

Why should you ask a witness that? Of course, if he did not know about it, he could not testify about it. Everybody knows that but the Senator from South Dakota, and he evidently never suspected it.

Mr. BEAULIEU. There might have been.

Of course, everybody knows there might have been something. Maybe the Senator knows, but he has not told; I do not know.

Senator STERLING. Do you know anything about a letter written by Mr. Booth of the land office to WHEELER and Baldwin, giving a list of nine claims of Gordon Campbell Kevin Syndicate No. 1, and giving a description of each permit, and what should be done to straighten matters out at the land office?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. STERLING, if you have that letter, we think it ought to be produced.

Everybody knows that except the Senator from South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota said:

I am asking him if he knows anything about it.

The CHAIRMAN. I know; but you are asking for the contents of a letter. Now, we want the letter.

Who is trying suppress evidence?

Senator STERLING. I think perhaps you can have it.

Perhaps we may. Perhaps we can have it if he decides later on that we may.

The CHAIRMAN. That is just what we want.

Senator STERLING. I can not produce it right now, but during the course of these proceedings.

Mr. BEAULIEU. Now, there was some letter written by some one, I am not sure whether Mr. Feely or Mr. Booth or who wrote it, I remember, naming some permits; but I would not say, without seeing it, whether it was addressed to them, or to whom it was addressed. It is possible it was. I do not remember.

Senator CARAWAY. You did not receive it?

Mr. BEAULIEU. I may have received a copy of it.

Senator CARAWAY. It was not addressed to you?

Mr. BEAULIEU. I do not think it was. Now, I might be wrong on that. I do not think it was.

Senator STERLING. But you remember having heard something about such a letter?

"Heard about it"; not that he saw it, not that he knows what its contents are, but "You remember hearing some whisper somewhere on the street about such a letter?"

Mr. BEAULIEU. Yes; I do.

Senator STERLING. Do you know anything of a letter written by Mr. Campbell in which he suggested that he would give the lease rights to 40 acres of the land, worth \$26,000—

That from a man who loves competent evidence—

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a moment. You are asking for the contents of a letter.

Senator STERLING. I am describing the letter. I am characterizing the letter.

When a man at one time reads law and is examined and has a license to practice law he knows that if he has a letter he ought to produce it. You would not try a nigger for selling whisky and hold a letter and ask him if he had not written such a letter or had not heard about such a letter. The Senator said, "I am characterizing the letter." He was characterizing more than a letter. I continue reading:

The CHAIRMAN. You are asking for the contents of a letter, and I insist that that letter be produced, if you have it; and, so far as I am concerned as a member of this committee, I am not going to permit primary evidence to be produced in this way. You ask for the contents of a letter. You evidently have the letter, or you would not know what the contents of it are.

Senator CARAWAY. I would suggest that when any member of this committee is furnished anything, it ought to be furnished to the whole committee. If any information is furnished to any member of the committee, the whole committee must have it.

Senator STERLING. I have not seen any such letter.

Senator CARAWAY. The Senator has a memorandum. Would he mind producing that?

As the Senate will see, he was there reading from some paper furnished by somebody, of which he got possession somehow. I read further:

Senator STERLING. I have a memorandum of such a letter.

Senator CARAWAY. Would you mind furnishing it to us?

Senator STERLING. No. I shall mind saying who furnished it to me, of course. That is not material to this inquiry—as to who furnished me this memorandum.

Now, then, I hope the Senator has read it. That is what occurred. He sat there with the information furnished by somebody interested in this case, withheld it from the committee, and asked questions about it.

Of course, I am not the keeper of the Senator's course of conduct. He can disclose his own character by his own acts, and whatever pleases him pleases nobody else but him.

There are a lot of interesting things in this record, Mr. President, which I never expected to discuss, but since now it has become a matter of more or less public information and public curiosity, I am going to discuss it in full, and if the Senator wants to go into the question of probable cause, and who furnished the probable cause, and the conspiracy, and who were the conspirators, and who were the helpers and aiders and abettors of it, I am going to gratify his desire to his heart's content.

