

Also, a bill (H. R. 14356) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West Newbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14357) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Swampscott, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14358) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ipswich, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14359) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Manchester, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14360) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Merrimac, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14361) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Marblehead, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14362) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Newbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14363) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Georgetown, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14364) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Groveland, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14365) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hamilton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14366) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Danvers, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14367) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Essex, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14368) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Amesbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14369) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rockport, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14370) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wenham, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Resolution (H. Res. 501) providing for investigation and report by the Interstate Commerce Commission as to what the present methods are that are now being used in the purchase of railroad ties, switch ties, car material, and crossing plank; whether said methods are the most efficient; and as to whether there are any satisfactory substitutes now on the market for taking the place of the railroad ties, etc., now generally used and made of timber; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 384) providing for a joint committee to investigate all matters relating to mail and pay of soldiers in France; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. BESHLIN: A bill (H. R. 14371) granting a pension to William J. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 14372) granting an increase of pension to Simpson Newman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 14373) granting a pension to Thomas B. Leeper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 14374) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Deuel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 14375) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 14376) granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. CARY: Petition of National League for Woman's Service in Wisconsin, asking support of the Lewis-Raker bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of American Federation of Labor, protesting against sections of the war-revenue bill relating to the zone sys-

tem and increase of postage on second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions by the Industrial Commission of Wisconsin, indorsing the Smith-Bankhead bill for the rehabilitation of industrial cripples; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ELSTON: Resolution to be proposed by Hon. A. A. Wendering, California assemblyman, bespeaking action of Congress relative to naturalization of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of board of education and city clubs and associations of Oakland, Cal., indorsing Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of National Educational Association Commission on War Emergency, declaring approval of organizing youth of Nation for agricultural service; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolutions of the Industrial Commission of Wisconsin, indorsing the Smith-Bankhead bill for the rehabilitation of industrial cripples; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DOOLING: Resolutions of National Automobile Chamber of Commerce of New York, petitioning Congress to increase appropriations to aid extension of export trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Federation of Federal Employees of Greater New York, requesting that the order directing a reduction in the civilian force at the navy yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., be withdrawn temporarily until members of enlisted personnel have been released; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Resolutions of the Tacoma Rotary Club, Tacoma, Wash., urging that aliens refusing to bear arms in defense of the United States be forever barred from the privileges of citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KETTNER: Letter from Hon. Lyman M. King, Redlands, Cal., relative to maintenance of zone rate of postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Anaheim and Fullerton, Cal., regarding House bill 13159 and Senate bill 5306, prohibiting amateur wireless operations; also, letter of George P. Bush, manager Santa Fe telegraph offices, San Diego, Cal.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, letters from Clarence W. Barton, El Centro; Eugene De Burn, chairman registration and selection military service, San Diego; R. O. Price, chairman local board No. 1, San Bernardino; and Charles C. Chapman, member of local board, Fullerton, all in the State of California, relative to recognition by Congress for part taken in war by selective-service boards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions submitted by W. J. Capnel, recording secretary Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, San Bernardino, Cal., relative to Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolutions by the Teachers' Association of Oakland, Cal., indorsing Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 14, 1919.

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

Almighty God, at the beginning of a new day we lift our hearts to Thee and seek to draw from Thee day by day grace and courage and wisdom and strength for the battle of life. As we face the tremendous issues that are upon us to-day we would not face them alone, but, as our fathers did, we would gain Thy guidance and blessing. So we come, we trust, in the spirit of our fathers and in their faith lift our hearts to the God of Nations, praying that Thou wilt indue us plenteously with heavenly gifts and guide us in the discharge of our duty. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SHEPPARD and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, and countries contiguous thereto, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

AFFAIRS IN GREECE.

Mr. SPENCER. I send to the desk a resolution in the nature of a petition from citizens representing all the Greek societies, Greek community, and all Greeks who are American citizens, residents of the city of St. Louis, Mo., and vicinity, in meeting assembled on the 29th day of December, 1918, which I should like to have printed in the RECORD. The resolution deals with the rights of Hellenism, as they see it, at the peace conference.

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

We, native Americans and American citizens of Greek birth, representing all the Greek societies, Greek community, and all Greek residents of the city of St. Louis, Mo., and vicinity, in meeting assembled on this 29th day of December, 1918, at the Greek Church of St. Nicholas, St. Louis and Garrison Avenues, have unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the world war that cost humanity an untold sacrifice and suffering has come to an end, thanks to the valor and heroism of the combined forces of the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the leaders and representatives of the allied powers are about to assemble in peace conference at Versailles, France, to permanently decide the future peace, freedom, and happiness of the world; and

Whereas the heads of the allied Governments have declared that the war has been fought to abolish all arbitrary and autocratic powers and to secure the absolute freedom and justice for all the nations and peoples, strong and weak, upon the foundation as expressed by our illustrious President Woodrow Wilson, "The reign of law based upon the consent of the governed, sustained by the organized opinion of mankind": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request very respectfully that the peace delegates of the allied powers extend the ideals and principles of freedom and self-determination to the unredeemed Hellenism, inhabiting the northern Epirus, all of Thrace, including the Grecian metropolis Constantinople, the northern, western, and southern coast of Asia Minor, and all the islands of the Archipelago or Aegean Sea, including the Dodecanese, held by Italy since 1910, and Cyprus, held by England. These territories are either entirely inhabited by Greeks, or the Greek race predominates over all the other inhabitants. Historically, geographically, and ethnologically the rights of Hellenism is undisputable. These peoples have originally occupied and built the above districts, and for 2,518 years have heroically defended civilization and Christianity, which they themselves established, and saved more than once the western civilization from Asiatic rule. They have suffered more than any other race in the hands of the unspeakable Turk, and certainly more than any other are entitled to be helped to rid the black slavery and servitude imposed upon them by barbarians, and be permitted to reunite with their mother country—Greece—from which they have been forcibly torn away, while defending the ideals and principles for which the present democracies of the world united to preserve; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our noble President Woodrow Wilson, the United States Senate, the Governments of Great Britain, France, and Italy, and to the true leader of all Hellenism, Eleutherios Venizelos.

GUS. V. R. MACHIN,
Chairman.
JOSEPH CONSTAND,
Secretary.

DEMOBILIZATION OF AMERICAN TROOPS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I present a resolution adopted by the Huron Rotary Club, of South Dakota, on the subject of demobilization, a subject which is very important to everyone, I think, at this time, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

HURON ROTARY CLUB,
Huron, S. Dak., January 11, 1919.

HON. EDWIN S. JOHNSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am inclosing herewith copy of a resolution passed by the Rotary Club of Huron at their meeting January 8, 1919.

This resolution is the outcome of discussion on the matter of demobilization. Reports from the fathers of these young men in France and in cantonments in the United States show a condition that is demoralizing to these young men. Now that the armistice has been signed those who are so badly needed at home should be returned as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,
W. H. MAUL, *Secretary.*

Whereas it is now two months since the armistice was signed and it is manifest that no public good can be promoted by longer keeping our soldiers in camps and cantonments in the United States; and

Whereas it is also manifest that only a comparatively small portion of the American Expeditionary Forces is needed in Europe as an army of occupation; and

Whereas a vast number of men are held in idleness in various places in France and in cantonments in the United States who should be at once returned to their homes, where they are sorely needed in all the various fields of employment or where they should resume their studies in schools and colleges; and

Whereas the conditions that necessarily followed the taking away from these noble young men of the incentive to give their lives, if necessary, to win the war are those of relaxation, weakening of morale, and idleness, which tends to demoralization; and

Whereas thousands of these young soldiers are in foreign lands, where there is a most deplorable disorganization of the mail service, and they have been unable to receive news from their homes for months; and

Whereas in this community, which is fairly representative of the situation generally in the country, 16 boiler makers and machinists, 15 agents and telegraphers are imperatively needed by the local division of the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. at Huron and can only be secured by a return of soldiers, while every bank and business

house and trade in this city is similarly in need of men, one dealer needing 10, another 8, another 6, and so on down the line; and it is the same in the country on the farms; and

Whereas tremendous demands are daily made by parents and employers for the release and return of men from the Army; and

Whereas the lack of men in all useful pursuits is both appalling and apparent, and that by reason of the unnecessary detention of men in the cantonments and camps of this country successful agriculture is threatened, commercial activities are paralyzed, manufacture and industries are handicapped, and all useful and peaceful pursuits suffer, and the situation can only be relieved by the immediate discharge from the Army of all men in the camps in this country.

We urge upon Congress such action as may be necessary to bring about the immediate demobilization, and we demand such congressional investigation necessary to hasten the discharge of every man under arms not absolutely needed in completing the demobilization of men from overseas as rapidly as they can safely be returned to this country.

Rotary Club of Huron, S. Dak.: John Longstaff, president; W. H. Maul, secretary; R. E. Cone, banker; H. E. Dickinson, superintendent Chicago & North Western Railway Co.; J. C. Dexter, dry goods; D. G. Medbery, mayor; Paul Braden, train dispatcher; H. A. Perriton, drug store; W. F. R. Whorton, dentist; J. H. Foasberg, laundry; Coe I. Crawford, lawyer and lecturer; C. W. McIlvaine, secretary South Dakota State Board of Agriculture; B. E. Beach, president Dakota Savings & Loan Co.; George C. Fullenweider, president National Bank of Huron; A. H. Dodsley, manager oil company; E. C. W. Kuehn, architect; E. W. Pigion, clergyman; George H. Costain, music dealer; I. A. Churchill, lawyer; A. M. Urquhart, automobiles; A. K. Gardner, lawyer; W. C. Gagnon, wholesale candy; J. M. Morin, wholesale groceries.

EXTENSION OF FARM-LOAN ACT TO PORTO RICO.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I present a petition from the Farmers' League of San Juan, P. R., asking for the extension of the farm-loan act to that Territory. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The motion was agreed to.

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. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 5339) providing for the disinterment and removal of the remains of the infant child, Norman Lee Molzahn, from the temporary burial site in the District of Columbia to a permanent burial place; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 5340) to provide for the protection of persons from liability for the consequences of compliance with orders or instructions issued during the period of the war by Government officers or agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 5341) donating a captured German airplane, field-piece, and shells to the city of Birmingham, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS (by request):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 209) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the entry of distilled, malt, vinous, or other intoxicating liquors, except distilled spirits, into bonded warehouses under bond conditioned for the export of such distilled, malt, vinous, or other intoxicating liquors to some foreign country within one year from the date of entry into the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted seven amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

SALARIES OF JUDGES.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of Senators to the fact that immediately after the morning business tomorrow I hope to bring before the Senate the bill with reference to judicial salaries and retirement. I mention my intention publicly because there are a number of Senators who have expressed a desire to be present when the bill is considered.

RESOURCES OF ARIZONA.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I observe in a widely circulated and remarkably influential magazine, Collier's National Weekly, an editorial entitled "Prearranged pioneering." I am surprised that the editor of this high-class publication should have made such a sarcastic reference to the State of Arizona as he has done in this editorial. I ask that the article be read. It appeared on Saturday, January 14, 1919.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

PREARRANGED PIONEERING.

"Everyone seems to be entitled to at least one suggestion as to what is to be done with the returning soldier. Everyone, that is, except the returning soldier himself.

"I know just the thing," says a solicitous official. "The arid lands of the West! Our veterans can reclaim them."

"The swamps of Florida leave much to be desired as home-stand land," suggests another. "They would keep any number of men busy draining and shoveling for years to come."

"This leads to a train of similarly benevolent propositions, involving the working over of various undeveloped sections of the country, with an eye to keeping the unemployed veteran busy. But what about the veteran? He has not yet been quoted for publication on this 'arid-land' question. Presumably when he left this country a few months ago he was a normal American with a normal American's preconceived notions of what constitutes a good time. It is safe to assume that reclaiming arid lands has not been on his list of things that he wanted to do when first he reached home. What, therefore, will be his emotions on being greeted by his local reconstruction committee with this message: 'Welcome home, our hero! Your old job is gone, but we have the jolliest little bit of desert in Arizona which the Government will grant to you, and on which you can raise a practically unlimited family and perhaps a radish or two in time. Go West, young man; go West!'

"Life in God's great outdoors is doubtless a wonderful thing, and we have been led to believe that the thrill of the pioneer is a reward in itself; yet there ought to be at least an alternative reward for those returning soldiers who have benefited so little by military training as still to hanker after the effete life in the congested but congenial centers of human life."

Mr. ASHURST. I present a paper by one HENRY F. ASHURST, entitled "Arizona, the Old New State, Rich in Scenic Grandeur, Romance, History, and Natural Resources." I ask that it be included in the RECORD.

Mr. THOMAS. In view of the absence of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], who objects to everything being printed in the RECORD except spoken words, I simply suggest that the Senator from Arizona seems to be taking advantage of that fact.

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

ARIZONA, THE OLD NEW STATE, RICH IN SCENIC GRANDEUR, ROMANCE, HISTORY, AND NATURAL RESOURCES.
[By Senator HENRY F. ASHURST.]

Arizona was a populous land before the Pyramids were built. Years before Romulus and Remus were suckled, ancient Arizona peoples builded cities, not wholly lacking in grandeur. These peoples of antiquity wove and spun cotton and flax into gaudy tapestries; they melted gold and silver, from Arizona's hills, into chieftains' ornaments and queens' girdles, before Cæsar's shouting legions and laureled ensigns brought tribute back to Rome.

Centuries before the Knickerbocker set foot on Manhattan Island, their engineers watered Arizona's fertile sands from canals and reservoirs finished with hard linings of tamped or burnt clay, which in some degree possessed the endurance of our modern concrete. The origin of this people is unknown, enwrapped in the mists of antiquity. Nothing has been found of sufficient distinctiveness to enable us to do more than speculate and form ingenious theories as to whence they came, how long they enjoyed their tolerable civilization, and whither and why they went.

The Pima Indians reported to Padre Quino in 1698 that the Casa-Grande ruins were in the same condition at least 300 years before, which seemed to be as far back as the Pima tradition ran.

Whether these ancient peoples perished, migrated into Mexico, or broke up into the numerous tribes of aborigines still inhabiting the State is a matter of speculation.

Obscure and meager is that portion of our annals where we must seek for the meaning and derivation of the name "Arizona." According to bulletin 613, "Guidebook of the Western States," issued by the Department of the Interior in 1915, the word "Arizona" is taken from the Papago language, in which it is said to signify "place of small springs." According to the Encyclopedia of Names, the word is said to be "a corruption of Pima or Papago, 'Orlison,' meaning 'little creeks.'" Mowray in his "Arizona and Sonora," says: "The name is undoubtedly derived from the Aztec. In the original it is 'Arizuma' and the change is a corruption into the present word, which is accepted as Spanish. The impression among those who have been curious enough to investigate is that it signifies 'silver-bearing.'"

EARLY SPANISH EXPLORATIONS.

The first Caucasians to enter Arizona were two friars, Juan de la Asunsion and Pedro Nedal, who came in 1538. Fra Marcos de Niza, a Franciscan friar, and his party, entered in 1539 and journeyed to the source of the San Pedro River. History reveals nothing more fascinating than the annals of the "conquistadores" who represented Castilian pride and power—Ponce de Leon, Cortez, Pizarro, De Soto, Coronado, and their comrades, who flourished in the sixteenth century and made their grand tours over the western hemisphere impelled by a thirst for adventure and imbued with a contempt for danger.

Francisco Vasquez de Coronado, a native of Salamanca, Spain, of noble descent, who had attained distinction as a soldier and statesman, entered Arizona at the head of his command in 1540 and wandered for years in search of the gems and gold of the mythical seven cities of Cibola. Coronado's vagrant rambles yielded him no pecuniary profit, but he reported to his sovereign that in his explorations he was as richly rewarded as if he had found the legendary cities and Quivera's phantom towers.

Hernando de Alarcon sailed from Acapulco in May, 1540, to explore the region north of New Spain and reached the head of the Gulf of California, then known as the Sea of Cortez. He reported that he "found a mighty river that ran with so great a fury that we could hardly sail against it." There began the acquaintance of Europeans with the Colorado River, the "Nile of the West."

The Colorado River, which forms the western boundary line of the State, has the energy to drive practically unnumbered industrial enterprises, and if its waters were scientifically conserved they would irrigate lands sufficient to support nearly 2,000,000 persons. This river annually discharges 300,000,000 tons of fertilizing material. The wealth, population, produce, and tradition of the land of the Pharaohs could easily be reproduced in the valley of this river.

SPANISH MISSIONARIES AND MISSIONS.

Father Quino, subsequently known as "the great apostle to the Pima Indians," established the first mission in Arizona. He was a native of Trent, in the Austrian Tyrol, and died about the year 1710 after 26 years of missionary work in Arizona and in Sonora, Mexico.

The Mission of San Xavier del Bac, near the city of Tucson, known as a "rancheria" in the seventeenth century, and as a mission since 1720, is the oldest mission in Arizona or California which has not fallen into partial decay. It stands a monument to the zeal, industry, and architectural skill of the early missionaries.

AMERICAN INVASION.

The leaders of the American invasion were Kit Carson, the great scout and trapper; Sylvester Pattie and his son; Felix Aubrey; Lieut. Zebulon M. Pike; Bill Williams; R. W. Hardy; Jedediah Smith; Pauline Weaver; Gen. John C. Fremont, Senator from California, candidate for President and governor of Arizona; Brig. Gen. Stephen W. Kearny, commander of the Army of the West; and Col. Alexander W. Doniphan, the versatile lawyer and valorous soldier from Clay County, Mo.

In 1850 the first steamboat, the stern-wheeler *Yuma*, entered the Colorado River to the amazement of the Indians, who fled in terror.

In 1858 Lieut. Ives, of the Engineer Corps of the Army, with the little steamer *Explorer*, ascended the Colorado River as far as the lower end of Black Canyon.

The northern line of the Mexican Republic constitutes the southern boundary of the State. Physically considered, the State consists of series of wide plateaus, having a mean elevation of 1,500 feet on the southeast and up to 6,000 feet above sea level on the north. These plateaus are riven in all directions by vast gorges and great canyons of remarkable grandeur cut by the rivers which long ago eroded their way through. Mountain ranges and numerous high peaks greatly diversify the prospect. In no other place is nature more clearly caught in the act of world making than in the physical character of the larger portion of the State.

The climate of the State is varied, ranging from north-temperate winter in the mountains to isothermal heat in the tropical levels in the south-center. Infectious pulmonary afflictions never originate in the State. Health seekers are therefore very numerous. The glaring sunlight and ozone-laden atmosphere are said to be specifics for all tubercular troubles in the primary stages. The humidity is less than in any other State except Nevada, the rainy season being confined almost wholly to July and August. The rainfall is at times almost tropical in its excessiveness and rapidity of precipitation.

The population, exclusive of tribal Indians, is about 410,000. Of its 72,000,000 acres, only about 8,000,000 are privately

owned, the remainder being public land, Indian reservations, and national forests.

The Territory, as originally created, in 1863, embraced 120,912 square miles, but its area was afterwards reduced by Congress to 113,956 square miles.

Obviously there can not be narrated in this paper even a portion of the exalted heroism of the early pioneers in their contests with ferocious Indians, or their fortitude and sagacity in traversing and settling uncharted stretches of desert, whose raw and ruthless sun came down as a pitiless flail and where life was in constant peril from lurking savages or from a miscalculation as to the distance to or location of the next "watering place."

The process of evolving a vast, unknown domain into a prosperous State is a grim game.

Prior to the entry of the Southern Pacific Railroad into the Territory in 1879 merchandise and supplies were brought to Yuma by steamboat and thence distributed by freight teams to the various settlements. Six months were frequently required to transport a consignment of goods from San Francisco to the interior of the Territory.

Two transcontinental railway lines, the Santa Fe and the Southern Pacific, now cross the State. These pulsating arteries of commerce follow the general course of historic trails and stage roads.

The Santa Fe Railroad follows the general course of the "Old Santa Fe Trail," while the Southern Pacific follows the once busy Butterfield stage line. Over the Butterfield route, established in 1858, was run a triweekly stage for a distance of 2,535 miles, traversing a land infested by Indian tribes of unspeakable brutality. Twenty-four days were required to cover the distance between St. Louis and San Francisco. The shortest period of time in which the mail was ever carried was 21 days and 23 hours. The journey was difficult and filled with peril. The cost of passage per person was \$150, exclusive of meals. The route was abandoned in 1861 on account of the inveterate hostility of the Indians and the outbreak of the Civil War. The Butterfield stage line, although the longest, most important, and most romantic, was not the first to cross Arizona. The first stage line established was in 1857 and extended from San Antonio, Tex., on the east, to San Diego, Cal., on the west.

The Santa Fe trail, established in 1822, first ran from the Missouri settlements to Santa Fe, N. Mex., was later extended to the Pacific Ocean, and followed largely the same stretches of country explored by the first detail of European civilization on its way to the Grand Canyon in 1541. It in turn passes the Petrified Forest, the logs of which are the remains of trees that grew in Triassic time. The trees were of several kinds, most of them being related to the Norfolk Island pines. A small amount of iron oxide is distributed through the logs, which gives them their beautiful yellow, brown, and red tints. This old trail also passes near the Hopi villages, where may be seen to this day the most remarkable indigenous religious rite in the Western World—the snake dance; it passes the Painted Desert, and crosses and recrosses the path where walked the steps of Fray Garces, who, in 1776, wandered along the brink of the Grand Canyon while the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia was proclaiming freedom.

The city of Tucson, probably the oldest city in the United States, has undergone strange mutations and various conditions of occupancy, to wit: An Indian pueblo; mission for Spanish priests; presidio for Spanish soldiers; rendezvous for Mexican troops; capital of the Confederate Territory of Arizona and later capital of the Union Territory. Tucson was the first and only walled city in the United States. This wall existed for about 150 years and was built in the form of a square. The wall rose to a height of about 5 feet above the roofs of the houses. A tower guarded each corner and there were two entrances, defended by immense doors of heavy timbers, invariably closed at night. Some of the old wall was later used in the construction of modern buildings.

