

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 28, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Heavenly Father, the earth wind has blown and death has made its encroachment upon us and we are touched with sorrow. In the strength of noble manhood, in the light and promise of the Christian's faith, he has left us. Be with those who have such heaviness of soul and darkness of outlook and give them great peace. May we be impressed that the flowers of life wither even while they unfold; that the year is dying that we have just called "new." O teach us how few our days and how urgent is life. Lay Thy hand of wisdom upon our country and direct all who make and interpret our laws, and may the precepts and examples of Him who spoke with divine authority prevail among our people. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

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

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with business under the Calendar Wednesday rule to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to dispense with business under the Calendar Wednesday rule to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE PARRISH.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House that death has again claimed one of our Members, this time a man in the full vigor of life, a man whose going from us leaves a sense of personal loss to every Member of this body. Last night a message came from Texas to members of the Texas delegation that LUCIAN W. PARRISH, a Member of this body, had lost, in the brave fight which he was making against death. We understand the funeral will be to-morrow afternoon at his home.

At a later time I shall ask that a day be set apart for proper proceedings and resolutions in the House. At this time I send to the desk to be read the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 311.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. LUCIAN WALTON PARRISH, a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the resolution heretofore adopted, the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 29, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 11083) to repeal and reenact chapter 100, 1914 (Public, No. 108), to provide for the restoration of Fort McHenry, in the State of Maryland, and its permanent preservation as a national park and perpetual national memorial shrine as the birthplace of the immortal Star Spangled Banner, written by Francis Scott Key, for the appropriation of the necessary funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ATKESON: A bill (H. R. 11084) granting a pension to Catherine J. Mock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 11085) granting a pension to Carrie E. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION: A bill (H. R. 11086) granting an increase of pension to Rosa Green; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 11087) granting an increase of pension to John F. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

4864. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Women's Council of the Seneca Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging retention of the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

4865. By Mr. APPLEBY: Petition of citizens of Monmouth County, N. J., urging the passage of the Ackerman daylight savings bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4866. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the National Association of United States Civil Service Employees at Navy Yards and Stations, at Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to retention of certain supply stations; to the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs.

4867. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Ottawa, Ill., protesting against the Hill bill (H. R. 9691); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4868. Also, petition of the board of supervisors of La Salle County, Ill., urging passage of the Hill bill (H. R. 9691); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4869. Also, resolutions of the city council of the city of Peru, Ill., favoring legislation to permit the manufacture and sale of pure beers and light wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4870. Also, resolutions of the Streator (Ill.) Ministerial Association, protesting against the propaganda to modify existing law so as to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and wine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4871. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Seneca Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4872. Also, petition of the Twenty-seventh Signal Company, New York National Guard, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 29, 1922.

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 16, 1922.)

The Senate met in open executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

NAVAL ARMAMENT TREATY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate resumes the consideration of the pending treaty.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty between the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, agreeing to a limitation of naval armament.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to chapter 2 of the treaty.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	France	Moses	Sutherland
Borah	Glass	Nelson	Swanson
Broussard	Gooding	New	Townsend
Bursum	Hale	Oddie	Trammell
Cameron	Harris	Overman	Underwood
Capper	Harrison	Page	Wadsworth
Caraway	Hitchcock	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Colt	Johnson	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Poindexter	Warren
Cummins	King	Pomerene	Watson, Ga.
Dial	La Follette	Rawson	Weller
Edge	Lenroot	Sheppard	Williams
Ernst	Lodge	Simmons	Willis
Fernald	McNary	Spencer	

Mr. DIAL. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH] is detained on business of the Senate. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], the Senator from

Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] are detained at a meeting of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. NICHOLSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are absent on business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, apropos of some discussion on yesterday touching the treaty now before us, I desire to call attention to a dispatch from Paris appearing in the Washington Post this morning in a rather inconspicuous part of the paper, as follows:

The council of the league to-day increased the membership of the mixed committee on disarmament, adding Lord Robert Cecil, of England; Gustave Ador, former president of Switzerland; former Premier Nitti, of Italy; M. Lebrun, former French minister of marine; Señor Gonzales Hontoria, former Spanish minister of foreign affairs; Señor Urrutia, Colombian minister to Switzerland; and Prince Sapieha, former Polish minister.

The council also urged the committee to resume as soon as possible the active work of preparing a basis for the general disarmament plan which the council will submit to the assembly of the league next September.

I am happy to announce accordingly that the work of the league in its effort to procure pacification and disarmament of Europe seems to be progressing with the cooperation of the first statesmen of Europe.

Mr. President, in Swift's lines on his own death he reviews what his associates will say concerning his probable dissolution as the evidences of age and decrepitude begin to manifest themselves. This one will predict that the Dean will not last a year; another one says that he will die within six months; another dear friend makes a prediction that he will not last 30 days; but he does last 30 days, to the great discomfiture of the friend who made the prognostication; and the Dean says:

I had rather die
Than his predictions prove a lie.

I sometimes think that the esteemed gentlemen upon the other side feel some kind of twinges of regret every time the League of Nations accomplishes anything, like the adjustment of the Silesian boundary controversy and the settlement of the controversy over the Aland Islands. I trust, however, that they will be glad to approve anything that is accomplished now by this rather imposing committee on disarmament.

I want to submit also, Mr. President, another article appearing in the same issue of this newspaper, affording us some hope that, notwithstanding it was found impossible by the disarmament conference in Washington to accomplish anything whatever toward disarmament, so far as land forces are concerned, the situation appears not to be altogether hopeless:

PARIS, March 28 (by the Associated Press).—When debate was resumed in the Senate to-day on the question of budget expenses recoverable from Germany, Senator Fourment presented the socialist view of the general financial problem in connection with reparations, asking whether it was really necessary to keep 800,000 men under the colors. Was there not, he asked, a danger of giving France the semblance of militarism in the eyes of the world?

Senator Fourment advocated suppression of bearer bonds as a preventive of fiscal evasion, and the creation of an international fund, with an international loan, for the payment of pensions.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am gratified that the pending treaty is here, and that we shall have an opportunity to vote for it. I, therefore, do not rise to criticize the treaty, but simply to suggest that it ought to be considered, not only in the Senate Chamber but elsewhere, as the beginning, and only the beginning, of the work of disarmament. I have no doubt but this treaty represents all that it was possible to secure from the disarmament conference: I have no doubt that our delegates did everything possible in the way of securing disarmament that it was practicable to do. Nevertheless, I should regard this treaty as a disaster rather than a benefit if the treaty should be regarded either here in the Senate Chamber or elsewhere as comprising all that there is to do in the matter of disarmament even during the next 10 years, the life of the treaty.

It is perfectly proper for us to congratulate ourselves and the country upon what has been achieved, but it is exceedingly important that we utilize the occasion also for considering what there is yet to do. Really, Mr. President, while it is a beginning, which, as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said yesterday, ought to mark, and, perhaps, will mark, an era

in the progress of civilization, nevertheless it accomplishes very little compared with what we must ultimately accomplish in order to get the benefit of this first step in the cause of disarmament. In other words, if we regard it as the beginning, we can not praise it too much; but if we regard it in any sense as a completed program, and the country is to understand that disarmament has been accomplished, I would consider it as a misfortune.

There has been much dispute about who was the author of the disarmament conference. The real author of the disarmament conference was public opinion. It never would have been called without the power and stress of public opinion, and able as were the delegates who represented us they could not have accomplished or achieved anything at all worth while without the power of public opinion; and so without the continued, sustained, and well-directed power of public opinion, the treaty which is before us will, in the end, amount to but very little in the way of ridding the world of the armaments under which it is now bending.

It is not, therefore, Mr. President, that I wish to be understood as appreciating any less than do others the worth of the pending treaty, but it is that I would be understood as saying that it is but the beginning, and unless we go forward, molding and directing public opinion to achieve real disarmament, we shall not reap very much benefit from what has already been achieved.

Consider the Navy, Mr. President, as it is left under the agreements in the pending treaty, and yet I understand, as I said a moment ago, at the first step the members of the conference accomplished all that was possible. But suppose that we were to be content with that; suppose we should sterilize the interest and the enthusiasm which has been aroused in favor of disarmament and should rest with the achievements thus far accomplished, what would be the condition of the world with reference to naval armaments alone? No such naval armaments have ever been known in the history of the world as will exist when this treaty shall have been ratified. I have before me the statement which was placed in the Record a few days ago by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] with reference to the capital-ship strength of the various nations, which in itself is stupendous; but in addition to that the conference was wholly unable to deal with the question of submarines or to deal with any other implements of modern sea warfare other than airplane carriers. The great instruments of modern sea warfare are left untouched, uncontrolled, and unlimited. To-day, Mr. President, so far as the Orient is concerned, Japan has all the navy that she needs to dominate and control the entire situation. When we take up and review the budgets of the respective nations which were here assembled and compare those budgets as they will go into effect after the ratification of the treaty with the budgets which were carried last year the difference will be found to be almost insignificant.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In reinforcement of what the Senator from Idaho is saying I should like him to permit me to read an extract from the April number of the World's Work, showing a curious popular apprehension of the practical effect of the naval disarmament treaty. The article, among other things, says:

A curious misconception of the most dramatic achievement of the Washington conference seems to have become widespread in the United States. That achievement was truly epochal in human history; it wrote "Finis" to the ruinous and war-breeding race of the nations for greater relative naval strength. That race had led America, Great Britain, and Japan into projects for navies of much greater size and power than any now in existence. These projects were abandoned at Washington, and each country agreed to a permanent relative power and to a fixed maximum.

And this is especially what I wish to call attention to—

But this fixed maximum (and here enters the popular misconception) is not less than the navies these countries now possess, but is considerably larger in every case. Thus the "Hughes-plan" American Navy is a more powerful Navy than the one we now possess.

By the "Hughes plan" we lose 4,000 tons in capital ships, but we gain 135,000 tons in aircraft carriers. And as no limits were set upon submarines, destroyers, and auxiliary craft, the "Hughes-plan Navy" remains in these respects the Navy of our previous program, which called for considerable building in these craft. The "Hughes-plan Navy" will probably cost about \$50,000,000 a year more than our present Navy; but it will cost \$120,000,000 a year less than the Navy we should otherwise soon have had, with every prospect that that Navy would grow continually larger and more costly. We have achieved a great moral gain and avoided a great financial burden, but we should remember exactly what the gain was and exactly how the burden was lifted.

I happened to be reading that a few minutes before the Senator took the floor, and it comes so absolutely apropos in

reinforcement of what he is saying that I wanted it inserted in his speech.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the quotation which has been read by the Senator from Mississippi ought to be utilized, not, of course, for diminishing the credit due the achievement which has resulted, but to indicate what is yet ahead of us if we are going to have real disarmament.

The weapons of modern warfare on the sea are all as yet practically without any limitation or control. I read this morning a statement that—

Japan is building large submarines of such great cruising radius that they will be able to cross the Pacific and operate on our western coast for a month and then return to Japan without refueling.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I should like to inquire from what that quotation is taken?

Mr. BORAH. It is from the April number of the Atlantic Monthly in an article by Mr. Gardiner.

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

Mr. BORAH. I will yield in just a moment. We are simply beginning the great struggle for disarmament, which can only be carried to a successful conclusion by the same power which has brought us thus far on the way, and that is the power of public opinion. I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator heretofore in some of his admirable addresses has referred to Archibald Hurd, one of the great naval experts of Europe. In a recent article written by him and appearing in the Fortnightly Review of January of this year he states that one of the results of the Washington conference will be to—

set up a higher standard for submarines, placing upon each nation what amounts practically to an obligation to continue building submarines—

And so forth.

In effect, he declares that the work of the Washington conference will not diminish the cost of naval armaments in the future.

Mr. BORAH. It will if we go ahead with the work and do not regard the result of the Washington conference as the conclusion of the work.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator has stressed the necessity of continued activity in the direction of the reduction of naval armaments. In that suggestion I entirely concur; but, in view of the reference to the activities of the League of Nations, I am wondering if the Senator in his thought as to future activities along this line believes that the agency of the League of Nations would be the most conducive to real, practical results or that some other instrumentality had better be employed.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think it is worth while or necessary for me to digress and discuss that proposition. I will say, however, in view of the suggestion made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] this morning, that it might be applied particularly to those who are known as "irreconcilables," that there are no twinges of regret over here upon our part, so far as I know, at any success which the League of Nations may have or may enjoy in settling the controversies and difficulties in Europe, or any success which it may have in relieving Europe of the burdens of armament. I have my own opinion as to what it has accomplished. It is not necessary at this time to debate it. It might differ entirely from the view entertained by those who are more earnest in support of the league; but if it should transpire that the league can adjust the controversies of Europe, can assist in relieving Europe of its armament, and can mollify the situation, no one will be more happy to record that fact than the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, will the Senator suffer a further interruption there?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am very glad to hear this avowal from the Senator from Idaho, in view of the attitude he has always taken with respect to the League of Nations. I think, without regard to party affiliations, every one of us who attended the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union at Stockholm last summer was profoundly impressed with the seriousness with which the European statesmen there assembled took the work of the League of Nations and how they regarded it as a live and active and most beneficial agency for the adjustment and settlement of the many perplexing problems that confront the nations of Europe. Regret was generally expressed that the United States was not a member of the league; but a determination was manifested, notwithstanding that, to use and develop this agency for the purpose of settling their own troubles and controversies.

I submit, Mr. President, whether the Senate of the United States and the executive authorities of the United States might not very wisely take into consideration whether the United States might not be helpful by sending representatives to act, as they were invited to do, in a consultative capacity, merely observers, as we do in connection with other agencies established by the treaty of Versailles, to lend at least our moral support to what they are doing, instead of standing back and jeering at what they are trying to do.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana what, in a practical way, the League of Nations has accomplished, in view of the present disturbances in Europe and the Near East?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I refer the Senator—

Mr. POINDEXTER. One second, in order to call the Senator's attention to the particular matter I have in mind. The league already includes practically all the European nations; and if it has any effect, as its advocates claim, it would seem that it could accomplish some substantial service for mankind in Europe, in that section of the world composed of its constituent members. I read the other day—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will stop in just one second. I read the other day a very circumstantial account of a parade of the so-called red army in Moscow, and a declaration of Mr. Trotski that they proposed to dictate their policies, so far as Russia was concerned, at the point of the bayonet, so to speak. The world is disturbed about the controversy between the nationalist Turks and the Greeks, and there are many other such warlike operations going on within the area of the League of Nations. I have heard of nothing substantial that they have done even to mollify that situation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator from Idaho will permit me, I respectfully refer the Senator from Washington to the able review by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] here a few weeks ago of what has been accomplished.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not want to get into a discussion of the league question because that is not what I rose to discuss this morning. I only wanted to say in answer to the Senator from Montana that the league can not achieve anything which will make me at all regretful of the position which I have taken. If it accomplishes anything substantial, I will rejoice with the Senator from Montana in that fact. I have always felt that until Europe should adopt some kind of a federalizing principle with reference to Europe there is no hope for Europe, and it is possible that the league itself may have the effect of bringing about in Europe something in the nature of a federalized Europe. I believe, as has been said by Mr. Wells, who is a great advocate of the league—and I do not always agree with him—that until Europe does federalize itself to some extent, no one who is a friend of America can expect America to go into such a chaos as obtains there.

That, however, is aside from what I rose to say.

I have referred briefly to the condition in which the naval treaty leaves the world with reference to naval armament. Perhaps there will be a saving of something like fifty to one hundred and fifty or two hundred million dollars, as it has been estimated, in the way of actual expenditure, by reason of this treaty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator means, for America alone?

Mr. BORAH. I mean for America alone; and that is about all that will be saved, too, altogether, because it is now apparent that the other nations are transferring the expenditure from the battleship side to the submarines and other instruments of naval warfare. When, however, we compare one hundred and fifty or two hundred million dollars with the budgets which are actually being prepared, and the amount of money which we will have actually to raise, we can see how much work there is ahead before the taxpayer will get any real relief from this great movement of disarmament.

But naval disarmament is not alone the one which must have consideration at the hands of those who believe in disarmament. I was opposed from the beginning, as you all know, to including land disarmament in this call. I felt that the situation in Europe would not admit of any progress, that nothing could be accomplished in regard to it; and it seems to me, in view of subsequent events, that that belief was well founded. That, however, is no reason why the movement should not continue and the cause go forward until the situation may be such that the question of land disarmament can become a subject to be dealt with in a practical way.

At the present time, Mr. President, there is no limitation at all upon armament with reference to land. It was suggested here the other day in the Senate that France had reduced her

army. It may be true; I do not know; it is very difficult to get the exact facts in regard to that; but the latest information I have been able to secure is that she has not, and, according to Poincaré's statement lately made, they do not propose to do so. Japan certainly has not reduced her army. I have here an item from the press a few days ago which advises us as to her attitude in regard to that matter. This is dated March 18, and is a press dispatch:

Japanese reactionaries have apparently won their fight against an almost universal demand for army reduction.

The militarists are standing pat, announcing they prefer cabinet crises to reduction of armaments.

Besides insisting upon a large army, reactionary leaders have proposed a bill to restrict liberal thought. Recent developments in Japan, believed to presage a more liberal era, have only served to bring out the full force of reaction and militarism.

The Japanese War Minister, Yamanishi, is at outs with the premier over the army. He has announced he will agree to a reduction of not more than 50,000 men and that the money saved must be applied to the purchase of more machine guns.

And so forth. That is true in France; that is true in Japan. There is not very much desire in the United States, either, to reduce the Army. We now have an Army of 150,000 men. That is the same sized Army that we had before the four-power treaty was ratified and before the naval armament conference met, and they contend that nothing has happened which justifies the reduction of the Army in the slightest; so we are not getting any benefit from the standpoint of reduction of the Army by reason of anything which took place at the conference. In addition to the 150,000 Regular Army, we have now, as I am advised, a National Guard approaching 150,000 men; so we have at the present time a force of something like 300,000 men. We are advised, nevertheless, by General Pershing and by the Secretary of War that it would be very dangerous to reduce the Regular Army below the 150,000 mark.

One statement which was made by the Secretary of War last night is really surprising to me. I should like to know more about it. Perhaps the paper does not give the full statement.

"I consider Hawaii and the Panama Canal Zone," said Mr. Weeks today, "to be the two most important points at which this Government should maintain troops. It is absolutely essential that the Canal Zone be fully protected at all times against any possible contingency or attack."

Secretary Weeks stated that a most careful study was being made of all possible methods of defending the Panama Canal against attack from any quarter.

Of course, I understand perfectly that the Panama Canal should be policed; that there should be sufficient guards and sufficient protection to prevent evildoers or those who might be disposed to destroy it from accomplishing their end; but here is a statement which seems to indicate that the authorities in charge of the War Department contemplate some kind of an attack, that there is still a danger there. Mr. President, if we have entered into the four-power treaty and if we are proceeding now upon the theory of disarmament and upon the theory that these things mean peace, there ought to be some manifestation of that in our program with reference to the strength of the Army. I do not believe that there is any danger of attack on the Panama Canal in the sense that some nation is going to attack it, some country is going to assail it. If I thought so, I would regard the four-power treaty as a trap, as a camouflage to protect the enemy, as calculated to mislead the people and to lull them to sleep while the enemy is lurking about for the purpose of availing itself of the advantage of our sleep.

I hope that when the Army bill reaches the Senate these people will have experienced a change of feeling, and that it will manifest itself in our appropriation bills. I think we could very well afford to reduce the Army to a hundred thousand men, in view of the fact that we have a National Guard of 150,000 men, and if we do so I will be glad to credit it to the conference.

I observe that France takes a position with reference to her army almost identical with the view which is held by the representatives of our Army. I deplore these things, because I know if we proceed along that line that inside of five years—yes; inside of two years—the last vestige of benefit in the way of economy will have been wiped out; that no benefit whatever will be realized by the taxpayers from these treaties. If we are going to fill the public mind with the idea that there is still danger of attack from some foreign power, what benefit shall we derive from the conference? Where is the nation which is going to attack us? Is it Germany? Is it Austria? Is it Spain? Is it Italy? Is it France? There are only two nations in the world which, by any possible stretch of the imagination, could assail and attack us at the Panama Canal Zone or anywhere else. I need not mention those nations. But if the danger does lie with reference to those nations—and it can lie nowhere else—then we are making a fatal mistake in ratifying this treaty, and we made a fatal mistake in having ratified the

four-power treaty. If we are not to have the faith which the treaties express, according to their proponents, if we are not to rely upon them, then they are a delusion and a snare. The way to manifest our reliance and to manifest our faith is to lead on in the cause of disarmament, which I trust we may do. We take risks in war; let us take some risk in the great cause of disarmament.

Mr. President, it has been about four years now since the war closed, but we are not by any means free of the war spirit, of the idea that we must rely in these matters entirely upon force, that there is no other security. I think there will have to be a regeneration in our mental attitude, as well as a reconsideration of our budgets in regard to these things. I hope that those who have been advocating these treaties will put it in the form of a concrete fact, to wit, in our appropriation bill, and place a little less reliance upon force as the only remedy or the only method for the settlement of international affairs.

Mr. President, I would not take from the conference the honor or the glory which justly belongs to it, even if I could. I would not detract from the prestige of its delegation, or any one of them, even if I could. But I am interested in what has already been achieved only as a part of a great cause—a cause just begun and which must be carried forward to final success or civilization must perish. The cause of disarmament will fail, utterly fail, the moment the people lose interest in it or the moment they cease to be active and persistent in the cause. This is the people's fight, and to lull them into inactivity by giving out the word that disarmament has been achieved or that sufficient has been achieved to warrant inactivity would be to betray the whole cause and to imperil civilization. I have said what I have said, therefore, to-day as an indication of what I trust shall be my course in the future and something as a suggestion to those who are concerned in the cause to continue in the good work.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, there is one part of this treaty to which I desire to advert, because it has been of extraordinary interest to me and to many who reside in the territory from which I come; that is article 19. With the rest of the treaty, that which relates to naval disarmament and which constituted the subject of the very brilliant opening of the arms conference, in common with everybody else, I was in full accord and to it gave enthusiastic indorsement. I am very glad indeed to register that approval and that indorsement.

When first I read article 19, however, I had some very serious misgivings. It will be observed that the article provides for the maintenance of the status quo in the Pacific with regard to fortifications and naval bases. Under it, without going into vast detail, we no longer will endeavor to fortify or make defensible the Philippine Islands nor will we attempt to establish a naval base at Guam.

It seemed to me at first, Mr. President, that this was an abandonment of the Philippines and a retreat in the Pacific. I could not quite reconcile that abandonment of the Pacific with the maintenance of a great naval base at Singapore by the British and with the maintenance of those bases which Japan in reality maintains and can maintain under this provision.

When the Foreign Relations Committee had this treaty under consideration I asked that some of the experts be called and that some information be afforded us. I was alone in that request; it did not have even a second, and the treaty was reported without any hearing or any evidence whatsoever. I then set about endeavoring to ascertain what I could in respect to it. I am not a naval strategist nor am I versed in military tactics at all. I talked with the Assistant Secretary of the Navy; I talked at length with many others who presumably are expert concerning naval affairs. I interviewed others whose knowledge of fortifications is well known, and every one of them has assured me that this article 19 is not unjust to the United States and that the view I entertained respecting it was erroneous.

I am not entirely satisfied even now, Mr. President, although I concede my ignorance of the technical aspect of the question, and I would not for an instant put any view of mine in contradistinction to the views of the experts and our military and naval strategists. But, even though I am uncertain, I feel that I can not do otherwise than accept the views which have thus been put so emphatically to me. Whatever misgivings I have concerning article 19, though to my untutored mind it may seem to constitute an abandonment of the Philippines and a retreat in the Pacific, I feel I can do nothing else but accept the unanimous view which has been asserted to me, and the statements officially presented and those made by officials unofficially to me. I shall therefore yield my personal views of article 19 and vote for the ratification of the treaty as reported.

Mr. FRANCE obtained the floor.

Mr. WARREN. I ask the Senator from Maryland to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. FRANCE. I yield.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I realize that we are in executive session, and that the time belongs to the consideration of the treaty, but there is a conference report which I desire to call up. It is a partial report, and will require only adoption and the appointment of conferees for further consideration to dispose of it. The House is waiting and can not act until we act. So I ask unanimous consent for that reason to call up the conference report on House bill 10329, the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and as in legislative session the Chair lays before the Senate the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10329) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARREN. I ask that the report may be agreed to.

Mr. KING. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. KING. I presume from the report submitted that there are a number of items upon which an agreement has been reached. Does the Senator ask us now to ratify the action of the conferees in agreeing upon those items?

Mr. WARREN. Certain matters have been agreed to and certain others have to go back for further consideration.

Mr. KING. It seems to me, if we are asked to ratify the action of the conferees as to those items upon which they have agreed, and which now the Senator desires we shall approve, we ought to be advised about them.