TARIFF ON BUTTER

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. President, I wish at this time to call up the resolution submitted by me last Saturday, and I ask for its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 226) was read and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas in the general depression from which agriculture has been suffering, particularly in the grain-growing sections of the Nation, some agreeable relief has been experienced from the gradual but marked expansion of the dairy industry; and

Whereas the future of the region hereinabove specifically referred to depends in no small degree upon the growth of that industry to which the soil and climate thereof is peculiarly adapted; and

Whereas, with the sanction and approval of the President of the United States, an effort is being made to finance and promote therein the further development of the dairy industry; and

Whereas during the months of January and February, 1924, butter was imported into the United States amounting to 9,500,000 pounds, almost one-half of the total importations for the year 1923, and the highest monthly average ever recorded, resulting in a rapid decline of the price of that commodity on the New York market until it now commands a price little if any above the cost of production: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission be, and it hereby is, requested forthwith to institute an inquiry under the provisions of section 315 of the act approved September 21, 1922, concerning the cost of the production of butter in the United States and in those countries from which our importations thereof come, and to report its findings to the President of the United States with a view to the increase in the duty on imports of butter should such increase be warranted by the facts found.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate bill 2327.

The Senate as in Committee of the Whole resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2327) to amend section 4 of the interstate commerce act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] to the amendment reported by the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. I will state that I make this request for the purpose of calling up the veto message of the President of the United States on the adjusted compensation bill. I do not think the request is necessary, and if it is not granted I shall then ask for the consideration of the bill and veto message under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to withhold his request for a moment because I would like to submit a request for unanimous consent that the disposition of the veto message on the bonus bill go over until Saturday of this week. The matter was suggested on last Saturday and two Senators objected, but both of them tell me now that they can arrange it and that that date will be satisfactory to them.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, to save debate I will object to that request. I object to any day other than to-day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Is there objection to temporarily laying aside the unfinished business for the

purpose stated by the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none. The Chair lays before the Senate the message from the President of the United States which will be read.

The reading clerk read the message as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

Herewith is returned, without approval, H. R. 7959, a bill "to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes."

The bill provides a bonus for the veterans of the World War and dependents of those who fell. To certain of its beneficiaries, whose maximum benefits do not exceed \$50, this bonus is to be paid immediately in cash. To each of its beneficiaries who are not to receive such immediate cash payments there is to be provided free insurance under a 20-year endowment plan. The face value of each policy will be based upon the military service, the average amount being at least \$962, payable at the expiration of 20 years or at death prior thereto. After the lapse of two years the holder of a policy may borrow thereon from banks at reasonable rates of interest. If amounts so borrowed are not repaid by the veteran, the Government is obligated to pay to the banks this indebtedness, which ultimately reduces the maturity value of the policy.

An appropriation of \$146,000,000 for the fiscal year 1925 will be required to provide the prorated annual cost of the insurance and to meet cash payments to those not receiving such insurance. This does not include administrative costs, which will amount to approximately \$6,500,000 the first year. For the fiscal year 1926 an appropriation of \$155,500,000 will be required, and the annual appropriations for the 20-year period will aggregate, according to the lowest estimate, \$2,280,758,542. These, and the other figures herein are from the Veterans' Bureau, but the Treasury estimates are materially more.

That part of the annual appropriation not required to meet the cash bonus or to pay policies maturing on account of death will be invested in Government bonds. The face value of the bonds thus acquired plus the interest thereon reinvested will equal during the 20-year period the maturity value of the insurance policies, aggregating at the lowest estimate \$3,145,000,000.

The money spent for the acquisition of these bonds manifestly can not be spent for any other purpose, no matter how urgent our other requirements may be. In other words, we will be committing this Nation for a period of 20 years to an additional average annual appropriation of \$114,000,000. This of itself should require most serious reflection, but if we are to have such commitment it should be in some form which would be in harmony with recognized principles of Government finance. The provisions of this bill are not so in harmony. Under it the Government will not have in the fund in 1945 two and a half billions of dollars. All it will have will be its own obligations, and it will owe two and a half billions of dollars cash. It will then be necessary to sell to the public this two and a half billions of bonds—a major operation in finance which may be disastrous at that time and may jeopardize the value of Federal securities then outstanding.

We have no money to bestow upon a class of people that is not taken from the whole people. Our first concern must be the Nation as a whole. This outweighs in its importance the consideration of a class, and the latter must yield to the former. The one compelling desire and demand of the people to-day, irrespective of party or class, is for tax relief. The people have labored during the last six years under a heavy tax burden. This was necessary to meet the extraordinary costs of the war. This heavy assessment has been met willingly and without complaint. We have now reached a financial condition which permits us to lighten this tax burden. If this bill becomes law, we wipe out at once almost all the progress five hard years have accomplished in reducing the national debt. If we now confer upon a class a gratuity such as is contemplated by this bill, we diminish to the extent of the expenditures involved the benefits of reduced taxes which will flow not only to this class but to the entire people. When it is considered that less than \$40 a year would pay for the average policy provided by this bill, there is strong ground to assume that the veterans themselves would be better off to make that small payment and be relieved of the attendant high taxes and high living costs which such legislation would impose on them. Certainly the country would. We have hardly an economic ill to-day which can not be attributed directly or indirectly to high taxes.

