

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petition of Allouez Council, No. 658, Knights of Columbus, of Rock Island, Ill., for making October 12 a holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Merchants' Association of New York, favoring the Fowler currency bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of S. M. Wilson, favoring the Crumpacker bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Chicago City Club, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of merchants of the city of New York, favoring a currency commission—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Molders' Union No. 84, of Buffalo, N. Y., for exemption of labor unions from the operations of the Sherman antitrust law, for the Pearre bill regulating injunctions, for the employers' liability act, and for the eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of agent of Indian Rights Association, against legislation authorizing the issuance of fee-simple patents for Indian allotments—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Amarillo Assembly of the American Federation of Labor, against extension of naturalization rights, and against Asiatic immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of citizens of Bloomington, Ill., for amendment to Sherman antitrust law (H. R. 20584), and for Pearre bill (H. R. 94), employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, favoring H. R. 10457, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATKINS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Jacob Israel—to the Committee on War Claims.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, April 27, 1908.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

### NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. The order of the Senate providing for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill for the entire day to the exclusion of all other business, I ask that the regular order 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 pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES], which will be stated.

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

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the restoration of our maritime power is of supreme importance. No greater question could engage the attention of Congress than one designed to accomplish that end. For many years, both in and out of Congress, I have been an ardent advocate of an increased navy and of policies looking to the rehabilitation of our merchant marine. The two things are so related that I can not think of the one without thinking of the other. The decadence of our maritime prestige and power constitutes one of the most discreditable and humiliating facts in our history. This is not the occasion to discuss the causes that have led to this misfortune or the fatuous policies which, if blindly persisted in, will make the continuance of that misfortune inevitable. No man is more solicitous than I to see our merchant ships swarming over the world, and I doubt if any is more keenly alive to the wisdom and necessity of constructing a war navy adequate to subserve the needs of our country.

Both of these things are important, but to my thinking it is really more important that we should become a commercial maritime power than a mere fighting maritime power. We need merchant ships more than we need war ships. Indeed the war ship in an important sense is but the complement of the merchant ship. Of course if we had not a single merchantman afloat we would still need a navy for purposes of defense and for the protection of our people and their interests abroad.

Nevertheless, the need of a navy is greatly augmented and the uses to which it can be put are greatly multiplied as the merchant marine of a nation grows and the commerce and carrying trade of a nation expands. To-day we are practically without a merchant marine, although some feeble effort to revive that great interest is now being made—an effort, however, which I believe is destined to fail because directed upon mistaken lines. To-day we have but a few merchant ships on the ocean outside the coastwise trade, and 90 per cent of our foreign tonnage is carried in foreign bottoms. England, Germany, and other commercial countries have their merchant ships scattered all over the world, and the vast interests these commercial vessels represent magnifies the necessity of a larger naval force for their protection than would otherwise be required.

In this respect the situation of the United States is not analogous to that of the other leading naval powers. I hope the day is not distant when this disparity which stands as a monument to a policy at once sinister, sordid, and short sighted will disappear. But the condition now is as I gave it. Nevertheless, I am heartily in favor of going ahead with the work of building an adequate navy.

I favor an adequate navy, not necessarily a powerful navy. What we want now to do is to supply a navy sufficient for our probable present needs, and then we should go on from year to year with the work of adding to it so that its growth will keep pace with the public requirements. Under present conditions I do not quite fancy the word "powerful" as applied to the Navy. It would be an odd spectacle to see the ocean highways and sheltering places crowded with war ships without ever seeing or rarely seeing a merchant ship floating our flag. We should not aspire to become the bully of the sea. Our aim should be higher than that. Let us get rid of this profitless and arrogant notion of a powerful fleet, for which manifestly there is no present need unless it be to make the world afraid. Let us get rid of that and get down to the sane business of building a navy adequate for our purposes by adding to it from time to time as occasion demands.

Mr. President, what do we want a fleet for? Not, I hope, that we may go dancing around the world with defiance flung from the flag pole, or merely to make a gaudy and pretentious exhibition of our strength; but we want a navy to aid in the protection of our seacoast from assault and for the purpose of protecting such interests as we have abroad. How large a navy do we need for that? Already in naval armament and destructive force we rank second among the nations of the world. Our important seaports are strongly fortified, and these fortifications are being extended and new works constructed from year to year. With such a navy and with such coast defenses are we in danger of assault?

It is inconceivable that any sane man can believe it to be within the range of human possibility that any nation on earth could make a successful attack on this country. And it is almost as absurd to say that a hostile fleet would attempt to cross the Atlantic or the Pacific to assault us, for at the best the only thing they could hope to do would be to batter down an occasional defenseless coast town or village. They could not land troops or hope to capture important ports, nor levy tribute or secure booty sufficient to pay the fuel cost of their battle ships. To my thinking it is ludicrous to speak seriously of a hostile fleet crossing thousands of miles of ocean, bringing supplies, and establishing a base on American shores.

Our strength as a nation, both in men and in resources, and the spirit and courage of the American people, more than a navy are the things that give us immunity from outside aggression, and are the things also that make most for the world's tranquillity. And certainly, Mr. President, as long as we maintain our position as the second naval power of the world, or even maintain a position equal to any other power except Great Britain, it is worse than folly to anticipate that any nation would attempt to wage an offensive war against us. I am not in the least moved by suggestions of that character. We should have an adequate fleet, undoubtedly, and we will have it and maintain it because as a great nation with a great mission we ought to have it, but there is no need of frightening ourselves with bugaboos. Of course the contingency of war is always possible, and we ought to be always reasonably prepared for it if it comes. The aggregate of our naval strength should enable us to maintain an adequate defensive fleet in both the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans, and the two combined should be strong enough, ordinarily at least, to constitute an offensive fleet in the improbable event of needing it for that purpose.

I want the Navy increased; I want to see it strong, but we can not build in a day. There are other needs more emergent for money. We need buildings for the transaction of public business; our rivers and harbors must be improved; great in-

terior works of inestimable value must be developed—there are innumerable needs which, in the aggregate, will require very large expenditures. There is no pressing need for striding with great leaps and bounds in these warlike preparations; there is no need of rushing on at a furious pace and with headlong extravagance. We can wisely afford to make haste more slowly and deliberately. No one is menacing us with war. I know of but one acute international imbroglio confronting us now, and I do not know that that is acute. I read almost daily press accounts of a controversy between this Government and that of Venezuela, but, however that controversy may eventuate, no one imagines that it can ever necessitate the employment of a large naval force. With the balance of the world, so far as I am advised, we are at peace. This little speck on our southern horizon, hanging there like the soiled hand of a spoiled child, and about as dangerous, is the only sign of a storm. Senators have filled this Chamber with ominous warnings and lugubrious intimations, but they do not enlighten us as to the facts, if any facts there be, upon which they predicate their frightful prophecies.

They say the President urges the construction of four ships instead of two, and then they take us far enough into their confidence to tell us that we do not know what the President or the Secretary of State may know. We are solemnly advised that these high officials may be possessed of information which they have not vouchsafed to us. That may be, and they may have had also some special revelation about the day of judgment that we know not of. But, Mr. President, all this is to me like the fabric of a dream—baseless, intangible, fanciful, impossible. I can not be driven by such sensational "tommyrot." Something was said, too much, indeed, about the possibility of war with Japan.

Mr. President, these were unwise utterances on the floor of the American Senate. They were made, I am sure, without proper deliberation. They were ill-considered, untimely observations, thoughtlessly made in the haste and ardor of debate and made no doubt with the hope that the bare suggestion that such a tragedy was possibly impending would promote the cause the Senators were advocating. These utterances were all the more unfortunate because so much has been said in sensational journals and magazines, both here and in Europe, about the possibility of a serious breach between the United States and Japan. Within the last twelve months the world has been flooded with this lurid literature. Mr. President, talk of this kind, iterated and reiterated as it has been, is most unfortunate. More than that, it is wanton and wicked.

Of course we can have war with Japan if we want it and seek it. But you know, Mr. President, and every sane man in America knows, that we do not want a war with Japan, and I know that Japan does not want a war with us. During the spring and summer of last year it was my privilege to spend some months in Japan. While there I met and mingled with all classes of her people. I conversed with many of the highest officials of the Empire—ministers, judges, and legislators. I met leading members of the bar, doctors of medicine, doctors of law, educators, bankers, merchants, and manufacturers—men representing the various industrial activities of the nation—met them singly and in company; and I met hundreds of the middle classes and the common people and talked with them, usually through an interpreter, although many spoke English fairly well. In other words, I went all over Japan and talked with people everywhere and of every class, from the most powerful public officials down to the jinrikisha man, that human horse whose unmatched endurance is one of the marvels of the Orient.

I was in Yokohama when the first news came of the San Francisco riot and was in Japan during the earlier and more acute stages of the school controversy at San Francisco. The news of these incidents came by way of Europe, and you may be sure that they were duly exaggerated, red as blood, and streaked with yellow. The comments of the local press for the most part were dignified and temperate. There were occasional outbursts of resentment and defiance, but these were exceptional. I was unable to observe any widespread excitement among the people. There was little effort made to arouse a spirit of aggressive hostility. The general expression of the press and of the people was one of surprise and regret. They did not believe that the people of the United States or that the Government of the United States was unfriendly to them, and I pledge you, Mr. President, I did not hear at any time a single expression from any Japanese, whether of high or low degree, that did not indicate the highest regard and friendship for our Government and our people. It might be that less credulous men than I would have regarded such assurances with suspicion. It may be that the entire people of Japan play a game of duplicity and deception, but I did not think so then, nor do I think so now. I was

impressed, as was ex-Senator Towne, with whom I traveled, with the sincerity of Japanese friendship for America. What cause have we for war with Japan or Japan with us? Already the delicate questions growing out of Japanese immigration to these States has been substantially adjusted by diplomacy. I can not conceive it to be within the range of human probability that these two great countries will ever have occasion to enter upon a disastrous war about a matter of that kind. The possibility is too remote to challenge our serious attention.

Then, are we going to war about Manchuria and the open door? In answer to that question I desire to read an article I recently clipped from one of the leading papers of Washington. I regret not having made a note of it, and hence I am not now able to state whether the article was from the Post or the Herald, but I have seen the publication, at least in substance, in several other of the important journals of the country. The article is as follows:

The "open-door policy" as to China, it is explained, is simply a policy, an attitude of mind. It is not guaranteed by a treaty, and no scheme for enforcing it has ever been formulated and adopted among the nations.

In fact, the State Department authorities are of the opinion that Japan's aggressions in Manchuria do not violate in any way the letter of the open-door understanding. Rather, Japan is doing the very things that the open-door idea makes possible for any enterprising nation to do that cares to take advantage of the opportunity, and is skillful enough to get the concessions.

If American or English or German interests wanted to go into Manchuria and compete with Japan, they would be at liberty to do so. The difficulty is that Japan has been so prompt and determined in grasping the opportunity that she has grasped all there is of it. Even if the United States were disposed to insist on a better chance for Americans in Manchuria, there would be no benefits, because there is no American trade there, nobody seems to care to develop any, and there are no American ships on the Pacific to carry such commerce.

Japan is forcing competition out of Manchuria, and more and more absorbing the trade of the rest of China, simply because she has pushed the opportunity and strengthened her position. But to root her out now, it is said, must be a commercial rather than a diplomatic affair.

Mr. President, that article so well expresses the thought I have that I do not care to elaborate it. Is Japan doing anything in China that any other nation is not at liberty to do? Embracing and utilizing her opportunities, she is rapidly extending her commerce not only in Manchuria but throughout China. Has not Japan a right to compete, as much right as we have to compete, for the business of China or of any other country? What ground of complaint have we on that account?

But I am told that Japan has designs on China, not only on Korea or Manchuria, but on China proper; that her policy is grasping and sinister, and that she looks not only to commercial extension but to some character of suzerainty over the Empire, and to the domination of its political as well as its commercial policies. I do not know about that. I would not be surprised if there was some foundation for that apprehension.

But, Mr. President, are not other nations doing substantially the same thing? Are not several of the great powers of Europe moving along the same lines, establishing spheres of influence covering large areas with enormous populations and involving commercial interests with vast possibilities? Are they not seeking to do substantially what we are told Japan seeks to do? Why do we object to the one more than to the other? Why do we fear the one more than the other?

I favor the open-door policy, and I am opposed to the disintegration or the partition of the Chinese Empire. Circumstances may arise some time when it will be necessary for this nation to take an advanced and maybe an extreme position upon this question. The protection of our rights may some time make that necessary. But that lies off in the future; it is not a question for to-day, and it does not involve us alone. It is a possibility too remote to make it the basis of immediate and immense war preparations.

If for any cause we contemplate a war with Japan or with England or with Germany or with any other power, and if it is our purpose to prepare for it now, then we ought to build not four but forty battle ships.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that any apprehension regarding Japan closing the door of Manchuria or Korea to this country or to the rest of the world comes with an ill grace from this country, which has been seeking by an organized effort, represented by a measure that passed the House during the last session, to give this country preferred rights of trade in the Philippine Islands, and which has put upon the statute book a law intended to drive Japan entirely out of the carrying

trade of the Philippines and to give a monopoly of the trade to the American people.

It seems to me that if there are any signs of aggression in the Orient, the signs are manifested by the United States much more than they are by Japan and that we have taken a more advanced step toward entering that territory and endeavoring to close out the legitimate trade of other nations than Japan ever has taken.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the Senator may be right. I will let his statement stand. But I wish to say that the Japanese are a wonderful people. Their rise is the marvel of a century. They are a highly civilized, intelligent, progressive, and aggressive people. There is much in their history, particularly during the last half century, that challenges the admiration of mankind. But they do not command my unstinted admiration. My friend from Nevada speaks of Korea and of the Philippines. It so happened that during my journey in the East I arrived at Seoul, the capital of Korea, on the evening following the battle which occurred in the streets of that city as the result of a remarkable and historical order issued. I have no doubt under compulsion, by the imbecile Emperor of Korea disbanding his army. I will not speak now of the tragic and exasperating scenes incident to that struggle, a part of which I witnessed and a part of which was related to me by eyewitnesses. For manifest reasons I think it best not to discuss that subject at this time on the floor of the Senate.

But this I will venture to say: That the Japanese in Korea are as arbitrary, domineering, despotic, tyrannical, and cruel as any conquering nation has ever been in modern times, if not in the whole history of the civilized world. It was pathetic to see the people of Korea in their quaint garb moving with fear about the streets, afraid to gather in groups, speaking in whispers, the very picture of a people subjugated and overwhelmed with despair. It was a pathetic scene—a tragic situation. But, Mr. President, when I looked at it I did not feel authorized as an American, remembering the Philippines only a few hundred miles to the south and a part of that same great Orient, to level any rasping criticism against the Japanese for what they were doing in Korea.

But I go back to the point where I was when interrupted, and ask, waiving everything else, Can we hope successfully to compete with Japan for the trade of China? Of course we ought to extend our trade in China, as everywhere, but under existing conditions I doubt whether it is possible for us to compete, with great hope of success, with Japan for the trade of the Orient.

Let us see about that. In the first place, Japan has already a merchant marine superior to ours, and is adding to it rapidly from year to year. The policy of free ships is the policy of Japan. The Japanese can buy his ship anywhere in the world, give it Japanese registry, and fly over it the Japanese flag. More than that, the policy of subsidizing, with a view to encouraging and aiding in the construction of merchant ships at home, prevails in Japan. Free ships and subsidies by the Government is their policy, and there is in consequence a rapid augmentation in the number of Japanese merchant vessels. Why, Mr. President, I saw it reported a few days since that a contract has been practically completed for the establishing of a new Japanese line between Tacoma and our Northwestern ports and Yokohama. When that is done, if it shall be, it will make, as I understand it, the fifth line of Japanese ships plying regularly between Japan and America. We have but two, I think it is, and one of these, at least—the Harriman line, so-called—is compelled to fly foreign flags over a part of their ships, and they are forbidden to take on and carry passengers or freight between Hawaii and our mainland, because they were built abroad. This disparity puts us at a great disadvantage.

Then, Mr. President, consider the proximity of Japan to China as compared with us. Japan can reach our hand and put her fingers upon the shores of China, while we have 8,000 miles of ocean rolling between the two countries.

Then, again, Mr. President, the question of labor, standing alone, is an almost insuperable bar against our people maintaining a successful commercial competition with Japan in China. Their manufacturing industries are growing apace with a rapidity that excites wonder and challenges admiration.

I visited numerous establishments in many cities of Japan, great manufacturing industries of divers and sundry kinds. I will speak only of Osaka, for Osaka is the leading manufacturing center of Japan, as it is of the entire Orient. Osaka is a town of about 1,200,000 population. While there we visited numerous establishments. There are over 600 establishments in Osaka, each employing more than 50 people, and altogether these 600 establishments employ 96,000 men and women. We visited the Royal brush factory at that place. This establishment employs 600 people, 80 per cent women and girls. The

wages paid by them range from \$17 to \$20 per month for men, from 11 to 12 cents per day for women, and from 7 to 8 cents per day for girls. We also visited one of the Osaka woolen mills and one of the cotton mills. The former employs 400 people, 90 per cent women, and the cotton mill employs 2,000, about 90 per cent women.

The product of these mills is of excellent grade and quality, up to the standard of production in this country or in Europe. The hours of labor are eleven; the wages running from \$17 to \$20 per month for men, 11 to 12 cents per day for women, and from 7 to 8 cents for girls. We also visited the Osaka iron works and shipyard. This establishment employs 4,000 men, every one a Japanese. It is a mammoth concern, engaged in manufacturing steel and iron products and in shipbuilding. At the time we were there they had ten merchant vessels of different dimensions in the docks and in course of construction. There are other similar large establishments in the Empire. As I understand it, Japan builds her war vessels in her own shipyards. But there are several large shipbuilding establishments owned by individuals or corporations, and I was told that all were constantly employed to the utmost of their capacity.

Here is a country that has free ships. They can come here or go to Europe or anywhere, buy their ships, and fly their flag over them, and yet they have thousands and thousands of men daily employed in the construction and repair of ships of all kinds at home and are filling the seas with their own manufacture.

Mr. President, the overcrowded condition of the population in Japan makes it absolutely necessary to her existence that she should develop her industries and give employment to her people, and that makes it necessary for her to struggle to command the trade of the Orient. It is a matter of life with her.

Mr. President, there is a kind of commercial interdependence between Japan and China. Iron, wool, cotton, brush bristles, and other raw materials are imported in great quantities from China. It is from China she gets the bulk of her raw material—all she can get—and naturally to China she will sell the bulk of her manufactured products. Perhaps our best chance in the Orient is to sell raw cotton to Japan. About 80 per cent of the cotton now absorbed in the mills of Japan is from America.

Still Japan will buy all she can from China, because it is closer, because it is cheaper, and because it is to her interest to do so.

Mr. President, the Government of Japan is aiding in the development of Japanese manufactures. The consul-general at Yokohama, a very intelligent and capable man, showed me—and I have no doubt that he has sent it to the State Department—a report upon that subject. Japan aids in the development of manufactures first by lending money at low rates of interest to manufacturers, not directly out of the imperial treasury, but indirectly through the imperial banks, the stock of which is largely owned by members of the imperial household. They go abroad and borrow money at the lowest possible rates of interest and lend it to the manufacturers whenever the enterprise is such as to command the confidence of the Government. Then the taxing power is also used in the way of tariffs and subsidies to aid in manufactures. Subsidies are employed directly in Japan to upbuild manufacturing industries. The Government is behind them. The people individually are for the most part poor, but Japan is a great beehive of industry. The governmental and social organization is such that the power of the whole people and the wealth of the nation can be employed to promote the national welfare. Altogether they constitute a stupendous and powerful unit. Every effort is being made and every energy spent by Japan to develop and increase her industrial activities, and especially her manufacturing interests.

More than that, special rates of transportation are given to the manufacturers over the railroads, all of which are owned by the Government, not only in Japan, but also in Korea and Manchuria, and the subsidized merchant vessels give special rates when required to the transportation of goods designed for foreign trade.