Mr. WARREN. As a matter of fact, there are only three or four real differences, and they have been reconciled, but on account of the troublesome, and I might say almost obnoxious, rule of the House in one respect, a number of items, some 15 or 20, have to go back, because the conferees on the part of the House fear that they may contain legislation. We have agreed upon them, and the conferees on the part of the House will ask the indorsement of the House of those items.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I notice that a reduction has been made in the appropriation for the continuance of the work of construction of the transmountain road in the Glacier National Park from \$100,000 to something like \$65,000. I called the attention of the department to that feature, and I have not yet had an opportunity to confer with them about it. Inasmuch as this is not a final report, why should it not stand over until to-morrow morning?

Mr. WARREN. It would simply delay the further consideration of the appropriation bills and result in a congestion which I would like to avoid.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I hope the Senator will find no serious objection to the request I make that the matter stand over until to-morrow.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will state directly what he has in mind, I can perhaps give him some information upon it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have in mind the appropriation to which I referred, the usual appropriation of \$100,000 for the continuance of the work of construction of the transmountain highway through the Glacier National Park. The usual appropriation is \$100,000. That was heretofore carried in the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; it was.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Apparently the House has cut it to \$65,000.

Mr. WARREN. The House did cut all of those matters, and the Senate put them up to the Budget estimate. In settling it they have asked us to take a certain percentage off all those items, which we have agreed to, and that, with others, is not in further conference.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My recollection is that about one-third was taken off this item. I would like to have an opportunity to confer with the department further in regard to it.

Mr. WARREN. I have no desire to cut the Senator off. I think in the end he would have to take it up with the conferees as conferees rather than with the department.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should not care to insist upon the delay if this were a final disposition of it, but the bill remains here, anyway.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will acquaint himself with the fact he desires to ascertain very soon, I shall not press it further now. This matter has been delayed for two months almost, for various reasons, and I am anxious to get it over to the House.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator permit me to propound an inquiry as to amendment No. 81?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. Am I correct in understanding that the conferees have agreed to restore the matter stricken out by the Senate and to reinsert the following paragraph:

For continued investigation of the feasibility of water storage on the lower Colorado River for irrigation and other purposes and related problems, \$100,000.

Mr. WARREN. That matter was settled by a slight change in language, and the appropriation of \$100,000 was left in.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PITTMAN. There was an item carried in the bill as it came from the House making an appropriation for the Yellowstone National Park, which was stricken out by the Senate, I believe.

Mr. WARREN. We have stricken out nothing that was provided for that park. In fact, there was nothing added by the Senate, and hence nothing stricken out or added in conference. The House put in the amount estimated. The Senator is speaking of the Yellowstone?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes. I was referring to that. What about the Grand Canyon National Park?

Mr. WARREN. The Grand Canyon item is still in disagreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will lie over for the present.

Mr. WARREN subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 10329) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes, still in disagreement between the two Houses, and request a further conference with the House, and that the Vice President appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. As I understand, the report of the committee of conference has been agreed to. My request is simply that the Senate insist on its amendments and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN. At what time was the conference report agreed to?

Mr. WARREN. It was agreed to this morning.

Mr. PITTMAN. I thought the conference report was to go over until to-morrow morning.

Mr. WARREN. No; it was simply laid aside in order that the Senator from Montana might have an opportunity to consider an item which was contained in the bill. He has done so, and is now satisfied to have the action taken that I have suggested.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, there are some other Senators who are interested in matters which are contained in the bill.

Mr. WARREN. I do not wish to take up time which belongs to the consideration of the pending treaty, but I wish to suggest to the Senator from Nevada that, while of course it is nothing to me personally, the conference reports on appropriation bills must be considered if the Senate is to transact its business. They have to be passed on here in the Senate in order that they may be sent over to the House of Representatives.

Mr. PITTMAN. I realize that the Senator from Wyoming is very industrious in these matters—in fact, he possibly may be too industrious—but I notice a number of these bills have been reported to the Senate on one day and on the next day have been passed. There were several Senators this morning who desired to investigate items which are contained in this very important bill. I made inquiry with regard to a certain item in the bill and the Senator from Wyoming stated that it was still in conference, but I want to look into it further. I certainly understood, however, at that time that the report was to go over until to-morrow morning.

Mr. WARREN. Until some other Senator may want it to go over for another day?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, there are a great many things in this bill, in my opinion, which should be considered.

Mr. WARREN. I should be very glad if the report might be considered. It has been before us for some days, having been presented by me, as I recall, four days ago. Of course, if the Senator objects, it will have to go over.

Mr. PITTMAN. I give notice, Mr. President, that I will move a reconsideration of the vote by which the conference report was adopted. I understand it was adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The understanding of the Chair is that the conference report was not agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. The conference report, as I understand, was agreed to, but I have not the slightest objection to the vote by which it was agreed to being reconsidered. There is no disposition on the part of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to secure action on any measure which is not understood, but I submit that, with 96 Senators, it is very difficult to make every Senator understand what is contained in the appropriation bills if he will not look at them. This conference report has been printed and has been lying on the desk of the Senator from Nevada, I presume, as it has been on the desks of other Senators. So I suggest now that Senators examine the report sufficiently so that at some time we may have it taken up and acted upon.

Mr. PITTMAN. Under that understanding—

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the understanding of the Chair that the report has not been agreed to.

Mr. PITTMAN. Very well. I misunderstood the Senator from Wyoming. I will say that to-morrow morning I will be prepared to present to the Senate the matter which I have in mind.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator understands that the subjects which the Senate is considering in open executive session and which are privileged keep us waiting here for days at a time to secure action upon measures which ought to be transmitted to the other House in order that further proceedings may be had between the House and the Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN. I understand that, and that is one reason why I want the report to go over. I desire to be attending to this business, so far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. DIAL. Will the Senator from Maryland yield to me that I may offer a resolution?

Mr. FRANCE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

CAUSES OF DEPRESSED PRICE OF COTTON.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I desire to offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. If there is any objection to it, I shall not press it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be read as in legislative session.

The resolution (S. Res. 262) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Federal Trade Commission is hereby requested to investigate the cause, or causes, of the present depressed price of cotton in the United States, and especially with reference to cotton exchanges' operations; to ascertain their methods and plans of operation and to secure any and all data that may be available in connection therewith; whether trading carried on by such exchanges is done in a fair, just, and legal way, and whether, in its opinion, the present laws operate equitably to the grower of cotton, or whether they are in any way prejudicial; and that it consider in connection with said investigation stocks of raw cotton now on hand in the United States and elsewhere, yearly world consumption for 1919, 1920, and estimates for 1921, and the imports and exports of raw cotton into and from the United States; that it ascertain the quantity of linters, untenderable and unspinnable cotton in the United States; that it ascertain the size of the cotton crop in the United States for the years 1919, 1920, and 1921, and the number of contracts said to have been sold on each of such exchanges during each of said years herein mentioned, together with amount of cotton delivered on contract; that in the event it finds remedial legislation necessary, either in the manner of making or executing contracts or otherwise incident to such trading, that it so inform the Senate concerning such facts, with such recommendation as it may believe feasible to make.

Mr. DIAL. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in legislative session, the Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DIAL. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

NAVAL ARMAMENT TREATY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty between the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, agreeing to a limitation of naval armament.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I desire to say but a few words in explanation of my vote upon the pending treaty. It is not pleasant for me to mar the beautiful picture of harmony which would have been created by a unanimous vote in ratification of the pending treaty, but I shall vote against it. I shall stand in the minority here in the Senate, but, standing in the minority here, I believe that I shall stand with the overwhelming majority of the American people.

When innumerable doves of peace are beating the air with obedient wings, when all our senses are being enchanted with the intoxicating harmonies of universal pacifism, when we have recently surveyed floating from our public buildings the flags of the great empires of the earth in places of equal honor with

the incomparable flag of this Republic, the first prophet and last defender of liberty, it is not pleasant for me to disturb the perfect harmony by rising here to remind the Senate that languishing in prison cells, under sentences of extraordinary severity, are men convicted under a Federal statute of the crime of pacifism.

When the greatest assault in history was being made upon the institutions of liberty by one of the mighty empires of Europe these men, standing in the minority, painted the horrors of war. They dwelt upon its inhumanity. They called attention to the crime of the shedding of one man's blood by another. They extolled the beauties of universal brotherhood, universal love, and universal peace, and for that, under a Federal statute clearly out of harmony with the Constitution of the United States, they were convicted of the then newly created crime of pacifism and were cast into prison where to-day they languish. And now men are taking to-day, even in the legislative halls of the Republic, the positions which those men took.

I believe that those men were unjustly convicted. I believe they should be freed, but I believe they were mistaken—mistaken, however, when they were exercising the constitutional right of every man who is a citizen of this Republic to express the minority, even if the repugnant, opinion. But they were doing then what is being done now to-day. They were preaching pacifism. Now, to my mind pacifism is nothing less than the doctrine which desires peace at any price. It is the doctrine which says, "Let us have peace regardless of the terms of that peace." Pacifism is for peace and for disarmament even when injustice is in the saddle and when the iron hoofs of empire are crushing the anguished hearts and trampling upon the inalienable rights of men.

I am not a pacifist. I do not believe that any progress can be made in the direction of disarmament, in the direction of doing away with the settlement of international disputes by force, until there shall be set up some different method of settling international disputes, until there shall be some international tribunal where oppressions, wrongs, and injustice can be remedied and where the oppressed can find redress.

Loathing war as I do, looking forward fondly as I do to the time when there shall be set up international tribunals for the establishment of international justice, I shall vote against the pending treaty. I shall vote against it because that time has not come. I must confess, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] was indicating a few moments ago, to certain twinges of conscience with reference to my attitude upon the League of Nations when I contemplate this new international arrangement which is far less satisfactory. The League of Nations at least pretended to set up a tribunal of justice which should take the place of force in the settlement of international disputes, but under this arrangement we are offered disarmament with no substitute whatever in the way of an international tribunal designed to give us justice.

Mr. President, I am surprised at much of the shallow thought of the statesmanship of our time. It seems not to have ever occurred to some of the statesmen who have been studying the problems of peace, of war, and of disarmament that armaments are not the disease, that great armies and great navies and great guns are not what ails the world, that these are not in themselves the disease, but that they are only the symptoms of the disease and that those symptoms will persist until the disease is cured. Of course, the disease is nothing else than international injustice and oppression. Loving peace as I do, I love liberty, progress, and justice far more. I do not wish to see disarmament, I do not wish to see the navies disappear until I can be assured that there may be set up the means by which justice may be secured and by which the progress of liberty throughout the world may be made more certain.

I want to say to the Members of the Senate and I want to say to the Members of the House of Representatives that the people of the United States understand this question better, I believe, than do their representatives. The people of the United States love the American Navy. Throw upon the screen of any moving-picture palace or theater of humbler degree in any part of the Republic the animated picture of great American battleships bravely plowing the turbulent waters of the ocean, bearing the Stars and Stripes, representative not only of the wealth, the majesty, and the power of this great Republic, but of its invincible devotion to the higher ideals of liberty, and from the spectators, whose hearts beat true to American traditions, there will arise tumultuous applause. The American people love the American Navy. They realize that it is their first line of defense. They realize that with their great wealth the support of this Navy is an insignificant burden upon them. They realize, further, that our Navy will never be used to promote injustice

or oppression, and that it will always be used in the defense of the American ideals of emancipation, of elevation, of liberation.

I shall vote against the ratification of this treaty; and from having noted an actual canvass in my State made some time ago by one of the newspapers, I am convinced that the people of Maryland—a State which has done so much for the Navy, not only in contributing to the great Navy of the United States heroes of years past and of more recent days, but in contributing at Annapolis every year a magnificent class of young midshipmen—are opposed to the crippling of our splendid Navy. I know that they will trust the Republic. I know that the people of the United States believe that this Republic should have the most powerful Navy in the world as a first wall of defense for the protection of our own liberties and as the great benevolent right arm to be always extended for conciliation, for propitiation, for mercy, for humanity, for liberty, and for justice over all the peoples of the world.

Oh, Mr. President, what a prophet was the Father of our Country when he warned us against the insidious wiles of foreign influence! How insidious are these influences! Is there an American Senator or an American Representative or an American citizen who believes that our financial condition is such that we can not afford to support the largest Navy in the world? I do not know of such a one. It was not long since that all of our newspapers, before the insidious influence of foreign lands began to operate, were speaking proudly of our great achievements in building up a Navy. As an illustration of that, I desire to close my remarks with an editorial from the Washington Post of December 23, 1920, which, to my mind, reads like good, old-fashioned Americanism; an Americanism still held by such reactionary old gentlemen as myself; an Americanism which will be held by this reactionary old gentleman, he hopes, until he is consigned to his eternal rest, perhaps with the flag draped about him in some recognition of what he has tried to do in maintaining and defending the ideals of this Republic. From the Washington Post of only a year ago I read this editorial:

AMERICAN SUPREMACY AT SEA.

Within three years the United States will hold supremacy over the seas. After 300 years of undisputed supremacy, the British Navy will take second place and the Stars and Stripes will float over a fleet stronger than the two fleets that fought the Battle of Jutland. In number of ships, in number of guns, and in size of guns and weight of broadsides the American fleet will be overwhelmingly superior to the British fleet. The two navies will stand about as follows in 1924, counting capital ships only:

	Great Britain.	United States.
Ships.....	18	27
Displacement..... tons.	487,450	983,000
Heaviest guns..... inches.	15	16
Greatest speed..... knots.	31.50	33.25

Japan is building eight capital ships and by 1924 will be a promising rival of Great Britain. Indeed, some naval experts are of opinion that the Japanese fleet by that year will be more effective than the British, although the British fleet will excel in tonnage. A point to be borne in mind is that while the American and Japanese ships are new, the British vessels are of an older pattern. No first-class capital ship has been laid down in Europe since the war began, while the United States and Japan have been building up their navies quite actively. The program adopted in 1916 in the United States provided for 157 ships of various types. Among them are 4 battleships of 32,600 tons each and 6 battleships of 43,200 tons each, besides six battle-cruisers of 35,300 tons each, with a greater speed than any similar vessels afloat or planned.

Japan's program calls for 24 capital ships, of which at least 8 will be of the latest type, equal to those of any other fleet. Japan's spokesmen announce that the Empire can not halt its shipbuilding program, while the United States continues to increase its fleet, and it is recognized that the disparity of strength will be in favor of the United States in spite of all that Japan can do.

There is no reason to look for a cessation of American naval increase. President-elect Harding has in fact already announced his policy, in his speech at Norfolk upon his return from Panama. He favors a Navy and a merchant marine second to no other in the world.

I will say that this is not a criticism of the President, because the President believes that under this plan we shall have a Navy second to none in the world, and, therefore, a Navy in harmony with what he said upon this occasion:

Therefore he will not interpose objections to a reasonable continuation of the expansion program, and certainly he can not be expected to cut down the program adopted in 1916 and now in process of execution.

The resources of Great Britain and the disturbed conditions in the British Isles do not seem to encourage a great naval increase. Hence it need not be apprehended that the United States will fail to take first place by 1924, or perhaps by 1923.

Premier Lloyd-George took occasion only yesterday to discuss the question of disarmament. Speaking to the British and Imperial delegates to the League of Nations, he said there could never be real peace until the nations ceased competition in armament and until all

nations were in the League of Nations, for all nations must act together in this matter. No nation dares to take the risk of disarmament unless all will agree to disarm.

Of course, Mr. President, when Mr. Lloyd-George said that he overlooked, as have all the statesmen of the world recently overlooked, the fundamental principle to which I have called attention, the principle that to attempt to get rid of the symptom until you cure the disease is the utmost of folly. All the armies of to-day might be disbanded, all of the battleships might be scrapped, but if oppression and injustice remained new methods of warfare would be invented. From the beginning of the world men have fought, generally on the one side fighting against injustice and oppression and on the other side fighting for self-aggrandizement, exploitation, and oppression. Men have fought since the beginning of time. They fought with stones; they fought with stone weapons; with bronze-tipped spears; they defended themselves with shields made of hides; they fought in canoes; they fought, after gunpowder was first discovered, with makeshift arms; and now they fight with vast machinery of the utmost perfection and power of destruction. If all the navies of the world should be destroyed tomorrow, and the reason for those navies should remain, we would still have conflicts just as deadly, just as destructive, between merchant ships carrying guns.

Some one has said that in the old days we had wooden ships and iron men, while to-day we have iron ships and wooden men. That is not true of the American Navy. The American Navy is made up of iron men, with courage in their blood, with patriotism in their hearts, and with a knowledge of world conditions which constitute those men among the best prepared in this Republic to know what our naval policy should be; and generally they are opposed to this wholly irrational scheme.

But scrap the big battle cruisers and the big dreadnoughts of the world and then let one imperial nation attempt to take advantage of a weaker but honest competitor in the markets of the world, and before we know it merchantmen will be carrying guns, and great disasters like the *Lusitania* disaster, one of the most terrible in all the history of the world, will have their repetition.

Mr. President, I am not surprised that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] feels that the rejection of the League of Nations plan, which, at least, attempted to substitute an international tribunal of justice for force, was a mistake and that that plan should have been accepted rather than this. The editorial continues:

These statements, like all others that have appeared on the subject, omit one all-important qualification. Everything depends upon the nation that is superior in arms. If it is determined to have peace, it can have peace instead of war.

Here is the essence of the whole matter. I challenge any Senator or any Representative in Congress to go out upon the streets or to talk, as I do when I have occasion, with his farmer neighbor across the fence and ask him whether a nation should have a large navy. I am sure if a Senator will ask his neighbor at home whether a nation should have a big navy or not, the average neighbor would answer very much in this language:

Everything depends upon the nation that is superior in arms. If it is determined to have peace, it can have peace instead of war. We deny—

And the average American will deny, as was denied a year ago by the editor of the Post—

We deny that superiority in armament makes a nation warlike or that competition in armaments drives nations into armed conflict. Great Britain herself is a witness against Mr. Lloyd-George. The British Navy is supreme on the seas, and yet Great Britain does not provoke war. She did not start the World War, although her navy was armed to the teeth and could have defeated Germany by a sudden stroke at any time before the completion of the Kiel Canal.

The strongest army in the world in 1919 was the United States Army. But it did not seek war. The possession of enormous armed strength on land and sea did not make the United States a whit more warlike than during the seemingly pacifist years 1914-1916. Who is the American who believes that in 1924, when the United States will possess the greatest Navy afloat, this Nation will seek war? We believe the United States will use its Navy to promote peace, as the British Navy has been used.

The most important part of Mr. Lloyd-George's observation is that which makes it clear that the nations do not trust one another.

Mr. President, there is still some slight evidence of this condition to-day, even after the great disarmament conference; a condition under which the nations do not trust one another.

That is a solid, incontrovertible fact, a fact that outweighs the mountains of theories concerning brotherhoods, leagues, and peace based on loving confidence. Not trusting one another, the nations must retain their independence and their strength. So far as the well-meaning and reliable nations can cooperate for the world's welfare, well and good; but they have traitors and assassins among them, and therefore they dare not depend upon leagues as substitutes for armies and navies.

The United States craves the privilege of cooperating with enlightened and free nations for the sake of all mankind. At the same time, seeing the world as it is, and not as it might appear through

rainbow-tinted spectacles, the United States uses its resources in its own defense. As this Nation contains most of the world's wealth and as its resources are the greatest in the world, it is proper that the United States Navy should be the most powerful in the world.

This is an editorial from the Washington Post of a year ago.

Mr. President, it is not many years since Great Britain, under the hysteria of a pacifist movement there, was almost persuaded to do what we shall do when we ratify this treaty. A great naval expert of Great Britain, a man who has since been highly honored by the Empire, called attention to the grave danger which might confront the Empire within a few short years if she should adopt the policy which we are adopting to-day, when, with war threatening, I say, from many directions, we are preparing to scrap so much of our great—real and proposed—Navy. He warned them, I say, as to the danger which might confront Great Britain in a few years if she adopted a policy of drastic naval reduction. By a very narrow margin the contrary policy was adopted, and the great British fleet was preserved; but if it had not been for the courage and for the vision of that Briton who refused to be swept from his feet by an unreasoning hysteria of pacifism the history of the last war would have been very different, and the future course of history would have been in a totally different direction.*

I believe that we should build our Navy. I believe that we should go on to complete our 1916 program. I believe that the great institutions of liberty upon the Western Continent will face grave dangers during the next decade. I believe that we should be prepared with ships and men to defend the American ideal and the American flag against the menacing dangers of the great empires of the world, which hate with a deep, abiding hatred which will never die as long as the imperial system lives the very system and ideals of Americanism, which are in conflict with everything for which the empires stand.

There is not one of those great empires which would not crush the life out of the American ideal and the American system if it could—an ideal and a system which, unless they be destroyed, will march steadily on with irresistible conquering force until the ideals and system of imperialism have been wiped from the earth, which for so many centuries has been stained and cursed by them.

I shall vote against this treaty if I vote alone, and I shall wait for the patient years to vindicate my vote; and I know that the majority of the American people fully realize that this policy, which is indeed a sudden reversal of a well and long considered policy—this policy of scrapping so much of the great American Navy at the very moment when that Navy was coming to a position where it would have held supremacy of the seas—is a grave mistake.

As far as I am concerned, I can vote "nay" with perfect confidence that my vote is the proper vote, and if that unhappy time shall ever come, which I pray God may not be, when we shall be menaced by a combination of the empires which hate us, if we shall be unprepared the blood, the havoc, the destruction shall not be charged to me nor to my record as a Member of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. FRANCE subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks this morning two resolutions which I introduced, being a resolution of January 14, 1919, for the calling of an international conference, and a resolution of April 12, 1921, providing for an international conference and consultation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The resolutions referred to are as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1919.

[Senate resolution 412, by Mr. FRANCE.]

Whereas on the 11th day of November, 1918, the President of the United States announced the signing of an armistice between the United States and the Central Powers, against which this Nation had been at war, the President at that time declaring, "The war thus comes to an end"; and

Whereas it has not as yet come to the knowledge of the Senate of the United States that peace negotiations have been entered into with the enemy; and

Whereas the keeping for any length of time of an American Army upon European soil is undesirable and a cause of vast expense and of deep anxiety to the American people; and

Whereas profound unrest among the people of many nations and violent revolutions in several countries, which spirit of unrest and revolution are augmented by the hardships resulting from the maintenance of armies of occupation, and by that underproduction, throughout the world, of the necessities and commodities of life which has resulted from the long withholding of many millions of men from productive industry must be a cause for deep concern on the part of the several Governments: Therefore be it

Resolved, First, That the Senate, as part of the treaty-making power of the Government, does hereby consent to and most earnestly advise that, at the very earliest possible moment, negotiations be entered into with the enemy looking to the establishment of a just peace, and that all subsidiary questions which might delay the establishment of such a just peace between the nations, without which peace national stability is everywhere endangered, may be postponed for a later discussion at an international conference.

Second, That the Senate, as part of the treaty-making power of the Government, does hereby consent to and most earnestly advise that at the earliest possible moment consistent with the safety of this Nation American troops be returned from Europe; and, further, that after the establishment of peace the President call upon the Governments of North and South America to appoint two delegates each to an international conference, to be held at some suitable time and place, to consider plans for the closer cooperation of these Governments in promoting justice, progress, and friendship among and within the said countries of the Western Continent; and, further, that the President also, at some time subsequent to this conference of the American Republics, call upon all the nations to appoint delegates to another international conference to be held at some suitable time and place to discuss and consider plans for the promotion of justice, progress, and friendship among and within the nations of the world, such conference to particularly discuss and consider plans for the removal, so far as may be, of the economic and social causes of war, and to this end particularly give attention to—

First. The congestion of population of some nations.

Second. The underpopulation of other nations.

Third. The unregulated competition between the more populous and industrial countries for the raw products and trade of the less populous and agricultural ones.

Fourth. The exploitation of the weaker and the less advanced by the stronger and more highly organized nations.

Fifth. A larger self-determination of peoples and nations.

Sixth. The possibility of the cooperation of the more advanced nations, for the improvement of the conditions of the backward countries, particularly those of Africa and parts of Asia, by the formulation of plans for the reclamation of waste lands, for the utilization of natural resources, including water powers, for wise colonization, for education, and for the spread of civilization, in the interest of those countries and of the world.

Seventh. The best means for the wider and more rapid extension of education and civilization throughout the world, looking to the ultimate elimination of national, racial, and religious antagonisms.

Eighth. The establishment of constitutional republics or of governments of such uniformity throughout the world as would make for that national stability upon which could be based a permanent international order.

Ninth. The elimination of all causes of national enmities and the establishment of friendship and justice between the nations, with a view to the ultimate establishment of a league of nations or world federation of republics, for the purpose of promoting the cause of progress and of peace throughout the earth.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

April 12, 1921.

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) providing for the reestablishment of peace and the calling of an international conference to institute a concert of nations to advise concerning international cooperation as a substitute for the League of Nations.

