

ican navy in European waters, and the exchange of messages between Admiral Sims and Admiral Beatty has stirred our imagination. In particular Englishmen have noted how Admiral Beatty's phrase of "chivalry of the seas" is used as an English translation of the equivalent American phrase "freedom of the seas." But the real reserve of the United States in this war is not after all what we may call the line or the professional reserve, but its amateur and territorial reserve, mobilized from the business house, the workshop and the study.

H. SIDEBOTHAM.

Manchester, England.

## The Filibusters—Ten Weeks Later

PERHAPS, if the war had not come, the senators charged with defeating the "armed neutrality" bill with a filibuster, in March, might have had better opportunity of clearing themselves of some of the unsparing criticism they received at that time. Of the eight who held over from the last session—Cummins, Gronna, Kenyon, Kirby, LaFollette, Norris, Stone and Vardaman—more than one had an excellent record in ordinary peacetime legislation. Ordinary peace times might have offered a chance; but the war has obscured them, and left for them only the attitude of intolerance which they won for themselves three months ago. It is not necessary to accept Mr. Vardaman's theories of diplomacy, or to imply that Senator Stone is in any way fitted for the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to realize that much of the criticism which these men still bear is not fair. From the actual work of war preparation the eight filibustering senators have not held back sullenly.

In the early reactions to the war resolution, when many senators were somewhat bewilderedly turning back to their old interests and finding that they no longer existed, the group of filibusters showed at least an average possession of adaptability. One of the first measures to be brought up in the Senate, after April 5th, was the Sundry Civil Appropriations bill which had failed of passage in the previous session. In spite of the new conditions this measure remained of the familiar omnibus type, carrying numerous local gifts of one sort or another. Only one protest was made against the lack of adjustment displayed in the bill: Mr. Kenyon realized that forty thousand dollars appropriated for a postoffice in Sandpoint, Idaho—993 people—is not compatible with the demands of a war budget; and though he re-

ceived no support in his contention, he stated, "I take this occasion to say that in my judgment we ought not to commence any public buildings at this time unless there is some unusual reason for it."

How well the whole group of filibusters have managed to grasp a new and unwelcome set of standards is surprising. Senator Norris, who had been ready to appeal to his constituency to determine whether he was not accurately representing their wishes in opposing the preliminaries of war, urged, two days after war was declared, that Congress take steps to provide the army with plenty of aviation fields, situated, so as to benefit practice, in various altitudes. So limited are our training facilities at the present day that we have been obliged to send recruits to fields established by the private enterprise of manufacturers of aeroplanes. A week later Mr. Kenyon acquainted the Senate, almost for the first time, with the existence of a serious problem in food shortage, by introducing a resolution calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture to inform the Senate what steps he had taken to provide for an increased production. And about the same time Senator Stone pointed out that service in the ranks of the American army was less remunerative than sweeping the halls and corridors outside the Senate chamber, and made a plea for better terms as a matter of justice and a stimulant to recruiting in those branches of the service where volunteering is still necessary. Later on, when the conscription bill was being debated, Mr. Kenyon took up the same argument, and it is due to an amendment which he introduced that the men who are to serve in France will not receive wages approximately half as large as those paid in the Canadian overseas regiments.

The first discussion of the policy of paying for the war so far as is practicable by taxation came when the bond issue bill was under consideration in the Senate. Though the revenue bill was not to be introduced for a month, three members—Stone, Kenyon and Kirby, all in the group of filibusters—urged that the President be supported in his plea for a war largely sustained by the present generation. Nor is this discussion, which anticipated the meeting of the issue by seven weeks, the only instance of foresight in financial matters shown by a member of the filibustering group. To the present day there has been but one argument in the Senate for the desirability of taxing government bonds: on April 17th, Senator Stone declared: "We propose to concentrate and lock up two thousand million dollars of the nation's surplus wealth in bonds. . . . It is impossible for me to believe that a great interest-bearing, non-taxable public indebtedness, represented in the form of bonds, is a public blessing." Substantially

this is the theory that has been put forward by many good economists, and totally ignored in both houses.