Mr. President, under such circumstances, considering the proximity of Japan to China, considering the capacity of the Japanese to create the things that the Chinese need, and her absorption of Chinese raw material, considering the interdependence in a commercial way of the two countries, considering the aid the Government gives to the upbuilding of the national industries, considering the vastly greater cost to us of production and transportation, and considering the overwhelming necessity of Japan reaching out and controlling as far as possible the commerce of that part of the world, is it not clear

that when we undertake to wrest the trade of China from Japan we will undertake an extremely difficult task?

Mr. President, I think we would do better if we would turn our attention more to the south, to the growing countries of Central and South America. Our position with reference to them, so far as proximity, civilization, and all that is concerned, is not much different from that which obtains between Japan and China. The commercial policy of our people should be, so it seems to me, to reach out to the south and strive to control that commerce—already vast, and which during the next century is destined to increase with great rapidity.

Mr. President, Japan has as much right to fight for the commerce of China as we have, as England has, as France has, as Germany has; and so long as the door is open, so long as we can go in and compete without unfair interference, we have no just reason to complain. Our people are doing but little to acquire commercial supremacy in the Orient. Our trade there is comparatively small and we are doing nothing, or but little, to enlarge it. Japan is devoting all the mighty energies of her great people to that one thing above all others; and if she excels us, if we fall behind, what else could we expect?

At all events, this commercial rivalry and competition furnishes no occasion for war. It is not even a provocation to war when considered from the standpoint of a Christian civilization.

No, Mr. President, there is no more cause for war with Japan nor danger of it than of war with any European power. Therefore, I see no need whatever, nothing present, nothing apparent, nothing within the range of the probable, for undue haste in this work of navy building. Let us go on with the work, but let us proceed along sane and conservative lines in the due course of practical administration. On this side, at least, let us avoid hysteria, spasm, and jingoism, go slow, and wait. It was a Democratic Administration that revived the policy and gave new impetus to the work of rebuilding the American Navy and making of it a strong and effective arm of the public service. A few months hence we have excellent reason for believing that this great work will be again committed to the same hands. If that good fortune comes to the country, we will go on building ships, building them fast enough and building them without waste or extravagance. The extravagance of our expenditures has become so appalling that even such Senators as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] and others like him rise here to protest. Let me read a brief extract from the speech made on Saturday last by the Senator from Rhode Island:

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 \$80,000,000. 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?

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], and others expressed themselves to the same effect. The Senator from Rhode Island asks—

What do Senators propose to do about this?

I go beyond the Senate and ask, "What does the American electorate, the great body of the American people and taxpayers, propose to do about it?" Every dollar going into the Treasury to meet the expenses of the Government is a dollar wrung in some form from the people. Every dollar of that kind represents an exaction levied on the industrial activities of the country. I do not care whether it is done directly or indirectly, whether in one way or another, it is a tax, and taxes are paid by the people. There is nobody else to pay them. Our friends on the other side confessedly have been going on piling up millions upon millions in the Treasury, useless millions. Inevitably and with the certainty of fate the influx of these vast revenues would lead, as the Senator from Rhode Island admits they have led, to wild, reckless, and wasteful extravagance in expenditures. We have schemes upon schemes—everybody has a scheme—to get money out of the Treasury under the guise or pretense of some public good. Fast as the revenues have grown, they have not kept pace with the growth in expenditures. This year we are promised a deficiency of \$60,000,000 or more, and the end is not yet. Here we have a number of eminent Republican Senators clamoring for additional appropriations,

among others this great and comparatively useless appropriation for two additional battle ships, and none can tell to what point this enormous deficiency will be advanced. Mr. President, I am waiting for the day when the expenditures of the Government may be reduced and the burdens of the people reduced. I am waiting the day when the tax burden will be levied to raise only enough to meet the needs of the Government, honestly, efficiently, and economically administered. Put an end to this era of tax extortion and wild extravagance—put an end to that, and we will end it when the opportunity comes, and then be sure we will go on developing and improving our country, building its Navy, expanding its commerce, and administering all its stupendous affairs without bankrupting the Treasury or oppressing the people.

I shall vote for two ships and no more. I shall do that because it is enough and all we ought to attempt.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I desire to say a word or two, and a word or two only, with reference to the pending question. I intend to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. FILES], proposing to increase the number of battle ships to be constructed under the terms of this bill from two to four, and I have no apology to make here or elsewhere for that vote. I intend to vote for the amendment, not because I believe war to be either certain or probable, because I do not so believe; but because I know war is always possible. I shall vote for it upon the same theory that I would take out a policy of insurance upon my home—not because I believed that it was either certain or probable that it would be destroyed by fire, but because I knew that such a calamity was always possible, and that it was the part of prudence for me to indemnify myself against that contingency.

The President of the United States has been credited with having given utterance to a somewhat famous aphorism—"speak softly and carry a big stick. You will go far." The President does not advise us to carry a stick in the spirit of the bully who goes up and down the land seeking heads to crack for the mere satisfaction of cracking them, but he in effect advises us to carry the big stick for defensive and not for offensive purposes at all. Applied to the affairs of Government, in my judgment, no wiser or better thing has even been said. Thus applied the police force of a city becomes the big stick of the municipality. Every well-governed city maintains a police force big enough adequately to meet and cope with exceptional emergencies. It is very rare indeed that the entire reserve force is called into aggressive action, but the enemies of organized society understand that it is there ready at a moment's notice to preserve the peace and prevent disorder. A hundred men, Mr. President, may be employed month after month peacefully, and during all that time perhaps not ten may be called into active service, but no wise man ever insists for that reason that the force is unnecessarily large, because he realizes that after all the principal purpose of the organization is to stand as a grim and silent shield between him and the lawless elements of society.

In the same way the Navy is the big stick of the nation. We build our Navy big and strong, not for purposes of aggression, but for purposes of defense. We maintain it at a high standard of efficiency, not to make war, but to conserve the peace. The people of this great Republic being a peace-loving people, ought to be given the ability to be a peace-compelling people as well. No navy, however big, can ever be used for any purpose of which the American people do not approve. For anyone to contend that the building of a great and powerful navy will make our people more aggressive or render war any more likely is to assert an idle and foolish thing. It might as well be asserted that because a man has big muscles and high courage he is therefore necessarily more quarrelsome.

In the one case as in the other, the very possession of this strength prevents trouble, because it constitutes an admonition to those who may be seeking strife to go elsewhere in search of it. In the last analysis it is neither the Army nor the Navy which makes war. It is the American people, and their poise of character, their sense of justice, their intelligence are all such that they will never consent to the making of any war that is not both just and necessary. If we shall build a great and powerful navy, it will deter others from seeking war against us, and between the two things—namely, our own desire for peace and the wholesome respect which our obvious strength will inspire in others—an unjust or unnecessary war will become almost impossible.

Upon the other hand, Mr. President, we are told that a foreign war is an impossibility and therefore a greater navy is unnecessary. No man has any authority for making that assertion. He would be justified in saying the chances of war are remote, but they are not impossible. War is always possible

just as fire and pestilence are always possible. We have not yet reached the millenium. There have been wars from the beginning, and there will be wars to the end until that day shall come, when, to paraphrase the language of Tennyson—

The war drum throbs no longer and the battle flags are furled  
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.

It is no doubt a melancholy fact, but it is a fact nevertheless, that the nations of this world, when their interests are involved, respect power a good deal more than they respect sentiment. It is quite true that in the past our diplomacy has been sufficient in the vast majority of instances to settle our diplomatic disputes, and it will be sufficient for that purpose in the future. But in the future as in the past there will come that occasional, exceptional day of great stress when our battle ships and our great guns will do more to preserve the credit and the honor of this nation than all the diplomacy which can be practiced between now and the day of judgment. It is that exceptional one day—and not the three hundred and sixty-four days—which I have in mind in casting my vote in favor of this amendment. The historic gentleman from Texas expressed my thought precisely when he said:

You do not often need a gun in Texas, but when you do you need it mighty sudden.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator from Utah pardon an interruption at this point?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I will remind him that in the border land, especially between Texas and Mexico, when they have a dance, and when it is understood that it will be a peaceful dance, they always deposit their guns and check them, knowing by experience that the absence of guns insures a peaceful entertainment, while the presence of guns may entail the reverse.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In just a moment I will.

Mr. CARTER. I should be glad to have the Senator's comments upon both observations at once. The same rule relative to the checking of guns preliminary to a dance in Texas applies to a cake walk in North Carolina, when gentlemen are requested to check their razors upon entering.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This discussion on the habits in Texas in reference to dances and of the people of other localities in reference to cake walks, with which the two Senators seem to be so familiar, is very interesting. But I suggest that while there may be peaceful dances and peaceful cake walks, there are not any peaceful wars. When we get into war we do not want to have our guns checked. We want to have them on hand.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator, and that is, whether he can suggest any nation which in the eventuality of disturbance will check its navy?

Mr. CLAPP. I suggest that one can not answer the inquiry at this time without infringing too much upon the time of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the Senator might say at once whether he thinks any foreign nation would be willing to check its navy.

Mr. CLAPP. I am perfectly willing to say now, in my humble judgment, that the nations of the world will not check the development of their navies in the presence of a sudden and unexplained development to a fourfold ratio of our own Navy.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think these nations will check their naval development, whatever we do.

Mr. President, the argument for economy which has been made here does not appeal to me with any great force. The Senators who exhibit so much alarm for the safety of the Treasury because of this proposition to appropriate an additional \$22,000,000 for the national defense will have laid before them in a few days a bill appropriating twenty or thirty million dollars to build some additional post-offices in the United States. I am inclined to think they will vote for the bill with the utmost tranquillity. I do not complain of this. It is right. I am in favor of that bill, and I shall vote for it as I vote for this proposition, because I think it is a wise and proper expenditure of the public money and because I think this nation is rich enough to afford it. But as between the two measures, this proposition, in my judgment, is vastly more important in the proportion that the national defense is more important than the national comfort.

To build battle ships costs money, it is true, but war costs more. War not only costs money, but costs human lives and

human heartache and human suffering, none of which can be measured in terms of dollars and cents.

Mr. President, if I had my way the great fleet which now lies in the Pacific waters would remain there permanently, and we would build upon this side another fleet big enough and powerful enough and efficient enough to protect this rich and populous coast against even the most unexpected contingency. If we shall do that and in the course of fifty years prevent a single war, we shall have justified every dollar of expenditure which may be made in that time. If we shall do that and war shall not come, so much the better. If we shall do that and war shall come, so much the better also, because we will then be prepared to meet the emergency with honor and with success.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, this debate seems already quite too protracted. I should not venture to consume the time of the Senate at all were it not for some things said and other things to be inferred from what has been said in the course of the discussion on this question. No Senator is required to explain why he votes a certain way, but it is sometimes better, not necessarily to attempt to convince others, but candidly to state the impelling motive for action on an important question.

The present situation is very simple in one aspect and very serious in another. To the end that we may draw something of a clear view from what has been said and done, I will briefly recapitulate what has gone before this discussion.

In 1905 the President of the United States in a well-considered message complimented the Congress and the country upon the steady, conservative growth of our Navy. He wisely suggested that it would be well to counteract deterioration and to steadily add something to existing strength by constructing one battle ship each year.

In 1906 substantially the same recommendation was made, but the President suggested in December of last year that four battle ships be provided for at this time instead of one. The Congress authorized the construction of two battle ships, following the message of 1905, and it provided for two battle ships following the message of 1906.

There was a variance only in number, the President recommending one and the Congress, having in mind a continuance of its steady, conservative policy, free from any manifestation of fright, authorizing the construction of two battle ships each year.

When the President in December last suggested the propriety of constructing four battle ships, the Senate, without regard to party lines, in conformity with the habit which has grown up, naturally felt inclined to accept the views of the President. But a committee of the other body, consisting of nineteen members, thoroughly skilled and experienced in the consideration of naval legislation, concluded, with only two dissenting voices, that two battle ships, to be authorized this year as last, would respond to the needs of the country and comport with the best judgment of the committee. The House of Representatives, by substantially two-thirds majority, sustained that view.

Thus the measure came for consideration to this body and was duly referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. That committee, consisting of Members under whose care the new American Navy has been built up, concluded unanimously that the construction of two battle ships was wise, and that the construction of additional battle ships was unnecessary and inexpedient. So the committee unanimously reported to the Senate the bill of the House without amendment as regards the number of battle ships to be authorized.

At this point the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] presented an amendment proposing to strike out the word "two" and insert the word "four," so that the bill will read "four battle ships" instead of two, if the amendment is adopted. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], the chairman of the committee, suggested that the Senate's mind was made up, and a vote might be taken. The Senate had been considering this subject.

It had been a matter of discussion in the public press of the country. It had been considered in committees of both Houses. Extensive debates in the other branch appeared in extenso in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from day to day, in which debates Members had cited every fact and circumstance that has been recited or referred to in the course of this protracted discussion in the Senate. So I think the Senator from Maine was clearly within the proprieties in saying that in his judgment the mind of the Senate was made up and it would be well to take a vote. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] at this point—

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CARTER. Most assuredly.

Mr. FLINT. Does the Senator from Montana insist as a general proposition that every measure which has been considered in the House of Representatives and has been debated there should, without one word of debate in this body, be considered as having a majority in favor of it?

Mr. CARTER. That is not the statement made. The Senator from Maine said that the Senate had considered this subject fully, and, he thought, was ready to vote. I think the Senate is ready to vote now. I am not giving undue prominence to any of the many avenues of information upon which the Senate has deliberated or through which it has acquired knowledge on the subject.

Mr. CLAPP. Including the Senator's own effort.

Mr. CARTER. I hope that will count for something. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] thereupon proceeded to catechise and lecture the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] for presuming to suggest that this honorable body would proceed to a vote without deliberation, and thereby destroy the ancient and honorable reputation of the Senate as a deliberative body. I was led to believe that the thanks of the membership might be due to the distinguished Senator from Indiana for flying to the relief of the Senate's imperiled reputation in that direction.

He would be so entitled to our eternal thanks were it not for the definition of the word "deliberate." I find in the dictionary, and will have inserted in my remarks the definitions of the word "deliberate." "Deliberate" means to think over, to weigh, to balance, to consider. Now, Senators are very much like folks. Some folks speak without deliberating, and other folks deliberate without speaking, and still others deliberate and speak. I am not classifying in this behalf, but merely attempting to define mental methods.

But the Senator, not content with this assault upon the Senator from Maine, proceeded to marshal a line of alleged historical facts. I was led, when the Senator from Indiana was catechising the Senator from Maine, to the thought that if we should resolve the Senate into a school for the study of naval construction, history, and power, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Maine, would be entitled to a professorship, teaching a postgraduate course, while most of the balance of us would be in knee breeches and shirt waists in the kindergarten class of that school.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. FLINT. I was about to suggest, if the Senator from Montana was going to make comments upon the Senator from Indiana, that it would be well to have the latter Senator present.

Mr. CARTER. I observe he is here. The Senator from Maine, by thirty-eight years of superb and spotless service in the halls of Congress, has become entitled to a place in the front rank of the high class of American statesmen. I am free to say, as to the American Navy, or the new Navy, more properly speaking, not one dollar has ever been appropriated in any bill for its creation or maintenance except in a bill reported by the Senator from Maine, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. When he says, with the support of his entire committee, that this conservative measure is the wise and prudent limit of present development in our naval construction, I believe he is speaking with sufficient justification.

But, aside from the criticism upon the Senator from Maine and the defense of this as a deliberative body, the Senator from Indiana shook my faith in both his capacity as a prophet and his keenness of penetration in all matters relating to correct historical deduction. He cited us cases wherein we had been suddenly plunged into war, and said all wars come suddenly, unexpectedly. He cited the war, the so-called "war," with Tripoli, made renowned by the exploits of Commodore Decatur.

Mr. President, that is not important here, but it is important to determine somewhat of the kind of facts with which Senators deal on those commonplace matters with which we are all familiar. In 1795 we began paying tribute to the Barbary pirates. There was, except when we purchased peace, a state of war thenceforward until Commodore Decatur went to Tripoli in 1804. The flagstaff of the American consulate at Tripoli was cut down in 1801, and that act was a declaration of war. It was three years thereafter before we took notice of that war. It had been brewing for almost a generation. It did not come upon the country suddenly at all.

The war of 1812, the Senator says, burst from the clouds, as it were. Mr. President, that war was germinated in the days of George Washington.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator misquotes me. All wars had been germinating for a long time, but when they come they come suddenly, in spite of prophecies that they will not take place.

Mr. CARTER. The two wars referred to did not come suddenly, and they did not come unexpectedly. They did not come as quick as the American people thought they ought to come.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator deny that right down almost to the outbreak of hostilities between this country and Spain there were statements by very eminent and very conservative men that there would not be and could not be a war? I have the authorities here. Does he deny that?

Mr. CARTER. I suppose some Senators did not think there was a demand for it—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The point was with reference to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], that he had said that war was "absolutely impossible." I cited instances to show that prophecies had been made as to wars being utterly "impossible" to come, and yet, in spite of such prophecies, within a very short time they were upon us. That is the statement I made.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator referred to the *Trent* affair, and stated that the *Trent* affair had almost precipitated war unexpectedly. The truth is that Mason and Slidell were captured on the *Trent*, and Secretary Seward and Mr. Lincoln completely backed down and disavowed the act of the commander of the vessel and left nothing to fight about.

Then the little riot down in New Orleans was cited as a case that ought to be considered in connection with this bill. Twenty-five thousand dollars settled the difficulty in New Orleans. Would this country or any country go to war over that kind of a proposition?

Take our Spanish-American war, which the Senator suggests burst suddenly and unexpectedly upon the country. We practically ordered the Spanish minister out of this city, and I suppose if we had had two more battle ships we would have ducked him in the Potomac River. We ordered the minister out of the Capital and began shooting at the Spaniards. Yet we were surprised by the war.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will ask the Senator to keep down to the facts. I want to ask the Senator whether he thinks the demand for the war was supported by the American people.

Mr. CARTER. Whether the war was supported by the American people?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Was the demand for it supported by the American people?

Mr. CARTER. I think if the American people had considered more thoroughly, had taken more time, had been less inflamed by loose talk of war—

Mr. ALDRICH. And in the Senate.

Mr. CARTER. And largely in this body—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall put on record here to-day or to-morrow the language of certain Senators that I think myself was loose.

Mr. CARTER. Undoubtedly the American people supported the war. The Congress declared war and the American people supported it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But before it was declared was that the sentiment throughout the country?

Mr. CARTER. I doubt that very much.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I wish to call the Senator's attention to what was said here with reference to that war. I quoted the remarks of the Senator from Maine from the RECORD three months before the war broke out, stating that the cause of the insurrectionists in Cuba had no support whatever in this country. I had his remarks as found in the RECORD, and I quoted them, although the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] differed distinctly from him at that time.

Now, that is what I called attention to, and, since the Senator is defending the Senator from Maine and attacking me, he may as well have the benefit of it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was a member of this body during that period, and I will say that notwithstanding the utterances that were made in this Chamber for or against the war, there never was a moment from the explosion in the harbor of Habana by which the battle ship *Maine* was blown up to the time of the war when there was any doubt in my mind that the American people were for war.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, if the Senator from Montana will permit me, the Senator from Maine on the contrary, and it is in the RECORD, and I quoted it last Friday, said three months before the war that it was not supported by the country at all.

I want to say another thing in that connection. I happened to be, in an humble way and out of public life, one of the men who was distinctly against having that war come on before we

were prepared, and I thought it very unwise on the part of eminent and most excellent men who were urging it before we were ready. Now, the Senator is discussing one question and using language about another. He was not mistaken in saying that the war had been brewing for a long time. The point I was making, and it is in the Record, is that when we were almost on the verge of war it was the opinion of very able men in this country that it would not come and could not come. And the Senator from Maine actually used the expression that it was not supported throughout the country. Therefore, if he were wrong in that matter, he might be wrong here.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CARTER. In a moment.

Mr. President, I do not propose at this time to enter into a discussion of the causes or the results of the Spanish-American war. I do say, however, that the Congress having declared war and the Congress having largely worked itself up to the war spirit, the American people did as they will always do, fly to the rescue of the flag and defend the honor of the country, and inquire into the causes leading to the struggle a little later on if necessary. It brings up merely the old suggestion of Decatur, "Our country; right or wrong, our country."