Whereas on the 11th day of November, 1918, the President of the United States announced the signing of an armistice between the United States and the powers with which the United States had been at war, the President at that time declaring "the war thus comes to an end"; and

Whereas it is most desirable that there shall be a prompt termination of the status of war by the formal legal reestablishment of peace between the United States and Germany; and

Whereas the peace treaty has failed to receive the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate; one of the reasons for the negative action being that more than one-third of the Senate hold that the covenant of the League of Nations incorporated in said treaty, if adopted by the United States, would contravene its fundamental principles as declared in the Declaration of Independence by subjecting the external relations of the United States to the control of a foreign body not recognizing these principles, would violate the Constitution by attempting to change the form of government of the United States without a constitutional amendment, and would ignore and tend to destroy the right of States under the law of nations to defend themselves and to extend civilization in behalf of all civilized nations by means of war when other means are impossible; and

Whereas there is a profound unrest throughout the world, due in large part to the failure of the Paris peace conference to formulate such plans for peace and for international cooperation for the advancement of justice, liberty, and the general welfare as would commend itself to the great liberal spirit of the age and the new enlightened conscience of mankind; and

Whereas the long-continued underproduction and rapid destruction during the war of the necessities and commodities of life, particularly of food, have resulted in a serious shortage, which makes imperatively necessary an immediate reorganization of all agricultural, industrial, financial, and commercial activities for the maximum production in all countries and for the distribution among the nations by the normal methods of trade and commerce of such food, necessities, and commodities; and

Whereas because of the close community of financial, industrial, and commercial interests of all of the nations of the world, the industrial and financial prostration and paralysis of Germany, Austria, Russia, and other recently belligerent countries of Europe, with the necessarily ensuing unemployment, impoverishment, and starvation of their citizens, with the threatened unrest and revolution in certain of these countries, are impeding the rehabilitation and are menacing the peace of the world and the stability of all governments; and

Whereas, therefore, it is desirable to bring about immediately a situation of general peace and to take measures for establishing at the earliest practicable moment a form of international organization, approved by the public sentiment of the people of the United States, to deal with the social and economic problems growing out of the present war, and to bring about as nearly peaceful relations as possible between States by judicious and carefully wrought out measures of international cooperation; and

Whereas those opposing the plan of international organization contained in the covenant of the League of Nations recognize that it has now become necessary for the United States to cooperate methodically and permanently with the States and countries of the world and to take the lead in establishing a concert of nations to direct such cooperation by considered advice, but have heretofore been confined to an indirect and imperfect expression of their views by means of reservations to the said covenant proposed in the Senate: Now, therefore, in order to promote a general pacification, to declare the plan of international organi-

zation approved by those opposed to the plan of the League of Nations, be it

Resolved, etc., That the status of war with Germany, declared by the Congress by Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, on the 5th day of April, 1917, be, and it is hereby, declared to be terminated and the full status of peace be, and it is hereby, declared to be reestablished.

2. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and advised to make treaties of peace without annexations or indemnities and of trade and intercourse with the Republic of Germany, all matters of dispute between the two countries to be submitted for arbitration to The Hague tribunal.

3. That in pursuance of this resolution declaring the reestablishment of peace all American troops now upon foreign soil shall be immediately returned to the United States.

4. That the President is hereby authorized and directed, by invitations to be sent out by him during the month of June, 1921, to invite the States signatory of or adherent to the convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes, of July 24, 1899, and their successors, and all other States since recognized or which may be recognized prior to the sending out of the invitations to send three delegates each and also two delegates in behalf of each of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, respectively, of the various States having colonies, protectorates, or dependencies, to assemble at Washington, on a date in September, 1921, to be fixed in the invitation, to consult concerning the formation of a more perfect general concert and union, the establishment of general justice, the assurance of the general tranquillity, the promotion of the general welfare, and the securing generally of the blessings of liberty to the peoples now living and to their posterity.

5. That the list of said States to be invited shall include the following: Argentine Republic, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjaz, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Yugoslavia, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Persia, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, Salvador, Serbia, Siam, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

6. That the invitations shall expressly state that the motive of the United States in issuing them is to initiate and bring about a concert of nations as a substitute for the League of Nations and shall be expressly with the understandings as herein set forth, namely: There shall be an international conference of the States, composed of three delegates from each of the States, and an assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, composed of two delegates from each of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, the international conference and the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies to sit separately but at the same time. The assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall deliberate exclusively concerning social and economic measures and shall report to the international conference. The international conference and the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall be the first of a series of periodical conferences and assemblies of similar character, meeting at periods of three years at places determined by the international conferences. The general object of the conferences and assemblies shall be to constitute a concert of the States and countries of the world on the general lines of the international conference of American States and the Inter-American high commission, by means of central and national institutions and processes adapted to carry on orderly discussion, deliberation, and judgment concerning matters of common interest with a view to inducing such peaceful and voluntary action of the States in the common interest as may be needful to bring about international cooperation. All resolutions agreed upon either in the international conference or in the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall be of an advisory character, and any international or pan-national organs or processes initiated or instituted shall be of a voluntary nature and shall have only advisory powers. The international conferences shall establish and maintain a system of advisory correspondence, with continuation committees sitting in the intervals between the conferences to prepare for the international conferences and the assemblies of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies and to carry on the system of correspondence. The more specific objects of the international conference, of the assembly of colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, and of the continuation committees, and the purpose of the correspondence between the States participating shall be—

(a) To consider the common and mutual interests and the social and economic relations of the States and peoples of the world as naturally and necessarily united for mutual aid and benefit and to recommend such projects of uniformity or reciprocity in the action of the States, respectively, as will enable them to cooperate for the general welfare.

(b) To formulate a body of international law based on the security of the fundamental rights of the individual as the prime function of all Governments and for applying as between States the analogies of the laws of partnership and cotenancy, and as between States and their respective colonies, protectorates, and dependencies the analogies of the laws of conservatorship, guardianship, and trusteeship.

(c) To devise methods for the advancement of the peoples of colonies, protectorates, or dependencies from the status of dependence to that of independence and to full participation in the international conferences.

(d) To decide concerning the admission into the international conferences of any communities claiming to be States formed by the division of existing States or by the junction of States or parts of States.

(e) To promote cooperation among the more advanced nations for the improvement and advancement of the backward countries and territories, particularly those of Africa and parts of Asia, by the formulation of plans for the reclamation of waste land, for the utilization of natural resources, including water powers, for wise colonization, for the promotion of education and the spread of civilization throughout the world.

(f) To consider the problems of the congestion of some and the underpopulation of other nations and the unregulated competition between the more populous and industrial countries for the trade and raw products of the less populous agricultural ones.

(g) To study the problem of international finance, credits, and exchange with a view to the prompt shipment on suitable credits, particularly into Russia, Germany, Austria, China, Africa, and any other agriculturally or industrially undeveloped or prostrated countries, of tools, agricultural implements, seeds, and other materials necessary to production, as well as foodstuffs, necessities, and commodities, for the purpose of encouraging a resumption of production which will be favorable to the rehabilitation of the world.

(h) To localize hostilities between States by cooperative policing of the high seas of otherwise and to take such action in case of such hos-

tilities that the result of any armed conflict between States may be to increase the area within which the rights of the individual are effectively secured and to render more perfect the union of all the States for mutual aid and benefit.

(i) To make further provision for the pacific settlement of international disputes and for the settlement of such disputes according to accepted principles of law and by due process of law; and for this purpose to establish an international supreme court of justice and a system of inferior international courts having jurisdiction of controversies between States in which the parties in interest are citizens of different States, and also of such controversies between States in their own right as may be susceptible of decision by application of accepted principles of public or private law.

(j) To encourage the establishment, where stable governments do not exist, of constitutional republics or governments of such character as would make for that national stability upon which would be based a permanently peaceful international order, and to promote the institution in each nation of appropriate national agencies of international correspondence and concert and the control by national legislatures of the appointment and instruction of national delegates to the international conferences.

(k) To promote amity and mutual understanding between the oriental and occidental peoples and to proceed with all possible means and speed to conciliate the people of Russia, China, India, Afghanistan, the Central Powers, and Turkey, in order that these nations or countries may not form against the western powers a hostile coalition which might menace the peace of the world.

7. That the President is hereby further authorized and directed, by invitations to be sent out by him during the month of June, 1921, to invite each of the aforesaid States to send five delegates, to be selected from the organized labor bodies of each of said States, to an international conference on labor to be held at Washington at the same time with the international conference of the States and the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, said international conference on labor to sit concurrently with, but separate from and independent of, the international conference of the States and the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies. This international conference on labor may send communications to and advise with the other two aforesaid conferences. It shall be the function of the international conference on labor to consider and deliberate upon all questions affecting the general welfare of labor throughout the world and to make recommendations to the international conference of the States and to the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies of measures which, in the opinion of the international conference on labor, would tend to promote the establishment of general justice, the assurance of the general tranquillity, the promotion of the general welfare, and the securing generally of the blessings of liberty to the peoples now living and to their posterity.

8. That the functions of the United States as the initiator and host of the international conference of the States, of assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, and of the international conference on labor shall be in the charge of a committee which shall come into existence in the month of May, 1921, and shall consist of the then Secretary of State as chairman, the then Secretary of the Treasury, the then Secretary of Commerce, two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The delegation of the United States to the international conference and to the assembly shall be nominated to the President by said organization committee and said nominees when approved by the President shall be appointed by him by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The said organization committee shall also suggest to the first international conference and to the first assembly a plan for their organization, a program of matters to be considered, a project for regulating the action of the continuation committees, and a plan for organizing and regulating the central and national agencies of correspondence and concert; but nothing in the plans, project, or program so suggested shall be inconsistent with the provisions of this resolution.

9. That the general expenses of the international conference and of the assembly shall be borne by the United States, each participating State, however, paying the salaries and expenses of its own delegates and of the delegates in behalf of its colonies, protectorates, and dependencies.

10. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any sums in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the carrying out of the provisions of this resolution the sum of \$500,000.

11. That the provisions of this resolution shall take effect immediately after its passage and its approval by the President.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], let me say that in the summary of the work of the League of Nations at the conclusion of my speech in the Senate on Wednesday, October 5, 1921, which summary was republished in yesterday's RECORD at the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], I find that the eleventh item—the item relating to disarmament—should have included the fact that the last assembly of the league, which met at Geneva on September 5, 1921, directed the league's committee on disarmament to prepare a general plan of disarmament for presentation to the next assembly, which meets this year, the nations to furnish inventories of existing armaments, with a statement of cost. This last assembly also recommended an international conference on restriction of the manufacture of arms and condemned the use of poison gas in war. It recommended that world-wide propaganda be instituted for disarmament.

It will be seen, therefore, that the league is developing a broad and comprehensive plan for disarmament—disarmament on land, disarmament on sea, disarmament in air—a plan embracing nearly all the nations of the world. It will be seen further that the statement that the league has done nothing toward disarmament is without foundation.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I have not heretofore discussed any of these treaties, and in the consideration of this particular treaty there has been little discussion on this side, for the reason we were anxious to cooperate with those who

were steering it through the Senate, that a vote might be taken at the earliest possible moment.

There is no partisanship in the consideration of these treaties, nor was there any in the Conference on the Limitation of Armament. I hardly believe there was ever held a conference so free of politics as this one. While it was called by a Republican President and three of the four delegates representing this Government happened to be members of the majority party, so far as I have heard politics did not creep into it; and, that being true, it has been to some of us a matter of regret that certain Republican spokesmen high in the councils of the party—one holding the second highest official position in the service of the Government have seen fit recently to claim it as a great administrative or Republican achievement. The chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee, whether he employed those words or not, conveyed that meaning; and the Vice President, in his speech on Sunday, which was reported throughout the country, claims it in the first paragraph as a great administrative achievement.

Mr. President, I am speaking now in behalf of this treaty not as a Democrat but as an American. We on this side of the aisle who did oppose the four-power pact did so with regret.

It was not because we desired to prolong the discussion of it or to vote against it that the fight was waged here, that the suggestions of modifications were offered and the amendments or reservations proposed. We earnestly and sincerely hoped that the treaty might be so framed that we could give it our support. From the beginning to the end we have desired that the result of the disarmament conference might be such that it would be acceptable to representatives on both sides of the aisle, and we were indeed sorry that at least one reservation was not accepted to the four-power pact, so that we might have been permitted in the end to vote for it.

We were against that pact because we believed it to be an alliance of the four great powers. We believed it to lay the germs of distrust amongst other nations and be a breeder of wars. We believed that the four powers who joined in the pact should agree to respect the rights of other nations, great or small, the same as according to the terms of the treaty, they were to respect the rights of the parties to the treaty. We believed that it should have been amended so that not only would we be compelled to refrain from all acts of aggression as against the other parties to the treaty and they as against us, but that we and the other powers to the pact by its terms would agree to refrain from all acts of aggression against other powers which might not be named in the pact. We desired that the treaty might be amended so that if a controversy should arise in the Pacific other nations interested than the four nations named in the pact might be invited into the conference that their views might be presented, and that this Government might then take sides in the interest of right and justice as presented in the controversy, without guaranty or obligation upon our part.

It was because such reservations were not included in the four-power pact that the great majority of Democratic Senators in the end voted against it. I have no doubt that if a reservation such as that proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], carrying out the suggestions I have just referred to, had been adopted by the Senate there would not have been half a dozen votes against the final ratification of that treaty. So, Mr. President, the opposition to the four-power pact was not partisan; it was solely in the interest of peace, against "entangling alliances," and toward a good understanding among all nations. I would not have the country get the impression that because there were quite a number of us who voted against the four-power pact there was any partisanship in it or that there was any lack of sincere interest in the success of the disarmament conference.

Sirs, no better proof could be offered that there was no partisanship during the disarmament conference or since the treaties have been presented here than the fact that from the time the conference met until it adjourned no voice was lifted on this side in criticism of the work of the conference. We held our tongues. We wished it well. We tried to cooperate to the fullest extent in having that conference succeed, and I dare say that no member of the delegation representing this Government rendered more splendid service than the Democratic member of that delegation, the leader of the Democrats in this body Mr. UNDERWOOD.

When gentlemen of the opposing party go out upon the hustings from now on until the coming election, proclaiming these treaties as a great achievement of the present administration, I would have those who hear them proclaim that doctrine recall the facts which prompted the convening of the disarmament conference.

I would have those hearers remember how, when other treaties were presented—and that was not very long ago—to this body, the discussion was strung out for days, for weeks, into the months, and almost into years, before the final action was taken. Nothing like that was evidenced in the consideration of these treaties. Indeed, this side of the aisle, through a majority of the minority who opposed the four-power pact in its original form, tried in every way to amend it by reservations or otherwise, to carry out the ideas I have just suggested; we tried to shorten the discussion and we agreed, with only a few weeks' debate, to vote upon the treaty. Unanimous consent was obtained, and the treaty was hastened to its ratification, even though there was very strong opposition to it.

Those who in the coming months hear these spellbinders proclaim that this is an achievement of this administration and of the Republican Party should remember that within less than 48 hours after the naval treaty was presented to the Senate for consideration a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into to vote upon it within less than 50 hours after it was presented, and when the roll is called there will be as few Democrats as Republicans casting their votes against it. It will be ratified almost unanimously. So we are still cooperating and trying to expedite the ratification of these treaties which in our opinion justify it, and the course which is to be pursued as to the other treaties which are to come along, three or four in number, I believe will show the same degree of cooperation and support from this side of the Chamber.

Mr. President, it can not be charged that there is any partisanship in the consideration of these treaties.

As to the history of the matter, what right have the Republicans to claim this treaty, if there is any good in it, as an administration achievement or a Republican achievement? I agree with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that much work lies ahead for us to do toward reducing these large expenditures for the building of armaments, both for the Navy and upon land; that the work is just begun. I agree with him that the success of this conference is not as great as we had hoped for. I am sorry that we are not called upon to ratify a treaty limiting land armament. I am sorry that the treaty pertaining to gases does not go further and prevent their manufacture. I am sorry that there is not a treaty here to prevent the building of submarines and other smaller naval craft. But they are not here. So far as they were concerned, the conference did fail; but this treaty now pending is no doubt the best the American delegates could obtain. It is better than nothing. It does provide for a 10-year naval holiday so far as the building of capital ships are concerned, and will be some saving to the American taxpayer. So I am for it, and enthusiastically for it, and I am sure that that sentiment is entertained by practically every Senator on this side of the aisle.

Mr. President, this conference was called for the limitation of armaments, and in the first call there was nothing said about a four-power alliance; indeed, I suppose the thought had never been conceived. So those in the country who are prone to criticize those of us who opposed the original four-power pact must know that it was not in the original call, had no place in the conference, and the suggestions offered by us to it were of a constructive rather than destructive character—intended to eliminate its highly objectionable features and make it helpful instead of harmful.

Mr. President, what right has anyone who belongs to the party which to-day is in the ascendancy here to claim the results of the conference as an achievement? Are the Republicans not willing to admit that those of us who have been for the plan all the time did something to bring it about? The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] was indeed modest when he said that the author of the disarmament conference resolution was public opinion. Yes; it was public opinion, but the two men who crystallized public opinion in this country and forced the Congress, as well as the President, to call the disarmament conference were the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the ex-President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. It was those two men who popularized the idea and influenced public opinion to force the passage of the disarmament resolution and the calling of the disarmament conference.

I am reminded by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON] of what happened in a Democratic conference before this conference proceeded with its work. In that conference, made up of Democratic Senators, I had the pleasure of offering a resolution wishing for the disarmament conference complete success, and in order that the country may know that from start to finish we on this side were at heart for the success of the disarmament conference, I want to take time to read a resolution which was unanimously adopted in the conference of Democratic Senators on September 28, 1921, after

the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] had been appointed as one of the delegates. The resolution was embodied in an article in the New York Tribune, which reads as follows:

SENATE DEMOCRATS VOTE SUCCESS TO ARMS PARLEY—RESOLUTION ALSO EXPRESSES GRATIFICATION AT SELECTION OF UNDERWOOD.
[From The Tribune's Washington bureau.]

WASHINGTON, September 29.—Senate Democrats, in conference to-day, adopted by unanimous vote a resolution offered by Senator HARRISON, of Mississippi, expressing the hope that the Conference on Limitation of Armament would succeed, and also expressing gratification that Senator UNDERWOOD had been named as a delegate. The resolution follows:

"Whereas it has been a principle of the Democratic Party, for which its leaders have worked, to reduce taxes through limiting large expenditures for armaments:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this conference that the fullest measure of success attend the disarmament conference called by President Harding to meet in the city of Washington on November 11, 1921; and

"Further expresses its gratification at the selection as a member of the conference representing the Government of the United States the Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, the leader of the Democratic minority in the Senate, whose broad statesmanship and sincere advocacy of disarmament and wise counsel amply qualify him as an ideal representative."

So, Mr. President, in the consideration of this treaty, in agreeing to this unanimous consent to vote to-day at 3 o'clock, with but little less than 12 hours for discussion of the great questions involved in it, we have been carrying out the wish and hope of the Democratic Party throughout the country as expressed in this conference of Democratic Senators months ago.

I would not have the country forget that it was back in 1912 when a Democratic Member of the House of Representatives, Mr. Hensley, proposed and had adopted in the House a resolution expressing the hope that some plan might be evolved disarming the nations of the world. I would not have the country forget that in 1916, through Democratic committees in the House and in the Senate, there was incorporated in the naval appropriation bill the idea and the plan of calling a conference for disarmament.

I would not have them forget, either, that it was ex-President Wilson, fighting as no man had ever fought before, who had incorporated in the covenant of the League of Nations article 8, providing for a plan of disarmament.

I would not have them forget that the distinguished Democratic Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], on December 11, 1920, offered a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations just four days before the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] offered his celebrated resolution calling for a disarmament conference. I would not have them forget that it was the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Idaho which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and was voted down in the Committee on Naval Affairs by the Republican members of that committee who were then present, and that every Democratic member of the committee then present voted to report out the Borah resolution.

They should not forget, either, that as public opinion continued to crystallize the Senator from Idaho again offered his resolution, and it again went to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and again the Republican members of that committee voted unanimously against reporting the resolution, and again the Democratic members of the Committee on Naval Affairs voted favorably to report the resolution.

Ah, we will not forget how the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] fought for days and days when the naval appropriation bill was under consideration before the Senate to defeat the Borah resolution, which was offered as an amendment to the naval appropriation bill. The RECORD is full of the utterances of these Senators and others who were on the inside who knew that President Harding had sent the word "down the line" not to accept the Borah resolution in any form. During all this time and at every step the solid Democratic minority was supporting the Senator from Idaho in his efforts to have his resolution passed. It was only after the force of public opinion had moved you and moved the White House that the resolution was finally agreed upon, and as a result of it the disarmament conference was called by President Harding.

Mr. President, there can not be and there is not any politics in this. There should be no partisanship in it. We want to cooperate with you, as we have done in the past, to see these treaties move on out of the way. If you had accepted the suggestions offered on this side of the aisle when the four-power pact was up, as embodied in the Robinson amendment, there would have been little opposition to that pact, the country would have been better satisfied, and there would be little or no disgust now among those nations which are not parties to it.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, there seems to have been a rather continuous effort on the part of a number of Senators on the other side of the Chamber to connect the accomplishments of the Washington conference with the activities or lack of activities of the League of Nations. The continued reference during the session of yesterday and during the session of to-day to the renewed activities of the League of Nations, coming at this time, would lead one to infer that there was a distinct relationship. To me it is amusing, if not pathetic, that they deem it necessary to emphasize the possible activities of the league as having any relationship whatsoever to the actual accomplishments of the Washington conference.

The fact remains, and it can not be successfully controverted, that the conference which met at Washington for approximately 10 weeks, participated in by the representatives of nine nations, accomplished by unanimous consent more in that time than has ever been accomplished by any international conference of any character and, in my judgment, even more than has heretofore ever been hoped for. Without a constitution, without a supergovernment, without a covenant of any kind, simply sitting around the table, authorized by their Governments to endeavor to reach agreements which would bring about at least a start toward disarmament, the delegates unanimously agreed and the results have been represented by the treaties which we have already ratified and are still considering.

The League of Nations may develop in the future some real, definite plan to contribute to the problem of disarmament. I do not know. As the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has suggested, I hope it can do so. It has been in existence for two or more years, and certainly it has had opportunities of all kinds and character because of the turbulent condition in Europe, yet what tangible agreement has resulted? True, the United States does not hold membership in the league, but there is no trouble in the United States, so far as concerns those difficulties which would necessarily and properly be adjusted by such a conference, beyond that which we have met through the conference in Washington. Land disarmament or reduction in Europe could certainly have held and should have held the attention of the league, and the absence of the United States, in my judgment, should not greatly deter, if at all, real positive results if that type of organization is to bring about any results of any kind. European conditions can well focus their attention.

My view of the difference, as I think very well evidenced by the results of the Washington conference as compared to the lack of results on the part of the subdivisions or subcommittees of the League of Nations, is simply because of the fact that this conference worked without supergovernments or constitutions or covenants; rather the representatives sat around the table and conferred as business men sit around the conference table and endeavor to reach conclusions on any subject or any problem they have before them, while under the covenant of the League of Nations the procedure, as we well know, is entirely different.

I believe the result of the Washington conference marks a new era in the settlement of international difficulties, and when differences have arisen, following the usual and ordinary exchange of diplomatic notes through the state departments of different countries, if that fails to bring about a solution, the calling together of representatives of the nations involved in the difficulty or the prospective misunderstanding, without any agreement before they enter into their negotiations, but conferring as representatives ready to give and take, as evidenced by the successful results of the Washington conference, will be the accepted method of settling international disputes.

I have no desire to take from our friends on the other side of the aisle any of their feeling of assurance as to the possible results of the future activities of the League of Nations. If it relieves their minds at all to bring into this debate the League of Nations, with its known failure of accomplishment in this direction during its existence of two or three years, they are certainly entitled to do so; but it would seem to me that the comparison itself of that deplorable lack of results with the definite accomplishments of the conference would make it of doubtful expediency.

I am, however, glad to see the disposition evidenced on the other side of the Chamber to at least join practically unanimously in the ratification of the pending treaty. It marks the commencement certainly of the recognition of a principle that competition between nations in building warships and ironclads is a policy of an age behind us. Perhaps it has not gone far enough, but the principle is certainly definitely established, and if we maintain the ratio of navies as provided under the conference agreement we shall certainly be in relatively the same

position, or even a better one, than we were before the agreement, and the great burden of taxation will be materially relieved.

While referring briefly to that situation, I want it to be understood that I am one of those who believe most positively that with the 5-5-3 ratio, now that our Navy is to be parallel with and equivalent to the other great naval powers, it is our first duty and responsibility to maintain and keep to the pink of perfection the ratio of five allotted to us. The personnel necessary to properly man those ships must be provided, and we must also provide all the equipment necessary for the navy yards and all that is essential to maintain a Navy of the first class. The American people, while I believe they are heartily in favor of this mutual agreement to limit armament, are opposed to any reduction in personnel or appropriations necessary to keep our allotment of the 5-5-3 ratio up to the very maximum of efficiency.

While, in the ratification of the pending treaty, navy personnel is hardly the question before us, yet to me it would seem most unfortunate if as a result of a mutual limitation of armament we should feel that that involved also a lessening of the power of the Navy allotted to us by the agreement reached at the conference.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, yesterday, during the colloquy between the Senator from Alabama and myself, the Senator misapprehended my position in relation to this treaty. I am not opposed to it and shall vote for its ratification, but in so doing entertain the view that it will fail to accomplish all that is expected by many people. I stated in substance yesterday that the treaty does not presage the millenium and will prove in its application and operations a disappointment to the people of the United States, who have been led to believe that it, together with the other treaties formulated at the Washington conference, would bring about world disarmament and relieve the American people of all military and naval burdens.

