

methods being used in Congress against reporting at once the Stevens bill, for repeal of duty on wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of citizens of Milford and North Attleboro, Mass., for amendment to Sherman antitrust law, for the Pearre bill regulating injunctions, employers' liability bill, and national eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Local Union No. 287 of the International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Horseshoers and others, of Galeton, Pa., for amendment to the Sherman antitrust law, for the Pearre bill regulating issuance of injunctions, employers' liability bill, and national eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of Excelsior Lodge, No. 11, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, of Phillipsburg, N. J., for pending bills having for their object the preservation of the lives of locomotive firemen—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of James Horan, of Trenton, N. J., praying for legislation to modify the antitrust law, to regulate and limit the issuance of injunctions, for employers' liability, and for the extension of the eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of directors of the Trades League of Philadelphia and of the Union League Club, of Chicago, for H. R. 10457, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 25, 1908.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for inclusion in the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill relative to the preparation of reports and materials necessary to enable the Secretary of State to utilize and carry out the work partly performed by the Joint High Commission in 1898 for the settlement of questions relating to Canada, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1589) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Yeoman, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17874) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers of said war, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 6028) to provide for safety of life on navigable waters during regattas or marine parades.

VISITORS TO WEST POINT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BULKELEY and Mr. McCREARY members of the Board of Visitors on the part of the Senate to attend the next annual examination of cadets at the Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., in compliance with section 1327 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of Third Division, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants' Association of the State of New York, praying for the appointment of a currency commission, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Phil Sheridan Post, No. 14, Department of the Potomac, Grand Army of the Republic, of Washington, D. C., praying that an appropriation be made for

the erection of a suitable memorial at the National capital in recognition of the services of the enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 2, United Hatters of North America, of Bethel, Conn.; of sundry union labor men of Charleston, W. Va., and of sundry citizens of Newark, N. J., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the so-called "Sherman antitrust law," relating to labor organizations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of Local Union No. 247, International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen, of Lisbon Falls, Me.; of Local Lodge No. 23, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, of Berlin, N. H., and of Adirondack Local Lodge, No. 65, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, of Piercefield, N. Y., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on white paper, wood pulp, and the materials used in the manufacture thereof, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of Local Union No. 15, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, of Lisbon Falls, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on white paper, wood pulp, and the materials used in the manufacture thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 1063, of Bath, Me., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the so-called "Sherman antitrust law" relating to labor organizations, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Greene, Me., praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post bill," which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of Local Union No. 182, International Molders' Union of Belleville, Ill., and a petition of sundry citizens of Johnson City, Ill., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the so-called "Sherman antitrust law" relating to labor organizations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Business League of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the enlargement of the Navy of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLATT presented petitions of the American Publishers' Association of New York City, N. Y., and of the Associated Press, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the duty on white paper, wood pulp, and the materials used in the manufacture thereof, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Aldrich currency bill," which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants' Association of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the appointment of a commission to consider changes in the present currency system, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry labor organizations of Brooklyn, Cohoes, Ilion, Lockport, and Olean, all in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the so-called "Sherman antitrust law" relating to labor organizations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WETMORE presented a memorial of Local Division No. 19, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Providence, R. I., and a memorial of Local Division No. 10, Irish National Foresters, of Central Falls, R. I., remonstrating against the ratification of the treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry labor organizations of Woonsocket, R. I., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the so-called "Sherman antitrust law" relating to labor organizations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a national forest reserve in the Southern Appalachian and White Mountains, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. STEWART presented a petition of Local Grange No. 23, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sheffield, Vt., praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post bill," and also for the passage of the so-called "Crumpacker bill," providing for the

employment of additional clerks for the taking of the Thirteenth and subsequent censuses, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Monson, Mass., and a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the so-called "Sherman antitrust law" relating to labor organizations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CURTIS presented a petition of the Zodiac Club, of Lawrence, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for competitive examinations for clerks employed in the taking of the Thirteenth and subsequent censuses, which was referred to the Committee on the Census.

He also presented petitions of sundry labor organizations of Fort Scott, Parsons, Pittsburg, and Kansas City, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the so-called "Sherman antitrust law" relating to labor organizations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented a petition of sundry citizens of Berlin, Vt., and a petition of sundry citizens of Hartland and Taftsville, Vt., praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill," which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. STEWART presented a petition of Local Union No. 28, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, of Rutland, Vt., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the so-called "Sherman antitrust law" relating to labor organizations, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BULKELEY presented a petition of Tunxis Grange, No. 13, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bloomfield, Conn., praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post bill," which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of Third Division, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of Third Division, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the City Club of Chicago, Ill., and a petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a national forest reserve in the Southern Appalachian and White Mountains, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. KNOX, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6074) to provide for holding terms of the United States circuit and district courts at Springfield, Mass., reported it without amendment.

Mr. BURROWS, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 130) to constitute Eastport, Idaho, in the customs collection district of Montana and Idaho, a subport of entry and delivery, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce, which was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 6826) to correct the military record of Albert S. Austin, which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KNOX introduced a bill (S. 6827) granting an increase of pension to Christian Paul, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6828) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Wyeth;

A bill (S. 6829) granting an increase of pension to Willard Morris (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6830) granting an increase of pension to Theodore D. Mather (with accompanying papers).

Mr. GORE introduced a bill (S. 6831) providing for the platting and selling of that part of the southwest quarter and the west half of the southeast quarter of section 14 in township 7 north, range 10 west of Indian meridian, lying south of the right of way of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, situated in the county of Caddo, Okla., for town-site purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6832) providing for the holding of the United States district courts at Hugo, Okla., which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6833) granting an honorable discharge of George Vandegriff, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,446.34 to pay Howard B. Carpenter the balance due him for survey of boundary line between the States of Idaho and Montana, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DIXON submitted an amendment providing that the unexpended balance of appropriation in pursuance of treaty stipulations for subsistence and civilization of the Northern Cheyenne and Arapahoes for the year 1907 be appropriated and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT TO OMNIBUS PUBLIC BUILDINGS BILL.

Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment proposing that the limit of cost of the United States post-office and site at Kearney, Nebr., be increased from \$85,000 to \$110,000, intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus public buildings bill, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. WETMORE submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15372, known as the "omnibus claims bill," which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15372, known as the "omnibus claims bill," which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15372, known as the "omnibus claims bill," which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM BOLDENWECK.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like to call up the bill (S. 890) for the relief of William Boldenweck, assistant treasurer of the United States at Chicago.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. The naval appropriation bill has been continued so long that it is essential that it should be passed to-day. I must object after this to any time being taken for the consideration of bills.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope this bill will take but a few moments.

Mr. HALE. If it gives rise to any debate, of course I must object.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It authorizes the proper accounting officers of the Treasury, in settling the accounts of William Boldenweck, assistant treasurer of the United States at Chicago, to pass to the credit of said Boldenweck the sum of \$173,000, being the sum which was stolen from the subtreasury at Chicago during the year 1907.

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

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the naval appropriation bill be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20471) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES]. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 85, line 17, before the words "first-class battle ships," strike out "two" and insert "four."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to have it. The yeas have it, and the amendment is disagreed to.

Mr. HALE. I would be very glad to have the bill disposed of in that way, but two or three Senators—

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will wait a moment, if no Senator desires further to debate the bill, I am entirely willing and ready for a vote, and will call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, my purpose in rising is to present an amendment if there is no amendment pending.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. FRYE. There is one pending.

Mr. CULBERSON. I inquired if there was an amendment pending.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. HALE. I withdraw the call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CULBERSON. I offer the following as an additional section.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CULBERSON. Let the amendment proposed by me be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the following paragraph:

That none of the amounts herein appropriated for construction shall be expended where any laborer or mechanic doing any part of the work contemplated by the contract, in the employ of the contractor or any subcontractor contracting for any part of said work contemplated, shall be required or permitted to work more than eight hours in any one calendar day upon such work except upon permission granted by the Secretary of the Navy during time of war or a time where war is imminent, or where any great-national emergency exists: *And provided further*, That the contractor contracting with the United States shall, in the event of the violation of said covenant as to hours of labor, forfeit to the United States the sum of \$5 for each laborer or mechanic for every calendar day for which he shall have been required or permitted to labor more than eight hours upon the work under such contract.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment I proposed to the pending bill was voted upon. I had gone out of the Chamber for a few moments to meet a gentleman from my State. My understanding was that several Senators desired to address the Senate and that the matter was to be further considered. I should like to have the amendment reconsidered and brought again before the Senate. If not, I reserve the right to renew my amendment in the Senate.

Mr. HALE. That right, undoubtedly, the Senator will have.

Mr. PILES. I do not think the amendment ought to be disposed of in the way it was. I do not think an amendment of this character and importance ought to be taken up and passed upon suddenly when the Senator who offered it had been called out of the Chamber. For that reason I hope the Senator from Maine will consent to a reconsideration of the question and let us have a vote upon it.

Mr. HALE. I did not push the vote. The Chair put the question to a vote, as was proper. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] was to speak first to-day and was present, and he stated that in order to have a vote, he did not care to go on, and the Chair put the vote, as was natural. There has been no attempt on anybody's part to foreclose the amendment or debate upon it. All the rights that the Senator from Washington or any Senator has will be entirely preserved in the Senate. There will be no attempt in this case to prevent a square stand-up vote of the Senate finally on the proposition. The Senator will get all his rights. I did not push the matter.

Mr. PILES. I will ask the Senator if he does not think, then, that under all the circumstances the vote ought to be reconsidered and the amendment taken up in the usual way in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. HALE. If the Senator thinks that that is preferable, I will not object. Either way would take the same length of time.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It can be offered in the Senate.

Mr. HALE. As the Senator from Indiana says, it can be offered in the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I wish to understand the parliamentary condition as clearly as possible. I am not nearly so well versed in parliamentary procedure as the Senator from Maine, but I understand that when the bill goes out of Committee of the Whole and is in the Senate it is still open to amendment.

Mr. HALE. It is open to amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. In every part.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And the amendment of the Senator from Washington can be offered in the Senate as though it never had been offered before.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And then the bill with the amendment is still open to debate in the Senate as much as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HALE. As to that or any other amendment.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Indiana is clearly right in his statement.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I merely want it so that we may understand it. I was not sure myself. Of course the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Rhode Island are masters of parliamentary procedure. So we do understand that when the bill comes out of Committee of the Whole into the Senate the rights of the Senator from Washington are not impaired, and he will then have the right to offer his amendment again in the Senate just as fully as in Committee of the Whole and to debate it to that extent.

Mr. HALE. Then, on the suggestion of the Senator from Indiana, I will ask that we shall go on with the bill.

Mr. PILES. I prefer that the amendment shall now be reconsidered and that we shall proceed with it in the manner in which we were proceeding upon it originally. The Record now shows that the amendment was defeated, and I think it would be better under all the circumstances to have the amendment proceed on the same line we were proceeding with it before the vote was taken upon the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington move a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was rejected?

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. PILES. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. The Senator need not move to reconsider it. If the Senator is not content with the suggestion made by the Senator from Indiana, I am entirely willing that by unanimous consent the vote shall be regarded as reconsidered and the amendment be before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was rejected? The Chair hears none. The amendment is before the Senate, and the question is upon agreeing to the same.

Mr. TELLER. I rose to make that suggestion. That was the only purpose I had in rising, and it is now disposed of. I suppose the debate will go on as if the vote had not been taken.

Mr. HALE. Yes; and in the meantime the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas is pending.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the one offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CULBERSON. I withdraw the amendment proposed by myself until the other is disposed of.

Mr. HALE. That is better.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the one offered by the Senator from Washington. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the pending proposition is to authorize four ships of a certain type instead of two, as suggested by the Committee on Naval Affairs in a bill making appropriations for the extension and the support of the Navy for the coming fiscal year. The bill carries aggregate appropriations in excess of \$123,000,000. The extraordinary contention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] that this amendment is one of great national and international importance, and that the governments and cabinets of the world are waiting breathlessly upon the decision of the Senate upon it, if it were not for certain serious aspects of the case, would be simply ludicrous.

If the Senator from Indiana had said to the Senate that the question whether the recommendations of the British Admiralty as to whether they should build one ship or three ships of the *Dreadnought* type was a question which involved the peace of the world, one which involved the honor and the supremacy of Great Britain, that statement would have been considered absurd. Is there anything about the condition of the United States that takes away the element of absurdity from the proposition made by the Senator from Indiana? I think not.

I have said that there were certain very serious aspects to this case. I regret exceedingly the tone of the remarks of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Indiana upon the floor on yesterday. I suggest to Senators that a self-respecting nation, jealous of its rights and its powers and feeling its responsibilities as a member of the great family of nations, would look with more disfavor upon insinuations and innuendoes made upon the floor of the American Senate by persons claiming to have the authority of the President of the United States than they would upon open threats or open manifestations of hostility.

The suggestions that there are nations professing friendly relations with the United States that have designs not to be spoken of above a whisper that would be detrimental to the interests of the United States, should certainly not be stated

here unless known to be true. These insinuations should not in any event affect our vote on the pending amendment.

Does any Senator suppose that our friendly or unfriendly relations with other countries is to be determined by the fact that we have thirty-three battle ships instead of thirty-one? If there is any nation that has designs upon us, are they likely to yield their purposes if we have thirty-three battle ships instead of thirty-one? Does any Senator have any such idea?

Mr. President, in my opinion neither the Senator from Indiana nor the Senator from Washington had any authority to speak for the President of the United States in this regard, and when the Senator from Indiana said in his place in the Senate that if this amendment was to be considered in executive session it would receive the unanimous vote of the Senate—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH (continuing). Plainly stating as plain as language could, that there are in existence facts known to him and perhaps known to others that would lead the Senate, if they were voting free and with a knowledge of the facts, to an opposite conclusion—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator, of course, does not want to misquote me nor any man, nor to do any man an injustice.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; certainly not.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have not my remarks here, and I have not had time to go over them. Otherwise they would have appeared in the RECORD. I have sent for them and will have them in a moment.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator will pardon me just a moment. Neither the Senator from Washington nor myself said to the Senate that we spoke on the authority of the President any more than any other Senator might. I made distinct reference only to his message, and I said—and I have my remarks downstairs and will get them—that what he might have in his mind no man knew.

As to the executive session, the Senator is again wrong. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] put to me the question, naming a certain foreign friendly power, whether I thought there was any similarity in the situation between us and that specific power and the situation that existed between that power and another friendly power prior to a recent war. I responded—and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FAYE], sitting in his seat in front of me, said from his chair "that is right"—that it was not proper to discuss a possible conflict, in my judgment, upon the floor of the Senate in open, or even hardly in executive, session when naming particular powers. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] instantly recognized that, and said he thought that it was true, and withdrew his question.

Mr. President, I merely make this interruption so that the Senator may not go on upon a misapprehension. I did very carefully and definitely state, and it will be found in my remarks, the exact limitations to which I thought we might go in debate upon that question.

While I am on my feet I will say that I had and I shall later on in the debate produce speeches by a very eminent Senator—

Mr. ALDRICH. That is hardly an answer.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; it is merely a correction; but if the Senator does not want me to make the statement I shall not make it.

Mr. ALDRICH. But I do not like to have you make too many speeches in my time.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course I will not say more than I think the exigencies call for. I have and, if necessary, I shall produce speeches made heretofore by an eminent Senator, a veteran Senator, where the limitations of debate upon such a question as this that I yesterday marked out were not at all followed, but were exceeded, and where trouble between this and another friendly power was set forth in such vigorous terms that it got the attention of the entire country. I suppose the older Senators here will remember that debate. Also I shall produce the speeches of other very distinguished Senators of like character. By them I shall show that my remarks yesterday were moderate and mild compared with theirs on former occasions.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I only wish to have the Senator yield that I may contribute my clear recollection. The Senator from Indiana has not stated all that was said. When reference was made to the discussion in executive session, and when it was said that only there and in an extreme case should it be discussed, the Senator from Indiana did say that if this matter

could be discussed in executive session there would be no vote against four ships.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. HALE. My recollection is—

Mr. ALDRICH. That was my statement of what the Senator from Indiana said.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator from Rhode Island permit me?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield further to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator desires to withdraw the statement or explain it, I am quite willing to yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have my speech, which when published will stand the test. The Senator from Maine must do me the justice to say—

Mr. ALDRICH. I am talking about the speech as made and not as it will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. HALE. Other Senators heard all this.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well; all right. The speech will appear just as it was made. But I have no objection to anything I said if other Senators do. It was not said in executive session. My recollection of what I said in answer to the Senator from Maine is that I said nobody knew what information the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief of the Navy, has.

Mr. ALDRICH. The statement was not in that connection.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes, in that connection; and I said that doubtless if we could discuss this matter fully there would not be many votes against it. Executive session was not mentioned.

Mr. ALDRICH. My recollection is perfectly plain, and I am willing to leave it to the recollection of Senators who heard the Senator from Indiana. The impression made upon me, and I assume it is the impression made upon every Senator, was that there were facts in this case known to the Senator from Indiana that would have changed the result if they were known publicly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but what I did say was that no man knew what facts the President had.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is not what I am talking about. That is not the statement I am discussing. The impression made upon my mind, and, I think, the impression made generally, was that there were facts in existence in this case that, if they were known to the Senate generally, would change the result of this vote. I venture to deny for the President of the United States and for the Administration and for the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who, I hope, will be heard from in this connection, that there are any facts with reference to our relations with any friendly power that if they became known would affect the question now pending before the Senate.

It is undoubtedly true that the President of the United States is in favor of four battle ships; he has made his position known to the Senate and to Senators; but that he is in favor of this change for any such considerations as those urged by the Senator from Indiana on yesterday I deny. Now, if there are any such facts within the knowledge of the Senator from Indiana, he is bound to say so to the Senate and to the country. I think there are none.

Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana says that if we vote for four battle ships peace is secured, and that everything is to be harmonious and lovely in the future; but that if we vote for only two battle ships that there is great danger of war, and that every evil to which mankind is liable is certain to result if the Senate declines to follow his judgment and his opinion.

The Senator from Indiana says that we should not have had the Spanish war if we had had two more battle ships in 1898. Everyone who knows anything of the circumstances under which that war was brought about and the attitude which Spain was obliged to take by reason of conditions in her own country and not here, realizes that statement is very far from the facts. If we had had forty battle ships at that time Spain would have been obliged to go to war to preserve her Government at home, if for no other reason.

The Senator from Indiana said that Great Britain owes her exemption from war to her great navy, and that she could not have carried on the Boer war successfully—perhaps the Senator should like to interrupt me about that—unless she had a great navy. Is there anything in the facts to justify that statement? I think not. The Boer war did not grow out of the fact that Great Britain had a navy. It was carried on in spite of the fact that Great Britain had a navy. It was not put down by the use of the navy. The navy of Great Britain had no more to do with it than the Navy of the United States, either in its inception or in its conclusion.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the American mules, which the British succeeded in getting in the Boer country, enabled them to succeed in that war.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think that that fact had more to do with it than the navy of Great Britain.

The Senator from Washington and the Senator from Indiana assume that there is something almost sacred about the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington for four ships. As I have said, why four ships and not five; why not six, or seven, or ten? If there is some great war cloud hanging over this country, if the Pacific Ocean is to be, as the Senator from Washington says, the storm center of a great conflict, why does the Senator from Washington show this modesty and forbearance with reference to the safety of his constituents?

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

Mr. PILES. I wish to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that I did not speak with any authority of the President.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am glad to hear one disclaimer. We may have perhaps another disclaimer from the Senator from Indiana. I do not know whether he is going to make it later or not. I hope he is.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I dislike to interrupt the Senator any more, but I wish to answer him.

Mr. PILES. I read the portion of the President's special message to Congress which I thought was necessary for me to present in the course of the remarks I made. I have had no communication with the President on this subject, direct or indirect. I got my communication from him through his message.

I beg the Senator's pardon, but I made no statement yesterday that the Pacific Ocean was to be the storm center of any war or that we were to have any war.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. PILES. If the Senator will pardon me a moment—

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. PILES. What I said was that if we had a war, the Pacific Ocean would be the storm center of that war. That was my statement.

Mr. ALDRICH. If we should get into war with Germany, I suppose the Pacific Ocean would not be the storm center.

Mr. PILES. I maintain, and I think it must be apparent to all men who have thought of the situation, that if we do have a war, the next war we will have will be on the Pacific Ocean. I apprehend no war, but I wish to state, as I said yesterday, that in my judgment if we do have a war the Pacific Ocean will be the storm center of that war.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is what I am finding fault with, or trying to find fault with, in my feeble way. The Senator made a statement that the Pacific Ocean would be the storm center. I suggested then that that was only another way of saying that there is a possibility of war with Japan. There is no other power with which we could engage in war in which the Pacific Ocean could be made the storm center.

What I am objecting to as strongly as I can is the insinuations made by both Senators that there is some mysterious, baneful influence or disaster hanging over the people of the United States that should force us to favor four battle ships, and I was discussing the sacredness of this number. I should like to have some Senator tell me why thirty-three battle ships instead of thirty-one can be relied upon to preserve the peace of the world. Does any Senator here think that Great Britain, for instance, if we should have differences with her, would yield her convictions as to what her honor or her interest required because the United States had thirty-three battle ships instead of thirty-one?

If there is any danger of a conflict between the United States and any power, does any Senator suppose that that power, whether Japan or Great Britain, or any other country on the face of the globe, would change their convictions of duty to themselves and to their people simply because the United States has two more battle ships? The contention, Senators, is absolutely absurd.

The Senator from Indiana also proposes to try Senators as to their loyalty to the Navy and its traditions and its prowess upon the question whether they are going to vote in this body for four battle ships or for two. I will say to him and to the Senator from Washington that there were patriotic Senators who devoted their time and their energies successfully to the upbuild-

ing and the preservation of the American Navy before the advent of the Senator from Indiana or the Senator from Washington. I have misread the history of my country—

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. PILES. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if he heard me make any statement in my remarks which challenged the patriotism of any Senator on this floor—

Mr. ALDRICH. No; perhaps not—

Mr. PILES. Or that, by the greatest stretch of imagination, could be assumed—

Mr. ALDRICH. Perhaps not their patriotism, but their judgment. When the Senator said that we have a fleet composed largely of ships of an obsolete type, I think that was an intimation that the men who are controlling these matters, both in the Department and in Congress, had not kept abreast with the times, at least in providing for the construction of a Navy.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me a moment, the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. ALDRICH. Very well.