Now, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FORAKER. I perhaps should not interrupt the Senator at all, but I was in this body when we discussed the Spanish-American war and the causes leading to it, and I think at that time I was in pretty close touch with the people of the country, whatever may have happened since. My recollection is that the people of this country supported what was done in that respect. I remember the pressure was so strong that we should take some positive action that at the Republican national convention which met at St. Louis in 1896 we found it necessary, as we thought, to adopt a plank that really looked in that direction and which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] reminds me that he helped to draft. Neither one of us is warlike, both of us are peaceful, and we were willing to fight for peace if necessary, but that was the situation for more than a year prior to the breaking out of the Spanish-American war. After I came into this body we were discussing it constantly during the year 1897 and down until the *Maine* was sunk in the harbor of Habana, in February, 1898, and then followed war. It was impossible to resist the demand for it after that occurrence.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the sinking of the *Maine* was the fulminating cap. If that event had not occurred, the serene and patient efforts and the skilled diplomacy of William McKinley and his Secretary of State would have brought about satisfactory results without the shedding of blood.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. As long as the Senate is considering the historic situation just preceding the Spanish war, I wish to say that prior to the *Maine* disaster and during the Administration of Mr. Cleveland there was war in Cuba, which everybody recognized. Over 250,000 soldiers had been sent over to put it down. Both Houses of Congress took cognizance of the serious condition of Cuban affairs.

I fully believe that our war with Spain would not have taken place at all if Congress and the President had been in accord in giving belligerent rights to Cuba. If a state of war had been recognized, as it could have been under the recognized rules of international law, she would have fought her own fight with Spain, and America perhaps might have avoided the responsibility afterwards assumed by us.

Mr. President, it is not too much to say that the House of Representatives passed the resolution and I think the Senate passed it. But the President treated it as a nullity, because it was a concurrent resolution and merely an expression of legislative opinion having no binding effect upon him as a matter of law.

I happen to be cognizant of some of the things that took place prior to that war. I was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House at that time, during which this matter came up, and I feel very sure, and I have no hesitation in putting it upon record, that the war with Spain upon the part of the United States would have been avoided if Congress and the Executive had been in accord in conferring belligerent rights upon the insurgent de facto government.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I think it will be readily inferred from all that has been said that the Spanish war did not come upon us suddenly.

Now, the next question interjected is—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. As the Senator has referred several times to the fact that the Spanish war came on a sudden, if he is referring to me, of course I used absolutely no such language nor any statement from which it could be inferred. What I said had reference to this, that the Senator from Maine predicted three months before the war broke out (and I will say that I have his remarks right here) that the insurgents had no sympathy whatever among the American people.

Mr. BACON. I am sure the Senator from Indiana does not know how much his remarks are appreciated in this debate or he would speak louder.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the only point I will say to the Senator. The Senator, of course, will not intentionally put words in my mouth that I did not use. Here is what the Senator from Maine said—

Mr. CARTER. As to the contention between the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Indiana, I beg leave to ask that it be interjected somewhere else.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator was interjecting it. He was talking about it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I think it is very apparent by the respectful silence that I have observed that at present, at least, there is no controversy between the Senator from Indiana and myself.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not in the least. The Senator does not deny what he said.

Mr. HALE. This matter is going on very much to my satisfaction.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator does not deny what he said.

Mr. HALE. I do not in any way interfere with it. I have some things to say, but while things are going on this way I am content.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator will recognize the right we all accord to each other in contributing to some particular point, but I merely pointed that out to show that the ablest and wisest of men right on the verge of a conflict often think that it is impossible and not supported by the country, and they are sometimes wrong; that that is a natural proposition.

Mr. HALE. Of course, the deduction from that is that as to this whole matter, if I was wrong then, I am wrong now.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; not at all. I stated distinctly the reverse.

Mr. HALE. Did not the Senator mean by referring to the fact that I was wrong about the war with Spain and did not believe that it would come, to draw a moral that I am wrong now—that there was danger then of war and now there is danger of war? I disagree utterly and totally with the Senator upon that point.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I repeated it because the Senator from Montana was bringing up the point which he thought I made at that time, but which, as a matter of fact, I did not make. I referred to it, I will say, only to show that the Senator was one of a large number of the ablest statesmen we have had all through our history who were mistaken about these things, and I pointed that out merely to show that the statement that war is an impossibility is not new.

I shall not interrupt the Senator again.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I was not trying to place any words in the Senator's mouth, for two reasons. First, it is not necessary; and second, I am not qualified for that task. I do not wish to be understood as misrepresenting the Senator. I did not pretend to quote verbatim, but I do pretend to speak from the general impression created by what he said as well as specific words used by him from time to time.

The Boer war was cited as another instance why we should vote for four battle ships instead of two, and that was suggested as one of the wars put down by naval power. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] well answered that by saying that the Boer war was largely suppressed by the American mule. He ought to have said the Missouri mule.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And not very much to our credit.

Mr. CARTER. It was not much to our credit. The Montana cayuse contributed his portion to that great struggle. There was not a shot fired by a man-of-war in connection with that struggle, as far as I have ever heard. Certainly the poor Boers did not fire any shot from a vessel, because they did not have any. The naval power had nothing to do with the Boer war.

Then the Russian-Japanese war is brought forward and the Chinese-Japanese war, and the glorious days of the early months of 1898 are brought back vividly into this Chamber.

I remember, sir, the yellow telegrams in 1898 coming in from

that enterprising paper, the New York Journal, and other great journals of civilization like it, urging Senators upon this floor to expedite the issue of war. I noticed the other day the same yellow missives coming through the Chamber from enterprising sources endeavoring thus to produce the thrilling effect necessary to work men up to the pitch of battle.

Mr. President, it was amazing to me that any Senator or number of Senators should expect a single supporting vote in this Chamber in favor of four battle ships, or any battle ships, in the presence of the hue and cry of impending war, or what is the just equivalent of it—the eloquent plea of the Senator from Indiana for peace in the presence of grim-visaged war his own imagination had conjured up out of the absence of two more battle ships. The peace of the world hung trembling in the balance, with only a few pounds of steel and a few guns between us and a world-wide conflagration.

Mr. President, the Chief Magistrate refrained from giving any specific reason for the four battle ships. It was not necessary that he should give any reason. We might have assented to the four battle ships in the midst of that silence preceding the vote, which the Senator from Maine suggested was due deliberation. But after this florid, lurid, warlike appeal for the preservation of the imperiled world's peace by preparing now for the dire issue of war, I for one say that I look upon the mission of this great Republic as a mission of peace, and I will not willingly consent to have it assume an hysterical or frightened attitude in the midst of the nations of the earth in order that we may either repel a fancied approach of war or demonstrate our own rugged courage and bravery.

The American nation now has substantially 100,000,000 people. In 1890, on the same rate of increase as occurred between 1890 and 1900, we will have 150,000,000 people. By 1940 we will have substantially 200,000,000 people. We have to-day the largest number of Christian people ever loyally devoted to any flag in any age. Our mission has always been one of peace. The God of the universe apparently intended that we should execute a mission of peace, because he has cushioned our coasts with two mighty oceans, constituting a line of defense without any menacing power either to the north or south upon the mainland.

In the old days of the sailing vessel we had something to fear from foreign fleets coming up against our coasts, but in these days of steam power the capacity of coal bunkers will always measure the range of naval activity.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. FLINT. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana what would be his idea about peace with the outlying possessions in the Atlantic and in the Pacific?

Mr. CARTER. I think it was Abraham Lincoln who said—and the figure carries with it in an overwhelming way a mighty truth—that all the combined armies of the world can not take a drink of water out of the Ohio River unless we want to let them. The nations of Europe are not as happily situated as we are.

I remember during a short visit across the water some years ago—a very brief one, indeed—I inquired of the man who was presiding as clerk or proprietor at the hotel as to where the limit of their system of stamp assessments stopped. He said, "We have stamps on everything. We are taxed on our income, we are compelled to procure stamps to put on every bill and every check and every receipt, and everything that passes as business." I asked, "Why all these taxes?" The reply was, "The great army, the immense army to maintain." I said, "Why do you not disband the army?" He said, "These outside states would crush us like an eggshell if we did. We have got to keep the army in order to protect our property, our identity, and our honor."

A nation situated in that condition is not in a position to lead in the column of peace. It is in constant danger of invasion or destruction. Disarmament of a European state can not be expected as a means of reaching universal peace. I think it has been given to this country, made up of contributions from the loins of the best of all Europe, molded into a mighty nation, not Celtic, not Anglo-Saxon, but now and forever to be an American nation and an American people, self-reliant, just, and capable of commanding peace at home and giving a worthy example in favor of its preservation abroad.

Mr. President, if we could step aside and see for a moment with any clearness of vision our relation to the world, we would hesitate before throwing the gage of battle into the face of the Orient.

Our good people are the natural progeny of the people who were driven from the Caspian and the Bosphorus and the shores of the Mediterranean across Europe, pursued by the Asiatics, occasionally conquered at points and places, but still tenaciously adhering to the doctrine underlying the Christian religion, to wit, that man has an individual responsibility, and that as an individual responsible man he can not belong to any other man. That theory left this world, as far as our people controlled it, without a master and without a slave.

War was the song our ancestors sung in dealing with the oriental character, and with what success, I pray? The cleavage between our civilization and oriental civilization on the line of Turkey is as clear as the cleavage of that desk is. Northern Africa is to-day as it was twenty centuries ago. The guns are resounding in northern Africa now, a continuation of an old conflict of two thousand years' standing. We are the vanguard of the Aryan race, and we are approaching from the East the same problems our ancestors approached from the West and failed to solve. They elected to engage in protracted war. That war has been without any distinct results in advancing Western civilization. Some fifty-odd years ago an American fleet dropped anchor in one of the harbors of the Nippon Empire. We were given the privilege of introducing to the family of nations the country of which we are all proud—Japan.

And let me, Senators, call your attention to this one significant historical fact, that Christian or Western civilization has made more progress in Japan in five decades than the warring factions of Europe made in the Orient in twenty centuries.

These apt people possess fine brain power, indomitable energy, and unquestioned courage. They first observed the value of the material products of our civilization, they adopted our ways, and to-day they have constitutional government, and Christian missionaries are welcomed everywhere in the island of Japan. Treaty rights are fairly respected, international obligations are assumed and discharged, and this is the nation, it is suggested, we should marshal up battle ships in order to control. It is not our policy to control Japan or its destinies, except through the beneficent influence of our institutions, which we hope may finally reach around this globe to the starting point in the ancient valley of the Euphrates.

Why, Mr. President, whenever a vote is to be taken in the Senate which shall indicate to the Japanese people, or to anyone in the Orient or elsewhere, that, in the absence of impending danger, in the absence of any present difficulty, we are proceeding to arm ourselves for aggressive warfare, my vote shall be cast against that measure, regardless of who recommends it.

I think we owe a duty to civilization, and the highest duty in that behalf is to occupy the position of the world's peace-maker. I am with the President's message of 1905. We want a navy for defense, not for aggression. We want to have an army, not of subjugation or invasion, but an army skeletonized and ready for emergency when it arises; but we do not want to maintain armies proportionately as are maintained in the little states of Europe, each constantly imperiling the other's existence.

If we vote for four battle ships after this discussion, if we vote for four battle ships after this long and needless talk about war, we will thereby send a message across the ocean—a message subscribed to by the Senate of the United States as a part of the treaty-making power of the Government, the only part of the legislative machinery coming in contact with foreign relations—that we deliberately believe that such an emergency has arisen as to cause us now to depart from our well-established, conservative, and progressive system of naval construction and to prepare at once for the eventualities of aggressive war.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. FLINT. I will ask the Senator from Montana what would be his construction of the message of the President of the United States recommending that we should do this very thing?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I am happy to announce from the text that the President does not pretend to advance any urgent reason for wanting four battle ships instead of two. He stated in 1905 that, in his belief, one battle ship every year would stay deterioration and make a little progress. He has changed his view about it, and it appears that Congress had changed, too, prior to the President's change, by providing for two instead of one. But Congress has not been advised by the President of any impending emergency. For aught we know,



from any source—and I think our information is reliable—there is no danger of war at present or in the immediate future, and there is no reason for a departure from our well-considered and conservative method of naval construction.

But there are weighty reasons furnished by this debate for avoiding what will appear to be a response to this war-like declamation, this grave apprehension of a disturbance of the peace which we think exists only in imagination here, but which, if given credence by our votes, would fly away as a fixed conviction of the American people that they were about to be cast into war.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suppose the Senator from Montana will agree with me that the trouble about this matter is not the President's message, but it is the unauthorized interpretation of that message which has been placed upon it here in this Chamber?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I have endeavored to say that I agree with the Senator in his trite and apt suggestion of the fact.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not "trite;" surely not "trite." The Senator said "trite." He did not mean "trite," of course.

Mr. CARTER. Well, "apt." I always yield to the Senator on words. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have labored to little purpose if I have not made it apparent that it is my solemn and deliberate judgment that whatsoever may have been the disposition of Senators when this debate started, the course of the debate, the reasons assigned in support of the amendment, the needless flashing in the air of the lightnings of war, make it the duty of every Senator to vote down any amendment that can, in any colorable sense, give the approval of the Senate to the course of this debate and the reasons assigned in favor of the amendment. We have all heard of the court reaching a correct conclusion, but assigning wrong reasons for it. This may be one of the cases. This may be a good amendment, but it is supported by such infirm and recklessly exploited reasons that we have to vote down the amendment in order to discountenance the reasons given for its adoption.

I shall cast my vote against it, believing that duty requires me so to do. At the same time, I believe I can truthfully say that this is the first vote I have ever cast against the construction of an American vessel of war. I have in and out of season, in the other House and in this, supported, without variation or sign of change, the naval programme recommended by the committees of the respective Houses. I shall continue to do so, Mr. President. I have no idea whatever that two battle ships this year will preclude two battle ships next year, if it shall appear proper to the committee to continue the construction on that conservative basis. It may be that you will think four battle ships will be necessary next year. If so, we will vote them. It will not be long until we shall have the opportunity, but at this time I feel constrained by the sense of duty I owe to the country, menaced by a cloud of war through loose and inconsiderate declamation, to vote against this amendment, and I shall so vote with much pleasure.

Mr. BACON. Before the Senator takes his seat—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I should like, with his permission, in order that the RECORD may be complete upon the subject as to whether or not the Spanish war was a sudden war, to read a resolution which was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate two years before the war. [Laughter.] It was reported on the 5th of February, 1896, more than two years before the war. It is as follows:

February 5, 1896.—Mr. Morgan, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following concurrent resolution as a substitute for concurrent resolution No. 19, reported January 29, 1896:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in the opinion of Congress, a condition of public war exists between the Government of Spain and the Government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba; and that the United States of America should maintain a strict neutrality between the contending powers, according to each all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States.*

The minority of the committee, through Mr. Cameron, reported what I shall now read in place of the one which I have just read:

*Resolved.* That the President is hereby requested to interpose his friendly offices with the Spanish Government for the recognition of the independence of Cuba.

Of course, it was a well-recognized fact that the adoption of either resolution meant war.

Mr. FLINT obtained the floor.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President, in view of the remark of the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] that the adoption of the amendment which I had the honor to propose would be in effect a message of war, I desire to insert in the RECORD, at the conclusion of his remarks, a statement from the President's message. The Senator from Montana says that the President of the United States did not give any reasons for urging upon Congress the necessity of providing for four battle ships instead of two. If the adoption of my amendment would be a message of war, then, Mr. President, I submit that message of war has already gone forth in the message which the President of the United States submitted to this Congress on the 14th instant. In that message the President said:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

Let me again urge upon the Congress the need of providing for four battle ships of the best and most advanced type at this session. Prior to the recent Hague conference it had been my hope that an agreement could be reached between the different nations to limit the increase of naval armaments, and especially to limit the size of warships. Under these circumstances I felt that the construction of one battle ship a year would keep our Navy up to its then positive and relative strength. But actual experience showed not merely that it was impossible to obtain such an agreement for the limitation of armaments among the various leading powers, but that there was no likelihood whatever of obtaining it in the future within any reasonable time. Coincidentally with this discovery occurred a radical change in the building of battle ships among the great military nations—a change in accordance with which the most modern battle ships have been or are being constructed, of a size and armament which doubles, or more probably triples, their effectiveness. Every other great naval nation has or is building a number of ships of this kind; we have provided for but two, and therefore the balance of power is now inclining against us. Under these conditions, to provide for but one or two battle ships a year is to provide that this nation, instead of advancing, shall go backward in naval rank and relative power among the great nations. Such a course would be unwise for us if we fronted merely on one ocean, and it is doubly unwise when we front on two oceans. As Chief Executive of the nation, and as Commander in Chief of the Navy, there is imposed upon me the solemn responsibility of advising the Congress of the measures vitally necessary to secure the peace and welfare of the Republic in the event of international complications which are even remotely possible. Having in view this solemn responsibility, I earnestly advise that the Congress now provide four battle ships of the most advanced type. I can not too emphatically say that this is a measure of peace and not of war.

And yet the Senator from Montana says that the President of the United States gave no reasons why he urged upon this Congress the construction of four battle ships in place of two. Therefore, Mr. President, I felt that it would probably be beneficial to the country to read, in connection with the speech of the Senator from Montana, what the President did say on that subject, so that they may know that he did express his reasons to Congress why four additional battle ships should be provided.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President—

Mr. FORAKER. Before the Senator from California proceeds—

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

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. FORAKER. And before the Senator from Washington resumes his seat I want to ask him a question simply to get information. I am not familiar with the message of the President of 1905, in which he recommended only one battle ship, and I want to ask the Senator, for he is doubtless familiar with it on that point, whether the President put that recommendation in his message upon the ground that The Hague Tribunal or a peace conference was about to reconvene and that it was anticipated there would be an agreement for the limitation of naval power?

Mr. PILES. No; I do not know whether that was the reason or not.

Mr. FORAKER. I asked the Senator simply for information.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] placed in the RECORD the message of the President of the United States to the Congress recommending the building of four battle ships instead of two. It is proper that this message should go in at this time. I had hoped that this discussion would go beyond the mere criticising of a Senator for words he may have used in this debate. We are here discussing a great question presented to this Congress in a special message from the President of the United States. To my mind, there is no necessity for discussing war in connection with the recommendation of our President; but it seems to me that the remarks of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] and of the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] have been played on so that those who are opposed to four battle ships have been able to make that the

issue, so as to deter Senators from voting as the President has recommended. It seems to me that the talk of war comes from those who want but two battle ships and not four. It seems to me, as outlined by the President in his message, there are good and sufficient reasons why we should have four battle ships, and that, too, eliminating any question as to war.

The pending bill came to the Senate from the House of Representatives on the 17th day of April, and on the 20th day of April it was reported from the committee and presented to the Senate. As reported to the Senate, it provides for two battle ships. The committee in the House also reported a provision for two battle ships, although there was a minority report in favor of four. Four battle ships have been recommended by the General Board of the Navy, by the Secretary of the Navy, and by the President of the United States.

It seems to me that there should not be the feeling that has been displayed here because of the fact that some of us are desirous of following the recommendations of the President, Secretary of the Navy, of the Naval Board, rather than the Naval Committee. No one has a higher opinion of the chairman of the Naval Committee than I have. I realize that he has had great experience, that he is master of this subject. I also realize the fact that my colleague [Mr. PERKINS], from my own State, has been a member of that committee for many years, and that he has been familiar with seafaring matters all his life. He has studied this subject, and he is also an authority on questions relating to the Navy of the United States. Those Senators, together with the other Senators on the committee, make a unanimous report to the Senate recommending the construction of but two battle ships, and it is with some reluctance that I find myself disagreeing with the chairman and other members of the Naval Committee and in favor of four battle ships.

I find, upon examining this question, that even the chairman of the Naval Committee finds that there have been at least some errors in the programme outlined for our Navy, and that is the lack of colliers, and this has been demonstrated by the cruise of the fleet to the Pacific.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the remarks of the Senator from Maine, made some time ago, in discussing the question of the fleet going to the Pacific. His statement is so strong that I prefer to quote it. He said:

Mr. HALE. I do not want to interfere with the line of the Senator's argument, but I am very largely in sympathy with him, for he has struck what is the weak point in our entire naval establishment, so far as ships are concerned. We are deplorably lacking in the essentials that make a great fleet not only formidable, but seaworthy.