In December, 1846, Lieut. Col. St. George Cooke, commanding the Mormon battalion, composed of 500 courageous Mormon soldiers who were marching to the assistance of Gen. Stephen Kearny, then hard pressed by the Mexicans in California, issued the following order:

HEADQUARTERS MORMON BATTALION,
CAMP ON THE SAN PEDRO,
December 13, 1846.

Thus far on our course we have followed the guides furnished us by the general (Kearny). These guides now point to Tucson, a garrisoned town, as our road, and assert that any other course is a hundred miles out of the way and over a trackless wilderness of mountains, rivers, and hills. We will march then to Tucson. We came not to make war on Sonora, and less still to destroy an important outpost of defense against Indians; but we will take the straight road before us and overcome all resistance. But shall I remind you that the

American soldier ever shows justice and kindness to the unarmed and unresisting? The property of individuals you will hold sacred. The people of Sonora are not our enemies.

By order of Lieut. Col. Cooke.

(Signed) P. C. MERRILL, Adjutant.

Reaching Tucson the next day, the command passed through the gate into the walled city, whereupon Col. Cooke raised the American flag and then made a short speech in which he stated that no one would be harmed, as his troops would not in any way interfere with the private property and civil rights of the citizens.

To the unsophisticated "tenderfoot," the deserts of Arizona present nothing attractive, whereas a familiarity with them reveals that they bear upon their bosoms, flora of gorgeous beauty. Much has been written of the "arboreal Arizona deserts," for these deserts bloom with flowers. The prevailing hue of the desert is not monotonous; for there are ever-changing color-tones of the sky and far-away mountain peaks that form the rim of your world. The rich purple tones in the distant hills, the pearl gray touches, and the deep translucent azures in the arching heavens make up myriad glints of light and color that may not be set upon canvas.

Within the State is the largest area of recent volcanic action to be found on the continent, "recent" being employed in its geological sense. In the State is the largest and most interesting cave dwelling; the most extensive "pinus ponderosa" forest in the United States, and in the forest are hundreds of small parks—bowl-like gems of exquisite scenery.

Maj. J. W. Powell, whose labors as an explorer and geologist were of incalculable value to the American people, left a rich legacy by his early explorations of the Grand Canyon. Scarcely less fearless and prominent were the subsequent journeys and explorations through the canyon made by Lieut. Wheeler in 1871, Mr. R. B. Stanton in 1890, and the Kolb brothers in 1912.

The total number of Indians maintaining tribal relations in the State is about 44,000. The Navajo (one of the boldest and most sagacious of tribes) is domiciled in northeastern Arizona. The Navajos were wily foes and their raids and depredations were usually victorious. After the acquisition of the great Southwest by the United States, the Navajo warriors killed many citizens. Several attempts were made to subdue the Navajo, but none succeeded until 1863, when Col. Kit Carson drove them into New Mexico, where they were held as prisoners until 1867, when they were permitted to return to their old haunts in Arizona, where a reservation covering more than 9,000,000 acres was apportioned to them. Since that time they have been peaceful and in some ways prosperous. The Navajo was not mentioned by travelers prior to 1629 and apparently began as a small offshoot of the Apaches. They call themselves Dinneh, "the people." The Spaniards called them, "Apaches de Navajo," from Navahu, the name of an old Tigua pueblo. The women weave the famous Navajo blankets, which bring them nearly \$500,000 a year, and men and boys tend their sheep and goats and raise a few crops.

Despite their history as predatory savages, the Navajo are in general jovial, intelligent, and, as Indians go, industrious and capable. They have an ample vocabulary, a complex grammar, an elaborate religious system, and hundreds of songs.

Arizona is the premier copper mining State; it produces annually one-third of the copper output of the United States, being about one-sixth of the entire world output. The value of the State's copper production for the year 1918 was over \$200,000,000, while the annual output of gold, silver, lead, and zinc aggregated \$13,000,000.

The total value of crops raised in Arizona for the agricultural year of 1918 is \$36,000,000, and of this crop long-staple cotton furnished a value of \$14,000,000.

That portion of Arizona, exclusive of the Gadsden purchase, was formally ceded by Mexico to the United States in 1848 by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

The Gadsden purchase, consummated in 1854, added 24,940 square miles to the Territory's domain.

Immediately after the Gadsden purchase, increasing numbers of Americans, from the stream of immigrants to California, began to make permanent homes in the Territory. These pioneers possessed the vision and energy of State builders and the spirit of Crusaders. As early as 1856 the settlers in Arizona petitioned Congress for separation from New Mexico and for the establishment of a Territorial government. In December, 1850, Senator Jefferson Davis introduced a bill to create a temporary government for the Territory of Arizona. Through the vicissitudes of government, Arizona was organized as a Territory by the Congress of the Confederate States a year before the Congress of the United States erected the Union Territory, and was occupied during the Civil War by a force of Confederates

from Texas, who were driven out by the Federal troops entering from California in 1863.

The civil government of the Union Territory was formally set up at Navajo Springs in 1863; hence the capital may be said to have been once at Navajo Springs. It was at Prescott from 1863 to 1867; at Tucson from 1867 to 1877; again at Prescott from 1877 to 1889, when it was permanently located at Phoenix. Almost immediately upon the erection of the Territory the question of statehood was agitated. Such a bold and dominant vanguard of American pioneers would not long permit their new home to remain in a posture of vassalage and dependency. Moreover, the Territorial government was set up by men of large ability and high ambition. The first Delegate to Congress, Charles D. Poston, born in Hardin County, Ky., in 1825, was a brilliant orator and charming raconteur.

The first man inducted into the office of governor was John Noble Goodwin, born in South Berwick, Me., in 1824, a graduate of Dartmouth College. Mr. Goodwin was elected to the Thirty-seventh Congress from the State of Maine. His state papers, and especially his messages to the Territorial legislature, evince a high order of patriotism and scholarship. After his service as governor he was Delegate to Congress from the Territory.

The first secretary of state was the classically educated Richard Cunningham McCormick, born in New York City in 1832. He was with the Army of the Potomac as a correspondent of the New York Evening Post in 1861 and 1862; was secretary of the Territory, governor, and in the Forty-first, Forty-second, and Forty-third Congresses, was Delegate; appointed minister to Brazil in 1877, but declined; appointed minister to Mexico in 1879, but declined; elected as a Republican from New York to the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The efforts of the people of the Territory to obtain statehood have at times been marked by disagreement between the people of the Territory and the Federal Government. A constitution was framed in 1891, and undoubtedly Arizona would have been admitted into the Union at that time, except that the Arizonians were unwilling to eliminate from their proposed State constitution a provision that silver and gold should be a standard of legal tender.

In 1903 statehood was defeated by a filibuster led by the able Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, who with other Senators, "talked to death" what was known as the omnibus statehood bill, providing separate statehoods for Arizona and New Mexico. In the following Congress, Senator Beveridge obtained committee approval in both Houses for his plan of uniting Oklahoma and Indian Territory as one State and Arizona and New Mexico as another. The bill passed the House and came to the Senate, where Senator Joseph Benson Foraker, of Ohio, encouraged and aided by the then Delegate from Arizona, MARCUS A. SMITH, now United States Senator, the wisest and most experienced statesman of the Southwest, conducted a determined contest with Senator Beveridge. The Beveridge bill passed the Senate with the "Foraker amendment," which provided that the vote of Arizona and New Mexico, counted separately, should determine whether they were to be admitted as one State. Under this amendment Arizona found refuge, and at the elections in 1906, by a large majority, refused to link her destiny with another community.

An enabling act authorizing the admission of Arizona and New Mexico as separate States was passed by Congress and approved by President Taft on June 20, 1910. The constitutional convention assembled in October of that year, and after a session of 60 days framed a constitution, which was ratified in February of the succeeding year by nearly four-fifths majority of those voting.

Congress by joint resolution of August 21, 1911, agreed to admit Arizona if the judicial recall provision were eliminated from the proposed constitution, which was done by the voters at the general elections held in the following December.

On February 14, 1912, President Taft issued his proclamation declaring Arizona admitted as a State, and on the same day George W. P. Hunt, president of the constitutional convention, was inducted into the office of governor.

The laws of the State represent an enlightened policy, and have mitigated, if not wholly removed, some of the worst evils that most balefully afflict society.

As a State, Arizona united the energy of youth with the wisdom of experience, and accomplished that rare feat in reforms of fusing progress with stability. The birth of a sovereign State and its entry into the American Union is an important and majestic event. Under our Federal system it is the most beautiful and symmetrical creation of political authority known to men. Although at times it seems that the States are being

gradually weakened or absorbed by the Federal Government, no American should forget that the sovereignty of statehood is the highest and most beneficent plan which human wisdom can devise.

Do you seek the land of romance! Go to Arizona.

Would you engage in stock raising! There are grown the wool and hides that clothe a Nation and the mutton and beef that sustain it. Hydroelectric power! There are strategic points where may be generated sufficient hydroelectric power to turn all the wheels and propel all the trains requisite to carry the commerce of the entire southwest.

Von Humboldt called Arizona the "treasure vault of the Americas," over 100 years ago. The State is nature's alembic, where the base metals are transmuted into gold. She is El Dorado! Remain there and shout "Eureka!" for into her hills and caverns nature has poured more mineral wealth than Ophir had to burden the fleets of Solomon.

Scenic grandeur! The deep alcoves, the green and gray crags, the vermilion gleams and roseate hues of the Apache trail, open the door to regions of beauty and glory.

Let Music Mountain, with its regularity of strata and its singular erosive work, point you to a sheet of music carved on the face of the mountain by the Great Composer, through the agencies of wind and water.

The Painted Desert casts its bewitching spell upon you and you perceive the "sea of jasper;" you seem to descry fortifications with flags flying on their ramparts, walled towers on conical hills amidst an admixture of light and shade beneath a vault of flawless turquoise blue.

Only a facile pen and not this dull one may be dipped deep enough into the ink of temerity to attempt a description of the colonnades, pyramids, fluted pilasters, swelling domes, sculptured architraves, mosques, minarets, and inverted temples in that 13-mile-wide gash, the Grand Canyon.

A prose-poet of no contemptible order will find himself hard pressed, even tamely, to describe the bold escarpments, sheer cliffs and isolated mesas, within that wondrous canyon, between whose walls there tumbles and rolls and boils the rapid and forbidding Colorado River.

Would you follow that noble vocation by which the multitudes of the earth are nourished, agriculture? Would you become a producer? Consider then that the fertile sands and salubrious climate of Arizona produce the Tunis date, the Egyptian long staple cotton, the orange, the olive, the lemon, the Louisiana sugar cane, the Michigan sugar beet, the Canadian strawberry, the Kalamazoo celery, the California cantaloupe, the French asparagus, and all the fruits and grains and flowers. And lest the rainy season might not synchronize with the "heated spell" there have been built irrigation projects so big and yet so simple, so practical and yet so ideal that they charm the imagination with their wizardry while they pour their "living waters" out upon the rich alluvial soils.

Do you seek health? Arizona is a dreamful tranquillity, which soothes the throbbing nerve of pain. She blows a bracing, healing air that reddens the bloodless lip and paints the rose upon the invalid's pallid cheek. And the citizens! They are of active enterprise and unbending courage. They are disciples of industry, therefore apostles of success who know that all independence, competence, and all livable conditions of life come only from constant striving and long-sustained effort. The wealth and beauty of enterprise, the public order, justice, and progress that have been set up in Arizona during the past 30 years make the lamp of Aladdin and the purse of Fortunatus appear tame and commonplace by comparison. Her people, testifying to the eternal and supreme truth of Christianity as a solid foundation for civilization, have built a State which will give good government to the people and strength to the Union so long as men love liberty. Fair dealing, moderation, industry, sobriety, frugality, freedom from bigotry, are the great virtues, and they who visit these shrines never come away empty handed. These virtues build a State.

Hail the giant—the old-new State! Her past is romantic; her present is radiant. Those who are banished from her borders by caprice or misfortune are irresistibly recalled by the splashing splendors of her noonday sun; her sunsets that are wedges of flaming gold, and her cloudless nights lit with eternal stars, which, bright and clear, bespangle the serene and silent arch above.

PEACE POLICIES.

Mr. FRANCE. I offer a resolution and ask to have it read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 412) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

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—

1. The congestion of population of some nations.
2. The underpopulation of other nations.
3. The unregulated competition between the more populous and industrial countries for the raw products and trade of the less populous and agricultural ones.
4. The exploitation of the weaker and the less advanced by the stronger and more highly organized nations.
5. A larger self-determination of peoples and nations.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.

CALENDAR MONDAY.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the Senate proceeded yesterday with its usual custom of disregarding Calendar Monday. The Vice President called attention to the fact that Calendar Monday had not been observed since the rule providing for it was adopted. I wish to give notice that hereafter on Calendar Monday I shall object to any variation whatever from the regular order to the end that Calendar Monday may be observed. I give this notice now in order that Senators may be fully advised.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 13708. An act providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, and countries contiguous thereto, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, whatever there may be of virtue or of vice, of strength, or of weakness in the proposition of a league of nations, whether it shall prevail or whether it shall fail, I think it profitable to discuss the problem. Certainly no subject of such moment should be permitted to pass into practical form without the most thorough consideration and discussion upon the part not only of those in public place but of and by private citizens.

There are, it seems, as many different kinds of leagues of nations as there are advocates. But I think it may be fairly said that all are but modifications of two fundamental types or plans. The first is a league which would organize the moral forces of the world. The second is a league which would or-

ganize the military forces of the world. The former depends for its effect upon public opinion and the power of ideas. The second rests ultimately, if not primarily, upon force, upon repression. The former is indicated in President Wilson's speeches in France and Italy. The second has its most distinguished and industrious advocate in ex-President Taft.

I do not at this time discuss the first plan. I recognize in government and among men the power of public opinion. We shall watch with interest the development of the machinery by which it is to be made effective for the settlement of concrete questions and particularly difficulties in international affairs. It is upon the second plan that I wish to submit some observations, for peace by repression may be infinitely worse than war. It may not be a peace of justice or of liberty at all. It may be the same kind of a peace that Germany contemplated for all the world in case her scheme had ripened into success. It was frustrated, however, by the liberty-loving people of the free nations, who thought there were some things dearer than peace, and among them the right to live our own lives in our own way.

At the time that the League to Enforce Peace was first organized it was apparent to those who gave it consideration that it must rest ultimately upon force, upon the principle of repression. But the advocates of this particular league were very slow to admit to the public that that was the true construction to be placed upon their program. It was some time before it was conceded that force would have any particular part in the maintenance and execution of the objects and purposes of this league. It was argued that it might ultimately be relied upon, but that it would be seldom used. We have now arrived at that stage of the discussion when its proponents concede that the distinguishing feature of this league over all others is that it depends upon force and that its fundamental principle is that of repression; that it can only be maintained by the organization of the military power of the great nations, to be used whenever those powers shall deem it proper.

Naturally, the first question that one would ask would be, "How are you going to raise your Army to sustain this vast military program or this league based upon force?" Would the citizens of the United States volunteer to enter the Army for the purpose, for instance, of settling difficulties in the Balkans? Would the American boys leave their homes or the farms or the factories for the purpose of taking part in the adjustment of a controversy between Japan and Russia over Manchuria? How are you to have a sufficient force in a free nation with which to maintain the program outlined by this league? After some delay, the ex-President was frank enough to say precisely how it was expected to raise and maintain a sufficient Army to support a league to enforce peace. I call attention to this because it is one of the practical features now indicated in the workings of this program; it is one of the things which come home direct to the citizen, and which enable him to see precisely what his duties and obligations are to be if this particular principle should be incorporated in the league of nations. We are to have conscription in time of peace.

We yielded, Mr. President, to the principle of conscription in the great emergency through which we have just passed, but it is certainly of extraordinary moment to the people of this country to have presented to them the question of conscription in time of peace in order to secure a force with which to sustain the proposed league. In a speech made in New York some time ago in advocacy of the league of nations, the ex-President said:

Very little service of any kind has been exacted from the great body of the people. Conscription is needed to discipline our native young men and to teach them respect for authority. It is needed to teach our millions of newly created citizens loyalty. Congress should enact a conscription law making provision not only for the present but for the future after the war shall end.

The ex-President should be commended for his candor. It was clear from the beginning that must be the true basis, and the only basis, upon which a league to enforce peace, based upon the principle of force, could ever be maintained. We will never be able to call into activity or into service a sufficient force from the American homes to do our part in a league of nations to settle the controversies of Europe and of Asia by means of military power except by fastening conscription upon the American people. At a time when other governments, which have had experience with conscription, are pledging the people that it shall be abrogated and eliminated from their system this Republic is to have it made permanent. While others are trying to get away from it the league to enforce peace would require that we ingraft it upon our system as an abiding principle. Lloyd George and others who have spoken upon the subject have said that it shall not only be eliminated but that it shall be forgotten as a precedent. The league to enforce peace states that the basis upon which it expects to operate is that of inaugurating

this principle even in time of peace. That is the practical, and the first practical, proposition with which we shall have to do in the organizing of this particular form of a league. I think it well to read a paragraph from Mr. Lloyd George's speech about the time that he was asking the people of England for their suffrages:

On the eve of this important election which means so much to the country I wish to make it clear beyond all doubt that I stand for the abolition of conscript armies in all lands. Without that the peace conference would be a failure and a sham. These great military machines are responsible for the agony the world has passed through, and it would be a poor ending to any peace conference that allowed them to continue.

That which the premier of England looks upon as the basis of militarism and the exclusion of which is essential to the peace of the world, the ex-President regards as indispensable to the successful operation of a league to enforce peace. Both are correct, and, peculiarly enough, both are for a league of nations.

We pass on to another feature of this program of a league to enforce peace. We are not only to have an army based upon conscription but we are to have the largest navy in the world. Admiral Badger, appearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs, outlined the Navy we should have, and frankly stated the objects and the purposes for which it was being built. I trespass upon the patience of the Senate long enough to read a paragraph or two from the admiral's testimony. On page 495 of the hearings he gives a list of the battleships, battle cruisers, scouts, and so forth, which are to make up the largest navy in the world, as follows:

Battleships	12
Battle cruisers	16
Scouts	30
Destroyers	108
Submarines:	
Fleet	21
S type	146
Antisubmarine	24
Mine laying	42
Mine sweepers	284
Destroyer tenders	12
Submarine tenders	6
Airplane carriers	6
Patrol vessels	376
Aircraft:	
Large seaplanes	1,704
Dirigibles	156
Kite balloons	544
Rigid airships	24

In his testimony he says:

Navies must be the principal support of a league of nations, and the United States, from its wealth, influence, and power, will be called upon to contribute a very large share of the international police force to render such a league effective.

The able Secretary of the Navy, addressing the committee a few days afterwards, among other things said:

It is desired to enter the Paris peace conference with the assurance from Congress that the American Navy would be enlarged to a size commensurate with the greatest naval power.

Why should we enter a peace conference at which no one will have a seat other than our friends and our allies with the assurance from the American Congress that we are building the biggest war machine in history? If I meet with my neighbor to settle a difficulty, announcing in advance that we are there for the purpose of arranging our difficulties upon peaceful terms and in a peaceable way, it is calculated to disturb the serenity of the gathering if I throw upon the table my loaded revolver. There is no one at the peace table, Mr. President, to whom it is necessary to say that we are preparing for war upon a gigantic scale. I have no particular objection to the game of international bluff, provided it is not too expensive for the taxpayers. Besides, the bluff might be called, and that would be the beginning of another war.

Again he states:

I may say that you can not do anything in the world which would so strengthen this country's position at the peace conference as to authorize this enlarged naval program.

I quote from a report of his testimony in the New York Times of December 31:

It is the desire of Secretary Daniels and the Navy officials to have a Navy which will be as large as that of any other country, not only for defensive purposes but for policing the world in case a league of nations to enforce peace is created at the Versailles conference.

This program is estimated to cost \$600,000,000. This is the largest single naval expenditure in the history of the world, all in order that a league to enforce peace may not fall for want of respectability.

I can not understand this demand for so heavy an expenditure for warships at this particular time. The facts and the reason and the psychology of the situation, if I may use that term, are all against it. Battleships are made for war, for the purpose of fighting some one. Where is the enemy that compels this speedy and tremendous expenditure at this time?

Germany is conquered and her navy subject to the disposal of her conquerors. Russia is dismembered and broken. Every one of these ships built at this time will rot upon the sea before Russia is again a factor upon the ocean. Are we then challenging or throwing doubt upon the friendship of France or of England? Japan is a powerful nation, but her relations with this people are now friendlier than they have been for a decade. In addition to that, the relation of England and Japan is amicable enough. I would favor a reasonable building program at this time, although the necessity for it is less commanding than it has been for 15 years. But to put out this extraordinary and bewildering and threatening program at this time is unnecessary to the situation, unwise as an international move, and highly unjust to the taxpayers of this country, already harried and worried with the fearful burdens of the war.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that in enumerating these formidable countries he should not overlook Bolivia and Switzerland?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know that the Senator from Idaho has stated it, but if this program is carried out it will give the United States a larger and stronger Navy than that of Great Britain at the beginning of the war, and if the ships that are now under construction are completed, it will give the United States a stronger Navy than the combined navies of the three next powers—Japan, France, and Italy.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, we can best realize this stupendous program by comparison. France, Russia, Germany, and England combined expended in round figures \$200,000,000 upon their navies in the year 1913. This was at a time when there was a feverish, though undefined, feeling of unrest in Europe. In fact, after 1906 Germany had in a sense challenged England's sea power by her increased building program. But even so, those four great powers combined expended little more upon all their navies than we now propose to expend upon ours in the next year. After the war has come to an end, with our enemies defeated and all the great naval powers friendlier than ever before in our history, we propose to spend \$600,000,000 in the next three years upon a powerful fighting machine. Is this not a direct challenge to the good faith of our allies, or does it not throw doubt upon the sincerity of our own professions? Above all, is it not a signal act of injustice to the people of this country, who have paid taxes and bought liberty bonds and saved and stinted and denied themselves in this crisis? Is the American taxpayer to have no place whatever in this program of national affairs save that of a coddled peon? Are we going on with this shameless orgy of expenditure until the people are forced to cry out with the voice of revolution against the madness that is grinding them to powder? The expenditures of this war will amount to easily thirty billions, and yet we are proposing to add billions upon billions for war purposes in time of peace.