Mr. PILES. My statement was that there were eleven, as I understood, of the thirty-one battle ships that are of an obsolete type. I said nothing more and nothing less than that, and I meant not to impugn any Senator's motive or the motive of anyone else in not keeping our Navy up to the standard.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not suggesting that the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Indiana impugned the motive of anybody. But if I heard the Senator from Indiana correctly or understood the force of his argument, it was that we had reached a crisis in national affairs, and that whether a Senator was loyal to the American Navy, whether he was loyal to the great principles of peace, whether he was loyal to a desire to promote the future welfare of his country was to depend upon whether he would vote for four battle ships. We were held up, as it were, and told that the President of the United States having asked for four battle ships, we could not refuse without ignoring the experience of the world, without turning our back upon the American Navy and putting the United States into a position where she would be defenseless in case of a war, which seemed to be impending somewhere in the universe.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not intend to interrupt the Senator any more than is absolutely necessary for the correctness of this debate, preferring to reserve such things as I have to state until afterwards. Not only was there no imputation of any Senator's patriotism, but I particularly said—I remember the statement, which I have since read, in my remarks made directly to the Senator from Rhode Island—that the Senator from Rhode Island was as patriotic as any Senator in this Chamber, and that every Senator in this Chamber was as patriotic as every other Senator in this Chamber. Those were the exact words addressed particularly to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Next, with reference to this being a crisis, having referred to the large number of incidents where war had come unexpectedly, I said it might be possible, in view of the past, that this will be a critical vote. Now, those were the statements really made.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think I have not misrepresented the Senator. Certainly I have not done so intentionally.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I know you have not, but I made that statement directly and emphatically and in plain words. So far from impugning anybody's patriotism, I stated positively that I asserted the equal patriotism of all, and especially that of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. It was possibly an impeachment of our intelligence, rather than our patriotism, that was intended to be conveyed.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not say anything about that, of course. We have different views.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understand the Senator from Indiana stated—I do not want to misquote him, and I do not think I do—that if we were not to have a navy which was adequate for the purposes of peace, any money taken for the support of the Navy was, I think he used the word "filched," from the people of the United States. Now, let us examine that question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I want to say that I will not interrupt the Senator again, but I can not permit him now to go on making statements that he says I made, but which I did not make; and later I shall give precisely the statements that were made, as I have before me just exactly what I did say.

Mr. ALDRICH. I certainly heard the Senator make the statement on two different occasions, but I am entirely willing that the Senator shall modify it or explain it in any way he pleases—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; not at all. I stand on that particular statement precisely where I did stand, and I will repeat it when I come to reply to the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. It must be evident to the Senate that I am laboring under a great deal of difficulty in discussing this question with the Senator from Indiana in having to rely upon my recollection of what he said, though I think my recollection is perfectly clear.

But is it true that we must have a navy which is adequate or have no navy at all? Who is to decide the question of adequacy? We had in 1898 a new navy, a reconstructed navy. Now, does the Senator from Indiana mean to say that the Navy at that time was inadequate? Who is to determine the question as to the adequacy of the American Navy, except the representatives of the American people, taking into consideration all the circumstances and conditions which surround the country? Are we to have a navy as large as that of Great Britain? There is not a Senator who listens to me who does not know the conditions and circumstances under which the navy of Great Britain is maintained. Are we to go into competition with European nations, especially with Great Britain, as to the size of our Navy? Who is to determine this question? Is the Senator from Indiana to be the sole judge of the question of the adequacy of the Navy? I submit that it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to provide a navy which is adequate and efficient. I think they have done so. What addition shall be made in this bill to the naval programme is a question not of sentiment; it is a question not of peace; but it is a question of practical administration, taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances that surround us.

The Senator from Indiana said yesterday that those of us who would not agree with him upon this proposition must disagree solely upon the ground that we did not think war was possible. Am I mistaken in that statement?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will say to the Senator that I have made up my mind not to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is all right. I am glad to have the Senator interrupt me.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But I have my remarks here, and I think I shall answer the Senator to his satisfaction. I hope so.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Senator from Indiana said on three or four occasions that we could not resist the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] except upon the theory that we thought war was impossible. Every man who listens to me knows that nothing is impossible in the scope of human existence. I say to the Senator from Indiana that in view of the circumstances and conditions in which the United States finds herself, when we consider that the finances of a country are the principal element to be considered, when we consider that there is not an European nation that could be advantaged by war with the United States or by permitting a war with the United States, I say—and I mean to give my words all the power which I can give them—that war between the United States and any other nation is improbable; and I believe there is no Senator present who does not in his heart of hearts agree with that statement.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I said that same thing three times during my remarks.

Mr. ALDRICH. Well, if that is true, why are the Senators who do not agree with the Senator from Indiana as to the precise number of battle ships to be appropriated or provided for in this bill held up as the enemies of peace, simply because they do not agree with the Senator upon a practical proposition?

Now, is it true that anywhere at any time, the size of a nation's navy has had anything to do with the question of a declaration of war? Can any Senator remember a case in the history of the world where that has been the element which has been decisive in the question of peace or war? I shall be glad if any Senator can cite an instance.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator repeat that query?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think there never was a time in the history of the world when any war has been decided with reference to the relative size of the navies of the countries involved.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am glad to hear that statement repeated the second time. I did not catch it the first time, because I thought that I gave—

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, we on this side of the Chamber can only hear one side of the controversy. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] is not heard on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I thought I gave at least two recent, definite, admitted, historical examples; and when I come to say what I have to say—

Mr. ALDRICH. What were they?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. When I come to say what I have to say, I shall repeat them and illustrate them.

Mr. ALDRICH. Can the Senator from Indiana not state in two words what they were?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; perhaps not in two words, but in three or four words. I said that if Japan, at the close of the Chino-Japanese war, had had her present navy, she could not have been forced, and would not have been forced, to recede to China the Liaotung Peninsula. That is a fact admitted by all students and historians, and that recession was the sole cause of the war between Russia and Japan. Does the Senator from Rhode Island deny that?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Indiana assumes two or three different things of which I have no knowledge and as to which I assume he has no definite information.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Rhode Island assumes a good many things.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not like to assent to a conclusion until I know something about the premises.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am stating this as a fact, and the Senator asked me for an illustration.

I say, second, that I believe it is the consensus of students—I say this after having given some little attention to it—that again before the Russo-Japanese war broke out, if Russia had had a great up-to-date effective navy there is little doubt but that that controversy would have been settled by diplomacy. If there has been a student or writer who disagrees as to those recent historic significant examples, I do not know who he is, and I would be glad for the Senator from Rhode Island to point him out. There are two examples. I shall give more when I come to reply.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, both of the cases cited are based upon pure speculation. I said, and I repeat it, that I believe there is not a single example in modern times or in ancient times where the question of the size of a navy was the sole controlling element in a decision for peace. The Russo-Japanese war began, not because Japan had a larger or a more effective navy than Russia had, but because of underlying causes with which the Senator from Indiana is as familiar as I am. If I am not mistaken in my recollection, the Senator from Indiana, in a book which he wrote upon the subject of "The Russian Advance," thought that the Russian navy at that time was fully equal, if not superior, to the Japanese navy, and that this superiority or inferiority could not have had the least effect on the result.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There again: The Senator has not done me the honor of reading that chapter in that book in which, in my feeble way, I discussed that question. I can remember only now that I said that, from an uninstructed observer's point of view, the Russian ships looked to be in much better condition than people supposed they were. Yesterday the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] said that I had predicted a certain thing, which was the precise reverse of what I actually did say.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator from Rhode Island will permit me—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. Since the Senator's ample denial that his book showed, from his view, the superiority of Russia over Japan and the power of that great Empire to sweep Japan from the face of the earth, I have given myself the pleasure of going over the pages of the Senator's book, *The Russian Advance*; and the whole book, Mr. President, is devoted to the proposition that no nation could stand in the East before Russia; that anywhere and everywhere she would dominate and prevail, and would drive every nation from the Pacific. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. That is my recollection of the book. [Laughter.]

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island will permit me to say that, in view of the interpretation of my poor literary effort made by the Senator from Maine, at this "late and appreciative day," to use the language of the Senator from Iowa on another occasion, I think I shall have to make, before the debate is over, profert of exactly what I did say myself on this particular subject.

Mr. HALE. Or make another book. [Laughter.]

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I would almost be tempted to do that.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I am only alluding to the statement of the Senator from Indiana in his book to refute the statement which he has made here as to what was the opinion at that time of the relative strength of these two navies, and

that the war was not undertaken on either side simply because one side or the other had, as it believed, a preponderance of naval power. I may use it perhaps for another purpose—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I think I shall use it myself now—

Mr. ALDRICH (continuing). To say that possibly even the Senator from Indiana, whose scope of knowledge is certainly wide, once in a while may be mistaken when he undertakes to spread his powers of observations over the entire world. The power to do that is given to but few of us. The Senator from Indiana in this case, as perhaps in no other, was certainly mistaken.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I assume that I certainly have the common human failings. Yet every prediction made in my book came true. All of us make more mistakes than otherwise, no doubt; that is merely human; but, as a matter of fact, the chief thing in this book, to which I want to call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Maine at this particular juncture, is to the other statement. I will repeat in exact words what I said myself, that the original articles—five years before that war—stated the elements of the situation and why war was inevitable; but so greatly did the Senator from Maine—whose judgment I then and now esteem—so weightily did he differ from me that his judgment caused me to modify that statement, the opinion being held also by the Senator from Rhode Island at that time that war was absolutely impossible for financial, as well as for other reasons; yet within three months from the time that was done war was raging. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana has convinced me that he has more capacity as a prophet than he has as a historian or a statistician. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—
The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator from Rhode Island will permit me the observation, I should like to suggest that if some of the critics of the Senator from Indiana had reduced their own opinions to writing within the last few years they might find them quite as contradictory as the Senator from Rhode Island says that the Senator from Indiana has found his.

Mr. ALDRICH. Most of us are too prudent to do that. [Laughter.] But to get to the practical question which is before the Senate, because, if I am not mistaken, the Senate is not to determine this question upon pyrotechnics or upon the assumption that the President of the United States and the American Government are afraid to do what is right and just in their relations with the other nations of the world and that it is necessary for them to build four more battle ships to create a feeling of fear on the part of those countries, which in some way are contemplating hostile relations with us. Is there a Senator present who does not believe, if there is to be a war with anybody, that the entire resources of this country, vast and infinite as they are, will be immediately placed at the disposal of the Chief Executive as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him—not for a question, but for a very brief interruption—

Mr. ALDRICH. Very well.
Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is this: Of course every man of every party and of every faith in time of hostilities would put not only the resources of the country but his life at the service of the nation and the flag.

Mr. ALDRICH. I intended to include that, of course, in my statement.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator would except that?
Mr. ALDRICH. No, I meant to include it. I consider the resources of the American nation are, first, in the manhood and character of its people.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The point that I wish to make is that the resources of a people not utilized for the purpose of preventing war until war comes are infinitely less useful than when used in advance. For example, we can not, after hostilities break out, build a ship. The Senator will concede that. If we are unprepared—

Mr. ALDRICH. We might buy them if we could not build them, which I do not concede.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. You mean we could buy them during the war?

Mr. ALDRICH. We bought two in the Spanish-American war, and Great Britain bought a number during the Boer war.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will ask the Senator whether it is not true that in time of war fighting ships and all munitions of war are not contraband?

Mr. ALDRICH. Who is to determine that question? If we are in war, who pays attention to what is contraband?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. International law—that pays attention to what is contraband. International law! The Senator does not mean to say that he proposes not to prepare for war and then to escape the unpreparedness by violating international law?

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say that my understanding is we bought ships of exactly that kind during the Spanish-American war.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am glad that the Senator gave that illustration. We paid for those ships many times what they were worth and what they could have been obtained for before the war broke out. Does the Senator deny that? No! for the whole world knows it.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is a different question.
Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly, it is a different question. That is the point—it is a different question! Now, Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. I think I will have to go on. I think I will have to ask the Senator not to interrupt me further.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well; it was perfectly proper for me to interrupt, and I will be very glad to defer this; but at the time of our unpreparedness—

Mr. ALDRICH. There must be a limit upon interruption.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. At the time, I will say, both of the civil war and the Spanish war it cost us hundreds of millions of dollars in money and thousands of lives just because we were unprepared. It does not answer that statement to say the resources of this nation are open both as to its money and its manhood when war comes.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is confirming exactly what I am trying to impress upon the Senate—confirming it in the strongest possible way—that is, whether we are in favor of having an adequate navy and of appropriating the resources of the United States to be properly used, and that is the question which the Senator from Indiana proposes to determine for us.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have a right, have I not, Mr. President, to give my views and arguments?

Mr. ALDRICH. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Senator said in effect to us yesterday, if you do not vote for four battle ships—as I say, going back to the sacredness of this number—then you are not in favor of peace; then you are not in favor of using the resources of the nation as the President thinks they ought to be used. I am here as a Senator representing a State, as the Senator from Indiana is, and I do not propose to delegate to either that Senator or to any other man the right to use my judgment as to how the resources of the United States shall be used, having in mind all the time my duty as a Senator of the United States and my duty as a patriotic citizen of the United States.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. And I do not propose to permit the Senator from Indiana or any other Senator to say to me, "If you do not vote for four battle ships instead of two you are false to the traditions of this country and to its highest interests." I say there is no such question involved here. It is a pure, practical question of administration under the conditions and circumstances which surround us. I do not criticize the President of the United States for believing in four battle ships. That is his right. It is his right and his duty, if he so believes, to send to this Congress messages to that effect. I do not object to his sending for Senators and trying to impress upon them that they ought to vote in accordance with his wishes and his opinions; I have no fault to find with that, but I do find fault with the Senator from Indiana, who undertakes, in a speech, to say to us, as I understand him, "The President of the United States says this, therefore you must do it, and if you do not do it you are neglecting your patriotic duty as a member of the Senate."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, the Senator must permit me—

Mr. ALDRICH. I may have been mistaken in my construction of the Senator's speech, but I do not think I was.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator says that he will not delegate his right to think and vote to anybody. Does the Senator expect, on the contrary, that other Senators, representing States and having the same patriotic devotion to their duty that I yesterday ascribed to the Senator from Rhode Island, should delegate their duties and their votes and their arguments to anybody else?

Mr. ALDRICH. Not in the slightest degree. I am not finding fault at all with the opinions or the judgment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Has not any Senator the right to present to the Senate his views as well as the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the fact that I began my few remarks yesterday with the statement that on the day before the Senator from Maine—and it will be found in the RECORD—had said that the *mind of the Senate was* ALREADY MADE UP, *without any discussion.*

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not find fault with the judgment of the Senator from Indiana at all. He has a perfect right to his own judgment and his own opinions, and I hope he controls his own vote.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator knows I do—nobody knows it better than he. And I hope that every Senator on this floor does. The only thing that has appeared in this debate that might create any impeachment of that was the statement—which I said I was satisfied the Senator from Maine did not mean in that sense—that *the mind of the Senate upon this critical question was* MADE UP *BEFORE any debate or discussion had occurred.*

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator is entitled to his opinion, of course. The President of the United States is entitled to his opinion.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is right.

Mr. ALDRICH. What I have been trying to do—and I have failed in everything I have attempted, unless I have succeeded in doing it—was to convince the Senate that this was not a question affecting the peace and war of the people of the United States, or of any other country in the world; I objected to the Senator from Indiana putting it in that form, and I objected to the insinuation which permeated his speech and the speech of the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES], though not to the same extent, that there was some grave, impending difficulty, and that if the President of the United States should tell other Senators what he had told them, there would be a different vote upon this proposition.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, that statement will not—

Mr. ALDRICH. I object to arguments and statements of this character. I say, so far as the Senator from Indiana ventured to express the opinions of the President or the Administration, that he did it without any authority whatever.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is very distasteful to me to be compelled constantly to call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the fact that statements attributed to me were not made, and I resolved not to do it any more; but he will not find such a statement as he just now attributes to me in this RECORD. Furthermore, I have—

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not talking about the RECORD.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Furthermore, I have been nine years in this Senate and I have never assumed to speak for anybody except myself, being responsible to nobody except the people who sent me here and to the American people, and no statement will be found in any speech of mine—

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not assume, and never have assumed, to be a spokesman of anybody but myself—and the same thing can not be said of other Senators.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator from Indiana will observe the propriety of not making a speech in my time.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator must not make statements like that.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am only speaking in this connection of what my impressions were of the speech of the Senator from Indiana. I listened to it carefully from beginning to end, and the impression made upon my mind was that the Senator was speaking here *ex cathedra*. I venture there was not a Senator who listened who did not have the same impression when the Senator had completed his remarks. Now, I say, Senators, this is too serious and vital a matter for us to dispose of upon any such hypothesis as that.

I was saying, when the Senator last interrupted me, that this was simply a practical question of administration. I was saying that the President of the United States has a right to his opinion about it and the Senator from Indiana certainly has a right to his opinion; but let us look at the question itself,

divested, if you please, of all this extraneous talk about war and peace, about loyalty and disloyalty, as to the friends of the Navy and the opponents of the Navy—let us divest it of all of that and look at it as a practical question. Every Senator who has any knowledge of this subject knows that the building of great navies has been a slow process of evolution. Ships that are valuable to-day may, ten years from now, be of absolutely no use. We have saved money and gained by the experience of other countries very largely by not building an immense number of ships. As I said on yesterday, I remember on this floor hearing a discussion after the opening of the great contest between Japan and Russia, in which it was stated that every naval authority took it for granted that we would have to build no more large ships, but that we would build instead more torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers. The President of the United States, in the message which he sent here two or three years ago, recommended that we build one battle ship a year, recognizing the difficulties in the way of arriving at a type which would be valuable to us through all time. He has changed his mind, as he undoubtedly had a right to.

Now, let us look at this question a little further. Is there any reason at this time why we should provide for four battle ships? The legislative power of the Congress of the United States does not cease when the roll is called upon this amendment. If any clouds should darken the sky of our peaceful prosperity, if Congress were not in session, how long would it take the President of the United States to summon a special session of Congress to provide, not for two battle ships, but for as many as were necessary to meet the emergencies which might arise? It will take three years at least to build any of these ships. The cloud which the Senators see in the skies will disappear from even their vision long before any such contingency will arise. Does either of these Senators, who have suddenly become so learned in naval matters, believe that the type of these ships is to be the ultimate type which is to be adopted by the naval authorities and by the governments of the world?

I have not yet heard one single argument why two ships will not do as well as four. Now, there is another side to this question, and I propose to detain the Senate but a very short time in calling attention to that side, because while I believe that patriotism and love of country and devotion to national interests should first control the acts of an American Senator, still there is another side, which we are bound to take into consideration if we discharge our duty. Since the Spanish-American war we have had an era of extravagance in expenditures. There has been apparently little limit to appropriations and expenditures. With prosperity, a degree of prosperity that the world has never before known, our revenues mounted higher and higher every month, and we evidently, and perhaps naturally, thought there was no limit and should be no limit to our appropriations for the public service.

But a change has taken place. The revenues of the country are falling off. The deficiency in the month of April will be more than \$11,000,000. The deficiency for the present fiscal year will be at least \$60,000,000. What is the duty of Congress in this emergency? The appropriation bills now in this Chamber or in the other provide for an increase of appropriations over those made last year of a hundred and four million dollars; and the end is not yet. There is a public buildings bill, which will probably pass, which may add \$20,000,000 to that, making an increase of appropriations in this fiscal year over the last of a hundred and twenty-four million dollars, and this with a deficiency in revenue this year of \$60,000,000.

What do Senators propose to do about this? There is a suggestion made, which I imagine may eventuate in some results, that the committees of the two Houses shall in the near future, with a view of revising our revenue laws, consider the tariff and the revenues of the country. If such a committee is appointed, as things now stand and with the rapidity of increases in the expenditures, the principal duty of that committee will be to find new sources of revenue for the Government. New sources of taxation must be found, or the present revenue-producing taxes and custom duties must necessarily be increased.

I call the attention of the members of this body to that serious situation. If I thought that the peace of the United States or its honor or the welfare of the American Navy depended upon these additional battle ships, I would not hesitate to vote for two or twenty. But there is no such question here, gentlemen. No man will rise in this body and say, and there is no member of the executive branch of the Government who will say, we are to have any war within the next two or three years or at any other time in the near future. I do not say by that

that war is impossible. It is not necessary to say that. I say it is very improbable. We can not compete with Great Britain in a navy. There is no reason why we should. The efficiency of our Navy is of more consequence than its size. Every man who listens to me knows that. Four battle ships will add \$8,000,000 per annum to the ordinary expenses of the Navy for their maintenance. Eight million dollars more per annum at least should be added for repairs and depreciation. This authorization means, then, \$16,000,000 added every year to the amount raised by taxes to be paid by the people of the United States, for what purpose? To prepare for possible conflicts which, in my judgment, will never occur except in the fancy or imagination of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is with great reluctance that I detain the Senate, because I know that Senators are anxious to vote upon this question, and I realize the patience with which the Senator in charge of the bill has conducted the debate and would not willingly abuse. But I feel that it is merely justice to myself that I should give my reasons for the vote which I am about to cast on this question.

I shall vote for the four ships, but I should be very sorry to have it supposed that my reasons for that vote were some of those which have been put forward in the debate here in order to induce votes in that direction. Therefore I have felt it necessary to explain briefly why I shall give my vote for four ships.

I do not think, Mr. President, that I need to protest my interest in the Navy of the United States. I may be permitted to say, however, that it did not begin with the introduction of this bill in the House of Representatives a month ago, nor with this debate. Before I ever came to Congress, owing to certain strong personal ties, I had a very deep interest in the Navy, and my convictions of public policy, uniting with my personal inclinations, have always led me to support the Navy in every direction in which it was possible for me to do so.

I was not in Congress when the new Navy began, for the new Navy was begun under the Administration of President Arthur, when on the recommendation of Secretary Chandler the 20 per cent limitation of repairs was put on, thus preventing the continued rebuilding of the old and worthless wooden ships. The 20 per cent limitation ended that. In the Administration of President Arthur we built the first three ships of the new Navy—the *Chicago*, the *Boston*, and the *Atlanta*. The *Boston* served with distinction in the battle of Manila, and all three ships are on the active list of the Navy to-day.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. McCREARY. Is it not true that in the Fiftieth Congress the first appropriation was made for a battle ship in the United States?

Mr. LODGE. The first appropriation for a battle ship properly so called was made in 1890. I was on the committee which framed the appropriation. It was when Mr. Harrison was President and Mr. Tracy was Secretary of the Navy. I was on the committee which framed the appropriation for the first three seagoing coast-defense battle ships, heavily armored ships—the *Massachusetts*, the *Indiana*, and the famous *Oregon*.

Mr. McCREARY. I desire to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I remember very well when Mr. Herbert was chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, and during Cleveland's Administration an appropriation was made for the first battle ship that was authorized to be constructed. That was in the Fiftieth Congress.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is entirely mistaken. Mr. Herbert was Secretary of the Navy under Mr. Cleveland's second Administration. The *Massachusetts* and the *Indiana*, all good for the line of battle to-day, were authorized in 1890. I myself helped to frame the bill.

Mr. McCREARY. I refer to the first Administration.

Mr. LODGE. In President Cleveland's first Administration Mr. Whitney was Secretary of the Navy. He was a strong and good friend of the Navy. No battle ship, properly so called, was built under that Administration; but the Navy was advanced and some large armored cruisers were built.