The Senator said the other day, and the metaphor was not too strong, that without certain auxiliary ships the great battle ships of the United States fleet upon any waters outside of our own waters, in case of any emergency, with war threatened, would be derelicts, and it is too true.

Mr. HALE. The auxiliary force, Mr. President, that was improvised—I use that word, because it was not much more permanent than an improvised force—consisted, with but few exceptions, of transitory ships, yachts, small cruisers that were to be used for the emergency along the coasts and in the Caribbean Sea; but when the war ended they were found to be of little use. They made up an aggregate, and I have looked over the list time and again. Most of them were of no account and have gone out of use and are good for nothing to-day and would be good for nothing in any case of emergency.

Mr. President, it is a melancholy spectacle that this great fleet of ours in this regard presents to-day. It is the greatest fleet of great and formidable ships that the whole world has ever seen. It is completely manned. It is in every respect except one the most magnificent and formidable fleet of ships that any nation has ever put upon the waters of the globe.

Admiral Converse, who knows it root and branch, has so told us, and he is right. But this great fleet, which has been sent upon its voyage around the globe, is to-day absolutely dependent upon its motion, upon its existence as a moving fleet, on the indulgence of foreign powers.

I have here, Mr. President, a list of the colliers, without which a ship and a fleet can do nothing, that are to-day in attendance upon this fleet. There are only nine of our own. There are chartered from foreign owners attending this fleet of ours, enabling it to move, making it a movable fleet, twenty-eight foreign colliers. I have a list of them here—I will put it in the Record—ranging from 4,000 to 6,000 and odd tons each.

The list referred to is as follows:

*Coal for the fleet going to the Pacific.*

	Tons.
Government-owned colliers:	
Ajax to Rio with	4,800
Brutus to Rio with	3,800
Nero to Rio with	3,500
Abarenda to Rio with	3,500
Hannibal to Trinidad with	2,000
Leonidas to Trinidad with	2,000
Marcellus to Trinidad with	2,000
Sterling to Para with	2,000
Cæsar to Rio with	2,800
Chartered foreign colliers:	
Fortuna to Trinidad	4,224
Athalie to Trinidad	2,787
Kassala to Rio	5,150
Eilaline to Punta Arenas	5,449
Janana to Punta Arenas	5,627

	Tons.
Ripley to Punta Arenas	5,073
Towergate to Punta Arenas	5,166
Hector to Callao	5,600
Hermiston to Callao	5,392
Earl of Douglas to Callao	5,361
St. Andrews to Callao	4,351
Falls of Orchy to Callao	5,714
Allenton to Magdalena Bay	6,321
Otterburn to Magdalena Bay	6,000
Strathay to Magdalena Bay	5,308
Needles to Magdalena Bay	6,001
Baron Androssen to Magdalena Bay	6,002
Strathgyle to Magdalena Bay	5,367
Agapanthus to Magdalena Bay	4,832
Cape Finistere to San Francisco or Mare Island	6,510
Livingstonian to San Francisco or Mare Island	5,404
Guernsey to San Francisco or Mare Island	6,156
Earl of Carrick to San Francisco or Mare Island	4,940
Carlton to San Francisco or Mare Island	6,530
Inverkip to San Francisco or Mare Island	5,955
Braemont to San Francisco or Mare Island	4,803
Amherton to San Francisco or Mare Island	5,373
Madura to San Francisco or Mare Island	5,500

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, if when that fleet was ordered on this tour about the globe there had been the least menace of war from any power, no government owning one of these foreign colliers would have allowed a single ship to be employed by us, and our fleet, magnificent as it is, with any menace of war upon the sky, without these foreign colliers would be as useless and—

As idle as a painted ship  
Upon a painted ocean.

We do not realize this, Mr. President. I go further. If any complication should arise in the voyage of the ships, any danger, any menace of war in a foreign power, I do not know but that every foreign power represented in the ships which we have hired would feel compelled to withdraw them from the association of the fleet, and we would be hung up.

It is not, Mr. President, an agreeable thing to contemplate. We go on year after year building up and accumulating these immense ships at an enormous expenditure, and find ourselves, as we would in any emergency for which the ships are built, without a thing being done that makes the ships formidable as a fleet at sea. The Senator is right in his theories. There ought not to be another ship added to the American Navy until we add something that every other power has done to make the ships formidable in case of an emergency.

My colleague is right; the Senator from New Hampshire is right; we can not do it here. I do not think the Senator from Nevada wants to embarrass this bill; but when we come to the consideration of the naval appropriation bill I hope the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Maine, my colleague, and every thoughtful, patriotic Senator will join with me to try and see that something is done in this entirely neglected field that we have rashly and in the most foolhardy way neglected and abandoned in the past. Otherwise, Mr. President, if there is any call for the big ships, and they are to protect us in case of possible war, they are absolutely worthless unless we have something with which to build up an auxiliary fleet and to supply the ships that will enable them to move in the waters of the globe. Without these foreign ships, these colliers, Mr. President, we not only could not have gotten around Cape Horn, but we could not have gotten beyond the Caribbean Sea. Nobody has seemed to realize that. But when we come to the naval appropriation bill this matter will be laid before the Senate, and we will be made to consider what are the actual needs of the American Navy.

I call attention, Mr. President, to the remarks of the Senator from Maine for the reason that he realized that, at least in this respect, our fleet is in a very unsatisfactory condition.

Mr. President, there is another amendment that has been offered to this bill by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. It provides for the appropriation of \$20,000,000 for colliers and for an auxiliary fleet. I will support an amendment such as the Senator from Nevada has offered, for it is apparent from the statement—which I have read and will include in my remarks—furnished by the Senator from Maine that the auxiliary fleet that is accompanying our battle ships to the Pacific Ocean as colliers are not American vessels and that there is great necessity for addition to our Navy of this kind.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from California to the fact that my amendment is not limited simply to the construction of colliers. It provides 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.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, I think the amount fixed by the Senator from Nevada is perhaps more than is necessary at this time to provide simply for colliers, but it is necessary that we should provide colliers to accompany our fleet. On the Pacific we have a seaboard as long as that on the Atlantic, but we have from one end of that country to the other but four places that are fortified. We have, as a matter of fact, Mr. President, only one fortified place to amount to anything on the entire Pacific slope, and that is the city of San Francisco. That harbor is fortified. There are slight fortifications at San Diego, some on the Columbia River, and some on Puget Sound; and at this session we have provided appropriations for fortifying Puget Sound, San Francisco, San Pedro, and San Diego. I ask to in-

clude in my remarks a list of the places on the Atlantic coast that are fortified and also the places on the Gulf States that are fortified.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The following localities in the United States are fortified:

*Atlantic coast.*

Portland, Me.; Portsmouth, N. H.; Boston, Mass.; New Bedford, Mass.; Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island; eastern entrance, Long Island; eastern entrance, New York; southern entrance, New York; Delaware River; Baltimore, Md.; Hampton Roads, Virginia; Potomac River; Cape Fear River; Charleston Harbor, South Carolina; Savannah River.

*Gulf coast.*

Key West, Fla.; Tampa, Fla.; Pensacola, Fla.; Mobile, Ala.; mouth of Mississippi River; Galveston, Tex.

*Pacific coast.*

San Diego, Cal.; San Francisco, Cal.; Columbia River, and Puget Sound.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, from this statement it will be seen that on the Pacific coast we have but four ports that are fortified, and only one of these where the fortifications are adequate, although we have over 3,000 miles of coast line.

At the time the fleet started for the Pacific there was not a battle ship upon the Pacific coast, and during the last two years there has been a general demand along the entire Pacific coast that war vessels should be sent there, not because of any fear of war, but as a matter of right, for the people of the coast thought that a part of the Navy should be located on the Pacific coast permanently.

When the fleet reached the Pacific coast another condition developed, a condition that was given as a reason why the fleet should not remain but should leave the Pacific and return to the Atlantic, namely, that we have not facilities for properly taking care of and repairing these great war vessels, for the reason that we have not sufficient naval stations on the Pacific coast.

I find that along the Atlantic coast there are nine naval stations as follows: Portsmouth, N. H.; Boston, Mass.; New York, N. Y.; League Island, Pa.; Norfolk, Va.; Port Royal, S. C.; Charleston, S. C.; Key West, Fla.; Pensacola, Fla. In addition, there are two other smaller naval stations, making eleven stations along the Atlantic coast. On the Pacific side we have but two places—Mare Island, which is fully equipped, and Bremerton, which is now being equipped. I think it can be demonstrated to any thinking man that if we are to be protected on the Pacific coast at least a part of the Navy should remain on the Pacific coast, and that proper facilities should be made for repairing and reconstructing these vessels.

I am in favor of four battle ships of the *Dreadnought* class, for the reason that it is necessary to construct four vessels of this type to keep our Navy at its relative position with other nations, and for the further reason that in my opinion it is necessary to keep one fleet in the Atlantic and one in the Pacific, to accomplish which we will have to build additional ships of this class.

We should have an even navy, and the discussion of naval affairs in the last year or two has demonstrated the fact, among naval men at least, that what is to be the vessel for the future is the great *Dreadnought* type of vessel, and I am simply contending and asking for four battle ships, so that our vessels of the *Dreadnought* class will be brought up to the standard of the rest of the Navy and equal to the navies of the world.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. CARTER. Is not the vessel of the *Dreadnought* type experimental?

Mr. FLINT. I think not. I do not understand from anything I have read that it is. The report of the Secretary of the Navy would certainly demonstrate that it is not an experiment.

Mr. CARTER. I observe that the morning papers chronicle a sad event, which is instructive in this, that an ordinary merchant passenger boat sunk one of the great war vessels of England by running into its side, pulled off from the conflict, and went back to port.

Mr. FLINT. It was a second-class vessel, and I am not willing to depend upon newspaper articles to determine whether ships of the Navy are of the proper construction or not. As a matter of fact I think it is not disputed that vessels of the *Dreadnought* type are now being built by all the great nations of the world, and all that I desire in supporting this amendment is to bring the United States, so far as vessels of this

class are concerned, to the same standard that is maintained with respect to the rest of the Navy.

Mr. President, a great many people seemed to think that when this great fleet reached the Pacific coast it was away from home, as has been said a number of times in this debate. It is now in a home port, a part of this great country, and we on the Pacific coast are just as much entitled as is the Atlantic coast to have a great navy, and not only have a great navy, but have an equipment there sufficient to repair and take care of the fleet, keeping it there all the time. We should have sufficient navy-yards along the Pacific coast so that a fleet such as the Senator from Maine outlined in his remarks it is possible for us to have could be repaired on the Pacific coast.

Mr. President, the only difference between those who favor two and those of us who favor four battle ships is the fact that those favoring two think that our Navy now is sufficient without these additional battle ships. We who favor four battle ships believe our Navy, to be kept to its present standard, must have two more of these great new fighting machines.

I make the same plea for colliers sufficient to carry coal for the Navy that I do for these great fighting machines.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. CARTER. I am in hearty accord with the Senator's demand for the proper development of our naval equipment on the western coast, and being thus in accord with him I desire to inquire in what respect this bill fails to respond to the just demands of the west coast for the proper development of navy-yards on that coast—whether the matter has been neglected. If so, I will favor any amendment necessary properly to continue the development of the naval equipment of the west coast.

Mr. FLINT. In reply to the Senator from Montana I will say that the best evidence that the Pacific coast is not properly equipped is the fact that the Senator from Maine himself says that it is necessary to bring the fleet back to repair it properly.

But with nine navy-yards on the Atlantic coast within the same distance, it does seem radically wrong, with the same size of fleet on the Pacific coast, we should have only two navy-yards, and only one of those navy-yards equipped to-day so that it can build a ship. There is something radically wrong with a system that requires the fleet to leave the Pacific coast to go to the Atlantic coast to make these necessary repairs. We should have appropriations from time to time, in order that on the Pacific coast there will be navy-yards and docks fully equipped, so that fleets as large as the one now on the coast can be properly taken care of.

We have but one coaling station on the Pacific coast, unless you would designate what coal was stored at Bremerton a coaling station. At the last session I did secure, and the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs gladly aided me in obtaining, appropriations for a coaling station in the harbor of San Diego. We should have more coaling stations and more navy-yards on the Pacific coast. I am not criticising the Committee on Naval Affairs, but am pointing out the needs of the Pacific coast.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLINT. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. I understand the Senator's observations to lead to the conclusion that it is not an extra number of battle ships that we need, but an extra amount of accommodations for the battle ships we have, in so far as the west coast is concerned.

Mr. FLINT. Both.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLINT. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Before the Senator takes his seat I should like to say that I think we all recognize that heretofore it has been almost accepted, as suggested the other day by certain Senators, that the true home and abiding place of our fleet is the Atlantic coast. It is a false idea. Both coasts need a navy; one coast should not appropriate all the Navy to itself, as the Atlantic coast heretofore has done. It should have a navy, but so should the Pacific coast.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to make upon this occasion a set speech, but to analyze in my feeble way some of the arguments which have been presented in favor of this sudden proposed change from a policy which has been pursued in the past with satisfaction to all. If the Senator from California [Mr. FLINT] had made his speech at the open-

ing of this debate and the Senate had stood to the issue as he framed it, we would have completed this debate in a very short time. If there had been presented to the Senate the issue as he framed it, and which is the real issue, whether with a due recognition of the patriotism of this body, in view of a desire for a navy commensurate with the honor of this country, the safety of our people, and the progress of peace, the ordering of two battle ships or four battle ships were necessary, we might have concluded it long ago. For the real question is, having due regard for the conditions I have enumerated, should we now provide for the construction of two or four additional battle ships?

But this debate has taken a peculiar turn. I shall not attempt to analyze the words that appear this morning in the cold record of this debate, but to analyze the spirit of the debate as it bears upon these questions. We were referred first to the *Trent* affair. Either that affair had some bearing upon the question whether we should authorize four battle ships or two or it had no bearing at all. Unfortunately for the Senator who made the suggestion, the *Trent* affair, as it has already appeared, occurred before we had the Navy—which grew out of the great civil war—and that illustration necessarily was eliminated from this discussion.

When the Senator made reference to the *Trent* affair, it seemed to me that if he wanted an illustration where a foreign power finally arbitrated with us with the shadow of a great navy in the background, he might have taken the *Alabama* case. We had then successfully emerged from a great struggle. We had then, comparatively speaking, a great navy and a million men who had learned the art of war in the only school in which men can learn that art—that is, in the activities of war itself.

If England, in the *Alabama* affair, was actuated, as I believe she was not, by a thought of brute force on our side, it was not the Navy which we then had, but it was a condition which existed then, that exists to-day, and will exist as long as England's greatest colonial possession is separated by only an imaginary line from a people who number eighty or ninety millions. But I prefer to believe, sir, that England, even in that affair, was actuated by a nobler principle and acted upon a broader basis than the mere fear of brute force. That illustration, then, was unfortunate.

We are then cited to the case of the New Orleans incident, and when the Senator made that citation and closed the illustration by pointing to the fact that we paid \$25,000 to the representatives of the Italians who were slain in New Orleans, I felt like asking him whether this great nation had paid that in cowardly fear of Italy, as she was in those years an infant to what she is to-day, and whether he thought if we had not paid it, Italy would have crossed the Atlantic and sponged us off the world's map. The Senator was unfortunate in his illustration, and this misfortune of his was inevitable because, sir, when you once start with error, error will defeat error, and it was error to inject into this discussion the issue which has been injected into it.

If we shall some day rise to that high ideal which is to-day a dream of some of the most thoughtful of our people, when we become the guiding star which leads to a sisterhood of nations founded upon the broad basis of universal peace, it will be a glorious career, and yet one of the brightest and proudest chapters which this Republic will then have placed upon history's page will be that relating to the Italian incident, when this great nation made reparation to a feeble nation that was absolutely powerless to secure it by the arbitrament of arms. It will ever stand to the credit and glory of this nation that we made that settlement with Italy under those circumstances, and that illustration must fade from this debate as having no bearing upon the question whether to-day we should order the construction of four battle ships, to be completed three years from now, or order the construction of two battle ships further than to show that a nation may be great in her generous impulses.

We were next referred to the Spanish war and told in mysterious tones that it had been stated upon eminent authority—and it is always so given here in debate that back in the background somewhere lies eminent authority—that if we had had three ships more we would not have had war with Spain. Mr. President, I can imagine that the American Republic might have had a navy so absolutely overpowering in comparison to Spain's, even when we declared war ourselves, that Spain would have submitted to humiliation rather than to resist; but for any man to say that the precise number of three more ships in our Navy would have averted war is either moonshine or the effects of moonshine. While we can not say how many more ships would have averted war, I propose to stand upon this floor and say

that if we had had one ship less—and that one ship the *Maine*—we would not have had war with Spain in the manner in which war did come.

I am not going to be misunderstood upon this question, Mr. President. Along the pathway of human history the tide of human sacrifice has ever risen higher and higher, and it reached a lofty climax when in 1861 the people of the Northland, without the fear of invasion, without the fear of coercion, and with no thought of conquest or plunder, enveloped themselves in an immortal historic achievement. But I believe, sir, it went one step further when the best young blood of America went forth, without even a thought of our own institutions, to battle and die that a foreign race might be free. As we stand on yonder portico and gaze across the majestic river we can look to the spot where 1,100 of America's best and bravest young men sleep the eternal sleep, their sacrifice a benediction to an alien race. It stands without a parallel in all the glorious chapters of sacrifice in the cause of human liberty.

But that is one thing, and the conduct of this great nation with Spain at that crisis was another thing. That I might speak with authority beyond my own memory I asked a moment ago the remembrance of the junior Senator from Maine, and upon that authority I say now that until the *Maine* was blown up and until this Congress declared war there had not been one hostile act on the part of Spain, save so far as we may impute to Spanish perfidy the blowing up of the *Maine*. Had we acknowledged Cuba's belligerent rights, as we should have done, and later her independence, it might have resulted in war, but we did not pursue that course. If you want to trace the concrete cause, if you want to have the exploded match and the tinder box, of which the Senator spoke as the cause of war, it is found not in the absence of three great ships added to our Navy, but in the unfortunate fact that we sent one ship there upon that mission at a most inopportune time. That illustration was a most unfortunate illustration for the Senator's argument.

We are next presented with the suggestion that the man who would count dollars and cents in the balance with the nation's honor and the security of the people and the cause of peace is not worthy of recognition at the hands of manhood; and I agree with the Senator upon that proposition. But why was this question injected into this debate? Did the Senator believe there is a Senator on this floor who for one moment would count the cost if the nation's honor was in the balance, if the safety of the people was in the balance, if the cause of universal peace was in the balance? Ah, when it comes to the record we will be told that he stood here and distinctly disclaimed that intention; that he reiterated time and time again that there was no man in this Chamber who would count the cost in such a crisis. And so he did. Then, sir, why the suggestion?

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] answered it this morning in an analysis which should be read from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It could only be for one of two purposes—either to build up a man of straw that he might pound it down or that there might be conveyed to the public mind of this country the impression that notwithstanding his declaration that there was no want of patriotism in the Senate, nevertheless it was wanting, and the people thus be brought to the point of passion and prejudice by the injection into the debate of an issue which had no place in it.

We were told, Mr. President, that it is the man who has bared his breast to the battle's storm who is in favor of peace. Would the Senator be understood as implying that there is a man in this Chamber, whether he has seen war or not, who is not in favor of peace? Then why that suggestion? There can be but one answer—the answer I have already made.

We have been criticised here this morning for talking about war; that we have injected war into this debate. It began with talk of war, and it has been talk of war from start to finish. There have been false issues presented which have no place in the Senate. The time has come when some man ought to rise upon this floor and enter a protest against the custom that too long has prevailed here of recognizing that every man in this body is in favor of the best and the truest interests of this country, and then instead of presenting the details of measures designed to ultimately reach the desired end convey to the country the idea that the real issue here is one of patriotism and regard for the welfare of the people of this country and not of the question of how to reach the desired result.

I do not know, sir, nor can I help what may be the result of my remarks at the hands of the man who later will follow. He is my junior in years, but my senior in service in this body, and before I entered this body I was one of the thousands who looked to him with love and admiration.