Then there comes from the War Department a demand for the purchase of all the cantonments. These vast war utilities are to be purchased at a cost of from twelve to fifteen millions and to be maintained and kept up at a cost annually of from fifteen to twenty million dollars. These things are the first incidents or preliminary preparations of the league to enforce peace. These are the modest preparations for peace by repression, by force. While we seem to have great plans in theory, nevertheless in practice we are still apparently following the rule of kings and autocrats and that is to first frighten the people and then rob them through taxation. I call attention to these facts at this particular time for the reason that it is a program advocated by men of vast influence and of great standing in this country who have announced that they propose to hold conventions in all the large cities of the country in order that the people may understand precisely what their program is and to secure an indorsement at the hands of the people. What effect that might finally have upon the congress at Versailles I do not know, but I want, if I can in my humble way, to convey to the people the fact that the league to enforce peace does not mean disarmament, it does not mean relieving them from taxes or from the great burdens of war but of adding to them permanently and for all time to come. It is not certain that this program will bring peace, but it is morally certain that it will bring great armies and navies and crushing burdens and taxes without "stint or limit."

Now, let us see what they propose to do with that great military force when they get it. We are not left in doubt in regard to it. The principle upon which they propose to use

it has been stated repeatedly. Slowly but surely the scheme unfolds.

Speaking at Baltimore, December 9, 1918, the ex-President of the United States said:

We have got to have a league with force enough to say to all those small nations: "We do not propose to let you start a conflagration that will destroy this peace that we have endured so infinitely much to bring about."

Again, at Atlantic City:

We should make a start in Russia right soon. You can not deal with the Bolsheviki in any other way than their own system. The only way to deal with those people is to kill them off.

The league to enforce peace is, therefore, according to the explicit language of its most distinguished advocate, based entirely upon the principle of repression. The only remedy which is now proposed is that of absolutely repressing any movement that does not accord with the idea of the league to enforce peace.

The whole scheme, Mr. President, is founded on force. These advocates of this particular league can find no amelioration, no remedy, save that based upon force. "Kill them off," cries the league's most distinguished exponent. While yet in the formative period, even before they have an army at their command, before they have actually tasted the power for which they hunger, the watchword is "kill them off." What will be the program when once power is lodged in their hands? "He tasted blood and felt no loathing. He tasted again and liked it well." That is the story of all individuals and of all institutions believing in or founded upon the gospel of force. If these people would enter Russia, with whom we are at peace, and slay and decimate because of internal troubles, what would they do with other nations which might from time to time have internal disturbance or revolutions? Have they not said in explicit language that "we want a force to deal with small nations when they start a conflagration." Are all conflagrations to be put out save those which meet with their approval? The fathers started a conflagration in 1776. Other peoples may start conflagrations of the same kind. India, with her countless millions, may in future years express a desire for independence and for freedom. Other subject nationalities may feel some time or other that they want their independence and freedom. What will be the doctrine of the league? They have announced it—"Kill them off."

The people have been told of the halcyon days that were to come with the league. Men would no longer make war. The crushing burdens of stupendous armaments were to be lifted. The dull, monotonous struggle of the masses bending under the weight of governmental expenditures was to have an end. But not so. We are to have a larger standing army than ever. Why? In order to support the league. We are to have the largest Navy in the world. Why? In order to support the league of peace. We are to have militarism such as Prussia only dreamed of. We are to have taxes beyond the taxes of any era or of any age. Why? In order to support the league of peace. We are to compose all the troubles and put out all the conflagrations started to destroy kingship or bureaucracy. And how are we to stop the troubles? How are we to put out the conflagrations? Why, in the same old way, nothing new about it at all. Precisely the same way and in the same method of the holy alliance—"kill them off." If the people are to be taxed and taxed, and if they rebel against the burden are to be killed off I do not see the virtue of the scheme. I confess that my vision may be somewhat blurred and I know my fancy is somewhat troubled when I see these vast equipments of war, this vast array of force—standing armies, conscription, great navies, and taxes without stint or limit—with no answer to give the people when they cry out in resistance save the cry coming down through the centuries from the lips of tyrants and despots, "kill them off."

Those who while wanting peace nevertheless have feared a league backed by a vast military power have not had long to wait to see their fears justified. They had looked into the pages of history and they feared that human nature was in all probability still the same—that arbitrary power backed by military force would resort to repression as the only means of maintaining peace. And how quick the change! They changed their shibboleth overnight. During the war the air was laden with promises for a freer and more democratic world, a less burdened people, the rights of small nations with no invidious exceptions, self-determination, open diplomacy, disarmament, and democracy. These things intoxicated the very air we breathed. Cheered by these promises the people fought and bled and died in the great cause. Mothers gave up their sons, wives their husbands, and the common people faced hunger and disease, starvation and death in the belief that they could see ahead for their children at least

a freer and a less burdened world. Kings and armaments and royal tinsel and secret agreements and all the pretense and vicious practices which have weighed humanity down seemed nearing their eternal end. But scarcely had the armistice been signed until a different tone, a discouraging warning voice was heard from those in authority. A noted leader, an advocate of the league on the other side, hastened to say, "The world can not be made safe for democracy by increasing the number of democratic states." Self-determination, it was declared, could only have a most limited application. Open diplomacy has been rejected, disarmament has given way to an ambitious program for stupendous armies and navies. As for the rights of small nations, if they should start a conflagration the remedy is to kill them off. These are not the principles upon which we fought the war; and these are not the principles, either, upon which permanent peace may rest, but they are the principles which are already foreshadowed by this league based upon force.

The league to enforce peace organized just 100 years ago ran the same course. Its original protestations were upon a high plane. Its purposes were based upon the widest humanitarianism and the greatest liberty for all. It specifically declared in favor of self-determination and it pronounced in favor of open diplomacy. But when once organized and backed with power it had but one principle by which it was guided, and that was repression. When the people cried out against injustice and made a move for liberty they were suppressed by force without regard to their rights or to the justice of their cause. When the small nations of South America started a conflagration they made a move to put it out. This putting out conflagrations is a fascinating pastime. But America said no; these conflagrations are shedding a kindly light upon the homes and the hearthstones of the long repressed and they shall not be put out, neither shall those who started them be killed off. Revolution is the people's law of self-defense, and you shall not deny it to those South American people.

Senators, you can not establish peace by force, by repression. If you have any other workable scheme or plan, bring it forward, but the scheme based on force is more repulsive and destructive of human justice and human liberty and human progress than Prussianism itself. It is Prussianism extended, amplified, and denationalized. If you think you can seek out and do justice to all nations, great and small; if you think you can find an organization based upon the principles of human progress and whose decrees are enforced by public opinion; if you think you can prescribe reasonable rules for change and growth and progress; if you think you can look into the hearts of a particular people and interpret that inexplicable passion which when the appointed hour comes melts away all obstacles, rejects all restraints, and forces its way from a small to a great nation; if you think you can look upon a French revolution cursed with apparent stupidity and steeped in blood and foretell that in a hundred years those same people, disenthralled and free, will stand between civilization and organized barbarism as the French stood at the Marne; if you think you can now look upon a broken and dismembered and bleeding Russia and foretell her future or point out along what paths she will move in order that she may realize the best there is in her; if you think you can do what the living God has not been able to do, standardize the human family; if you feel you can undo what He in His inscrutable wisdom did when He planted race prejudice in the hearts and stamped color upon the faces of men, then give us your prospectus. We will be glad to look it over. We shall be infinitely happy if we find that it is workable. But if you are simply going back to the old discarded league of military power with which to put out conflagrations, to repress movements, and to kill off those who are dissatisfied and who in their madness and helplessness are striving for better things, we should reject it and denounce it as a menace to human liberty and a challenge to human progress.

Mr. President, it may not be uninteresting to call attention to some other views, foreign views, of this league to enforce peace. I think it throws some light upon it to have the construction of those who do not feel timid on account of our institutions or the possible bias or prejudice of the people against transferring their sovereign powers to a supertribunal. Mr. H. G. Wells, one of the most fascinating writers of the day, in his book entitled, "The Fourth Year," discusses the league of nations as follows:

If this phrase, "the league of free nations," is to signify anything more than a rhetorical flourish, then certain consequences follow that have to be faced now. No man can join a partnership and remain an absolutely free man. You can not bind yourself to do this and not to do that and to consult and act with your associates in certain eventualities without a loss of your sovereign freedom. People in this country and in France do not seem to be sitting up manfully to these necessary propositions.

I like the candor of the writer. He states without circumlocution that any organization of the league which will amount to anything at all must necessarily imply the surrender of sovereignty upon the part of the individual nations. We must transfer to some one the right to determine when we shall enter a war or when we shall make use of our armed forces for any particular purpose in the execution of the plans of the league. He can not conceive of an organization which would have any prestige which did not detract or subtract from some one a sovereign power which it had taken unto itself. Some one must give up that sovereign power, and the individual nations must do that. Further along in his interesting volume he says:

Firstly, then, it must be able to adjudicate upon all international disputes whatever. Its first function must clearly be that. Before a war can break out there must be the possibility of a world decision upon its rights and wrongs. The league, therefore, will have as its primary function to maintain a supreme court, whose decisions will be final, before which every sovereign power may appear as plaintiff against any other sovereign power or group of powers. * * * But in addition there is a more doubtful and delicate class of case—

After having enumerated the different cases which have occurred to him—

arising out of the discontent of patches of one race or religion in the dominions of another. How far may the supreme court of the world attend to grievances between subject and sovereign?

The author is probably correct. It is likely true that the next war will not be a war between governments or between nations but between the governments and the people. I admit that the future is filled with many forebodings, but they are of internal conflicts. Those of us who believe in an orderly, regulated liberty, in a government of law, a government by the people in orderly and manly fashion, have something of a task before us. I deplore the madness and the fearful crimes of Russia, but we must find some remedy besides killing them off. I am one of those who believe that the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution, that Robespierre and Lenine, are the legitimate outgrowth and offspring of the injustice and oppression, the hideous, prolonged, and insistent cruelty of the governments which preceded. There has not been a mass movement in all history that did not have a just foundation. We might have differed wholly with the methods, we might have deplored the madness, but there was a cause for it, nevertheless, lying back. There has not been a crime committed in Russia in the last six months that had not its legitimate parent crime in the indescribable oppression of the bloody Romanoffs for the last two and one-half centuries. Now, my friends, we can not shoot up or kill that kind of movement. If we are not strong enough and wise enough to remove the injustices and the wrongs, to restore security and confidence to the people, then these things will have to work themselves out in blindness and in wrath and in destruction. You have got to feed the Russian people on something besides bullets. That is the food which the Romanoffs have fed them for the last three centuries. America should adopt a different plan. You have got to remove the causes of disturbances or the disturbance will go on, for starving people are not afraid to die at the cannon's mouth. It is natural, therefore, that this writer, as well as the ex-President, entertaining the views they do, advocate a league which will not only determine controversies between different nations, but which will go into Russia, which will go into this country and into that country, and adjust the internal affairs of that particular nation in accordance with the program of the league.

You can see, therefore, that this conscript army for which Mr. Taft calls and the greatest navy in the world are not alone to settle the difficulties between the different nations, but they are to adjust and compose the internal difficulties of the different nations, especially if they are calculated to spread over national lines. Mr. Wells says here, giving an illustration of some of the things that may arise:

Such cases are highly probable, and no large, vague propositions about the "self-determination" of peoples can meet all the cases. In Macedonia, for instance, there is a jumble of Albanian, Serbian, Bulgarian, Greek, and Roumanian villages always jostling one another and maintaining an intense irritation between the kindred nations close at hand. And quite a large number of areas and cities in the world, it has to be remembered, are not homogeneous at all. Will the great nations of the world have the self-abnegation to permit a scattered subject population to appeal against the treatment of its ruling power to the supreme court? This is a much more serious interference with sovereignty than intervention in an external quarrel. Could a Greek village in Bulgarian Macedonia plead in the supreme court? Could the Armenians in Constantinople, or the Jews in Roumania, or the Poles in West Prussia, or the negroes in Georgia, or the Indians in the Transvaal make such an appeal?

The author seems to reason that unless these difficulties are adjustable before this tribunal and before the league it must necessarily result in disturbing the stability of the nations which compose the league. I do not myself see how we can avoid fol-

lowing the gentleman to the final conclusion where his logic leads.

Then he says:

Behind the decisions of the supreme court must lie power. And here come fresh difficulties for patriotic digestions. The armies and navies of the world must be at the disposal of the league of free nations, and that opens up a new, large area of delegated authority.

In a discussion of this subject in the *New Statesman*, an English publication, in a recent issue, this exceedingly interesting suggestion is made:

One of the first things to be considered by the league of nations must necessarily be the need for an international agreement for the enforcement in all countries of legislation on factory conditions, a maximum eight-hour day, the prevention of sweating and unhealthy trades necessary to protect the workers against exploitation and oppression, and the prohibition of night work for women.

Would the American workingman be willing to have the standards for labor, what constitutes exploitation and what constitutes oppression, determined by a supertribunal composed of representatives from nations whose labor standards are confessedly far below ours? Would it likely result in raising the standard to ours or lowering it to theirs? Could we compete against labor standards before a tribunal better than we can in actual fact, and would labor of this country be willing to throw down the bars to the labor standards of China, Japan, the Balkans, and countless south European countries?

No better illustration of the difference between theory and practice can be found than appeared in the public prints a few days ago. Mr. Gompers, the able and patriotic leader of the labor forces of this country, a recognized leader among the labor forces of the world, appeared before a committee of the Senate within the last few days and warned them and the country that labor would not stand for enforced arbitration, and then hastened away to the boat to take passage to Versailles to lend his influence to the league to enforce peace. While the laboring men of this country will not submit to a league to enforce peace in labor troubles, it is thought that a league to enforce peace throughout the world would be both practicable and satisfactory. Mr. Gompers was right. If labor consents to enforced or compulsory arbitration, it will result in labor becoming in many industries the peon of superior forces. But if labor, a part of the Nation, will not submit to the principle of enforced peace, shall all the people, of which labor is a part, submit to enforced peace? Is the principle of repression to be rejected by a part and not the whole of a nation? Can a people submit to compulsory arbitration things which may involve their liberty, their independence, their prosperity and industrial existence and labor reject it because it is supposed to be inimical to its vital interests? And how would labor like to submit to enforced peace or compulsory arbitration at the hands of a tribunal composed of members whom, save one, they had no voice in selecting or electing and whose viewpoint might be wholly different from the viewpoint of those upon whose interests they were passing? How would American labor like to submit its vital interests, the question of wages, of sanitarianism, to a tribunal composed of a Chinaman, a Japanese, a Bulgarian, and a Russian, and even the nations with labor standards much higher? And yet it is not clear, and does not Mr. Gompers know, that enforced peace at the hands of such a tribunal would inevitably have its effect upon the standards of American workingmen? If it were not for the common sense which the experiences of men inject into the schemes and dreams of men, what a bubble-chasing life we would live—at least until supper time.

Another quotation from this earnest and illuminating article in the *New Statesman* is interesting and possibly instructive. It should be remembered that this is an article which works out the whole plan in detail and leaves nothing to the imagination. We seem to get a better insight into just where we think we are going. It reads:

The league of nations that the world is about to establish ought, if it is to be anything more than the ropes of sand in which diplomatists have hitherto delighted, to have its District of Columbia, with its own metropolitan city independent of any other jurisdiction, free from the suspicion of police or economic pressure by any of its constituent units, conveniently easy of access for them all on the borders of the sea which has become the world's greatest highway; and last but not least, under climatic conditions making for composure rather than for nervous excitement.

It will be seen from this that the capital of the league is not to be upon this mundane sphere. It is to be in the celestial kingdom beside the crystal sea. Heaven alone knows who the president will be under such circumstances.

But summing it all up, the views of the ex-President, the platform of the league, the constructions placed upon the platform by its authors and by those who are in sympathy with it, here is what the league to enforce peace proposes: Conscription in time of peace and a large standing army; the greatest navy in

the world; adding by the Navy alone to our great tax burdens from two hundred and fifty to three hundred million dollars a year; the transferring, if not legally, in effect, the power to declare war from the Congress of the United States to some tribunal over which the people themselves who must fight the battles and pay the taxes have no control; the renouncing of the doctrine of Washington and the entering of the politics and alliances of Europe; becoming a member of a league from which we can not withdraw; the abandonment of the Monroe doctrine and permitting Europe to interfere in the affairs of the western continent; the sending of American soldiers to Europe and Asia and Africa whenever any disturbance arises, although it may not affect our people at all; and the whole scheme has just one ultimate power, and that is military force—the same power and the same principle which every despot has relied upon in his efforts against the people when the people were seeking greater liberty and greater freedom, the same power which George III and Wilhelm II made the basis of their infamous designs. That is the program to be given to the American people under the soporific term of a league to enforce peace.

Mr. President, I am not ashamed to say in these days of advanced thought and cosmopolitan faith that I believe in the old-time Americanism, in the policies and principles which made us great and which alone will keep us great. I want America, disenthralled and disentangled, by precept and example, through influence and counsel, to continue her lead in the grand march of civilization—in the world struggle for free government. What we need—and may Providence hasten the hour—is a rebaptism of the national spirit and a reconsecration to the national ideals. Give us again the vision and the courage of that steadfast pilot who guided our frail bark through the first perilous years; give us the Americanism which fired the fighting soul of Andrew Jackson; give us the faith in our institutions and the love of our common country of him who walked unscathed through the fierce fires of an internecine war to the deathless glory of martyrdom; give us a people bound together by the ties of respect and confidence, inspired by a common hope, devoted to a common country; give us something that is our very own, which we may love and for the preservation of which men are willing to die, and you will have an America, a United States, which will exert far more influence and dispense greater happiness and lead more certainly to world contentment than an America shorn of her individuality and embarrassed in her free movements by alliances or sickened and enfeebled by the international virus. I beg you to believe that there is nothing to take the place of this old-time Americanism. Let us cling to it as of old they clung to the horns of the altar. Let us foster it as you would foster the virtues about your own family hearthstone. Without it we will go the way of all the republics of the earth.

The fact is we have come in contact with two evil forces from the Old World—Prussianism and internationalism. Instead of repelling and rejecting them we are yielding to their slimy maw the proudest heritage ever left to the keeping of any people—American principles and the American conception of government. These two hands are not more alike than, in the last analysis, are the doctrines of Lenine and Trotsky and that of Wilhelm and Ludendorff. Both contemplate world dominion and the utter destruction of the national spirit everywhere. Each would undermine and destroy the individuality of all governments and compound all under one universal rule. Both are founded upon treachery, deceit, lying, repression, force, decimation, and assassination. They came together at Brest as naturally and as inevitably as common criminals combine to stay the hand of the law. They were both against America and everything for which America stands. But while civilization starts back in shuddering contemplation of the rule of either, certain American statesmen propose to take something from the creed of both and substitute it for the teachings of Washington and the faith of millions of American homes. Instead of our own Government, controlled and directed by the intelligence and patriotism of our own people, instead of American standards and American principles, instead of devotion to our institutions and to our own flag, we are to have an international superstate resting upon Prussian force, with a vast army of repression, a superstate in which the national spirit stands rebuked and the international flag is the sole symbol of our hopes. I do not know what the future has in store. I can not look very far into that time which is not yet. But I do know that there was brought into being on this western continent nearly 150 years ago an experiment in government which has weathered every storm, which was baptized with the wisdom of the greatest leader of this or any other age, which has excited the emulation and inspired the efforts of people in every quarter of the globe, which has given freedom and prosperity

to the people at home and precept and example and inspiration to the world abroad. And as for me, I shall not by any act or vote of mine surrender it or even compromise it in the eyes of the world.

If the chief objects of government be that of disseminating happiness among its people and building character, of endowing the citizen with individual worth and the nation with collective strength, why should we turn our backs upon the policies of the past? Is there an American who, looking abroad in other lands and making his comparison, is not in this respect proud of the achievements of his country? Why should we disregard the teachings and disown the policies under which we have come to our present commanding position in the world? Or if the highest glory of a State be the devotion and love which the people bear it, where shall we look for greater glory than our own Government has experienced from the first until now? And when has the patriotism of its people known such exaltation as at this very hour? Go with me to Chateau-Thierry or look upon the scene at Belleau Wood. The crisis of the great war is at last at hand. The whole liberty-loving world is awaiting the contest. The stakes for which they fight is nothing less than civilization. All that the free people of the earth have, all they love is here to be saved or lost. Three brave nations are reeling under the fearful blows of organized barbarism—force incarnate. Circumstances and chance itself, that silent arbiter of so many battle fields, seem to favor the desperate foe. Can the enemy pass? Can he enter Paris? In this dread hour the American marines arrive upon the scene. They are boys from American homes—not soldiers by profession, not the Hessian puppets of some superinternational tribunal, nor yet the anemic minions or soulless scavengers of internationalism—they are red-blooded Americans, representing the majesty and the authority of a self-governing Nation accredited to their fearful task by the sovereign act of a free people, sustained and encouraged by the prayers around countless thousands of American hearthstones, themselves imbued with the spirit of liberty, fighting for the country they love; and as such they are invincible.

The thing which finally won this war, which overcame and beat down militarism—trained, efficient, disciplined, brutal militarism—was the Frenchman's love of country, the Briton's love of country, the American's love of country—that which internationalism would murder. This it was that stayed the march at the Marne; this it was that turned the tide at Chateau-Thierry; this it was that went into the Belleau Wood, which human fiends had made into an earthly hell, and dragged militarism from its chosen lair; this it is that defends the ideals of a nation. God pity the ideals of this Republic if they shall have no defenders save the gathered scum of the nations organized into a conglomerate international police force, ordered hither and thither by the most heterogeneous and irresponsible body or court that ever confused or confounded the natural instincts and noble passions of a people. Oh, no, Mr. President, let us leave these things—the lives of our people, the liberty of our whole Nation—in the keeping and under the control of those people who have brought this Republic to its present place of prestige and power. What we need in this hour is faith in the institutions that our fathers gave us, faith in the career which everything indicates we shall enjoy unless we in public place prove recreant to our duties in this great and trying hour.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall not take much of the time from the Senator from Colorado nor much of the time of the Senate. I understand the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has just made a speech in its main intentment bearing against the proposition of a league of nations. I want to insert in the Record a couple of short poems, and I want to say nothing about them except that the first one was written by the author soon after her boys had been reported to be dead. All that she had went, all that she had died, and she wrote these lines:

Lie down and sleep,
Leave it with God to keep,
This sorrow, which is part
Now of your heart.
When you awake,
If still 'tis there to take,
Utter no wild complaint;
Work waits your hands;
If you should faint,
God understands.