Mr. PERKINS. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts wishes to have the record correct. He is not correct. In 1886 Congress authorized the building of the battle ship *Texas* and the battle ship *Maine*.

Mr. LODGE. I was going to say, when the Senator interrupted me, that under Mr. Whitney they built the *Texas*, which was classed erroneously as a battle ship, which was a failure and is to-day practically worthless. The *Maine* was another armored cruiser. They were armored cruisers. They

were not true battle ships and their description as "second-class battle ships" is meaningless. The point is really of no consequence. I am not reflecting upon Mr. Whitney's administration of the Navy. He was a good Secretary and did everything he could to advance the interests of the Navy.

Mr. McCREARY. I agree with the Senator from California in his statement that the first appropriation was made in 1886, and Mr. Cleveland was President at that time. I do not like to be personal, but I happened to be in the chair, presiding in the House of Representatives, when the amendment to the naval appropriation bill was offered and I can not be mistaken about it. It was in 1886.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. I am not able to throw any particular light upon the exact time when the first battle ship was constructed, but I happen to have before me a statement of the expenditures of the Navy, which it occurs to me does throw some light upon when the new Navy began. It shows that in the Fiftieth Congress, in 1888, the naval expenditures were increased from \$16,489,000 to \$26,263,000 in round figures.

The Senator from Massachusetts, of course, as I assume, did not intend to cast any unnecessary reflection upon the battle ship *Texas*. If he did, I invite his attention to the unparalleled record of that ship in the battle of Santiago.

Mr. LODGE. The conduct of the *Texas* in the battle of Santiago had nothing to do with the value of the ship. American sailors would fight well on a raft.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. One moment. I should like to finish what I was saying. The *Texas* was built on English plans, which were bought by the Secretary of the Navy at that time. She never was a good ship. She did good service at Santiago unquestionably. She is completely obsolete now, and any inquiry of the Department will satisfy Senators that she never was a first-rate ship. I am not saying this to reflect upon anybody. I was here when Mr. Whitney was Secretary of the Navy. He was an excellent Secretary of the Navy. He promoted the Navy in every possible way. But the new Navy did not begin then. It began absolutely with the well-known limitation with respect to the old wooden ships, and the first three new modern ships were the *Chicago*, the *Boston*, and the *Atlanta*—all in the Navy to-day. The *Texas* and *Maine* were not battle ships under the proper definition of the term, but the *Maine* was a good ship according to the standard of that time.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator from Massachusetts now permit me?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I want to state that I do not think the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] intended to reflect on anyone, but I also think he is mistaken when he says the *Texas* and the *Maine* were not battle ships. They were built and classed as second-class battle ships, and they have been so rated ever since. If you will consult—

Mr. LODGE. I have here a list of the battle ships of the United States, and if the Senator will point out to me the *Texas* among them—

Mr. MONEY. It may have been dropped out as the Senator says, as a worthless ship, or it may not have been included in this rating. But I want to say that the *Texas* was built under peculiar circumstances. The fact is that the plans for the *Texas* were brought over here from England, after having been twice submitted to two foreign nations and rejected. The plans were fought over in the Bureau of Construction by the different engineers of the United States, and Mr. Bowles, a young engineer, who afterwards rose to great distinction, advocated the building of the *Texas* from those plans, and his view was contested by all the older officers. Secretary Whitney concluded to accept Bowles's judgment, and he accepted the plans, and paid for them. He said:

Since you have advocated this plan, I will make you responsible for it, and make you build the ship.

It has been told to me very frequently, and I believe it, although I do not know whether it is true or not, that when Bowles began to consider the question of flotation connected with the plans accepted he thought he had undertaken too much, and he caused the skimming, as they term it, of the timbers and scantling of the ship. When she went into Hampton Roads she struck an obstruction and her bottom "buckled up." She has been repaired two or three times since.

I want to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts, who is well informed generally, to the fact that Captain Glass, who commanded the *Texas* in 1898, said there was not a better fighting ship in our American Navy. Whether she has

been dropped from the rating of battle ships I do not know. But she was in the naval registry as a second-class battle ship.

I am obliged to the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I did not rise to discuss the history of the *Texas*, which is a very unimportant point. It is a ship universally known to be a failure. I meant simply to refer to the past as indicating my own interest in the Navy and as in part explaining why I shall vote in favor of the four-ships amendment.

I do not so vote because I apprehend war. I know of no menace or threat of war now impending over the United States. I am aware of no war cloud on the horizon. No one has informed me of any danger of war, either in my capacity as Senator or as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not think there is any cause to apprehend war with any people or that we have any reason to expect that anyone will make war upon us.

I am quite aware, without laying any special claim to erudition, that wars often come unexpectedly. I am also aware that history shows that some wars have been expected and prepared for. It is no answer to the statement I am making, of my personal belief and judgment, that wars occur suddenly. Men can only judge from the conditions known to them. I do not know of any cause to apprehend war at this time, and I should be very sorry to have it supposed that I was voting for four battle ships, which it will take three years to build, because I expect war or think the country is menaced by war.

I am quite aware, as I have said, that wars arise unexpectedly, and also that wars are expected and prepared for. I know of the dangers which exist in this country from the outbreak of citizens in given localities and of the prevalence in certain quarters of what is to me the monstrous idea that one State can disregard treaty obligations and plunge forty-five other States into war and that the United States has nothing to say about it.

Mr. President, I realize the danger which arises from that mistaken state of feeling; but yet I do not believe that there is any present danger of war in that direction. But there is no question that the talk about war is liable to produce a situation from which war may come. If I thought war was near us, I should not for one moment think of predicting it or suggesting it on this floor. I should endeavor to the extent of my poor ability to get the Senate to make provision for a war which I believed imminent, and should say as little about it in public as possible. Incessant talk and hinting at indications of danger from one country or another country is the way very often that the unexpected war is stimulated and brought on. There is only one thing more ill advised and mischievous, and that is to sneer at other countries by name and explain that they would not dare to go to war with us or are too poor to do so.

I do not reflect on any country. I do not suggest that war is coming from this quarter or from that; nor do I belittle or sneer at any country by doing so. It is wise also to bear in mind what Hamlet said when he swore his friends to secrecy:

You * * * never shall,
With arms encumber'd thus, or this head-shake,
Or by pronouncing of some doubtful phrase,
As "Well, well, we know," or "We could, an' if we would,"
Or "If we list to speak," or "There be, an' if they might,"
Or such ambiguous giving out, to note
That you know aught of me.

Mr. President, I think that sort of indication, or mysterious hinting at, that shaking the head and looking wise has very frequently just as much effect in giving the impression of the danger of war as the direct statement, and I feel strongly inclined at the moment to go on with Hamlet's speech and say as he says a moment later:

Rest, rest, perturbed spirit!

Mr. President, wars are fostered and brought on by loose talk about the dangers of war, and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, who takes some pains to keep himself informed on such subjects, I want to disclaim any such idea in any vote that I give.

Also, Mr. President, I do not want it supposed that I vote as I do because I think our Navy weak or insufficient. I do not agree with the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] that we have eleven obsolete ships. We have some ships begun in 1890 that are not in speed and in improvements up to the standard of the ships built last year. There is no doubt about that. But those ships in 1890, I am told on the best naval authority, are perfectly able to take their place in the battle line to-day. When Senators make that statement about obsolete ships they seem to forget that the lists of ships of other

countries represent ships built during a period of years just like our own, and when you are comparing navy with navy it does not do to start with the assumption that the enemy's fleet is made up entirely of ships built last year while some of ours date back to 1890.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. PILES. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if in his judgment this Government would build any more ships of the type of the eleven to which I referred?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know what eleven the Senator referred to.

Mr. PILES. I had a list of them here yesterday.

Mr. LODGE. I will take the oldest ships—

Mr. PILES. Take the ships—

Mr. LODGE. The *Oregon*, the *Indiana*, and *Massachusetts*. Our Navy Department thinks those vessels are good enough to spend a half a million apiece on them in order to repair them.

Mr. PILES. I am not discussing that question.

Mr. LODGE. Very well. Then, they must be of some value. I am talking of the very oldest ships on the list. I say those three ships—and I say it on good naval authority—are fit to take their position in battle line to-day, and they carry very heavy guns.

Mr. PILES. That was not the question. I am asking whether the Government would build any more ships of that type. I do not mean to say that some of those ships are not in condition to take their place, for what they are worth, or would not be useful to a certain extent. But when I suggest that the ships are of an obsolete type I mean that the Government would not build any more ships of that type, in view of the character of ships that the other nations of the world are building.

Mr. LODGE. No one proposes to build ships of the *Oregon* or *Indiana* type. Those were the best types of that day. They are still useful, effective ships, fit for the battle line. We want now to have the corresponding type built that is the best possible type to-day. My point is that other navies extend over an equal period of years. Other navies are not made up of *Dreadnoughts* built last year. They range from ships of 1890 down to ships of last year.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me? I do not want to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I yield; certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. With respect to the eleven ships referred to, I will ask the Senator if it is not true that they are chiefly useful now for coast defense purposes?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know what the eleven ships referred to are.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The *Alabama*, *Illinois*, *Indiana*, *Kearsarge*, *Kentucky*, *Maine*, *Massachusetts*, *Oregon*, *Wisconsin*, and so forth.

Mr. LODGE. Some of those ships whose names the Senator has read are first-class battle ships, as good as any in the world.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit a further inter-rrogatory?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There is not a single one of those battle ships that is of 12,000 tons except the *Maine*, which is 12,500 tons. Some of them are as low as 10,300 tons.

Mr. LODGE. I am aware of that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator, I hope, does not think, because my information from high naval authority is to the contrary, that they are equal to the best battle ships of the world?

Mr. LODGE. Well, Mr. President, I do not intend to compete in naval knowledge with the Senator from Indiana. I have studied it for a great many years, and I can only give my best judgment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. LODGE. I shall go on when the Senator is through.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I wish to ask a question, if the Senator does not object to being interrupted.

Mr. LODGE. No; the Senator can ask any question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. With of course only the limited knowledge that I have on this subject, but which I acquired directly and quite recently from the highest naval authority in this country, I understand that all the ships I have named are of an out-of-date type, and further that of these the *Alabama*, *Indiana*, *Iowa*, *Maine*, *Massachusetts*, and *Oregon* are not with the fleet but are being overhauled.

Mr. LODGE. They are now being repaired.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Is it not true that the *Massachusetts*, which the Senator from Maine said yesterday was with the fleet on its cruise, is now dismantled in the navy-yard?

Mr. LODGE. On the *Indiana* the repairs are nearly completed. I think the other two are under repair.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall not interrupt the Senator further at this time. I have the information myself directly and immediately, which I shall present later.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this argument proceeds as if the navies of the rest of the world had no ships of types that have been improved, as if they had nothing but ships built last year. Their fleets extend over a similar period.

Moreover, it is by no means a settled fact that the ship of great size is going to prove the best fighting ship. Admiral Capps and Admiral Converse, both men of great experience and knowledge—I think superior, probably, as experts to anyone here—said in the Senate committee hearings that they would as lief command the *South Carolina* and *Michigan* as a *Dreadnought*, and could make, in their judgment, as good a fight with them. It is by no means a proved case for the big ship, although I favor the *Dreadnoughts*.

The point I am making is that the idea that our Navy is an insufficient navy is a complete mistake. Take it and compare it ship by ship with the navies of the world to-day. Of course I bar England. England builds her navy on what is known as the "two-power standard." Her standard is that she shall more than equal the combined navies of any two powers in the world. We of course have never intended to rival the British standard. I believe, as a very conservative and sensible Senator said to me yesterday, who will probably vote differently from myself on this bill, that "we should not attempt to have a navy as big as England, but we should always have a navy a little better and more powerful than that of any other country." That, I believe, is the condition of the American Navy to-day.

When the President made his recommendation of one battle ship a year, about which so much has been said, he was making that recommendation under the conditions then existing, and is not in the least inconsistent in what he now recommends. That was before the introduction of the large ships familiarly known as the *Dreadnought* class. It is the introduction of the big ships which has changed the naval situation. It is not that the American Navy as a whole is not strong; is not, as foreign observers and native experts alike testify, one of the best in the world. It is because in that particular type of ship we are as yet not up to the other powers, and that is the ground on which I desire to put my vote.

We have two *Dreadnoughts* building. We authorize here two more. I should be glad to see that authorization raised to four for the purpose of making that branch of the Navy proportionately strong with the rest of the list. I want to keep the Navy just where it is, better and more powerful than that of any other power except England; and I do not want to do it, Mr. President, because I think there is war impending or that we have got to look for trouble in some distant ocean. I do it, as I have always supported all the ships for the Navy, because I think it is a great measure of peace.

The Senator from Indiana said yesterday that to appropriate all this money—I wrote the words down at the moment—would be to "filch it from the pockets of the people if there was no danger of war." Mr. President, if there was danger of war it would be simply folly to sit here debating about a naval programme which it will take three years to carry out. The business of the Senate and of the Congress of the United States under those conditions would be to give the Government twenty or thirty millions and let them go out into the world and buy any *Dreadnoughts* they could find in any yard. That would be a war measure.

The purpose of this programme, and the only reason that such a programme can have, is because some of us believe very strongly that the Navy is a guaranty of peace and that if it had not been for our building up a strong navy we might have been involved in war before.

I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that the mere presence of a navy perhaps never prevented a specific war, but there is not any doubt in the world in my mind that the English fleet has meant peace for England—so much so that she has not had a serious war since the battle of Waterloo. If it had not been for her navy she would have been attacked again and again and her colonies would have been torn from her.

It is the same way, Mr. President, with our two great coasts. I believe that a navy second only to that of England is necessary for the preservation of the peace of the United States. I

place my vote on no other ground. I deprecate any debate which reflects in the remotest way on friendly nations, which would intimate in any way that we are building ships in order to fight somebody in the future. Nothing could tend to bring on the very war that we do not want more than such challenges as that. There are abundant reasons and good reasons now, in my judgment, for making our Navy powerful, for increasing it particularly in this branch of the *Dreadnoughts*, without rising up here to flutter the wings of war in the faces of the other nations of the earth.

Mr. President, I wish to disclaim any knowledge which would lead me to vote war appropriations for the Navy. I have not sought to pry into the confidence of the Executive. I do not think that his special message was lightly sent. I believe it was sent with a grave sense of responsibility. I know no more about it than all the world or than those who heard it read, and I give it very great weight, indeed.

One hundred years ago, Mr. President, a distinguished predecessor of mine in this Chamber, who was subsequently President of the United States, when a Democratic President sent in a message recommending a warlike measure, broke from his own party and said, "The President recommends this on his high responsibility. I would not debate. I would not deliberate. I would act." The Democrats at that time received the adhesion of this eminent Federalist without any disturbance of feeling about Executive usurpation, and welcomed his support of Mr. Jefferson on that measure.

I think, Mr. President, that without exaggerating Executive power unduly, but recognizing merely that the Executive is necessarily charged with the conduct of our naval affairs and has a knowledge of our relations with foreign countries which in the nature of things can not be communicated to anyone probably but the Secretary of State, it may be properly said that the recommendation of the President should lead us all to give great weight to what he advises, as I most certainly do. His words have great influence upon my action.

But, Mr. President, I take what he says and what he recommends as he says it, and I do not take it through any interpreter. To that message I give great weight. To my own belief as to the necessity of enlarging this branch of the Navy I give even more weight. For these reasons I shall vote for four battle ships.

But I wish, Mr. President, once again and in reiteration to disclaim all sympathy with this talk of war impending here and there. I think it is mischievous internationally, and very dangerous. I dislike references to other friendly powers, whether in alarm or, what is even worse, in contempt. If we have to go into questions like that, this is not the arena for it. I do not believe, according to the best knowledge that I can get, that there is any ground for such dismal prophecies of war or for rumors of war. I prefer to place my vote on what seem to me grounds which are relative and reasonable at all seasons, which imply neither alarm nor contempt, which reflect on no one, and which are entirely valid and proper at this moment in a time of profound and, I believe, uninterrupted peace.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, every patriotic American believes in a great, strong navy. He believes in having ships equal to those of any other nation, with guns and other equipment equal to those belonging to any other nation. Armed and with officers and men who are American citizens, that navy is invincible.

I believed, Mr. President, from my cursory examination of the legislation and my knowledge of the work of the Committee on Naval Affairs during many years past, that we had a pretty good navy until we heard the speech yesterday of my friend from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] and my friend from the State of Washington [Mr. PILES]. Their criticisms of the Committee on Naval Affairs struck me very forcibly. For thirty years the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. HALE] has been a member of one branch or the other of Congress, and during those thirty years he has been a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Every bill proposing an appropriation for the building up of the Navy during that time has received his assent or has been presented to Congress by him. I am reminded of a passage I once read in the good Book of Books, which reads:

Let not him that girdeth on his armor boast himself as he that putteth it off.

And so with my friends who have recently come into Congress. With more ability perhaps than the members of the Naval Committee, they have not given this subject-matter perhaps the same consideration that your Committee on Naval Affairs have given to it.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. PERKINS. With pleasure.

Mr. PILES. I should like to inquire of the Senator from California what criticism I made of the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. PERKINS. By their inaction in not giving four battle ships instead of two.

Mr. PILES. I made no criticism of the Naval Committee.

Mr. PERKINS. By inference, certainly.

Mr. PILES. I have no objection to the Senator voting against four battle ships if he thinks they are unnecessary, but I do object to the Senator putting something in my mouth which I did not say or endeavoring to make it appear that I have criticised the Naval Committee of the Senate. I made no criticism of the Naval Committee. I stated the reasons why I concluded to vote for four battle ships, and if that is criticism of the Naval Committee I am unable to understand it.

Mr. PERKINS. I am very sorry I misunderstand the Senator. I am glad to know he approves of the action of the Committee on Naval Affairs and that by inference he will now vote with the committee.

Mr. PILES. I have not said that I approved of the conduct of the Committee on Naval Affairs in reporting four battle ships. I did not consider it was my place to criticize the Committee on Naval Affairs any more than I considered it the duty of the Senator from California to criticize Senators who have lately taken their seats in this body.

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly I am not criticising anyone adversely, but I want to commend the labor of the Committee on Naval Affairs in the Senate, of all excepting myself, for I have had the honor of being a member of that committee for fifteen years, and during that time there has been no minority report ever presented to Congress. They have taken up the question, giving it every consideration possible, and the result of their investigations and deliberations has been what they believed to be for the best interests of the Navy and the honor of our country.

The Senator from Washington certainly pictured the defenseless condition of the Pacific coast, and it is that, perhaps, which prompts me at this time to make a response to his criticism in that respect. Parenthetically, I want to say I received a letter this morning from a friend in Seattle stating that there were fifteen ships of war anchored in Puget Sound, near the home of my friend from Washington. There were fifteen ships of war there on last Saturday. Certainly, Mr. President, they are not in a very defenseless condition on Puget Sound.

When I became a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs there was not, Mr. President, a single battle ship in commission. As has been stated, the *Texas* had been authorized, the *Maine* had been authorized, and several others had been authorized to be built, but there was not a single one afloat, and none went into commission until the *Maine* went into commission. The *Maine* and *Texas* were commissioned in 1895, the cruiser *New York* in 1893, the *Oregon*, *Massachusetts*, and *Indiana* in 1896, and the *Iowa* and *Brooklyn* in 1897.

In 1893 the naval appropriations amounted to \$23,611,000. We had outlined a programme that had been inaugurated by Secretary Chandler and was carried out by Secretary Whitney and by his successors in office. We believed that plan of developing our Navy would give us one second to none in the world. We believe we have accomplished that, Mr. President, and to-day this bill, instead of \$23,611,000, as it did in 1893, carries \$123,000,000, in round numbers, for the building up of the Navy. In 1893 we rated as the fifth naval power in the world. To-day we are the second naval power in the world, and with ships and armament equal to that of any in the world.

There is one phase of this question which has not been presented here, and that is the number of guns that the ships carry. A ship without guns is as useless as "a painted ship upon a painted ocean," so far as being for offensive or defensive purposes is concerned. The question of the guns has not been spoken of at all. It is the keystone of the efficiency, effectiveness, and power of our Navy.

I want to state the armament of 12 and 13 inch guns on our battle ships that we have and those of Great Britain, France, Germany, and Japan.

Great Britain has built of 12-inch guns 162, 32 13-inch guns, and is building 60 12-inch guns, making a total of 222 guns.

The United States has built 68 12-inch guns, 32 13-inch guns, and is now building 36 12-inch guns, making a total of 136 all told.

France has only 93 all told; Germany has 56 12 and 13 inch guns on her battle ships, building and all told. Japan has, all told, building and built, 68. The United States therefore has more than double the number guns that Japan has. I will place the statement in the RECORD for reference.

The statement referred to is as follows.

Twelve and thirteen inch guns on battle ships.

GREAT BRITAIN.		12-inch.	13-inch.
Built	-----	162	32
Building	-----	60	0
Total	-----	222	32
Grand total, 254.			
UNITED STATES.		12-inch.	13-inch.
Built	-----	68	32
Building	-----	36	0
Total	-----	104	32
Grand total, 136.			
FRANCE.		12-inch.	13-inch.
Built	-----	46	15
Building	-----	32	0
Total	-----	78	15
Grand total, 93.			
GERMANY.		12-inch.	11-inch.
Built (no 12 or 13 inch)	-----	0	56
Building	-----	40	8
Total	-----	40	64
Grand total, 104.			
JAPAN.		12-inch.	13-inch.
Built	-----	40	0
Building	-----	28	0
Total	-----	68	0

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PERKINS. With pleasure.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator from California to say that the United States is the second naval power in the world.

Mr. PERKINS. It is the second naval power in the world.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator whether he thinks she should remain the second naval power in the world?

Mr. PERKINS. I do, Mr. President; and I think we should be proud of that position.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I would like to ask the Senator this question: Suppose Germany to-day has authorized or will authorize four battle ships each year until the year 1917 of the *Dreadnought* type. How does the Senator expect the United States to hold her position as the second naval power in the world if we do not build battle ships equal to the other nations that are now lower than we are in the scale?

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator from Indiana yesterday ventured into the domain of prophecy and it has not redounded, judging from the speech of my friend from Rhode Island, to his credit. My friend from Utah should profit by his example, perhaps, and not prophesy what Germany is going to do. As a matter of fact, she has not authorized those ships. It is a newspaper story and there is no authentic record that she has done so.

Mr. HALE. I will say to the Senator from Utah that we have to-day nothing authentic about the future programme of Germany. We do not yet know what that programme is.

Mr. SMOOT. The reason why I asked the question is because I have been informed, and from a source that I thought was absolutely reliable, that the order for those battle ships has been made, and that they will be built. I may be mistaken. I simply asked the question, basing the question upon the belief that those ships had been ordered and would be built.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PERKINS. With pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will state again that my statement yesterday, which I read from the paper I held in my hand, was furnished to me as an authentic statement from the highest possible authority on naval matters that we can get. I think that the opinion of the world is that that is true.