But, sir, it was a surprise—nay, a disappointment—to hear him last Friday; for it is unfortunately my nature that when I like a man, I do like him. I looked forward to the time, sir, when, perhaps, if the people of my State were satisfied that I should remain in this Chamber, by my acquiescence I could help elevate him to what I regard as the highest position in this great Republic, namely, the acknowledged leader of the American Senate. His brilliant intellect, his generous impulse, and what I felt was an instinctive sense of fairness impelled me to admiration, even almost transcending the limits of admiration. But for years I have sat in this Chamber and seen false issues raised that the public might be prejudiced, that the public might be led from the real issue, when we were considering measures for one common purpose, differing possibly in the means to be employed, but all seeking one end; and yet the issue conveyed to the public that we were not differing upon the question of how to reach that end, but that we did differ as to the end and the time has come when there should be a protest.

We were then told that it would be mercenary to count dollars in connection with this great question of a nation's honor, its safety, and the progress of universal peace. The impossibility of reconciling error with right, and the argument proceeding upon an issue that did not exist in the Senate, it could inevitably only bristle with mistakes and unfortunate comparisons.

In the very next breath we are told that as a business proposition a great navy was an example of shining success. We were pointed to the record of England as proof of that proposition. Mr. President, it is not my purpose this morning to institute comparisons. When England started her colonial policy it was the policy of the nations to take and hold colonies by force, and England had to prepare for that condition. England had to maintain a great navy, and has been unable to free herself from the force of that tradition. Let us see what the result has been. It has been just as it has been in the case of every empire in the world's history that pursued that course. First, it drained the home country of its best material.

Witness the fact that in her colonial possessions throughout the world she has made most marvelous progress, marvelous because between an aristocracy at one end and a poverty-crushed mass at the other, she has drawn from the great middle class from her own home her best and strongest blood, draining her own land of this force which has so splendidly developed her great colonies. But, sir, that is not all.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] last Saturday told us of the distress and ruin in Italy, and he might have drawn a picture not quite so dark, but of the same character, as the result of England's boasted commercial policy. It is true a few people of that nation have amassed great wealth. It is true that for some years by wise fiscal policy she was enabled to loan credit in the development of this, our own land.

But those who go to England to-day—it has never been my fortune to visit that country—tell me of the distress and the poverty and the decay that crop out on every hand. And statistics—I do not believe much in statistics, for while it is said that figures never lie, they are the ready weapon of the prevaricator, and so I do not attach much importance to statistics—statistics prove the same thing. But there is other proof, and we do not have to take the say so of a tourist who tours through England, whether on the one hand he hobnobs with the aristocracy or on the other hand studies the mass at the foundation of her social and economic fabric. We have before us the fact that the boasted policy of England, the attempt to get trade at the mouth of the shotted gun, has brought England's once proud credit to the point where her securities are below par, depreciating year by year, enjoying a slight acceleration at the present, because of the depressed condition in our own markets, which permit of investment elsewhere.

There is the verdict of history upon the policy of forcing trade at the mouth of the gun or in the presence of hostile fleets. The Senator from North Dakota was criticized because he recently declared that we ought to secure a world-wide trade and now opposes what he thinks an unnecessary and unreasonably great navy. There is but one way to take the markets of the world, and that is first to produce what other nations want and then sell those productions at a price which induces the people to purchase them. That is the only true policy of extending trade. It is the only policy that will survive the disastrous effort of every empire that ever tried to put wealth into her coffers through the aid of armies and navies.

Now, Mr. President, a few words more and I am done. We have heard a great deal here to-day about peace. We have been told, not in exact terms, but by subtle suggestion, that there are impending some mysterious conditions that make it important that we shall have four battle ships, not added to-day to our Navy, for it will be three long years before, in the

ordinary course of events, they would be added to our Navy, but their construction authorized now.

I say it is absolutely absurd to suggest that any unknown condition prevails in our relations to the world that requires not four battle ships to-day, for that might be, but which requires exactly four battle ships three years from now. The man does not live who can cast a horoscope and tell us how many ships to a certainty we will need three years from now. Why is it the magic number is four? If a man wants two ships, then he is subject to the criticism that was made here by pointing out the duty of Congress in regard to the nation's honor, the safety of a people, and the cause of peace. If he wants three ships, he is still recreant to that great trust. If he wants five ships, he is still recreant to the trust. But, forsooth, it must be four ships, no more and no less. That is the test of our loyalty to the best interests and the highest standard of legislative patriotism.

Mr. President, it has been said that there is no danger of war. Then why this talk about war? If there is no danger of war, then we are asked, Why build any ships? You might as well reply that if there is danger of war, why limit them to the paltry number of four? If I believed there was that danger of war which those who favor four battle ships profess to believe there is not, then I would not talk about the addition of four ships, but would insist upon many more. The fact is, the argument falls of its own force, the one proposition confronting the other, like the argument that was made last Friday, that we as Senators, upon our oaths as Senators, owe a duty to the country regardless of what the House says upon this subject, and then in the same breath we were told that that duty which rests upon each one of us individually is to be abdicated because, forsooth, some Senator puts a construction of his own which has no basis upon a suggestion of some one individual.

It is one error combating and destroying the other. There is no logic in an argument of that kind. We have a right to consider what the House has done. We have a right to consider what the people think. We have a right to consider what the Executive thinks. Then, after all, it is our individual right, as it is our individual duty, to act, not in the light of what one branch of the Government or another may think, but what it seems to us upon our oaths as Senators best to be done.

It is said that a great navy will conduce to peace. Mr. President, you may go to-day into a western section where naturally the first people who enter that section go armed. In a few years the arms disappear. They disappear in obedience to the most powerful law known to civilized man, and that is the law of public opinion. But somewhere in the interval between the time when all men carry arms and the time when the community condemns a man who carries arms some one has had the nerve, the physical courage, and the moral courage to stand out first and discard his arms.

Now, I am not going to be misunderstood. We can not disband our Navy; no one for a moment thinks of that. We owe it to this country to maintain a certain standard of navy, a navy that, according to each man's conscience and judgment—and to no other conscience or judgment on this earth—brings the Navy to the standard of one commensurate with the honor of his country, the safety of the people, and the cause of universal peace.

We indulge in a peace conference. We stand here day after day talking peace and saying to the world we want universal peace, and then we say to the world, "We will give you peace; we will proceed to arm that we may enforce peace."

It must, sir, provoke a smile from the people of other nations. Here we are without any new conditions. Nothing can call for or justify the proposed change. We are prating of peace, and then for no cause that we can assign we are immediately doubling our preparations for war.

The Senator from Massachusetts said in his speech that it was the talk of war that made war. There is something that talks louder than the human voice, and that is the constant preparation for war, not along the lines that we have pursued when the conditions did not vary from the condition of to-day, but to-day without any cause on earth assigned we are asked suddenly to double our preparations.

Mr. President, that is not the way to promote a spirit of peace. I say we can not disband our Navy, but we can show the nations of the earth that we, this great power, with our vast resources, our splendid historical traditions which are inspiration to great and grand achievements, can be the first nation, not to disband our Navy, but to put a stop to the useless building of navies beyond reason.

Ah, but it will be said that while the nation by law or the people by sentiment may put a stop to carrying weapons we can not put a stop on our part to the building of the navies of other nations. That, in a measure, sir, is true. No mandate

of ours will do it, but a mandate of ours will cause them to build more navies. Does any man suppose for one moment that if we build four more battle ships, with nothing in the world assigned as the cause for the sudden augmentation of our Navy, other nations will not go on increasing their navies? To the extent, then, of showing the world that we do not propose to do that, and to the extent of not forcing them to do it, we may in truth and in fact be the apostle and the vanguard of peace.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, certainly there is no new member of this body who feels a greater respect and reverence for the older statesmen of this body than I do. I hold them in the greatest honor. I have great regard for their experience in the management of the affairs of the Government. In regard to the pending bill, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this body is following the Committee on Naval Affairs without a single exception save this one item.

Of all the items reported on the naval appropriation bill it is suggested that the battle-ship item alone should be changed, and even in this case it seems to me that to ask the building of four ships rather than two is but accentuating the report of the committee and emphasizing and enlarging what they have recommended. The only argument against four ships that has appealed to my judgment is the argument of cost.

I rather take it, both in this Chamber and in the other branch of the National Legislature, that the question of economy is really the true reason for insisting on two battle ships instead of four battle ships.

I do not think that those who represent the several States of the Union and who have not had the honor to have been long members of his body should be thought by the older members either presuming or offensive or looked upon with disfavor when they venture to express their sincere opinions about our national naval policy.

I have listened with great interest to this debate, and with the indulgence of the Senate I would like within the very few minutes I shall speak to explain the reasons which have led me to favor the present authorization of four ships of the *Dreadnought* class.

The arguments which have been leveled against authorizing the present building of four ships I have listened to with interest and carefully considered.

*The first great argument is that if we have four ships instead of two ships it will be construed as a threat of proposed war with some of the friendly powers, or at least will carry a suspicion of an aggressive purpose on our part.*

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the great moderation of the United States as compared to the other great powers of the world in this particular. At present Great Britain has seventy-eight battle ships and armored cruisers in the Atlantic, with ten on the keel, two laying, and three others of the *Dreadnought* class available to purchase (Brazil ships), making fifteen more ships as a total of the *Dreadnought* class which will be available for Great Britain within a short time.

Shall we take offense against Great Britain because of this mighty armament, because of this great power on the sea? No, Mr. President, we have no reason for offense nor for suspicion. Great Britain has a magnificent and tremendous commerce, a vast merchant marine, and her diplomacy covers the world. She has a right to prepare herself against any eventuality whatever.

Germany, in like manner, has twenty-seven of these great ships available on the Atlantic, five on the keel and eight projected, making thirteen of these giant war ships which Germany is proposing to build in the immediate future. When the United States, with a more tremendous commerce, proposes four war ships, shall Germany take offense, with twice and more than twice as many projected? And in speaking of the German programme I call attention only to that of the immediate future and not up to the year 1917, up to which we have just reason to believe the programme of four battle ships annually has been determined, or forty new battle ships.

I call attention to France, which has thirty-one of these vast war ships available for the Atlantic coast, with six additional ships of this class with keels laid, and six more projected, making twelve. Why shall France regard with disfavor the building of four ships by the United States?

In like manner Japan has two leviathans with keels laid and seven more proposed, making nine ships of this gigantic class, and Japan furnishes us an example of what they believe to be wise and judicious. Are we unfriendly or the just object of suspicion if we authorize half that number? This argument against four battle ships is obviously unsound and shows the poverty of argument against this enlargement of the Navy.

I call attention to the Navy Year Book, compiled by Pitman Pulsifer, 1907, and the report of the various great nations as to the number and displacement of war ships built and building of 1,000 or more tons and of torpedo craft of more than 50 tons. The table referred to is as follows:

*Number and displacement of war ships, built and building, of 1,000 or more tons, and of torpedo craft of more than 50 tons.*

[Vessels over 20 years old not included unless reconstructed since 1900.]

	Number.	Tons.
<b>GREAT BRITAIN.</b>		
Battle ships (10,000 tons and over)	56	821,390
Coast-defense vessels		
Armored cruisers	38	468,350
Cruisers above 6,000 tons	19	183,950
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons	46	203,580
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons	26	56,305
Torpedo-boat destroyers	150	60,791
Torpedo boats	71	13,326
Submarines	48	13,318
Total	454	1,821,610
<b>UNITED STATES.</b>		
Battle ships (10,000 tons and over)	29	406,146
Coast-defense vessels	11	45,384
Armored cruisers	12	157,445
Cruisers above 6,000 tons	5	43,800
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons	20	72,620
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons	19	26,317
Torpedo-boat destroyers	21	10,707
Torpedo boats	32	5,615
Submarines	19	3,774
Total	168	771,758
<b>FRANCE.</b>		
Battle ships (10,000 tons and over)	27	368,461
Coast-defense vessels	12	73,304
Armored cruisers	23	220,974
Cruisers above 6,000 tons	3	24,409
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons	13	52,543
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons	12	23,152
Torpedo-boat destroyers	60	19,595
Torpedo boats	271	25,680
Submarines	90	27,992
Total	520	836,112
<b>GERMANY.</b>		
Battle ships (10,000 tons and over)	28	358,650
Coast-defense vessels	8	33,203
Armored cruisers	10	113,808
Cruisers above 6,000 tons	1	6,300
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons	21	85,210
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons	19	40,685
Torpedo-boat destroyers	72	33,858
Torpedo boats	48	8,539
Submarines	3	540
Total	210	680,782
<b>JAPAN.</b>		
Battle ships (10,000 tons and over)	13	191,498
Coast-defense vessels	8	18,786
Armored cruisers	13	188,100
Cruisers above 6,000 tons	2	13,130
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons	11	43,094
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons	9	17,888
Torpedo-boat destroyers	57	20,556
Torpedo boats	77	6,842
Submarines	9	1,426
Total	194	451,320
<b>RUSSIA.</b>		
Battle ships (10,000 tons and over)	9	121,200
Coast-defense vessels	4	21,380
Armored cruisers	7	70,200
Cruisers above 6,000 tons	7	46,460
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons	1	3,100
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons	7	8,800
Torpedo-boat destroyers	97	36,254
Torpedo boats	57	6,834
Submarines	31	5,812
Total	220	320,040
<b>ITALY.</b>		
Battle ships (10,000 tons and over)	13	167,904
Coast-defense vessels		
Armored cruisers	10	78,520
Cruisers above 6,000 tons		
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons	1	3,530
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons	10	21,920
Torpedo-boat destroyers	13	5,593
Torpedo boats	7	10,109
Submarines	6	857
Total	120	288,433

Number and displacement of war ships, etc.—Continued.

	Number.	Tons.
AUSTRIA.		
Battle ships (10,000 tons and over)	3	31,800
Coast-defense vessels	6	41,700
Armored cruisers	3	18,800
Cruisers above 6,000 tons		
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons	2	8,000
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons	3	7,050
Torpedo-boat destroyers	6	2,400
Torpedo boats	39	4,885
Submarines	6	1,600
Total	68	116,235

Age of United States battle ships from first commission.

Name.	Date of first commission.	Age by years.
FIRST-CLASS BATTLE SHIPS.		
Alabama	Oct. 16, 1900	7
Connecticut	Sept. 29, 1903	1
Delaware		
Georgia	Sept. 24, 1905	1
Idaho		
Illinois	Sept. 16, 1901	6
Indiana	Nov. 20, 1895	12

Age of United States battle ships from first commission—Continued.

Name.	Date of first commission.	Age by years.
FIRST-CLASS BATTLE SHIPS—continued.		
Iowa	June 16, 1897	10
Kansas	Apr. 18, 1907	
Kearsarge	Feb. 20, 1900	7
Kentucky	May 15, 1900	7
Louisiana	June 2, 1903	1
Maine	Dec. 29, 1902	5
Massachusetts	June 10, 1896	11
Michigan		
Minnesota	Mar. 9, 1907	
Mississippi		
Missouri	Dec. 1, 1903	4
Nebraska	July 1, 1907	
New Hampshire		
New Jersey	May 12, 1906	1
North Dakota		
Ohio	Oct. 4, 1904	3
Oregon	July 15, 1896	11
Rhode Island	Feb. 12, 1906	1
South Carolina		
Vermont	Mar. 4, 1907	
Virginia	May 7, 1903	1
Wisconsin	Feb. 4, 1901	6
SECOND-CLASS BATTLE SHIP.		
Texas	{ Aug. 15, 1895 { Nov. 3, 1902	12

Time in building battle ships, United States Navy.

Name.	Keel laid.	Launched.	Contract date of completion.	Date of first and latest commission.	Time.
Alabama	Dec. 1, 1896	May 18, 1898	Sept. 24, 1899	Oct. 16, 1900	Ys. M. D. 3 10 15
Connecticut	Mar. 10, 1903	Sept. 29, 1904	Mar. 15, 1906	Sept. 29, 1906	3 6 19
Delaware					
Georgia	Aug. 31, 1901	Oct. 11, 1904	Feb. 18, 1904	Sept. 24, 1906	5 0 24
Idaho	May 12, 1904		May 25, 1907		
Illinois	Feb. 10, 1897	Oct. 4, 1898	Sept. 26, 1899	Sept. 16, 1901	4 7 6
Indiana	May 7, 1891	Feb. 28, 1893	Nov. 19, 1893	Nov. 20, 1895	4 6 13
Iowa	Aug. 5, 1893	Mar. 28, 1896	Feb. 11, 1896	June 16, 1897 Dec. 23, 1903	
Kansas	Feb. 10, 1904	Aug. 12, 1905	Dec. 16, 1906	Apr. 18, 1907	3 2 8
Kearsarge	June 30, 1896	Mar. 24, 1898	Jan. 2, 1899	Feb. 20, 1900	3 7 20
Kentucky	do	do	do	May 15, 1900	3 10 15
Louisiana	Feb. 7, 1903	Aug. 27, 1904	Mar. 15, 1906	June 2, 1906	3 3 25
Maine	Feb. 15, 1899	July 27, 1901	June 1, 1901	Dec. 29, 1902	3 10 14
Massachusetts	June 25, 1891	June 10, 1893	Nov. 18, 1893	June 10, 1896	4 11 15
Michigan					
Minnesota	Oct. 27, 1903	Apr. 8, 1905	Dec. 20, 1906	Mar. 9, 1907	3 4 12
Mississippi	May 12, 1904	Sept. 30, 1905	Mar. 25, 1907		
Missouri	Feb. 7, 1900	Dec. 28, 1901	Aug. 30, 1901	Dec. 1, 1903	3 9 24
Nebraska	July 4, 1902	Oct. 7, 1904	Mar. 7, 1904	July 1, 1907	4 11 27
New Hampshire	May 1, 1905		Feb. 27, 1908		
New Jersey	Apr. 2, 1902	Nov. 10, 1904	Feb. 15, 1904	May 12, 1906	4 1 10
North Dakota					
Ohio	Apr. 22, 1899	May 18, 1901	June 5, 1901	Oct. 4, 1904	5 5 12
Oregon	Nov. 19, 1891	Oct. 26, 1893	Nov. 19, 1893	July 15, 1896	4 7 26
Rhode Island	May 1, 1902	May 17, 1904	Feb. 15, 1904	Feb. 19, 1906	3 9 18
South Carolina					
Vermont	May 21, 1904	Aug. 31, 1905	Dec. 20, 1906	Mar. 4, 1907	2 9 13
Virginia	May 21, 1902	Apr. 5, 1904	Feb. 15, 1904	May 7, 1906	3 11 16
Wisconsin	Feb. 9, 1897	Nov. 26, 1898	Sept. 19, 1899	Feb. 4, 1901	3 11 25

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the tonnage of Great Britain is 1,821,610 and of the United States 771,758.

The tonnage of France is 836,112; of Germany, 680,782; Japan, 451,320; Russia, 320,040. With the new type of great ships building, which I have pointed out, the United States will take the third or fourth place unless it shall also follow in the plan laid out by other nations.

I can not think this is wise or businesslike or economical in the highest and best sense.

The argument has been made that a big navy invites competition in warlike preparations, and this argument is true. Except for the fact that the other great nations have been preparing these great armaments there would be no occasion for the United States to make like preparation. The dignity of this nation and the power of this nation and the relative rank of this nation compel the United States to parallel in some degree the enlargement of the naval power of other nations upon the sea.

The argument has been advanced that we can not get the men to man these ships, and yet it will take years to prepare the ships, and with all the thousands of seamen which are already upon our ships we are told that it is impossible to obtain the men. I insist that there should be no serious difficulty whatever in preparing the men by the time these ships shall have been built, and that plans should be made, if the ships are to be constructed, for the preparation of men who shall be competent to take charge of them.

Strong stress has been laid upon the views of the President—1905, that he argued for only one ship a year; of 1906, that he

argued for only one ship while Congress provided two, twice as many as he asked for. I respond to that argument by asking, why is it that Congress provided twice as many ships if Congress did not think the argument was sound to so enlarge the Navy? It shows that the President has been more conservative than Congress in the past and that his present careful argument for four should be listened to as the voice of a proven conservative.

You are committed upon your own argument. You have yourself said that there was needed twice as many as the President said in 1905 and in 1906; and now, when he recommends four, it is alleged upon the floor that he gives no reason whatever. I have analyzed that message, and he gives many good and sufficient reasons. I think it would be well to read the President's message before denouncing it and alleging its lack of information and its want of sound reason. I call your attention to the reasons given by the President:

First. The failure of an agreement between the "different nations to limit the increase of naval armaments."