The prosperity of the Nation, which is the prosperity of the people, rests primarily on reducing the existing tax burden. No other action would so encourage business. No other legislative enactment would do so much to relieve agriculture. The drastic executive campaign for economy in Government ex-

penditure has but one purpose—that its benefits may accrue to the whole people in the form of reduction in taxes. I can not recede from this purpose. I am for the interests of the whole people. The expenditures proposed in this bill are against the interests of the whole people. I do not believe they are for the benefit of the veterans.

The running expenses of the Government for services and supplies must be met. Certain other obligations in the nature of investments for improvements and buildings are necessary and often result in a saving. The debts of the Nation must be paid. The sum of all these is a tremendous amount. At the present rate it is nearly \$35 for each resident of our country, or \$175 for each average family every year, and must be for some time. This bill calls for a further expenditure in the aggregate of nearly \$35 for each inhabitant and lays nearly \$175 more on each family, to be spread over a period of 20 years. No one supposes the effort will stop here. Already suggestions are made for a cash bonus in addition, to be paid at once. Such action logically would be encouraged if this bill becomes law. Neither the rich nor the profiteers will meet this expense. All of this enormous sum has to be earned by the people of this country through their toil. It is taken from the returns of their production. They must earn it; they must pay it. The people of this country ought not to be required by their Government to bear any such additional burden. They are not deserving of any such treatment. Our business is not to impose upon them but to protect them.

If this bill be considered as insurance, the opportunity for such a provision has already been provided. Nearly \$3,000,000,000 of war risk and Government life insurance is now outstanding, and over \$500,000,000 has been paid on such policies. When this provision was made in 1917 it was on the explicit understanding of the Congress that such insurance was to relieve the Government of subsequent contributions. The then Secretary of the Treasury said in relation to the proposed insurance act: "It ought to check any further attempts at service pension legislation by enabling a man now to provide against impairment through old age, total disability, or death resulting from other causes, and to give all this protection to those kindred who may be dependent upon him and who do not share in the Government compensation." This opportunity was afforded all those who entered the service. It was distinctly understood that it covered every obligation on the part of the Government. The intent of this bill now to provide free insurance lacks both a legal or moral requirement and falls into the position of a plain gratuity.

Considering this bill from the standpoint of its intrinsic merit, I see no justification for its enactment into law. We owe no bonus to able-bodied veterans of the World War. The first duty of every citizen is to the Nation. The veterans of the World War performed this first duty. To confer upon them a cash consideration or its equivalent for performing this first duty is unjustified. It is not justified when considered in the interests of the whole people; it is not justified when considered alone on its own merits. The gratitude of the Nation to these veterans can not be expressed in dollars and cents. No way exists by which we can either equalize the burdens or give adequate financial reward to those who served the Nation in both civil and military capacities in time of war. The respect and honor of their country will rightfully be theirs forevermore. But patriotism can neither be bought nor sold. It is not hire and salary. It is not material, but spiritual. It is one of the finest and highest of human virtues. To attempt to pay money for it is to offer it an unworthy indignity which cheapens, debases, and destroys it. Those who would really honor patriotism should strive to match it with an equal courage, with an equal fidelity to the welfare of their country, and an equal faith in the cause of righteousness.

I am not unmindful that this bill also embraces within its provisions the disabled of our veterans and the dependents of those who fell. To state that the disabled veterans and these dependents are entitled to this additional gratuity is to state that the Nation is not meeting its obligation to them. Such a statement can not truthfully be made. The Nation has spent more than \$2,000,000,000 in behalf of disabled veterans and dependents of those who died. It is now spending for compensation, training, insurance, and hospitalization more than \$400,000,000 annually. Solicitude for the disabled veterans and the dependents of those who lost their lives is the Nation's solicitude. To minister to their every need is a sacred obligation, which will be generously and gratefully met. The Nation stands ready to expend any amount needed for their proper care. But that is not the object of this bill.