Now, one point more. The Senator from California says that we are the second naval power in the world.

Mr. PERKINS. I do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask the Senator if that is not arrived at by merely considering tonnage?

Mr. PERKINS. My authority is Lord Brassey's Annual, who is a recognized authority on naval affairs throughout the world. My second authority is that of the Navy Department of the United States Government.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The statement that we are the second naval power in the world I have looked into a little bit in the last forty-eight hours, and the estimate is made merely by placing the respective tonnage of the various nations in amount, we appearing the second. If you remove what is termed by very competent men, who give their lives to the subject—of course, I know nothing about it, as compared with what the Senator from California does, personally—the ships that are now practically obsolete and to be used for coast defense purposes and the other tonnage that is useful for nothing, that place is of course wiped out.

If the third fact be considered—that is to say, if it is true, and it is the weight of all the naval authority I can get hold of (and I am merely stating their opinion), it is recognized all over the world that since the Russo-Japanese war the type of the fighting ship is the *Dreadnought*, or the eighteen and twenty thousand ton ship. Therefore, from that point of view, as a matter of fighting strength and not merely of paper tonnage, we are not the second power in the world, but more nearly the fifth.

On that particular statement I tried to get the opinion this morning, and succeeded in doing so, of what the nation has a right to accept as the most competent naval opinion in the world.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the Senator challenge my statement of the number of guns carried in the battle ships?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not challenge any statement the Senator makes. Any statement the Senator makes I will accept.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly; we want all the light we can get on this subject.

Mr. SMOOT. As far as I am personally concerned, I think a number of our ships are obsolete. I also think that the question of tonnage cuts very little figure in this discussion, for no doubt every other naval power in the world has obsolete ships as well as we.

But what I want to ask the Senator is, if it be true that Germany has ordered the four ships built each year until the year 1917 of the *Dreadnought* type, would the Senator, then, be in favor of the United States building four ships at this time or only two?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I am in favor of the naval programme laid down not only by this Administration, but by the three previous Administrations and carried out by the Committees on Naval Affairs in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate, and approved of generally by the Department; and I want to say that it is approved of by the President, notwithstanding the special message that came in the other day.

In passing I wish to say that I had a feeling at least kindred to resentment when the charge was made by my friend from Indiana yesterday that those who did not vote for four battle ships in accordance with the recommendation of the President and his special message were not loyal to our Government, and certainly did not show a proper respect for the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Navy. Mr. President, no one has greater admiration or respect for the President of the United States than I have. I honor him for his great ability. I honor him for his high character and for his integrity of purpose. Therefore, because we do not agree with him on a simple business proposition as to whether we shall build two or four ships, it is unfair in my friend from Indiana to say that we are not showing proper respect to the Commander in Chief of our Navy.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PERKINS. With pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course the Senator will find that I said no such thing as that. I am not responsible for any—

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator did in his impassioned appeal yesterday. If he did not, then I can not understand the English language.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well; then let the Senator take that as his impression. I will not go into that now, but later. I wish simply to call the attention of the Senator, if he will permit me, to another point.

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Is it so much a question whether we have obsolete ships, as other nations also have obsolete ships, as it is a question whether or not we have ships in proportionate number of the latest type at all comparable to other nations? The Navy, as I take it, in a common-sense view, is not to be reckoned by the number of ships or the tonnage, but by its effective fighting strength compared with that of other nations.

I have before me here, and I do not want to vex the Senator's patience, a list of the most modern battle ships of the other countries of the world and also our own, and according to that statement we are in an uncomfortably inferior position.

Mr. HALE. The Senator has got it all wrong.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have it merely from information that is the highest I can get.

Mr. HALE. So have I.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If the Senator from Maine has higher information, of course I will not dispute it. I must take the best information I can get.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I was about to say that I think I am in full accord with the proposition as to these battle ships. In his message to the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress the President stated as follows:

We have most wisely continued for a number of years to build up our Navy, and it has now reached a fairly high standard of efficiency. This standard of efficiency must not only be maintained, but increased. It does not seem to me necessary, however, that the Navy should—at least in the immediate future—be increased beyond the present number of units. What is now clearly necessary is to substitute efficient for inefficient units as the latter become worn-out or as it becomes apparent that they are useless. Probably the result would be attained by adding a single battle ship to our Navy each year, the superseded or out-worn vessels being laid up or broken up as they are thus replaced.

That we have been doing. The President again stated in his message in the second session of the Fifty-ninth Congress, on December 3, 1906:

I do not ask that we continue to increase our Navy. I ask merely that it be maintained at its present strength, and this can be done if we replace the obsolete and out-worn ships by new and good ones, the equal of any afloat in any navy.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PERKINS. In a moment.

Mr. President, we carried out the President's policy. In 1906 we built two ships, when the President said but one would be necessary, and in 1907 we authorized an appropriation for two ships, when the President said that only one would be necessary. This year we are appropriating for two battle ships in this bill as it comes from the Committee on Naval Affairs. That makes six ships, counting one ship for 1906, one for 1907, and the four he recommends now. Now I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from California has read from the President's messages of former times.

Mr. PERKINS. Only in the last Congress.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The last Congress expired over a year ago. I call the Senator's attention to the fact, as he will see in a moment, that the President in his special message gives the reasons why he departs from that view.

Mr. PERKINS. But have we not already built six ships?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The President thinks we should have four more, or, of course, he would not have sent his special message.

Concerning the other matter about which I am speaking, since the Senator made that point I have received a list of the effective fighting ships of the best type of this and other countries, and that list, which I shall probably refer to later, shows—

Mr. PERKINS. Will the Senator please give me their kinds, the number of guns they carry, and their caliber?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It does not show the guns. It gives the names of the ships and their tonnage. They are along the line of the *Dreadnought* class.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. There is but one ship on the waters of the world of the *Dreadnought* type. That is the British *Dreadnought*. It takes years to construct such a ship. There are talks and rumors about programmes.

The Senator from Indiana cited France. France has adopted no such large programme as the Senator indicates, nor has Germany, and it will be years before any other great ships of

that kind will be put on the waters of the globe. We will get ours on as quickly as any other nation; and when it is assumed that we are behind in this type it is a mistake, for we are no more behind than is any other nation. We are keeping up our Navy, we have kept it up, and will keep it up without being dragged into an extreme and expensive programme at a particular time.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, with the Senator's indulgence—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly. If the committee are wrong on this proposition, we want to be set aright.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think the committee itself will admit that the statement of the Senator from Maine, that there is only one ship in the world of the *Dreadnought* type, is not accurate.

Mr. HALE. On water?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes, sir; on water.

Mr. HALE. Where is she?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In England. The *Temeraire* and the *Bellerophon* are both of heavier tonnage. The ones I named yesterday are building; they are on the stocks or are authorized. France has seven larger than the *Dreadnought*. On the programme for 1908 are six of 21,000 tons.

Mr. HALE. When the Senator talks about programmes he has not got the legally authorized construction. He has merely got the programme.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, the first I mentioned was not merely the programme, but a thing actually in being. So far as the information is concerned, however, it is the same information and from the same source from which the committee itself had to get any information which it got.

But I do not want to take the Senator's time further. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that the Senator was not quite accurate when he said that there was only one *Dreadnought* on the waters, because there are several now, according to this information. The paper I hold in my hand is a careful verification of the statements made from the information I gave yesterday; and, so far as information can be given to the Senate which will command its respect and credence, certainly, if this is not correct, then no correct information can be had. I shall refer to this later. I am very much obliged to the Senator from California for his patience.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, from 1883 to 1892 we made appropriations which were expended in the construction of new vessels amounting to \$49,258,000, as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZED.

1883	\$2,440,000
1885	2,967,000
1886	6,834,000
1887	5,386,000
1888	9,191,000
1889	1,567,000
1890	12,187,000
1891	2,690,000
1892	5,996,000
Total	49,258,000

Since then we have appropriated \$260,101,190, as follows:

Texas:		
Authorized	1886	
Commissioned	1895	
Maine:		
Authorized	1888	
Commissioned	1895	
New York (armored cruiser):		
Authorized	1888	
Commissioned	1893	
Oregon:		
Authorized	1890	
Commissioned	1896	
Massachusetts:		
Authorized	1890	
Commissioned	1896	
Indiana:		
Authorized	1890	
Commissioned	1895	
Iowa:		
Authorized	1892	
Commissioned	1897	
Brooklyn (armored cruiser):		
Authorized	1892	
Commissioned	1897	
Total cost of all vessels built or building	\$309,359,190	
Vessels authorized up to 1893	49,258,000	
Voted on	260,101,190	

The list of the vessels in Admiral Dewey's fleet in the battle of Manila Bay is as follows:

	Tonnage.
Olympia	5,870
Baltimore	4,415
Raleigh	3,133
Boston	3,000
Concord	1,710
Petrel	892

Mr. President, with that navy we won our great battle at Manila. We won our battles with Spain on that appropriation of \$49,000,000 in the construction of new vessels, while since then, as I have said, we have appropriated \$260,101,190. Dewey at Manila had not a single battle ship under his command, and had not, I think, a ship of 6,000 tons. He had the *Olympia*, the *Baltimore*, the *Raleigh*, the *Boston*, the *Concord*, and the *Petrel*, ranging from 5,870 tons down to 892 tons; and yet he won one of the most gallant naval victories in the history of this or any other country.

As to the comparison of the strength of our Navy with that of other nations, I will read from remarks I made in the Senate some few days since, containing statistics which were carefully compiled and which I know to be correct; or they were correct at the time the speech was made, and are so still, unless some other authority, which my friend from Indiana can produce, shall prove the contrary. My statement was:

THE UNITED STATES SECOND IN NAVAL STRENGTH.

It is the opinion of the writer of the above—

That was Lord Brassey—

and of many experienced naval men that the only true basis of comparison is total displacement modified by consideration of age. If this basis is adopted and comparison is made with the naval strength of the other principal nations of the world, the United States is found to be second only to Great Britain. The relative order of tonnage of effective fighting vessels stands as follows:

	Tonnage.
Great Britain	1,633,116
United States	611,616
France	609,079
Germany	529,032
Japan	374,701
Russia	232,943
Italy	207,632
Austria	113,235

According to the Bureau of Navigation, the tonnage of all naval vessels built or building November 1, 1907, shows France in the second place, with 836,112 tons, against 771,758 for the United States, and if we authorize two battle ships of the *Dreadnought* type the figures for the United States will be increased to about 812,000 tons, leaving France still second in tonnage on the sea. But these figures are, in a way, deceptive, for they include coast-defense vessels.

I call my friend's attention to that especially. They are "deceptive, for they include coast-defense vessels"—

which are not designed for cruising, and consequently should not figure in our computation of strength on the high seas. If we eliminate these we shall have 766,666 tons for the United States and 762,812 for France, leaving us still second by a small margin. But if we compute the strength of line-of-battle ships—the true fighting strength of the Navy—including battle ships and armored cruisers, we shall find a still greater margin in our favor.

I challenge my friend to contradict or disprove that statement. It was made up and carefully compiled in the Navy Department, and I believe it to be correct.

Mr. President, we all have but one object in view, that which is for the best interests of the country; and I believe the policy that has been inaugurated in the programme I have outlined is a wise one. The only difference to-day on this whole question is simply as to which is the best business policy.

I will ask the Senator from Indiana a question. I should like to have him remain to answer it now. He brushed aside my inquiry yesterday in regard to the lack of officers. When I said the Secretary of the Navy had testified before the committee of the House of Representatives that we were 1,846 officers short even to officer our present ships, he replied to me that, if we would only promote those we have in the service, it would provide an abundance. I find that we have at the Naval Academy 852 midshipmen, and there are 312 midshipmen at sea, making 1,164 midshipmen all told; and some of them had only been in the Academy a year or less. Even if we should promote every one of them, no one for a moment would contend that they are capable of taking the positions of officers on ship-board, any more than a nurse or an interne in a hospital is capable of taking the place of the chief surgeon or physician of the hospital. No one would for a moment think them capable of it. I want to know how and by what mathematics the Senator can solve this problem and provide sufficient officers for these ships? It is a physical impossibility, even without making allowance for death, resignation, or other cause of depletion.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will answer that only by the information furnished by the Department itself—as I have said time and again I have no personal knowledge on the subject—which is, that if the personnel legislation, which has been urged upon Congress for now, I believe, four or five years and has been the subject of at least two messages from the President—if I am wrong the Senator will correct me—had been passed we should have an abundance of officers. I took occasion yesterday to read somewhat from that message of the President and to cite the crying necessity for additional legislation. I quoted from his message respecting the ages of captains in our Navy and in other navies of the world. I am informed—and, as I say, I can only take that information—that the Department itself thinks that we have an abundance of officers if Congress will only enact the personnel legislation which the Department asks and the President urges, and, further, that by the time these four ships, if we should determine to build them, would be completed we should have plenty of officers graduated from the Naval Academy to command them.

Mr. PERKINS. We only graduate from about 175 to 200 annually from the Academy. It would take nine years even to fill up the present deficiency.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The estimate of the Department, as given me yesterday, was that we would have substantially 800 new graduates that could be made into officers by the time the ships could possibly be completed. That is all I know.

Mr. PERKINS. There is no question, Mr. President, but that there is not an ensign in the Navy who would not like to be promoted to a lieutenant; no lieutenant who would not like to be promoted to a commander; no commander who would not like to be promoted to a captain, and no captain who would not like to be promoted to the grade of admiral; but the question is, Are they qualified to discharge those high and important duties?

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves that, for it is a very interesting point, I should like to know, assuming that all that might be done, where would we get the subordinate officers, except only from the midshipmen, who would then be qualified to hold any kind of commission? As I understood the statement the Senator from California made a few moments ago, it was to the effect that there are, all told, only about 1,100 midshipmen.

Mr. PERKINS. One thousand one hundred and sixty-four.

Mr. FORAKER. Some of those have been in the Academy less than a year, and certainly they would not be qualified for the command of a ship.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Oh, no.

Mr. FORAKER. And I do not see how by this personnel bill we are to work such effective results as an increase of nearly 2,000 in the number of officers necessary to give each ship now in commission a proper complement of officers. It will be remembered that in 1899 we passed a naval personnel bill. It was framed, if I mistake not, in accordance with suggestions from the President. Certainly, as I understood at the time, and have understood ever since, it had his entire approbation; but we have all learned, very much to our regret, that that bill, which it was thought would accomplish this purpose so effectually, has failed to accomplish this purpose, and we are still in the very unsatisfactory situation of having more ships to-day than we have officers to command them, the deficiency being almost 2,000.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Ohio asked me a question. Of course, my only answer to that would be, first, that it is not proposed by any human being that I know of to promote midshipmen to captancies or even to commanderships or anything of that kind—

Mr. FORAKER. I suppose to lieutenants or ensigns.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But to promote them to be officers and then let them go up in the various grades according to experience and seniority and all that sort of thing. I am informed also by the Department that each ship—

Mr. FORAKER. But the point was, if the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, and the Senator from California does not complain, that if we were to promote every midshipman in the Academy, those who have been there less than a year, as well as those who are soon to be graduated from there, we should still be short practically a thousand officers. Where would the necessary number come from? No personnel bill has provided that we shall make commissioned officers in the Navy from civil life.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, the answer to that is the same, of course, that I have made to the Senator from California, that the Department believes that if the naval personnel bill were enacted, there would be an abundance of officers. I

understand that on each one of the ships now on the cruise there are twenty or more midshipmen, and every one of them has completed the course at the Academy.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I am an enthusiast on the increase of the Navy, and my vote and my influence, if I have any, have been toward the building up of the Navy. I claim that we are working on the proper lines in building up a great Navy. From being the fifth in rank when I had the honor of first becoming a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, we have to-day reached the position of the second naval power in the world.

I differ from some of my colleagues as to the advisability of the mission of the fleet to the Pacific coast. I think it was a wise departure from the routine that has heretofore prevailed to send them around to the Pacific coast. It gives an opportunity of maneuvering the ships at sea, of disciplining, and training the officers and men; and the expense is not so much more than it would be if the ships were cruising up and down the Atlantic coast. The only actual extra expense there can be is the cost of transporting coal in colliers to supply the ships on the voyage around to the Pacific coast.

My views on the increase of the Navy have been shared by the members of that committee; and, Mr. President, I want to repeat what I said before, that there has never been a minority report during the eleven years I have been a member of that committee. It has been wholly nonpartisan. Our Democratic friends have vied with the Republicans in voting for measures that would build up our Navy, and to-day the result of our efforts in that line, I think, is apparent on looking at the register of the vessels which we have to-day in the service.

The voyage of the battle ships to the Pacific coast is a wonderful event in the history of our Navy, and I think it has had a good moral influence. Where they stopped at ports in South America there has been evidence of good fellowship and comity between the nations of South America and the United States. I think the cruise of the fleet to the Pacific coast has reflected great credit on the Navy. Their target practice in Magdalena Bay has been of great value. They have demonstrated very high efficiency as marksmen. Their marksmanship has been equaled by that of no navy in the world; indeed it exceeds that of all other navies of which I have any knowledge. I think, when they make the cruise up that coast from San Diego to Puget Sound, that it will be productive of great benefit to the men and officers on those ships; and wherever they may go from there the voyage will be of great benefit, and they will profit by their experience.

The proposition as to whether we shall build two battle ships or four battle ships, Mr. President, as I said before, is simply a question of business policy. I believe it the part of wisdom for us to profit by the mistakes of other countries and benefit by our own experience. The ships that we built twenty years ago have all been stricken off of the list. We have to-day 100 fighting ships of over a thousand tons and none of them over 20 years old. Of course everyone who is conversant with maritime affairs realizes there must be expense each year in keeping them up, but there is no more on ships in active service, with their engines working, their boilers being fired, if they are properly cared for, their electrical appliances and other apparatus being used and kept in order, than there is if they were tied up at navy-yards. With our 38,000 blue jackets and 8,000 marines, 46,000 men in all in the Navy, and our 3,000 officers, it seems to me that they ought to be kept going somewhere on just such a voyage as the fleet is now making.

My friend from the Puget Sound country [Mr. PILES] is fearful that we are in a defenseless condition. I want to say that the Secretary of the Navy informed me that, prior to the arrival of the Atlantic fleet, which consists of 16 battle ships, we had on the Pacific coast 2 battle ships, 8 armored cruisers, 1 harbor-defense vessel, 9 protected cruisers, 3 torpedo-boat destroyers, 5 torpedo boats, and 2 submarines.

Mr. PILES. Let me ask the Senator what battle ships they were?

Mr. PERKINS. The battle ships on the Pacific coast were the *Nebraska* and the *Wisconsin*.

Mr. PILES. The *Wisconsin*, as I understand, was in dry dock for repairs, and the *Nebraska* was just fitting out.

Mr. PERKINS. The *Nebraska* had been built at Puget Sound.

Mr. PILES. It was just completed, and all her crew was not aboard the vessel.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to say, Mr. President, that the Naval Committees in Congress through their recommendations have not neglected the Pacific coast. We have had built on the

Pacific coast the *Nebraska*, the *Ohio*, the *Oregon*, the *Wisconsin*, all first-class battle ships. Of armored cruisers, there were built on the Pacific coast the *California* and the *South Dakota*; and two better ships than the *California* and the *South Dakota* can not be found in the world in the armored-cruiser class. Of the protected cruisers, the *Milwaukee*, the *Olympia*, the *San Francisco*, and the *Tacoma* were built on the Pacific coast; and, in addition to that, we have had submarine vessels, torpedo-boat destroyers, and torpedo boats. The Pacific coast is well protected. If we had 100 more vessels, I do not see how it would avail us if the Commander in Chief should order them to other parts of the world—to Asiatic waters, for instance.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks that our Navy is large enough properly to defend the Atlantic coast and also the Pacific coast?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, we do not use battle ships to defend our coasts. We use them as vessels of offense and defense—offense principally. We have fortified our ports on the Atlantic and we are doing so on the Pacific coast. This year we have appropriated only \$8,000,000 for fortifications and ordnance, while the Department recommended \$38,000,000. I think it is better to put the money into forts and fortifications and submarine torpedoes than it is to put it into battle ships for the defense of ports.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply asked the question for information, and I always get it from the Senator, because I know he has had a great deal of experience along this line.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, with torpedo-boat destroyers, submarine mines, and torpedoes as an auxiliary to our forts, there can be no better defense. San Francisco is one of the best fortified ports in the United States, second only to New York; and we hope to have Puget Sound, where my friend from Washington [Mr. PILES] lives, amply protected. We have provided nearly two and a half million dollars or three million dollars for the fortifications on Puget Sound.

Mr. PILES. The Senator would not say that it is sufficiently fortified at the present time, would he?

Mr. PERKINS. I think it is not, and therefore I cheerfully gave my vote to provide for the proposed fortifications.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator a question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not think I exactly understood the Senator in another part of his speech, and I wish to ask him how many battle ships are there now under construction?

Mr. PERKINS. How many have we all told?

Mr. OVERMAN. How many in process of construction at the present time?

Mr. PERKINS. We have and have under contract twenty-nine battle ships. There are four of those now under construction, which are not completed, or at least not placed in commission. With the completion of the two ships provided for in this naval appropriation bill, we shall have thirty-one battle ships.

Mr. OVERMAN. There are four under construction. Does that include armored cruisers?

Mr. PERKINS. Four battle ships have not yet been commissioned, but are under construction.

Mr. du PONT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. du PONT. I will ask the Senator if he does not think the Pacific coast would be better defended by proper fortifications at Pearl Harbor in the Hawaiian Islands? That would make an admirable naval base.

Mr. PERKINS. I think they would be a valuable auxiliary to the defense of the Pacific coast, Mr. President, and this naval appropriation bill has in it an appropriation of \$1,000,000 to provide a coaling station at Pearl Harbor, in the Island of Oahu, near Honolulu, and we provided in the fortifications bill a liberal appropriation to fortify that island. It is a base of naval supplies, as the Senator from Delaware so pertinently says. It is a base which is of more value to us on the Pacific coast, perhaps, than any other point that I can think of at this time; certainly equal to anything in the Aleutian Islands,

because no nation at war with us could attack the Pacific coast without having some base of supplies and a rendezvous there. That was one of the principal reasons why I voted for liberal appropriations for fortifying the island and for a naval station there. That was one of the reasons why I cast my vote for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States. They have been a source of revenue to us and not a disappointment or a care or an anxiety as the Philippine Islands have been. The Philippine Islands, of course, came to us as the result of a great war. We were very magnanimous in that war. After our Navy had wiped out the Spanish fleet, we sent home to Spain, in our own transports, all of her prisoners, and we paid \$20,000,000 as a peace offering for the Philippines. This great American people has always been magnanimous to a fallen foe.

As has been stated so well by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], there is no more danger of war with any foreign country than there is of our having any other great catastrophe of which there is no warning given to us. I believe, Mr. President, that this naval appropriation bill is a liberal one and meets the approval of the people generally. I believe that the construction of two battle ships will carry out the programme we have heretofore planned and will be productive of the very best results.