Second. The failure to secure an agreement "especially to limit the size of war ships."

Third. The improbability of obtaining such agreements in future within a reasonable time.

Fourth. A radical change in size of the new battle ships of other nations, making them twice or three times as effective.

Fifth. Every other great naval nation has or is building a number of such huge ships.

Sixth. If we build but two per annum, we "shall go backward in naval rank and relative power among the great nations."

Seventh. As Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, the President, on his solemn responsibility, earnestly advises four battle ships of the most advanced type.

*Eighth. He emphatically declares it a measure of peace—not of war.*  
*Ninth. He said we need a navy commensurate with our powers and needs.*

*Tenth. It "will be the surest guaranty and safeguard of peace."*  
*Eleventh. "Undeclared wealth invites aggression."*  
*Twelfth. "Our liberty of speech and action" may develop sudden trouble with foreign powers.*

*Thirteenth. A proud nation jealous of its honor can not be content to rely for peace upon the forbearance of other powers.*  
*Fourteenth. The power of self-defense is essential to the protection of our interests.*

*Fifteenth. Quotes George Washington's opinion in support of the principles involved.*

And yet the opponents of the President deny that he gives any reason for the request, and appear to show the most transparent satisfaction in denouncing the argument for four ships, as if there were some peculiar pleasure in making light of and holding up to contempt the President's wishes and views.

The argument that authorizing four ships would be offensive to friendly nations seems to me to be peculiarly unsound. Why should Great Britain be offended, when she is herself proposing twelve of these great ships? Why should Germany be offended, when she is herself proposing thirteen of these great ships, and why should France be offended, when she proposes for herself twelve of these great ships, or Japan, which proposes nine? There is obviously no sound reason in such logic.

Mr. President, the argument in favor of four ships depends first of all upon our national policy. Since 1883 we have built up a modern navy, but really our Navy has been built up substantially since the Spanish war. At the time of the Spanish war the total expenditure for our Navy was only about \$49,000,000, and now the able Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] points out to us what is true, that we have expended over \$300,000,000 for building this modern Navy. I ask you why have you built this great Navy if there is no cause and no sound reason for it? And why shall we hesitate so seriously about putting ourselves upon an equality with the nations of Europe and of the Orient in the matter of these new ships, which are estimated to be two or three times more powerful than previous first-class battle ships.

A great navy is obviously of supreme importance to the United States in order to maintain its relative dignity, its relative rank of naval power with the other great nations of the world. It is a question of relative strength, and the history of the world records that no nation is respected in the same degree when it has not the power to enforce at the cannon's mouth, if necessary, its just and righteous demands.

China with her 400,000,000 of population and with her policy of peace, peace at any price, has become the prey of the commercial nations of the world, and only their jealousy to-day prevents its dismemberment.

A navy is of extreme importance to our national honor and our national commerce. This country can not be safe from insult or from wrong if this country is powerless to reprove it by force, if necessary. That was the policy laid down by our fathers. It was the policy laid down by George Washington in the early days of this Republic; and the very words of President Washington are appealed to by President Roosevelt to persuade the Senate of the importance of preserving for the United States its relative rank and power with the other great nations of the world.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a very important matter—one which appeals to me, at least, with great force, and which I believe has not yet been suggested in this debate. I call the attention of the Senate to the growth of our imports and our exports since the Spanish war. Table 228 of the Statistical Record of the Progress of the United States exhibits the following: That our total imported merchandise in 1898 was \$616,049,654. After a hundred years we had only reached \$616,049,654 of imports, and yet in eight years—since that Spanish war and since we have put our flag upon the ocean—it has increased to \$1,226,562,446. In a hundred years we had not increased our imports before our modern navy as in eight years after we placed it on exhibition.

The following table shows in detail our increase in imports during those years:

Year.	Per cent of total.	Total value.
1898.....	0.70	\$616,049,654
1899.....	.68	697,148,489
1900.....	.64	849,941,184
1901.....	.74	828,179,165
1902.....	.62	908,320,948
1903.....	.58	1,025,719,237
1904.....	.68	991,087,371
1905.....	.60	1,117,513,071
1906.....	.74	1,226,562,446

But I call your attention to a like growth also of our exports, as shown in Table No. 228. In 1896 the exports of this country were \$863,200,487. We had lived one hundred years of national life; we had reached up to that time only this volume of exports, and yet after our Navy had made us known to the other peoples of the world our exports doubled, until in ten short years they amounted in 1906 to \$1,717,953,382.

The following is a table of our exports of domestic merchandise during this period:

1896.....	\$863,200,487
1897.....	1,032,007,693
1898.....	1,210,291,913
1899.....	1,208,031,222
1900.....	1,370,763,571
1901.....	1,460,462,806
1902.....	1,355,481,861
1903.....	1,302,231,302
1904.....	1,435,179,017
1905.....	1,491,744,641
1906.....	1,717,953,382

Is our Navy of no value to our people in obtaining foreign markets?

Our immigration from 1898 to 1906 was as follows:

1898.....	229,299
1899.....	311,715
1900.....	448,572
1901.....	487,918
1902.....	648,743
1903.....	857,046
1904.....	812,870
1905.....	1,026,499
1906.....	1,100,735

Did our Navy in the Spanish war advertise and make attractive our great Republic, or not?

I think, as a matter of advertisement, we are justified in giving the United States a navy which shall occupy at least a second place in the rank of the world's powers.

We have heard much said about war, about the probability of war. I take it, Mr. President, that there is not a Senator on this floor who really believes that we are in any danger of war from any nation on the earth, and, least of all perhaps, in danger from Japan. For my single self, speaking of that great nation of the Orient, I can hardly find words to express my admiration for their wonderful development. I not only feel the greatest admiration for them, but I feel the warmest friendship and fraternal kindness, and so I believe do all who are within these walls. We have no hostility against any nation on the earth; on the contrary, it is the policy of the people of the United States and of their representatives here to promote in every way possible a spirit of benevolence, a spirit of kindness, and a spirit of fraternity with all the nations of the earth.

Our nation has been conspicuous in endeavoring to bring about arbitration treaties, yielding our own differences to arbitration in an international court. We have led in that, and I will say here and now that, not only am I willing to build up the American Navy so as to give it its relative place of respectability and power, but I am willing to vote for \$40,000,000 more as a fund for conducting a deliberate propaganda for the permanent establishment of peace and good will among the nations of all the earth. I think that the Senate ought to find means by which such a propaganda should become one of its noble accomplishments, so that this Senate shall become the voice, the active agency, of the American people in promoting an actual abiding, guaranteed peace throughout the nations of the world. There is not a nation on the American continent which would not gladly follow the United States with locked arms in that effort. It can be accomplished; and I believe in the providence of God that it will be accomplished before many years shall have passed.

But in the meantime, Mr. President, I do think that the United States would be derelict if it permitted itself to lag behind the line of progress in the matter of armament and make of itself a third-rate or fourth-rate or fifth-rate naval power. When we come to consider that aspect, there is hardly any of those who advocate only two battle ships at this time who would be willing to openly say or to think to themselves that it would be wise for the United States to take the third or the fourth or the fifth rank in naval power on the sea.

Mr. President, with me it comes down to the question of relative authority.

The weight of authority is in favor of our maintaining our place as the second naval power on the sea. Our English-speaking brethren are a long way ahead of us in power on the ocean, and we can not and need not have any desire to rival them, because we have a multitude of ties of blood, of common language, of common religion and common commerce, and of ideals and thoughts and opinions which are common bonds between us. We furnish them their food and materials for their factories.



We are bound together in such a way that a breach between the English-speaking peoples of the world is inconceivable and impossible.

With regard to the question of authority, whether it is a good thing to have a strong navy, I call your attention to the fact that we have the authority of all the nations of the world. What about Great Britain, with 1,800,000,000 tons? What about Germany, struggling with all her might to take a stronger place upon the sea? What about France's great efforts along the same line? Are their opinions of no value? We have the authority of these great nations, whose acts demonstrate that they believe that it is necessary for them to protect their commerce, their honor, their integrity, and their dominions.

Our own expenditures of over \$300,000,000 in the last twenty-five years show the steadfast opinions of changing Congresses favoring a vigorous expansion of our Navy.

It was boldly stated that the Naval Committee of the House favored four battle ships, but only desisted on the ground of economy, urged by the financial leaders. We have every reason—the maintenance of our dignity, honor, commerce, and diplomacy—and as a business investment besides.

But we have, in addition to that, Mr. President, the substantial reasons given and the weight of the authority of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. His reasons have not been answered. Their existence has merely been denied. It has merely been said that he gave no reasons. He gave an abundance of reasons, and his first reason was that, while he had made the most resolute effort to establish the principle of limiting the naval armaments among the nations of the world at The Hague, he had failed, and was not within measurable distance of obtaining success.

More than that, he called attention to the extreme power of the *Dreadnought* class of battle ships—equal to two or three of the old first-class battle ships. He called attention to the fact that if this Congress does not provide four of these ships at this session, this nation will go back from the second place to the third place, and the statistics which I have inserted in my remarks, and to which I have called attention, demonstrate the correctness of the President's position.

He points out another reason, namely, that we have two great coasts to protect, making it doubly necessary for us to have a sufficient armament on the sea, and he declares that it is—

Vitally necessary to secure the peace and welfare of the Republic in the event of international complications which are even remotely possible.

I deprecate as much as any Senator any suggestion that would wound the feelings of any of the great nations of the world, with all of whom we are on the most friendly terms; and, certainly, I do not believe that it has been any just ground of offense to any of the great nations of the world that this debate should have proceeded along the lines that it has. There has been no one on this floor who has declared that comparatively modest addition to our Navy was proposed either for offense or for defense against a proposed or fancied aggression of any of the great powers. On the contrary, everyone has declared our friendship for all nations and has made that declaration truly, because America is absolutely known to be at profound peace with all the nations of the world and has no purpose of aggression of any kind or character.

The purpose of the United States, as shown by its policy, is to submit its own grievances—if any arise—to arbitration of an impartial international tribunal; and when we take that advanced step there can be no just ground of offense on the part of any other nation on the earth or any suspicion of our purpose against it.

There was never a more economical time to do this work than now. Hundreds of thousands of men are out of employment. This expenditure will give employment that will stimulate our people's industries and help revive the depression due to the recent artificial panic.

Mr. President, I regard this expenditure as a wise national economy, which will abundantly justify itself. We can easily afford it, and will never feel it.

Mr. President, one suggestion, and I shall conclude. I want to say that when I consider the weight of the authority of the gentlemen of the Naval Committee, with the unsatisfying reasons they suggest, or the weight of authority on the other side, the President and the reasons he gives; when I come to consider this question of relative authority—and I am compelled to decide it one way or the other way—I propose to decide it on the safe side of enlarging our Navy.

I prefer to make an error, if I do err, on the safe side, on the side of giving our Navy a greater relative strength, rather than to give our Navy a weaker position; I shall prefer to vote to give our Navy the second rank among the navies of the world,

rather than adopt a policy leading our Navy to the third or fourth rank in dignity and power, and I believe my beloved State of Oklahoma and the people of the United States will approve the vote.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, when the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] in 1905 was pressing with great vigor the ship-subsidy bill, which had been reported by the Committee on Commerce and which had been approved by the Merchant Marine Commission that had been in session for some time, my attention was for the first time called to the fact that our Navy was a disproportioned navy; that whilst it had a great force of fighting ships which could maintain themselves successfully as fighting ships, they lacked the supporting ships so necessary in case of war—the colliers, the scouts, the transports, the dispatch boats, the tugs, and other vessels constituting an auxiliary navy and just as essential to the success of a fighting force as the fighting ships themselves.

That view was set forth in a report prepared by the General Board of War of the Navy, over which Admiral Dewey presided, a report which was prepared for the Merchant Marine Commission at the suggestion of its chairman and presented by him with a view to supporting a ship-subsidy bill then before the Senate. The question was asked the War Board as to what vessels would be necessary as an auxiliary navy in case of war, and their reply is contained in a document, which I shall ask to have printed in the Record—that about 200 ships, costing on the average, I believe, about \$1,000,000 each, would be necessary in order to support the fighting ships of the Navy in case of war, particularly if that war were such a war as endangered the retention of our insular possessions.

I then sought to have an amendment in the nature of a substitute acted upon by the Senate providing for the immediate construction of about thirty-two ships, costing a million dollars each, which I claimed could serve a double purpose. On the one hand, in case of war they could act as transports, colliers, or scouts in the Navy, and in times of peace they could be used as training ships for our naval reserve, and also in opening up new routes of mail and commerce to South American, Australian, and oriental ports. The Senator from New Hampshire at that time was contending that thirty-two vessels were necessary for that service, and he sought to secure them by a subsidy, which it was estimated would in a period of ten years aggregate an expenditure upon the part of the National Government of about \$32,000,000.

I insisted upon it that if that expenditure was necessary in the interest of commerce, if it was necessary in order to promote commerce with those ports, the United States Government should subsidize American ships for ten years to the extent of \$32,000,000, it would be a wiser policy for the Government itself to construct the thirty-two ships as a part of the auxiliary navy, holding them for use as training ships for our Naval Reserve, manning them in large degree with our Naval Reserve, and turning them over in times of peace under lease to shipping companies, who could themselves open up these new routes of commerce and of mail. I contended that at the end of ten years, if we pursued the system of subsidy, the Government would own nothing; but if we pursued the system of ownership, the Government would at the end of ten years have the thirty-two ships into which its \$32,000,000 had gone. I insisted upon it that we could accomplish a double purpose—promote commerce with other nations, open up new commercial regions with which it is our desire to connect ourselves, and establish training ships for the sailors whom it is our desire to train for our Navy, and have at the same time these ships in reserve in case of war for use as an auxiliary navy such as I have described.

I presented the same view later on in the dying hours of the ship-subsidy bill, and recently, in a few remarks on the 20th of March, when the Senator from New Hampshire was presenting another subsidy measure involving simply a mail subvention, I presented an amendment, not in the hope of securing its passage, but with a view of bringing to the attention of the Senate the importance of this question, the importance of establishing a well-proportioned navy, not a lopsided navy, composed only of fighting ships, but a navy including also not only other ships absolutely essential to support and maintain the fighting ships in case of war. My voice was raised here, without an echoing note anywhere, until finally the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] raised his voice, and I propose to quote his words briefly. Whilst I was on the floor the Senator from Maine interrupted me and said:

Mr. HALE. I do not want to interfere with the line of the Senator's argument, but I am very largely in sympathy with him, for he has struck what is the weak point in our entire naval establishment, so far as ships are concerned. We are deplorably lacking in the essentials that make a great fleet not only formidable, but seaworthy.

The Senator said the other day, and the metaphor was not too strong, that without certain auxiliary ships the great battle ships of the United States fleet upon any waters outside of our own waters, in case of any emergency, with war threatened, would be derelicts, and it is too true.

In another place the Senator from Maine said:

Mr. President, it is a melancholy spectacle that this great fleet of ours in this regard presents to-day. It is the greatest fleet of great and formidable ships that the whole world has ever seen. It is completely manned. It is in every respect except one the most magnificent and formidable fleet of ships that any nation has ever put upon the waters of the globe.

The Senator from Maine then went on to show the number of colliers that it was necessary to employ in the present cruise of our great fleet—not American colliers, but colliers of foreign registry—and the Senator from Maine went on to show that in case of war the obligations of neutrality would prevent any one of these foreign countries permitting its ships of foreign registry from coming to our rescue. The Senator added:

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, if when that fleet was ordered on this tour about the globe there had been the least menace of war from any power, no government owning one of these foreign colliers would have allowed a single ship to be employed by us, and our fleet, magnificent as it is, with any menace of war upon the sky, without these foreign colliers would be as useless and—

As idle as a painted ship  
Upon a painted ocean.

The Senator from Maine further said:

It is not, Mr. President, an agreeable thing to contemplate. We go on year after year building up and accumulating these immense ships at an enormous expenditure, and find ourselves, as we would in any emergency for which the ships are built, without a thing being done that makes the ships formidable as a fleet at sea. The Senator is right in his theories. There ought not to be another ship added to the American Navy until we add something that every other power has done to make the ships formidable in case of an emergency.

And then the Senator from Maine issued me an invitation, in response to which I will at the proper time offer an amendment to this bill. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Maine a moment, I wish to read his invitation. The Senator from Maine said:

I do not think the Senator from Nevada wants to embarrass this bill; but when we come to the consideration of the naval appropriation bill I hope the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Maine, my colleague, and every thoughtful, patriotic Senator will join with me to try and see that something is done in this entirely neglected field that we have rashly and in the most foolhardy way neglected and abandoned in the past.

Now, Mr. President, in view of the emphatic utterance of the Senator from Maine, I must say that this bill is a most "lame and impotent conclusion." It is true that this bill does provide for a few colliers. It provided as it came from the House for two fleet colliers, each costing \$1,800,000, or a total of \$3,600,000. To that provision the Senate committee has added another provision for the purchase of three new steam colliers—I presume of slower speed—costing each not exceeding \$600,000. So that we have a total of five ships added to our auxiliary navy at a total cost of about \$5,000,000; and yet the Senator from Maine showed in his remarks upon a previous occasion that the colliers of foreign registry then employed by our fleet in Pacific waters were some twenty-eight in number, probably costing from \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000. And yet in case of war we would need not only colliers but scouts, transports, dispatch boats, and other vessels, which would be as unattainable from the American register as the colliers would be.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do.

Mr. HALE. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator. In the long time that this bill has taken of the consideration of the Senate, in the absence of the Senator, the same questions which he now raises have come up, and I have stated what the committee felt itself justified in doing. So far as concerns the equipment of our fleet with colliers, the most important subject, the bill as reported by the committee will not satisfy the Senator. It is not a large programme, but it is something in the right direction. The bill provides five good serviceable colliers at a very considerable expense, and I should hope that it would be a permanent feature of naval bills for the future, and that in considering the continued appropriations for the Navy—and I expect so long as I am a member of this body to see appropriations for maintaining a strong, serviceable Navy—we should go on each year and make as a part of that programme provision for colliers that may accompany the fleet in any emergency and which will always be a desirable and necessary part of the establishment.

Of course the Senator knows, while it has been said to be rather an ignoble consideration, that we have to attend somewhat to the conditions of the revenue, the great expenditures, and the approaching alarming deficit. We can not consider the Navy nor the Army, nor any part of the Government, without

taking that into account, and, all things considered, the committee believed that this provision for five efficient, valuable, serviceable colliers is all that we can do this year. If we had a surfeit of money and did not know what to do with it, we might go more largely, which I should be very glad to do at as early a day as possible, into the other questions of the auxiliary navy, the building up of ships in the merchant marine, as England does and other great powers, that shall be built in cooperation with the Navy Department and that can be used in an emergency as valuable accessories to the Navy. Other powers have a large list, not on paper, but existing of the auxiliary navy. I wish we had more. I wish the condition of our finances and our revenue justified us entering that field.

The Senator is right in his general view of what we ought to do. But we have gone on devoting ourselves mainly, as the Senator and all Senators know, to the increase of the Navy proper, the ships of the Navy, and have not given great attention to these other very essential accessories to that part of the establishment. I do not believe that this year we are justified in doing more than what the bill provides in that respect.

So I would be glad if I could join with the Senator, and I am indebted to him for the early and valuable suggestions that he made, which certainly attracted my attention and, which have led, I think, and the Senator is entitled to credit for that, to some development in this direction.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I am very glad to learn that this is but the commencement of a continuous policy. The Senator from Maine will not think me too critical in saying that the action of the committee was hardly a realization of the hope which he indulged in his former speech in the Senate, for at that time his utterance was emphatic that there should not be another ship in the Navy built until this needed want was filled. I agree with the Senator from Maine that there should be a limit to naval expenditures. I would gladly see all military expenditures reduced. I would not willingly favor any large increase in the present measure of expenditures. What I hoped for was that the committee would refuse to report in favor of more fighting ships until the auxiliary navy was brought up to a certain standard.