America entered the World War with a higher purpose than to secure material gain. Not greed but duty was the impelling

motive. Our veterans as a whole responded to that motive. They are not asking as a whole, they do not want as a whole, any money recompense. Those who do seek a money recompense for the most part, of course, prefer an immediate cash payment. We must either abandon our theory of patriotism or abandon this bill. Patriotism which is bought and paid for is not patriotism. Our country has maintained the principle that our Government is established for something higher and finer than to permit those who are charged with the responsibility of office, or any class whose favor they might seek, to get what they can out of it. Service to our country in time of war means sacrifice. It is for that reason alone that we honor and revere it. To attempt to make a money payment out of the earnings of the people to those who are physically well and financially able is to abandon one of our most cherished American ideals. The property of the people belongs to the people. To take it from them by taxation can not be justified except by urgent public necessity. Unless this principle be recognized our country is no longer secure, our people no longer free. This bill would condemn those who are weak to turn over a part of their earnings to those who are strong. Our country can not afford it. The veterans as a whole do not want it. All our American principles are opposed to it. There is no moral justification for it.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 15, 1924.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I think Senators have their minds made up as to how they intend to vote on this question, and, so far as I am concerned, I do not intend to take up any time in discussing the veto message, and am ready for a vote.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I know of no reason why the vote should not be immediately taken.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I arise to submit a question of privilege. I wish to read for the information of the Senate an article of extraordinary prominence which appears in this morning's Washington Herald, and which constitutes an outrageous attack upon the intelligence, the independence, and the very manhood of 10 Republican Members of this body.

The article in question is as follows:

BONUS ADVOCATES, KEEP YOUR EYE ON THESE 10 SENATORS

Propagandists for rejection of the soldier bonus bill are concentrating their efforts on 10 Republican Senators who voted for the measure and were reported yesterday to be wavering. Friends of the bonus, keep your eye on these Senators to see how they vote on the final roll call: FESS, Ohio; WARREN, Wyoming; CAMERON, Arizona; COLT, Rhode Island; ELKINS, West Virginia; KEYES, New Hampshire; MCLEAN, Connecticut; PHIPPS, Colorado; SPENCER, Missouri; WILBIS, Ohio.

Mr. President, could Sapphira have imagined or Ananias have uttered a more pernicious libel against these distinguished Senators?

Of course, every Democratic Member knows that not one of these Republican Senators could be induced by the flattery of plutocracy, or coerced by the great political power of the President, in this crisis to sacrifice his manhood, outrage his conscience, and desert the World War veterans by changing his vote on the soldiers' adjusted compensation bill.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. The most conclusive answer to that slander will be to vote right away, and see how those Senators will vote.

Mr. NEELY. I know how my honorable and courageous friend from Ohio, with whom I served eight years in the other House, will vote. I know that no Wall Street subsidized newspaper or even powerful presidential propaganda can prevent the Senator from Ohio from voting for this bill, just as he voted for it when it was first passed by the Senate. I know that every one of these 10 Senators will prove, when his name is called, that he is "not a pipe for" even the President's "finger to sound what stop he please," but, on the contrary, that he is as—

Constant as the northern star,
Of whose true-fix'd and resting quality
There is no fellow in the firmament.

Mr. President, we shall soon have additional cause to be proud of the Senate; we are about to furnish the country conclusive proof that the Members of this body are unterrified, and that they stand for the right as steadfastly as Casibianca stood upon the burning deck.

We all know that these 10 Senators whom the Herald has so basely libeled will, when their names are called, again vote for the adjusted compensation bill, and thus prove not only to the vast and intelligent audience in the galleries but to all the world that they are not spineless creatures, that they are

not pliant tools in the President's hands, but that every one of them is "every inch a man."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding? Upon that question the Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NORRIS (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). I was requested to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent on account of illness. If he were present, on this question he would vote "yea." I have not been able to secure a pair for him.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have been asked to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is unavoidably absent, but that if present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are necessarily absent. If they were present, they would vote "yea."

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], if present, would vote "yea."

I desire further to announce that the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] are necessarily absent. They are paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL]. If they were present, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] would vote "nay" and the two Senators from Mississippi would vote "yea."

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], if present, would vote "yea." I wish further to announce that he is on a train returning from keeping an engagement in his home State yesterday. He expected the debate would lead to a vote not being reached until a later hour in the day.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], if present, on this question would vote "yea."