I want to say, in regard to the cruise of our ships to foreign countries, that I look upon the voyage of this great naval fleet not only as promoting good fellowship and comity between the nations, but as promoting respect for the American flag. When as a sailor boy I reached a foreign port and saw, as I did see, the Stars and Stripes waving over the office of the American consul, I felt almost as Moses did when he drew near the burning bush, that I had gazed upon holy ground. By the narrow policy our Government has pursued toward our merchant ships we have virtually wiped them off the sea, and to-day it is well for us and well for the honor of our country that we should send our naval ships into foreign ports, so that other nations may see, honor, and respect our flag.

This bill also has been liberal to the officers of the Navy and the men. It has increased the pay of the officers of the Navy one-fifth—20 per cent—more than we have been paying them. It increases the pay of the men of the Navy 10 per cent. It offers prizes, and in that respect we have followed England. England appropriated £5,000 or more last year for prizes for marksmanship. I believe that instead of increasing the appropriation so as to provide for four battle ships we should put the money into new guns and the improvement of our navy-yards, as we have already done in respect to the appropriation for the Bremerton navy-yard. I believe in building up every navy-yard in the country and in improving our coaling stations. We have provided in this bill for building one of the battle ships in a navy-yard and one of the colliers in a navy-yard, to be built of American material by American mechanics, built under the Stars and Stripes, vessels which shall carry the colors of our country to foreign countries, where people must respect it if they know the great power that is back of it.

In this discussion our friends, including the Senator from Indiana, have not made one reference to the great Hague Conference. We twice there tried to do away with war. We believe in arbitration. The President has sent to us from time to time arbitration treaties. At the Hague Conference twenty-eight nations signed conventions to commit differences of certain classes to arbitration rather than to appeal to arms. Only a few years ago a treaty submitted to arbitration a question of the greatest and most vital importance to this nation, especially to us of the great Northwest, and that was with respect to the boundary line between Alaska and Canada. It was a question which greatly agitated the minds of our people. If it had not been for the wise counsel of that Commission, of which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was a member, which went to London and arrived at a decision satisfactory to both parties, dire results might have eventuated. It was reason, it was deliberation, it was patriotism, it was love of our country and our institutions and humanity that caused us to submit the question to arbitration. It resulted in benefit to us all.

So I believe, instead of increasing our Navy more than we have under this programme, we should carry out that which has been recommended by your committee, after weeks of consideration. It has been charged by one of those who oppose our programme that we have not deliberated over it, that we had the bill before us only a few days. As a matter of fact, it was under consideration for weeks and weeks. The Book of Estimates has been before us; the communications from the Navy Department have been submitted to us; and, after considering

every recommendation made by the President and the Secretary of the Navy and by the different bureaus of the Navy Department, we have formulated this bill and presented it to you for your consideration. I submit the question to the Senate. I know the Senate believes that the Committee on Naval Affairs, if it has erred, has committed an error of judgment only, and that it has so framed the bill that, in its opinion, the best results will be attained by carrying out its recommendations and, so believing, will sustain the action of your committee.

I will not weary the Senate by recurring to the matter in detail, but with the permission of the Senate will place in the Record the list of ships on the Pacific coast.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Battle ships, armored cruisers, protected cruisers, torpedo vessels, and coast-defense vessels of the United States Navy on the Pacific coast January 20, 1908.

Vessel.	Normal displacement.	Speed on trial.	Probable date could be made ready for active service.
Battle ships:	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Knots.</i>	
Nebraska.....	14,948	19.06	Now in commission.
Wisconsin.....	11,552	17.17	April 15, 1908.
Armored cruisers:			
California.....	13,680	22.20	Now in commission.
Colorado.....	13,680	22.24	Do.
Maryland.....	13,680	22.41	Do.
Pennsylvania.....	13,680	22.44	Do.
South Dakota.....	13,680	22.24	January 27, 1908.
Tennessee.....	14,500	22.16	Now in commission.
Washington.....	14,500	22.27	Do.
West Virginia.....	13,680	22.15	Do.
Harbor-defense monitors:			
Wyoming.....	3,225	11.80	May 1, 1908.
Protected cruisers:			
Albany.....	3,430	20.50	Now in commission.
Boston *.....	3,000	15.60	July 1, 1908.
Charleston.....	9,700	22.04	Now in commission.
Chicago.....	4,500	18.00	Do.
Cincinnati *.....	3,188	19.00	July 1, 1908.
Milwaukee.....	9,700	22.22	Now in commission.
New Orleans.....	3,430	20.00	March 1, 1908.
Raleigh *.....	3,188	19.00	July 1, 1908.
St. Louis.....	9,700	22.13	Now in commission.
Torpedo-boat destroyers:			
Paul Jones.....	420	28.91	July 1, 1908.
Perry.....	420	28.32	Now in commission.
Preble.....	420	28.03	Do.
Torpedo boats:			
Davis.....	154	23.41	February 1, 1908.
Farragut.....	279	30.13	Do.
Fox.....	154	23.13	Do.
Goldsborough.....	255	27.40	April 1, 1908.
Rowan.....	210	27.07	Do.
Submarines:			
Grampus.....	107	8.00	May 1, 1908.
Pike.....	107	8.00	Do.

* Condition of vessel such as to restrict her movements and affect her speed.

The armament of these vessels is contained on pages 138, 146, 150, 156, 158, 184, 190, and 192 of the Annual Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, 1907, transmitted herewith.

Protected cruisers, torpedo vessels, and coast-defense vessels of the United States Navy in Asiatic waters January 20, 1908.

Vessel.	Normal displacement.	Speed on trial.	Probable date could be made ready for active service.
Coast-defense vessels:	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Knots.</i>	
Monadnock.....	3,990	12.00	In reserve at Olongapo.
Monterey.....	4,084	13.00	Can be made ready for service at short notice.
Denver.....	3,200	16.65	Now in commission.
Protected cruisers:			
Chattanooga.....	3,200	16.45	Do.
Cleveland.....	3,200	16.75	Do.
Galveston.....	3,200	16.41	Do.
Torpedo-boat destroyers:			
Bainbridge.....	420	28.45	February 1, 1908.
Barry.....	420	28.13	Now in commission.
Chauncey.....	420	28.64	Do.
Dale.....	420	28.00	Do.
Decatur.....	420	28.10	Do.

The armament of these vessels is contained on pages 152, 158, and 184 of the Annual Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, 1907, transmitted herewith.

Mr. BURROWS obtained the floor.
Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BURROWS. Does the Senator from Oklahoma desire to take the floor?

Mr. OWEN. No, sir; except for a moment.

Mr. BURROWS. I yield.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to say that in view of the number of speeches that are yet to be on the bill this afternoon, desiring to be heard with regard to the matter before it is disposed of, I should like to have the opportunity on Monday of being heard on this measure, if it meets the approval of the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. The chairman of the committee who has the bill in charge is not present, and I suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that he make his request later on, in the presence of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, were it not for the fact that I am conscious of a difference of opinion among the people of my own State and in the country generally in relation to the question as to the number of new battle ships to be authorized, I should not care to be heard for a moment. But in view of this division in my State and in the country, I desire to set forth briefly the reasons which will control me in voting against the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] to increase the number of battle ships to be constructed from two to four. As a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I joined in the report, which, so far as I know, was unanimous in favor of the authorization of but two battle ships at this time.

Before any Senator can determine this question with any degree of satisfaction to himself it will be necessary to call to mind what the strength of our Navy is to-day and then consider the sufficiency of the reasons assigned for this proposed increase. As to the present strength of the Navy, I present the official statement of the Secretary of the Navy, taken from his last annual report and summarized in a table which I will ask to have inserted in my remarks without reading. The heading to this table is as follows:

Cost of all vessels of the new Navy.

STATEMENT SHOWING COST OF EACH COMPLETED BATTLE SHIP, ARMORED CRUISER, PROTECTED CRUISER, AND UNPROTECTED CRUISER BUILT UNDER APPROPRIATIONS FOR INCREASE OF THE NAVY TO JUNE 30, 1907.

	Hull and machinery, including armor.	Equipage, including armament.	Total.
BATTLE SHIPS (23).			
Texas.....	\$3,638,284.99	\$563,836.50	\$4,202,121.49
Indiana.....	5,333,708.05	649,683.93	5,983,371.98
Massachusetts.....	5,401,844.97	645,272.98	6,047,117.95
Oregon.....	5,914,021.90	661,010.86	6,575,032.76
Iowa.....	5,162,587.12	708,619.20	5,871,206.32
Kearsarge.....	4,429,890.69	613,700.99	5,043,591.68
Kentucky.....	4,418,094.99	580,924.44	4,999,019.43
Alabama.....	4,077,010.09	588,810.13	4,665,820.22
Wisconsin.....	4,162,617.53	561,276.75	4,723,894.28
Illinois.....	4,073,429.26	547,970.56	4,621,408.82
Maine.....	4,506,642.69	814,439.09	5,321,081.78
Missouri.....	4,438,925.08	819,335.47	5,258,260.55
Ohio.....	4,475,190.32	790,129.39	5,265,309.71
Connecticut.....	6,343,731.81	1,323,875.12	7,667,606.93
Kansas.....	6,018,320.94	1,052,822.54	7,071,143.48
Louisiana.....	5,906,787.76	1,003,321.50	6,910,109.26
Minnesota.....	5,886,708.61	1,046,559.96	6,933,268.57
Vermont.....	6,027,361.76	896,168.34	6,923,530.10
Georgia.....	5,525,068.50	923,583.14	6,448,676.64
Nebraska.....	5,373,456.82	817,115.91	6,190,572.73
New Jersey.....	5,364,678.09	1,072,922.98	6,437,601.07
Rhode Island.....	5,343,450.55	1,092,023.88	6,435,474.43
Virginia.....	5,438,089.56	1,051,993.05	6,535,082.61
Total.....	117,364,917.08	18,824,485.71	136,189,402.79
ARMORED CRUISERS (8).			
Brooklyn.....	3,944,820.73	478,969.36	4,423,790.09
New York.....	3,897,840.32	448,802.07	4,346,642.39
Colorado.....	4,831,408.00	860,201.59	5,691,609.59
Pennsylvania.....	4,855,881.02	850,493.65	5,706,374.67
Maryland.....	4,874,500.11	808,019.89	5,682,520.00
West Virginia.....	4,855,072.48	843,840.85	5,728,913.33
Tennessee.....	5,193,678.07	950,755.36	6,144,433.43
Washington.....	5,063,106.54	955,519.36	6,018,625.90
Total.....	37,546,307.27	6,196,602.13	43,742,909.40
PROTECTED CRUISERS (18).			
Newark.....	1,439,382.20	300,735.00	1,830,117.20
Baltimore.....	1,554,483.94	422,245.41	1,976,729.35
Philadelphia.....	1,561,392.47	397,267.91	1,958,660.38
San Francisco.....	1,738,257.82	397,045.49	2,135,303.31
Olympia.....	2,484,027.54	495,255.84	2,979,283.38
Cincinnati.....	2,023,326.91	348,577.61	2,371,904.52
Raleigh.....	1,807,934.32	331,795.48	2,199,729.80
Columbia.....	3,461,900.26	447,051.00	3,908,951.26
Minneapolis.....	3,403,707.07	446,289.37	3,849,996.44
Tacoma.....	1,113,395.45	285,386.30	1,398,781.75

Cost of all vessels of the new Navy—Continued.
STATEMENT SHOWING COST OF EACH COMPLETED BATTLE SHIP, ETC., TO JUNE 30, 1907—continued.

	Hull and machinery, including armor.	Equipage, including armament.	Total.
PROTECTED CRUISERS—continued.			
Cleveland.....	\$1,068,320.33	\$276,488.77	\$1,374,809.10
Denver.....	1,135,833.66	278,914.08	1,414,767.74
Des Moines.....	1,150,256.68	269,884.74	1,426,101.42
Chatanooga.....	1,378,445.75	308,145.45	1,686,594.20
Charleston.....	3,117,234.16	664,176.84	3,781,411.00
Galveston.....	1,426,850.73	309,923.50	1,736,774.23
Milwaukee.....	3,171,668.53	660,834.33	3,832,502.86
St. Louis.....	3,173,324.35	644,408.09	3,817,732.44
Total.....	36,305,822.17	7,374,388.21	43,680,210.38
UNPROTECTED CRUISERS (3).			
Marblehead.....	1,061,426.30	229,736.63	1,291,162.93
Montgomery.....	1,050,933.54	216,176.17	1,267,109.71
Detroit.....	1,004,711.65	228,328.25	1,233,039.90
Total (52).....	3,117,071.49	674,241.05	3,791,312.54

From this official statement I find that we have classed under the head of the "new Navy" twenty-three battle ships, costing \$136,189,402.79; eight armored cruisers, costing \$43,742,909.40; eighteen protected cruisers, upon which we have expended in first cost \$43,680,210.38; three unprotected cruisers, costing \$3,791,312.54, making an aggregate of fifty-two ships, upon which we have expended \$227,403,835.11.

It further appears from the report of the Secretary of the Navy that the tonnage of our Navy has more than doubled during the last year, and for the first time in the history of the Navy we have been able to mobilize sixteen battle ships.

But this is not all. I hold in my hand an official table giving a list of vessels in course of construction on November 1, 1907.

From this it appears that we have now under construction, in addition to the ships I have named, seven battle ships, two armored cruisers, three scout cruisers, five torpedo-boat destroyers, two submarines, two colliers, and two other minor craft, making a total of twenty-three in addition to those already completed, and upon which we have already expended \$36,454,000.

The table referred to is as follows:

List of vessels in course of construction on November 1, 1907.

Name.	Ship as designed, fully equipped ready for sea, normal stores, ammunition, and coal.				Speed on trial.
	Length between perpendiculars.	Breadth on load water line.	Mean draft.	Displacement (normal).	
BATTLE SHIPS (7).					
Mississippi.....	375 0	77 0	24 8	13,000	*17.00
Idaho.....	375 0	77 0	24 8	13,000	*17.00
New Hampshire.....	450 0	76 10	24 6	16,000	*18.00
South Carolina.....	450 0	80 2 1/2	24 6	16,000	*18.50
Michigan.....	450 0	80 2 1/2	24 6	16,000	*18.50
Delaware.....	510 0	85 2 1/2	26 11	20,000	*21.00
North Dakota.....	510 0	85 2 1/2	26 11	20,000	*21.00
ARMORED CRUISERS (2).					
North Carolina.....	502 0	72 10 1/2	25 0	14,500	*22.00
Montana.....	502 0	72 10 1/2	25 0	14,500	*22.00
SCOUT CRUISERS (3).					
Chester.....	420 0	47 1	16 9	3,750	*24.00
Birmingham.....	420 0	47 1	16 9	3,750	*24.00
Salem.....	420 0	47 1	16 9	3,750	*24.00
TORPEDO-BOAT DESTROYERS (5)					
No. 17.....	289 0	26 0	8 0	700	*28.00
No. 18.....	289 0	26 0	8 0	700	*28.00
No. 19.....	289 0	26 0	8 0	700	*28.00
No. 20.....	289 0	26 0	8 0	700	*28.00
No. 21.....	289 0	26 0	8 0	700	*28.00
SUBMARINES (2).					
Octopus.....					
Tarantula.....					
COLLIERS (2).					
Vestal.....	450 0	60 1	26 0	12,585	*16.00
Prometheus.....	450 0	60 1	26 0	12,585	*16.00
TUGS (2).					
Patapsco.....	148 0	29 0 1/2	12 3	755	*13.00
Patuxent.....	148 0	29 0 1/2	12 3	755	*13.00

* Estimated.

Mr. OVERMAN. May I ask the Senator from Michigan a question? I ask merely for information. Do I understand that twenty-three vessels are now under construction?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes; twenty-three crafts are now under construction, seven of which are battle ships.

Mr. OVERMAN. Battle ships?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes; and two armored cruisers. I beg to submit here an official table showing the vessels now under construction, their names, and the amount expended thereon to June 30, 1907, which, it will be observed, is \$36,454,634.01.

Expenditures on vessels under construction to June 30, 1907.

Michigan.....	\$843,213.45	Torpedo-boat destroyer No. 18.....	\$3,160.23
South Carolina.....	1,228,606.70	Torpedo-boat destroyer No. 19.....	371,789.66
New Hampshire.....	4,374,092.23	Vestal.....	25,136.96
Idaho.....	3,896,752.88	Prometheus.....	42,446.17
Mississippi.....	4,108,971.07	Patapsco.....	27,381.63
Delaware.....	17,443.99	Patuxent.....	204,924.16
North Dakota.....	12,002.63	Viper.....	162,938.17
California.....	4,491,789.80	Cuttle Fish.....	150,908.18
North Carolina.....	3,905,743.99	Tarantula.....	149,283.28
Montana.....	3,622,860.32	Cumberland.....	425,981.18
South Dakota.....	4,896,695.31	Salem.....	399,793.74
Chester.....	1,266,110.62	Torpedo-boat destroyer No. 17.....	3,160.25
Birmingham.....	1,160,865.27		
Salem.....	1,159,922.50	Total.....	36,454,634.61

Amount expended under increase of the Navy appropriations on all vessels other than those above named (including \$2,500,000, approximate cost of equipage of monitors and torpedo boats), \$45,500,721.20.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the Secretary of the Navy in his last annual report states the total cost of "all vessels of the new Navy, built and building," to this time is \$309,359,190.92.

I also ask to have inserted in my remarks, without reading, a table taken from the report of the Secretary of the Navy, giving a summary of all the vessels in the United States Navy June 30, 1907, from which it appears that there are "fit for service, including those under repair, 285; under construction, 20; authorized, 8; unfit for sea service, 12;" making a total of 325 crafts of all classes, constituting the present strength of our Navy.

The table referred to is as follows:

Summary of vessels in the United States Navy June 30, 1907.

Type.	Fit for service, including those under repair.	Under construction.	Authorized.	Unfit for sea service.	Total.
First-class battle ships.....	22	5	2		29
Second-class battle ship.....	1				1
Armored cruisers.....	8	4			12
Armored ram.....	1				1
Single-turret harbor-defense monitors.....	4				4
Double-turret monitors.....	6				6
Protected cruisers.....	22				22
Unprotected cruisers.....	3				3
Scout cruisers.....		3			3
Gunboats.....	9				9
Gunboat for Great Lakes (not begun).....			1		1
Light-draft gunboats.....	3				3
Composite gunboats.....	8				8
Training ship (Naval Academy), sheathed.....	1				1
Training ships.....	2				2
Training brigantine.....	1				1
Special class (Dolphin, Vesuvius).....	2				2
Gunboats under 500 tons.....	13				13
Torpedo-boat destroyers.....	16		5		21
Steel torpedo boats.....	25				25
Wooden torpedo boats.....	1				1
Submarine torpedo boats.....	8		4		12
Iron cruising vessels, steam.....	4				4
Wooden cruising vessels, steam.....	5			4	9
Wooden sailing vessels.....	8			2	10
Tugs.....	41	2			43
Auxiliary cruisers.....	5				5
Converted yachts.....	23				23
Colliers.....	15		2		17
Transports and supply ships.....	10				10
Hospital ship.....	1				1
Receiving ships.....	5			5	10
Prison ships.....	2			1	3
Total.....	285	20	8	12	325

Mr. BURROWS. I will also submit an official table showing the war-ship tonnage of the eight leading naval powers of the world, viz, Great Britain, France, United States, Germany, Japan, Russia, Italy, and Austria, from which it can be seen at a glance the naval strength of each nation, the number and character of ships completed and under construction, and the relative order of war-ships tonnage among these naval powers at present and when existing constructions are completed.

War-ship tonnage of the principal naval powers, number and displacement of war ships, built and building, of 1,000 or more tons, and of torpedo craft of more than 50 tons—November 1, 1907.

Type of vessel.	Great Britain.				France.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	Num-ber.	Tons.	Num-ber.	Tons.	Num-ber.	Tons.	Num-ber.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class ^a	52	749,090	4	72,300	19	228,641	8	139,820
Coast-defense vessels ^c					12	73,300		
Armored cruisers.....	32	372,800	6	95,550	19	166,580	4	54,394
Cruisers above 6,000 tons ^d	19	183,950			3	24,409		
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons ^d	45	200,280	1	3,300	13	52,549		
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons ^d	26	56,305			12	23,152		
Torpedo-boat destroyers.....	142	53,235	8	7,556	35	10,594	25	9,001
Torpedo boats.....	47	7,490	24	6,486	257	24,322	14	1,358
Submarines.....	39	9,965	9	3,352	41	5,532	58	22,460
Total tons built and total tons building.....	1,633,116		188,494		609,079		227,033	
Total tons built and building.....	1,821,610				836,112			
Type of vessel.	United States.				Germany.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	Num-ber.	Tons.	Num-ber.	Tons.	Num-ber.	Tons.	Num-ber.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class ^a	22	292,146	7	114,000	22	260,250	6	98,400
Coast-defense vessels ^c	11	45,334			8	53,200		
Armored cruisers.....	10	128,445	2	29,000	8	79,600	2	34,200
Cruisers above 6,000 tons ^d	5	43,800			1	6,300		
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons ^d	17	61,570	3	11,250	18	74,190	3	11,050
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons ^d	19	26,317			19	40,685		
Torpedo-boat destroyers.....	16	6,957	5	3,750	60	26,298	12	7,560
Torpedo boats.....	32	5,615			48	8,539		
Submarines.....	12	1,632	7	2,142	1	180	2	360
Total tons built and total tons building.....	611,616		160,142		529,032		151,570	
Total tons built and building.....	771,758				680,602			
Type of vessel.	Japan.				Russia.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	Num-ber.	Tons.	Num-ber.	Tons.	Num-ber.	Tons.	Num-ber.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class ^a	11	152,548	2	38,950	5	62,600	4	58,600
Coast-defense vessels ^c	3	18,786			4	21,380		
Armored cruisers.....	11	108,900	2	29,200	4	46,200	3	24,000
Cruisers above 6,000 tons ^d	2	13,130			7	46,460		
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons ^d	10	38,994	1	4,100	1	3,100		
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons ^d	7	15,288	2	2,600	7	8,800		
Torpedo-boat destroyers.....	54	19,413	3	1,143	93	33,834	4	2,420
Torpedo boats.....	77	6,842			57	6,834		
Submarines.....	7	800	2	626	25	3,735	6	2,077
Total tons built and total tons building.....	374,701		76,619		232,943		87,097	
Total tons built and building.....	451,320				320,040			
Type of vessel.	Italy.				Austria.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	Num-ber.	Tons.	Num-ber.	Tons.	Num-ber.	Tons.	Num-ber.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class ^a	10	130,629	3	37,275	3	31,800		
Coast-defense vessels ^c					6	41,700		
Armored cruisers.....	6	39,200	4	39,320	3	18,800		
Cruisers above 6,000 tons ^d								
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons ^d	1	3,530			2	8,000		
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons ^d	10	21,920			3	7,050		
Torpedo-boat destroyers.....	13	4,133	4	1,460	4	1,600	2	800
Torpedo boats.....	66	7,804	11	2,305	36	4,285	3	600
Submarines.....	3	497	3	450			6	1,600
Total tons built and total tons building.....	207,623		80,810		113,235		3,000	
Total tons built and building.....	288,433				116,235			

^a Battle ships, first class, are those of (about) 10,000 or more tons displacement.