Such a policy would not mean larger annual expenditures on the part of the Government, but it would mean a usable navy, a proportioned navy—a navy in which each part was adjusted in operation to every other part—not a great machine of war, with essential parts absolutely lacking to such a degree that the machine would break down in case of war. I have likened our Navy of splendid fighting ships to a vigorous man, with strong lungs, strong heart, firm muscles, but lacking in an arm or a leg. And that is what our Navy is to-day. It is a navy without arms. It is a navy without legs. It is a navy without the ability to support itself in case of war, without a merchant marine upon which it can call for these auxiliary ships.

We not only are without transports and colliers and dispatch boats, but we have not them within our reach, so far as our domestic resources are concerned and so far as the world itself is concerned and our ability to call upon other nations in case of war for these auxiliary ships and to purchase them—ships now under foreign registry. The Senator from Maine has well said that to permit such action upon their part would be a violation of the laws of neutrality.

Mr. President, therefore I am as opposed as the Senator is to any increase in the total of our naval expenditures. But I suggest that if we are to expend \$100,000,000, of that sum \$20,000,000 might now be well spent in making this a proportioned navy, in securing the parts now lacking to its efficient and successful operation, and that this work of increasing our auxiliary navy ought not only to be commenced now, but it ought to progress vigorously, at the expense, if necessary, of the immediate construction of fighting ships, of which we to-day have a surplusage as compared with these useful ships so necessary in case of war.

Judged by present conditions we have a surplusage of one kind of ships and we are lacking in other essential ships, and the businesslike thing is, while limiting the total expenditure, to divide that expenditure, so as to provide the needed parts of this Navy and not to increase those parts of which we have at present a surplusage.

Mr. President, while discussing this point I wish to say that I do not believe we should enter upon the policy of creating an auxiliary navy unless we pursue it in a businesslike way. I know it is not regarded as essential to apply business considerations to governmental work. Whenever an attempt is made to do it the cry is raised that the Government should not go into business, and the terrors of governmental ownership are held before us. I do not wish to see the Government go into busi-

ness. I do not want to see Government ownership of any business. But it does seem to me that when the Government enters upon a great work, it should enter upon it in a businesslike way.

This auxiliary navy is needed for the emergency of war. What are we to do with it during the period of peace? Can we settle that in a businesslike way? One complaint is made that it is difficult to get the men to man the ships in case of war; that we have not a merchant marine which is training men for this service; and the necessity of a great naval reserve has been pointed out. It has been insisted that we should have a reserve of at least 10,000 trained men to meet the emergency of war. England has 30,000 such men. It seems to me the suggestion is a wise one, and the question is, How shall we train that naval reserve—on land or at sea? Certainly these ships can be used as training ships, officered by surplus officers of the Navy, who will be needed in case of war. A training school on a ship will cost less than a training school on land. We have a training school at Goat Island, in California, and possibly we have others. These ships can be used in that way.

But it occurs to me that the expenditure for moving these ships from port to port in the training of the naval reserve should be made in a businesslike way, and if any part of it can be saved it should be. What trade is the Government of the United States endeavoring to reach out for? The promotion of commerce with South America, with Australia, and with the Orient. Complaint is made every day that our merchant marine has declined. Complaint is made every day that the merchant marine of the United States can not compete with the marine of any other country upon waters not monopolized by the United States. We all know that the cost of American ships is at least one-fourth more than that of ships of foreign register. We all know that in building American ships the American shipbuilder has to pay the steel trust of America \$8 a ton more for its steel than does the foreign shipbuilder building for a foreign country and buying the steel from the same trust. We all know, also, that as a result of the high protective system which we have established in this country everything in this country, as compared with other countries, is upon stilts, everything adjusted to the monopoly of production in the great industrial establishments secured by the maintenance of this high tariff wall.

The result is that the cost of administration of the American ship, manned by American sailors, is from 30 to 40 and 50 per cent higher than that on foreign ships. How, then, can we expect to open up these lines of commerce and of mail to South America, Australia, and the Orient when our merchant marine labors under these obvious disadvantages in competition with other countries?

I ask, then, why these ships, this auxiliary navy, which we are creating, should not be used in a businesslike way, not in traversing routes now established, but in opening up new routes; not under the direction of the Government itself, but intrusted by lease under favorable conditions to private shipping companies, the Government retaining its control over the reserves on the ships, maintaining its officers on the ships, and thus aiding to that degree in the economical administration of the ships, so far as the carrier company is concerned, and thus these ships can be used for the purpose of auxiliary ships in case of war, for training schools for our reserves, and the temporary purpose of aiding our mercantile interests in establishing new routes of mail and commerce to South America and the Orient. By doing that we can largely diminish the cost of the operation of these ships, diminish the cost of the training school itself, diminish the cost of the operation of the auxiliary navy, and at the same time promote the commerce and business of the country.

Why should not the United States Government when it is doing or proposes to do a paternal thing—for ship subsidy is paternalism—do it in a businesslike way? If it is to pay out money to aid in building ships for our merchant marine let it own the ships. If it is to aid in the administration of such ships let it share in the benefits of the administration, in the development and the training of the Naval Reserves, capable of responding efficiently to the call of the country in case of war.

Mr. President, in that way we may possibly open up new lines, and when business is established private shipping companies will take the place of these auxiliary ships, which are simply the advance agents of commerce, and we may then have real ships upon the ocean. At present one of the chief arguments for the creation of a great navy is protection of the merchant marine. That is the plea made by every country. That is the reason why England has a great navy; that is the reason why Germany has a great navy; that is the reason why France has a great navy. We have built our Navy in advance of our

merchant marine. We have built our Navy to protect phantom ships. I would have these ships real ships. First, auxiliary ships of the Navy as advance agents of commerce, and then, as the result of established business and commerce, American lines bearing the American flag which the American Navy will protect throughout the world.

Mr. President, at the suggestion of the Senator from California, I have modified the amendment which I have proposed as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington, by striking out the last few lines, after the word "peace," in line 7, and I will ask the Secretary to read the amendment as modified.

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

The SECRETARY. After line 5, on page 87, it is proposed to insert:

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.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words regarding the appointment of this commission. It is true that this is a naval bill, and it is true that these are naval expenditures, and they are to be made under the direction and control of the Navy Department, but it seems to me obvious that inasmuch as it is desirable that this auxiliary navy should be built and conducted in a businesslike way, with a view to as small an expenditure as possible in the future in the way of operating expenses, we should at all events study a plan under which it can be made useful, self-compensatory, or partly compensatory. Now, what Departments of the Government are interested in these questions? Obviously the Navy Department, because of its control of the Navy; obviously the Department of Commerce and Labor, which has a mixed jurisdiction over the entire subject of commerce, and obviously the Post-Office Department, which Department has control of the mails.

We are seeking now to promote an auxiliary navy. We are seeking to promote commerce with South America, Australia, and the Orient, and we are seeking to establish new lines of mails. Why, therefore, would it not be wise to put the three heads of those Departments into one commission with a view to a study of the subject, so that a ship can be constructed which will be useful for all the purposes to which I have referred—for the Navy, the commerce, and the mails—and a commission that can study a plan for economically working out the best interests of the Government in creating a proportioned Navy and in advancing commerce and new lines of mail.

No power is given to them except the power of recommendation, and I would ask the Senator from Maine whether he would have any objection to the appointment in this bill of such a commission.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I am not prepared to assent to that, because I do not think that it has had mature consideration enough to be embodied as a part of the appropriation bill. We are dealing with the money that we should expend. The question of a commission to take up great subjects I do not think has been presented sufficiently to justify putting on that matter at this stage, when the vote must be taken to-night by an agreement of the Senate.

I do not say that at the proper time I would not favor such a commission, although my experience is that government by commission is not very practical or effectual government. Commissions do not accomplish much unless you would give them absolute power, which we can not grant. An advisory commission never has effectuated much.

Without taking up more time, because I know the Senator desires to go on, I will say that I am not prepared to agree to that proposition upon this bill.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator can not see his way clear to accept at all events this part of the amendment, for it always seems to me that when a question of this kind is up for discussion before the Senate that is the appropriate time for action. I am always opposed to the policy of drift, and that has been the policy of legislation ever since I have served in the House and in the Senate. I believe that now is the appropriate time for action upon this subject, and I regret, in view of the fact that the Senator himself has so emphasized the importance of action upon this subject he does not see his way clear to assent to the proposition now.

The Senator remarks that the work of commissions is not always satisfactory; that we can not give them full power, for that might mean, I presume, a delegation of legislative power, and that advisory commissions rarely accomplish much good. Yet the Senator will bear me out in the fact that we rarely

consider an important bill involving the work of any Department without submitting that bill to the head of the Department, with a view to securing the report of the Department, involving the view of the experienced men there regarding the work. I find that that has been done in the recent mail-subvention bill prepared by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

If the Senator will refer to the report upon that bill, he will find that it was submitted to the Postmaster-General, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and the Secretary of the Navy for their opinion relating to it. It does seem to me if it is desirable to do that, it is desirable to get them together in consultation and have the aid of experienced men, with the aid of experts, so that we may have not simply the individual judgment of each, but combine the judgment of all after a careful study of the subject.

It is for that reason that I favor this method of proceeding, and not with a view, of course, of conferring upon the commission any of the powers belonging to Congress.

Mr. President, I should like to add to my remarks certain extracts from reports, which I will ask leave to print.

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

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, at this stage of the debate it would not be expected that I should occupy very much time, nor would that be possible with the limitation upon me. At no time in the debate have I intended to occupy much time in the discussion of the special question now before the Senate, which has taken so many days.

I must say that for some reason, which I myself can not explain, I have never been able to allow myself to be agitated to the extent indicated by other Senators, who seem to think that very much of principle is involved in this discussion. I can not see why a Senator who favors in this bill two battle ships under the situation as it now exists is not in favor of an efficient and effective navy as well as a Senator who favors four battle ships.

I have thought, and I still think, that there is no present disturbance which ought to lead us to the belief that the present is specially and exclusively the time when we should increase the number of battle ships. In 1906 we appropriated for only one battle ship, and at two or three sessions of Congress we provided for one battle ship. At the last session, I believe, we provided for two, and I did not understand at that time that there would be any great distress if only two were provided for.

In the legislation prior to this time we have only authorized the construction of battle ships. We have never, as I remember, hastened or facilitated the construction of these ships, so when we provided for one or for two or for three, as we have at different times, we simply authorized the construction, and the appropriation for the construction of the ships naturally did not take place until a year or sometimes two years after the authorization.

I merely mention this to show that to my mind we have made a great advance over any action hitherto taken in legislation for the quick and active construction of battle ships. I believe it is understood that whether we authorize two or four ships it will require three or four years for their completion.

Therefore, Mr. President, I was favorably impressed with the action of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate, if I gathered it aright, when they proposed to change somewhat the practice of the two Houses with respect to these ships. Under a message of the President which asked for four battle ships the House of Representatives authorized the construction of two battle ships, but I understand they made no provision by way of appropriation for the two ships. I believed then and I believe now that we ought under our present situation and the circumstances that surround us to make provision for two battle ships each year for at least some years to come.

When I found that the Committee on Naval Affairs had undertaken to facilitate the construction of the battle ships provided by the House by an appropriation of \$7,000,000, I was content with that appropriation, as I am content now with it; and I would be willing, as I think most of the Senate would, and I think there would be no serious objection to it, to provide at the next session of Congress for two additional battle ships, and to do that year by year until our modern Navy is sufficient for the needs of our country and efficient in all its provisions.

So, Mr. President, if I am put to the test of voting for two or four ships at this time, with my understanding of the situation, I shall be compelled to vote, and I shall vote, against the amendment providing for four ships. I believe that if the provisions that are now before us are acceded to by the two Houses and receive the approval of the President under the plan

of two battle ships per annum, as it appears, we will make rapid and regular progress in building up our Navy.

Mr. President, there may be exceptional reasons in the future, but I do not believe there will be, whereby we shall, under extraordinary exigencies, be compelled to provide ships in addition to the two. But that situation, to my mind, is not now before us. I think the situation is especially an agreeable one as respects the prospects for the future. Wherever I have been and have had an opportunity of reading and studying the condition of the world at this time I have been led to believe that there is no danger of war at present or in the near future, or even in the remote future. I have been led to believe that the educational forces of our country and of the world have been such in the last four or five years as that the nations of the world are establishing a higher standard of conduct in regard to international obligations than prevailed hitherto. The Hague conference and other international conferences indicate this trend.

I was struck especially with the suggestion made by Secretary Root only two days ago at an important international law conference, in which he stated that, happily for the world, gradually public opinion is forming against large armaments controlling civilization, and that rapid, or at least successful, progress is being made in this direction.

Therefore, it has seemed to me that if we adopt the orderly method of dealing with the pending naval appropriation bill, as we have dealt with all the naval appropriation bills that have preceded it, we will find that we have made ample provision for every exigency that is likely to apply to our Navy.

Believing this, and being placed in the alternative of voting for two or for four battle ships, I shall vote for two.

I should be glad if it could be generally understood in this Chamber and in the other House and in the country that we have entered now upon the construction of two battle ships per annum instead of one, because of the present situation; that that is to go on without alarming the other nations or our own people, and that we intend to be as a nation prepared for war, though surrounded as we are by all the conditions of peace.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

Mr. HALE. Before the Senator takes his seat, I will state that it is to me a matter of great satisfaction to hear the veteran, experienced Senator from Iowa express so clearly his view in this matter. That is my view, and I am glad to agree with him. I have stated already in the course of the debate that the committee believes this a moderate programme, and without, of course, foreseeing what may be the conditions hereafter, we will expect to carry it out to this extent in the future, and that it will give us not a moderate navy, but a very great navy, and keep up in the second place in the world.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I am glad that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is in accord with my view on this question. I understood him to so express himself the other day. In my view this simply resolves itself into a question whether we are to authorize four battle ships at this time or two now and two more seven months from now. I do not regard that as a question of such enormous magnitude as to distress and disturb our relations as respects the Navy.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, the debate will proceed under the so-called "ten-minutes rule."

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, it will not be necessary for me to occupy all of the ten minutes allowed, for I only want in a very brief way to state the two or three reasons why I shall vote against the pending amendment increasing the number of battle ships from two to four.

We are all aware, as it has been repeated here time and again during this debate, that in his annual message to Congress in December, 1905, the President expressed the opinion that our Navy had reached such a size that by the addition of one battle ship each year we would be making a sufficient provision for the maintenance of our Navy, and that that would keep us at a proper standard.

We were told in a special message, sent to us a few days ago, that he entertained that opinion prior to the recent Hague conference, and he entertained it because he hoped that at that conference an agreement would be arrived at whereby there would be a limitation placed upon naval armament and that in that expectation he had been disappointed. That I understood him to give as the chief reason and argument why now, instead of adhering to the policy he recommended of increasing our Navy by only one ship each year, we shall start

upon a policy of increasing it for at least this year at the rate of four ships.

I took pains to look back to the message of 1905 to see exactly what it was the President had then said to us, for when I read the reason he now assigns I was somewhat surprised to find that he had been governed by such an expectation. I did not have any such expectation as that with respect to The Hague Conference. I do not think anybody had a right to expect that an agreement would be there arrived at for such a limitation. I was brought largely, as I can recall it, to that opinion by what the President himself said to us on that subject in his message of 1905, when he first made the recommendation that we should limit ourselves to one ship to be added each year. In that message he said:

Our aim should be from time to time to take such steps as may be possible toward creating something like an organization of the civilized nations, because as the world becomes more highly organized the need for navies and armies will diminish. It is not possible to secure anything like an immediate disarmament, because it would first be necessary to settle what peoples are on the whole a menace to the rest of mankind, and to provide against the disarmament of the rest being turned into a movement which would really chiefly benefit these obnoxious peoples; but it may be possible to exercise some check upon the tendency to swell indefinitely the budgets for military expenditure.

And so on.

In other words, I understood the President at the time, and I think anyone without an explanation of that language would understand, now reading it, that the President really had no very earnest expectation that an agreement would be arrived at by The Hague Conference, in accordance with which naval armaments would be limited.

I am glad to be set right by the President as to his expectation, for I had a different opinion on that point; but aside from that, Mr. President, we come now, as we must always do with respect to a matter of this kind, to consider existing conditions. The question is, after having heard the recommendation of the President, and having heard from everybody else who has a right to speak to us on the subject, what is the situation by which we should be governed and what should be our judgment in view of that situation?

I have been here now in the Senate almost twelve years. The Navy is larger now than it has been at any time heretofore during all that period. It was thought to be adequate for aught that we could foresee twelve years, ten years, five years, two years ago; and, so far as I can discover, we have a right by the same token to consider it adequate now.

I happen to be a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. If there were any complications with any other international power, I would not speak of it in open Senate, but I know of no reason why I should not say here to the world that never in all these twelve years has the sky been so bright as it is at this very moment. Nowhere is there a spot of any kind on the horizon in the nature of a threat or a menace of war. On the contrary, we are in far better relations with the rest of the world and freer from all kinds of complications and all kinds of threat and menace than we were in 1905, when the President made the recommendation that we should limit ourselves to one battle ship a year. At that time we did have some diplomatic negotiations in progress, of which we did not know what might be the result, but as to which we had no serious concern, although it was possible for trouble to grow out of them. Those negotiations were adjusted, and all other diplomatic relations have been, peaceably, and to the satisfaction of all concerned, save and except only—speaking of this period alone—our relations with Spain.

Now, the Navy being greater to-day than it has been at any time heretofore during the period that I have had responsibility with respect to legislation on account of it, and the situation being freer, as it is this very minute, than it has been at any time heretofore during that period, I do not see why the addition of two battle ships should not be as much as we ought to be called upon to make.

But there is another reason, Mr. President, that we ought to take into consideration here—it has been referred to in this debate, and I need not speak upon it to elaborate it—and that is our financial situation. Every Senator knows that, as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] told us last Saturday in this Chamber, our financial situation is not as satisfactory as it was one year ago, not as satisfactory as it has been at any time during the past ten years, not as satisfactory as we hope it may be next year. This year we are running behind, relatively speaking, and at a pretty serious rate. I can not quote the figures so accurately as the chairman of the Finance Committee, but I understood him to say, on Saturday last, that the deficit for this year already amounts to \$60,000,000 and that it will be \$100,000,000 before the end of the year. What, there-

fore, Mr. President, is the excuse, if we have no threat of war, for going into this unnecessary expenditure that we may have four battle ships instead of two?

I quite agree with other Senators that war comes generally unexpectedly; that it is never an impossibility; but if ever we were justified in saying that it is an extreme improbability, we are justified in saying that now. With every other Senator here, if there was any threat of danger, any prospect of war, any probability that we would be in a clash with any other power, I would vote willingly not only for four, but for forty, for a hundred, battle ships, if it might be necessary, and without regard to what our financial situation might be; for we all know that our resources are abundant and that we would subject them to the meeting of any such high and patriotic purpose as that; but without some real reason for it I see no necessity to go beyond what the committee has approved. I shall therefore vote with the committee.

I might speak of another reason, but it has been sufficiently dwelt upon, and that is, that we are short now, as I understood the statements made in this Chamber on Saturday last, almost 2,000 commissioned officers.

Mr. PERKINS. We are short 1,846 officers.

Mr. FORAKER. As the Senator from California informs me, we are short 1,846 officers.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. du PONT. Mr. President, on the basis of some personal experience, I have a vivid conception of the horrors of war, which, in my judgment, is one of the greatest calamities that can befall any nation.

As an opponent, then, of war, I advocate an adequate military and naval establishment as the most efficient and the most certain method of insuring the countless blessings of peace, and I believe that the President's position in regard to a strong and a suitable navy has the general approval of the country, regardless of party. I shall not discuss this position, Mr. President, believing that it has been very adequately and very aptly referred to in the able speech of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

Mr. President, should this amendment prevail, in view of the large majority in the other Chamber in favor of the construction of only two battle ships, the utmost that could be expected, it seems to me, would be that a conference committee might agree to three battle ships, so that a vote in this Chamber for four battle ships practically means a vote for the possible construction of three battle ships at most.

Now, Mr. President, the principle of the gradual and progressive development of our Navy by the construction annually of a fixed number of battle ships—say, two, for example—is a principle which, I have no hesitation in saying, commends itself to me.

Under its application, we are able to take note and avail ourselves of the progress and of the experience of the navies of the whole world, and thus promote the progressive development of our own Navy on the best and most approved lines.

But, Mr. President, any principle which is so unbending and so undeviating as to take no note of special circumstances or of special conditions becomes a mental and an intellectual tyranny against which I find myself in revolt.