That this treaty does possess some virtue is gladly conceded, and that it leaves much to be desired all must frankly confess. It does not deal with the question of land disarmament, nor with the entire question of naval disarmament; and there is serious doubt as to whether in dealing with only one factor of naval disarmament it has not accentuated the evils that exist and will be exaggerated by other factors.

Sufficient has already been said by Senators who have discussed this treaty to indicate that there will be but little, if any, reduction in the naval budget which the United States will be called upon to meet during the coming year, as well as during the immediate future. Indeed, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] has just indicated, if I interpreted his remarks correctly, that the burden resulting from naval expenditures will be exceedingly onerous. The Senator from Alabama yesterday declared that for the coming year, and perhaps for several years, there would be no appreciable reduction in the naval expenditures of the United States.

Of course, the reason is obvious. The Washington conference dealt only with capital ships, and it only limited the number of capital ships to be constructed, but it did not limit other naval craft and agencies and instrumentalities to be employed in naval warfare. It did not deal with submarines or airplanes, or bombs, or naval warcraft of less than 10,000 tons. Indeed, the entire field of naval war is left unrestricted and unrestrained, except that branch which deals with capital ships.

With the marvelous developments in modern science and in the engines of destruction, both upon land and upon sea, it is manifest that the future, and the immediate future, will devise innumerable weapons to aid in carrying on naval warfare which may prove to be infinitely more destructive of human life and of the forces of belligerent powers than capital ships. It is also manifest that to restrict one naval weapon without any attempt to restrict others will direct attention to such other naval weapons, as well as to undeveloped fields.

I venture the prediction, Mr. President, that notwithstanding this treaty and the ratio of capital ships provided therein, the demands which will be made by the executive departments of the Government for the coming fiscal year will exceed \$400,000,000. Congress, in my opinion, partly in response to the demands of the Navy Department, will vote appropriations approximating that amount. And there is but little prospect, unless other treaties are negotiated or the League of Nations is successful in its purposes and present activities, of the naval Budget of the United States for the next 10 years being less than \$300,000,000 to \$350,000,000 per annum. In other words, notwithstanding this treaty, the United States will, in my opinion, expend more each year for a number of years than it expended annually for many years prior to 1917. This treaty establishes a standard from which it will be difficult to depart.

The ratio, if carried out, will involve stupendous appropriations upon the part of the United States, so that there is a possibility of its increasing in the aggregate rather than diminishing the naval costs of the United States. However, with all of its defects and imperfections, I can perceive some advantage in the treaty, and, as stated, will support it.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] seems disturbed because of the numerous allusions to the League of Nations. He seems to rest under the belief that the discussion of the league was projected into the debate by its devotees and by those who do not ascribe to the Washington conference a degree of perfection never before attained by human wisdom. I think the record will show that Senators on the other side of the aisle, who have been the proponents of the four-power pact, have not failed to conceal their hostility to the League of Nations. Directly or indirectly, they have attacked it and attempted to belittle its achievements. There has been an evident purpose to glorify the work of the Washington conference and to detract from the achievements of the Paris conference. The efforts to discredit the League of Nations have been, as I have followed the discussion, manifest. The purpose seems to have been to place the work of the Washington conference in juxtaposition to the League of Nations and claim for the former virtues and advantages to which the latter may lay no claim whatever.

I venture to suggest, however, that the pitiful efforts made by many of our Republican friends to discredit the League of Nations and its splendid achievements will not be welcomed by a majority of the American people or by the liberal sentiment and the progressive forces of the world. The League of Nations, notwithstanding the obstacles interposed to its success and notwithstanding the powerful opposition which it has encountered from the Republican administration and from many Republican leaders, is still a living and vital force throughout the world.

Undoubtedly the absence of the United States from the league has materially weakened it and has constituted an impediment to its more effective operation. Its record of achievements is, however, impressive, and challenges the admiration of all who desire world peace and seek world fellowship. The league will not, I sincerely hope, be destroyed by the Washington conference, although the alliance which results from the four-power pact may further weaken it. It is quite possible that the nations now belonging to the league may regard the alliance between the United States, Great Britain, Japan, and France as an attack upon the league and as designed to absolutely bring about its destruction. Of course, if this view should become universal and should be sincerely accepted by a large number of nations now supporting the league, the result upon the league would not only be unfortunate but, indeed, disastrous.

My principal opposition to the four-power treaty grew out of the fact that I believed that it would be regarded as an alliance and would provoke resentments and counteralliances; that it would be regarded by some nations as an assault upon the league by the four great powers, signatories to the treaty, and as the beginning of a war upon the league which would end only in its destruction. Believing as I do in the league—that is, in a world league, with the necessary provisions for conciliation, arbitration, disarmament, and the enforcement of the mandates and sanctions of the league—I view with disfavor any movement calculated to destroy the league or to devitalize it or to diminish the confidence of the people of the world in its work and in its beneficent purposes. I look with apprehension upon groups or alliances of nations, believing that other groups and other alliances may be formed, thus reviving the old system which has been discredited and which has brought so much of sorrow and woe to the world.

But returning to the treaty before us and its effect upon our naval expenditures, let me say that we appropriated for the current year approximately \$500,000,000. That tax was enormous, and imposed a burden upon the American people which they ought not to be called upon to bear in peace times. For the coming fiscal year, notwithstanding this treaty, if we are to follow the views of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], the appropriation will not be greatly reduced. I make the prediction that Senators who urge enormous appropriations will resist all efforts made by Senators upon the floor to cut the naval expenses to reasonable limits.

When the Senator from Idaho was speaking a few moments ago I called attention to an article which discussed the accomplishments of the Washington conference, and referred particularly to the treaty which is now before us. In view of the extravagant claims which have been made by partisan Republicans

as to the work of the Washington conference, I desire to make further reference to the article which seems to point a rather different story.

The Senator from New Jersey has just stated that the achievements of the Washington conference were the greatest that the world had ever seen. Mr. President, I might say in passing that those who are acquainted with history can point to a half dozen conferences and congresses of nations where the results, so far as disarmament was concerned, were greater than will be the result of the ratification of this treaty which we are now considering.

The article to which I refer was written by Mr. Archibald Hurd, one of the greatest naval experts in the world, and appeared in the Fortnightly Review of January, 1922. It is entitled "Washington naval standards; war fleets of four million tons." He says:

What will be the influence of the naval agreement on the world's fleets? It will impose upon the maritime nations of the world what will come to be regarded as a liability to maintain warships of all types, of approximately 4,000,000 tons displacement, costing, roughly, \$800,000,000; and unless amendments are accepted—

And there is no evidence of a disposition to accept amendments, let me add—

It will set up a higher standard for submarines, placing upon each nation what amounts practically to an obligation to continue building submarines—

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. EDGE. Do I understand the Senator from Utah to have made the statement that many international conferences in the past had accomplished greater results in the matter of the limitation of naval armaments than had been accomplished by the Washington conference?

Mr. KING. The Senator from New Jersey understood the Senator from Utah correctly, but I have not time to go into that question now.

Mr. EDGE. Will the Senator enlighten us by stating when the conferences which he has in mind were held?

Mr. KING. If the Senator will do me the honor, when I discuss the other treaties, to listen to me I shall try to enlighten him, although I do not know how successful I shall be.

Mr. EDGE. I should think that now would be a particularly appropriate time, inasmuch as we are about to vote on the subject.

Mr. KING. The Senator, of course, may indicate the line of argument which he desires to pursue for himself, but I decline to permit him to prescribe the line of argument which I shall follow.

Mr. EDGE. I bow to the Senator's privilege.

Mr. KING. Mr. Hurd, in his article, further proceeds, completing the sentence when I was interrupted by the Senator from New Jersey:

in opposition to the whole spirit of the American notes to Germany during the war, and the naval clauses of the peace treaty, which called upon Germany to surrender all her submarines and to undertake to build no more of that description. The conference, in short, will result in an inconsiderable reduction in the number and size of surface vessels, but an expansion of the submarine flotillas. In the face of these facts it has been suggested that the Washington conference is bringing about "naval disarmament," and that navies are going to be practically abolished.

That is the propaganda which has been conducted in the United States. The author continues:

On examination it must become apparent that it is doing little more than varying the factors of naval power, subtracting from the surface tonnage of the world by scrapping obsolescent capital ships, while adding to its submarine tonnage, and checking what might have proved a most ruinous rivalry in naval power expressed in terms of super-dreadnoughts, costing anything from \$7,000,000 to \$10,000,000 each.

There is the crux of the situation. Instead of spending the large sums which in the past we have expended for super-dreadnoughts, and which the United States had proposed to continue to expend in the future for capital ships, possibly larger sums will be devoted to the construction of submarines, aircraft, and other weapons of offensive and defensive warfare. In other words, as suggested by Mr. Hurd—

there will be a transference of expenditures from capital ships to various other kinds of instrumentalities for naval warfare.

As Mr. Hurd states—

there are various factors in naval warfare. The United States has very foolishly been emphasizing capital ships and ignored to too great an extent undersea warcraft and aerial warcraft.

Our naval board has pursued reactionary policies rather than progressive ones. It has stubbornly followed the 1916 program, calling for hundreds of millions of capital ships, notwithstanding the fact that the war demonstrated that there were other important factors which challenge the supremacy of the capital ship.

As Senators know, Great Britain built no capital ships during the closing years of the war, nor has she built any since, and the same is true of France. As intimated by Mr. Hurd, the Washington conference deals with a factor in naval warfare, to wit, capital ships, the utility of which, in view of modern science and aerial warfare and undersea warfare, may be seriously, if not successfully, called into question.

The Senator from Idaho has just called attention to the fact that one nation is already devising a superior type of submarine. This type is much larger, and the submarines will have a wider cruising radius and greater carrying capacity. They will, indeed, have greater speed and will constitute formidable warcraft. Undoubtedly they will make more uncertain the value of capital ships for war purposes.

The naval experts in other nations are devising new types of warcraft, some operating upon the surface and some underneath the surface. Undoubtedly there will be remarkable developments in submarine warcraft, particularly since there has been a limitation in the use of capital ships. Undoubtedly Great Britain, France, and Japan, and perhaps the United States, will spend much more money in the construction of submarines and smaller naval craft than they would have expended except for this treaty. And so, as some writers are now insisting, the effect of the present treaty will merely be to divert some of the funds employed in the construction of battleships to the construction of other naval craft, and the net result, so far as saving is concerned, will be inappreciable.

Last Friday, in the House of Commons, the British air minister presented a report to Parliament showing the importance of aircraft, not only in land but in naval warfare, and made a strong appeal for large appropriations for the military and naval air-service branch of the Government. He referred to the importance of aerial craft for military purposes, both offensively and defensively, directing attention to the importance of developing aerial warfare and to the great work which had been done by aircraft not only upon land but upon sea. He also alluded to the efficacy of aircraft in the revolutionary movement in South Africa, whereby a few airships dispersed hundreds of armed revolutionists and enabled the loyal troops to quickly quell the revolutionary outbreak.

Mr. Hurd proceeds:

The Hughes scheme was also exposed to the legitimate criticism because it allotted to each of the three powers a large tonnage of submarines, thus raising the cruiser problem in acute form, since the cruiser, in association with small craft, is the antidote to the submarine. Mr. Balfour at the outset made it clear to the conference that the British delegation would support a proposal for the abolition of submarines, or, failing that, would welcome an understanding limiting the aggregate tonnage of each power, as well as the size of submarines which each power might be allowed to build. It at once became apparent that certain maritime countries, weak in large surface craft, would regard with disfavor any agreement which restricted their freedom to build submarines. It was suggested that the British delegation were impelled by the very weakness of the position of the British Isles in relation to supplies of food and raw materials to take a biased view of the problem.

You ignore, it was declared in effect, the needs of those States with limited funds for naval defense, which can not afford to build many surface craft—battleships, battle cruisers, light cruisers, and destroyers—and who have welcomed the submarine as offering to them an effective and cheap means of providing for their defense. The submarine is the antidote to the capital ships, and we can not agree to its excommunication.

He further says, after examining the program which was laid down by Secretary Hughes and the ratio of 5-5-3:

These alterations do not vitiate any of the arguments in the preceding pages of this article, but, on the contrary, reinforce the contention that the influence of the naval agreement upon naval expenditure in this country as well as elsewhere will not be considerable.

He makes the further observation:

In these circumstances not only will the adoption of "piracy" in the next war remain a possibility—

Speaking of submarines and their use—

but the suspicion that attack may again be made upon sea-borne commerce by "the assassins of the sea" may lead to a general movement for arming merchant ships, besides imposing upon the naval powers with considerable mercantile marines the heavy responsibility of maintaining large numbers of patrol craft.

In other words, Mr. Hurd sees the use of submarines enlarged and emphasized, an increase in their production and use, the necessity of larger expenditures for patrol craft, for submarine chasers, for scout cruisers, and for other important and costly weapons of war.

The main influence for good which the naval agreement will exert, if the submarine menace can be laid—

But, of course, it is obvious from his pages that it can not be laid—

will be the elimination of all idea of naval rivalry and the creation of a new spirit in relation to the armaments of the sea. That it will result in considerable naval economies, apart from the sums which might have been expended in the construction of new capital ships, is an anticipation which, as has been shown, rests upon no foundation.

It is clear, Mr. President, that Mr. Hurd does not expect important economies from the Washington conference or any material alleviation from the burdens resulting from the construction of naval warcraft. We know that France intends to construct larger and better submarines. It has been stated by numerous persons, some of whom are naval experts, that the submarine is the weapon which places the small state—at least for defensive purposes—upon a plane of substantial equality with the great state, and that with the development of submarines and aircraft an offensive naval war is rendered more difficult.

Admiral Sims, as well as other great naval experts, has repeatedly declared that it would be impossible for Great Britain to bring her capital ships across the Atlantic and make war upon the United States, or for the United States to send its war fleet to the Asiatic coast to make war upon Japan or any Asiatic power. As a result of submarines and aircraft and bombs and torpedoes, the greatest naval experts in the world have revised their judgment as to the value of capital ships, and many have declared that the day of the capital ship has passed. Without expressing any opinion upon that matter, it is obvious that with swift scouts and large cruisers and submarines, with a radius of several thousand miles; with airplane carriers and improved airships which may drop bombs upon warcraft; with the perfection achieved in the sowing of the sea with bombs and mines, which proved destructive of great war vessels, battleships are not as formidable as they formerly were; and it is clear that with the limitation in the construction of battleships large amounts will be devoted to the construction of other instrumentalities of naval warfare. Mr. Hurd has very much reason for the conclusions which he has drawn and the convictions which he has expressed.

Mr. President, I have before me the Fortnightly Review of February, 1922, which contains an article entitled "Evasions of Washington," by Mr. Lancelot Lawton. Speaking of the Washington conference, he says it—

has changed very little the territorial arrangements of the Far East. From a strategical point of view none of the powers will be at all inconvenienced. Great Britain retains Hongkong; France has Saigon, with its splendid anchorage of Camranh Bay; while Japan's favored position in Manchuria and Mongolia is actually strengthened by formal reaffirmation and recognition. But what about the limitation of naval armaments, it will be asked—surely in this respect the achievement of the conference was immense? To which I make reply: "Take up a map and glance for a moment at the vast expanse of the Pacific, and you will realize that Japan, situated as she is in the remote east, with China lying at her very doorway, occupies an almost unassailable position." In view of these geographical realities the ratio of battleships was not so important to her as many would have us believe. So long as she possesses an adequate fleet of submarines and supply of airplanes her position is as near to being impregnable as any position could well be.

Washington, therefore, has not achieved quite so much as has been imagined. Its success is only spectacular and superficial; the Pacific problem remains, in fact, unsolved; and the evil day of reckoning has merely been postponed. One can not help feeling that Washington has not even grasped what the Pacific problem really is. This was hardly to be wondered at. Statesmen wait on public opinion, and public opinion in turn waits on statesmen. Who leads and who is led it would be hard to determine. Hence things move slowly, and it is only when we are actually face to face with a great crisis that we bestir ourselves—often, alas, too late.

He further says:

The Japanese, who, unlike the western powers, are not saturated with sentiment, perceive where they are going. They have been willing to agree to a reduction of naval armaments which does not impair in the slightest degree their unassailable position in the Far East. At the same time they continue to maintain what is undoubtedly the most powerful army in the world. In so far as the Washington conference permits them to effect naval economies, it will relieve their internal difficulties, which were certainly becoming rather pressing. For this the Japanese must be profoundly grateful to President Harding. But to speak quite plainly, they have given up nothing that matters. Their secret military and economic agreements with China remain, and they still possess a colossal army, with a navy strong enough to insure against all comers the safe transport of troops to the Asiatic continent.

He further says:

The four-power agreement to maintain the status quo in the Pacific entirely ignores the wrongs of the past and realities of the present. It is merely a device of the diplomatists to justify all the previous hopes that were centered upon Washington. But it is neither a solution nor even the beginning of a solution—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, from what is the Senator reading?

Mr. KING. From an article in the February number of the Fortnightly Review by Mr. Lancelot Lawton. This writer declares the work of the Washington conference to be spectacular and superficial. I have not time to read the entire article, Mr. President, but a perusal of it will not be reassuring to those who attribute such supernatural qualities to the work of the Washington conference and ascribe to it invisible other powers to heal the nations and to destroy the hard visage of war. In my opinion, there is much loose talk of the flamboyant and, I

was about to say, "flapdoodle" character relative to the accomplishments of the conference.

It were better to describe the work of the conference as it actually is and seek to appraise it at its true value. Already the minds of the people have been inflamed and their imaginations wrought up to the highest point in expectation of universal peace and a relief from the burdens of naval and military armament. Some Senators who are now so loud in their declamatory utterances as to the transcendent virtues of the conference will have their faith and, indeed, their sincerity tested in the next few months, and particularly when the naval and Army bills are brought before the Senate for discussion.

In the Saturday Review of February 11, 1922, appears an article entitled "The Results of Washington." The article is rather gloomy and pessimistic and sees but unimportant gains by reason of the conference. It declares that the conference yielded to the demands of the French for a huge fleet of submarines when the British proposed the total abolition of submarines, although their own submarine fleet was the best in existence. It refers to the action of the conference in declaring a submarine tax upon merchant vessels as unlawful, and then states that the provision "will certainly be disregarded." The writer proceeds to state that if France builds a great fleet of submarines Britain will be compelled to build antisubmarine craft in proportion, and thus incur great expense.

This language is also employed:

Owing to the action again of France, the arms conference was a complete failure in bringing about a reduction of land armaments—certainly, viewed in all implications, as great a matter as any that came before the conference. It may be said, however, without unfairness, that America was concerned much more in a reduction of naval than of land armaments.

The article further declares that—

the conference failed to take really effective steps to protect China from encroachments. It passed at an early stage Senator Root's four pious resolutions about maintaining unimpaired the sovereignty and territorial integrity of China—resolutions which did no more than echo former statements of the powers, and can easily be broken by an aggressive power. The same may be said of the nine-power treaty which reaffirms the doctrine of the "open door," and leaves China to herself. Another failure was shown in giving in to Japan's demand to cancel the fourth of the Hughes resolutions, allowing the board of reference, which is to be set up, to examine the past as well as the future concessions and agreements made by China with the other powers. Japan thus secured by default her extensive claims in Manchuria and other former concessions of the greatest value.

In conclusion the article says:

To sum up, the truth about the conference is that if its conclusions are indorsed by the Senate some of the problems of the Pacific may be considered as settled for a time, but others, and not the least important, remain.

Mr. President, I have not called attention to these articles in any critical spirit, but to show the point of view of others who have examined the work of the conference with great interest and with a desire to discover what was really accomplished. It is disquieting to those who expected naval disarmament upon the part of the nations participating in the conference to learn that perhaps but little saving will result from the treaties accomplished and that "factors," using the expression of Mr. Hurd, of naval warfare not in the past regarded as of such paramount importance will now be emphasized and developed to the highest possible degree of perfection.

It is known that not only in the United States but in many lands research work is being done with a view to improving aircraft as well as submarines. Scientific men and experts are giving their attention to all forms of aircraft and to the production of the most deadly explosives. The Washington conference imposed no restrictions upon aerial warfare. In my opinion, a remarkable impetus will be given to the development of aircraft and, as I have stated, submarines much more deadly and effective than any heretofore dreamed of will be produced, so that the economies supposed to have resulted from limitation in the construction of capital ships will be lost in the expenditures for various other engines of destruction, both upon land and upon sea.

Lord Percy Scott, Admiral Sims, Admiral Fullam, and other naval experts in the United States and elsewhere have stated, in effect, that the primacy of the battleship had come to an end. Experiments recently conducted by the Navy Department show the deadly effects of bombs dropped from the air upon or in the vicinity of the most powerful warships. There has been too much emphasis laid by our Naval Board upon the capital ship. The surface craft have been emphasized, and the fact that naval warfare must be conducted upon three planes has not been always in the minds of our naval constructors and those determining our naval policies. The Washington conference deals with the heavy craft of one plane, but does not deal with the other two planes—under the sea and over the

sea. Unless other treaties are negotiated, and unless the League of Nations brings about a limitation in naval armament, there will be remarkable development in airplanes and in submarines. The scout cruiser with the swiftness of light will be developed and other water craft of a deadly nature will be developed to take the place of the capital ship.

The hope which I have of future reduction in armament rests largely upon the League of Nations. If the powers who have signed the treaty before us shall immediately signify their desire to cooperate with the League of Nations and work with it for the purpose of bringing about world disarmament, then the work of the conference may be of far-reaching importance and benefit to the world. It is to be hoped that there will be no attempt by the signatories to the four-power pact to set up a rival organization or to cripple or disparage or weaken the league.

Mr. President, there are other treaties which we will act upon within the next day or two. I shall not enter upon an examination of them at this time. It has been said by many that at least two of them are merely magnificent gestures. The great powers assembled at the conference professed the greatest interest and devotion to the welfare of China. They professed a desire to maintain her territorial integrity and to recognize her political independence. A treaty will be presented to us which scarcely measures up to these high-sounding protestations and declarations. It in effect declares that China is not a nation and is incapable of governing herself or of providing her own revenues to meet governmental expenditures. A treaty was drawn which imposes upon China tariff duties.

It is tantamount to saying that the powers will not permit China to manage her own fiscal or internal affairs or to enact legislation for her own welfare and development.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that some of the work of the conference can be indorsed by the American people. It promises some benefits, but its record is not without alloy, and the future alone can determine just what good has been wrought. I have been desirous of supporting the treaties prepared at the conference and have earnestly attempted to discover reasons to justify voting for the ratification of all of them. As indicated, I shall vote for the pending treaty, sincerely hoping that it may prove of benefit to the United States and to the world.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, most of the time occupied by Senators on the other side of the aisle in the debate upon this treaty has been an endeavor to show that the result of the Washington conference, after all, was a weak, puny infant, never destined to reach maturity, and really not of any particular value anyway; yet yesterday afternoon the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HUTCHINSON] occupied about 20 minutes in endeavoring to claim paternity for this puny infant for the Democratic Party, and this afternoon reference has been made to the attempt that has been made from time to time to contrast this treaty and the other treaties growing out of the Washington conference with the Versailles treaty.

Mr. President, it is true that there are some very sharp contrasts between these treaties and the Versailles treaty. One of the contrasts is in the fact that in the Versailles treaty Shantung was taken from China and given to Japan, while the Washington conference rectified that wrong and restored Shantung to China.

Mr. President, it is clear from the speeches which have been made on the other side of the aisle that the Democratic Party stands to-day upon the League of Nations and the treaty of Versailles as they stood two years ago; that if they had the votes to-day they would enter into the Versailles treaty and the League of Nations exactly as presented to the Senate by President Wilson. When they admit that, Mr. President, it is a little curious how they found it so difficult, and so many of them found it impossible, to support the four-power treaty, because they said they were afraid that some time we might be called upon under it to come to the aid of Japan against Russia, whereas if they had the power to-day to ratify the Versailles treaty they would bind the United States, in case this island of Sakhalin, about which they have talked so much, were invaded by the red army of Russia, not to go into a conference but to send American soldiers and American battleships across the Pacific Ocean to drive the Russians out of the island of Sakhalin.

Mr. President, we have heard much about the four-power treaty being an alliance and the troubles we would get into if we ratified it, even if there be no commitment to force, because, it has been repeatedly said upon the other side of the aisle, if we enter into an understanding with four nations it is sure to result in an alliance among nations not within the group. Yet, Mr. President, after all this talk about this four-

power treaty being a quadruple alliance, we yesterday found the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], in discussing the question of land disarmament, complaining because the United States has not entered into a triple alliance with Great Britain and France against Germany.