That was published some time ago, coming from the pen of Katrina Trask. Later on came this answer to the Senator from Idaho, and it is complete and sufficient, although she did not even know that he was going to speak. It is entitled "Citizens, arise!"

CITIZENS, ARISE!

[By Katrina Trask.]

Rise, Citizens, arise! the mad world war is done,
But our divinest duty has only now begun:
With every power we now must work to make a righteous world,
To hold Truth's standard steadfast, to wave Truth's flag, unfurled,
To plow and sow the shadowed earth until it blooms anew,
To make the Word of Prophet and Philosopher come true.

Not the word of the so-called "practical man" who never
saw beyond his nose in his life—

'Tis ours to help, to teach mankind to choose the better part—
To clasp kind hands with brother, not to shoot him thro' the heart.
To us the glorious victory, O Citizens, is given
To bring to this black, bloody Earth a foretaste of clean Heaven.
Let beast tear beast to fragments, let ruthless savage fight:
For man there dawns a morning—a clearer, holier light:
Redemption, federation, are possible at last—
Great hopes that have been cherished in all the ages past.

This was written by a woman whose boys were dead, not written
by me or any other man who was in the safest bomb-proof
position on the surface of the earth, to wit, the floor of the
Senate of the United States—

Behold! the dreams that prophets dreamed are now upon the way—
A league of nations may be formed to match the dawning day,
A bond of human brotherhood, a true God-welded bond,
To hold mankind together, with cohesion far beyond
The strength that comes from weapons and from armaments of might,
Nations allied to nations by everlasting right.

"Everlasting right," which, in the long run, by the way, I
will say is might—

This potent league of nations will need no gun nor sword,
Its order is the law of the Everliving Lord—

"The Everliving Lord," who still exists, I do not care what
you say about it—

The law of harmony, all brutal war shall cease—
Its corner stone is justice, its translucent walls are peace.

Rise, citizens! Arise from the weary, blood-drenched sod,
Proclaim the league of nations—sealed with the seal of God!

"Translucent walls"! Anybody not a fool can see through
them. They are translucent—God is behind them. Ultimately
you must see Him, whether you will or not.

"With the seal of God," and, thank God, not with the seal
of the Senate of the United States, unless the Senate shall here-
after indicate a sufficient degree of common sense to affix its
seal, which I doubt.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I thank the Senator from
Colorado for yielding to the Senator from Mississippi that we
might be regaled by that profound discussion of a league of
nations?

CONDITIONS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on the 12th day of December
last the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] introduced
a resolution requesting the Secretary of State to send to the
Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, "all data,
documents, and information showing or bearing upon our
present relations with Russia as to peace or war, so that the
Senate and the Nation may know why and for what purpose
our soldiers are in Russia and what is the policy of the Govern-
ment in reference to Russia, and if not incompatible with the
public interest to advise the Senate of the number of United
States soldiers in Russia and their location, and of their
operations, together with any lists of casualties which they
may have suffered."

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign
Relations, of which I am a member. It there became the sub-
ject of consideration shortly afterwards and again just prior to
the Christmas holidays. On each of those occasions I voted to
report the resolution to the Senate. Should it again become
the subject of discussion I shall, if opportunity be given, again
cast my vote for its appearance upon the calendar.

I do not, Mr. President, mean to be understood as favoring
the resolution because of my attitude toward it as a member of
the Committee on Foreign Relations; but I believe that, inas-
much as the suppression of a resolution can not suppress the
discussion of its substance, and inasmuch as the resolution
calls for information to which the Senator and the public in
general are entitled, unless it be incompatible with the public
interest, and inasmuch as such information will be withheld
if it is so incompatible, nothing can be gained by keeping it
within the possession of a committee.

Moreover, a failure to report so important a resolution justi-
fies the impression that the real purpose is to withhold the in-
formation desired, whatever the real purpose may be. Hence
the very conditions which the withholding of a resolution may
be designed to prevent will assert themselves because it is
withheld.

There are two methods of reporting a resolution—one favor-
able, the other adverse. Either is sufficient to place it on the

calendar, and neither is necessary to a full discussion and
consideration of its purpose. Hence I felt, and I still feel,
that some committee disposition should be made of this resolu-
tion, to the end that we may dispose of it and proceed to the
consideration of other and perhaps more exigent business during
the short session of this Congress.

The resolution involves in some degree the great question of
allied duty toward Russia, not only for the present but for the
future, and I have no doubt that one of the reasons actuating
the Senator from California in introducing the resolution was
to enable him, by information to be obtained through it, to
intelligently discuss all features of the situation. I regard it
as one of the very important problems now confronting the
allies; one which they can not avoid; one which they must
solve if we are to have, indeed, a permanent peace after a
hard-earned victory. I think, Mr. President, that we can aid in
the solution of that problem by considering their former atti-
tude toward Russia and the part which that great people have
played in the war during its first two years.

Mr. President, the primary object which Germany had in
view when upon the 1st day of August, 1914, she declared war
against Russia was the overwhelming of that great nation.
Bismarck had taught his people the importance of conquering
other nations, one by one, and of preventing, so far as diplo-
macy and falsehood could do so, any interference with that
program by other nations.

Russia had just emerged from a disastrous war with Japan.
She had not yet fully reconstituted her civil government, her
army, or her navy. She was in that formative process through
which every nation must pass after a great war. She was po-
tentially formidable in her vast population and in her vaster
territory. Her reestablishment as the practically dominating
balance of power in Europe would impose limitations upon
German ambitions and German expansion.

To avoid this embarrassment Russia must be overthrown as
the first step toward world dominion. It is therefore a signifi-
cant fact that immediately upon the service by Austria of the
ultimatum upon Serbia and the known attitude of Russia as
the protector of Serbia, Germany at once became prominent in
the negotiations preceding the declaration of war, and that she
declared war against Russia six days before Austria did so,
although the mobilization of the Russian forces was aimed at
Austria and officially declared to be for that purpose only. The
interval between the service of that ultimatum and Germany's
declaration of war against Russia was utilized by the Kaiser in
the effort to detach both France and England from the struggle.
Germany's purpose was to mass her forces upon the eastern
frontier and to make Russia the first victim of her terrific
power. Russia crushed, the ultimate problem which France and
England presented would, as a matter of course, be greatly sim-
plified and the ultimate result made morally certain.

Germany supposed Great Britain would remain neutral in the
event of a declaration of hostilities because of her domestic dif-
ficulties. Ireland was upon the verge of civil war; disaffection
ran riot throughout her dominions in India; and, by some strange
mental aberration, the German people believed that England's
entry into a world war would be inevitably followed by the
desertion of her colonies. She was, therefore, much more con-
cerned with France.

Her ambassador was instructed to ascertain, in the event of a
declaration of war against Russia, whether France would re-
main aloof from the struggle and virtually disregard and dis-
avow her obligations to Russia, assumed some time before
under treaty stipulations with which the world is familiar.
Should she respond favorably to the ambassador's inquiries
he was authorized to say to the French Government:

If it declares it will remain neutral, your Excellency will be good
enough to declare that we must, as a guarantee of its neutrality,
require the handing over of the fortresses of Toul and Verdun; that we
will occupy them and restore them after the end of the war with
Russia. A reply to this last question must reach here before Saturday
afternoon at 4 o'clock.

The reply of France to this astounding demand has become
historic. Germany thereupon declared war against Russia, and
shortly afterwards against France. Germany struck France
first. She expected to overwhelm that great people, while
Austria, her forces having been mobilized, should hold Russia
in check on the eastern front. The Central Empires would then
easily overcome Russia, and Germany, as the mistress of Eu-
rope, would then dispose of England and America when her in-
terests required it.

This, then, Mr. President, was Germany's original war pro-
gram, and it may be said that because of the preparation which
she had made and the weaknesses which, largely through her
intrigues, were then apparent among her enemies, every proba-
bility indicating her swift and sure success. Disregarding treaty

obligations, her vast army poured over little Belgium, held for a short time by the gallant though ineffective defense of that splendid people. She swept through northeastern France, and within the short space of 60 days the sound of her guns was heard upon the streets and boulevards of the great city of Paris.

Mr. President, the actual winning of the war has been attributed to many causes. Some say the intervention of America; some, British supremacy upon the sea; others, the food supply; and still others the morale of the Anglo-Saxon. All these causes were, to my mind, essential to the great victory, but we must not overlook the part which Russia played during the time that she was in this war as one of its most active participants.

It is true that Russia was the typical despotism of the world; that under the Government of the Romanoffs neither life nor property was safe from the ambitions or the whims of the monarch; that, as compared to Russia, Prussian kaiserism had its elements of attraction and superiority. I make no defense either of the Czar or of the character of his Government, for neither is compatible with American ideals of liberty and justice; but the fact must be told, as a part of the history of the war, that the cooperation of the most despotic Government in the world with the freer and more enlightened countries of western Europe made it possible to defeat German ambitions and to dethrone the House of Hohenzollern.

Before the French frontier had been reached by the German armies the Grand Duke crossed the eastern frontiers of Germany and entered upon German territory with hundreds of thousands of his troops, and between that hour and the time when the German forces reached the Marne the German general staff was compelled to detach 13 divisions from the army of von Kluck and speed them with all haste under the command of Ludendorff to the eastern frontier. I need not ask whether the miracle of the Marne would have been possible but for this diminution of German force at such a time.

Shortly afterwards, when the little army of England was the sole impediment between the legions of the Kaiser and the channel ports, another demonstration by the Grand Duke required the detachment of 15 more German divisions to withstand the increasing menace upon the eastern frontier. I need not ask whether but for that situation the splendid little army of England would not have been sacrificed in vain.

I can not take the time to describe in detail the many—because they were numerous—instances in which the cooperation of the Russian Army and the Russian Government with those of France and England saved the day to civilization. It may, however, throw some light upon the general subject and illustrate the extent of Russian sacrifice for the allied cause to refer to Russian casualties during her engagement as an active combatant in this mighty struggle.

The lowest estimate which I have seen of Russian casualties is 9,500,000 and the highest 12,000,000. I think perhaps the average of these two figures would conservatively state her actual losses from the 1st day of August, 1914, until the Bolshevik appeared, when her armies collapsed and she disappeared as a combatant in the struggle against Teutonic world dominion. This average is 10,750,000.

Russia's losses, therefore, exceeded the total casualties of France, England, Italy, and the United States from the commencement of the war to its triumphant close, on the 11th day of November. Her actual losses of life are estimated in round numbers at three and a half millions of men, equaling those of all her allies. If buried side by side in a straight and unbroken line, their graves would cover a distance of 2,000 miles. And we must not forget that during the time when Russia was an active ally her soldiers were poorly clad; they were poorly armed; they were betrayed by enemies at home while holding at bay those upon the front; but, notwithstanding all these terrible drawbacks, the Russian soldier always fought. He fought whether advancing or retiring. When there was 1 rifle to 2 men he fought, when the supply became 1 to 5 he fought, and when they were reduced from 1 to 10 he still fought on, waiting his turn to take the rifle falling from the hands of the dying man who held it.

What would have been the result of this conflict but for the heroism of the Russian soldier, but for the activities of the Russian Czar, but for the tremendous Russian front, extending from the shores of the Baltic Sea to the confines of Constantinople, compelling a division of the forces of the central powers for more than two years, when the Russian Government collapsed and chaos supervened? We can not conceive, although we are very prone to forget, the far-reaching and immeasurable benefits she conferred upon civilization and upon democracy by these heroic efforts and sacrifices. Indeed, so tremendous are they that we may condone much of the conduct which has since characterized Russia's attitude toward this great war.

I express no regret over the downfall of the Czar or any sentiment but approval of the action of the Russian people in determining that the time had come for their emancipation.

Indeed, Mr. President, the anachronism between the Russian despotism of the East and the British and French democracies of the West united against the same foe, for the same purpose, and practically committed to the same future destiny was too manifest to have resulted otherwise. It was not only inconsistent—under ordinary circumstances it would have been unbelievable—but the contrast did more to hasten the hour of the overthrow of the Romanoffs than any other single influence.

The Government overthrown, a provisional government was established in its place, which was immediately recognized by the allied powers. It had the confidence of the world, and evidently had behind it the progressive, orderly, and liberty-loving forces of that great people. Unfortunately it was a weak government in experience, comprised largely of incapable men, who believed rather in compromise with the turbulent elements always accompanying changes in government than in meeting and repressing them for the time being, to the end that social and industrial stability might attend the crystallization of the new order into permanency and strength.

At this time Nicholas Lenine, since noted as the real ruler of Russia, was a refugee in Switzerland, where, during the previous period of the great struggle, he was preaching in German interest the doctrine of misgovernment and demoralization and using his influence wherever possible against the cause of the allies, while Leon Trotzky, high in the councils of the I. W. W., was denouncing the Government of the United States upon the streets of the city of New York. Both were working against the allies, and both went to Russia as soon as possible after the overthrow of the Czar as emissaries and representatives of the Kaiser; and from the time of their return to this good hour they have represented forces antagonistic to everything for which the allies stand and to every principle upon which the American Government has been established.

These succeeding the weak and despicable Kerensky government represent the forces and the influences now confronting us and which are directly involved in our attempted solution of the Russian problem. Russia's sacrifices and heroism under the Czar and her base and cowardly betrayals of her allies under the Bolsheviks are its principal factors.

It is perhaps a fortunate circumstance for us that America entered the war after the Czar's abdication. She never was the ally of a despot, however greatly her sympathy with the cause to which he devoted himself, his people, and his resources. America's entry into the war almost synchronized with the abdication of the Czar. To us, therefore, came from Russia's new government appeals for that aid which she must have if she were to continue the struggle. I well recall the occasion when, in this Chamber, the new ambassador from the provisional government addressed the Senate from the platform which you, Mr. President (Mr. HENDERSON in the chair), now occupy. I well remember the enthusiasm with which his assurances and his pledge of Russia's aid to the end were greeted. We responded to that appeal at once. We responded with money, with men, with supplies. We gave of our abundance in unstinted measure of every resource upon which we could draw. We were conscious of the great debt which civilization owed to Russia. We were conscious of the obligations of the American Government to every people struggling for freedom and imitating our example; and, above all, we were conscious of the necessity of continuing the eastern front intact, and by that means hastening the war to a glorious conclusion.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his recent report, tells us that a credit was established after April 6, 1917, with Russia of \$325,000,000, of which cash advances were \$187,729,000, and balances under established credits were \$137,270,000. All this occurred before Kerensky's downfall. The money advanced was perhaps the smallest part of our contribution. We sent engineers, we sent industrial experts, we sent economists, we sent mechanics, we sent from every class of our citizens those who were competent by their experience and education to expand the great resources of that mighty country and to continue its industries, to the end that they might become effective agencies in the prosecution of the war and minister to the well-being of the Russian people after its close.

Upon the wharves of Vladivostok, American supplies soon appeared in tremendous bulk and quantity, consisting of artillery, ammunition, clothing, railway supplies, hundreds of new American locomotives, and all the paraphernalia essential to an active and vigorous offensive. We united with our allies in landing supplies nearer the field of action, and large quantities, valued at hundreds of millions, were also sent to the Murman coast and to Archangel, there to be transported over two lines of railroads to Petrograd and to the front. During the time

we were transporting these huge supplies France and England were calling for all the aid upon the western front that we could give them. Losses by the submarines far outstripped our capacity of construction. Our soldiers were going over slowly, our supplies more slowly. Both could have been vastly increased could we have utilized the tonnage essential to the transportation of Russian supplies. Uncle Sam did his bit in the Orient as well as upon the western front, and responded to every call from the Russian people up to the hour when the Kerensky government collapsed and Bolshevism rose from its ruins armed with the torch and the dagger.

Mr. President, in this we only did our duty. We did it manfully, and the sacrifices which we made we would duplicate were we confronted with a similar emergency.

But during this time in what work were the agencies now in control of Russia busily engaged? They were engaged in demoralizing the army, in undermining the navy, in slandering the allies and their cause. They preached animosity to Americans and the American Government. They were the most potent forces working for German militarism and the undoing of democracy outside the ranks of the German Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDERSON in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Senator will yield while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

Mr. THOMAS. It is not necessary, Mr. President, to rehearse the bloody and dismal tragedy of Bolshevik supremacy from the hour when Lenin and Trotzky became the dominant forces in Russia down to the date of the Brest-Litovsk treaty. That treaty embodied conditions dictated by Germany and was negotiated at a time when its psychological effect upon the allied morale would be far-reaching and possibly disastrous. Lenin and Trotzky received their orders from Berlin and obeyed them with alacrity.

The prospect was a somber one for the allied forces all through the fall and winter of 1917-18. It was during that period that the tide of their fortunes reached its lowest ebb. It was first signalized by the final collapse of the entire Russian land and naval forces. Then followed the Caporetta disaster to Italy, an event which turned the tide completely within 48 hours upon the Italian front and threw the magnificent Italian Army, broken and demoralized, back to the plains of Venetia. They narrowly escaped utter annihilation, but were rescued through the heroic efforts of Diaz, who re-formed and held his broken lines upon the Piave River. Saloniki was thus left to its own resources; and Roumania, surrounded by enemies, collapsed and surrendered.

The Brest-Litovsk treaty was therefore aptly timed and while the shock of the Caporetta disaster was putting French valor and British nerve to the supreme test. That treaty, Mr. President, will go down into history as the most shameful and humiliating surrender of a great nation recorded in the tides of time. To call it a treaty is to play with words. It was Bolshevik betrayal of civilization in the name and by the apparent authority of the Russian people. Except the subsequent surrender of the German fleet without a blow, it stands as a reproach to the integrity of every human virtue.

Lenin and Trotzky, at the command of their German employers, invited the allied nations to participate in their treaty deliberations and extended to them the advantages and privileges they pretended to hope for as a result of their efforts. Impudence and insolence could not go beyond this.

What did it accomplish? It placed Russia absolutely at the mercy of Germany. It released not less than 500,000 effective veteran German soldiers for duty upon the western front. It enabled Germany for the first time during the history of the war to concentrate all her forces at a given point. It enabled her to abandon the eastern front to second and third class soldiers, who went from Province to Province, from city to city, and from section to section without meeting any resistance whatever, and to annihilate Roumania, who fought on, notwithstanding the Russian débâcle and in the face of the most fearful odds that ever confronted a weak and dying people.

I only refer to the March drive for the purpose of emphasizing its importance as a Bolshevik contribution to the German cause. That it did not succeed was little short of miraculous. Nothing there saved the allies except the incomparable discipline of the French and the bulldog determination of the Anglo-Saxon. But for these two indispensable and unconquerable attributes, the channel ports would have been reduced and Paris taken. The war would have ended in the triumph of Germany, and the triumph of Germany would have been due to its Bolshevik mercenaries.

Fortunately, the tide of battle finally went the other way, and we can say with truth and a feeling of devout thankfulness that our victory was achieved over all the powers of man and all the powers of hell; achieved against the Kaiser of Germany and the Bolsheviks of Moscow and Petrograd.

Meantime, Mr. President, what was this so-called government doing on its own account? What were its other contributions to German success and to German victory? It repudiated Russia's debts to all other nations, including the allies. It repudiated its \$325,000,000 of obligations just assumed to the United States.

It outraged ambassadors and murdered consuls, outraged the rights of the citizens and subjects of other countries, conducted its campaign of murder and robbery against the stranger within its gate as against the unfortunate people subject to its domination. It confiscated the property of allied citizens and subjects everywhere. It robbed Roumania of the little fund of gold which it had deposited in Petrograd as a safeguard in the hour of possible disaster. It sold all war supplies that could be found to German agents; it sent its own throughout the country gathering them up and delivering them upon whatever terms the Germans might impose. It delivered the Russian fleet to Germany, a transaction as shameful though not so extensive as the subsequent surrender of the German fleet. It submitted to Germany's cold exactions and depleted the Russian treasury, that Germany might profit thereby. All this time it proclaimed its animosity to all forms of organized government, its bitter hatred of Germany and of everything German, its mission to revolutionize and destroy the world in the cause of idealistic principles and a bloody pretense of universal brotherhood.

It encountered domestic difficulties, one of the most important of which was the obstinacy of the Finnish people, who determined to set up a government of their own upon the principle of self-determination, and who did so, thereby incurring Bolshevik invasion, pledged to Finnish massacre, robbery, and subjugation in the name of brotherhood and democracy.

Finland appealed to the Kaiser. She threw herself into the arms of Germany, and the Kaiser, nothing loath, instantly responded. Between a union of his troops and the White Guard, bolshevism was repelled. Pending the determination of which German prince should occupy the throne of Finland, German forces menaced Archangel and the Murman coast through Finnish territory. Her purpose was obvious. First, she desired these northern ports for another submarine base. America and Great Britain had thrown a barrage of bombs and mines across the northern boundary of the North Sea, and submarine outlets to the Atlantic were mined with tragedy and disaster.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I dislike to interrupt the Senator in his very able exposition of the situation, but it seems to me at this point where he mentions Finland it would not be inappropriate to invite attention to the fact that there has been unjust criticism in our own land of the Finnish people. The Finnish people did not desire an alliance with Germany, but, as the Senator from Colorado has stated, they invoked Germany because they preferred German protection to Bolshevik rule. The Finnish people are democratic and desire a liberal progressive democracy. They do not desire bolshevism and they do not desire German control.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, some day the history of the laying of that barrage will be given to the public. It will constitute one of the most thrilling incidents of this war. Suffice it to say, it was an effective barrier to that outlet into the Atlantic Ocean. It is true that an occasional submarine might successfully negotiate the passage, but equally true that it had been made practically inaccessible to submarines. Germany was therefore dependent upon the channel, perhaps more dangerous than the barrier to the north of the sea, and these northern submarine bases were absolutely essential to the further prosecution of her submarine campaign.

