

# Power of Congress to Raise Armies

does used in the Austrian navy, besides several of the new seaplanes, are made by the Whitehead torpedo works in Hungary. This firm has also a place at Weymouth. They are making torpedoes for the British navy at Weymouth and torpedoes with British capital in Hungary in order to destroy British ships. This reference appeared in Armstrong, Whitworth and Co's annual report in regard to their interests in Austrian torpedo works:

"The directors in view of the important part played by torpedoes in naval warfare have acquired an interest in Whitehead and Company."

I want to refer very briefly to one other point. Members of Parliament who are not directors of armament firms and not shareholders can not always avoid being influenced in their actions by the fact that they have in their constituency those who are interested. I make no personal imputation whatever upon the opinions of the hon. member whose words I am going to quote. I am quite sure that he regrets the action I am now going to describe as much as any man possibly could. We have in this house some half-dozen members who represent dockyard constituencies, or in whose constituencies are firms who employ a large number of men who, under existing conditions, depend for their livelihood upon naval expenditure. The hon. member who represents the Brightside division of Sheffield (Sir J. Tudor Walters) is in such an unfortunate position. He was addressing his constituents on 31st July, 1907, and it appears that there had been complaints that he had not been getting sufficient orders from the admiralty and from the war office for Sheffield, and he was being compared with his predecessor to his own disadvantage in this respect. This is what he said in a public speech in his constituency:

"When he secured from the government a large order for Sheffield, he was not so simple as to go shouting about it in the House of Commons. If you shout you can not do much. If you want to accomplish things, you have to go to work quietly and carefully. It is not for me to shout about orders. It is for me to go to the war office and the admiralty and get them."

Nobody, I think, can help feeling sympathy with a member of Parliament who is compelled, like a commercial bagman, to go to the war office and the admiralty begging for orders because the maintenance of his seat depends on his success in that direction. What can I suggest as a way out of the difficulty? The first suggestion I make is that something must be done to get out of the clutches of these crooks, swindlers and thieves, politicians and generals, makers of armaments. It is also important we should give some practical proof of our desire that this naval expenditure should end. In spite of the high-sounding words uttered by successive first lords of the admiralty in favor of a reduction in naval armaments, nothing practical has been done. The right hon. gentleman spoke some time ago about a naval holiday, but it was stated in the last naval debate in the Reichstag that there never had been any proposal made by this government for the reduction of international armaments. If this proposition means anything at all, let the government give it practical shape. Year after year we hear statements in Germany and France, as well as in this country, about the wasteful expenditure on armaments. Not long since our present foreign secretary said that if this thing went on there could be only one of two possible results, either a Europe knee-deep in blood or bankrupt European nations. What is the use of such talk? Is European statesmanship so bankrupt that it can not find any means of giving practical expression to what everybody professes to be their desires?

We have been told by the chancellor of the exchequer that this is the most favorable moment in the last twenty years for doing this. When we opened our newspapers last New Year's morning and read his New Year's message to the nation, some of us hoped, and were for a moment inclined to believe, that the present chancellor of the exchequer was at last going to have the courage of the late Lord Randolph Churchill. But we have been disappointed. What did he say?

"The most favorable moment for the last twenty years."

And he went on to say:

"Unless Liberalism seizes this favorable opportunity it will be false to its noblest traditions, and those who have the consciences of Liberalism in their charge will be written down for all time as having betrayed their trust."

Are ministers to be written down for all time as having betrayed the trust? I have noticed

[From The Johnstown, Pa., Democrat.]

In this republican form of government, as distinguished from a monarchy, the constitution of the United States expresses all the powers which the congress and the President possess. All other powers are reserved to the states and the inhabitants thereof, as defined in their constitutions.

The war powers of the nation are defined in Sec. 8 of Art. 1 of the national charter: "Congress shall have power," it says, "to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal and make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies; but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the union, to suppress insurrections and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the states, respectively, the appointment of officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by congress."

These distinctly enumerated powers are all related to the one subject of war and are known as war powers. The framers of the constitution had in view the original declaration of rights, which was opposed to standing armies to fatten off the arts of peace.

The Declaration of Independence accused King George thus: "He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our legislatures," etc.

The constitution of Virginia, for which our President should have a deep veneration, adopted in 1776, declared, in the language of the British Bill of Rights of 1689, "that the raising or keeping of a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace, unless it be with the consent of parliament, is against law."