If it was wrong for the United States, France, Japan, and Great Britain to enter into a friendly understanding to consult together with reference to disputes which may arise in the Pacific, if the very existence of that understanding would give rise in the future to an understanding between Germany, China, and Russia, I would like to ask Senators on the other side, if that be true, why they were willing to vote to ratify the Anglo-Franco-United States treaty, which committed the United States to war, which committed the United States to again send its soldiers across the Atlantic Ocean to fight against Germany? That is exactly what they proposed to do, and that is what the Senator from Montana insisted yesterday we ought to have done in this Washington conference; that we ought to have made such an agreement with France, in order to secure a limitation of her army, and that we ought now to enter into a triple agreement, not for consultation, not for conference, but that the United States ought to agree to go to war in Europe, join with Great Britain and join with France in fighting Germany in case there was any unprovoked aggression upon France by Germany in the future.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We did that in 1917.

Mr. LENROOT. We did that in 1917, yes; but we did not do it because Germany invaded France.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Such an agreement as that proposed by France would be a protection against us being obliged to do it again.

Mr. LENROOT. We did not do it because Germany invaded France, and the Senator from Montana was one who helped win the election in 1916 upon the promise that we would not get into the European war. Germany had invaded France then. Was the Senator from Montana, was the Democratic Party, in favor of going to the aid of France in 1914? Were they in favor of going to the aid of France in 1915? Were they in favor of going to the aid of France in 1916? If they were, why did they not say so to the people of America, in which case President Wilson would not have been elected to a second term?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Since that time the party of the Senator from Wisconsin, or many members of it, have taunted the Democratic Party because they did not go in as soon as the *Lusitania* was sunk, or as soon as Belgium was invaded, and I dare say the Senator from Wisconsin joined in that.

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator thinks that is an answer, he is welcome to it.

The Senator from Montana, however, would have the United States enter into an agreement to do at any time in the future what his party thought in 1914, 1915, and 1916 the United States never should do. They complain about the quadruple treaty in the Pacific on the ground that it is an alliance, although there is no commitment to force; but if the Democratic Party had the votes to-day, they would have the United States enter into the Versailles treaty, with its commitment upon the part of the United States to send its soldiers to every part of the globe and fight in every quarrel of the world, although it might not affect us in the least. If they had the votes to-day, they would ratify the treaty making a triple alliance against Germany, a treaty entered into between Great Britain, France, and the United States, to send our boys across the Atlantic to fight, although the issue might not in the least concern the welfare of the United States.

That is the record, Mr. President, the Democratic Party is making in this debate. That is the record which will be read by the American people.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Wisconsin hurts his reputation by being inconsistent. I, for one, do not hold it against him. However, it is hard to understand how one who claims to have such a correct knowledge of international law as does the Senator from Wisconsin could assert that an alliance between four powers to consult together about the best means of waging war against some other nation with which one of these powers may be engaged in a controversy is the same thing as the League of Nations, which sought to bring into a common council all the nations of the earth, those with whom we may have had a controversy, as well as those with whom we entertained friendship, and there adjust any differences which might arise.

I am sure he fools himself; he has the power of intoxicating himself with his own reasoning, but he does not fool anyone but himself when he asserts that there is no difference between an alliance under which four powers bound by a treaty agree to

consult as to the best means of resisting aggression and a conference among all the people to settle all international difficulties in a peaceable manner.

I shall not argue with a Senator who has that viewpoint; it is useless; a man who can not see a difference between an agreement among three or four men that they will stand together and resist any other man's assertion of right, and a community of law-abiding citizens, under which all of them agree to assert their rights under a common law which affects each one of them alike. Here are four nations which bind themselves that if a controversy shall arise between one of those nations and some other outside power the four will consult together in order to devise the best means of resisting aggression. The league provided all nations should have a common council, as all citizens of a country shall recognize a common law, and if a difference should arise they would consult together under the law as to the best means of adjusting the differences. That is the difference between the four-power pact and the League of Nations. One is an alliance for war; the other a pact for peace.

I would, if I could, follow the logic of the Senator from Wisconsin, but I feel that if I were to do so I should meet myself coming back. The Senator thinks it is a wonderful thing for four nations to get together to adjust their differences, but a horrible thing for all nations to agree to do so. If it is a good thing for four nations so to agree—and it may be—how much better would it be for all the nations so to agree that they will adjust peaceably all their differences? Law grew up by groups of people asserting a common right. Nobody contends that the old feudal times, when one lord defended his clan against another, were better than our times, when all of us who are citizens of a common country recognize a common sovereignty and obey a common law. Yet the comparison is made here of all the people of the world who say they want to inaugurate a reign of law as against a reign of individual selfishness, and four nations which bind themselves together to respect each other's rights. Here are four nations which have bound themselves together to respect each other's rights, and it is said it augurs well for peace. How can Senators say that if the agreement of four nations to consult together in order to keep the peace is a wise thing, an understanding among all the nations of the earth to consult together is a bad thing? I have no power of following that kind of logic. The Senator from Wisconsin may have that field to himself.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fletcher	McNary	Smoot
Ball	France	Moses	Spencer
Borah	Frelinghuysen	Myers	Stanfield
Broussard	Gerry	Nelson	Sterling
Bursum	Glass	New	Sutherland
Calder	Gooding	Oddie	Swanson
Cameron	Hale	Overman	Townsend
Capper	Harris	Owen	Trammell
Caraway	Harrison	Page	Underwood
Colt	Hitchcock	Pepper	Wadsworth
Culberson	Johnson	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	King	Poindexter	Warren
Dial	La Follette	Pomerene	Watson, Ga.
Dillingham	Lenroot	Rawson	Watson, Ind.
Edge	Lodge	Sheppard	Weller
Elkins	McCormick	Shields	Williams
Ernst	McCumber	Shortridge	Willis
Fernald	McLean	Simmons	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The hour of 3 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will proceed to vote on the treaty. The treaty is in Committee of the Whole and the question is on agreeing to chapter 2. Without objection, it is agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. The further reading of those chapters has been dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to chapter 3. Without objection, it is agreed to. If there are no amendments to be proposed to the treaty as in Committee of the Whole, it will be reported to the Senate.

The treaty was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The treaty is in the Senate and open to amendment. If there are no amendments, and without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the resolution of ratification, which the Secretary will report.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive L, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, a treaty between the United

States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, agreeing to a limitation of naval armament, concluded at Washington February 6, 1922.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution of ratification, and the question will be taken by yeas and nays.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LODGE (when Mr. BRANDEGEE'S name was called). The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] is detained from the Senate. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. CARAWAY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote as I shall vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES]. If present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. I am reliably informed that on this question he would vote as I shall vote. I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BROUSSARD (when Mr. RANSELL'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. RANSELL] is absent on business of the Senate. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. CARAWAY (when Mr. ROBINSON'S name was called). I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON] is unavoidably absent on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], who is absent. If he were present he would vote as I shall vote, and I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DIAL (when Mr. SMITH'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. SMITH] is detained on official business of the Senate. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I am informed that that Senator, if present, would vote as I intend to vote, and I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who is absent. I understand, however, that he would vote as I expect to vote upon this measure, and therefore I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BALL. My colleague [Mr. DU PONT] is absent on account of illness. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. MCCORMICK. I have a standing pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. I am informed that if he were present that Senator would vote as I shall vote, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. ERNST (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY]. I am informed that if present he would vote as I voted. Therefore I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. NICHOLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] are absent on the business of the Senate. If present these Senators would vote "yea."

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY], if present, would vote "yea."

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are absent on official business. If present they would all vote "yea."

The roll call resulted—yeas 74, nays 1.

YEAS—74.

Ashurst	Curtis	Hale	McLean
Ball	Dial	Harris	McNary
Borah	Dillingham	Harrison	Moses
Broussard	Edge	Hitchcock	Myers
Bursum	Elkins	Johnson	Nelson
Calder	Ernst	Jones, Wash.	New
Cameron	Fernald	King	Oddie
Capper	Fletcher	La Follette	Overman
Caraway	Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Owen
Colt	Gerry	Lodge	Page
Culberson	Glass	McCormick	Pepper
Cummins	Gooding	McCumber	Phipps

Pittman	Simmons	Townsend	Watson, Ga.
Poindexter	Smoot	Trammell	Watson, Ind.
Pomerene	Spencer	Underwood	Weller
Rawson	Stanfield	Wadsworth	Williams
Sheppard	Sterling	Walsh, Mass.	Willis
Shields	Sutherland	Walsh, Mont.	
Shortridge	Swanson	Warren	

NAYS—1.

France

NOT VOTING—21.

Brandegee	Kellogg	Newberry	Robinson
Crow	Kendrick	Nicholson	Smith
du Pont	Keyes	Norbeck	Stanley
Harrell	Ladd	Norris	
Hedin	McKellar	Ransdell	
Jones, N. Mex.	McKinley	Reed	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the treaty.

Mr. STANLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I was temporarily absent from the Chamber when the roll was called on the naval limitation treaty. If present, I would have voted "yea."

NOMINATIONS REPORTED.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in closed executive session, to report favorably from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys certain nominations and ask that they may go to the calendar; also a similar favorable report from the Committee on Naval Affairs certain appointments, and I ask that they may go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

PUBLIC-LAND ENTRIES BY DISABLED EX-SOLDIERS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I present a conference report on House bill 9633. It is a complete report, and I ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

The report was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9633) to extend the provisions of section 2305, Revised Statutes, and of the act of September 29, 1919, to those discharged from the military or naval service of the United States and subsequently awarded compensation or treated for wounds received or disability incurred in line of duty, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

REED SMOOT,

T. J. WALSH,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

N. J. SINNOTT,

ADDISON T. SMITH,

JOHN E. RAKER,

Managers on the part of the House.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT IN BROOKLYN.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, in Brooklyn last Sunday, under the auspices of the Brooklyn Institute, Vice President Coolidge delivered a most comprehensive address on the subject of "A year of reconstruction." I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the RECORD in the regular RECORD type.

There being no objection, the Vice President's address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

A YEAR OF RECONSTRUCTION.

At the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, Brooklyn, N. Y., at 3 o'clock Sunday afternoon, March 26, 1922, Vice President Calvin Coolidge spoke as follows:

The fundamental ideal of mankind is the attainment of liberty. This motive has been predominant through all the centuries. The course which it follows depends on environment. Institutions grow up to fit conditions. Failing that they disappear. The institution which developed national liberty was monarchy. The institution which maintains individual liberty is the Republic.

Parliamentary government is not peculiar to any time or place. The germ of it has scarcely ever failed to appear in the development of any people. Wherever it has been able to grow to maturity into a true form of representative Government its nature has been determined by the predominance of contending forces. There is no such thing as a free man in a subject State. There were parliaments in Spain and France which developed earlier than that of Great Britain. No doubt the largest contributing factor to their decline and final disuse was

the menace of foreign conquest. For purposes of national defense a commander in chief surpasses a legislative body. A constant pressure from without upon the countries of the European Continent made it necessary to submerge the freedom of the individual to insure the freedom of the realm. The grant of authority to raise money to support the army in time of war was carried over by the monarch into a claim of the right to support the government by the same taxes in time of peace. At the outbreak of the French Revolution the states general, which in theory alone possessed the taxing power, had not been summoned for 175 years.

Across the English Channel there was more seclusion. England was free from foreign invasion after the days of William the Conqueror. A sturdy people found an almost invincible ally of national defense in their surrounding waters. There the predominant force against the development of freedom came from within. Relieved of pressure from without, individual liberty was able to prevail. In the long contest culminating with the Stuarts, who even sought to preserve the claim of the monarchy by the device of foreign wars, the power of the King has been steadily limited, the power of Parliament steadily enlarged, until it stands to-day practically supreme. The power which it holds over the individual has scarcely any limit save in the temper of the people. The supports of stability were strengthened by an upper house, hereditary in its foundation, but continually refreshed with new memberships drawn from the people. By this means vested interests and popular rights are both protected. But when party control of the House of Commons changes, the whole Government changes with it. The dominant power in the Commons is the dominant power in the whole Empire.

The working out of these principles has been apparent in American history. The early colonists were strongly individual in theory, but public peril contributed largely to making them national in practice. When General Wolfe won victory on the Plains of Abraham, the colonists, relieved of the menace of an alien invasion, were ever after unhampered from without in the natural desire for greater liberty. They soon found that so long as they remained with the British Empire they were subject to the claims of supreme authority on the part of a Parliament then dominated by the influences of a king ambitious to grasp the entire sovereign power. That problem was solved by the American Revolution, which took from the territory of the British Empire but added to the freedom of all British subjects.

Creative action grows into institutions. The experience of the Revolutionary period was gathered up, declared, and adopted in the American Constitution. That instrument of government recognizes that sovereign power resides in the people alone. It was created to guarantee individual liberty. It intrusted the supreme authority of government to neither executive nor legislature. It provided a republic to be administered by representatives of the people. As a further guaranty of freedom its powers are limited and its functions divided and separated. There are three departments: Legislative, executive, and judicial, independent of each other, with power to function only in their own sphere, but each acting as a check on the other. The sovereignty of the people does not, therefore, express itself with that completeness in the legislative body which is the characteristic of the British Parliament, but is divided between the Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court of the United States. To impose any burden on the people these three great powers must act in substantial harmony, but acting alone any one of them can save the people from any diminution of their liberties.

It is thus that under our institutions there are more full and complete guaranties of the rights of the people than under any other Government in the world. That was very nearly the sole consideration moving those who organized the American system. Thought of national peril sinking to the minimum, thought of individual peril rose to the maximum. How closely these have always been connected is shown not only by the course of history but by the curious coincidence that just after Lincoln had come into power, to check the rising tide of domestic claims and counterclaims, Secretary Seward suggested smothering them all in foreign complications and wars. The great service of Lincoln is that he preserved national integrity and advanced individual liberty.

Another safeguard arises from our having a continuing Government. The entire membership of the House of Representatives, but only one-third of the membership of the Senate, is renewed each two years; the Presidency is renewed each four years; and the Supreme Court is renewed irregularly, as its members hold by life tenure. As must always be done, speed is

sacrificed for safety. We have adopted the party method of political expression. It is easy to see that the two Houses may be dominated by different parties and that the President and the Congress may be of a different political faith. A government chosen piecemeal means that any one election may be inconclusive.

One of the most remarkable examples of such an election took place in 1918. It is almost axiomatic that a Government successful in the conduct of a war will be successful in securing the indorsement of the people. From the middle of July, when the Americans, advancing through the retreating lines of the war-worn French, for the second time beat back the German invasion at the Marne, there was a steady succession of victorious advances ending in the complete triumph of armistice day.

Six days before this greatest military triumph ever recorded, notwithstanding a personal appeal to the people soliciting their support for his party made by the Commander in Chief himself, the American national election brought the almost unbelievable result of a defeat at the polls of the party under which the war had been conducted, taking from it the control of both Houses of Congress. After the fourth day of the following March the President and the Congress were of different parties.

Under some circumstances this might have made little difference in the work of reconstruction. Under the dominating personalities then in control at either end of Pennsylvania Avenue it was destined to make a great deal of difference. Our own completion of reconstruction at home and our inescapable participation in reconstruction abroad were hindered and delayed. A treaty of peace was negotiated by the President and submitted to the Senate in the summer of 1919, where it was debated for many months and rejected. The Congress enacted some remedial legislation which was approved and some which was vetoed. There was an entire lack of harmony and cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, aggravated by the severe illness of the President, which made him almost inaccessible. Demobilization of military forces was very largely accomplished and necessary legislation provided for the return of the immense properties of transportation and telephone and telegraph lines to their former private ownership, but with enlarged Government regulation. The Congress started a system of relief for the disabled and of vocational training for former service men. A reduction of expenditures was begun, but when the fundamental requirement for economy was provided by a budget bill it was vetoed. The peace resolution duly enacted was also disapproved by Executive veto. Yet there was a very commendable amount of necessary and important legislation. The private interests of the Nation were all the while recovering themselves through the lapse of time, but when the first regular session of the Sixty-sixth Congress ended on June 5, 1920, the public requirement of reconstruction, necessarily to be accomplished by Government action, reaching up even to the establishment of peace itself, remained for the most part unaccomplished. Clearly the time had come to go to the country for a determination of policy and a party unity of administration.

The National Government functions in response to public sentiment. There was need of that thoroughgoing agitation, of that clarification of the public thought, and expression of the public mind which comes only from a presidential election. It was only until after that event that there could be any adequate determination of policies having sufficient public support to make their adoption practical. All elections are the result of mixed motives.

Through the campaign of 1920 there ran a great variety of issues, but its result made plain, by unquestioned expression, the main desires of the country. It was another declaration of independence. It expressed a distinct reaction against militarism and any form of engagement which placed any qualification or limitation on the privilege of refraining from all armed intervention in contentions between foreign countries which did not involve our own interests. It reiterated a desire for securing all possible guaranties of peace. It was particularly distinct in its demand for abolishing all Government extravagance. It was a clear and unmistakable mandate for economy in the conduct of our foreign relations and in the management of our domestic affairs. That these policies might be adopted the election unified party control of the Presidency and the Congress.

All of this meant a general readjustment. It meant the facing of painful facts. It meant a period of economic stress and strain. The first years of the war sent large amounts of gold to our country in exchange for supplies. This resulted in

the natural inflation of prices. The financing of our own war needs through the issue of bonds which, when they found their way into Federal reserve banks as security for rediscounts, greatly increased the issue of currency, caused a further and much greater artificial inflation. The results of this continued long after the armistice in a round of increasing prices and increasing wages. This condition brought forth a general statement from President Wilson in the late summer of 1919 when he made his decision on railroad wages. "Increase in wages," he said, "will, moreover, certainly result in still further increasing the costs of production and, therefore, the cost of living and * * * would utterly crush the general campaign which the Government is waging with energy, vigor, and substantial hope of success to reduce the high cost of living." Economic forces caused this warning to go for the most part unheeded until in the spring of 1920 inability to buy was all at once transformed into inability to sell. Producers found themselves without a market. Inflation had broken down, as it always does. The reaction was severe. There were great losses, all of which are not yet revealed, but the disaster of a panic was averted, and deflation now appears to have completed its course.

When as the result of the election the new administration came into power a year ago, there was a condition of economic disorder. National finances were administered under war-time tax laws. Railroad transportation was in great stress for credit. The emergency fleet, which had cost billions to construct, was disorganized and disintegrated. Proper methods of administering war relief had not been devised. There was an impending avalanche of foreign peoples and foreign merchandise toward our shores. There were great disproportions between the returns for production and the cost of distribution. Agriculture was not thriving. Employment was uncertain. There were methods which caused improper restraints in the building trades. Cost of government was a stupendous burden. There was friction and irritation in the Orient. Our attitude toward Mexico and Russia was undefined. There was need of more friendly relations with the Latin-American Republics. We lacked the respect and confidence of Europe. We were still in a state of war with the Central Powers. It was plain that there must be something more than a treatment of local symptoms. It was a time when it was necessary to seek out and remove the fundamental causes of national disorders.

A special session of the Congress was summoned to meet on the 11th day of April. The ordering of the finances of the Nation lies especially within their province. In accordance with the recommendations of the President work was at once begun on a revenue bill for the purpose of revising, equalizing, and reducing internal taxation, and on a tariff bill for the purpose of revising the customs duties in accordance with the principle of protection and to meet the exigencies of foreign exchange.

Tax bills are not popular measures. They are not enacted for the purpose of securing public favor, but with a sordid desire of securing revenue. There is never any question about the American Government meeting its obligations. There can be no such thing as a perfect national tax bill. It must always be the result of a compromise between the contending forces of different sections and different policies. The problem of the present Congress was to provide for a greater equalization of taxation. That has been done. It was to reduce the amount of taxation. That has been done. It was to secure a better method of administration. That has been done.

Our national finances had been conducted under the stress of war. Under that compelling force the Government had taken, through loans and taxation, close to one-fifth of the wealth of the country. When it is considered how small a proportion of the total wealth could be converted into a cash or credit asset, it will be realized how severe had been the strain and how much need there was of relief. The present problem was to raise substantially four billions of revenue, so distributed as to cause the least possible discouragement to those general business activities which promote industrial development and provide profitable employment.

The main theory of the American Government is that it shall be conducted for the welfare of all the people. It is ever watchful to maintain not only political but economic freedom. It has no favorites. It is based on the belief in equality. It recognizes that class distinctions are artificial and unreal, that under the natural conditions of equal opportunity, generally speaking, economic rewards will be in proportion to service rendered.

This theory has to be remembered in relation to taxation. If there are no privileged classes, there can be no special servitudes. These always go together. We have refused to establish privileged classes because we believed such a system of society to be unfair, unjust, unnatural, and contrary to the public in-

terests. For the same reasons we can not impose special servitudes. It is impossible to impose a disproportionate burden of taxation upon a selected few without doing injury to the general welfare. Such an attempt not only defeats itself in its purpose to raise revenue but causes economic disarrangement, stifles industry, and results in general distress among the very people that it has sought to relieve.

There is little time under the stress of war to consider general economic welfare. When, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1917, it was necessary to appropriate almost \$19,000,000,000, and for the following fiscal year more than twenty-seven billions, the money had to be taken wherever it could be found. A heavy system of excess-profits taxes, and, in addition, surtaxes on incomes rising to a total of 73 per cent, were laid to meet the outlay for military operations. When war conditions no longer existed it was found that the revenue from excess profits had shrunk to about one-sixth, and while taxable incomes had increased nearly twelfold in number and more than threefold in amount, the number and amount of incomes of over \$300,000 had been cut in two.

The excess-profits taxes were, therefore, discontinued and the surtaxes reduced, probably not yet enough to produce the largest amount of revenue or secure the highest degree of general prosperity, but enough materially to advance the public welfare. The charges against the heads of families with moderate incomes have been diminished by almost one-half. Those charges on transportation and sales which became popularly known as "nuisance taxes" have been repealed and the burden of past taxation has been reduced under the new law \$728,900,000 for the first year it is in effect, and will be followed by a large reduction in the succeeding year. Further revision of revenue is in prospect and has been recommended by the President, but these changes already made in our system of taxation are fundamental in principle and are in the right direction. They accomplish a distribution of the burden. They constitute a real reform. The ability to reduce taxation and yet easily meet current requirements from current income without resorting to loans is an accomplishment in which, among the great nations of the earth, America stands alone.

One of the first domestic problems to receive attention was the perfection of an adequate organization for the administration of Government relief of war veterans. This had been divided up between the Treasury, the War Risk Insurance Board, Vocational Training Board, and other departments, creating confusion and resulting in applicants being referred from one bureau to another, causing endless delays. The whole work was unified and placed under the supervision of the Veterans' Bureau. To increase facility of contact the country was divided into 14 districts with 140 suboffices.

It is easy to realize what a stupendous task this work is when it is remembered that there has already been paid to disabled veterans and their dependent relatives about a billion and a half dollars and there is going out of the Treasury each day close to a million and a quarter dollars. The Government already has nearly 30,000 hospital beds, and will soon have 35,000. There are about 29,000 men already in hospitals who receive, besides their keeping and care, from \$80 to \$157 each month. The awards for compensations run over 200,000 each month and the awards for insurance over 140,000, while there are 15,000 compensation claims and 1,200 insurance claims received during the same time. There are about 105,000 men receiving vocational training, most of them under pay and at a maximum cost of \$160 each per month. There are already in existence 107 hospitals which provide 182 employees for each 200 patients. There are 5,000 schools used throughout the country for training ex-service men and 7,000 institutions for placement training.

Two hundred thousand claims were awaiting adjustment when the War Risk Department was reorganized. All of these claims which were uncontested were adjudicated long ago. There are about 700 claims received each day which are at once decided. It may take time to establish and determine facts, but there are no longer claims awaiting adjudication and the work of the department is current. This stupendous task is not yet completed. It is being perfected day by day. The department is in contact with all public and private charities, every office of the Red Cross, and every Legion Post. It is impossible to prevent every abuse or to administer every needed relief, but for this purpose there has been provided the best possible organization. No expenditure of money or effort has been withheld. Under a business system, in accordance with scientific principles, the Government is giving expression to that great obligation which the people feel toward veterans suffering from the results of the war.

In order that we might be free from a threatened inundation of war-distressed peoples, which, instead of relieving them, would only result in the discomfort of our own citizens, a temporary restriction was placed on immigration, limiting it to 3 per cent during the year of each nationality already represented here. This has been an effort to prevent complications in a threatened condition of unemployment during a time of readjustment of wages. It has not been free from hardships in individual instances, but it has without doubt protected our country from much undesirable immigration.

There was likewise impending an avalanche of merchandise and agricultural products. An exchange of commodities, imports and exports, are desirable and are to be encouraged upon a sound and stable basis. America was the Nation least in distress for cash. There was a great temptation for those who needed cash to dump merchandise on our market at a sacrifice which affliction always imposes. Such a bankrupt sale could not have restored balance to foreign trade and foreign exchange which would be to our advantage, but would have tended to injure our own producers and our own wage earners, without proportionate benefit to ourselves or anyone else. For the protection of agriculture and to prevent those sacrifice sales which are referred to in trade circles as "dumping" an emergency tariff law was enacted, which will remain in effect pending a permanent revision of the tariff. In so far as it has tended to produce stable conditions it has been beneficial. Without doubt it has been of material assistance to the live-stock interests in the West, and to a less degree to the industries of the East.