^b Omitting the Iéna.

^c Includes smaller battle ships and monitors.

^d All unarmored war ships of more than 1,000 tons are in this table classed according to displacement as cruisers. Scouts are considered as cruisers in which battery and protection have been sacrificed to secure extreme speed. The word "protected" has been omitted because all cruisers except the smallest and oldest now have protective decks.

N. B.—The following vessels are not included in the tables:

Those over 20 years old, unless they have been reconstructed and rearmed since 1900.

Those not actually begun, although authorized.

Transports, colliers, repair ships, torpedo depot ships, converted merchant vessels, or yachts.

Vessels of less than 1,000 tons, except torpedo craft.

Torpedo craft of less than 50 tons.

Relative order of war-ship tonnage.

At present.		As would be the case were vessels building now completed.	
Nation.	Tonnage.	Nation.	Tonnage.
Great Britain	1,636,116	Great Britain	1,821,610
United States	611,616	France	836,112
France	609,079	United States	771,758
Germany	529,082	Germany	680,602
Japan	374,701	Japan	451,320
Russia	232,943	Russia	320,040
Italy	207,623	Italy	288,433
Austria	113,235	Austria	116,235

Mr. BURROWS. From this statement it appears that the United States to-day ranks second among the naval powers of the world.

Mr. President, with such a Navy completed and in course of construction as we possess to-day and at peace with the world, the question arises, What pressing necessity can there be for increasing the limit as fixed in the bill, as it came to the Senate, from two to four battle ships? One of the reasons urged—and I may say the chief one—is the apprehension expressed by certain Senators that we are to have in the immediate future serious trouble with some foreign nation. The Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] and other Senators—the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE]—are apprehensive that we are to have difficulty with some nation somewhere; and the Senator from Washington especially, while disclaiming a belief that there is any immediate danger of trouble with Japan, yet nevertheless says there is a possibility of difficulty with that Empire in the near future, and therefore we ought to be prepared to meet such emergency should it arise.

I do not question the sincerity of the Senator's apprehension, but I will be permitted, and pardoned, I am sure, if I place more reliance upon what the Secretary of State says touching this matter, who, by virtue of his position, has superior opportunity to judge of the attitude and temper of foreign nations toward us. Secretary Root, whose diplomatic skill and genius adorn the great office of Secretary of State, speaking of this apprehension of difficulty with Japan, says:

There was one great and serious question—referring to the recent difficulty in California over the school question—

Mr. FORAKER. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. BURROWS. From the American Journal of International Law, and from a speech of Secretary Root delivered before the Society of International Law, of which he is president.

There was one great and serious question underlying the whole subject which made all questions of construction and of scope and effect of the treaty itself—all questions as to whether the claims of Japan were well founded or not; all questions as to whether the resolutions of the school board was valid or not—seem temporary and comparatively unimportant. It was not a question of war with Japan. All the foolish talk about war was purely sensational and imaginative. There was never even friction between the two Governments. The question was, What state of feeling would be created between the great body of the people of the United States and the great body of the people of Japan as a result of the treatment given to the Japanese in this country?

What was to be the effect upon that proud, sensitive, highly civilized people across the Pacific, of the discourtesy, insult, imputations of inferiority and abuse aimed at them in the columns of American newspapers, and from the platforms of American public meetings? What would be the effect upon our own people of the responses that natural resentment for such treatment would elicit from the Japanese?

The first article of the first treaty Japan ever made with a western power provided:

"There shall be a perfect, permanent, and universal peace and a sincere and cordial amity between the United States of America on the one part and the Empire of Japan on the other part, and between their people respectively, without exception of persons or places."

Continuing, the Secretary says:

Under that treaty, which bore the signature of Matthew Calbraith Perry, we introduced Japan to the world of western civilization. We had always been proud of her wonderful development—proud of the genius of the race that in a single generation adapted an ancient feudal system of the Far East to the most advanced standards of modern Europe and America. The friendship between the two nations had been peculiar and close. Was the declaration of that treaty to be set aside? At Kurihama, in Japan, stands a monument to Commodore Perry, raised by the Japanese in grateful appreciation, upon the site where he landed and opened negotiations for the treaty. Was that monument henceforth to represent dislike and resentment? Were the two peoples to face each other across the Pacific in future years with angry and resentful feelings?

The great question which overshadowed all discussion of the treaty of 1854 was the question: *Are the people of the United States about to break friendship with the people of Japan? That question, I believe, has been happily answered in the negative.*

How idle is this talk of war with Japan in the light of these declarations of Secretary Root!

Mr. President, we would do well, too, to remember in the midst of this cry of war that this is an era of peace; an era of international parliaments seeking to devise means to settle international differences through the peaceful instrumentality of arbitration.

Let me quote the words of another great Secretary of State, Richard Olney, deploring the spirit of the times—the spirit of militarism which seems to have taken possession of some people—and invoking the higher and more humane spirit of arbitration, more in harmony with the spirit of advancing civilization of the age.

Speaking of the potency of this influence, ex-Secretary of State Olney says:

In favor of all wise and just rules of international conduct formulated by conferences at The Hague or by other like conferences, the public opinion of the civilized world may be relied upon to furnish a force ever growing more and more potent, until such rules receive complete international recognition and acceptance. When, in 1823, Webster would have had this country express sympathy with the revolt of the Greeks against Turkey, and it was objected that the thing was useless, because we did not propose to fight for Greece or to endanger our own peace in any way, he made an answer which is among the most impressive of his public utterances:

Sir, this reasoning mistakes the age. The time has been indeed when fleets and armies and subsidies were the principal reliances, even in the best cause. But, happily for mankind, a great change has taken place in this respect. Moral causes come into consideration in proportion as the progress of knowledge is advanced, and the public opinion of the civilized world is rapidly gaining an ascendancy over mere brutal force. It is already able to oppose the most formidable obstruction to the progress of injustice and oppression, and as it grows more intelligent and more intense it will be more and more formidable. It may be silenced by military power, but it can not be conquered. It is elastic, irrepressible, and invulnerable to the weapons of ordinary warfare. It is that impassible, inextinguishable enemy of mere violence and arbitrary rule which, like Milton's angels,

Vital in every part,

Can not but by annihilating die.

This exalted sentiment, expressed by Mr. Webster more than three-quarters of a century ago, is peculiarly applicable to the times in which we live. "Though dead, he yet speaketh."

Secretary Olney further said:

The Hague conference of 1899 did much in that direction by facilitating international arbitration and making mediation between angry states rather a friendly courtesy than a piece of officious impertinence. Other like conferences may be expected to make substantial progress in the same direction, and the advent of the time when "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more," is by no means to be put down as among the dreams of poets or the visions of seers. The interdependent relations of states, constantly increasing in number and closeness and strength, are constantly making war increasingly difficult, impracticable, and repulsive. They are steadily bringing nearer and making more imperative agreements between the civilized states of the world, by which war, already branded as the worst possible violation of the dictates of common sense and sound morals, shall also be a crime in the sight of international law, and as such be both preventable and punishable by all the forces which organized civilization may be able to command.

I ask permission of the Senate to insert in my remarks, without reading, some excerpts from an article appearing in the last issue of a magazine called "The Navy," justifying the course of the committee in reporting the authorization of but two battle ships instead of four. The reasons are so cogent as to command attention.

The article is entitled "The battle-ship programme," from which I quote:

It seems not wholly unfortunate that the House Naval Committee has reported a bill providing for only two battle ships instead of the four asked for by the Department. Undoubtedly the naval requirements of this country demand the very early addition of four battle ships of the *Dreadnought* type; but it is probable that the *best interests of our fleet* will be served by authorizing *only two this year*.

Several considerations have to be borne in mind in regard to this matter. In the first place, four ships authorized now would in all probability be mere repetitions of the *Delaware* and *North Dakota*. The designs of these two ships, especially in regard to turret arrangements—which materially affect the interior structure of the ship—were not finally settled until well into last November. And there appears no reason to believe that the Board of Construction has devised or contemplates any improvement on these ships.

One of these ships, moreover, is herself an *experiment*. The *North Dakota*, fitted with Curtis turbine engines, is an entirely new venture for our Navy; and there is no means of knowing until after she is

afloat and has had her trials, what modifications in her design may be necessary. Like the English *Dreadnought*, she is in a sense our big experimental ship; and until we know what she will do, and whether her designs need changing in order to make her efficient, it is certainly prudent not to duplicate her. It is at least possible that she may not behave well in squadron with ships of the same size driven by reciprocating engines. On the other hand, if the *North Dakota* proves to have the superiorities over ships with reciprocating engines that are to be hoped for, our future big ships should be turbine driven.

Some lessons may have to be learned also from foreign ships. The newly launched German *Nassau*, in particular, is one whose design our constructors need to pay attention. The number of guns she will carry and their arrangement appear to be so far a complete secret, outside the German officials. Our Berlin correspondent, whom we have reason to trust, says she will carry sixteen 11-inch guns, in an arrangement which he has roughly described. But it is apparent, from the tone of British service journals, that the armament of the new ship is not known in England. This ignorance of the details of the *Nassau* may, in fact, account, more than considerations of economy, for the decision of the British Admiralty to lay down no more than one *Dreadnought* this year. It will be seen, therefore, that neither as to our own *Dreadnoughts*, nor the newest ships of that type abroad, have we such knowledge as is desirable before entering upon a construction of a group of four new ships. Two more *Delawares* would give us a squadron of four ships of the same size; and, in the present uncertainties regarding this type, that is perhaps as far as it is prudent to go now.

The delay that would be occasioned by waiting for the trials of the *North Dakota* and *Delaware* could be compensated for in two ways. The contractors could undoubtedly be helped to finish them in considerably less than the contract period; and as to future big ships, a proper management of preparation should enable us to complete them in two years, instead of in the four or five now required. Measures could be so taken that the delay of any additional big ship for two years would leave us just as well off four years from now as there is any likelihood of our being if four ships are authorized this year and built under the prevailing system; with the added advantage that we should have "improved" *Dreadnoughts*—a thing not apparently probable now.

More than this, there is urgent need, before entering upon extensive construction, of adopting a definite naval programme extending over a series of years and planned with reference to the programme of other nations. We should decide upon a certain size of fleet, made up of certain kinds of ships, and work consistently and steadily toward getting it. So far we have "muddled along," doing too much one year and not enough the next, and doing it inconsistently, with such a result, for instance, as the launching this year of two battle ships, the *Idaho* and *Mississippi*, that are woefully out of date. It is to be hoped that the awakened interest in the Navy all over the country will support Congress and the Department in the adoption of a well-arranged and definite quantity of naval construction.

These reasons, I submit, are sufficiently cogent to command attention if they do not convince.

But it is contended that we must follow the lead of other nations; that England is building a great navy; Germany is increasing hers; and it is important that we should keep pace in our sea armament with the naval powers of the world. I have in my hand a pamphlet which answers this contention so well that I venture to read an extract from an address delivered by Doctor Jefferson, an eminent divine of the city of New York. He says:

2. But if these four nations—

Speaking of England, Germany, France, and Japan—

have great navies, we must follow their example. We can not afford not to do what they do. So men say; but why not? We are not like them. Their situation is different from ours. They have enemies, hereditary enemies; we have not. Everybody says we have not. President Roosevelt says so. All our statesmen say so. All the statesmen of all the other countries say so. Moreover, these four nations are our special friends. We are coming closer all the while to England. Germany and America have never been such good friends as now. France and our Republic have always gone hand in hand. Nobody outside of a pack of mischief-makers has ever dreamed that Japan has any feeling toward us but one of good will. We never have been entangled by the international complications of the wild and rude centuries that are gone. Why should we follow the example of nations who became embroiled centuries ago? Why should we squander our money in adopting a fashion which is not needed here, and which is so ruinous that the wisest hearts and heads of the Old World have groaned under it with an agony that is unspeakable?

But it is said:

4. "We have colonial possessions and we must protect them. How can you protect them if you do not gather them under the steel wings of a fleet of battle ships?" So men ask. But this terror is born of a disordered mind. When men become infected with the poison of militarism they have many of the symptoms of a man in delirium tremens. The world becomes filled with snakes, day and night are crowded with horrors, the universe is a hateful, hostile, hissing thing, and every moment gives birth to a new peril.

But it has been said in course of this debate that we must build a larger navy in order to insure peace with the world; that the way to keep the peace is to impress the nations of the earth that we are mighty and invincible in war. The distinguished Secretary of State in his recent unostentatious visit to the South American countries did more on that one journey in the interest of peace than could have been accomplished by the marshaling of all the battle ships we could command.

Doctor Jefferson comments upon this folly as follows:

5. "To keep the peace we must prepare for war." Some one said that long ago, and men have repeated it as though it were a word from the mouth of God. Its hollowness is evident to anyone who will look into it. The fact is that to keep the peace we must prepare for peace. If you want war, then prepare for war, multiply your guns, burnish them and make them shine, practice with them, keep

the air filled with the reverberations of the roar of cannon. Swing your fleet from one ocean to another just when hearts are most irritated. Fill your newspapers with accounts of what your ships are doing, crowd your magazines with pictures of torpedo boats and destroyers. Set all the young men of the country thinking and talking about war, and then some day war will come. It is inevitable. If a nation does not want to fight it must put up its sword. It is amazing that there is an intelligent man on the earth who can not see this.

But it is said we need a larger navy in order to defend the Monroe doctrine. May I ask to have read a communication from Hon. John W. Foster, that accomplished diplomat and Christian statesman, in reply to the statement that our Monroe doctrine is no stronger than our Navy.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

EDITOR POST: Secretary Taft is reported, in your issue of this morning, to have declared, in a public address at Louisville, that "the principle of the Monroe doctrine is just as strong as our Navy and Army, and no stronger."

A greater fallacy never was uttered by an intelligent statesman. Our history plainly proves the contrary. The two most important occasions when the principle, or doctrine, was asserted aggressively by our Government was by President Monroe, in 1823, and by President Cleveland, in 1895. The "Holy Alliance," against whose aggressions the doctrine was asserted by President Monroe, had navies and armies which, either separately or combined, very greatly exceeded those of the United States. And the same may be said respecting the relative navy and army of Great Britain and the United States when President Cleveland uttered his warning.

I thank God there is a greater power in the world to-day than navies and armies. It is the moral sentiment of mankind. If the Monroe doctrine was not founded on sound policy and justice, with all our great resources we could not build a navy or organize an army large enough to maintain it.

JOHN W. FOSTER.

WASHINGTON, April 11.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator object to an interruption?

Mr. BURROWS. I prefer to finish, as I understand the Senator is going to close the debate, and can then make reply.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There was not any debate except one speech to-day. Of course it is necessary for me to say something in reply.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will not ask the Senator to yield, but I shall want to refer to the speech made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, it is said that this increase in our naval armament is demanded by the people. The last authoritative expression of opinion by the people upon this subject comes from the popular branch of Congress, which, elected by the people, speaks for the people; and that voice is against the building of four battle ships by a recorded vote of 199 to 83. That is the latest and most authoritative expression of the will of the people, and I have no hesitancy myself in following that expression of the public will and agreeing with the House of Representatives in the construction of only two battle ships.

The spirit of this age, Mr. President, the dominating thought of this country, is the spirit and thought of arbitration, of peace and not war; and that spirit permeating the Christian people of this country to-day as never before is only marred by the discordant notes of war heard in the halls of the American Congress.

Let us hope, Mr. President, that the time is near at hand, nay, already here, when the people of the United States and the civilized nations of the world "shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can not help but feel that Congress itself has a duty to perform in the great subject that is before us to-day. I can not help also but feel that the framers of the Constitution, when they separated the great powers of this Government and set the line of demarcation between the exercise of those powers, intended that Congress should exercise its judgment, and that the vote of Congress should be the consensus of the opinion of all the members of both bodies.

I have not changed my conviction upon that proposition in all the argument that has been made before us upon this great, this most important question. Congress has its duties to perform. Congress receives all the information that it can from each of the great Executive Departments, digests that information, measures its ability to comply with the request of each of those Departments, and in the end it generally does what is right and just for the American people.

Under the system that is in vogue to-day each Department reports to the President the requirements of that Department

for the ensuing year. The President communicates that information to us in the messages which we receive at the beginning of every session. Then Congress takes account of the expenses and the income of the Government, and if it acts justly and in accordance with the will of the country, it makes every possible attempt to keep its expenses within its income, and so apportion the outlays for the demands of government as will meet the necessities of each Department as near as it is possible to do so. I am somewhat surprised that in all the argument for the additional enormous outlay for battle ships not one word has been said as to where we are to get the money to pay for them. Are we to borrow the money or come back here in a few months and vote a deficiency bill carrying some \$80,000,000?

We know as a matter of fact, Mr. President, that if we followed absolutely the recommendation of each of the great Executive Departments of the Government for what the Department thought was proper to be appropriated for its purpose, we would bankrupt the Government in a single year. So we are compelled to prune down here and there until we have brought the expenses as near as possible to our idea of what the future will bring of money for our use. That is the business proposition that is presented to us to-day.

I know that there are many people of the press and I know that there are many other people in the United States who are actuated more or less by the love of power, which permeates every individual to a certain extent, who will always be in favor of building up the Army and of increasing the Navy to any extent, and no matter what the extent of any proposed addition it will always be popular with a large number of people.

But, Mr. President, those same people who are guided and controlled by their impulses in matters of this kind are always the very first ones to open their batteries of condemnation upon Congress if at the end of a fiscal year it is compelled to borrow money in "piping times of peace" to carry on the Government of the United States. So I insist that as a business proposition we should keep our expenses as near as possible within our income for the ensuing year.

Mr. President, I believe that there is not a single Senator in this body nor a single Member of Congress who is not in favor of maintaining a good, strong Navy, and of building it up as rapidly as the conditions of our income will warrant, taking into consideration the demands along every other line.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] but a few days ago made a most eloquent plea for a greater number of public buildings. The plea which he made to the Senate was one all must admit to be correct and proper. We were forced to the conclusion that we have not sufficient public buildings in the United States to properly conduct the business of the country. We were forced to the conclusion that we are paying three or four times the amount that we ought to pay for the rental of buildings in which to conduct our business. And yet we are compelled in order to keep within our income to forego the construction of these buildings that are so necessary.

Again, the whole West and Northwest, desiring to build up their country, are appealing to us to appropriate a greater sum of money for soil surveys. The people of that section wish to present their claims not only to the old countries, but to this country, by showing the soil in a particular locality and demonstrating that it is a place to come to make American homes. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was compelled to cut that appropriation down, because they say we have not sufficient income to meet that demand.

In considering the question of whether we should provide for two or three or four battle ships this year, I can not idly lay aside the conclusion, and, considering its importance, I must believe the careful conclusions of the Committee on Naval Affairs of this body. I know that every question pro and con has been carefully considered, and I can not but feel that if they believed that the immediate demand for four instead of two battle ships for this year was so imperative as to justify overdrawing our income some \$20,000,000 for that item alone, it would have been so recommended. Nor can I lose sight of the fact that the other House of Congress, after having also carefully considered the matter, by a vote of nearly three to one, spoke its judgment in favor of two battle ships this year.

Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to the illogical logic—what I consider very one-sided logic—about this necessity of preparing for war in order that we may keep the peace of the country. That proposition, old as it may be as a plea to the public to build up the armaments of each of the great military establishments of the world, in my opinion has no foundation on which it can possibly stand.

The rule is exactly the opposite of this. If it were possible that we could conceive of every nation being about as powerful

as every other nation and supplant that with the conception that each one of these nations is desirous of despoiling the other, then the rule would be applicable; each would be compelled to arm itself equal to its watchful antagonist. But inasmuch as that condition can never be, the rule can seldom be applied to conditions as we find them.

Mr. President, let us look into this proposition for a moment. Let us take the countries of Europe and see whether the rule applies there. Germany has a vast standing army. She is always prepared for war upon the land. Has that vast standing army been to Europe an assurance of peace, or is it a condition that is always inclined to lead her into war?

Everyone who reads the press of the country and the press of the world knows that it takes the combined diplomacy of all Europe to prevent a conflict, ever imminent, because of her preparedness for war. Let us carry our minds back two or three years to the Moroccan occasion, to the dispute between Germany and France. Germany was ready, ready at a moment's notice, to strike at her old enemy. It was the influence of the world and the diplomacy of the world that maintained peace at that time; maintained it not because Germany was prepared, but despite that preparation.

So we can follow history from its beginning down to the present time, and I say that instead of the rule being that preparedness for war is a prevention of war we are forced to the opposite conclusion.

Mr. President, we of the Caucasian race have always the spirit of warfare and of aggression in our hearts. We never can eliminate it. It is absolutely true and undeniable that the great Caucasian race has fought more wars of aggression, and, we are compelled to admit, more wars of injustice, ten times over, than all the rest of the world.

But I want to show that the question whether preparedness for war is a guaranty for peace depends entirely upon conditions outside of this preparedness. Little Switzerland has been able to live independently for a great many years. Norway, in its merchant marine, being about the third or fourth country in the world to-day, has no great battle ships to repel a German attack, and yet her situation and the condition of her environments in Europe are such as to insure her independence as against an aggressive nation. If there is a universal rule that the peace of a nation is dependent upon its being able to match its army or navy with each other power, how is it that these little kingdoms of Europe still continue to live happily and peacefully, freed from the burdens of supporting vast armies and navies?

Italy can not to-day compete with Germany or any of the great powers in Europe with her navy, and yet she is absolutely protected against aggression from other countries. That is true, Mr. President, of all of the countries of Europe, but about four.

Now, let us glance for a moment to our own conditions and environments. The Senator from Indiana says we should approach this subject from a business standpoint—I want to comply with his suggestion. A competent general not only takes cognizance of the strength and weaknesses of his own army and how it is surrounded and protected, but he also looks at the condition of the enemy and determines therefrom whether he will be the one who shall make the attack or whether it will be the enemy that will be liable to make it. When we look at our condition and situation as regards the rest of the world, we are forced to the conclusion that we are so situated that we can determine the time when we shall have war with any other nation upon the face of the earth, unless we, through a sensational and lurid press, are inclined to flaunt our superiority of arms and power in the face of nations that must fight in order to sustain their own honor.

Mr. President, every argument that I have heard in favor of the building of four war ships is just as good an argument in favor of building ten war ships. Not one sentence which has been uttered here has given the foundation for the argument that we must have four war ships, which does not apply with equal force to the theory that we must have ten or more war ships.