Her second object was the securing of the vast stores of supplies and munitions which the allies had landed at these harbors, which they and the Red Guards were equally anxious to obtain.

Meantime she was also intriguing with Bolshevik authorities for the capture and utilization of the stores at Vladivostok, which, of course, involved control of the Siberian Railroad. To that I shall presently refer.

The allies met, as they should have met, that situation by throwing a force as soon as possible on the Murman coast and into Archangel. I can not conceive what criticism of them would

not be just if they had failed to act upon the crisis as they did. The only one which occurs to me as now applicable is that the force was not as large as it should have been, but Germany at that time had her hands too full with the marines and American soldiers and soldiers of the allies on the western front, and the menace therefore to throw additional detachments northward developed its Bolshevik features, for German stress was Bolshevik opportunity, and the Red Guards again overwhelmed Finland and threatened both Archangel and the Murman coast. But our forces were still on guard and our supplies intact. When they are withdrawn our property must be withdrawn also.

I come now, Mr. President, to another one of the fundamental events which helped to win the war. Had it not occurred there is every probability that the hundreds of thousands of German and Austrian prisoners in Russia would have been speedily repatriated and remustered into the armies of the central powers, and Germany would have secured possession of the Siberian Railway and of the vast allied supplies at Vladivostok. I refer, of course, to the retreat of the Czecho-Slovakian forces.

It will be recalled that during the campaign of 1916 Gen. Brusiloff, in his offensive against Galicia, captured about 500,000 prisoners. The facts are that most of those prisoners were Czecho-Slovaks who deliberately, taking their guns with them, left the ranks of the Austrian Army and eagerly surrendered to the Russians. They were inspired, rightly or wrongly, by their views of patriotic duty. They were devoted not to Austria but to their own people, who had been subjected to Austrian oppression and domination for centuries. They perceived that the war gave them the great opportunity of time, and that they would be faithless to their countrymen and to themselves did they not take advantage of it. After their surrender they volunteered for the Russian service, were mustered into her forces, and held their part of the eastern front from the good hour when they became an integral part of the Russian Army and long after the main Russian force had collapsed. Not until they were the only remaining force upon the eastern front with arms in their hands did they retire.

The Austrian Government offered them full immunity and full pardon, provided they would return to their former allegiance and reenter the Austrian service. They were also urged by the Bolsheviks to identify themselves with the Red Guard. True to themselves and to their faith, they spurned both of these temptations and determined upon a course which will command the admiration of mankind for all time. They resolved to continue the fight for the allies and to proceed, regardless of obstacles, from the Russian front across Russia and Siberia to Pacific ports, across the Pacific Ocean to San Francisco and Seattle, across the American Continent to our Atlantic ports, and across the Atlantic Ocean to the front in France.

Mr. President, these heroic men determined in the face of the most appalling difficulties and dangers to traverse three-quarters of the globe and reappear as militant soldiers against the power of the German Kaiser. When we consider the distances, the vast spaces by land and by sea, the desolation of the Siberian desert, the limitless difficulties of transportation across two oceans, the dangers lurking in their pathway across the 5,000 miles of territory stretching from the Ukraine to Vladivostok, and their resolution to brave them all, we may well conclude that the heroism and moral courage of man admits of no limitation. They began that march. They were assured free conduct by the Bolshevik Government only to have them revoked through the intrigues of the German Government. They disregarded the revocation. They were then assured that if they would surrender their arms to the Bolsheviks they would be permitted free and safe passage to Vladivostok. They surrendered their arms, and as a result were immediately attacked by the Red Guard. With bare hands, the only weapons that nature gives to man, these heroes assumed the offensive against their treacherous enemies, recaptured their arms, and continued their march to the Pacific Ocean.

Not only so, but they maintained themselves as a fighting force against the rapidly accumulating Red Guard army, manned with German munitions and officered by German veteran commanders. They saved the Russian situation. They saved the Siberian line of communication. They relieved the pressure on the western front. They compelled the retention in Russia of that vast body of German and Austrian prisoners which under the treaty of Brest-Litovsk would have been rapidly transported back to the central empires and reincorporated into their militant armies.

It must not be assumed for a moment, Mr. President, that the progress of these men was attended by unbroken triumphs. On the contrary, their very existence was more than once imperiled. They appealed more than once to the allies for aid, and

finally, through the efforts of Masaryk, now President of the Czecho-Slovak Nation, that appeal was heard. They asked to be aided in the struggle to reach the Pacific Ocean. They said, and said truly, that theirs was the only force representing the allied powers in Russia. Their supplies were exhausted. Their ammunition had practically given out. Their clothing was in tatters. They were menaced by constantly increasing foes. They called upon the allies for help, and they called in vain for weeks and months. Winter, with all its Siberian horrors, confronted them. Death in its most horrible form lurked in their rear and threatened their flanks, embodied in the powers of the Red Guard.

Finally some action was taken. The allies sent a force to Vladivostok, and the President announced in August what our purposes and objects were. The Johnson resolution recites that announcement.

I have heard this episode compared to Xenophon's retreat of the Ten Thousand. It is the only thing in history that furnishes any parallel. But Xenophon's Ten Thousand marched a bare thousand miles up the Tigris from central Persia to the Black Sea and then reenlisted as mercenaries in the ranks of another contestant. These men in a hostile country, destitute of clothing and provisions and almost destitute of arms, determined to march over 10,000 miles of land and traverse 3,000 leagues of ocean, not to enlist as mercenaries but to continue to fight for their ideals of freedom and of justice and to liberate their countrymen, their wives, and children from the tyranny and oppression of Austria. Xenophon's memorable episode fades into insignificance when compared with this epic of the Czecho-Slovak, fighting every foot of their beleaguered way. This campaign of 150,000 heroic central Europeans, inspired by devotion to the greatest cause that ever animated mankind, justified its sacrifice of blood and treasure.

As I have said, we finally and reluctantly yielded to this appeal and dispatched a very small contingent of soldiers, together with those of France and Great Britain, with a very much larger contingent of Japanese, to their relief. Japan announced her purpose by a pronouncement of August 2. Her Government declared that it "agreed with the American Government to dispatch troops to relieve the pressure weighing upon the Czecho-Slovak forces, who, aspiring to secure a free and independent existence for their race and loyally espousing the common cause of the allies, justly command every sympathy and consideration for the belligerents.

"In adopting this course the Japanese Government remains constant in their desire to promote relations of enduring friendship, and they reaffirm their avowed policy of respecting the territorial integrity of Russia and of abstaining from interference in her internal politics."

They further declare that upon the realization of the objects above indicated they will immediately withdraw all Japanese troops from Russian territories and will leave wholly unimpaired the sovereignty of Russia in all its phases."

Mr. President, this comparatively small contingent of soldiers rescued the Czecho-Slovaks within the territory lying between Vladivostok and Lake Baikal, but there is a considerable body of them west of the lake who need all the force that the allies can spare for their rescue from certain annihilation, yet it is announced that not only America, but Great Britain and Japan, according to dispatches of this morning, have determined to withdraw all of their troops from Asia, thus leaving these heroic souls to their fate.

I assert that if we carry out this program and desert these men, we will put an ineffaceable stain upon the glorious record of the allies. We owe it to every consideration of justice, of decency, and of gratitude to rescue every Czecho-Slovak soldier in Russia from that hell of bolshevism, aid him in returning to his country, now, for the first time in centuries, enjoying the blessings of freedom. I am amazed that, our task being half done, we propose to abandon it and leave these immortals to the terrible fate confronting them. It is wrong, and posterity will hold us, and ought to hold us, accountable if we now desert these heroic men, who saved the situation upon the eastern front, who deserve our immediate and most effective assistance, who are allies in very truth, and who in the immortal words of Lincoln have given our cause the full measure of devotion. If we now withdraw, it is certain that before the suns and showers of springtime shall again visit the earth we will read of their massacre, attended by circumstances that will revive our school-boy memories of death and torture by American savages and African bushmen.

Moreover, Mr. President, our enormous stores are still at Vladivostok. Scarcely anything that we sent there has found transportation farther west. They were all seized by Bolshevik looters. Some of them were scattered and sold for a song.

They will become a total loss if we are to abandon Russia altogether.

I for one protest, Mr. President, against the withdrawal of American troops either from the Archangel coast or from Vladivostok until every American and every dollar's worth of allied property has been salvaged and returned.

The complaint which I make, Mr. President, is that the force which we sent to Russia was insufficient. I grant you that they may have been exposed to undue danger and peril; I grant you that, with the ever-increasing Bolsheviki menace, they may be seriously imperiled; but should we, Mr. President, withdraw because of that fact? Should we not rather reenforce our gallant men at both these critical points, that we may successfully establish ourselves there until the need which requires it shall have been fully subserved.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have been very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Colorado, with the latter part of which I very fully agree; but I want to ask him a question, if it will not interrupt him to have me do so. Does the Senator understand that the Bolsheviki soldiers in Russia to-day are largely officered by Germans?

Mr. THOMAS. They are largely officered by Germans. Their instruction has been entirely that of German officers. The Bolsheviki program, among other things, resulted in the murder of Russian officers; indeed, of every one who fell into their clutches.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Further, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if we have no power under our armistice agreement to compel Germany to take those officers out of Russia?

Mr. THOMAS. The terms of the armistice require that the German forces occupying any Russian territory shall evacuate it, but that does not meet this difficulty. These officers are Germans, but they are not now German officers. They are the commanders of the Russian army and are an integral part of the Russian force. Consequently they are no longer subject to the orders of the German Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, if, under the terms of the armistice, we should compel our small forces which are in the country now to come out of Russia we would not only sacrifice largely the Russian people who welcomed our forces there and who would welcome, no doubt, an additional force and the establishment of a government along the lines on which the allies entered the war, but it would neutralize all that we have done. Such a course is based on neither right, duty, nor justice. What the allies ought to do, in my opinion, is to send enough soldiers into Russia to assist our comrades there in arms and to help the people who fought with us so bravely for the freedom of the world to establish a government of their own choosing rather than to allow them to be starved first and then slaughtered like beasts by a force infinitely worse than that of the despised Prussian armies. The Bolsheviki government is a creature inspired by the German Kaiser. Their agents and soldiers were sent into Russia to organize it, and it seems to me to be all one common enemy.

For myself, I am free to say that I fear the red flag of Russia. I have repeatedly talked with Members of this body, pointing out, as I saw it, its great and immediate danger to our peace conference at Versailles, as well as the European countries as a whole. I do not hesitate to say that, in my opinion, if it is not stamped out now and forever, it will be a living menace to the European countries and may eventually control them. And I also greatly fear its influence upon our own Nation. I have argued that it was the first question that ought to be taken up and settled, and time only convinces me that my conclusions were right.

Bolshevikiism is an enemy to every civilized nation in the world, and I fail to see why we are not to-day at war with the same class of people that we have been since we allied ourselves with the Russian people.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, the problem is fraught with a great many difficulties, and its solution with a great many undesirable consequences.

It is said, Mr. President, in view of the fact that conflicts have occurred between our own and the Red Guard troops, that we are making war upon Russia. I do not think that our troops were sent there with guns in their hands simply to stand quietly and let the enemy run over them. Foch says the best of all defenses is an offensive, and that is also a fundamental principle in the strategy of the German staff; but, be that as it may,

the Red Guard troops will not be troubled by our troops at Archangel or at Murman if they let them alone, and because we have successfully attacked them some distance from Archangel by no means implies that we are waging a war against them. We are protecting our property and our citizens as far as we can reach them, and I think that it is our duty to continue to do so. I confess to much apprehension regarding the situation there, because of the constantly increasing Red Guard forces and the constantly diminishing allied forces. It seems to me that England, France, and the United States are pursuing the worst possible policy, which is the policy of inaction. If there are not troops enough for the purpose, they should either be reinforced or withdrawn. To withdraw them without taking also the property which they were sent there to safeguard would render the entire enterprise humiliating and disgraceful, if not absurd. It is said by some that we are warring against an ally.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. KING. Apropos of the statement of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], I desire to say that lately I have been talking with a man who recently came from Russia, and he stated that the withdrawal of the troops from the Murman coast and from Archangel would subject to massacre at the hands of the Red Guard the Russians who have been loyal to the allies and loyal to the views for which the allies contended and the 6,000 or 7,000 Russian soldiers who were there operating with the allied troops.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly they would share the fate now threatening the few Czecho-Slovaks operating west of Lake Baikal.

Mr. President, we are not warring against an ally. Russians who have acted with the allies have begged for intervention much more actively than they have received it. If there is any element in Russia which deserves intervention at the hand of the allies it is that element which cooperated with them during the reign of the Czar, during the existence of the provisional government, and of the Kerensky administration.

But, Mr. President, the Bolsheviki long ago declared war against us. They have declared war against every established government upon the face of the earth. They have announced their purpose to wage war until they are overthrown. Theirs is an international movement; and they make no disguise of the fact. Theirs is a movement designed to substitute for established government everywhere the Bolsheviki government of Russia. They proclaim eternal warfare against all organized society. How, then, can it be said that we are making war against an ally? God deliver us from such an ally! It is Bolsheviki influence that is opposing peace; that is embarrassing the reconstruction of Roumania; that has postponed the crystallization of the governmental forces of the Czecho-Slovaks and the Jugoslavs. At the behest of the imperialists of Germany, and under the leadership of Liebknecht, they are endeavoring to reduce the condition of that unhappy people to chaos, that their followers may plunder the multitude, while junkerdom secures the return and restoration of the Hohenzollern dynasty.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS. I will do so in just a moment. There is grave danger that these influences will overwhelm both Poland and the Slovak peoples before a treaty of peace shall have been negotiated and the allies shall have framed even the rudiments of their proposed league to enforce peace.

Now I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. In connection with what the Senator from Colorado is just stating, I invite his attention to the fact that recently there have appeared in Hungary a number of the Russian Red Guard and representatives of Lenine and Trotzky, with Russian gold and Bolsheviki paper money, and that they are doing everything possible to prevent the Hungarians from establishing a stable form of government upon the ruins of the Austrian Empire.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, I have considerable material upon that feature of the situation as affecting not only Hungary but many others.

To give a fair notion of what the Bolsheviki idea of its relations to other Governments should be, let me recall the Bolsheviki proposal to Great Britain for the establishment of diplomatic relations, which, of course, involved the recognition by Great Britain of the Bolsheviki government. The British authorities said, "Suppose that we do this, we understand that your diplomats, in the event we receive them, will at once become the advocates of bolshevism in Great Britain." The answer was, "Certainly; that is why we want to make this

arrangement. Our ministers and our consuls will be instructed to propagate bolshevism wherever possible, to urge your people to overthrow your Government, to tear down the pillars of your social fabric, and introduce into your country the conditions now prevailing in Russia."

Who does not remember the recent conduct of Joffe? I regret that this creature bears a name so nearly identical with that of the great hero of France, who must be tempted to change his name and adopt some other appellation. Joffe is the Bolshevik ambassador to Berlin appointed pursuant to the treaty of Brest-Litovsk and recognized as a matter of course by the German Government. With the liberation of Liebknecht from his prison, Joffe began his Bolshevik propaganda among the people of Germany. He became so offensive, and went to such extremes in his advocacy of fire and sword, death and destruction, that the Ebert provisional government ordered his deportation from the country. Why, Mr. President, the Bolsheviks are serving Germany in France and England and America as efficiently as German secret service ever did. A recent article in the New York Times, of January 7, by the Times's correspondent in Paris declares:

In well-informed circles here the feeling grows daily stronger that bolshevism is one of the greatest dangers with which the allied conference must cope. The mass of the public does not yet realize the full extent of the danger, as the newspapers avoid alarming news on the one hand and on the other are overready to feature exaggerated stories emphasizing the utter disorganization and ruin of the Bolshevik régime in Russia.

Yet those who know the "secrets of the gods" in Paris no longer disguise their alarm at the course of events in Europe. Holland, Spain, and Switzerland are seriously menaced by labor troubles. Stockholm is overtly the headquarters of the Bolshevik propaganda, whose funds amount to millions of dollars as a result of unprincipled speculation by henchmen of Lenine and Trotzky on the ruble exchange and in Russian oil and other industrial shares whose variations they can influence at will.

Even in France, England, and Italy there are disquieting symptoms whereof the dissatisfaction over the demobilization question is not the sole manifestation. In Germany the Spartacists grow daily more dangerous, powerful, and daring, and while the allies are hair splitting over the conference procedure and the exact significance of the league of nations the Bolshevik flood rolls steadily westward across Poland.

What is really happening in that direction may be judged by a leading editorial in the Swiss Journal de Geneve, whose neutral impartiality can not conceal its profound anxiety. The writer says:

"The Russian Bolsheviks are advancing. They have reconstituted an army of mercenaries very well paid, and, it is said, organized and disciplined. Its numbers, reckoned by its adversaries as high as 2,000,000, are, perhaps, exaggerated; but at least they are sufficient to move almost without meeting resistance on the footsteps of the retreating Germans.

"All the populations of western Russia, Lithuanians, White Russians, etc., are falling, one after the other, into the power of triumphant anarchy. Now Poland is threatened. The aid promised by the allies is not forthcoming, and the Poles are hard pressed on all sides by Ruthenians and Bolsheviks, without its being possible to determine the unique and mysterious hand which certainly is maneuvering their host of enemies.

"The internal situation of the country is hardly less threatening. Ravaged by the Germans in an unparalleled fashion, Poland has no longer a single machine or single plow. Her industrial cities are thronged by a starving mass of Russian prisoners, Polish workers dismissed by the Germans, and retiring German troops scouring the country of its last reserves of food like a plague of locusts. Disorder, pillage, riot, and murder are the order of the day.

The remainder of this article, which is very short, I ask to have incorporated in my remarks.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

"The Polish Government is faced by well-nigh insurmountable difficulties. Its chief, Gen. Pilsudski, is unsupported by the allies, and his efforts are hampered by a committee of people who for four years have not set foot in Poland. Czechs, Jugo-Slavs, and other exiles in the entente countries have returned home, but the Poles alone continue to create in Paris difficulties for the Government of their country. Meanwhile anarchy rises and grows more serious.

"And what is Germany's attitude in this turmoil? It is hard to say. While the Poles are accusing the Germans of favoring bolshevism in Poland and break off diplomatic relations on that account, the Germans, for their part, dread the Bolshevik danger which the neighborhood of Poland represents to them. At the moment when, despite all assertions to the contrary, Liebknecht grows every day stronger and more menacing, Poland is for Germany a peril no less social than national.

"In any case Europe's interest is evident—to save Poland and in order to save it to strengthen the hand of its Government, for bolshevism is not a force that can be checked with ease. To-day it is at Minsk, perhaps to-morrow at Vilna. When it shall have triumphed at Warsaw and Cracow can it be prevented from reaching Berlin and Vienna? And then what will become of all of us—allies and neutrals alike?"

The despairing appeal of the last sentence, coming as it does from one of the soberest and most reliable newspapers in Europe, whose friendship to the entente cause has been unswerving throughout the war, should be enough to open the eyes of the allied leaders to the danger of further talk without action and further temporization and delay.

Mr. THOMAS. I might read a similar communication from the Paris correspondent of the New York World, on the 9th day of January, and of similar import; but I will not detain the Senate by doing so.

While bolshevism is arrayed against the property-holding class, and while its avowed purpose is to endow a very small segment of people with all of the power of organized society, while it proposes to abolish selfishness and cupidity, it recruits its army of mercenaries, and holds it in leash by paying wages hitherto unknown in military history. One of the greatest inducements to war, through all the stages of civilization, has been the cupidity of the soldier, the prospect of plunder, of loot, of rapine. The acquisition of property and of goods by conquest instead of labor has attracted the cupidity of the world from time immemorial; and the Bolsheviks are utilizing precisely the elements for the dissolution of the social compact which the allied countries propose to disarm by a league to enforce peace. Their soldiers receive from 250 to 450 rubles a month. Having looted the treasure of 180,000,000 of people, being in control of their industrial forces, operating through the Soviets, they have no difficulty in securing sufficient funds for their army and their emissaries engaged in the work of instigating riot and revolution in other countries. This explains the expansion of the Bolshevik army, an army of mercenaries, well paid and encouraged to plunder and loot at home and abroad.

These creatures are creating dissension among the allies now gathered at Paris for the reestablishment of peace. They are directed by the cunning German hand, so potent for mischief when working in secret. Bolshevik emissaries, with ample funds, spin their webs and weave their toils as German brains suggest and German hands direct. An "ex-attaché" has recently informed us through the columns of the Washington Post that Prince Von Bulow, the greatest chancellor that Kaiser Wilhelm ever had, and one of the greatest and most unscrupulous intellects of time, was in charge of Bolshevik propaganda; that his master hand in intrigue is easily recognized by those familiar with his methods in all of the dissolving forces and influences now so active in Paris, in every country in the world. Germany is seeking, under cover of bolshevism, to undo the power of the allies through agencies more dangerous than her armies ever were, for they are organized not only but subtle and unseen.

What bolshevism has done for Russia through German agencies it may do elsewhere. And bolshevism calls itself democracy. One of the first acts of this democratic organization was to disperse the Duma, which had been elected under the Kerensky régime which revealed an overwhelming anti-Bolshevik majority in its attempted organization. It was dispersed with bayonets the day succeeding its meeting; it never has been permitted to reconvene, and bolshevism has made no attempt to ascertain the will of the great majority in Russia either through the processes of an election or otherwise.

In fact, Mr. President, bolshevism in Russia has been one long agony of murder, of pillage, of destruction. It has attracted to its ranks all the criminals, the idlers, the adventurers, and the outcasts of the Empire. Murder and all the crimes of the category are sanctified in the Bolshevik declaration of faith. It is an inverted autocracy. Composed of numbers of many instead of one, it is far more atrocious and far more demoralizing and far more cruel than Czarism ever was.