The position of several of the filibusters, particularly Mr. Cummins and Mr. LaFollette, in the matter of the Espionage bill is better known. It has become the majority thing to do, lately, to take sides against censorship, and the last attempt to put a censorship provision into the Espionage bill failed by a vote of 48 to 34. But before the present supply of publicity was available, there were early attempts made in the Senate to eliminate restrictions on the publication of news. In the last session Senator Cummins offered nine amendments—all of them defeated—to break the rigidity of the censorship provisions. In the present session he was again at the head of the opposition, and moved, on April 20th, to strike out the section in dispute. The movement against censorship, however, had not yet gained enough in conviction or publicity, and his motion was voted down, 40 to 34. It was only when the bill came up again, three weeks later, that several new converts came in with prepared speeches, and a few additional votes, that an end to the issue was apparently reached.

In participating to this considerable degree in the dispatch of war measures, the filibustering members have managed not to be indifferent to matters of domestic interest. Other senators, by virtue of position as committee chairmen, have contributed more in the direct handling of one war bill or another; but no group of members, it can fairly be said, has so far been better able to straddle the issues abroad and at home. Mr. Gronna has been at work to get consideration for a corrupt practices act, just as if the war had not wiped out interest in the status of politics at home. Mr. Kenyon has introduced a bill for a national budget, and pointed out that the United States and Turkey are the only two civilized nations without a budget system of some sort. All members of the group have participated in a matter so purely domestic that it attracted no outside attention in the newspapers: the appeal, on March 26th, of the employees of the Washington Railway and Electric Company for an investigation of that company's high-handed suppression of collective bargaining and the right of fair appeal. In response to the employees' petition, Senator Hughes brought a resolution into the Senate, providing for the appointment of an investigating committee. This resolution Mr. Smoot moved to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Such a course would at least have meant a delay, with a falling off in local interest and less chance of a successful outcome for the employees. Senators who

believed in making Washington safe for democracy also feared that it would mean a complete end to the resolution. The result was a roll-call fairly indicative of sentiment: Mr. Smoot's motion was voted down, 36 to 30—with all of the filibusters, save two who were absent, voting in the 36—and members of such notorious opposition to progressive principles as Messrs. Gallinger, Penrose, Smoot, Lodge, and Sherman, in the 30.

It is in the last matter which the Senate has had under consideration, however, that the interest shown by this group of men has had its most substantial effect. The first administration food bill was brought into the Senate on May 21st. There was every reason, then, why it should have been advanced, if not promptly, at least connectedly. But from the bill itself the discussion shifted to a point of order. Against this waste of time an objection was made, not by one of the senators who had willed the war, but by Mr. Norris: "Those who have been talking about hurrying and speeding things up realize that the food proposition is one of the important considerations. . . . But we have devoted an entire legislative day to a discussion of a motion to recommit. I am not finding fault with that, but it seems when we get through with this day's work it has been understood all the time that the bill is going to be re-committed. Then why waste all this eloquence?"

That the bill was put through as promptly as it was, is due in great measure to the efforts of Mr. Kenyon. After the discussion had gone on with considerable aimlessness for eight days, Senator Jones, who had no reason for a partial comment, declared, "I think if this is a war measure we ought not to have been adjourning from day to day, taking hours for the consideration of other matters in the morning hour, but we should have been pushing it at all times of the day. I have not seen very much insistence upon getting a vote upon the bill, except upon the part of the Senator from Iowa." Mr. Kenyon performed a varied service. He pointed out the inconsistency of refusing to permit the government to sell seeds to the farmers—while several hundred thousand dollars was being spent annually for the Congressional distribution of free seeds; he answered, in a sensible fashion, the sly criticisms which certain Republican and Democratic members had made of Mr. Herbert Hoover; he protested when Mr. Calder and other senators sought to swing the discussion to irrelevant topics, with a plea for "more common sense and a little less oratory." There have not been many instances in which a general measure has received more guidance from a single senator, and one not a member of the administration party.

Aside from the support given in this way by individual filibusters in the consideration of war measures, there is certain general evidence to illustrate their attitude as a group. The matter of introducing bills is not an infallible guide, but it is in the aggregate a good test of intention. So far, in the present session, 2,469 bills have been introduced in the Senate. Of this number the vast majority have been for pensions and local improvements, and not more than 307 are what might broadly be termed "public" bills. This is a rate, for the whole Senate, of 12 per cent. But the eight filibusters, with 25 "public" bills in a total of 77 introduced, have an average two and a half times as great—32 per cent. They stand well, too, in the matter of attendance. General absence has been an unfortunate characteristic of a session with measures of such consequence to be acted upon. The average attendance of the Senate on the 79 roll-calls since the declaration of war has been 41; the average of the eight filibusters has been 54. Without subscribing in any way to individual theories of foreign policy, it should be apparent that simply on the basis of support given to war measures there is good ground for a new estimate of a group of men who have endured, and are still enduring, a censure that has not often been matched in bitterness.