I am not insensible to the argument, that if actual war should at any time be thrust upon us, we should regret that we had not these two extra battle ships. Yes, and we should also regret that we did not have ten more instead of two. No nation ever entered into a war that did not regret that it did not have greater strength and more war material. These two extra ships could not stave off war that is imminent, because they could not be completed within three or four years.

I should like to disillusion the mind of my friend from Washington [Mr. PILES] of the idea that the specter of war is hanging over the Pacific Ocean, and that it is liable to come down like a cyclone upon that section of the country at any time.

When two great nations determine that they must resort to the arbitrament of arms in order to settle a dispute, they will generally consider what that arbitrament of arms will mean to them. That final result of appeal to arms is just what every country in the world must and will take into consideration. There is no Senator here who will not agree with me that the nation that will be successful in war will not only be the nation that has got the men, but the nation that has got the money and resources back of it in order to conduct a war.

In the late war between Japan and Russia, the little Empire of Japan was compelled to borrow of every country in Europe, and in the United States, and to sell her bonds bearing 6 per cent interest for a little over 90 cents on the dollar at the time. That was when she was fighting for her very life, and fighting right at home, upon her own borders, and fighting a battle of defense against an enormous power, which meant either that she must be victorious or must forever sink to the level of a fifth or sixth class power. She was compelled, under those conditions, to draw upon every one of the banks of Europe. What would be the condition of that little nation across the ocean, with only about one-half the population of the United States, with only one five-hundredth of the territory of the United States, with less than one one-hundredth of the income of the United States—what would be her position in the financial world if she attempted to borrow money to conduct a war against this mighty nation? She could not get a dollar in all Europe; and not having a dollar at home to-day, being loaded with a debt that must hang heavily upon the shoulders of her people for many years, she would not venture into an aggressive war against such a powerful nation as this. That we might force her into it to maintain her own honor is barely possible, but very improbable.

Nor is that the only reason. I agreed with the Senator from Indiana when he wrote so optimistically of The Russian Advance, and I will agree with him that that mighty power has only been checked. I do not believe any nation in the world understands that any better than the little kingdom of the Mikado; and the moment that nation should engage in a bloody war with such a powerful opponent as this the Russian bear would again be upon its haunches, and with its iron claws would destroy the little empire and regain Manchuria before it could turn from one giant antagonist to the other. So I am not afraid of an aggressive warfare from that side of the ocean.

Let us see, then, where else war is to come from. The next and greatest naval power in the world is Great Britain. Will she ever attack the United States? Great Britain with her immense navy is the most peacefully inclined country in the world to-day. Why? Not because she has such power, but because she knows what war will mean to her. She knows that while the sun never sets upon the British Empire, the sun must also never set upon the war ships that must be kept where Britain's colony is located. So while a mighty country like this would not be vulnerable from any point, the great Empire of Great Britain is vulnerable at a thousand points at one time. Her situation, her environments, and her scattered colonies on which she is dependent for food for her millions renders a great navy indispensable to her safety. But not being situated as is Great Britain there is no reason on earth why we should take the British navy as a standard by which we should build up our own.

In addition to this, the hostage for peace between this country and Great Britain lies to the north of us. I speak of these things to show how impossible war is with this great country, whose immense shore lines are on two oceans, with our power and our ability to raise an army for defense and to maintain an army of any necessary size and to continue building battle ships all of the time to answer the demands of a gradual and proper growth.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. McCUMBER. Always.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from North Dakota has just said in his closing utterance that war was impossible; which I hope is right. If war, then, is impossible—

Mr. McCUMBER. I will not say "impossible." I will modify it, if I used the word "impossible," and say "almost impossible—improbable."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, that of course is different. "Almost improbable" is different from "utterly impossible." The only question, then, that I was going to ask—but I will not ask it now—if the Senator thinks it is absolutely impossible, or, as he stated, "utterly impossible," does he not think it is a wrong policy for us to pursue to build any navy at all?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no; Mr. President, not by any means. War is always possible; but if we are to build a navy upon the possibilities and not upon the probabilities of war, then our Navy should be as great as all of the navies of the world combined. No nation on earth will or could pursue that policy.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment. Great Britain is compelled to maintain a navy double that of any other country in the world, because she is subject to attack at more than double the number of places of any other nation in the world, and must necessarily distribute her forces. With a little island only about half as large as the State in which I live, in which she must care for more than 50,000,000 people, it is necessary for her to have egress and ingress to all the markets of the world, and it is necessary for her to have a navy that will keep them open for her. We have enough to live on for a hundred years at least in our own country without calling upon the outside world for one dollar's worth of material, and during all that time, safe in our mighty realm, we could be striking at any other nation in the world. That is why we have the guaranty of peace.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I stated when I arose that I intended to ask the Senator a question, but I shall not now ask it. I will, however, ask a question in view of the Senator's last remark. I remember that no plea more eloquent and informing has been made in this Chamber or in public life for foreign trade than that of the Senator as to the absolute necessity of our having foreign trade, and although now the exigencies of debate make the Senator say that we could live for a hundred years absolutely disconnected from the outside world—of course we could, I think, for a thousand—but now the question I was going to ask is this: The Senator modified his statement of war being utterly impossible—with which I wish I could agree—to "almost improbable."

Mr. McCUMBER. I will put it "improbable," leaving out the word "almost."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, "improbable." That is a very distinct limitation. Now, then, upon that no one contends that the Navy should be as large as all other navies of the world combined, because we could not possibly—that is an impossibility—get into war with all nations combined.

Mr. McCUMBER. Not impossible—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; with all nations combined.

Mr. McCUMBER. But very improbable.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. With all nations combined, impossible. Now, it being true that it is improbable—that is, it may be or it may not be—ought we not to have a navy adequate to immediately act in case the improbability became the fact?

Mr. McCUMBER. That is what we are doing, Mr. President. That is just exactly what we have done to-day. I am speaking of that improbability, and saying that we are prepared for the improbabilities, and for the great improbabilities. It has been admitted again and again, and I think that it is without any doubt, that we are the second great naval power in the world to-day, vessel for vessel and gun for gun. That is our present situation, and if I am to vote to increase the Navy beyond that necessity, I must see what the danger is that will necessitate a greater navy than that.

The only power in the world having a greater navy is Great Britain. That greater navy in all probability would not be used against this country, because the final result must necessarily be disastrous to a country that must depend wholly upon her international trade. She is subject to weaknesses to which we are not subject. So we will eliminate the British Empire from the field of war probability.

Then, I come next, after having eliminated Japan and Great Britain, to the probability of a war with Germany. The only thing that has ever been stated by our press—and I disagree with it on that—is that the great German Empire has had an eye upon South America, and would, therefore, wish to break in upon our Monroe doctrine.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I ask the Senator a question right there?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think perhaps the Senator's recollection will be much more vivid than my own. I do not see here the Senator to whom I am going to refer, but was not a speech made upon this floor by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], whose learning all of us admit and admire, upon the acute probability of difficulty with Germany about South America some three or four years ago, during our mutual incumbency of seats in this body?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think any Senator has ever gone to the extent of presupposing that any acute question would arise upon a breach of the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I may be wrong about that, but I think not. The Senator may remember about it. I shall look it up almost immediately.

Mr. McCUMBER. A serious question, if I may call it serious, and yet one that could easily be diplomatically settled, was the question whether foreign powers should bring their war ships across the ocean to enforce private contracts in the South American Republics. That matter has been settled. It went to The Hague. Such questions will always go to some arbitrating of that character rather than to the arbitrament of war. But I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that we have maintained the Monroe doctrine during all these years when we had practically no navy. If we have maintained it without any navy in all the past years, what reason have we to assume that now it must necessarily take a navy greater than that of any country except Great Britain in order to maintain that doctrine?

Mr. President, there have been in the past promises, almost, on the part of the Committee on Naval Affairs. After we had appropriated large sums for these great war ships we have been assured almost positively that the policy would be to build one war ship each year. We have done that and more than that. The President of the United States has concurred in the action of the two committees of Congress upon that subject. Suddenly it comes from somewhere—I assume first from the Navy Department and then through the President—that we ought to provide this year for four instead of one battle ship. In this bill the committee has gone half way and provided for two, and the only question that is before us to-day is whether we shall have two this year and two next year, or whether we shall have four this year and possibly none next year.

Mr. HALE. Or four more.

Mr. McCUMBER. Or possibly four more next year. If what has been stated by the Senator from Indiana, as I understood the purport of his address, and by the Senator from Washington has anything more than vivid imagination for its foundation, then this whole subject ought to have been considered in secret session and not publicly. The very fact that we have not seen fit to close these doors is evidence to my mind that no Senator has any grounds to urge upon this Senate why we are in such imminent danger from these great powers that it is necessary for us to go outside of what we had determined to do and to double the number of battle ships in this particular year.

But few of the people who are always clamoring for this immense show of power have ever fully realized what it costs the American people. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs ever since I have been in the Senate has given us year after year a solemn warning of what we were coming to in this respect. He informed us, or some one did only a few days ago in debate, that we are to-day paying more than 70 per cent of all the income of the United States for matters pertaining to past wars and for preparing for future wars. If the policy of the War Department and the policy of the Navy Department should govern us in our deliberations, in less than ten years we will be paying out 90 per cent of all the income of the United States for war purposes alone.

Mr. President, I have before me a statement, which I cut from one of the great New York papers, entitled "What the biggest battle ship means in money," and I ask that the Secretary read it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WHAT THE BIGGEST BATTLE SHIP MEANS IN MONEY.

The *North Dakota*, when completed and ready to go into commission, will represent an initial outlay of \$10,000,000.

Nearly \$1,000,000 of this will be spent for guns alone. There are ten 12-inch guns, at \$65,000 each, and fourteen 5-inch rifles, at \$10,000 each, in the main battery, besides twelve rapid-fire guns and minor pieces.

To fire one broadside from the main battery will cost \$17,000, exclusive of cost of maintaining gunners. One shot from each 12-inch gun will cost \$1,160, and from each 5-inch gun \$430.

One broadside from the main battery means the firing of 10,000 pounds of steel shot. This is 3,000 more pounds of projectiles than Dewey's whole fleet could fire at the battle of Manila.

To fire one shot from each 12-inch gun will require 250 pounds of powder, at 80 cents a pound. Each projectile for the 12-inch guns weighs 850 pounds and costs \$310, making a total cost of \$510 for each shot. To this must be added an allowance of \$650 for deterioration in the gun, as the 12-inch firing piece is practically unfit for further use after being fired 100 times.

The cost of keeping the *North Dakota* in commission and in first-class fighting trim will be \$1,000,000 per annum. This includes the feeding and paying of her crew of 900 officers and men, ordinary repairs, machinery, and other ship supplies and coaling.

Mr. McCUMBER. These figures, Mr. President, are most astounding. Few of us are capable of comprehending what an immense fleet's daily or weekly gun practice means in money that is absolutely burned up. Every shot from a 12-inch gun means \$1,160 blown out of existence. Every broadside from the *North Dakota* means \$17,500 furnished by the taxpayers of the American nation. Take all of your vessels, with their constant practice, and then you will be able at least to comprehend in some slight degree the enormous expense of maintaining an efficient navy. This ought to cause us to halt for a moment to see what it means—the curtailing of appropriations for the thousands of things we ought to have for our internal needs. I, Mr. President, can understand why Great Britain, Germany, and even little Italy, should strain every nerve in order to keep up their vast armaments; but when I travel into one of those countries and see their mighty marine power on the one hand, with the gold braid and the gold rope, the pomp and the power, and all that it signifies to the world, and then look upon the pinched and starved faces of the millions upon millions who are being taxed to death for the very purpose of maintaining those mighty armaments, my whole heart and soul go out for peace. When I feel that this country, above all other countries in the world, is so situated that she can at all times use her mighty power and influence for peace, then I hate to see her, one of the great powers, go into competition with and compel all of the great powers of Europe to bring their citizens down to the verge of starvation in order to match the great American vessels. We should speak for peace, and, in my candid opinion, our voice should ever be for the purpose of disarmament rather than for the purpose of armament.

Mr. President, it has been stated by the Senator from Indiana that if at the time of our war with Spain either our country or Spain had had more war ships we might have had peace instead of a resort to arms. We determined when we wanted to go to war with Spain. We knew that we had the power to crush her at any moment's notice. We did not need but twenty-four hours' notice.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is possible that if we had not been so well armed we would not have hurried quite so much. It is possible that if the great nations of Europe were not so well prepared for war they would use diplomacy for a longer time and that diplomacy in the end would win. So this theory that being prepared for war brings peace is certainly as broad as it is long, and, in my opinion, it is broader.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If the Senator will permit me—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator says that we knew we could crush Spain. The trouble is, as I pointed out, that our preponderance was not such that Spain knew that same fact. Had our preponderance been that great, I think most of those who have studied the question agree that Spain and ourselves would have settled the difficulty by diplomatic processes.

Now, I wish to ask the Senator a question. He said that we knew that war with Spain was coming. How many persons knew that war with Spain was coming three months before it did occur? None of the veteran Senators here thought so.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is mistaken. I do not say that this country knew that war was coming with Spain.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think the Senator will find it in the RECORD.

Mr. McCUMBER. I may find it in the RECORD in some one's else address, but certainly it is not in the RECORD in my address.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think it will be found in the Senator's remarks.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; Mr. President. The proposition I make is that with a weaker power we are always able to go to war at once if we are prepared, whereas if we are not so well prepared we often settle by diplomacy what would otherwise have to be settled by the sword. The Senator from Indiana knows as well as I know that the man who goes armed is always the man who does the shooting in self-defense; that the man who knows that he is ready for an encounter is always the man who finds some excuse to get into that encounter; and what is true of the individual is equally true of great nations. There is not a powerful nation in Europe to-day capable of taking territory from another power that, by reason of her vast preponderance of power, is not anxious and ever seeking a pretext to extend her domain.

So, Mr. President, I can hardly understand the necessity for this feverish activity to suddenly add four more battle ships to our Navy. We can not even wait to build colliers to supply them, but we are compelled to go into the open market for them. It would be considered the height of folly if we were to say that we should build ships and provide guns and yet have no ammunition with which to fire them.

But that is no more of a folly than the idea that we can go to war and can supply the men for these great ships until we have built up our merchant marine. We may take young men to-day and put them directly into the Navy, but whenever with that Navy we get into a war with any great power we will have to double the number of men immediately, and where are you going to get them? You can not get them, if they are to be any good, unless they are seamen. You can not have seamen unless you build up your merchant marine. And so side by side with the gradual development of our Navy should be the gradual development of our merchant marine, to furnish the men for the Navy. And yet we are doing nothing along that line.

Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], with a great deal of vehemence, almost tragically intimated that his vote upon this subject would be governed by what foreign countries did not want him to do; and in a sentence with a dash between each word as long as a crowbar he said: "How would any foreign country want you to vote on this question?" I can answer him, "How would the steel company have us vote on a question of ten ships?" I will not be governed by the foreign idea of what we ought to do, nor will I be governed by what the steel trust would like to have us do. But I shall be governed by what I feel we ought to do in the gradual and proper building up of a great navy.

Mr. President, we are second in naval power to-day. There is not any question in my mind that in a few years we will be first, and what have I to base that assumption upon? I tell you, Senators, that the ability of these foreign countries to maintain navies of the kind they are building now has about reached a limit. They all understand that they have not the resources to continue that development and growth indefinitely. We can go on year in and year out and put out two or three or a greater number of battle ships, if it is necessary, to add to our Navy.

There is not to-day any country in Europe whose budget does not show a greater expense every year and comparatively less income to meet that expense and whose national debt is not being increased every year in order to meet the great demands upon it. There will be a limit on the other side of the ocean, and long after they have reached their limit we will be developing and increasing our Navy to a higher and higher standard of power and effectiveness. So I believe, Mr. President, that the best policy is for us to keep on developing our Navy, not too hastily, and to keep somewhere within our income. If we were to construct four this year, they would probably each be of the *Dreadnought* class. Who can say that next year we might not change our plans about effectiveness and with the same money build two or three times the number of a smaller type?

I did not really relish what I think the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] did not purposely intend to convey and yet which was conveyed to me, that every man who could not agree with the Commander in Chief upon how many ships we should build in a year was necessarily hostile to him and his policies. I do not believe there is a Senator here who is more closely attached to those great policies of the President of the United States in reference to the economic conditions in this country and the opening up and keeping open of the field of opportunity to every man, woman, and child on the American continent than I am. But that does not mean that in order to agree with him upon these great policies I must surrender my individual judgment upon just what should be done in every particular case, as to whether we should build two battle ships this year and two next, or whether we should build four this year and none next, or just how we should apportion our income to meet the thousands of governmental necessities.

So I do not believe it is proper, at least from my standpoint, to assume that anyone speaking against the consumption of nearly all our resources for the purpose of building up the Navy is hostile to the Administration generally or hostile to the wishes of the Department. I say I do not believe the Senator from Indiana intended it in that way, and yet it was conveyed to many of us in that sense. I always have stood by and ardently supported all the President's great economic reforms, because I feel that they are fundamentally and eternally right.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If the Senator from North Dakota will pardon me—

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have my remarks before me. I never made any such statement, and when the Senator comes to read my remarks, unchanged, he will find that the statement at the time it was made was absolutely free from any possible inference of that kind. I not only stated that any Senator who disagreed with the President upon the question of four battle ships was not hostile to his economic policies, but that he was not hostile to him even upon this policy. My reference, as the Senator will see when he comes to read it, was distinctly as to the weight which the Senate of the United States should give to what the President himself in his message called his solemn request of Congress to provide these ships.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am glad to have the Senator state what he has just stated. I think I attach as much importance to messages which come from the President of the United States as any other man in the Senate, but I can not but remember that only a very few months ago the President was in absolute accord with the committee of both Houses for one battle ship a year. We gave him the one; we gave him two; and if there was any reason given to the Senate why we should suddenly give four, I would support four, and if I was as fearful of war as some Senators who have expressed themselves upon this subject seem to be, I would vote for ten.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does not the Senator—

Mr. McCUMBER. I am through.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat. The Senator says "if any reason was given." Does not the Senator think that some reason was given in the President's special message, which we all have before us and which has been made public not only to this body, but to the world?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have heard of none, unless it is based upon the idea that as the other countries of the world are more rapidly increasing their navies we should do likewise.

Mr. HALE obtained the floor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HALE. I want to say a word about the order of business—

Mr. STONE. Proceed.

Mr. HALE (continuing). In which the Senator is as much interested as I am.

Mr. President, the Senate has spent substantially a solid week of long days upon this one appropriation bill. It is met with the fact that there still remain untouched the agricultural appropriation bill, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill, the great sundry civil appropriation bill—

Mr. FRYE. The post-office appropriation bill.

Mr. HALE. The post-office appropriation bill, and the general deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. WARREN. And the Military Academy bill.

Mr. HALE. And the Military Academy bill. The list is even larger and more formidable than I supposed.

Mr. WARREN. I may say that there are also conferences on nearly all of the other bills.

Mr. HALE. I was going to say that there are conferences on almost every one of the other bills which have been passed.

I think there is a general accord of sentiment that it is better, all things considered, that we have an early adjournment. I may be wrong about that, but I leave that suggestion to the minds and wishes of Senators. I think that is the feeling.

Now, we can not encompass an early adjournment unless we bring these appropriation bills speedily before the Senate and consider them and pass them and send them with the amendments to the other House and get them into conference and wind up that part of the business of the session.

That does not exclude the consideration of other appropriation bills, important bills, beside the regular appropriation bills—the omnibus claims bill, the public buildings appropriation bill and other important legislation affecting the business of the country that will come in at times when the appropriation bills do not preoccupy the floor.

I thought this was a fitting time—it is a sort of an old story—to bring this to the minds of Senators. I think it is fitting that we should over Sunday consider these things and see what we are going to do in the way of the business of the Senate.

As I have said, this bill, very important, but only one of the important bills, has occupied substantially a week. It is now half past 4 o'clock, the end of a laborious, wearisome week. I have a list, which has been given to the Presiding Officer, of those who desire to be heard on this bill. While for my

own convenience, and I presume in accord with the wishes of a very large majority of the Senate, I should like to end this bill to-night, as I hoped to do last night and the night before, I see that that is practically impossible. I am not doing this in any way to exclude proper debate; we have had it for a week, and Senators have spoken and spoken well, intelligently, and they have stuck to the subject, with no wandering, but I am constrained to do now, what is always done when we meet a condition of this kind, see if we can not agree that this bill shall be disposed of. I do not suggest holding the Senate here until 6 or 7 o'clock and then perhaps finding that we can not pass it, which would be adding a needless burden and make it tiresome, but I ask unanimous consent that the bill and all amendments shall be voted on finally previous to the adjournment on Monday.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the pending bill and all amendments—

Mr. HALE. All pending amendments.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. And to be offered—

Mr. HALE. To be offered; that is well understood.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Be voted upon before the Senate adjourns on Monday next.

Mr. STONE. Certainly, Mr. President, I have not any objection to that arrangement. I am as anxious as the Senator from Maine can be, although he is in charge of this measure, to bring it to a speedy conclusion, very largely for the reasons he has stated.

The debate so far, however, has been almost wholly upon the other side of the Chamber. Only one Senator upon this side, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY], has spoken, and he briefly. I do not know how many Senators desire to speak on this bill. I should like on Monday morning to occupy a short while. I do not wish to prolong what I shall say to the discomfort of the Senate. I wish to discuss some phases of this measure, and particularly a collateral question that has been projected into it in the course of the debate. I do not wish to proceed to-night, at this late hour. I have not any doubt that by 5 or 6 o'clock Monday we will be able to conclude the debate. We certainly ought to be and get a vote upon the amendments and upon the bill and bring it to a conclusion.

Mr. HALE. For three days, each morning, Senators have said to me, "We shall settle this matter before night." The day has gone; the time has been consumed. Can we not agree now that a day shall be fixed when we will take a vote? I want every Senator who desires to discuss it. I agree I will not interfere. I will not be in the way, although I have charge of the bill. I desire, and I presume I should have the opportunity before a vote is taken, to close the debate upon the amendment, but I do not even expect to ask that privilege. I should feel safer if we could agree that a final vote shall be taken before adjournment on Monday. I do not want to limit it to 5 o'clock. We may stay here one day until 6 or 7.

Mr. STONE. I have not any objection to that suggestion. I wish simply to say, and the Senator from Maine and others will bear me out in saying, that I have not very often protracted the final disposition of measures before the Senate by useless discussion. I do not believe that any Senator who has indicated, so far as I know, a wish to be heard has any purpose of that kind in view. I am inclined to think that the suggestion of the Senator from Maine is well made, that we conclude this bill before adjournment on Monday.

Mr. HALE. Yes. I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I wish to make one suggestion in connection with the proposed consent agreement, which is that after 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock on Monday we be limited to ten-minute speeches. There are a good many Senators here who would like, in a few words, to express why they intend to vote as they will vote, who will not have any chance unless there is some limitation of that kind. That will give everybody an opportunity to say something.

Mr. HALE. I did not think of that.

Mr. FORAKER. It is reasonable to make that request.