Mr. President, the French Revolution has ever been regarded as the most awful episode of blood and carnage in human history, and down to the accession of Bolshevik power in Europe that was true. No one doubts the awful character of the French Revolution, nor yet that it was largely justified by the events of preceding centuries. The guillotine was said to be active in Paris, during the days of Rebespierre and Marat, by day and by night. It counted its victims every moment; and yet, Mr. President, the total number of men and women sacrificed to the guillotine during the French Revolution was less than 4,000. My friend from Utah [Mr. KING] says it was 2,700. But the Bolsheviks in Petrograd in a single day last fall murdered 860 human beings; and if all the victims of its reign of terror could be enumerated they would doubtless reach into the hundreds of thousands. There is no similar period of organized butchery known to history.

The French Revolution, too, had an organized government. It was a forceful government. It was a government which in large degree respected life and property. Its terrors were waged against practically a single and a very small class, the nobility, which had oppressed and trodden underfoot the common people of France for centuries. Even so, Mr. President, the reaction from its horrors resulted in the downfall of Robespierre, and in the emergence of Napoleon from its wrack and ruin. France, drunk with blood and reeling under the weight of a task it could not accomplish, threw herself into the arms of a usurper, and abandoned her ideals for the glories of world dominion. And when bolshevism shall have run its

bloody course, Russia, stricken and despairing, may welcome a deliverer albeit he may rescue her from its infernal clutch only to rivet her chains of servitude more securely than before.

I have stated my view regarding what our attitude toward Russia should be. Summarized, I contend that we should rescue the Czecho-Slovaks west of Lake Balkal at whatever cost; second, that we should safeguard until we can remove the property of the allies at the ports of the Pacific and of the northern ocean; and, lastly, that we should determine upon some policy toward an international condition more menacing in its consequences than any which our civilization has confronted. If we have overthrown the Kaiser only that bolshevism shall wax in power then it were better that an all-conquering Kaiser had spread his dominions over every land. His was a government infinitely preferable to the enthronement of the criminal elements of society, devoted to the destruction of life and the confiscation of property everywhere, without trial, without investigation, without appeal. I shall never believe that after paying the price which autocracy's overthrow demanded America will fail to measure up to the more supreme duty of the hour and take this hideous monstrosity by the throat and strangle it forever.

What is bolshevism? It is hard to describe in adequate language what is meant by that term. The recent Dutch minister from Holland to Russia, who barely escaped with his life, and who has made an impassioned plea for allied intervention as a duty to civilization, in an interview in the London Times said:

I wish to give a solemn warning to the working classes of all nations. Bolshevism, I say without exaggeration, is the end of civilization. I have known Russia intimately for 20 years and never have the working classes of Russia suffered as they are suffering at the present moment. I have never seen or dreamed of the possibility of such corruption, tyranny, and the absence of all semblance of freedom as there are in Russia at the present moment.

Translated into practice, the five points of bolshevism really come to this: (1) High wages; (2) do not work; (3) take other people's property; (4) no punishment; (5) no taxation; and I suppose there will always be a certain number of people who will adopt a program which in practice amounts to this. That is why, having myself seen the disastrous effects of this policy on all classes of society, I take the first opportunity on my arrival in England to warn the public. The bulk of the workmen in Russia are to-day far and away worse off than they ever have been, and the state of unemployment is simply terrible. When I left Petrograd the situation was one of utter starvation, and most people hardly knew how they would exist through the following day. The future to me seems hopeless. One thing is certain, that, left as she now is, Russia will be in a state of utter and complete ruin. Wherever bolshevism rules the nation has been beaten to a pulp and is utterly helpless.

I have said that this movement appeals to the predatory instincts of the criminal class, and I will venture the assertion that there is no so-called Bolshevist organization in any country in the world that is not welcomed by its criminals, by the man who would cut his neighbor's throat for a nickel or burn his neighbor's house for pastime. Bolshevism is destruction enthroned against a civilization that is entirely constructive, and if it succeeds it means relapse into a condition of absolute and primitive barbarism.

Mr. President, Russia is the center from which all governments, as I have said, are being attacked. I want to call attention to a few significant and sinister circumstances in support of that assertion.

I have here an extract from the New York World of January 9, which states the policy of the so-called Spartacus Bund, which is the name of the organization in Germany.

The Spartacus Bund is a group of direct-action Socialists determined to carry on the class struggle of the working classes against the bourgeoisie until a Government is established by and for the working classes, excluding all others from participation. It represents the great mass of the proletariat, not only in Germany but in the entire world.

WORLD-WIDE PLANS.

The revolution it is carrying on in Germany is only a step toward the world-wide revolution, which is to end in the universal establishment of dictature by the proletariat. Class struggle must be carried to the point where government by the proletariat masses shall be so thoroughly established that it can crush resistance. The proletariat of all countries must be united, and it must rule the world.

The immediate objects of the Spartacus Bund in Germany were outlined by the recent Spartacus Congress. What the Spartacus Bund proposes to do follows:

It will disarm all the police, all the soldiers, and all others not belonging to the proletariat. It will deprive the ruling classes of all arms and make resistance impossible. It will take control of all arms and ammunition plants in the name of the Arbeiter-Soldatenrat and arm all workmen devoted to the cause of the proletariat as a workmen's militia.

A red guard will be constructed from the proletariat as an active militia to fight counter-revolution. Discipline imposed by officers and under officers will be removed, substituting the free disposition of the soldiers, thus putting an end to military caste. All officers and their adherents will be removed from the soldiers' soviets.

The old administration will be replaced by one true to the cause of the proletariat.

A revolutionary tribunal will be established, before which will be tried the men chiefly guilty of causing and prolonging the war. This list will include both the Hohenzollerns, Ludendorff, Hindenburg, Tirpitz, and all their accomplices, as well as counter-revolutionists.

If the purpose were confined to the last recital, I do not know that the world would seriously object; but, unfortunately, bolshevism perceives no distinction between the world-wide criminal who deserves punishment and the peaceful citizen who happens to have a clean collar and 10 cents in his pocket.

Politically the purpose of the Spartacus Bund has been to put an end to the federation of States and to substitute a single German Socialist republic, the Arbeiter-Soldatenrat, to take over all parliamentary functions and all State functions except those originating in that body.

Election to public office and to parliament will be confined to soldiers and workmen, and there will be the right of instant recall of representatives. A central committee will be constituted by the Arbeiter-Soldatenrat for the exercise of executive power. There will be absolute socialization of the State, with a six-hour day and unemployment insurance.

God have mercy upon the company which takes the risks or the Government that may be called upon to assume them.

I have another clipping, which I shall not read, Mr. President, because I have already spoken longer than I intended, but which indicates the class of individuals, and those alone, who will be permitted to exercise any power or enjoy any rights of citizenship. It consists solely of those who do not employ anybody for anything. If I ask John Smith to curry my horse for wages I instantly disqualify myself from the right of citizenship. If a man employs another to do anything, however needful, however helpful to the employee, he writes his sentence of political death under the Bolshevist régime and is excluded from this choice band of thieves and scoundrels by virtue of that simple fact. This, they say, is carrying to its logical sequence the doctrine of the rule of the proletariat, and I am inclined to think that is true. It surely demonstrates the utter hollowness, tragedy, and impossibility of the Bolshevist scheme.

Mr. President, I have said that Russia is the center from which all Governments are being attacked. The attacking forces are operating in America actively, operating quite as freely as in countries across the sea. They have been identified with our industrial life for some time through an organization known as the I. W. W.; and it is a significant fact that nearly all of the prominent leaders of bolshevism in Russia, Lenine excepted, graduated from eastern New York, from Chicago, from Philadelphia, and from Buffalo, and every mother's son of them were members of the Industrial Workers of the World.

We are told by the press in the last few days that the Bolsheviks are organizing soviets in our large cities and that two, I believe, already exist in New York, and others are forming or are to be formed in Chicago, San Francisco, and Seattle. This means the establishment in free America of organizations whose avowed object and purpose are to agitate for the overthrow of this Government. It means, if it is permitted to be, that these scoundrels and expatriates from Russia, in combination with other scoundrels and criminals in this country, may organize with impunity for the propagation and practice of treason. It means that these centers of pernicious activity are to become the rallying points and nurseries of the I. W. W. When we consider the vast range of the criminal population of the great centers of this country, men who live by crime, and who will flock to these organized points under the rallying cry of "Brotherhood and the proletariat," disseminating their doctrines upon every street corner under the plea of freedom of speech, and the temptations which they offer to the unscrupulous, the unemployed, and the dissatisfied, we may readily perceive that here will be fruitful ground for this terrible menace to civilization.

I predict that unless the Government of the United States in cooperation with the States, in their sovereign capacity, shall stamp out these organizations and punish those who dare thus to menace the integrity of our institutions and advocate the overthrow of our Government the scenes of Petrograd and Moscow will be repeated on the shores of Lake Michigan and the island of Manhattan. How much further they will spread God only knows; but I am convinced that there is no duty to-day confronting the people of the United States, the American Congress, and the legislatures of our Commonwealths more imperative than this to which I am now calling attention.

Mr. President, only a few days ago a terrible riot—a so-called labor riot—developed in the Republic of Argentina. It was so formidable in its dimensions that the army was mobilized, the President for the time being surrendered his functions to the commander in chief, and the military power of the Republic was invoked to quell the insurrection. Two hundred and fifty lives were lost and some 750 persons were wounded, many of whom will die. It now appears that this entire trouble was fomented

and engineered by Russian Bolsheviks from Petrograd and Moscow, and that Uruguay would have been involved in the uprising but for the rigor of its authorities.

MONTevideo, URUGUAY, January 12, 1918.

The police have uncovered a plot on the part of Russians to instigate a Bolshevik movement here and in Buenos Aires. Four of the leaders in the movement are said to have confessed their participation in a plan to overthrow the Uruguayan and Argentine Governments and institute soviets in both countries. The police by quick work prevented an outbreak here which had been arranged to occur simultaneously with that in Buenos Aires.

The director of the "cultured center" is Isaac Molinoff, a Russian, who is said by the Buenos Aires police authorities to have been an accessory in a bomb-throwing plot in the Colon Opera House several years ago. Since that time Molinoff had lived here. He was arrested during the general strike last August, charged with carrying explosives.

FREED AFTER SHORT SENTENCE.

He pleaded that he was taking the bomb to sea to destroy it. He was given a short sentence and recently was released from custody. It is said that Molinoff since his release has been engaged in Bolshevik propaganda.

Among those arrested with Molinoff are Moses Federmann, Numann Patulyoski, and Marcos Mirnovich. Federmann, questioned by the police, is reported to have said that an anarchist revolution could not be long delayed in Uruguay, and that he would establish a soviet government along the lines of Nikolai Lenine. He is alleged to have said that he did not believe the arrest of the ringleaders in the present movement would hinder the ultimate success of the plan.

Patulyoski told the police that he had come to Montevideo from propaganda work in Buenos Aires in order to aid in the local movement. He said he knew Molinoff in Russia, where Molinoff had been active in propaganda work.

Another serious disturbance, formidable in its proportions, has just broken out in Peru. I have no particle of doubt that it has been fomented by the same pernicious influences, and that these will continue to occur until the strong hand of the Governments shall be unsparingly exercised against them.

I have referred to the I. W. W. It is beyond controversy that this criminal organization was a potent agency for German intrigue and German crime prior to America's entrance into the great war. There is no question that the 20 or 30 men affiliating with it who have been convicted were properly convicted, and that, considering their menace to this country in time of war, their sentences were not extravagant. But now that the war is over this organization is again beginning its activities and the exercise of its deviltry. It is the original and will continue to be one of the agencies of the Bolshevik propaganda in the United States.

I have read from a newspaper clipping the purpose of the Bolsheviks in Germany. I now read the preamble, or statement, of the I. W. W. principle:

The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among the millions of working people and the few who make up the employing class have all the good things of life.

Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers of the world organize as a class, take possession of the earth and the machinery of production, and abolish the wage system.

Instead of the conservative motto, "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work," we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, "Abolition of the wage system."

It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. The army of production must be organized not only for the every-day struggle with capitalists but to carry on production when capitalism shall have been overthrown. By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.

Its methods are thus set forth by its historian:

As a revolutionary organization the Industrial Workers of the World aims to use any and all tactics that will get the results sought with the least expenditure of time and energy. The tactics used are determined solely by the power of the organization to make good in their use. The question of "right" and "wrong" does not concern us.

This organization is tolerated in many parts of this country. It boasts of apologists and admirers. Some regard it as one of a natural sequence of our disturbed and altogether unsatisfactory social and industrial condition. It may be, Mr. President; but it is a matter of great satisfaction to me to know that the American Federation of Labor repudiates it and that it denounces all labor organizations recognizing and operating under the wage system. I know individually some of the leaders of this organization. I know their purpose to be identical the purpose of Russian bolshevism. There is no difference. "Direct action" is their watchword, which means kill, burn, destroy, assassinate. Before the war in some of the States upon the Pacific coast juries dared not punish these people for their crimes, because over their heads hung the constant threat and menace of the organization. In the section from which I hail that condition at one time came very near being the established fact. This means that unless the citizenship of the country are protected by their Government and by counter organization the criminals that constitute these organizations will increase in numbers, in terrorism, and in menace to our established institutions.

Mr. President, just a word, and I am through.

I do not believe that a disorder of this kind can be destroyed by penal legislation, however rigidly enforced. There is much unrest in the world. There is a widespread and largely justified dissatisfaction with the existing industrial, social, and economic conditions. The complaints against the oppression of trusts, combinations, and organized capital are in many instances unfortunately only too well founded. There can be such a thing as bolshevism in high life, depriving men by illegitimate combinations through legal processes of their property without taking their lives, perhaps more pernicious in their consequences than violent assaults upon human life and property.

No man can deny the Bolshevik's argument when he says that but for the despotism of the Romanoffs there would be no Bolsheviks, although it is but partly true. Nor can we deny that the Industrial Workers of the World is the offspring of the railroad wrecker and the monopolist. The leading industrial, commercial, and financial forces of this country, recognizing the perils confronting society, must abandon practices and policies engendering these conditions and conform the economic life of the Nation to the lines of equity and of justice. This, more than codes and correctives, will promote tranquility and deprive anarchism of its only refuge.

I had thought, Mr. President, that with the affliction of a world war, the magnificent response the American people have made to all consequent demands upon them, the transient extinction of class differences, the prevalence of a true spirit of democratic sacrifice and cooperation, the predatory outrages of financial power would terminate during the interval of strife. But, unfortunately, Mr. President, I was overoptimistic. Some of them have occurred during the war, whose excitements have served to make their perpetuation easy; others are in process.

A great railroad in my State, the Denver & Rio Grande, one of the most prosperous systems in the United States prior to the war, is to-day in hopeless, irredeemable bankruptcy. Its stockholders have lost virtually their entire investment through no fault of their own. A few years ago this stock commanded from \$80 to \$85 a share upon the market. To-day there is no market for it whatever. The road has been looted, wrecked, robbed, and destroyed by as heartless and conscienceless a combination of bankers and capitalists as ever coveted a prosperous and desirable property. Strange to say, they have accomplished this object by utilizing its obligations to another railroad, which they also captured for a song, and then used the guaranty of the Rio Grande for its destruction. When the history of this incident shall be understood by the people of the United States they will perceive in it a bolshevism as dangerous to American institutions and to the integrity of our civilization as that of Lenine and Trotzky at the other end of the social system.

No, Mr. President, there is much to do besides legislation. We must recognize and remove, as far as we can, the evils and the abuses which are the sole possible defenses for this unfortunate and dangerous situation.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I wish to offer a few remarks upon the Knox resolution, which was presented some time ago by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

The principal object of the Knox resolution is contained in the third paragraph thereof, which reads as follows:

That any project for any general league of nations or for any sweeping change in the ancient laws of the sea as hitherto recognized as international law and violated by the Teutonic powers should be postponed for separate consideration not alone by the victorious belligerents but by all the nations, if and when at some future time general conferences on those subjects might be deemed useful.

The present war has been the most disastrous of any in the history of the world. It is estimated that over 7,000,000 men have been killed and that over 15,000,000 men have been disabled or wounded. It has been calculated that the cost of the war, including the destruction of property, has amounted to more than \$200,000,000,000, in consequence of which bonds have been or will be issued by the various nations involved which it will be impossible to liquidate for more than a hundred years. It is safe to say that no wars are remunerative, even to those nations that are victorious.

The United States at all times has recognized the horrors of war and sought in every way to avoid engaging in conflict. Not until ruthless disregard by Germany of the principles of international law in sinking American ships and destroying American lives did we make our declaration of the existence of a state of war. The United States has at all times in the past been among the foremost of nations to encourage the formation of arbitration tribunals for the settlement of international disputes and the making of agreements to mitigate the brutalities of war. In the interest of humanity and civilization it has always been the pur-

pose of the United States to form some kind of covenant with all or the leading nations of the world to prevent the recurrence of war which ruthlessly exterminate so much of the youth and flower of our land and which places a burden of crushing taxation upon the countries of the world. It must be remembered that this burden rests mostly upon labor, as wealth is nothing but accumulated labor. It has taken just such frightful results as are unfolded to our view to demonstrate the necessity of avoiding war, to make people consider seriously some method of averting future visitation of such catastrophes. It is said that the Napoleonic wars, by reason of the death and disabling of so many of the stalwart soldiers, reduced in the following generations the average height of the men of some large districts of Europe as much as 2 inches. Our policy has produced a nation of wealth, power, and intelligent citizenship which is unequalled in the history of the world.

The question presented by the Knox resolution is whether, when these evils are vividly before us and when all of the world is appealing for some measure to prevent such terrible recurrences, we should proceed with the peace negotiations and not consider at this time any proposition concerning a league of nations, by which such horrors might be avoided. The resolution bears upon the face of it an opposition to any such league. It states that the subject "should be postponed for separate consideration, not alone by the victorious belligerents but by all the nations, if and when at some future time general conferences on those subjects might be deemed useful." It suggests no time when such conferences shall be held; it casts doubt upon the propriety of ever holding them when it says, "if and when at some future time general conferences on those subjects might be deemed useful."

Mr. President, there are two ways of defeating the plan for a league of nations: First, by openly opposing and voting against it; and, second, by postponing its consideration to a time when other subjects are engrossing the attention of the world and when there may exist divisions and disputes among nations which might destroy any chance of effecting an agreement. In my judgment, to vote for the Knox resolution proposing postponement is virtually to vote against the formation of any league of nations for the purpose of avoiding wars.

One of the principal reasons for our entering the war was to bring about such a compact with other nations as would insure the peace of the world forever. That was the statement made by the President to the Senate and House of Representatives at the time of our entrance into the war. No dissent was made to that declaration by Senators or Representatives, but all enthusiastically applauded the sentiment. We have said time and again that if such a result is obtained it will compensate us for the great loss of life and property occasioned by this disastrous war. Every Senator or Representative who has addressed citizens of our country in favor of the various liberty loans has dwelt upon this as one of our highest aims. Is it possible that anyone with fairness can now in an indirect manner propose the abandonment of that, the greatest argument we had in getting the approval of the people of the United States to subscribe to gigantic loans for the prosecution of the war?

In the past the principal retarding influence in the creation of a league of nations has been the fear on our part that the court or arbitration body would be so dominated in the interest of the monarchies of Europe that we might be swept into the monarchial system instead of having prevail the just principles of the rights of humanity as set forth in our Declaration of Independence. It was the apprehension that we might be at a disadvantage in submitting our disputes with other nations to a tribunal composed of judges the majority of whom would in all likelihood be from monarchies.

The continued discussion of the formation of a league of nations has developed many proposals for the determination of international disputes. In order to induce nations to enter into such a league it is necessary to avoid giving any advantage to one nation over another in the trial of such causes.

Mr. President, I have always believed that there should be established an international court to which all controversies threatening war between nations must be submitted; that the judges thereof should not be selected for the determination of all disputes presented, but should sit only in those cases to which they may be assigned; that each nation should have at the court as many judges as it deemed proper to appoint to act as a panel from which to select those who are to pass upon each international question; and that when a dispute threatening war arises between any two nations each nation, after the formulation of the pleadings, should select an equal number of judges of its own if it so desires, and those so chosen to select the odd judge of the court, and if they can not agree upon the odd judge, then, if no other way can be devised, they shall resort to chance in

the selection of such odd judge. Even if, in the selection of the odd judge, an advantage should be obtained by one side, it would be inconsiderable when weighed with the destruction of life and property of each nation in case of war.

A court so constituted would be regarded by all nations as fair, and thus the first great requisite of a successful arbitration tribunal would be accomplished. Under those conditions all of the nations would find security in the league which would prevent many, if not all, wars, and consequently they would likely be willing to enter into such a league.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator may intend discussing at a later part of his speech the point concerning which I was about to interrogate him, and, if he does so intend, I shall be very glad to have him so inform me.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I shall be glad to have the statement of the Senator.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator contemplate a system which would require that all who are parties to the convention or league of peace, whatever form it assumes, shall submit to it every question affecting the vital interests or the honor or territorial integrity of each nation?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not as to territorial integrity. My idea concerning an agreement as to the territorial integrity is this: I believe there ought to be specified in the peace treaty we are negotiating the boundaries of each nation, and we should stipulate that those boundaries, except as modified by mutual agreement of each nation interested, with the consent of the inhabitants of each, shall be respected and protected by the nations to the league. That, in my judgment, would do away with nine-tenths of the wars of the world, because territorial acquisition has been the bone of contention and has been the aim of nations who desired conquest more than any other cause. I have no doubt that nine-tenths of the nations of the world that have been fighting have had their causes originate from a desire to obtain the territory of some other nation.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that upon the part of those who are discussing this question the terms justiciable and non-justiciable are employed?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes.

Mr. KING. Accepting the terminology and the definition so given, is the Senator willing to have our Nation join a league of nations which would require that we should submit to the league of nations, for instance, the Monroe doctrine, the question of tariffs, and other vital questions, some of which would be entirely nonjusticiable?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I must say that it would depend somewhat upon the controversy which was presented. But my desire is as near as possible to submit all questions that arise in controversies between nations. I will cover that, if the Senator will allow me, a little further on, and probably a little more clearly. The Monroe doctrine will not be jeopardized by a league of nations to enforce peace, but will be made more secure by the guaranty of all the nations instead of by ours alone. If the United States should have a dispute with Belgium, that kingdom could well say that it has as good a chance of winning the controversy against the great United States as would be the chance of our own Government, and we, desiring no acquisition of territory and desiring nothing but what is right and just, would be glad to accept the terms of arbitration and select our judges of the court which would determine the controversy. We could not refuse, unless we were to exercise those very qualities of domination of great nations over smaller nations which we have so unanimously condemned in this war. With the full confidence on the part of both Belgium and the United States that the tribunal would be fair, both would submit, knowing that the determination in the judgment of the majority of a tribunal so formed would be in the interest of the orderly administration of justice. The first great requisite in the formation of a league of nations for the prevention of wars is, in my judgment, the establishment of a court so constituted.