Under Government operation of the railroads large sums were expended for improvements and new equipment, which were charged to the roads. On their return to private ownership there were great amounts of unadjusted claims. The roads were in want of credit, both to settle with the Government and provide themselves with means for necessary extensions and improvements. In order to relieve the acute situation in which they were found they were permitted under the provisions of law to fund their debts to the Government through duly secured obligations, which were placed on the market through Government agencies. This has given the necessary relief and provided funds, which has resulted in an increased employment of labor.

The Shipping Board found itself in control of many hundreds of Government-owned ships, into which there had gone \$3,500,000,000. Their maintenance and operation cost many millions each month. Their depreciation in value was simply enormous. The problem presented was to get the Government out of the shipping business with as little loss as possible, and to provide an American merchant marine, that American goods might not have to be carried to market in the ships of competitors, and that there might be sufficient ships to provide for an adequate national defense. There has been worked out and presented by the President to the Congress a plan which promises to secure these results. For the first time within generations there is a fair prospect that our country will have a merchant marine, supported from a small proportion of the revenue derived from shipping and holding a place on the seas worthy of the American people.

Two important conferences dealing with domestic questions have been held in Washington. It became apparent late in the summer that a situation was developing which might result in a serious condition of unemployment. The Government did not wait for such a situation to develop, but, through the Department of Commerce and Labor, immediately brought to Washington representatives of the public and of managers and employees of all kinds of industrial activities. Plans were perfected and put into operation for local relief which are estimated to have secured employment for more than a million and a half people which, although it did not provide a complete remedy, afforded very great alleviation.

Another conference was for the promotion and encouragement of agriculture. Notwithstanding very bountiful crops, a season of low prices threatened this great enterprise with a distress so acute as to affect the economic condition of the whole Nation. Early in the session \$25,000,000 of public money was provided for use of farm loan banks. Fifty million dollars was secured through private sources for the relief of the live-stock industry. There was further regulation of the packing industry and of dealing in grain futures, both made for the benefit of the producer. The largest measure of relief was that which gave the War Finance Corporation power to extend practically unlimited credit to the farmers, which has already been availed of to an extent of about \$200,000,000. As the result of the conference provision is being made for greater freedom of cooperation in marketing and better understanding between the interests of banking, transportation, and agriculture. There has

been a desire on the part of the Government to extend every possible relief. The marked success which has been accomplished is reflected in the greater prosperity of all agricultural interests.

An action which is likely to result not only in great benefit to agriculture but to business in general was that of the President visiting one day the office of the Interstate Commerce Commission to advise with them as to what could be done to secure the readjustment of freight rates. There have already been thousands of reductions, and there is under way an investigation which has for its object the substitution of scientific rates for those which were adopted arbitrarily in the haste of the war. If such rates can be discovered and accepted, as now seems probable, it will do much to promote greater business activity.

The restrictive policies employed in the building trades have long been notorious. They have resulted in a lack of housing facilities and in a loss of employment which has been felt in that great variety of trades and occupations which supply building operations. As a result of investigations and conferences an amicable adjustment was made under the direction of the Attorney General and embodied in a decree, entered in the United States district court, which does away with all future limitations on the productive capacity of the individual workman, confirms the privilege of the employer to purchase materials of whoever he may desire, prohibits discrimination by organized employees against employers and trade associations, and the use of such discrimination to force the collection of debts or claims. This has removed restrictions and limitations from a great key industry which can but result in a renewal of building activity and the stimulation of many allied industries. It is a guide for future action, friendly, effective, and mutually beneficial.

There is due the United States from foreign Governments about \$11,000,000,000, mostly for money paid by our Government to our citizens for supplies produced here which were sent abroad during the war. Under an act of Congress a commission has been appointed by the President to settle all these claims and to agree upon terms of payment of interest and principal, which is not to exceed a rate of 4½ per cent for a limit of time not in excess of 25 years. The returns from this source, whether applied to current expenses or the reduction of the public debt, will give a great deal of relief to the present burden of taxation.

There has been passed by the House and about to be reported to the Senate a tariff bill. There were difficulties in arranging a revenue bill, but they were insignificant when compared to those which are met in framing a tariff measure. It is a comparatively easy task to remove and reduce duties and draw a bill merely for the purpose of revenue; one which will provide protection and increase revenue is quite another matter. We are living under a pre-war tariff modified by the emergency tariff. Heretofore there have been certain fixed standards, which could be approximately ascertained, of cost of production abroad and cost of production at home. The difference between these two measured in a fairly accurate degree the protective needs of each industry. Foreign exchange has heretofore varied but a trifling amount. No one knows at the present time what represents either domestic or foreign cost of production. No one knows what the rate of exchange will be. This uncertainty has required painstaking investigations to see if a flexible tariff could not be provided which might have a system of administration that could be adjusted to meet changing conditions. Heretofore import duties have been determined in accordance with the foreign value of merchandise. As the rate of exchange and unsettled conditions tend to make that now almost fictitious, an attempt has been made to provide for rates of duty in accordance with American valuations. This means the fair market value of the merchandise in our own markets. This is the principle adopted by most other countries. Both these systems are being worked out, compared, and considered, and that which appears to be best will be presented to the Senate for adoption.

The drafting of a bill of this kind requires a study and comprehension of the facts relative to almost every industry in the United States. It is doubtful if any measure was ever presented to the Congress which was the result of so much painstaking effort and care. There is back of it not only the facts and arguments assembled by the Tariff Commission as the result of intensive investigation permanently engaged in, but the taking of evidence and months of deliberation, representing many hours each day of the committees of the House and Senate, assisted by the expert knowledge of the Treasury Department and the best judgment and information of those engaged in productive enterprise. There has been no delay of action,

but there has been continuing determination to present the best tariff bill which industry and intelligence could devise.

The first thought and the chief effort of the present administration has been for a constructive economy. To secure that is to accomplish reconstruction. It has not been considered enough merely to go on under the old system of advising departments to refrain from extravagances and adopt business methods. There has been a complete change in the administration of the financial operations of the Government through one of the first acts of the present Congress in the adoption of a Budget system. This means the coordination of expenditures and the centralization of authority.

The rules of the House and Senate have been changed to bring the consideration and presentation of all appropriations under the direction of a single committee. An experienced banker and trained business man, who has achieved success in the administration of private enterprises and in the conduct of the business operations of the war abroad—General Dawes—has been made Budget commissioner. He has coordinated the different departments so that in a few months there has been a saving of nearly \$75,000,000 in the purchase of supplies and economy in general expenditures which will reach about three hundred million during the year. The Congress has provided for a reorganization of the various departments of government for which a plan is being perfected by a joint commission representing the President and the Members of the House and Senate. The number of public employees has been reduced nearly 60,000. The Army has been reduced by 85,000 and there is a proposal for a further reduction of 35,000, which would mean a reduction in all of more than one-half. There have been, and are proposed, large reductions in the naval forces. This important and effective work is beginning to show in the appropriations and expenditures of the Government.

Prior to the war the annual appropriations were a little over a billion dollars. For the last fiscal year they were slightly more than five and one-half billions. For the present fiscal year it is estimated that this will be reduced to somewhat less than four billions, and for the next fiscal year, for which appropriations are now being made, there will be a reduction to about three and one-half billions. The interest and payments required for the public debt are about one billion three hundred and fifty millions. The cost of ministering to the requirements of the Veterans' Bureau is about one-half a billion. The cost of the Army and Navy is over eight hundred millions and another quarter of a billion goes into pensions. If from present expenditures there be deducted those items that arose from the war and the extra amount now being expended on good roads and the Army and Navy, the present cost of running the Government would not exceed the pre-war cost by more than two or three hundred millions. This represents an achievement in economy which is almost incredible.

No doubt the proper measure of legislation is not number but weight, but something of the industry which has characterized the present Congress may be understood when it is remembered that the Senate has passed 496 bills and joint resolutions and that the House has passed 452. It is a work which will bear inspection and comparison. The record is there. It represents a solid and substantial achievement under the direction of men who make great sacrifices in the public service. To be appreciated it needs but to be known.

Twenty-five years ago America gave little thought to its foreign relations. Occasionally it reasserted the Monroe doctrine. But the responsibilities incurred as a result of the war with Spain brought new relationships, and our participation in the World War left us a dominating power among the nations. There are new interests and new obligations. We did not seek them; we can not evade them.

Shortly after the assembling of the Congress a resolution was adopted ending the condition of war. It carefully refrained from interfering with the peace treaty which other nations had made and carefully reserved all the rights which had accrued as the result of participation in the war. A treaty of peace with Colombia was concluded, disposing of a long-standing difference which arose from our relation to the Republic of Panama and the canal. A treaty was offered to Mexico which would have recognized her Government and declared her adherence to those principles of protection of the rights of persons and of property which are the necessary mark of a civilized State. Mexico has so far refused to execute it. A more than friendly interest in the people of Russia has been declared in our willingness to consider commercial relations on the presentation of evidence that there is to be maintained those rights of free labor, respect for contracts, and security of property, without which there can be no commerce, and our good faith demonstrated by great private charities and the ap-

appropriation of \$20,000,000 for the relief of her starving population. Treaties of peace have also been concluded with Germany and Austria. Our army of occupation is being brought home. The war is done. Peace reigns.

There has been a steady determination not to interfere in those European affairs with which we had no direct concern. When there was an attempt to place responsibilities on our Government for the fixing of reparations, it was firmly declined, but with the assertion that reparations must be met to the limit of ability. There has likewise been a refusal to participate in the Genoa conference out of a feeling that the chief causes of economic disturbance in Europe can only be settled by their own domestic action, and our unwillingness to become involved in any way in their political questions. The sincerity of American sympathy for European distress is revealed and established in loans of almost a billion dollars made since armistice day, in addition to the administration of enormous charities.

One of the great achievements of the past year, one which promises to be one of the achievements of history, was the convening, the deliberations, and the agreements of the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armament. There have been other gatherings which represented aspirations as high, and determinations as noble, as those which characterized this latest expression of the world's hope. If others have failed of complete success, they have not failed to make their mark upon history, nor have they ceased to be remembered as expressing a high ideal. This conference had the advantage of profiting by their mistakes and being instructed by their results. The conference proceeded on the fundamental theory of substituting for the sanction of force in international relations the sanction of reason. It declared the belief that differences could be adjusted without even resorting to arbitration by the simple device of taking counsel together.

This theory the conference proceeded to put into practice. Realizing that the greatest guaranty of peace is the removal of the causes for war, it settled and removed long-standing controversies in the Orient by mutual understandings. Both Great Britain and Japan have agreed to retire from occupations distasteful to China, and Japan has further agreed to retire from Siberia. An alliance for war between Great Britain and Japan has been ended. An agreement for peace between those two powers, and France and the United States, has begun. Competitive naval armament between five great powers is to cease. The use of poison gas in warfare and of unlawful submarine attacks on merchant ships have been forbidden. Hereafter there is to be equal opportunity among the nations in China and our claims in the island of Yap have been conceded.

These are accomplishments toward peace commensurate with the late accomplishments in war. They are results which mark off this conference as the beginning of a new era. For the first time powers great enough to control world action have voluntarily agreed to a limitation of armaments; voluntarily recognized the existence of a common purpose, a universal brotherhood, an all-pervading spirit of righteousness and of mutual obligations and responsibilities.

It has been a year of progress altogether worthy of a great people. It does not mean that the burdens of existence are to be lifted from mankind. It does not mean that military establishments are to be no longer required. An agreement to maintain a parity between navies is not an agreement to abolish navies. There will be a great saving of expenditure, but it will not be so much in present costs as in future requirements. These great remedial policies which are being adopted are fundamental in principle. They mean that hereafter a larger proportion of human effort can go into productive activity. They diminish the material waste of extravagance in government and the spiritual waste of distrust in diplomacy. Liberty has taken increased guaranties. Reason is more firmly enthroned. Hope and faith are revealed more clearly as the great realities.

As in legislative session,

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FERNALD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Gardiner, Litchfield, Hallowell, Carmel, Bangor, and Stetson, all in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 2747, the so-called Federal cooperative reclamation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. MYERS presented resolutions of the Chambers of Commerce of Troy and Kalispell, and the Commercial Club of Columbia Falls, all in the State of Montana, praying for inclusion in Senate bill 2747, the so-called Federal cooperative reclamation bill, of provision for reclamation of logged-off lands, which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. PEPPER presented a petition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade, favoring the ratification of the four-power treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade, remonstrating against the passage of the soldiers' bonus bill, except as applied to disabled soldiers, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

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. LODGE:

A bill (S. 3355) for the creation of an American battle-monuments commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 3356) to commission Capt. William Rees Rush as a rear admiral on the retired list of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 3357) setting aside a parcel of land as a home for the Sault de Ste. Marie Band of Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior and providing for the relief of said band; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. NEWBERRY):

A bill (S. 3358) granting a pension to Carrie Shanahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3359) for the relief of Lewis-Wedum Co. and others; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 185) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant permits for removal of rock and gravel from military reservations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SWANSON submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the acquisition of additional forest lands at headwaters of navigable streams, to be expended under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 961), as amended, from \$50,000 to \$1,000,000, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 10730, the agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TREATY ON SUBMARINES AND NOXIOUS GASES.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to call up the treaty dealing with submarines and noxious gases.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, proceeded to consider the treaty between the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan relating to the use of submarines and noxious gases in warfare.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the treaty be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the treaty.

The Assistant Secretary read the treaty, as follows:

EXECUTIVE M—SUBMARINES AND NOXIOUS GASES.

TREATY SUBMITTED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES, THE BRITISH EMPIRE, FRANCE, ITALY, AND JAPAN, RELATING TO THE USE OF SUBMARINES AND NOXIOUS GASES IN WARFARE.

The United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, hereinafter referred to as the signatory powers, desiring to make more effective the rules adopted by civilized nations for the protection of the lives of neutrals and noncombatants at sea in time of war, and to prevent the use in war of noxious gases and chemicals, have determined to conclude a treaty to this effect, and have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America: Charles Evans Hughes, Henry Cabot Lodge, Oscar W. Underwood, Elihu Root, citizens of the United States;

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India: The Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour, O. M., M. P., Lord President of His Privy Council; the Right Hon. Baron Lee of Fareham, G. B. E., K. C. B., First Lord of His Admiralty; the Right Hon. Sir Auckland Campbell Geddes, K. C. B., His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States of America;

And for the Dominion of Canada: The Right Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, G. C. M. G., K. C.;

For the Commonwealth of Australia: Senator the Right Hon. George Foster Pearce, Minister for Home and Territories;

For the Dominion of New Zealand: The Hon. Sir John William Salmond, K. C., Judge of the Supreme Court of New Zealand;

For the Union of South Africa: The Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour, O. M., M. P.;

For India: The Right Hon. Valingman Sankaranarayana Srinivasa Sastri, Member of the Indian Council of State;

The President of the French Republic: Mr. Albert Sarraut, Deputy, Minister of the Colonies; Mr. Jules J. Jusserand, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States of America, Grand Cross of the National Order of the Legion of Honor;

His Majesty the King of Italy: The Hon. Carlo Schanzer, Senator of the Kingdom; the Hon. Vittorio Rolandi Ricci, Senator of the Kingdom, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington; the Hon. Luigi Albertini, Senator of the Kingdom;

His Majesty the Emperor of Japan: Baron Tomosaburo Kato, Minister for the Navy, Junii, a member of the First Class of the Imperial Order of the Grand Cordon of the Rising Sun with the Paulownia Flower; Baron Kijuro Shidehara, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington, Joshii, a member of the First Class of the Imperial Order of the Rising Sun; Mr. Masanao Hanihara, Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs, Jushii, a member of the Second Class of the Imperial Order of the Rising Sun;

Who, having communicated their Full Powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I.

The signatory powers declare that among the rules adopted by civilized nations for the protection of the lives of neutrals and noncombatants at sea in time of war, the following are to be deemed an established part of international law:

(1) A merchant vessel must be ordered to submit to visit and search to determine its character before it can be seized.

A merchant vessel must not be attacked unless it refuse to submit to visit and search after warning, or to proceed as directed after seizure.

A merchant vessel must not be destroyed unless the crew and passengers have been first placed in safety.

(2) Belligerent submarines are not under any circumstances exempt from the universal rules above stated; and if a submarine can not capture a merchant vessel in conformity with these rules the existing law of nations requires it to desist from attack and from seizure and to permit the merchant vessel to proceed unmolested.

ARTICLE II.

The signatory powers invite all other civilized powers to express their assent to the foregoing statement of established law so that there may be a clear public understanding throughout the world of the standards of conduct by which the public opinion of the world is to pass judgment upon future belligerents.

ARTICLE III.

The signatory powers, desiring to insure the enforcement of the humane rules of existing law declared by them with respect to attacks upon and the seizure and destruction of merchant ships, further declare that any person in the service of any power who shall violate any of those rules, whether or not such person is under orders of a governmental superior, shall be deemed to have violated the laws of war and shall be liable to trial and punishment as if for an act of piracy and may be brought to trial before the civil or military authorities of any power within the jurisdiction of which he may be found.

ARTICLE IV.

The signatory powers recognize the practical impossibility of using submarines as commerce destroyers without violating, as they were violated in the recent war of 1914-1918, the requirements universally accepted by civilized nations for the protection of the lives of neutrals and noncombatants, and to the end that the prohibition of the use of submarines as commerce destroyers shall be universally accepted as a part of the law of nations they now accept that prohibition as henceforth binding as between themselves and they invite all other nations to adhere thereto.

ARTICLE V.

The use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases, and all analogous liquids, materials, or devices, having been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world and a prohibition of such use having been declared in treaties to which a majority of the civilized powers are parties,

The signatory powers, to the end that this prohibition shall be universally accepted as a part of international law binding alike the conscience and practice of nations, declare their assent to such prohibition, agree to be bound thereby as between themselves and invite all other civilized nations to adhere thereto.

ARTICLE VI.

The present treaty shall be ratified as soon as possible in accordance with the constitutional methods of the signatory powers and shall take effect on the deposit of all the ratifications, which shall take place at Washington.

The Government of the United States will transmit to all the signatory powers a certified copy of the procès-verbal of the deposit of ratifications.

The present treaty, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States, and duly certified copies thereof will be transmitted by that Government to each of the signatory powers.

ARTICLE VII.

The Government of the United States will further transmit to each of the nonsignatory powers a duly certified copy of the present treaty and invite its adherence thereto.

Any nonsignatory power may adhere to the present treaty by communicating an instrument of adherence to the Government of the United States, which will thereupon transmit to each of the signatory and adhering powers a certified copy of each instrument of adherence.

In faith whereof the above-named plenipotentiaries have signed the present treaty.

Done at the city of Washington the 6th day of February, 1922.

[L. S.] CHARLES EVANS HUGHES.

[L. S.] HENRY CABOT LODGE.

[L. S.] OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD.

[L. S.] ELIHU ROOT.

[L. S.] ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.

[L. S.] LEE OF FAREHAM.

[L. S.] A. C. GEDDES.

R. L. BORDEN. [L. S.]

G. F. PEARCE. [L. S.]

JOHN W. SALMOND. [L. S.]

ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR. [L. S.]

V S SRINIVASA SASTRI. [L. S.]

A SARRAUT. [L. S.]

JUSSERAND. [L. S.]

CARLO SCHANZER. [L. S.]

[L. S.] V. ROLANDI RICCI.

[L. S.] LUIGI ALBERTINI.

[L. S.] T. KATO.

[L. S.] K. SHIDEHARA.

[L. S.] M. HANIHARA.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, unless some Senator objects, I ask that the reading of the treaty by articles may be dispensed with.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question or two, although I have no desire to delay the consideration of the treaty. Is there any way to determine under this treaty what a merchant vessel is?

Mr. LODGE. Not under this treaty; but that has been determined many times by the Supreme Court. It is a matter which has to be decided in each case.

Mr. BORAH. The reason I ask the question is that I notice that France is proposing a reservation which will leave her free to determine for herself what constitutes a merchant vessel. What effect would it have upon this treaty if she should attach that kind of a reservation to the treaty?

Mr. LODGE. It would come back to us for ratification, for our acceptance.

Mr. BORAH. If France should attach such a reservation, it would not come to the Senate, would it?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. BORAH. If it were simply a reservation?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; reservations have to be accepted by this Government.

Mr. McCORMICK. Not by the Senate, however.

Mr. LODGE. Why not? If the reservation affects the treaty, why does it not have to conform to the ordinary procedure?

Mr. McCORMICK. Does the Senator from Massachusetts hold that the reservation which was adopted by the Senate the other day in connection with the treaty then under consideration will have to be adopted by the parliamentary bodies of the other powers?

Mr. LODGE. It will have to be accepted by them, but I do not know precisely what procedure they will follow.

Mr. McCORMICK. That is welcome news; I was not so advised.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if the reservation be merely one of construction of the treaty by a party to the treaty whether it will have to be presented to the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. It will have to be accepted by the other powers by constitutional methods, as the treaty provides.

Mr. LENROOT. But failure to object amounts to acquiescence, does it not?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will allow me, I wish to state that the question of what is a merchant vessel is a matter that a prize court must determine.

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely; in each case.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As to what effect one nation claiming the right to define for itself what constitutes a merchant vessel would have on international law I can not say, but I think international law has very clearly fixed the doctrine that if the principles of international law are complied with, and a treaty restates international law, the vessel must be taken to a court and the question of its title determined. Then the real issue is whether it is a merchant vessel or not. If it was a vessel of war, of course a different principle governs.

Mr. LODGE. That has been the practice in all cases, of which there are many.

Mr. BORAH. My interest in the matter is developed by reason of the reservation which France proposes to put upon her treaty, as indicated yesterday. I do not know whether she will do so or not; but if France is going to determine for herself what constitutes a merchant vessel under this treaty, I should think it would have a very marked effect upon what we should do.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should think in the end the prize court would determine the question if the rules of international law prevail.

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But, as the Senator from Massachusetts suggests, if a reservation is put on the treaty, undoubtedly it will have to come back to this Government and come back to the Senate for determination.

Mr. BORAH. No; under the doctrine of reservations it would not have to come back to the Senate, as I understand; but, of course, it would have to come back to the executive department.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I may be mistaken about it, but I do not agree with the Senator about that. The Senate is a part of the Government in making treaties, and a treaty is changed by a reservation. A Government may reserve its rights under a reservation. The other Government may not have to agree to that reservation, but it has to accept it; and there is no power that I know of in the hands of an American Executive to accept a change of a treaty unless the Senate consents.

Mr. BORAH. The Government might accept it by simply failing to reject the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. If it changes the character of the treaty, I think it would have to come back here. If it is an interpretive reservation, I suppose the general practice has been that acquiescence may be indicated by no representation being made by the other Government; but if a representation is made by any other Government, of course it has to come back to that Government, and it seems to me it is clear that the provision in the treaty "in accordance with the constitutional methods of the signatory powers" would require that any change in its character effected by amendment or reservation would have to come before the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BORAH. I sincerely hope that the two Senators are correct, but I do not so understand it, and we did not so understand it during the league discussion.

Mr. LODGE. I think this phraseology, "in accordance with the constitutional methods of the signatory powers," has only been rather recently used. That is my impression.

Mr. BORAH. But, as I understand, the construction placed upon it by the Senator from Alabama is that the character of a merchant vessel must be determined by the prize court, and so forth; but in the meantime it is at the bottom of the sea.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, if the question comes up that it has been unlawfully sunk, it still is a matter for the nations to determine, either in court or before a tribunal; but I thought the Senator was referring to the capture of a vessel and its being taken to a prize court.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, the liabilities, and so forth, are afterwards determined; but I am speaking now of preventing interference with merchant vessels as a practical proposition.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is in the hands of the captain of the submarine.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and with no guide for him to determine except his own ipse dixit or his discretion as to what it is.

Mr. LODGE. There is no guide that I know of that can be established, other than the courts, to determine the character of the vessel.

Mr. BORAH. I rather think that is correct; but I was just trying to get at the practical working of the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is the practical working. I think it has been under the old law, before the days of submarines.

Mr. BORAH. One other question, and then I will not detain the Senate further. Article 4 says:

The signatory powers recognize the practical impossibility—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Before the Senator passes from the matter under consideration, will he permit an interruption from me? There is another question that has been presented in connection with this matter of merchant ships. France is insisting or may insist upon a reservation to the effect that any ship which would otherwise be a merchant ship but which carries guns, even for her own protection, would not be regarded under this treaty as a merchant ship and would be likely to be sunk. It will be recalled that we were obliged to consider that question while we were neutrals in the late European war. A bill or a joint resolution was introduced here authorizing the President to equip our merchant vessels with guns for their own protection against the depredations of submarines. That was not passed, but failed by reason of the lapse of the session; but the President of the United States, acting within what he conceived to be his constitutional authority, proceeded thus to equip our merchant vessels with guns to protect themselves against the assaults of submarines. That same situation may be repeated at any time.