Mr. HALE. I have no idea that any Senator will object to it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Maine to the fact, which has been overlooked,

that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] has given notice that he will continue his remarks on the Brownsville affair on Monday.

Mr. ALDRICH. That can go over.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. WARNER. I have given notice that I intended to proceed with my remarks on Monday, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, but I certainly would not insist upon proceeding at that time if an arrangement can be made to dispose of this important measure, assuming that I will be given the same privilege on Tuesday. I recognize the importance of this matter and adapt myself to conditions.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senate will be very much obliged to the Senator for his unselfishness in the matter.

Now, I think we can readily agree that we shall take a vote previous to adjournment on Monday, and that after 3 o'clock speeches shall be under the ten-minute rule.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am in heartiest accord with the desire of the Senator from Maine for an early vote upon this bill. I expected it would be taken last night, and not only for my own personal comfort, but for the desires of other Senators I should be only too glad to come to a vote, so far as I am concerned, at any moment.

The Senator from Maine has been very courteous and very kind, as he always is, with this bill; but I wish to point out one fact: This amendment, which after all is the important amendment, as some Senators think, on this bill—more important than all the other amendments—has not taken up very much time. Only one day and part of another day have been taken up. While I was out of the Chamber I understand the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] gave notice of his desire to speak on Monday. I understand from the Senator from Delaware that he desires to speak on Monday. I have understood that the Senator from Idaho desires to speak on Monday—how long, I do not know. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] has just indicated his desire to speak on Monday, and both Senators from Utah, I think, and several other Senators, I understand, wish to speak. I regret to say—and I regret it as much as the Senator from Maine—that it will be necessary for me, I think, to consume a little time myself in some further remarks, called forth by the debate to-day.

I think all of us concede that we can get to a vote on Monday, and I suggest that the usual courtesy be extended. None of the Senators want to prolong this matter a moment. Everybody wishes that it was out of the way. I suggest that we go along and try to get to a vote on Monday. I have no doubt in the world we will reach a vote before adjournment, but let us not make an agreement which would cut any Senator off from expressing his opinions upon this very important subject, which, in view of its importance, has not taken very long.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I am deeply interested in this subject, and I did intend to speak on the amendment, but I hope the Senator from Indiana will not insist on letting this matter go on. I want to vote on it Monday.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. So do I.

Mr. SMOOT. And so far as I am personally concerned, rather than not have an agreement at this time that we shall vote upon it on Monday, I would waive my right to speak at all.

Mr. HALE. Other Senators have said the same thing.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall be very glad to make such an agreement. I will say to the Senator from Maine, with this modification, that we meet at 12 o'clock—

Mr. HALE. Eleven o'clock.

Mr. ALDRICH. Eleven o'clock.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Whatever the hour may be. I see on the Senator's list seven or eight speakers. We know that those speeches can not be made before 3 o'clock. I think the original suggestion of the Senator from Maine would be the wiser one.

Mr. ALDRICH. Why not make it 4 o'clock instead of 3 o'clock.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Let us leave it to the good sense and the mutual consideration of Senators, and agree to what the Sena-

tor from Maine originally requested, that we dispose of the bill and all amendments before adjournment on Monday.

Mr. HALE. That is all right.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well. I hope the Senator will make that request.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish merely to make a suggestion.

Mr. HALE. I have had so much experience with these things that I think we will get an agreement by gentle, easy processes.

Mr. McCUMBER. I was going to suggest—and I think it would come better from me than from some one who has not spoken on this subject, for they might feel some delicacy on the point—that those of us who have spoken on this question shall be limited to ten minutes in any address upon Monday. That will give better opportunity to those who have not spoken to be heard.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is a good Senator and a great humorist. I have another suggestion to make, which will help out—that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. KEAN. Take a recess?

Mr. HALE. We can fix that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is immaterial.

Mr. HALE. I can move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. KEAN. Let us take a recess.

Mr. HALE. Or take a recess, which is better still, and that after 4 o'clock speeches be limited to ten minutes. I do not want to curtail Senators who may want to make longer speeches on this matter, but that will give five hours. We can do all the voting in an hour or an hour and a half, and can get away and get to our homes seasonably. I shall feel like a new man when I get this off my mind. Therefore I make that request, and I will follow it by asking unanimous consent that, as a part of the proposition, the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock Monday.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. Let me make a suggestion to the Senator. Instead of taking a recess until 11 o'clock Monday I suggest that the Senator move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet at 11 o'clock Monday. I do not like the suggestion of projecting Saturday's session into Monday by a recess, which shall likewise include Sunday.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The question of a recess or an adjournment is not very material.

Mr. HALE. I do not think it is very material. I now move—

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator from Maine withhold his motion until certain bills may be laid before the Senate?

Mr. HALE. Other business can be transacted after the agreement is made.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understood that the Senator was about to move a recess.

Mr. HALE. No; I am not. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Now, I ask unanimous consent—meeting at 11, would not 3 o'clock give ample time?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Four.

Mr. HALE. Well, 4 o'clock. I ask that after 4 o'clock speeches shall be under the ten-minute rule—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think that is entirely fair.

Mr. HALE (continuing). And that the final vote shall be taken on all amendments and the bill before adjournment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think that is entirely fair.

Mr. HALE. Yes; that is satisfactory to everybody.

Mr. CULBERSON. Of course it is understood that the time between 11 o'clock and 4 will be somewhat equitably divided between those who want to discuss favorably the amendment and those who are opposed to it. With that understanding I have no objection to the agreement.

Mr. HALE. We have never made any definite agreement, but have left all that to the Chair. I have no doubt that that will be properly cared for.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine asks as a part of the agreement that the bill be taken up immediately upon convening on Monday?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the consideration of the pending bill be resumed at 11 o'clock Monday next, that the debate proceed until 4 o'clock, and that, beginning with 4 o'clock, speeches be limited to ten minutes each, and that the Senate vote on the pending amendment and amendments to be offered and the bill itself before adjournment. Is there objection?

Mr. BACON. I wish to inquire if the form in which the Chair submitted it would not cut off morning business?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It would. That is in the agreement proposed.

Mr. HALE. I want to cut off morning business.

Mr. BACON. Very well, if that is the intention.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17874) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers of said war.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the bill, with the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

SUSAN M. YEOMAN AND OTHERS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1589) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Yeoman.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the bill, with the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BULKELEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4806) to amend the military record of Aaron Cornish, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 568) thereon.

Mr. DILLINGHAM, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6242) for the establishment of a probation and parole system for the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 569) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6359) to change the name and jurisdiction of the inferior court of justice of the peace in the District of Columbia, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 570) thereon.

JOSEPH S. OAKLEY.

Mr. FORAKER. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Military Affairs the bill (S. 4451) to amend record and grant honorable discharge to Joseph S. Oakley, and I submit a report (No. 567) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to so amend the records of the War Department as to set aside the finding of the court-martial in the case of Joseph S. Oakley, late lieutenant, Company D, One hundred and twentieth New York Volunteer Infantry, and grant him an honorable discharge; but no bounty, pay, or other allowance shall become due by reason of 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.

LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. CLAPP. I report back from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 19541) to authorize the drainage of certain lands in the State of Minnesota, and I submit a report (No. 571) thereon. It is a local bill, it relates only to the State of Minnesota; and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I will be glad to explain it if anyone desires an explanation.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill, and there being no objection the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The first amendment was, in section 5, page 2, line 25, after the word "time," to insert the words "within three months," so as to read:

That at any time within three months after any sale of unentered lands has been made in the manner and for the purposes mentioned in this act patent shall issue to the purchaser thereof upon payment to the receiver of the minimum price of \$1.25 per acre, or such other price as may have been fixed by law for such lands, together with the usual fees and commissions charged in entry of like lands under the homestead laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, on page 3, line 7, after the word "laws," to insert:

If such payment is not made to the receiver within three months from the date of such sale all right to purchase or enter said land on the part of the person purchasing at the sale provided in section 3 of this act, shall cease and determine and said land shall, without further action or proceeding, be subject to entry under the homestead laws, subject first to the payment to the receiver of the minimum price of \$1.25 per acre, or such price as may have been fixed by law for such land, together with the usual fees and commissions charged in entry; second, to the payment to the receiver by the purchaser at such sale of the amount appearing to have been paid therefor under the provisions of section 4 of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, page 3, line 21, after the word "time," to insert "within ninety days," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 6. That any unpatented lands sold in the manner and for the purposes mentioned in this act may be patented to the purchaser thereof at any time within ninety days after the expiration of the period of redemption provided for in the drainage laws under which it may be sold (there having been no redemption) upon the payment to the receiver of the fees and commissions and the price mentioned in the preceding section, or so much thereof as has not already been paid by the entryman; and if the sum received at any such sale shall be in excess of the payments herein required and of the drainage assessments and cost of the sale, such excess shall be paid to the proper county officer for the benefit of and payment to the entryman.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURKETT. I understood that the bill was being read for the information of the Senate and that it was not up for consideration.

Mr. CLAPP. Oh, no; I asked unanimous consent for its present consideration, and it was taken up.

Mr. BURKETT. No one could tell whether he had any objection to it until he knew something about the provisions of the bill.

Mr. CLAPP. I hope no objection will be made. It is absolutely local and pertains simply to the State of Minnesota.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 5, at the end of section 6, after the word "entryman," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That unless the payment of \$1.25 per acre, or such other price as may have been fixed by law for such land, together with the usual fees and commissions charged in entries, be paid to the receiver within said ninety days all rights of the entryman and all rights of the purchaser at the sale provided for in section 3 of this act shall cease and determine, and said lands shall, without further action or proceedings, be subject to homestead entry under the provisions of the homestead laws, subject to paying to the receiver, first, the minimum price of \$1.25 per acre, or such other price as may have been fixed by law for such lands, together with the usual fees and commissions charged in entry of like lands under the homestead laws, and, second, upon payment to the receiver for the benefit of the purchaser at the sale provided for in section 3 of this act the amount which may appear due from the statement of such sale provided for in section 4 of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add, at the end of the bill, a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. That hereafter homestead entries and final proofs may be made upon all ceded Chippewa Indian lands in Minnesota embraced in the withdrawal under the act of June 21, 1906, entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department" (34 Stat. L., p. 325), and patents may issue thereon, as in other homestead cases, upon the payment by the entryman of the price prescribed by law for such lands, and on entries on the ceded Red Lake Reservation in addition thereto the sum of 3 cents per acre to repay the cost of the drainage survey thereof, which addition shall be disposed of the same as the other proceeds of said land.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURKETT. I have been told privately, but I should like to ask the Senator if there is any general drainage legislation contained in the bill?

Mr. CLAPP. I stated, and I supposed the Senator heard the statement, that it is purely a local bill and applies only to lands in northern Minnesota. I can make a further explanation of the bill if any Senator cares for it.

Mr. BURKETT. I understood the Senator to make that statement privately, but I did not hear him say so in the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. STEPHENSON (for Mr. LA FOLLETTE) introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6834) granting an increase of pension to Harrison J. Case;

A bill (S. 6835) granting a pension to Della S. Bond;

A bill (S. 6836) granting an increase of pension to James F. Spencer;

A bill (S. 6837) granting an increase of pension to Oscar C. Stevens;

A bill (S. 6838) granting an increase of pension to Mortica S. Smith; and

A bill (S. 6839) granting an increase of pension to George W. Van Tassel.

Mr. PILES introduced a bill (S. 6840) to amend the laws concerning transportation between ports of the Territory of Hawaii and other ports of the United States, which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPH CONVENTION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Senate a copy of the action of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Department of Commerce and Labor on the subject of the confirmation of the wireless telegraph convention signed at Berlin on November 3, 1906.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 25, 1908.

TESTS OF FUEL AND STRUCTURAL MATERIALS.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk. The resolution was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be requested to transmit to the Senate a statement of the purposes and results of the investigations and tests of the fuels and structural materials of the United States, showing the bearing of these investigations on the conservation of the mineral resources of the country.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. TELLER. It has been the custom in the Senate for thirty-odd years, to my certain knowledge, to direct and not to request an officer, except the President. I move to amend the resolution so as to direct the Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the word "requested" and insert the word "directed."

Mr. HEMENWAY. I accept the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be so modified. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

REPORT ON PETROLEUM INDUSTRY.

Mr. STEPHENSON. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to transmit to the Senate the report of the Commissioner of Corporations relating to the petroleum industry.

Mr. CARTER. I can not understand the necessity for authorizing the Secretary. I think the word "authorized" should be stricken from the resolution.

Mr. KEAN. I think I shall have to object to the consideration of the resolution to-day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the resolution will lie over.

TREATMENT OF NAVAJO INDIANS.

Mr. TELLER submitted the following resolution, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish for the information of the Senate copies of all correspondence and other papers on file in his Department or in the

office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relating to employment of United States soldiers during the year 1907 within or in the vicinity of the Navajo Indian Reservation, Arizona, in arresting By-allie and other Navajo Indians, which resulted in the killing by the soldiers or others of two Indians and the wounding of at least one other Indian, and such correspondence and other data, if any, as will furnish the names and the number of Navajo and other Indians who were imprisoned at any time within the three years last past, together with the names of those now imprisoned, in the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona, the charges against each of said Indians, by whom made, by what legally constituted court or other proceeding they were adjudged guilty of the charges against them, as a result of which the said Indians were imprisoned, the terms of their sentences, and whether at hard labor or otherwise.

RIGHTS OF THE STATES.

Mr. TELLER. I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read and then lie on the table.

The resolution was read as follows:

Resolved, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution are essential to the preservation of our republican institutions, and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States must be preserved.

That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed and lie on the table.

COMPANIES B, C, AND D, TWENTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

Mr. BULKELEY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Thursday next I will ask the Senate to listen to some remarks on Senate bill 5729, in regard to the Brownsville affray, on the supposition that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] will then have completed his remarks. I learn from him that owing to his condition of health he will require at least the morning hours of Tuesday and Wednesday under the present arrangement.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to ask my colleague on the committee a question. I assume that his notice to speak is not intended to interfere with appropriation bills?

Mr. BULKELEY. No, sir; not in any way.

RESURVEY OF TOWNSHIPS IN COLORADO.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I ask for the present consideration of the bill (S. 6033) to provide for the resurvey of certain townships in Colorado.

Mr. KEAN. The bill has already been read, I understand. I objected to it when it was up before.

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

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

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, beginning with line 5, to strike out all down to and including the word "meridian," on line 9, page 3, and to insert:

Township 9 north, of ranges 86, 87, 88, and 89; township 8 north, of ranges 86, 87, 88, and 89; township 7 north, of ranges 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, and 91; township 6 north, of ranges 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, and 91; township 5 north, of ranges 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, and 91; township 4 north, of ranges 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, and 91; township 3 north, of ranges 85 and 86; township 1 south, of ranges 101 and 102; township 2 south, of ranges 101 and 102; township 3 south, of ranges 100, 101, 102, and 103; township 4 south, of ranges 100, 101, and 102; township 7 south, of range 102; township 8 south, of ranges 102 and 103; township 10 south, of range 97; township 11 south, of ranges 97 and 98; township 12 south, of ranges 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, and 98; township 13 south, of ranges 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, and 98; township 14 south, of ranges 89 and 96; township 12 north, of ranges 87, 88, 89, 90, and 91; township 11 north, of ranges 87, 88, 89, and 90; township 10 north, of ranges 86, 87, 88, and 89; township 4 north, of range 90; township 3 north, of ranges 88, 89, 90, and 91; township 15 south, of range 89, all west of the sixth principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add, at the end of the bill, the following additional proviso:

And provided further, That the resurvey herein provided for be restricted to townships in which more than half of the area at the time of entering upon the work of resurvey is public land.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUXILIARY NAVY.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I offer the following substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr.

PILES] to the naval appropriation bill now pending. I will read it, as it is somewhat indistinct:

Substitute by Mr. NEWLANDS for the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] to the bill (H. R. 20471) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes.

The following to be added after line 5, page 87:

"For an auxiliary navy, consisting of transports, colliers, scouts, dispatch boats, and other vessels necessary in aid of the fighting ships in case of war, \$20,000,000, and the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and the Postmaster-General are hereby constituted a commission to recommend to Congress a plan for utilizing such ships in times of peace as training ships for a naval reserve and at the same time utilizing them under lease to private shipping companies or otherwise in projecting new routes of mail and commerce to foreign ports.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT EVERETT, WASH.

Mr. ANKENY. I wish to call up the bill (S. 4242) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Everett, in the State of Washington.

The Secretary read the bill, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 1, before the word "hundred," to strike out "four" and insert "two," so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase, or acquire by condemnation proceedings, a site and tract to be erected thereon, at the city of Everett, in the State of Washington, a suitable building for the use and accommodation of the United States courts, the post-office, and other Government offices in said city, with fireproof vaults extending to each story, the site and building thereon, when completed according to plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed the cost of \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 1, after the word "dollars," to strike out the following words:

And the sum of \$400,000 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the purchase of said site and the completion of said building.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 19, to strike out the following:

If, upon consideration of said report and accompanying papers, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem further investigation necessary, he may appoint a commission of not more than three persons, one of whom shall be an officer of the Treasury Department, which commission shall also examine the said proposed site and such others as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and grant such hearings in relation thereto as they shall deem necessary; and said commission shall, within thirty days after such examination, make to the Secretary of the Treasury written report of their conclusion in the premises, accompanied by all statements, maps, plats, or documents taken or submitted to them in like manner as hereinbefore provided in regard to the proceedings of said agent of the Treasury Department; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon finally determine the location of the building to be erected.

The compensation of said commissioners shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, but the same shall not exceed \$6 per day and actual traveling expenses: *Provided, however*, That the member of said commission appointed from the Treasury Department shall be paid only his actual traveling expenses.

So much of the appropriation herein made as may be necessary to defray the expenses of advertising for proposals, actual traveling expenses of said agent, and the compensation and actual traveling expenses of said commissioners and other expenses incident to the selection of the site, and for necessary survey thereof, shall be immediately available.

No money appropriated by this act shall be available, except as hereinbefore provided, until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of Washington shall have ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of said State and the service of civil process therein.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at the city of Everett, in the State of Washington."

MONUMENT TO GEN. PATRICK EDWARD CONNOR.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I ask for the present consideration of the bill (S. 643) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. Patrick Edward Connor.

The Secretary read the bill, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to appropriate \$20,000 for the purpose of procuring and erecting in Salt Lake City, Utah, a suitable monument to the memory of Gen. Patrick Edward Connor, the same to be expended and the site therefor selected under the direction of a commission composed of the Secretary of War and the governor of Utah.

Mr. KEAN. In order that my memory may be refreshed as to the valuable services of this gentleman, I should like to have the report published with the bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I ask that the report may be printed without being read.

There being no objection, the report, submitted by Mr. WETMORE on the 17th instant, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT.

[To accompany S. 643.]

The Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (S. 643) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. Patrick Edward Connor, have had the same under consideration and report it back without amendment.

Gen. Patrick Edward Connor came to America from Ireland at a very early age. He enlisted in the Regular Army and served on the southwestern frontier for five years. During the Mexican war he raised a company of volunteers in Texas and led them as their captain at the battle of Buena Vista, where he was wounded and received honorable mention for gallantry in the official dispatches. At the close of the Mexican war he settled in California. When the civil war broke out he was offered the colonelcy of the Third California Volunteers. His command consisted of the Third California Volunteer Infantry and a part of the Second California Cavalry, afterwards joined by a few companies from Nevada, and numbering all told 700 men. These troops had volunteered in the expectation of being ordered to the seat of war, but the long march overland was considered too irksome, and Colonel Connor was ordered to remain in Utah. About this time Connor was made brigadier-general.

General Connor's greatest service while stationed in Utah, outside of the firm stand he took in behalf of law and order, was his masterly campaign against the Shoshones and Bannocks, which ended in what is known as the battle of Bear River. For fifteen years these Northern tribes had infested the overland mail route, slaughtering and plundering emigrants, massacring settlers and burning their homes. General Connor determined to put a stop to these savageries and marched against the Indians in January, 1863. The main battle was fought on the 29th and the power of the Indians was broken. This victory opened up the fertile lands of Idaho and the North to settlement. This Indian war and the magnificent results which followed General Connor's victory have not received adequate recognition in the pages of history for the reason that our country was at the time engaged in the all-absorbing strife of the civil war, and the exploits of such soldiers as General Connor did not receive the attention, nor the commanders the credit, which would have resulted in times of peace. The grave of General Connor occupies a plot of ground in the military cemetery at Fort Douglas. It is proposed to erect a monument in his honor at some spot in Salt Lake City best suited to the purpose.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I want to say just a word or two. I knew Pat Connor, and I knew him very well. I knew him in the early days when he was out in the West, and I want to vote for his monument. I am very glad to do it.

Mr. KEAN. I have had no idea of voting against the bill.

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

THOMAS SMITH.

Mr. BULKELEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4134) to correct the military record of Thomas Smith.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of War to grant to Thomas Smith, a corporal of Company I, Eighty-seventh New York Infantry Volunteers, an honorable discharge as of date of June 30, 1862; but no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of 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.

MIRRIK R. BURGESS.

Mr. BULKELEY. I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 40) to correct the military record of Mirick R. Burgess.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in line 4, after the words "record of," to strike out "Mirick" and insert "Mirrick," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to correct the military record of Mirrick R. Burgess, late of Company I, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry,

and grant him an honorable discharge as of date March 28, 1863: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, or other emolument shall accrue by reason of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to correct the military record of Mirrick R. Burgess."

PUBLIC PARK IN WOODWARD, OKLA.

Mr. OWEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12773) granting to the city of Woodward, in the State of Oklahoma, lot 2, block 48, for park and other public purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to grant to the city of Woodward, Okla., lot No. 2, in block No. 48, in that city, for the use and benefit of the inhabitants of that city, for park and other public purposes.

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

JOHN OATES.

Mr. BULKELEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5883) to correct the military record of John A. Oates.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in line 5, after the name "John," to strike out the initial "A," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to review the military record and revoke the order of dismissal by general courts-martial of John Oates, late a private in Company D, Fourteenth United States Infantry, and issue to him an honorable discharge as of September 21, 1864: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to correct the military record of John Oates."

PUBLIC BUILDING AT MILLEDGEVILLE, GA.

Mr. CLAY. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2734) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Milledgeville, Ga.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, at the top of page 2, to insert "The building to be erected shall be unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet on each side, including streets and alleys," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, elevators, and heating and ventilating apparatus, for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office, in the city of Milledgeville, Ga., the cost of said site and building, including said vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, not to exceed \$50,000.

The building to be erected shall be unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet on each side, including streets and alleys.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Milledgeville, Ga."

COMPANIES B, C, AND D, TWENTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

Mr. WARNER. I do not know whether it is in the RECORD, but I should like to have it appear that the time for me to continue my address on the Brownsville affair has been changed from Monday, April 27, to Tuesday, April 28.

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 27, 1908, at 11 o'clock a. m.