Liebmann's Sons (Inc.), Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on cereal beverages, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

411. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the proposed turnover or sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

412. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Charles Werner Fur Co. (Inc.), opposing the present tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

413. By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Mrs. Theresa M. Phillips, of New York City, urging the recognition of the Irish republic, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

414. By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of citizens of the fifth district of Wisconsin, praying for an amendment to the Volstead prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

415. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Joseph B. Perkins, Springfield, Ill., favoring the Ralston-Nolan bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *May 2, 1921.*

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

Our Father, Thou hast made us for Thyself and we can not rest excepting we rest in Thee. So amid the restlessness of our age and the manifold problems and anxieties that confront us, we do ask that we may hear the still, small voice of Him who said come unto Me and rest. And so amid the day's duties and of the manifold responsibilities may our hearts respond and find even in activity the calm of Thy presence. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, April 28, 1921, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PACIFIC COAST PETROLEUM INDUSTRY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting part 1 of the report of the Commission on the Pacific Coast Petroleum Industry dealing with production, ownership, and profits, in pursuance of Senate resolution 138, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, which was ordered to lie on the table.