The constitution of Pennsylvania, adopted in 1776, upon which the revolution was successfully maintained, declared: "As standing armies in the time of peace are dangerous to liberty, they ought not to be kept up; and the military should be kept under strict subordination to and governed by the civil power."

It was under this doctrine that Pennsylvania furnished the best fighting organizations, along

with Maryland and Virginia. A man must be totally oblivious to the history of his country if he does not know that there was no "standing army" then.

Section 22, Art. 1, of the constitution of Pennsylvania ordains: "No standing army shall in time of peace be kept up without the consent of the legislature; and the military shall in all cases, and at all times, be in strict subordination to the civil power."

This being the fundamental law of state and nation, the Garrison plan of a large standing continental army is wholly unconstitutional.

It is only in case of actual or threatened war that our legislature may consent to such a program. The legislature must assent to it before a member of congress from Pennsylvania, who is loyal to our constitution, could conscientiously vote for such a chancellery monstrosity in time of universal peace on this continent. Nations whose brainy men understand law might well consider an act of congress, hurriedly and unconstitutionally adopted, as a tacit preparation to declare war upon them.

No one but an impractical theorist would traject such a proposition with honest intent. It will be noticed that the militia of each state is left to the regulation of the state, except when, in three cases, it may be called into the service of congress:

1. "To execute the laws of the union." This is wholly internal. It has no reference to international matters.

2. "To suppress insurrections." This also is wholly internal.

3. "To repel invasions." This provides for defensive purposes only. There is no power of congress written in the constitution besides; and these are the express limitations upon the purposes for which the militia may be called out.

Congress is given the general power to raise and support armies for war, when declared, but it is limited to appropriating money for that purpose "for a longer term than two years." This unconstitutional chamber scheme, ill-advised and ill-considered, contemplates foisting a permanent military system upon the republic. In order to do this it will be necessary to trample the constitution in the dust, outrage the memory of the glorious patriots and martyrs who established it, and give the lie to every democratic statesman we love to honor, as well as to contradict the truthful sentiments of the President in his last message to congress.

what has been to me a very painful change during the last week or two in the attitude of two or three Liberal journals upon this question. I do not hesitate to mention names—the "Manchester Guardian," the "Nation," and the "Daily News and Leader." Three months ago they were speaking on this question in a way which gave satisfaction to all of us. But they have been practically silent during the last few weeks, and last week the "Nation" dismissed the whole question in one short paragraph in the news topics. What is the meaning of that? I think the explanation is that pressure has been brought to bear upon these people to remain silent. Appeals have been made to them, pointing out the present precarious position of certain other questions. I am as ardently anxious to see Home Rule placed on the statute book as any member of this house, but you can pay too high a price even for that. Whatever may be the fate of the government, I, for one, and I speak practically for all my colleagues, will not give one vote in this house during the present session, whatever the consequences may be, which can be construed by any stretch of imagination as being in support either of the amount of these estimates or of the policy foreshadowed by the first lord yesterday. Really it is time that we changed all this wasteful expenditure. It is time we began to realize that a beautiful school is a grander sight than a battleship—a contented and prosperous peasantry than great battalions. It is time we began to realize that "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war."

The prime minister stated some weeks ago that the solution of this question was in the hands of international democracy. It is so. The peoples of the world have in the past trusted to king, emperors, and plutocrats, and each of them has failed. It is now for the people to trust

themselves. The workers of the world have no animosities; they have no jealousies; they have no diverse interests. All they want is freedom to work and the right to enjoy the fruits of their labor. I say again we echo, in the same sentiments as our comrades in the French Parliament and the German Reichstag, our determination to do what we can to change national opinion and national ideas upon this question, and I do not despair of our doing so. It may be the darkest night. The dawn comes slow—how slow!—but it does come, and I believe that out of the chaos and strife that now prevail there are rising brighter and better times, when nation will be no more against nation, and when all the people of the earth will realize that of all the grand, priceless blessings of humanity, the greatest of all is peace.

The republican leaders who have been insisting that the tariff shall be made the principal issue in the 1916 election little know what a tremendous strain they will be putting on the intellectuals of the party orators. Imagine a republican orator trying to prove that whatever depression has existed in business has been due to the democratic tariff, while it is a matter of government record that the war lessened imports more effectively than the highest tariff any republican ever desired to erect could do, while the increase in the value of imports for the year ending June 30, 1914, as compared with that ending June 30, 1914, was but 3½ per cent.

Congress has been in session for the better part of two months now and it has not passed any bill to increase the army and navy. Congress is likely to become extremely unpopular with the navy league and the munitions trust and a few other hurry-to-it organizations.