The roll call resulted—yeas 59, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—59

Adams	Ferris	Jones, Wash.	Ralston
Ashurst	Fess	Kendrick	Robinson
Brandegee	Fletcher	Ladd	Sheppard
Brookhart	Frazier	Leuroot	Shipstead
Broussard	George	Lodge	Shortridge
Bursum	Gerry	McKellar	Simmons
Cameron	Gooding	McLean	Smith
Capper	Hale	McNary	Spencer
Caraway	Harrell	Mayfield	Stanford
Copeland	Harris	Neely	Trammell
Cummins	Heflin	Norbeck	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Howell	Norris	Warren
Dale	Johnson, Calif.	Oddie	Wheeler
Dill	Johnson, Minn.	Overman	Willis
Elkins	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	

NAYS—26

Ball	Edwards	McKinley	Sterling
Bayard	Ernst	Moses	Swanson
Borah	Fernald	Pepper	Underwood
Bruce	Glass	Phillips	Wadsworth
Colt	Greene	Reed, Pa.	Weller
Dial	Keyes	Shields	
Edge	King	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—11

Couzens	McCormick	Reed, Mo.	Walsh, Mass.
Harrison	Owen	Stanley	Watson
LaFollette	Ransdell	Stephens	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Upon this question the yeas are 59, the nays 26; so the bill is passed the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will clear the galleries—if there be further manifestations of pleasure or displeasure.

Mr. HARRISON subsequently said: Mr. President, I merely wish to make an explanation. I understood that the veto message of the President would be called up at 2 o'clock to-day, and I was led to believe that there would be some discussion of the message, which might be prolonged several hours. I had a very dear friend who passed away and was buried in Arlington Cemetery this afternoon at 2 o'clock. In company with my colleague, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], I left to attend the funeral. During our absence of about 45 minutes, the vote on the veto message was taken. I am very sorry that I was not here to cast a vote. I was paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and my colleague [Mr. STEPHENS] was also paired with him. If my colleague and I had been present, we would have voted to override the President's veto and the Senator from Louisiana would have voted to sustain the veto.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to make a brief explanation because of my absence when the vote was taken this afternoon on the question of overriding the President's veto.

An engagement, long ago made, necessitated my presence in Massachusetts yesterday. It was physically impossible for me to return before 3 o'clock this afternoon. When I returned at 3 o'clock the vote had been taken, though it was generally believed when I left on Saturday that a vote would not be reached till late to-day. Had I been present, I should have voted "yea," sustaining the position I have taken on all other occasions, favoring the adjustment of our war veterans' compensation.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS—PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, the League of Women Voters in convention at Knoxville on the 9th of May invited me to address them on our "International relations," and not being able to do so on account of the revenue bill being before the Senate that day, I sent them a telegram briefly stating my views upon the live questions concerning our relations with foreign countries.

This telegram has been so misunderstood and in some respects garbled that I desire to place it in the RECORD, so that my views upon these important questions may not be misunderstood. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

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

WORLD COURT FAVORED BY DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 9.

Mrs. JOHN M. KENNY,

President of the League of Women Voters, Knoxville, Tenn.:

Will you express to the convention of the League of Women Voters of Tennessee my great appreciation of their kind invitation to address them upon our international relations and my sincere regrets that at the last hour I am detained in Washington? The final vote upon the Federal tax reduction bill is imminent, and it is believed that it will be had to-day or to-morrow. I felt that I should forego my inclination, personal pleasure, and interests and remain here to vote upon this important measure, the division of the Senate being very close. Our international relations are nonpartisan, and the subject is one singularly suitable for consideration for your organization.

It is a pleasant subject of discussion. The United States is at peace with all the world. We have no controversies with any nation likely to lead to war. We have treaties of peace, amity, and commerce with all civilized nations and entangling alliances that would likely embroil us in war with none. We have treaties with 50 sovereign nations, including the great powers, providing for conciliation and peaceful arbitration of all differences that may arise between the signatories of such treaties.

PERMANENT COURT OF ARBITRATION

The Permanent Court of Arbitration, with its seat at The Hague, Holland, was organized with ample procedure and jurisdiction for the peaceful adjustment of all international disputes and the promotion of peace and prevention of war and has settled many controversies threatening war and is now successfully functioning. The United States was chiefly instrumental in creating this court and is obligated by numerous treaties to submit differences with other nations to it.

We therefore have almost unlimited facilities for peaceful settlement of all disputes with other nations which can be arbitrated and adjudicated. We have no cause to fear a foreign enemy. There is no foreign nation that can conquer and subdue America. The whole world was astonished when in the recent war we raised and placed in the field, armed and equipped for battle with ample supplies, 4,000,000 men, and provided a formidable Navy, all within a limited time. We so demonstrated our great resources of men and wealth and the splendid efficiency, fortitude, and courage of our soldiers that no nation will ever dare to attempt to invade our country or conquer our people.