CHARLES MERZ.

## At the Capitol

"IT will not be very long," said Representative Norton in the House, on Saturday, "until our allies, so-called, will be saying that they will condescend to help us to carry on this war. I realize that England would be perfectly willing that this nation should take the entire burden off her hands. . . . It is about time that we stopped and considered the interest of our own people and proceeded on a program to fight our own part in this war without taking upon ourselves the burden of our so-called allies."

There has been recently a growing uneasiness in both houses of Congress over the scope which American participation is evidently to take. Senator Harding's widely published declaration, "It is not up to the United States to force democracy on to the world" is but one of many less advertised but more pointed indications of disagreement. Open expressions of concern have come, it is true, chiefly from those who were initially opposed to the war; but the tendency toward plain speaking has not been gratified until recently, and members who have been silent since the declaration of war are beginning to state their convictions less guardedly upon the floors of both houses.

It is natural that the decisions which are now being made should cause disagreement and awaken opposition, and there are instances of both disagreement and opposition in the record of the past week. Few of them, however, have been far-sighted or calculated upon in advance. Senator Harding's declaration was not an indication of

an effort to change the course of the war, or even a preliminary move in Republican partisanship, but a remark to which he had been provoked by Senator Lewis. Mr. Lewis, whose newspaper reputation as Democratic "whip" is a handicap to that party in Congress, and an affliction outside of it, had opened a cheap discussion with a fling at the effects of Mr. Harding's "personal pulchritude and manly beauty" on "a bevy of beauteous women." That he came off as lightly as he did, is regrettable. Mr. Norton's declaration that England was ready to shift its war burdens to this country was made when he was opposing a bill that simply extended the life of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau. Comparatively there was more opposition—and expression of disagreement with the conduct of the Allies—in the discussion of a bill giving the President control over the sale and distribution of explosives than in the consideration of the major war measures. Where dissatisfaction with the character of American participation has been expressed in action, it has usually been, so far, in some matter relatively insignificant.

One form in which this unwillingness has shown itself, particularly during the past week—an unwillingness of many members to believe that the United States is entering into full military as well as economic partnership with the Allies—is in the matter of government contracts. Ignorant of administrative action, there is uneasiness lest that action is tying Congress to a longer and broader war program than many members would of themselves choose. And with this apprehension is mingled a certain regret that Congressmen are apparently not to influence greatly the awarding of contracts. Many members are alarmed at the far-reaching and suddenly acquired powers of the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense. The Senate has no confirmatory control over appointments to the Commission, and its swift development into eighty sub-committees was not foreseen in either branch of Congress. It was concern, perhaps mingled with some resentment, which led the Senate to write into the Urgent Deficiencies bill a section providing that "the existence of war shall not be construed as enlarging the powers or duties of the Council of National Defense, but that such powers and duties shall remain as prescribed by the act creating said Council." Naturally, however, no such purely formal prohibition has been able to suppress the expansion caused by immediate war needs, and the fears of Congress are still alive. At present the daily complaints about usurpation of power and unfairness in distributing contracts are being answered by administration leaders with generalities. But to meet the increasing discontent, one member of the Committee on Appropriations has suggested that "there should be created at once a body, small in size, composed of men who are officers of the government—not necessarily existing officers—to supervise and control the letting of all contracts, hear complaints, and be practically a body of appeal."

Much of the uneasiness in Congress arises, of course, in the fact that vast amounts have been set aside for the war in lump-sum appropriations. With the lack of any adequate system of accounting this uneasiness is natural; but it is a comment on consistency that the same concern over the dangers of the lump-sum method has not been so prevalent in the consideration which the House has given this week to the Rivers and Harbors bill. This measure, a subject for banter at all times when it is not actually under discussion, has been able to appear on this occasion in the unfamiliar guise of a war measure. It contains certain items of a military value, but with them are bound up