Mr. LODGE. The Secretary of State at that time, Mr. Lansing, sent a note, in which he defined so far as it could be defined what constituted defensive as against offensive armament—that is, what took the ship out of the defensive-armament class—but that is a question of fact. I brought together here on that discussion all the authorities I could find in the way of decisions of the courts. The leading case is that of the *Charming Betsy*, which was a decision of Marshall. Merchantmen armed for their own protection have been sustained as not losing their character as merchantmen on that account, but it has had to be decided in each case whether the ship retains its character as a merchantman or whether it has been armed for offense. I do not see how it is possible to make any general rule on the subject in any treaty or anything else.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The trouble about it is this, and it addresses itself to me as a practical question, as it does to the Senator from Idaho: Two of these European nations get into a war, and we continue our trade, of course, with the other neutral nations; and one or the other conceives that goods not contraband going to a neutral port will eventually find their way into the country of one of the belligerents, and it resolves upon the same plan of unrestricted submarine warfare. If the ship arms itself so as to protect itself against the depredations of submarines, will it still be a merchant ship?

Mr. LODGE. That is the precise thing that must necessarily be a question of fact—what armament constitutes the ship a merchantman; how much she can carry without losing her character as a merchantman?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Would it not be extremely desirable, in order to avoid unfortunate controversies, if it could be defined in some way?

Mr. LODGE. How can it be defined when every case may vary? No general definition can be made.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If that is the case, then if a ship carried any armament whatever—even that which would be of very light caliber, comparatively speaking—she would run the peril of being classed outside of the class of merchant ships given the protection of this treaty.

Mr. LODGE. There have been all sorts of cases, with all sorts of limitations, which have been admitted by the courts—for instance, the caliber of the guns which would indicate that the ship had lost her character as a merchant vessel, and whether she was carrying bow chasers or only stern chasers. The carrying of a bow chaser—I am speaking of the old-fashioned ships—was an indication that she was not armed simply for defense; the carrying of a stern chaser was an indication that she was armed simply for defense; and there are an infinity of facts which would go to determine the character of the vessel. I do not believe it is humanly possible to draw a general statement that would cover every possible case.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Then, in that situation of affairs—and I followed with some care the consideration of the subject by the courts, as well as by the executive departments of the Government concerned at the time when it was rife here in the Senate—conceding all these difficulties to which the Senator adverts, suppose, now, that France should attach a reservation to the effect that any ship carrying armament, either defensive or offensive, should fall without the protection of this

treaty. What would we do about it? Of course, the ratifications, as I take it, will be exchanged by the President without any further action upon the part of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Yes. The Senator from Idaho, of course, was speaking of a change in the treaty, either by amendment or by reservation, on the part of France.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes. I am assuming now that France attaches to her ratification such a reservation as I have suggested—namely, that a ship carrying any armament will fall without the definition of a merchant ship as used in the treaty before us—and then the treaty comes back, and the President of the United States accepts it with that reservation, and the exchanges are made. We would then find ourselves bound as a matter of course by that definition, and no ship carrying any armaments whatever would be entitled to protection by the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, that is a complete disregard of all the decisions on the subject, and I should think that that would hardly be accepted by our Government without some consideration. France alone could not change the international law of the world.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Any definition that might be attached might be subject to question, of course. I merely inquire whether some effort ought not to be made to arrive at an understanding as to how a ship would take herself out of the protection of this treaty.

Mr. LODGE. That would be a very long and difficult process. It never has been achieved yet.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, suppose France should adopt a reservation by which France retains the full right to decide what is a merchant ship. The Senator thinks that that would have to come back to the Senate if that kind of a reservation were put on, does he?

Mr. LODGE. I think so.

Mr. BORAH. If that is true, I am not disturbed about the situation; but if France should retain by reservation the full right to determine for herself what constitutes a merchant ship, and that should be accepted by the President, and we should finally conclude that the Senate did not have to act upon it, we would practically destroy this treaty; would we not?

Mr. LODGE. I think so.

Mr. BORAH. One other thing, and I will close.

Mr. LODGE. If, by France deciding, it is meant that the captain of the submarine is to decide, of course nobody could accept such a proposition as that.

Mr. BORAH. My guess is that France is not going to permit a certain power to arm her merchant ships and then agree not to use submarines.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, there are some limitations on that, as the Senator knows, in the treaty we have just ratified.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator in view of his last statement that if the reservation to which he refers should be attached to the treaty by France when she ratifies it, it would have to come back to the Senate here for our approval? The Senator expressed the view that if that were true he did not know that he should object. Suppose, however, that France, resting upon the theory that she may judge for herself when war breaks out what is a merchant ship, determines at that time that a merchant ship may carry arms and still be a merchant ship. Does not the Senator think that the uncertainty which he has in mind now will be persisted in, even though France does not attach a reservation, if she places that construction upon it?

Mr. BORAH. That is a situation which might of course arise at that time, but I had in mind the question of final ratification of the treaty, and our being bound by it. Of course, it is practically no treaty at all under those circumstances. If all these nations are going to determine, when war breaks out, what constitutes a merchant vessel, this is worse than a blank piece of paper.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator will find that nearly every nation will determine that, or insist upon its right to determine it.

Mr. BORAH. I suppose so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I wish to say that the phrase "merchant vessel" is well defined in international law.

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Those who have any cognizance of the literature upon the subject, the representatives of every nation, will know it.

Mr. BORAH. I generally agree with the Senator from Mississippi, but when he says that the phrase "merchant vessel" is well defined, I want to say to him that I have found in my

limited investigation a great deal of difference of opinion about what constitutes a merchant vessel. I understood that there was considerable difference of opinion in the conference here as to what constitutes a merchant vessel, and that France was by no means satisfied with England's idea of what constituted a merchant vessel. I may be misinformed; I do not know about that. I got it rather directly, however.

Mr. LODGE. There was not any very great discussion. The delegates took the general legal expression, "merchant vessel," which has been defined, and not always similarly defined, in the cases. In the case of the *Charming Betsy* Chief Justice Marshall said:

The degree of arming which should bring a vessel within this description has not been ascertained, and perhaps it would be difficult precisely to mark the limits, the passing of which would bring a captured vessel within the description of the acts of Congress on this subject.

I do not think there is much to be added to that; but I do not want to take the Senator's time.

Mr. BORAH. I am very glad to have the Senator discuss the question.

Mr. LODGE. On the 19th of September, 1914—and this is what I was referring to a moment ago—Mr. Lansing sent to all the representatives of foreign powers the following circular defining the status of an armed merchant vessel:

(A) A merchant vessel of belligerent nationality may carry an armament and ammunition for the sole purpose of defense without acquiring the character of a ship of war.

(B) The presence of an armament and ammunition on board a merchant vessel creates the presumption that the armament is for offensive purposes, but the owners or agents may overcome this presumption by evidence showing that the vessel carries armament solely for defense.

(C) Evidence necessary to establish the fact that the armament is solely for defense and will not be used offensively, whether the armament be mounted or stowed below, must be presented in each case independently at an official investigation. The result of the investigation must show conclusively that the armament is not intended for and will not be used in offensive operations.

Indications that the armament will not be used offensively are:

1. That the caliber of the guns carried does not exceed 6 inches.
2. That the guns and small arms carried are few in number.
3. That no guns are mounted on the forward part of the vessel.
4. That the quantity of ammunition carried is small.
5. That the vessel is manned by its usual crew and the officers are the same as those on board before war was declared.
6. That the vessel intends to and actually does clear for a port lying in its usual trade route or a port indicating its purpose to continue in the same trade in which it was engaged before war was declared.
7. That the vessel takes on board fuel and supplies sufficient only to carry it to its port of destination or the same quantity substantially which it has been accustomed to take for a voyage before war was declared.
8. That the cargo of the vessel consists of articles of commerce unsuited for the use of a ship of war in operations against an enemy.
9. That the vessel carries passengers who are as a whole unfitted to enter the military or naval service of the belligerent whose flag the vessel flies, or of any of its allies, and particularly if the passenger list includes women and children.
10. That the speed of the ship is slow.

Then it goes on about port authorities, as follows:

(D) Port authorities, on the arrival in a port of the United States of an armed vessel of belligerent nationality claiming to be a merchant vessel, should immediately investigate and report to Washington—

And so forth.

Mr. McCORMICK. May I ask the Senator under what date that was written?

Mr. LODGE. That was written on the 19th of September, 1914. Then finally it stated that—

The conversion of a merchant vessel into a ship of war is a question of fact which is to be established by direct or circumstantial evidence of intention to use the vessel as a ship of war.

In drafting a general treaty we could only use the phrase which is used in all diplomatic proceedings—that is, "merchant ship"—but when you come to the question whether it is an armed ship, which takes it out of the category of merchant ships and relieves it of the protection which it has as a simple trader, you open up all those questions of fact which can only be decided by investigation. We can not possibly cover them in any general statement.

Mr. BORAH. I presume it is true that you could not write into a treaty all those details, but I do not think that removes the possibility of France saying that she would determine for herself whether or not a vessel was a merchant ship.

Mr. LODGE. What does she mean by saying she will determine it?

Mr. BORAH. I have an idea that she meant the same thing she meant when she said she would not consent to a limitation of submarines, that she does not propose to have the submarine interfered with by an armed merchant vessel.

Mr. LODGE. Then it is a question of the amount of armament.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and she will determine how much armament constitutes a ship an armed vessel.

Mr. LODGE. Who will?

Mr. BORAH. France.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Idaho will excuse me, it does not mean anything definite to say "France." Who will determine it? Will it be the captain of a submarine or a French court?

Mr. BORAH. It might be a French court; nevertheless, France will determine for herself, either through her captain or through her court, what constitutes a merchant vessel.

Mr. LODGE. I can not conceive how any other nation should accept a proposition of that sort.

Mr. BORAH. I am satisfied the Senator will find in a few days they are seriously considering that proposition.

Mr. LODGE. I dare say. I have no information about what the French Government is contemplating, but of course if it is put in in the form the Senator suggests, it practically destroys the inhibition of the use of submarines under existing rules of international law.

Mr. BORAH. That brings me to article 4, which I presume is the reason why France is acting as she does in regard to this matter. Article 4 provides that—

The signatory powers recognize the practical impossibility of using submarines as commerce destroyers without violating, as they were violated in the recent war of 1914-1918, the requirements universally accepted by civilized nations for the protection of the lives of neutrals and noncombatants, and to the end that the prohibition of the use of submarines as commerce destroyers shall be universally accepted as a part of the law of nations they now accept that prohibition as henceforth binding as between themselves and they invite all other nations to adhere thereto.

If article 4 should be accepted in good faith as it is written, it would practically prohibit the use of submarines as they were used during the war.

Mr. LODGE. For the destruction of commerce. Nothing affects their use for military purposes.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, no; but, as a matter of fact, the submarine did very little service in the war except in the destruction of commerce.

Mr. LODGE. That is quite true. Their formidable qualities were entirely in the destruction of merchant vessels.

Mr. BORAH. They are not so useful for war purposes; they are principally useful for destroying commerce.

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely.

Mr. BORAH. As the instrument is fit for no other use, it will likely be used for that purpose.

Mr. LODGE. There is no better lawyer than the Senator from Idaho, and he has noticed, undoubtedly, that articles 1 and 2 state the accepted rules of international law. Those were accepted by the signatories. Those are the recognized provisions of international law.

Article 4 is a new proposition entirely, applied only to submarines.

Mr. BORAH. And if accepted and lived up to in good faith, it would really have the effect of limiting the use of submarines.

Mr. LODGE. It would limit their use to purely military purposes.

Mr. BORAH. That is true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts that the reading of the treaty article by article be omitted? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WADSWORTH. At the risk of having it thought that I am out of sympathy with the dictates of humanity, I desire to make a few observations concerning article 5 of this treaty, which has to do with the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases, and all analogous liquids, materials, or devices.

I know full well that there is a very strong and widespread sentiment, not only in this country but in other countries, against what is known as chemical warfare, and I notice that the first paragraph of this article refers to its use as having been "justly condemned" by the general opinion of the civilized world. In my judgment, a large number of people very much misunderstand the actual results of chemical warfare.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the Senator goes into that, he did not quite complete the reading of the article. Of course, he is aware of the fact that the use is prohibited by The Hague convention, and it received the assent of all the powers of the world.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It did not receive the assent of all the powers of the world. The American delegates refused to agree.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator refer to both treaties?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The American delegation at The Hague convention, which promulgated the prohibition against the use of poisonous gas, declined to agree.

Mr. LODGE. Declined to agree to the use of poison gas?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Declined to agree to the prohibition of it.

Mr. LODGE. To the prohibition of all poison gas?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. As I was saying, I think a large number of people misunderstand the actual effect of this method

of warfare. Comparatively speaking, when it was first used in this war it was new, it was mysterious, it was horrifying. Likewise, in its immediate effect it was cruel, as are all methods of warfare, as are all weapons. But an examination of the annual report of the Surgeon General of the Army for the year 1920 discloses some rather interesting facts as to the actual effect of this weapon when used upon belligerents, upon troops in action.

During the war the American Expeditionary Forces suffered in battle casualties—that is, killed and wounded—to the number of 258,338 men. Of these 34,249 died on the field of battle; 13,691 died in hospitals as the result of their injuries incurred in battle. There were admitted to the hospitals, exclusive of marines, 224,089 men. Of this number 70,552, or 27.3 per cent of the whole number, were suffering from gas alone. Of the 70,552 gas cases only 1,221 died. Of the 153,537 admitted to the hospitals suffering from bullets, high explosives, and other methods of war except gas, 12,470 died. I think it is a generous estimate to state that 200 men in the entire American Expeditionary Forces were killed on the field of battle by gas alone. The deaths which did occur from gas occurred in much the larger proportion after the expiration of two, three, four, or five days, when the soldier had been brought back to a hospital.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. I have not been following the Senator very closely. Is his argument confined to the use of gas between belligerents?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not entirely. I will come to that later.

If we assume that about 200 men were killed upon the field of battle by gas alone, and hence were not included in the 1,221 who died in hospitals as a result of gas, we would then have 1,441 men in the American Expeditionary Forces who died from gas. That is less than 2 per cent of the entire number of men gassed. If we take the 187,586 men who were injured by bullets, high explosives, bombs, bayonets, hand grenades, and so forth, we find that 46,449 died, more than 24 per cent. Therefore the death rate from gas is one-twelfth the death rate from high explosives and bullets. A soldier, therefore, who suffered a gas injury had twelve times the chance for his life that the man had who suffered from bullet or high explosive wound. I think this fact is not generally well known.

The question has come up quite often since this new method of warfare was engaged in—engaged in first by the Germans in violation of their agreement to refrain from its use, an agreement reached in The Hague convention—as to the after effects of gas.

The impression has gone forth that a man who has been gassed is disabled to a greater or less degree for the rest of his life, and especially that a predisposition toward tuberculosis has been set up in his system. Some figures on that are rather interesting. In the Surgeon General's report for the year 1920 we find this paragraph:

One hundred and seventy-three cases of tuberculosis occurred during the year 1918 among the 70,552 men who had been gassed in action. The number of cases of tuberculosis for each 1,000 men gassed was 2.45. Since the annual rate of occurrence of tuberculosis among enlisted men serving in Europe in 1918 was 3.50 and in 1919 4.30 per 1,000, it would seem to be apparent that tuberculosis did not occur any more frequently among the soldiers who had been gassed than among those who had not been.

Mr. President, without attempting to go into extended remarks, or of course attempting to give my opinion as that of one learned in these matters, I think an examination of the medical authorities and the investigations made by physicians among disabled men in the United States, in France, and in Great Britain will disclose the fact that the theory that gas injuries are conducive to tuberculosis is exploded. In fact, some of the most eminent investigators of the question have stated, after the most exhaustive investigations, that they are unable to ascertain any marked predisposition toward tuberculosis among those who have suffered from gas. I am well aware that these conclusions reached by men who have studied the question are not in accordance with the public sentiment of the time. I think, however, they are worth relating.

Something has been said upon more than one occasion concerning the effect of gas poisoning upon the eyes. If, again, we will take the Surgeon General's report, we will find that 86 men in the American Expeditionary Forces were totally blinded—lost the sight of both eyes—440 were partially blinded in both eyes, and 644 were blinded in one eye. Of the gassed patients it is stated that 4 were blinded in both and 25 in one eye, a total of 29. These 29 were only 3.85 per cent of all those suffering blindness in one or both eyes. In other words, the bullets or high explosives and other methods of warfare than gas were responsible for twenty-five times as many blinded as the gas.

Mr. President, chemical warfare accounted in the British Army during the last 18 months of the war, which was approximately the period of our participation in the war, for 160,000 gas casualties. The death rate of that 160,000 was 2.5 per cent, about one-eleventh of the death rate among those who suffered from bullets and high explosives and shells.

Chemical warfare during our participation in the war accounted for 30 per cent of all the casualties in the American Expeditionary Forces. It accounted for a like percentage of casualties in the British service and, I assume, a like percentage in the French service.

I know I am speaking in contradiction of a very well-defined public sentiment, but, nevertheless, I think I am justified in making this observation. The question has occurred to me, Can any weapon which in a great war accounts for one-third of all the casualties be definitely and finally barred from use in the wars of the future? Will a nation in the future, with its back to the wall, fighting desperately for its life, refrain from using a weapon against the soldiers of its enemies which the last war has shown accounts for 30 per cent of the casualties?

It is easy, Mr. President, to declare prohibitions against the use of weapons in warfare. If I read history aright, the same protest was made against gunpowder many generations ago. It became too effective, however, for any nation to decline to use it if its life were threatened. I fear, should another great war curse the world and nations be driven to desperation in protecting themselves against what they may consider to be unprovoked and piratical attack, that when that day shall come article 5 of the pending treaty will not be worth the paper it is written on. Speaking for myself alone, I am not enthusiastic about entering into declarations concerning which there is a very strong probability of violation in the future.

War is cruelty organized. We can not escape that conclusion. All war is cruel. There is not a weapon used in it that is not cruel. Which is the more cruel, a high-explosive shell which tears off a man's arm and blinds him and condemns him for the rest of his poor life to stagger down the pathway toward the grave, never free from suffering, or a gas wound which mutilates not at all and from which the medical records now show the soldier, in a comparatively short time in an overwhelming majority of cases, entirely recovers? If we are to draw the line of demarcation as between a more cruel weapon and a less cruel weapon, frankly I can not see why it should be drawn in favor of the high-explosive shell and against the gas.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I suggest to the Senator, while I rather sympathize with his argument, that after all the use of poisonous gases is only in its infancy, and if we permit the cultivation and development of the poison-gas science it may be a much more terrific and destructive element in the next war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Doubtless that is true. The same degree of progress, however, could be noted in high explosives. The high explosive was never used to any considerable degree until this war. Of course, gunpowder was used for a long time before, but not high explosive as now known.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator says he is very much of the opinion that article 5 would become a dead letter in some emergencies which he has described. I have no doubt at all but what that would be true; but does not the Senator think that the same rule would apply, for instance, with reference to submarines? Does the Senator think that any nation which was fighting for its life would hesitate to use its submarines against a merchant vessel which was feeding its enemy? I think that a man carrying on the war at the head of the army or at the head of the navy who would give orders that merchant vessels should be respected which were carrying food to the enemy that was pushing him to the wall would be immediately displaced and somebody else put in his place.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think there is this distinction: The submarine as used in the last war was used very largely against noncombatants, against the passengers and crews of merchant vessels, unarmed and helpless. When it is used against a belligerent vessel, a vessel of war, I think it is just as merciful and just as cruel as the high-powered shell from the 14-inch gun, not much more, not much less. What I have been arguing about is the use of chemical warfare between armies and between navies, which use is prohibited by the pending treaty. The use of the submarine against war vessels is not prohibited by the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. No; but the submarine is practically worthless as a war vessel, as the records of the last war show.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would hardly subscribe to that. There were a good many vessels sunk by submarines.

Mr. BORAH. If Mr. Lee, who represented the English Government, is correct in his figures, which I have, it was practically a useless war instrument. It accomplished very little in that respect. Its efficiency in effect was wholly with reference to the destruction of commerce.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That was the principal use made of it, of course, by the Imperial German Government, and yet it was made use of by the German Government and by the other belligerents in attacks upon war vessels; but this treaty does not pretend to prevent or prohibit that.

Mr. President, it has seemed to me there has been much misunderstanding about this weapon which is now called new; yet I think centuries ago certain gases were used in the wars of the ancient peoples; Greek fire was used; but, as I understand, article 5 might be construed to prohibit a flaming liquid?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The question is, Can the treaty prevent one of two armies or prevent both armies from using weapons which will tend to destroy their respective enemies? I contend that no treaty can do that. Not only is war cruelty organized, but war is waged for destruction, and if the whole world knows that every chemical industrial plant within the borders of a nation stands ready any day of the year to turn out a weapon such as poison gas, which may be used by its soldiers in the field in the next great war, if there shall be another, the whole world will use that weapon. Not a day goes by in the industries of the United States but what poison gas is made as an incident to industry. Take chlorine. It is made from common salt; it is used all over this country to purify the water supplies of cities. Phosgene is used for exceedingly important industrial purposes.

Poison gas is used for the whitening of print paper, which makes it possible for newspapers to be printed in the form in which they now appear. These elements are used every day in our industrial life. Can any Senator tell me, that being the case and the weapon standing ready to hand in the event of a desperate struggle between armies, no army will use it, especially when it is known that in the last great war the weapon accounted for 30 per cent of all the casualties? Let us look things straight in the face as practical people.

It would be a blessing, Mr. President, could we abolish all these cruelties, such as the high explosives and the airplane bomb. Can there be anything much more cruel in its effects than a 2,000-pound bomb dropped from an airplane, literally tearing men to pieces? Nothing is said in this treaty about the use of airplanes which fly in the dark of the night and drop their loads of destruction upon huddled human beings, be they soldiers or civilians.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. FRANCE. Does not the Senator believe that all these horrors will be things of the past when we shall have ratified the pending treaties? I understood that the purpose of this treaty was to secure the peace of the world. If that is not its purpose, I should like to know what its purpose is.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand the Senator's sarcasm.

Mr. FRANCE. I should like to inquire of the Senator from New York, who is the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, if these treaties are merely treaties to make new rules for warfare, or if they are treaties to secure the peace of the world?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] pointed to the possible development of this weapon if it is not prohibited. There is no possible way of preventing its development. It is being developed to-day. If we should disband our Army and our Navy completely, it would still be developed in our industries. It is being developed in every industrial country of the world. The industries to which I have referred have been familiar with the effects of gas upon the human organism for many years.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. In connection with what the Senator from New York has said, that this development will go on, I desire to remind him that we were told a week ago that it was the purpose of the British Government to prosecute experiments for the purpose of producing more deadly gases, not that it intends to precipitate the use of them but to be in readiness in case another country should do so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Exactly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, the other country will be prosecuting similar experiments; so that the work of developing this weapon expressly for the purpose of war will apparently go on.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Inevitably. Mr. President, no nation in its senses will dare to refrain from developing it in research.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. What I mean is that it will not be necessary to rely upon such development as may take place in industrial life; the development will apparently go on by the nations themselves for the express purpose of using gases in war in case of an exigency.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Montana has cited the case of Great Britain; I am not familiar with that; but why not be perfectly frank about it? We are doing it.

Mr. BORAH. And on a very large scale.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We are developing chemical warfare.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I referred to a statement made about a week ago to the effect that British experts were over here in this country examining into the developments and experimentations that have been taking place here in the Chemical Warfare Service of our Army with a view to acquainting themselves with such improvements as we have made, and it was in that connection stated to be the purpose of the War Department fully to expose to the British experts everything that had been done here, so that they might have the advantage of any improvements and progress that had been made in that direction by our Government.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no doubt about that. Not only will development go on in industry inevitably—we could not stop it if we tried to—but every nation will endeavor, in the open or behind closed doors, to continue its research under governmental auspices, for no nation will dare take a chance. Poison gases have proved too effective a weapon to be ignored. I should be much discouraged if the Army of the United States ceased to experiment in the perfection of gas masks on account of this treaty. We do not dare stop endeavoring to perfect a mask which will protect our soldiers in the event that their enemy shall use gas against them, and the only way to perfect a mask is to experiment with the gases and to see what kind of gases will penetrate the masks. So the entire research circle is involved.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield further to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to inquire whether the production of poisonous gases and the prosecution of experiments for the purpose of developing this weapon has not been restricted in Germany by the combined action of the Allies?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; I think it has been.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Would it not be possible, then, to restrict the development by various nations in exactly the same way? In other words, in addition to the agreement here not to use poison gas, might it not be advisable to have a further provision to the effect that no nation shall conduct researches for the purpose of developing gases as a weapon of warfare, and providing for reports and inspection exactly as in the case of Germany? Would it not be possible in that way to restrict the research to industrial activities?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think not, Mr. President. Two, three, or five nations might enter into an agreement to restrict research work in gases projected for war purposes, but we could not stop private citizens of a country engaging in such research work; that would be utterly impossible. We might just as well enter into an agreement prohibiting a group of nations from conducting research in ballistics and in the tensile strength of steel in order to prevent in the future guns being manufactured which will shoot more than 70 miles, as the Big Bertha, fired by the Germans, did during the recent war. We can not stop these activities.