The Permanent Court of International Justice, also sitting at The Hague, established by the League of Nations in 1921, now functioning, has heard and determined one controversy and given eight advisory opinions to the league. The Permanent Court of Arbitration and the Permanent Court of International Justice are both courts of arbitration and have little or no resemblance to courts of judicature.

They have no compulsory jurisdiction over nations or subject matter and can only hear cases voluntarily submitted to them. There is no sanction for their decrees but public opinion. They are practically of equal dignity and power and functioning in the same city concurrently and harmoniously. The Permanent Court of Arbitration is open to all nations and the Permanent Court of International Justice to the members of the League of Nations and three other nations, including the United States, assenting to its jurisdiction. The chief difference between the courts is the method of election of the arbitrators or judges, the parties to controversies in the Permanent Court of Arbitration having a larger per cent of the selection than the parties to the

controversies submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

President Harding, when in life, favored the United States adhering to the Permanent Court of International Justice, and President Coolidge concurs with him, both asking the advice and consent of the Senate to do so, with reservations withholding and excluding legal relations to the League of Nations. Senator CLAUDE A. SWANSON, ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, after a conference with other Democratic Senators, some time since offered a resolution in the Senate providing that the Senate advise and consent to the United States adhering to this court with reservations absolutely excluding the United States from all legal relations and connections with the League of Nations. Senator W. H. KING, Democrat, has offered a similar resolution.

Senator THOMAS J. WALSH, also a Democratic member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in a speech made at the recent convention of women voters at Buffalo, advocated the United States adhering to the permanent court for the moral support it would give to Europe, stating that the majority of the Democratic Senators favored it, and at the same time saying:

"This is not a plea for the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations. Events transpiring since 1920 affect quite materially the view one must take of the problem of our relations with that organization we have so often been assured is dead, but which somehow refuses to stay dead and which is in fact very much alive and is considered by the nations of Europe as a most valuable agency for the adjustment of constantly recurring matters of difference among them.

"I do not plead for a reversal of the verdict through which the United States declined membership in the league. I plead for the active participation by our Government in any effort which may be made through it or any other channel to bring about a restoration of normal industrial activity to Europe and to establish a state of actual peace among them in every case in which it is reasonably safe to do so without entangling ourselves in their quarrels."

This statement of conditions and facts demonstrates that the American people and the majority of the members of the two great political parties, recovering from the emotions caused by the horrors of war and regaining their national soul, are now uniting in the policies of our Government in international matters and considering them from an American and nonpartisan standpoint, as Americans have done in the past from the foundation of our Government.

There should be no prejudice against the Permanent Court of International Justice because it was organized by the league, provided the United States continues absolutely unobligated and free from the political provisions of the covenant of the league likely to embroil it in the feuds and wars of other nations. While the Permanent Court of Arbitration and arbitration treaties seem ample to settle all international disputes, yet if adherence to the World Court by the United States will give it moral support and contribute to the peace and tranquillity of Europe, it should do so. The United States has always advocated peace at home and abroad, and by a policy of nonentangling alliances and nonintervention in foreign affairs held itself in a neutral position to offer its good offices to all countries involved in disputes, and by arbitration and settlement has prevented many wars.

FAVORS SWANSON'S RESOLUTION

In the cause of humanity and in the advancement of the material interest and commerce of its citizens, it should continue this policy where it can do so without prejudice to the interest of our people. The resolution of Senator SWANSON with the reservations proposed by him with those which the United States made in becoming signatory to the convention creating the Permanent Court of Arbitration, preserving our traditional policies in dealing with the other nations and withholding all questions involving vital interest, independence, and honor, which have never been the subject of arbitration or adjudication, should be adopted at the present session of the Congress, and I hope that it will be promptly done. The common understanding is that both of the great national conventions to be held next month will so express the will of the party which they respectively represent, and favor our adherence to the Court of International Justice under conditions hereinabove stated.

This will happily end the only great political dissensions among the American people concerning our foreign relations and the President and the Congress can give their undivided attention to legislation for the relief of the industrial and agricultural interests and other domestic matters so long suffering and neglected. I favored peaceful settlement and arbitration of all international disputes in my speeches in the discussion of the League of Nations as appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the probable policies of both parties are in full accord with the views I entertain.

JOHN K. SHIELDS.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I announced my views concerning the foreign policies of the United States relating to international courts and conferences in an address I made in the