Mr. President, the difference between that kind of a court and a court of fixed judges named by the league or named by all the nations to determine all controversies that come before it is the difference between night and day as to whether the arbitration will be regarded as fair. In other words, we have our doubts whether, if we have but one judge upon the tribunal and the monarchies of Europe have seven or eight, we will not be engulfed in the influence of those judges appointed from monarchial governments. Consequently the fear has been that we will not get justice. If we were sure that we would get justice there would be no difficulty in agreeing to almost any proposition for a league of nations that might be presented;

but where you agree that the court which determines the matter shall consist of judges selected by your own Government and judges selected by the opposing Government, and that those judges shall meet and determine and agree upon a third or fifth or seventh or ninth judge, dependent upon the size of the court, you can readily see that all nations will agree to come into a league that will have for its court such an organization. They will then know that their chances are equal, and that while there might be some advantage obtained by one nation over another in the selection of the odd judge, it would be inconsiderable compared to the great damage and wrong and death and destruction that must result from these wars.

As to the manner in which the decrees of the court shall be enforced there are many differences of opinion; some believe that its decrees should be enforced by such a great army and navy of its own as would make resistance by one nation futile. This, of course, would involve an agreement among the nations to reduce their armies and navies far below those provided for the international tribunal. If successful, the tribunal would prevent the enormous burdens upon the people which are now made necessary in order that each nation may be prepared for conflicts. Unless some agreement among the nations is made providing for compulsory submission of controversies to an international court, the powers of the world will compete more sharply than they have in the past in the enlargement of armies and navies. That policy will produce not only great burdens but will breed in each nation warlike tendencies and autocratic attitude in the exercise of its powers.

Others believe that the league of nations should simply exercise a moral influence against the entrance of nations into war or that by hindrance and delays such a length of time might elapse that the passions of each nation would subside and reason induce each to forego the declaration of hostilities.

There are objections to these contentions for the enforcement of the decrees of the court, but that some measure should be adopted which would prevent many, if not all, wars it seems to me clear. If nothing more results from the peace treaty than that each nation agrees to respect the territorial boundaries as fixed in the treaty and to aid in maintaining such territorial integrity, nine-tenths of the wars of the world will be prevented. As soon as a nation obsessed with the idea of conquest knows that it must fight the entire world if it attempts to seize territory, it will conclude that nothing is to be gained by an aggressive course and abandon such schemes. Nine-tenths of the wars of the world have been started for the purpose of acquiring territory, and if such an agreement were made by all the nations of the world it would eliminate nine-tenths of the wars of the world. Germany has been the one nation of all others to decline to enter into an international agreement for arbitration of controversies and now, in the formation of the peace treaty, we have a right to compel her to keep the peace by some such contract; whereas if the matter is delayed there is no way of requiring her to enter into such an agreement. It is therefore imperative, to my mind, that an international agreement, which will at least tend to prevent war in the future, should be considered and agreed upon before the peace treaty is concluded. There are others who believe that the decree of the court should be enforced, if necessary, by the army and navy of each of the signatory powers.

Mr. President, we heard a very eloquent speech to-day from the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] condemning that form of an international agreement. He said that there would be a competition by each nation endeavoring to get as great an army and navy as possible in order to preserve the peace of the world. He overlooked the fact that in that same agreement for the arbitration of controversies it can be stipulated and agreed that there shall be no enlargement of the armies and navies of the nations, or a limitation of the armaments can be specified and fixed according to population of the respective nations or by such other means and such other ways as may be devised. With an agreement of that kind I see no reason why that competition would exist which the Senator fears, but it will exist if no league of nations is agreed upon.

There are some who believe that the decrees of the court should not be enforced except by an agreement that a nation refusing or failing to submit a controversy to the international court should be punished by certain commercial restrictions imposed by all the nations of the world. Others contend that a nation refusing to submit a controversy with another nation to the international court should not recover against the other nation any indemnity. Such a rule, of course, would place the nation refusing to submit its controversy to arbitration at a disadvantage and likely to cause it to refrain from a declaration of war. To those who say it would be futile to simply agree to submit all controversies threatening war to an international

court and abide by the result because some nations might regard such treaties as mere scraps of paper, it may be said that the results from treating the Belgian treaty as a scrap of paper would likely prevent any nation in the future breaking a treaty with all the nations of the world.

While I believe in some of the more drastic means of enforcing the decrees of the court, yet any of the means suggested would be better than no agreement.

President Wilson is now in Europe endeavoring to negotiate a peace treaty that will not only settle the disputes as to the nations in this war but that will at least have a tendency to prevent wars in the future. As we have said so many times that we are fighting for a permanent peace among the nations of the world, that this is a war to end all wars, it seems to be inconsistent with our own declarations when we advise that he make no treaty with respect to the world's peace. He knows the situation and views of the nations and as to whether we can get a treaty that will insure peace to the world better than we who have no communication with the representatives of other nations. It may be that he will not accomplish the thing which we all desire, namely, making the world safe from wars, but we impair his influence if we pass resolutions urging that he should not endeavor to consummate such purpose at the most opportune time. Now is the psychological moment to produce such an agreement, and if there is anyone in the United States who can produce such a happy result it is the President, who, as the demonstrations in Europe show, is held not only in the highest regard but in the greatest affection by the people of the entente powers. To impose our advice on him when we are not familiar with the situation, it seems to me, is a proceeding which would greatly weaken his influence in the negotiation of the treaty. It, therefore, in my judgment, would be the height of impropriety to pass the Knox resolution.

THE CENSUS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] on page 8.

Mr. SHEPPARD. After consulting further with the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] I have prepared an amendment to be offered in lieu of the amendment which I presented yesterday afternoon and which is now pending. I ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 20, after the word "act," at the bottom of the page, at the end of section 7, insert the following additional proviso:

And provided further, That in the selection of the additional clerks and employees provided for by section 6, the director is authorized to use, so far as practicable, the reemployment registers established by Executive order of November 29, 1918, so far as the same applies to permanent appointments by competition.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, two or three Senators who are absent have suggested that they desired to be present when the pending bill was being considered. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum. I do not know anything about the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Shafroth
Colt	Kellogg	Myers	Sheppard
Culberson	Kendrick	New	Smith, S. C.
Curtis	Kenyon	Norris	Smoot
Fletcher	King	Overman	Spencer
France	Kirby	Page	Sutherland
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Poindexter	Thomas
Gay	Lewis	Pollock	Underwood
Gronna	McKellar	Pomerene	Vardaman
Hale	McNary	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Henderson	Martin, Ky.	Reed	Welcott
Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I have been requested also to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I have been requested also to announce the absence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on account of illness. I desire that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is absent on account of illness.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. TRAMMELL].

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on account of illness.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence, on account of illness, of my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD].

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. WEEKS answered to their names when called.

Mr. BANKHEAD entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], which the Secretary will state, as perfected by that Senator.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 7, on page 8, line 20, after the word "act," it is proposed to insert the following:

And provided further, That in the selection of the additional clerks and employees provided for by section 6, the director is authorized to use, so far as practicable, the reemployment registers established by Executive order of November 29, 1918, so far as the same applies to permanent appointments by competition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on the Census was, in section 8, page 9, line 10, after the word "home," to insert "whether or not a survivor of any war in which the United States has been engaged, and if so, of what war," so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 8. That the Fourteenth Census shall be restricted to inquiries relating to population, to agriculture, to manufactures, to forestry and forest products, and to mines and quarries. The schedules relating to population shall include for each inhabitant the name, place of abode, relationship to head of family, color, sex, age, conjugal condition, place of birth, place of birth of parents, nationality or mother tongue of all persons born in foreign countries, nationality or mother tongue of parents of foreign birth, number of years in the United States, citizenship, occupation, whether or not employer or employee, whether or not engaged in agriculture, school attendance, literacy, and tenure of home, whether or not a survivor of any war in which the United States has been engaged, and if so, of what war, and the name and address of each blind or deaf and dumb person.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, in line 2, after the word "manufactures," to insert "to forestry and forest products," so as to make the clause read:

The schedules of inquiries relating to manufactures, to forestry and forest products, and to mines and quarries shall include the name and location of each establishment; character of organization, whether individual, corporate, or other form; character of business or kind of goods manufactured; amount of capital actually invested; number of proprietors, firm members, copartners and officers, and the amount of their salaries; number of employees and the amount of their wages; quantity and cost of materials used in manufactures; principal miscellaneous expenses; quantity and value of products; time in operation during the year; character and quantity of power used; and character and number of machines employed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, in line 14, after the word "manufactures," to insert "of forestry and forest products," so as to make the clause read:

The census of manufactures, of forestry and forest products, and of mines and quarries shall relate to the year ending December 31 next preceding the enumeration of population, and shall be confined to manufacturing establishments and mines and quarries which were in active operation during all or a portion of that year. The census of manufactures shall furthermore be confined to manufacturing establishments conducted under what is known as the factory system, exclusive of the so-called neighborhood, household, and hand industries.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 6, before the word "determined," to strike out "The form and subdivision of inquiries necessary to obtain the information under the foregoing topics shall be" and insert "The number, form, and subdivision of inquiries provided for in section 8 shall be," so as to make the clause read:

The number, form, and subdivision of inquiries provided for in section 8 shall be determined by the Director of the Census.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, page 11, line 18, after the words "by the," to strike out "Secretary of Commerce upon the recommendation of the Director of the Census" and insert "President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. That the Director of the Census shall, at least six months prior to the date fixed for commencing the enumeration at the Fourteenth and each succeeding decennial census, designate the number, whether one or more, of supervisors of census for each State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, and shall define the districts within which they are to act; except that the Director of the Census, in his discretion, need not designate supervisors for Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, but in lieu thereof may employ special agents as hereinafter provided. The supervisors shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided,* That the whole number of supervisors shall not exceed 400: *Provided further,* That so far as practicable and desirable the boundaries of the supervisors' districts shall conform to the boundaries of the congressional districts: *And provided further,* That if in any supervisor's district the supervisor has not been appointed and qualified 90 days preceding the date fixed for the commencement of the enumeration, or if any vacancy shall occur thereafter, either through death, removal, or resignation of a supervisor, or from any other cause, the Director of the Census may appoint a temporary supervisor or detail an employee of the Census Office to act as supervisor for that district.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment go over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENDRICK in the chair). Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 13, on page 13.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in lines 11, 12, and 13, on page 13, I move to strike out the words "and in addition thereto \$1 for each thousand or major fraction of a thousand of population enumerated in his district, such sums," so that the section, if amended, will read:

SEC. 11. That each supervisor of the census shall, upon the completion of his duties to the satisfaction of the Director of the Census, receive the sum of \$1,500, to be in full compensation for all services rendered and expenses incurred by him—

And so forth.

It seems to me that the sum of \$1,500 provided in the section is ample for the few days' work that will be required at the hands of the enumerators.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, this is compensation for the supervisors, I will say to the Senator, and not for the enumerators. The work of the supervisors lasts for five or six months and sometimes longer. This is the compensation that was provided 10 years ago when the Thirteenth Census was taken. No change from the provision then enacted has been made in the present bill, and I do not think that the Senator ought to insist upon his amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in reply I will say that if experience has demonstrated that \$1,500 is inadequate compensation we ought to provide in the bill an amount that will be sufficient and fair. It seems to me that to leave it in this indefinite way is not the wisest and best method of legislation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is the method that has commended itself to the experts who prepared the bill originally and who made examination of the entire situation with a view to seeing what changes, if any, should be made. It was their view, the view of the House committee, and the view of the House itself that the compensation provided 10 years ago would be sufficient at the present time for the supervisors, which is \$1,500 and a dollar for each thousand people and major fraction thereof enumerated in a district.

Mr. KING. I will ask the Senator why we can not specify the amount to be allowed instead of leaving it in rather an indefinite way?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is uncertain as to how many people are in the various districts, and for that reason it was thought that a given sum plus a dollar for each thousand names and major fraction thereof would be a better form of compensation and would be something of an inducement to greater activity in the performance of duty.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator state that the evidence before the committee and the experience of the department have proved that \$1,500 is not sufficient compensation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That seems to be the consensus of opinion among those who have had experience in the matter.

Mr. KING. I believe, Mr. President, that the \$1,500 compensation provided is adequate, but I withdraw the amendment if the fact is that in the past they have been allowed the same compensation provided by this bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah is withdrawn.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of section 15, on page 17.

DEMobilIZATION OF AMERICAN TROOPS.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in regard to the question of demobilization. It will be remembered that shortly after the armistice the War Department, through Gen. March and others, as I recall, made statements to the press of the country that the Army would be demobilized at the rate of about 30,000 men a day. The latest figures shown by the department on Saturday are that 693,889 had been demobilized up to that date, or an average of about 11,564 men per day since the armistice, just a few more than one-third of the estimate of the department. Of course, the department must have planned to demobilize 30,000 per day or the first statement would not have been made. Of course, the department must have thought it advisable to demobilize 30,000 per day or that number would not have been fixed upon. We can not assume that the department was guessing at the number it planned to demobilize per day. It is no answer now to say we are demobilizing faster than England is. England's situation is different from ours. England's needs are different from ours. Surely our own original plans have not been changed because England is demobilizing more slowly than we are.

Mr. President, soldiers are being kept in camps, having absolutely nothing to do; officers are being kept in camps also with no duties to perform. I am speaking solely of our domestic forces. The Army abroad is under the control of Gen. Pershing, and, of course, he should be absolutely in control of that situation, but when he sends troops back here they should be immediately demobilized. If he had a use for them they would not be sent back.

The war is over, and it is our duty to get back to a peace basis at the earliest practicable moment. Our boys went into the Army, most of them, giving up excellent positions in civil life, in order to defend their country in the time of their country's peril. Now that that peril is over, surely it is as little as their country can do to permit them to go back to their accustomed duties. This was what was promised them. In many instances it seems to be the policy of the authorities not to permit the boys to be discharged upon application, if such discharge can be avoided. This is unjustifiable.

I wish especially to call the attention of the Senate to Circular No. 77 of the War Department, which I ask to have inserted in my remarks at this point without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair hears no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Circular No. 77.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 21, 1918.

DISCHARGE OF ENLISTED MEN FOR RELIEF OF FAMILY OR URGENT NEED IN INDUSTRIAL WORK.

1. Department commanders within the United States, commanders of ports of embarkation, and commanders of camps not under the jurisdiction of department commanders or of chiefs of bureaus of the War Department, are authorized to discharge enlisted men upon their own application when there is sickness or other distress in the soldier's family, or when he is needed to resume employment in an industry or occupation in which there is urgent need of his services, provided that such discharge will not disrupt or cripple an existing organization, and that the soldier's services can be spared. Consideration will be given to the fact that the machinery of camps must be utilized in the demobilization of the Army and due regard must be taken that it is not retarded by the discharge of personnel connected therewith.

2. The instructions contained herein apply only to individual and exceptional cases and are not intended to release men in large groups or blocks for any general employment or occupation.

3. Application for discharge under the provisions of this circular will be made in each individual case by the soldier concerned and through his immediate commanding officer. No man who voluntarily enlisted prior to April 1, 1917, will be discharged under this authority.

4. Men discharged under these instructions will be included in such weekly reports of men discharged as are required by the War Department.

5. Cases of the character indicated arising in places not covered by this authority will be forwarded to The Adjutant General of the Army for final action.

(220.81, A. G. O.)

By order of the Secretary of War:

PEYTON C. MARCH,
General, Chief of Staff.

Official:

P. C. HARRIS,
The Adjutant General.

Mr. McKELLAR. While this circular in its general terms is broad enough, men are not being discharged under it as rapidly and as freely as they should be discharged. Apparently it is the purpose of the commanding officers not to discharge at all, except when it can not be avoided. I think also a very restricted meaning has been given to it by the department. I have in mind especially the case of development companies, which, under a circular of the War Department, were to be demobilized among the first, as I recall. Up until a few days ago, and I imagine they are still there, there were four

battalions of the development companies, two white and two colored, that were being held at Camp Meade for the purpose, so I am told, of keeping the development companies together until a plan could be devised by the War Department for handling permanent development companies.

Of course the Senate understands what development companies are. They are men underweight, frail and weak men, men afflicted with disease or unfit for military service. They are not soldiers and can not be made soldiers until they are rehabilitated and cured.

The idea of keeping these undeveloped and diseased men in the Army, now that the war is over, is little short of ridiculous. The idea of having permanent development companies in a peace army is farcical. It puts the Army authorities in an indefensible position to keep these men in the Army.

I have written the department about this matter, but no action has been taken up to this time.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate and the country to another great mistake that is being made by the Army authorities in not permitting the discharge of men who have their old or who may have new places in civil life open to them. Circular No. 77 ought to be amended so as to provide that any soldier, enlisted man or officer, who has a place open to him and who presents an application for a discharge and an affidavit from a would-be employer showing that the old place or a new one is open to him in agriculture, industry, commerce, or business, or in any other capacity, ought to be discharged at once, without regard to any supposed need of the Army for him. The need of the soldier for a permanent place is greater than the need of the Army for a particular soldier, now that the war is over.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator for me to make a suggestion at this point in his very able speech?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am glad the Senator is calling attention to what seems to me a very serious oversight on the part of the War Department. From my State recently I have had probably a hundred letters from fathers whose sons are in the Army, mothers, and wives who live in the country; and they are impressing upon me the necessity of having the boys at home in the very near future if they are to make crops during the present year. It seems to me the War Department would see the necessity especially for letting the farmer boys out of the Army now, if they are to make a crop, and be relieved from a year of idleness. I am glad the Senator from Tennessee is calling attention to what seems to me a very serious dereliction on the part of the War Department.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it is true that farmer boys all over the country ought to be returned to the farms without delay, where they have farms open to them. There are great numbers of men in the Army who have no such positions open to them and who can do such necessary work as may be required for the Army. It is safe to say that not less than 100 letters are received by me each day from citizens of Tennessee, urging that Tennessee soldiers who have positions open to them be discharged and permitted to take these places while they can get them. I imagine other Senators get as many or more.

At least one department of the Government—the Department of the Interior—is making most strenuous and splendid efforts to secure positions and employment for our returning soldiers. This department is entitled to the greatest commendation for its effort along this line; but while it is making these efforts, apparently the War Department, doubtless for the most part unintentionally, but nevertheless it is in effect dealing with the subject so as to prevent young men from getting places which are now open to them. The Interior Department is trying to get them employment. The War Department is in many cases refusing to let them off to accept employment.

Our departments should get together and work in harmony for the benefit of these soldiers, getting them employment wherever possible.

Mr. President, according to the present outlook, it will take 12 months to demobilize our Army. Plans for a more rapid demobilization ought to be made at once. The present plans are inadequate. Indeed, these men are not being demobilized much faster than they were brought into the Army by Gen. Crowder, and they were drafted, it will be remembered, only at intervals. A comparison of the two systems, one of the draft under Gen. Crowder and the one of demobilization under the War Department, shows a very marked difference in success of the draft plan as compared with the plan for demobilization adopted by the department. The department had better place the demobilization of the Army in the hands of Gen. Crowder. He gets results, and if he planned to demobilize that number it would be done.

Mr. President, the people of the United States are tired of this red tape in demobilization, and I want urgently to request the War Department to dispense with it. The sooner we get back on a normal peace basis the better it will be for the country, and the better, I may say, for the Army. It can hardly be believed that any officer in the War Department or in the Army is trying to hold back demobilization in order to effect a larger peace organization of the Army. If there are any such officers, and I hope there are none such, they are making a great mistake. Nothing will work more to prevent a large peace-time organization than this red tape and delay as to demobilization.

I have introduced a bill providing for a more expeditious demobilization of our domestic troops, but I hope the War Department may speed up without requiring further legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I have heard from several sources that there has been an order issued to the commanding officers at most of the cantonments in the United States that only a certain percentage of the men should be discharged. As the Senator is a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I wish to ask him whether he has any information on that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, Mr. President, I have not. I think the Navy has some such proposition, and I think that is whence the Senator received his information, or that it relates to the Navy Department.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure the Navy has—

Mr. McKELLAR. The Navy has, I know.

Mr. SMOOT. Because I have received letters from the officials of the Navy Department virtually stating that and giving the reasons why; but I have understood from letters that I have received—and, I will say to the Senator, from the soldiers themselves—when I have asked that they be discharged if not inconsistent with the successful working of the Army, stating that the soldier could not be discharged because of the fact that the percentage that had been agreed upon by the War Department for discharges had been reached, and he would have to wait his turn. I wondered whether or not any such order as that had been issued by the War Department.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not think there is such an order from the department. It may be the order of some camp commander. I will call the Senator's attention to circular 77, bearing on this subject, and, as it is a very live question, for the benefit of the Senate I will read just a part of it:

Department commanders within the United States, commanders of ports of embarkation, and commanders of camps not under the jurisdiction of department commanders or of chiefs of bureaus of the War Department are authorized to discharge enlisted men upon their own application when there is sickness or other distress in the soldier's family, or when he is needed to resume employment in an industry or occupation in which there is urgent need of his services, provided that such discharge will not disrupt or cripple an existing organization and that the soldier's services can be spared.

If the War Department would leave out that proviso and instruct camp commanders to follow the order this matter would be absolutely settled; but I will say to the Senator, under this order the department commanders pay a great deal more attention, according to the letters I have received from them, to the proviso than they do to the main body of the circular. They seem to think that the discharge of a single man "disrupts or cripples an existing organization." In other words, whenever they see fit they decline to discharge soldiers, apparently without regard to the order, and the result is that only a very few men are being discharged on their own application, judging from the number of letters I receive on the subject. If that order was given its proper interpretation there probably would not be much trouble. Gen. Jervy, acting for the Chief of Staff, has in a letter to me put a very restricted meaning on the phrase "needed to resume employment in an industry or occupation in which there is urgent need of his services," and I assume that this restricted and distorted meaning of the phrase has been sent out to all commanding officers of camps. At all events, very few cases that have come under my notice have been discharged for this reason. I do not see how any fair-minded officer, under existing conditions, could refuse to discharge a man under him when a place is open to the soldier.