It may be discouraging for a Senator to make such an admission, but, Mr. President, we have got to look facts in the face; we can not stop research work. When a weapon is invented by a private citizen, whether it be a Colt automatic or a Browning machine gun, if he is a patriotic citizen, he takes it first to his Government, and if the Government can use it, is the Government to say to him, "No; you must stop your efforts toward developing that gun"? The Government will never do it in the world. Nor can we stop the development of the use of gases. It will go on inevitably; it will go on to the end of time, in my humble judgment. We may not live to see the day, but for one I would not be the least surprised if chemical warfare, developed to its highest point of perfection, made war infinitely more merciful than it is to-day. It is quite within the realm of possibility that gases shall be developed which shall put a

whole opposing force out of action and yet not injure permanently a man in that force.

I think article 5 is drawn somewhat carelessly. It starts out with this paragraph, although this is not apropos of my argument, Mr. President—

The use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases, and all analogous liquids, materials, or devices, having been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world and a prohibition of such use having been declared in treaties to which a majority of the civilized powers are parties—

The phrase "other gases" is all inclusive. It reads:

Asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases.

Mr. LODGE. To be used in war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but there are gases used in war other than asphyxiating or poisonous gases.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What for?

Mr. WADSWORTH. For balloons, such as helium gas, and hydrogen. A strict construction would seem to prevent the use of any gas in war. Undoubtedly that is not meant.

I glance at the French text, and notice that the phrase is:

Gaz asphyxiants, toxiques ou similaires.

It would seem in the French text that the word "similaires" ties the matter up, but in the English text the equivalent of "similaires" is not used. That, however, is a point of comparatively small importance.

I make these observations, lonely as I may be while making them, because I honestly believe that the condemnation referred to in article 5 as a "just condemnation" is not a just condemnation; that this form of warfare is not more cruel than other forms; in fact, the figures show that it is less cruel. I know, too, that there is a very grave dread that chemical warfare gases may be used indiscriminately against civilian populations. That is true; but so can every other weapon used prior to the World War and during the World War be used against civilian populations. Cities were shelled by high-explosive shells; Paris was bombarded by the so-called Big Bertha at a distance of 72 miles.

Many more people in the cities of Paris and London, innocent civilians, were brutally killed by high explosives than were killed by gases. In fact, I think none were killed by gases. The German planes that bombarded London at night and Paris at night dropped high explosives upon innocent people. To my mind that is contrary to the laws and usages of war. But I do not recollect that any specific prohibition of the use of high explosives on that account has been agreed upon by any two nations. And so if we are measuring and comparing cruelties and the dangers to civilians while a great war is going on, for the life of me I can not see how the danger is any greater when it is accompanied by the use of chemical warfare gases than it is when chemical warfare gases are not used.

In my humble judgment article 5 of this treaty will neither add to nor detract from the cruelty of war. My dread is that it will be disregarded, and once more a group of great powers will in the end convict themselves of insincerity.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am never very sure about my own memory, but I find that I was not mistaken in saying that the United States signed the treaties prohibiting the use of poison and poisoned weapons.

By the first Hague convention it was prohibited—

To employ poison or poisoned arms.

And it was signed by Mr. Stanford Newel. I think the Senator probably overlooked it by looking at the adhesions on the first page. We signed; we did not adhere.

The second Hague convention—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator? I have not examined that in some time, but my recollection is so clear that the American delegates declined to adhere to or agree on that occasion—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, they signed. They did not adhere, of course. They signed. The powers that adhered were the powers that did not sign, but adhered afterwards.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will take the Senator's word for it, if it is in that book; but it is contrary to the testimony given before our committee.

Mr. LODGE. That is possible.

In the second Hague convention this language is used:

In addition to the prohibitions provided by special conventions it is especially forbidden—

To employ poison or poisoned weapons.

That treaty was signed by Joseph H. Choate, Horace Porter, U. M. Rose, David Jayne Hill, C. S. Sperry, and William I. Buchanan on the part of the United States. The ratification there was deposited at The Hague. In the first Hague convention Mr. Stanford Newel, minister at The Hague, signed,

and, of course, the name of the United States did not appear in the list of adhesions at the beginning.

Mr. WADSWORTH. With no reservation?

Mr. LODGE. No reservation that I can find at all. We have reservations, but not on that subject.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is quite possible—in fact, it is more than possible; it is probable, now—that I was mistaken; but I invite the Senator's attention to the result. The nations paid no attention to it.

Mr. LODGE. That is quite true, yes; but I think, if the Senator will pardon me, that that is no argument. Undoubtedly the number of deaths in this war arising from poisoned wells was very small. Is that a reason for restoring to general use the poisoning of wells, which has been driven out of use simply by the effect of public opinion?

This clause in this treaty is not expected to prevent the use of poison gases at present. It is expected to do something toward crystallizing the public opinion of the world against it, and trying to make that public opinion more effective. I am aware that the losses of life in this war from poison gases were less than those from high explosives and other weapons; but it hardly seems to me an argument to say that because you kill more men with shells, therefore it is well to add another method of killing them. It seems to me just as well to get rid of methods of killing men, and to limit them as much as possible. The only way in which you can ever reach it is by the effect of public opinion. That is all that this clause is intended to effect. It is hoped that it will have some effect in that way.

It was obvious to the conference that it was impossible to make regulations for the production or the use of these poison gases, because they were made in the production of dyes and in all sorts of chemical productions of different kinds, and could not be dealt with. At least, no way yet has been found for their regulation or control for use in war; but there is the hope that public opinion may be crystallized against them, and I do not think it is an argument against a thing of this sort, any more than it is an argument to say, "What is the use of having statutes against murder? There are lots of murders. They will go on just the same. What is the use of passing statutes?"

In some way we want to build up public opinion, and the attempt was made here. It was made at The Hague. Of course, no attention was paid to it in the war. If the world is cursed with another such war, I dare say they will break out and use poison gases again; but there is always the hope that the opinion of the world may be so crystallized that it will prevent it, as public opinion alone has practically prevented the poisoning of wells or the giving of no quarter to prisoners. That has been done simply by the opinion of the world, and perhaps we shall get an opinion of the world by and by that will gradually be against all these methods; and if we can do something to stop one it is already something gained, and that was all. It is a repetition of what The Hague convention said, and was done with the same purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The treaty is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If no amendment be proposed as in Committee of the Whole, it will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I simply desire the record to show my disagreement with article 5. Apparently I am not to have an opportunity to vote on it.

The treaty was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment in the Senate, without objection the resolution of ratification will be presented to the Senate.

The Assistant Secretary read the resolution of ratification, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive M. Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, a treaty between the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan relating to the use of submarines and noxious gases in warfare, concluded at Washington February 6, 1922.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARAWAY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McKINLEY]. I understand that if present he would vote as I shall vote, and therefore I will vote. I vote "yea."

I also desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON] on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD (when Mr. CULBERSON's name was called). The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I shall vote, and I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DIAL (when Mr. SMITH's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official business. If he 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 am informed that if that Senator were present he would vote as I intend to vote, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who, if present, would vote as I shall do. I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BALL. Has the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. BALL. I have a general pair with that Senator, but I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. FERNALD. Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. BROUSSARD. My colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], is absent on business of the Senate. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL. My colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is temporarily absent from the Senate on official business. He is paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], and if present would vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] on account of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McKINLEY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. NICHOLSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] are absent on business of the Senate. If present, all these Senators would vote "yea."

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY] are necessarily absent. If present, they would vote "yea."

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are absent on official business. If present, they would all vote "yea."

The roll call resulted—yeas, 72, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—72.

Ashurst	France	McNary	Smoot
Ball	Frelinghuysen	Moses	Spencer
Borah	Gerry	Myers	Stanfield
Broussard	Glass	Nelson	Stanley
Bursum	Gooding	New	Sterling
Calder	Hale	Oddie	Sutherland
Cameron	Harris	Overman	Swanson
Capper	Harrison	Owen	Townsend
Caraway	Hitchcock	Pepper	Trammell
Colt	Johnson	Phipps	Underwood
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	King	Poinsette	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	La Follette	Pomerene	Warren
Dillingham	Lenroot	Rawson	Watson, Ga.
Edge	Lodge	Sheppard	Watson, Ind.
Elkins	McCormick	Shields	Weller
Ernst	McCumber	Shortridge	Williams
Fernald	McLean	Simmons	Willis

NOT VOTING—24.

Brandegge	Heflin	McKellar	Page
Crow	Jones, N. Mex.	McKinley	Ransdell
Culbertson	Kellogg	Newberry	Reed
du Pont	Kendrick	Nicholson	Robinson
Fletcher	Keyes	Norbeck	Smith
Harreld	Ladd	Norris	Wadsworth

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas are 72, nays none. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the treaty.

TREATY CONCERNING CHINESE PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall not ask the Senate to continue with the consideration of the next treaty, but I ask that it may be taken up, so that it will be before the Senate and be the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the treaty, which will be read by title.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Executive P—A treaty between the United States, Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, and Portugal relating to principles and policies to be followed in matters concerning China, concluded at Washington February 6, 1922.

Mr. LODGE. I shall call the treaty up in the morning, and hope to have it disposed of.

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS.

Mr. CUMMINS. As in legislative session, I report favorably, without amendment, from the Committee on the Judiciary the bill (H. R. 9979) to amend an act entitled "An act granting a charter to the General Federation of Women's Clubs," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting a charter to the General Federation of Women's Clubs," approved March 3, 1901, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That the said corporation is authorized to acquire, by devise, bequest, or otherwise, hold, purchase, and convey such real and personal estate as shall or may be required for the purposes of its incorporation not exceeding \$500,000, with authority in said corporation, should it be by it deemed necessary so to do, to mortgage or otherwise encumber the real estate which it may hereafter own or acquire and may give therefor such evidences of indebtedness as such corporation may decide upon."

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

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

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

PEACE PORTAL BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

Mr. LODGE. Before moving to go into secret executive session I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, for which I ask present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Assistant Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 263), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States desires to express its cordial sympathy with the erection and dedication of the peace portal between the Dominion of Canada and the United States as a memorial of the peaceful relations so long existing between the two countries, and extends to Samuel Hill and his associates its warm appreciation of their valued services in promoting this new bond of friendship between Canada and the United States.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business in closed executive session.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate take a recess in open executive session until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate, in open executive session, took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, March 30, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 29 (legislative day of March 16), 1922.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. John F. Mahoney to be passed assistant surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from March 18, 1922.

Asst. Surg. Marion F. Haralson to be passed assistant surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from March 18, 1922.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

AIR SERVICE.

First Lieut. William Lewis Wheeler, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

CHAPLAINS.

To be chaplains, with rank of captain, from March 23, 1922.

Chaplain Frank Camplon Armstrong.
Chaplain Nathaniel Alexander Jones.
Chaplain George Runyan Longbrake.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Joseph C. Dutra to be postmaster at Chula Vista, Calif., in place of G. A. Wiard. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Fred C. Alexander to be postmaster at Yosemite National Park (late Yosemite), Calif., in place of M. A. Thornton, removed.

Bertha Johnson to be postmaster at Cutler, Calif. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

GEORGIA.

James M. Lawson, jr., to be postmaster at Aragon, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Thomas W. Cobb to be postmaster at Warthen, Ga. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

James W. Long to be postmaster at Ashburn, Ga., in place of J. F. Jenkins. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1921.

IDAHO.

William W. McNair to be postmaster at Middleton, Idaho. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Arthur W. Gayle to be postmaster at Dubois, Idaho, in place of J. E. Paul. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

INDIANA.

John W. Williams to be postmaster at Walton, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

William M. Lyon to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Ind., in place of H. J. Harris, resigned.

William E. Robinson to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, Ind., in place of J. E. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Ulysses G. Butcher to be postmaster at Oakland City, Ind., in place of Curtis Butler, resigned.

IOWA.

Glen M. Reynolds to be postmaster at Irwin, Iowa, in place of W. S. Braunson, deceased.

KENTUCKY.

Lillian G. Hall to be postmaster at Eddyville, Ky., in place of P. C. Mayhugh. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

MAINE.

Ivory J. Bradbury to be postmaster at Hollis Center, Me. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George B. Waterman to be postmaster at Williamstown, Mass., in place of P. J. Dempsey. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MISSISSIPPI.

William B. Stone to be postmaster at Fulton, Miss. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Henry P. Patton to be postmaster at Sardis, Miss., in place of J. H. McCraw. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MISSOURI.

Archie C. Atterberry to be postmaster at Atlanta, Mo., in place of W. N. Bledsoe. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1922.

John W. Smith to be postmaster at Browning, Mo., in place of J. R. Williams, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

Chester W. Harris to be postmaster at Ansley, Nebr., in place of L. D. Russell, removed.

Herbert C. Robbins to be postmaster at Wallace, Nebr., in place of H. C. Robbins. Incumbent's commission expired August 6, 1921.

NEW YORK.

George E. Opdyke to be postmaster at Landing, N. Y., in place of G. E. Opdyke. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

John B. Read to be postmaster at Poland, N. Y., in place of Thomas McMahon. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

NORTH CAROLINA.

A. Eugene Ward to be postmaster at Lake Junaluska, N. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

OHIO.

Frank A. Hawkins to be postmaster at West Farmington, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

OKLAHOMA.

William A. Geren to be postmaster at Wetumka, Okla., in place of J. C. Puryear, resigned.

OREGON.

John A. McCall to be postmaster at Klamath Falls, Oreg., in place of W. A. Delzell. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Julia A. Ernst to be postmaster at Beavertown, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

TENNESSEE.

Hilary R. Vaughn to be postmaster at Hendersonville, Tenn. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

TEXAS.

Frances Ruge to be postmaster at Bandera, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

Claud A. Howard to be postmaster at Bronson, Tex., in place of C. A. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

VERMONT.

Walter J. Reiriden to be postmaster at Richford, Vt., in place of C. M. Boright. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 29 (legislative day of March 16), 1922.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII.

Emil C. Peters to be chief justice, Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII.

Antonio M. Perry to be associate justice, Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Albert L. Sittel to be United States marshal, southern district of California.

W. F. Appleby to be United States marshal, western district of Tennessee.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

James H. Elkins, Blytheville.
Edwin C. Widener, Delight.
Benjamin W. Allen, Hamburg.
Ida Burns, Heber Springs.
Henry R. Osterholt, Jerome.
James F. Rieves, Marion.
Grace P. Stark, Marked Tree.
John Q. Skipper, Morrillton.
Edward L. Hamilton, McCrory.
Henry Bringman, Pine Bluff.
William O. Roberts, Sheridan.
Lee R. See, Swifton.
Edgar E. Hudspeth, Texarkana.

CONNECTICUT.

William S. Tift, Seymour.

DELAWARE.

Stephen W. Miller, Camden.
Arthur S. Hearn, Laurel.
Mark L. Davis, Milford.
Josiah D. Robbins, Milton.
Willard L. Harris, Wyoming.

FLORIDA.

Charles N. Hildreth, jr., Live Oak.

GEORGIA.

Henry A. Moses, Uvalda.
Emmett D. Dial, Woodstock.

IDAHO.

Benjamin O. Braham, Kellogg.

INDIANA.

Joseph A. Spears, Loogootee.

IOWA.

Sid J. Backus, Algona.
Laura M. Smith, Montour.

KANSAS.

William R. Logan, Eskridge.
Henry Uhlenhop, Leonardville.
Leo Herrman, Liebenhal.
Philip S. McMullen, Norwich.

KENTUCKY.

Wyatt M. Insko, Carlisle.
Francis A. Wiseman, Cecilia.
Snowden Shirley, Sanders.
Albert R. Hornback, Sonora.

LOUISIANA.

Esther Boudreaux, Donner.
Harry J. Monroe, Elton.
Carl C. Brown, Haynesville.
Dennis M. Foster, jr., Lake Charles.

MAINE.

Everard J. Cove, Biddeford.
William C. Bryant, Lewiston.
Robert A. Alexander, Saco.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Russell E. McKenzie, Foxboro.
William S. Curtis, Hanover.
Samuel F. Brown, Indian Orchard.
Harry E. King, Millis.
Arthur I. Randall, Rockland.
Thaddeus B. Fenno, Westminster.
Benjamin R. Gifford, Woods Hole.

MICHIGAN.

Lewis J. Hough, Flushing.

MINNESOTA.

John J. Fitzgerald, De Graff.
Otto C. H. Heinzel, Sauk Rapids.
Edward B. Hicks, Winona.

MISSOURI.

Russell E. Worth, Bogard.
Fred R. Moran, Branson.
Alfred L. Jenkins, Chula.
Ada C. Luna, Gainesville.
Lewis E. Nicholson, Green Ridge.
Avery P. Blankenship, Holcomb.
Joseph Snider, Ludlow.
Mary Shivers, Malden.
Mary E. Blackburn, Malta Bend.
Lawrence J. Glover, Newark.
Henry Dodge, New London.
Fred M. Meinert, O'Fallon.

MONTANA.

Leontine M. Turco, Absarokee.
James N. Starbuck, Valier.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Albert C. Cochran, Andover.
Dana B. Rounds, Hill.

NEW JERSEY.

Fred D. Matteson, Berlin.
Charles Morgenweck, sr., Egg Harbor City.
Mary E. Cubberley, Hamilton Square.

NEW MEXICO.

Claud E. Herndon, Cloudcroft.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Marion B. Prescott, Ayden.
Jethro A. Hooper, Elizabeth City.
Otis M. Davis, Fremont.
Walter H. Finch, Kittrell.
Mack H. Brantley, Spring Hope.
Charles M. Freeman, Troy.

OKLAHOMA.

LeRoy K. Butts, El Reno.
James W. Elliott, Fairland.
George M. Caldwell, Maramec.
Dan Voorhees, Walters.

RHODE ISLAND.

Henry D. Banks, East Greenwich.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Thomas J. Karnes, Georgetown.

TENNESSEE.

Mamie B. Riley, Humboldt.
Solomon Seches, Memphis.
Helen M. Ruef, Sewanee.
Ocie C. Hawkins, Stanton.

TEXAS.

Charles E. Wood, Alto.
Hugo Simon, Farmersville.
Lee K. McKewen, Huntington.

Wilmer D. Randolph, Menard.
Augustus S. Hightower, Millsap.
Thomas A. Matlock, Petrolia.
Hugh D. Burleson, Streetman.
Frank L. Irwin, Terrel.
John Plummer, Thurber.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Scott Straley, Janelew.
Herman H. Haeberle, Macdonald.
John W. Kastle, jr., Martinsburg.
J. Carlin Husted, Meadowbrook.
William N. Cummins, Red Jacket.
Mamie H. Barr, Winfield.

WISCONSIN.

Theodore Buehler, jr., Alma.
James W. Simmons, Corliss.
Emma Thompson, Deer Park.
Harry J. Lugner, Neshotah.
Carlton C. Good, Neshkoro.
Harry B. Loper, West De Pere.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, March 29, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father of infinite truth and wisdom: Look upon us and see that our minds are awake with good desire. We accept this day as having some good meaning. Thou wilt not disappoint us; direct Thy purpose and in all diligence and high expectation may it be accomplished. Be with the family that is just now in the shadows of their sacred dead. Comfort them in faith that the blossom of the pure womanhood has only been transplanted to the gardens of God. Shed Thy light upon us that understanding and knowledge may prevail. We ask for true strength and true greatness to be revealed unto us. Bless our whole country. May our entire citizenship stand together in compelling desire for those principles that enrich and ennoble our Republic, and may the springtime of God come everywhere. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the bill making appropriations for the Army on which the previous question was ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendments. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the items increasing the National Guard. I believe there are three of those items. I have not before me the bill as amended. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. I ask for a separate vote on those amendments.

The SPEAKER. On each one of the three?

Mr. SISSON. Well, I do not know the numbers; I have not the amendments before me.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman want a vote on all three?

Mr. SISSON. On all three of those amendments. One amendment is—

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he understands what the gentleman desires. Is there any other amendment on which a separate vote is demanded?

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for a separate vote on the Dempsey \$15,000,000 proposition.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 79, line 25, strike out "\$800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,002,800."

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. CRAGO) there were—ayes 33, noes 48.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Clearly there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—ayes 188, noes 145, answered "present" 1, not voting 96, as follows:

YEAS—188.

Andrew, Mass.	Dunn	Kirkpatrick	Pringey
Ansorge	Dupré	Kissel	Purnell
Appleby	Dyer	Klue, Pa.	Radcliffe
Arentz	Echols	Kraus	Raker
Aswell	Edmonds	Kreider	Ramseyer
Bacharach	Elliott	Layton	Rayburn
Barbour	Ellis	Lazaro	Reavis
Barkley	Fairchild	Lea, Calif.	Rhodes
Beedy	Favrot	Leatherwood	Rogers
Benham	Fenn	Lee, N. Y.	Ryan
Bixler	Fish	Lehlbach	Sanders, Ind.
Blakeney	Focht	Lineberger	Scott, Mich.
Bland, Ind.	Fordney	Linthicum	Scott, Tenn.
Bland, Va.	Free	Little	Siegel
Blanton	Freeman	Logan	Smith, Idaho
Bond	Frothingham	Luhring	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Pa.	Funk	Lyon	Snyder
Brown, Tenn.	Gallivan	McArthur	Stedman
Bulwinkle	Gensman	McClintic	Stephens
Burdick	Gerner	McCormick	Strong, Pa.
Burrroughs	Glynn	McFadden	Summers, Wash.
Butler	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Swank
Cable	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sweet
Campbell, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Swing
Cantrill	Griest	McPherson	Tague
Carter	Griffin	MacGregor	Taylor, N. J.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hadley	Magee	Taylor, Tenn.
Chindblom	Hardy, Colo.	Maloney	Ten Eyck
Clarke, N. Y.	Hawes	Mapes	Tilson
Classon	Hawley	Merritt	Timberlake
Cole, Ohio	Hayden	Michener	Tinkham
Colton	Hays	Mills	Trudway
Connell	Hickey	Montague	Tyson
Connolly, Pa.	Hutchinson	Montoya	Underhill
Copley	Jefferis, Nebr.	Moore, Ind.	Vaile
Coughlin	Jeffers, Ala.	Morin	Vestal
Crago	Johnson, Ky.	Mott	Volk
Crowther	Johnson, Wash.	Nelson, A. P.	Walsh
Cullen	Jones, Pa.	Newton, Mo.	Wason
Curry	Keller	Norton	Weaver
Dale	Kelley, Mich.	O'Brien	Webster
Dallinger	Kelly, Pa.	O'Conner	White, Me.
Darrow	Kennedy	Osborne	Winslow
Davis, Minn.	Ketcham	Paige	Wood, Ind.
Dempsey	Kiess	Parker, N. Y.	Wyant
Denison	Kindred	Petersen	Yates
Dowell	King	Pou	Zihlman

NAYS—145.

Ackerman	Dickinson	Lawrence	Sears
Andrews, Nebr.	Dominick	London	Shaw
Anthony	Drane	Longworth	Shelton
Atkeson	Driver	Lowrey	Sinclair
Bankhead	Evans	Luce	Sinnott
Beck	Foster	McSwain	Sisson
Begg	Frear	Madden	Smithwick
Bird	French	Mann	Sproul
Black	Fuller	Martin	Stafford
Bowers	Fulmer	Mead	Stegall
Bowling	Garner	Millsbaugh	Steenerson
Box	Garrett, Tenn.	Mondell	Stevenson
Brand	Garrett, Tex.	Moore, Ill.	Strong, Kans.
Briggs	Gilbert	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Tex.
Britten	Goodykoontz	Moore, Va.	Thomas
Brooks, Ill.	Green, Iowa	Morgan	Thompson
Browne, Wis.	Hardy, Tex.	Nelson, J. M.	Tillman
Buchanan	Harrison	Nolan	Tincher
Burness	Haugen	Oldfield	Towner
Burton	Hersey	Oliver	Tucker
Byrnes, S. C.	Hoch	Overstreet	Vare
Byrns, Tenn.	Hooker	Padgett	Vinson
Campbell, Kans.	Huddleston	Park, Ga.	Voigt
Cannon	Hudspeth	Parks, Ark.	Volstead
Chalmers	Hukriede	Perkins	Wheeler
Chandler, Okla.	Humphreys	Porter	White, Kans.
Clague	Johnson, Miss.	Rankin	Williams
Clouse	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reece	Williamson
Cole, Iowa	Kincheloe	Reed, W. Va.	Wilson
Collier	Kinkaid	Ricketts	Wingo
Collins	Knutson	Roch	Wise
Cooper, Ohio	Kopp	Robertson	Woodruff
Cooper, Wis.	Langley	Robson	Woodyard
Cramton	Lanham	Rouse	Young
Crisp	Lankford	Rucker	
Davis, Tenn.	Larsen, Ga.	Sanders, Tex.	
Deal	Larson, Minn.	Sandlin	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Herrick

NOT VOTING—96.

Almon	Connally, Tex.	Gorman	James
Anderson	Doughton	Gould	Jones, Tex.
Bell	Drewry	Graham, Pa.	Kahn
Boles	Dunbar	Hammer	Kearns
Brennan	Fairfield	Hicks	Kendall
Brinson	Faust	Hill	Kitchin
Burke	Fess	Himes	Kleczka
Carew	Fields	Hogan	Kilne, N. Y.
Christopherson	Fisher	Hull	Knight
Clark, Fla.	Fitzgerald	Husted	Kunz
Cockran	Gahn	Ireland	Lampert
Codd	Goldsborough	Jacoway	Lee, Ga.