Now, it is clear that all of us are intensely anxious to get places for these boys in the Army. We are going to be called upon, and I think it will be perfectly right, to make appropriations that will cause the employment of a large number of these returning soldiers; public improvements may have to be made just to give them employment; and, while that is true, and while we all want to get them employment, here are thousands of young men with places open to them, but who can not take them because the War Department will not release them. I receive every day affidavits from would-be employers showing that men in the Army are absolutely necessary to their business.

I had one the other day as to the manager of a concern that has been paid \$20,000 a year salary. The concern have no manager, and they are anxious to get their former employee back.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will excuse me just a minute, they were anxious to get this former employee back to take charge of the business. The War Department had refused time and time again to grant that young man a discharge, and it was only after the most strenuous exertion upon my part that I finally got him discharged a day or two ago, and I am very grateful to the department for granting that discharge.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me yield to the Senator from Colorado, who addressed the Chair first, and then I will yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I want to call the attention of the Senator first to the very circumstances that he has set forth, to show that demobilization can not take place as rapidly as he might desire.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just let me reply to the Senator in this way, and then I will let him go ahead and make the statement: If 30,000 per day can not be demobilized, why was it that our military authorities told us in the beginning that they were making arrangements to demobilize at the rate of 30,000 a day? Why now are they performing that promise by demobilizing at the rate of only 11,500 a day? In other words, if it is now right to demobilize 11,500 per day, why did the department fix upon 30,000 per day and lead the country to believe that they were going to demobilize 30,000 per day?

Mr. SHAFROTH. We had a discussion here the other day by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and he was protesting most vigorously about the demobilization of men in large number without picking them out. He wanted those who had dependents upon them to be selected first, and the others to be held subject to the orders of the War Department. He made various other objections to the demobilization of men quickly. Now, Mr. President, I have not any doubt but that the policy of the Government is to demobilize these men within a reasonable time.

Mr. McKELLAR. According to the department apparently a reasonable time is 12 months. The law provides for 4 months after the peace signing in which the entire Army is to be demobilized, and the department, according to its own figures now, will occupy 12 months in demobilization. If they do not demobilize faster, or get the law changed, it may be that a part of the Army will be demobilized by lapse of time and by operation of law.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But, Mr. President, it becomes necessary, for the very reasons that the Senator proposes, to find out who have dependents, who are needed for the farms, and so on. I supposed that demobilization usually took place in companies, but under the system which is proposed, and which seems to meet the approval of the Senator, as a matter of fact these discharges are made by individuals, depending upon the individual circumstances, and, of course, inquiry with relation to the matter, and perhaps the presentation of affidavits, must of necessity take considerable time. There should be examinations as to the physical condition of the soldier, because this war is going to bring forth enormous numbers of pension applications, and it will be important to know whether the man when he was discharged had a certain ailment or disease and as to whether he had it at the time of his enlistment. All of these matters make it almost impossible to discharge men in the manner that probably we would like to have them discharged, and I have no doubt, too, that there are many soldiers who do not care to be discharged quickly.

Mr. McKELLAR. My remarks have nothing to do with those men about whom the Senator is talking. I refer only to those who have places open to them, with an affidavit from the would-be employer that there are places open to them as the ground for asking the War Department to discharge them.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have no doubt but that they will be discharged as soon as it can be gotten around to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Evidently they are not being discharged as the War Department expected to do it. There is a great difference between 11,500 and 30,000 per day.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, that may be. The department no doubt finds difficulties in the way, as we all do when we undertake something that is new to us; and on that account it seems to me that we are making a very creditable showing when we have demobilized six hundred and some odd thousand soldiers since the armistice took place.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I simply wanted to call attention to the fact that the other day Gen. March gave out an

interview to the effect that we were demobilizing our troops twice as rapidly as the British Empire had.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator probably was not in the Chamber when I addressed myself to that statement.

Mr. POMERENE. No; I was not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Gen. March gave out an interview in November, saying that the plan of the department was to demobilize at the rate of 30,000 a day; that they had not quite reached it then, but that was what they would do. They had demobilized up to last Saturday 693,889, which, by a simple calculation, is 11,564 per day, just a little over one-third of what they said they were going to demobilize per day. Now, by another simple calculation it will be found to take 12 months to demobilize our armies that were used in this war if we proceed in the future as we have in the past. The fact that England is not demobilizing more rapidly is a very different situation, because England is very differently situated. Besides, the department has already fixed 30,000 per day as the number of men that should and would be discharged. They published this determination. It was not conditioned upon the number that England might demobilize.

Mr. POMERENE and Mr. SHAFROTH addressed the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Ohio first.

Mr. POMERENE. There are certainly two sides to this proposition. I want to see these soldiers demobilized and in their homes as quickly as we can get them there; but it is a question of employment now, and that must be considered; and I know the department has taken steps looking to the determination of what portion of these soldiers have employment in prospect and what portion have not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; surely.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator receive letters every day from young men or their parents saying that places are open to them and asking the Senator to get them discharged from the Army, and does not the Senator find that it is practically impossible to get them discharged from the Army? I find it most difficult to get young men discharged. There is no question of employment, I will say to the Senator, in the class of cases that I am talking principally about. I am talking about the cases where employment is open to the soldier and the employer is trying to get the soldier released for the purpose of giving him employment, and the Army officials will not discharge him for that worthy purpose.

Mr. POMERENE. We do get some of them; but I have a case which came to my knowledge to-day from my own State, referring to a young physician at one of the camps here. He is a specialist on nervous diseases. There is need for him at home, but the Army authorities say: "We need him here. These boys are coming back, and many of them need specialists of his type, and we must look after the returning boys first." Now, that is one illustration. I can understand why, though this young man is needed at home, the Army could not see their way clear to release him.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I will state to the Senator from Tennessee that the governor of the State of Colorado wrote me a letter recently in which he very seriously objected to the discharge of soldiers in other places than the places where they enlisted. His theory was that they were discharged and given pay to get back to their point of enlistment, and that sometimes instead of doing so they expended their money and were unable to get back, and consequently he protested against the discharge of men other than at the place of enlistment. In other words, he wanted them brought back in a body to the cantonment and there mustered out of the service in the way which he thought would be the best way. Now, all of those are retarding things; and we who do not see the difficulties may think that they are taking a long time, but it seems to me that in view of the fact that nearly 700,000 men have been discharged in less than two months that is a mighty good record.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Colorado, if the Senator from Arkansas will excuse me just a minute, that there either has been or will be an application here from The Adjutant General's Department for increased clerk hire to answer letters about discharges. They are coming in in countless numbers, and most of them are about young men who have places open to them. I say that where a young man who is in the Army to-day has a place offered to him where he can go into civil life and make his own way, as he has done heretofore, it is the duty of the Government to discharge him instantly upon his examination.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think the Senator will find no difficulty in getting the discharge of that man.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why, it is almost impossible to do it now. My mail is filled with refusals to discharge under these conditions.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator at present makes inquiry with relation to the matter, and that means delay; and the very fact that the department wants a large increase in the force for the purpose of determining this matter demonstrates, to my mind, that there is an inadequate force to make these decisions, and for that reason there must be delay occasioned by that inadequate force.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, it is high time we were furnishing a sufficient force to get these requests for discharges acted upon promptly. Let us get our boys back into their usual occupations at the earliest moment possible.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I do not see that very much good can result from this discussion, which seems to me inopportune, but which has been projected and thrust in here.

I am getting tired of hearing everything that the War Department does criticized all the time. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs stood here for two or three or four hours the other day and criticized the alleged mistakes and failures and miscarriages of plans of the War Department. Notwithstanding we had, after declaring war, mobilized an army and put it on the battle front in one-half of the time that it took England to mobilize and get her army only 30 miles across the Channel into France, he criticized the organization of our Army and the slowness of the department's procedure, and commended especially the wonderful system of demobilization of the Army of England, and said that we were unable to demobilize our Army at all; that we had no plan for it, and knew nothing about what would be done in the future; and now here is another member of the Military Affairs Committee, who is jumping on the administration in the same way.

I desire to have printed in the Record, without reading it, an article from the New York Times that shows how the British Army is being demobilized, and that Lloyd George must ask the patience of the army for the length of time required for its being disbanded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair hears no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times of Jan. 9, 1919.]

LOYD GEORGE ASKS PATIENCE OF ARMY—PREMIER SAYS POWERFUL FORCE MUST BE MAINTAINED TILL PEACE IS CONCLUDED—FLEET JOINS IN GRUMBING—WAR OFFICE WARNS MEN CLAMORING FOR DEMOBILIZATION THEY ENDANGER COUNTRY.

LONDON, January 8.

Demobilization demonstrations were repeated to-day at the war office and some of the country camps. Gen. Robertson, commander of the forces, again received a deputation and promised the men the fullest investigation of their grievances.

An appeal was issued to-night on behalf of the premier saying Mr. Lloyd George was giving his personal attention to the matter and urging that as the German armies still were powerful it was necessary for Great Britain to maintain a strong army during the peace negotiations.

The men were urged to submit patiently to the inevitable inequalities and hardships. They were reminded that discipline was imperative and that the present course of the the soldiers would delay and not advance demobilization.

The Government has issued an announcement that from a date to be fixed no officer or soldier in France will be allowed to come to England on leave except on the distinct understanding that he will return to France at the expiration of his leave, and that on no pretext whatever will he be discharged during leave. The statement adds:

"Experience shows this order to be necessary in order to insure the maintenance of the army of occupation, the personnel of which must receive leave in their return."

The vicinity of the war office was invaded yesterday by lorries filled with men and by marching soldiers. They came from the Shoreham Camp. Many of them were on leave from Saloniki and objected to being sent back.

On the sides of the lorries were signs reading, "Get a move on," "We won the war; give us our tickets," "Get on with it. Lloyd George," and other similar sentiments. The men were generally well-behaved and treated the matter humorously, although they refused to disperse until a deputation was seen by officials, who assured them that Viscount Milner, secretary of state for war, and Gen. Sir William Robertson were then in conference on the grievances advanced by the soldiers.

A war office statement prints an address by Maj. Gen. Fielding, commander of the London district, to troops assembled in the war office quadrangle. He absolutely declined to consider grievances submitted in such a manner by the troops, and told them they must bring their objections to their own headquarters and to their own commanding officers. He reminded them that the war was still on and that "although we have won the war, we may lose the peace." He said he knew the trouble was being fomented by only a few agitators, and that "most of the men would be ashamed of the action they are taking if they only knew the danger in which they are placing the country."

One of the chief causes of dissatisfaction has been the belief held by numbers of the troops that they were to be sent to Russia. This has been dispelled by the official statement issued at the war office yesterday, saying that there was not the slightest intention of dispatching new forces to Russia.

It has been announced authoritatively that the rate of demobilization, which last week was 10,000 per day, has been already increased to between 20,000 and 25,000 daily.

Discontent has also made its appearance in the Grand Fleet, especially among the auxiliaries, whose duty it has been to sweep up mines.

The crews of many of the auxiliaries were recruited from the fishing fleets, and the men wish to share in the huge profits now being made by the fishermen. Two pounds extra weekly had been offered to them to continue at work, but they agitated for their discharge. The Admiralty has settled the matter by deciding that only volunteers shall be engaged in sweeping mines. About 65 per cent of those engaged in mine sweeping volunteered for that service.

The press is generally displaying full sympathy with the troops, but the more influential newspapers do not hesitate to tell them that they are acting inadvisedly in taking their present course, which is not open to their comrades overseas, who are equally entitled to demobilization.

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

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator give us his views on the question of our military plans in Russia?

Mr. KIRBY. My views about the military plans of this country in Russia are already made known to the public. I do not know why the American Army is in Russia to-day, except that the military exigencies originally required that a small contingent be sent there. I do say that if it is necessary for the Army to remain in Russia it must be reinforced until it is strong enough to take care of itself against all comers; or, if that can not be done, it ought to be withdrawn at once.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am in entire agreement with my friend from Arkansas about that matter; but when my friend jumps on me for being critical it seems to me that he is in the same boat. He has been criticizing our Army affairs in Russia.

Mr. KIRBY. I have not criticized our military affairs. I have not criticized the Government for finding a necessity for sending the Army there. I have not criticized the Government for retaining the Army there; but, if it is necessary to be done, then it must be strengthened; that is all.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what I am saying about these boys. If it is necessary to let them be demobilized, let us demobilize them.

Mr. KIRBY. We should not demobilize our Army until the war is over; and the bill for the organization of the Army provides that within four months after the war is over the demobilization shall occur.

Mr. McKELLAR. One minute. The Senator says—and I judge he speaks with authority—that the War Department is not intending to demobilize our Army. When the Chief of Staff comes forward in an interview and says that he is going to demobilize them at the rate of 30,000 a day, it looks as if there is some difference of opinion between the Senator himself and the Chief of Staff, at any rate. I think the Senator ought to get together with his department before he defends it.

Mr. KIRBY. I am only discussing the law. The law providing for the organization of the Army says when it shall be demobilized, and we have not yet declared that the war is ended by proclamation of the President. We are proceeding with demobilization as rapidly as it can be done. Suppose we took the view that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has expressed here to-day, that we must send an army across into Russia to protect a bandit horde of Czecho-Slovaks who became traitors to their own country and joined the Russian Army, and when the Russian Army quit fighting they continued, overran Russia, and harassed the Russians throughout the old Empire. According to that Senator we must organize an army and go to Russia to protect these people from the fate that must inevitably overtake them. If that is to be done, why demobilize the Army at all? He says that there are 2,000,000 mercenaries, trained fighting men, in the army that now recognizes the Russian authority; and the same people that are in authority in Russia now said to us when our little force went there: "This is Russia, and whenever an army comes into our borders here, without our invitation, we must necessarily regard it as an unfriendly force and declare war against its country to protect ourselves."

That was done. Now, that is the condition over there. We talk about demobilizing the Army here. Why, the Senator from Tennessee talks about demobilization of the Army just as though it could be done like dismissing a country school. He would say, "Well, school is out, children; you can all go home." He seems to have some sort of an idea like that in his mind. As has been suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], these men must be examined physically.

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

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not taking that course at all. I am just saying that I would prefer that the department would do what it said it was going to do, namely, that it would demobilize at the rate of about 30,000 a day. It seems to me that is a reasonable amount. That can be done. There is no doubt in the world about our ability to demobilize our forces at the rate of 30,000 a day. The department thought so 40 or 50 days ago. There is no reason why it should not be done; and

I am insisting that they carry out their promise to the people to demobilize along that line. The people accepted it, and they ought to have it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Was not that simply an estimate made by an officer there as to whether they could do it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Surely nobody ought to be in a better position to make an estimate than the Chief of Staff.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How many estimates have been made as to the time it would take to construct a public building, and how many times are we disappointed in many respects? As a matter of fact, can you not allow latitude to an officer of the War Department to change his mind after he has determined upon an estimate of that kind?

Mr. McKELLAR. A difference of 19,000 out of 30,000 is a pretty wide latitude, and if he falls a little short there ought not to be any complaint.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That may be; but—

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will pardon me a minute, he is paid \$7,500 a year, as the rest of us, and if two-thirds of it should be dropped off he would be left in a rather undesirable position about his salary.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. So it is with the War Department when it comes out and makes a statement to the country that the troops are going to be demobilized and sent back home and the boys with positions are going to be allowed to be discharged upon their individual application. I think they ought to comply with what they say. That is all I am saying, all I believe in, and all I request.

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator's position is a little singular in one respect of inconsistency, it seems to me. He has read a general order of the War Department, showing what the purpose is and how it ought to be applied. He has made no complaint that in the Navy Department only 20 per cent are expected to be released at all, and I understand the Marine Corps, consisting of over 200,000 men, nearly all of whom saw no fighting whatever in the war, is still intact.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to correct the Senator. In the first place, I am not as familiar with the Navy and Marine Corps as I am with military affairs, and I am talking about military affairs because I am familiar with them and keep up with them. In the next place, the Marine Corps is discharging men as rapidly as possible. I have never seen such activity as is displayed in that matter. They are acting very diligently about it from the commandant, Gen. Barnett, on down, as far as I know. The Navy Department I am not familiar with, but they are discharging men quite rapidly in that department; but that is different from the Army, because there are very few men comparatively in the Navy.

Mr. KIRBY. They provide for the discharge of only 20 per cent, and when it gets down to results they are allowing certain commanders and commandants to exercise the exclusive power to discharge these men, and if they do not think the men can be discharged without injury to the service they are not discharged at all. Their decisions are not reviewed like is done in the War Department, where discharges are granted in great numbers, notwithstanding the action of the commandants in refusing them in the first instance. But let us pass by that for a moment. Has it ever occurred to the Senate what might happen if the war is not over? Some of you have stood here and talked about universal military training and what shall be done hereafter to keep an Army and how many men we shall have in our standing Army, as though the war is over. But if this war is not ended, if all the government that Germany has is destroyed and Germany gets into the condition of the Russian people, so that we must go there and occupy that country with an army and reestablish the government under a protectorate, in order that it may be compelled to perform its obligations because of the crimes it has committed against humanity, how many men in an army from this country will it take to do it? Will a new army need to be raised for that purpose? How many will it take if we must go into Russia and pacify that country, which is torn and dismantled and dismembered and destroyed from the mighty empire it once was?

Mr. McKELLAR. Do I understand that the Senator argues in favor of sending a great army into Russia?

Mr. KIRBY. I am not in favor of that; but if you must do it, how many men do you want to discharge now?

Mr. McKELLAR. I may be mistaken, but I thought the Senator was opposed to the War Department sending any troops into Russia. Am I mistaken?

Mr. KIRBY. You are not mistaken.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what I thought.

Mr. KIRBY. But it all hinges on negotiations that are pending now yonder in the Old World about the settlement of this controversy. We have found it necessary to retain 30 divisions of the Army in France and Germany, and suppose it is necessary to resume fighting.

Mr. MCKELLAR. May I interrupt the Senator again? Does the Senator want the Senate and the country to understand that he is opposed to the demobilization of our troops in this country?

Mr. KIRBY. No; the Senator does not want the country to understand that, nor does he want the Senate to understand it, and he does not want to be interrupted any more by the Senator. I let him finish his speech, and I would be glad to hear him make another speech when I get through. I do not care about having him take my time here on that proposition. Before we get too far from the subject of demobilization I want to say that I think every man ought to be permitted to go home at the earliest possible moment, consistent with the good of the service and the safety of the country. I think that ought to be done. I think we ought to have a policy outlined as soon as it can be done definitely about what is to be done with reference to future armament; and until that is done, what are you going to do? Here is one man who insists that we ought to have universal military training. Another Senator says all the Army ought to be discharged at once, and he talks about it like it might be done in 15 or 20 minutes.

It seems to me if there was a policy and if we do need a great army we might have dispensed with any necessity for universal military training in the next few years by putting all the men who are to be discharged upon the inactive reserve list subject only to call into active service again on the proclamation of the President within three years, upon a declaration of war being made. We would then have had an army that could be raised on the proclamation of the President upon a declaration of war and the necessity of it, an army already thoroughly trained, and that necessarily would be composed of able fighting men. That would have dispensed with all the idea of this other way of doing things that has been suggested and would not have required any soldier on the reserve list to report for active service again unless a declaration of war was made and an army needed in the next three years. It is suggested that we dismember and demobilize our domestic army, and that our foreign army be allowed to remain yonder where necessity requires it until the necessity is ended, however long that may be.

I believe the War Department is going along with this work as rapidly as it can be done under existing circumstances. I know the War Department performed wonderful achievements in the organization of this Army. I know the Army has covered itself with glory in fighting on the fields of France. Now, we are back here at home. We have won a great victory, and I believe we ought to be a little patient and let these men be demobilized as rapidly as they can be, without too much criticism of the War Department down here that put the whole thing into being in the first place and established, transported, and maintained the Army and expect to continue to demobilize it as rapidly as it can be done.

That is all I want to say about it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

EDITH CAROW ROOSEVELT.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Pensions I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5318) granting a pension to Edith Carow Roosevelt, widow of Theodore Roosevelt, late President of the United States, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of that measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Edith Carow Roosevelt, widow of Theodore Roosevelt, late President of the United States, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$5,000 per year from and after the passage of this act.

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

THE CENSUS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

RECESS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 15, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 14, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Unto Thee, O God, our heavenly Father, in whose sacred presence we dwell, do we lift up our hearts in gratitude for that providence which hitherto has shaped and guided the destiny of our Republic.

Keep us, we beseech Thee, evermore in touch with Thee, that we may more and more increase in everything that makes a nation great and glorious; that we may further demonstrate to the world the utility of our sacred principles, justice, liberty, equal rights for all, and thus hallow Thy name as faithful disciples of the Jesus of Nazareth. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Vice President, in pursuance of Senate concurrent resolution No. 28, had appointed as members of the joint committee on exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of the late Theodore Roosevelt Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

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

Ordered, That Mr. FLETCHER be appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate on the bill (S. 1419) entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters,' approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce," in the place of Mr. SHIELDS, excused.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

An act (S. 3469) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products," approved August 10, 1917; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR SUNDAY, JANUARY 19, 1919.

The SPEAKER. The Chair assigns the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to preside next Sunday.

LIGNITE COAL AND PEAT.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3220, known as the lignite bill, insist on the House amendments thereto, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3220, to insist on the House amendments thereto, and agree to the conference. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3220) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations through the Bureau of Mines of lignite coal and peat, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products.

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

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. WINGO, and Mr. DENISON.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill H. R. 14077, a bill introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL], and relating to motion-picture shows, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Education. I understand the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary stated to Mr. RANDALL that he thought this bill should go to the Committee on Education, and I will state for the information of the House that last year the committee had considerable hearings and those hearings have been printed, and perhaps