I fail to see, Mr. President, why the application of this principle would be seriously affected by the construction of, say, three battle ships this year and of only one next year, but I do see, and see most clearly, that there are special existing conditions which have a bearing on the question involved in this amendment. I refer, Mr. President, to the paralysis of our industrial conditions—to the thousands and tens of thousands of unemployed workmen throughout the country—to their distress and to the suffering which devolves upon their wives and their children.

Believing, Mr. President, that the construction of even three battle ships at this time would be of marked benefit to the industrial situation generally and would mitigate, to some extent at least, much real distress and suffering, I am unwilling by my voice or by my vote to leave anything undone which can bring about so great a benefit, and I shall, therefore, if for no other reason, support the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have been deeply interested in the discussion of this question, for it is a question that I have thought considerably about in past years and one upon which I have had strong convictions. I have time and again said that, if I were going to be extravagant with the public money, I would be extravagant in building a strong navy. Our small Navy was forcibly brought to my attention during the recent Spanish-American war, and I shall never forget how I felt

when the Oregon was sailing from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean, unaccompanied by any other battle ship. No doubt we all prayed that she might make that voyage successfully and that no accident happen or the foe meet and destroy her. She made that wonderful voyage alone, we having no battle ship to accompany her. I made up my mind at that time that if I ever had an opportunity to vote or in any other way lend my aid in the building of a strong navy for this country I would do so.

Mr. President, I do not support the amendment for four battle ships on the ground that war is going to happen in the near future. I do not believe that war is imminent. I do not see a solitary incident in our relations with foreign powers to justify me in even thinking that there is going to be war, but I do feel that it is the duty of the lawmakers of the American people to provide battle ships sufficient to be prepared for war—not for aggressive war, but to be prepared to defend the lives of the people and the interests of this country in case of war.

While listening this afternoon to the remarks of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], I thought to myself, Why not strip this question of all innuendoes, of all insinuations, of all jingoism, and see just what the real differences are between the parties interested in four battle ships and those who are contending for only two? And in doing so I find the differences are small indeed, for it simply means the postponement of authorizing two battle ships for a short time, and this I gather from the statements made by the senior Senator from Iowa, and also by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], who has this bill in charge. As I see it, it is only a difference between authorizing the construction of four battle ships at this time, based upon the recommendation of the President of the United States, or authorizing two battle ships now and in the small space of seven months to authorize the construction of two more. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote for the authorization of four battle ships now. It is better to have the battle ships than to want them, and if we have them we are not likely to need them. I do not believe that we will make a mistake in voting for the increase, and if it should prove to be a mistake how easy it would be at the next session of Congress to refuse to authorize the building of a single ship. In that case we would have our four battle ships we all agree should be built under way.

In my judgment there are reasons for this course. As I look over the list of battle ships of the type of the *Dreadnought* that have been authorized by foreign powers, in addition to those of England, twelve by France, eleven by Germany, and four by Japan—and it is intimated that five more will be built by that nation in the near future—it seems to me, if we intend that this country shall be the second great naval power of the world, we can do no less than authorize the building of four battle ships at this time, not as a notice to the world of war, but simply a notice to the world and a message to them that the American people are determined to build a navy large enough to defend their coasts, to defend their interests, and to defend their honor; and if any difficulties should arise between us and foreign powers they must respect our honorable and just demands, and that we will not take an insult from any nation on the face of the earth.

I believe, Mr. President, in arbitration, and I hope to live to see the day when that great principle will be accepted by the nations of this earth. But as I study mankind and see the selfishness of man and the selfishness of nations it seems to me that it is going to be some time before arbitration is an assured success. A mighty oak is not matured in a day, and this mighty principle of arbitration is not yet accepted by even the Christian nations of the world, so I say we are not safe in relying for protection on this principle, but, as I said, I hope to see the day when arbitration will be universal the world over.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] the other day, in support of his position for two battle ships only, quoted the following words of Isaiah:

And He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

I believe, Mr. President, that the time will come as foretold by the prophet, but it was foretold that it would be in the last days, when Christ's kingdom should be established upon this earth, and that time has not yet arrived.

I am not one who thinks the time has arrived when the swords of the American soldiery should be beaten into plowshares or the spears of the American Army beaten into pruning hooks; for it seems to me that, so long as there is the feeling of distrust even among the Christian nations that there is to-day, it would be a false step to take.

In our late war one Christian nation was arrayed against another, one praying to the Almighty Father to give success to

its arms, the other praying to that selfsame God for success to its; and I say to the American people that when the time comes spoken of by Isaiah there will be a different condition existing in the world than exists to-day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe, Mr. President, that every member of this Senate is in favor of a strong navy, made up of good ships, equal to those of any other nation. I believe that public sentiment is back of Senators on the question of making sufficient appropriations for the support and maintenance and increase of a good, strong navy. The only question in issue to-day is whether we shall have thirty-one battle ships or thirty-three battle ships, whether this bill shall provide for the building of four battle ships or two battle ships. It is simply a question of business policy, and it seems to your committee, after having thoroughly considered the question, that we should provide for but two at this time.

I want to say, in passing, that the committee were criticised to-day by a member of the Senate, who said that we have not given due consideration to this bill, it only having been in the committee for two days before it was reported to the Senate. I want to say to that Senator that your committee have had the provisions of this bill under consideration ever since the report of the Secretary of the Navy was submitted to Congress. They have had before them the Book of Estimates, giving the estimates made by the different bureaus in the Navy Department—the Bureau of Construction and Repair, the Bureau of Equipment, the Bureau of Ordnance, the Bureau of Navigation, and all the other bureaus. We have considered those estimates from day to day, week to week, and month to month, and the result of our efforts is this bill which we submit to you for your consideration and which you are to pass upon to-day.

I believe it the part of wisdom for us to profit by our own experience and by the mistakes of foreign countries, and therefore I believe we should provide for the building of but two ships of the *Dreadnought* type to-day. It is an experimental question. There is not a ship building in any yard, either a merchant ship or a naval ship, this year that is not improved upon next year, and the following year still further improvements are made. So we should not proceed too rapidly, but should profit by our experience, as we have in the past ten or fifteen years.

The cable brings us a dispatch across the ocean that there was a collision on Saturday last off the Isle of Wight, on the coast of England, between the American merchant vessel *St. Paul* and the British protected cruiser *Gladiator*, and in fifteen minutes from the time our merchant ship struck the English war vessel the latter sank.

It is a question whether the *Dreadnought* type of ship is to be the class of the future battle ship. As an evidence of that fact, Mr. President, the lord of the British Admiralty says in his report in regard to the new naval programme of Great Britain:

This programme is exceedingly modest. It comprises the building of one battle ship of the improved *Dreadnought* class.

Only one battle ship of the improved *Dreadnought* class is provided for to-day by England's naval programme. So it seems to me, I repeat, the part of wisdom for us to profit by experience and by the mistakes made by England and other great countries.

We have a first-class Navy, and we are going to carry out the programme which has been inaugurated, and build ships from year to year as experience has demonstrated it is in the interest of the Navy and the public welfare for us to do.

The improvements alone in the turbine engine in the last two years have almost revolutionized the merchant service on the trans-Atlantic lines of steamers plying between New York and European ports. The return tubular boilers and the Scotch boilers are all experiments as yet. So, as a business proposition and from a patriotic standpoint, it is wise for us to go slowly if we want our ships equal to those of any other nation.

My friends have criticised me because I did not stand up for four battle ships in the interests of the Pacific States. I fail to see where their criticism can justly lie. Since I have had the honor of being a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs we have provided for building on the Pacific coast and the States bordering the ocean four battle ships and five armored and protected cruisers. Eleven vessels in all have been builded there. We have provided for our navy-yards and for building colliers and torpedo boats and submarine boats and other auxiliary craft for the Navy. We have 100 fighting ships of over a thousand tons each, exclusive of torpedo boats, submarine boats, and vessels of other types. We should profit by experience; and if we had a hundred, yes, two hundred ships on the Pacific coast, and the Commander in Chief saw proper to

detail them to Australia or China or Japan or some other country, I fail to see where this proposition would benefit us, as my colleague says it would.

There were 16 battle ships in the fleet that went around Cape Horn to San Francisco, and we have on the coast there now 10 battle ships and 16 armored cruisers, making 26 fighting vessels of over 5,000 tons each; and yet, if the Commander in Chief should order them around the world, we should be as defenseless and unprotected as if there were 250 vessels in the Navy. This bill already provides liberally for our navy-yards, for docks, for appliances. We have already equipped seventy-five vessels with wireless telegraphy. We are making more powerful our guns. The range of our guns has increased from 10 up to 75 per cent, and all through this bill there are appropriations which have not been criticised or referred to calculated to be valuable to our Navy and its building up. So I think the Senate, upon due reflection, will stand by the report of the committee, which has given this subject-matter every consideration and has presented the result of its labor.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, it had not been my intention to participate in the debate of this question, but I will take advantage of the ten minutes to give expression to the reasons that shall control me in casting my vote upon this measure.

I shall vote for the amendment for four battle ships. I believe with conditions such as exist in the industrial world to-day, the promise of the Government of the United States that it is going to expend twelve or twenty million dollars for labor and material will have a good effect and will be an element to encourage the people of this country that the Government at least is going to make available to the people some of the \$198,000,000 that rests to-day in the banks of the United States, idle so far as the United States is concerned, drawing no interest, there only for the purpose of being loaned, not for the employment of labor or the purchase of material. I am perfectly willing to vote for any Government enterprise that will result in the distribution of part of the money the Government has on hand and idle.

Mr. President, I have been glancing through this bill and I find that out of the items, comprising more than \$100,000,000, less than one-half of it goes into the channels of American labor or American material. The largest item is distributed under conditions where it is redistributed in various lands and not for home products or for the immediate prosperity of our own people in their homes.

So I am willing to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington that "two" be stricken out and the word "four" substituted, and taken in connection with the amendment adopted on the motion of the chairman of the committee, appropriating in all about \$7,000,000 to commence this work, the legislation will then stand in this way. We will have authorized—mark you—we will have authorized the construction of these four battle ships. We will have appropriated the proportion that will represent to the limit the labor that can be performed and the materials that can be purchased during the next eighteen months.

The amount appropriated, the \$7,000,000, will be sufficient to inaugurate this work and to keep it going on, and take that in connection with the assurance that the Government of the United States is going to put fifteen or eighteen million dollars more into this class of work, which represents, every dollar of it, American labor and American material, and it appeals to me. It appeals to me especially under existing conditions in the world of labor, as it affects the prosperity of our labor.

There is no question of war in it with me. I am not considering whether we are liable to have war or whether peace is assured. I care nothing for the poetic idea of turning swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks. This is a business proposition. It is a question of disposing of the money we have on hand. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], who is chairman of the Committee on Finance and speaks by authority, says that the deficiency between the income and the outgo this year will amount to about \$100,000,000.

Mr. ALDRICH. More than \$60,000,000, I said.

Mr. HEYBURN. I understood the Senator to say it was about \$60,000,000 now.

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. HEYBURN. And that it would amount to about a hundred million dollars.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is \$46,000,000 now, and it will be more than \$60,000,000 at the close of the year.

Mr. HEYBURN. I was somewhat astonished when I understood the Senator to say that it would be a hundred million dollars. Another Senator has quoted the Senator from Rhode Island as having said it would be a hundred million dollars. I am glad it will be only \$60,000,000.

Mr. ALDRICH. My statement was this: That the present deficiency is \$46,000,000, and that the deficiency at the close of the fiscal year will be more than \$60,000,000. The Senator, I believe, made his mistake in this way. I said that the additional appropriations this year over last year were more than \$100,000,000.

Mr. HEYBURN. We are bigger this year than last. We are doing more business this year than last.

Mr. FORAKER. I think perhaps the Senator from Idaho referred to me when he said another Senator had quoted the Senator from Rhode Island as saying it was a hundred million dollars.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. FORAKER. I did. I was not speaking of this fiscal year, ending June 30, but of the calendar year; and for the calendar year it will be far in excess of a hundred million dollars.

Mr. HEYBURN. Whether it is fifty or sixty or a hundred million dollars, the principle is the same. We have more than twice that sum available at five minutes' notice to pay for material and to pay for labor. I am in favor at the earliest hour of making available this money which the Government owns and has on hand. That is the policy of government which actuates me in casting my vote for this enlarged enterprise for the benefit of the people.

The Army and the Navy are just as much a part of the Government as the courts or the legislature or the executive branch. They are a part of the executive branch that make efficient the laws we pass in this body and that are construed by the highest court in the land. The Army and Navy are the arms of the Government. They stand in the same position that the police do to the municipal government. They only extend our power. Since the conditions that were referred to by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] existed the coast line of this country has more than doubled. As I said, we are growing. We will continue to grow. I would have the Navy of the United States the largest navy in the world and not the second, and I would do it because we are the largest nation in the world, and we will continue forever to be, so long as we do not bow our heads to any second class among the nations of the earth.

Mr. President, those are the reasons that actuate me. There is no element of warfare. I belong to a society of peace, but I believe that peace is best and most surely maintained by being able, and having others know you are able, to maintain that peace.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. President, it was not my intention to occupy the attention of the Senate, but I think it due myself to give the reasons why I shall vote for two battle ships. I have had the honor of serving in the Congress of the United States in one branch or the other for fourteen years. During the first term in which I served we appropriated \$25,000,000 in round numbers for the Navy. It is now proposed by the bill reported by the committee to appropriate \$112,000,000.

Mr. ALDRICH. This bill as it now stands appropriates \$123,000,000.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Then my reasons grow stronger all the time. One hundred and twenty-three million dollars is carried by this bill, or an increase in fourteen years of substantially \$100,000,000 for the Navy alone. If the other expenditures of the Government had increased at that ratio, it would be absolutely impossible to raise the revenue with which to meet the expenditures.

I have listened carefully to this debate. I have heard no reason given why this unusual increase in the Navy should be made at this particular time. Upon the other hand, there is every reason why it should not be made. The President of the United States in 1905 recommended one battle ship per year. I see no change in conditions between now and then. There is no more reason why we should have more than one battle ship per year than there was in 1905, when that recommendation was made.

There are other matters that must be looked into. We have great internal improvements that are being pressed upon Congress. During the last summer the President honored the section of country from which I come by making a trip down the Mississippi River. As a result of that trip we are receiving petitions from our people asking for the improvement of the great internal waterways. We can not improve our waterways if we spend all the money on the Navy.

We now have the second navy in the world. The appropriation for two battle ships will maintain our relative position with the other countries of the world. Then, why should we take the money from the Treasury that we need for internal improvements and invest it in battle ships at this particular time?

The attention of the Senate has been called to the fact that

we will have a deficiency of \$60,000,000 this year. My attention has just been called to the fact that the deficiency for April alone will be \$11,000,000. We have appropriated up to date on the bills that have already passed one House or the other \$104,000,000 more than we appropriated for the same purposes last year, as shown by the following statement:

Increase in round numbers of appropriations for 1909, compared with 1908.	
Agriculture .....	\$2,100,000
Army .....	16,300,000
Diplomatic and consular .....	450,000
Fortification .....	3,700,000
Indian .....	300,000
Legislative .....	400,000
Navy .....	26,000,000
Pensions .....	17,000,000
Post-Office .....	10,000,000
Sundry civil .....	1,500,000
Deficiencies .....	18,000,000
Miscellaneous .....	4,250,000
Permanent annual appropriations .....	100,000,000
Estimated total increase .....	104,300,000

We have yet the great public buildings bill, which will add some twenty-odd million dollars to the appropriations; the sundry civil bill will be largely increased before it is enacted into law, and I predict now that before Congress adjourns we shall have increased the appropriations over last year by \$150,000,000. What does that mean? Our revenues are decreasing, as shown by the Treasury statements. Our appropriations for this year will be increased \$150,000,000 if we appropriate for two battle ships only. That means that next year every dollar of surplus that we have in the United States Treasury will be taken out, and we will be fortunate if we do not have to borrow money to pay running expenses. With that deficiency facing us, why shall we, with no apparent reason, appropriate for four battle ships in place of two?

I have just been looking over the list of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, both of the House and the Senate. The House and the Senate have built up committees to give these matters special consideration. I find that the House committee is made up of strong men from every section of the country, and their report comes in for two battle ships. I find at the head of the Senate committee the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. Ranking next, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS]. We find Michigan represented. We find the Southern States represented, and we find the Central States represented, all by men who are known to transact the business of the Government carefully and properly, and they come here after giving careful consideration to this matter and say unanimously to the Senate, "Two battle ships are enough."

Then why this excitement? It is simply a question of business. It is simply a question whether we shall proceed more rapidly, or whether we shall proceed along lines recommended by the committee, having in view the money to pay our bills as they are incurred; and I want to call attention to those on this side of the Chamber that our party has not been a party of deficiencies. It has been a party that has so managed the Government that we have always had money to pay our bills when the bills came due. And are we now going to make appropriations that mean deficiencies, that mean direct taxation upon our people, that mean we must levy unusual taxes on the people as we have been compelled to do in times of war? That is what we are coming to.

I appeal to the Senate to use just good common business sense, as the committee did when they reported this bill to the Senate. Why should we get excited now, when there is absolutely no danger of war? Of course, as has been said many times, war comes unexpectedly, but we are assured by the Committee on Foreign Relations that the sky was never as clear as it is today. Then, why four battle ships, when in 1905 the President recommended but one? Why four in place of two, when the revenues are in the condition they are? Why take away from our internal improvements their fair share of appropriation?

The improvement of our internal waterways means cheap transportation and permanent benefit to all our people. Adding unnecessarily to the strength of the Navy means that these necessary improvements must be delayed.

Mr. President, I can not see my way clear to vote for four battle ships, and I shall vote for two.

Mr. DICK. Mr. President, we have had a week of unlimited debate—I was tempted to say of unbridled debate—and yet I feel that the rules of the Senate and its custom have been fully vindicated, since, by unlimited debate, we have driven the dogs of war back to their kennels, and have clothed the fleet of the United States in the garb of peace.

The best result of the week's discussion, so it seems to me, is that it brings the country to a full realization of the fact that nowhere on our horizon does there appear the slightest danger of war or conflict with our neighbors. But that is not all. The debate has demonstrated another fact, which perhaps was not entirely apparent to the country, namely, that the United States is the second naval power. One would have imagined at the beginning of the discussion that this was the initial move to create a fleet, and that four battle ships were an immediate necessity. But we find, at the end of the discussion, that we have now built and in process of construction twenty-nine battle ships, that the two provided for in this bill will increase it to thirty-one, and that in strength and power, ship for ship, we rank second among the nations.

Nor are these ships obsolete, as has been stated. In the message so frequently referred to sent to the Congress in December, 1906, the President recommended that we build one new battle ship each year to take the place of one which annually became obsolete, and not four which annually became obsolete.

Attention has been called to nine reasons which the President gives for the annual increase of four battle ships to the Navy. Only four were cited, and all four given existed when the original recommendation came to us for one new battle ship annually.

This bill carries an appropriation of \$123,000,000 for the building and support of the Navy. With a single exception it is the largest naval appropriation bill ever passed by the American Congress, and that exception occurred in 1898, when as a part of the naval appropriation bill \$50,000,000 was appropriated for the "national defense" in time of war.

I wish the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] had carried a little further his illustration with reference to the recommendation of the British Admiralty in the construction of a single battle ship of the *Dreadnought* type this year.

It has not yet been demonstrated that battle ships of the *Dreadnought* type are effective or efficient beyond improvement. That the great battle ship has come to stay there is no question, but who will say that in another decade battle ships of 30,000 tons displacement rather than battle ships of 20,000 tons displacement will not be the type preferred? Why go on building battle ships unnecessarily while this matter is still in an experimental stage, not only as to the size of the ships, but as to the thickness and strength and character of the armor, the size of the guns, the character of the shells, and the matter of high explosives? All these matters are still in the experimental stage, and unless there is great emergency demanding immediate action for an abnormal increase of the Navy, it seems to me the recommendation of the Committee on Naval Affairs, favoring the bill as it came from the House of Representatives carrying provision for two battle ships of this type, ought to prevail.

Another fact to be recognized, Mr. President, is this: Two added battle ships of the character which this bill carries gives us a squadron of four battle ships of the *Dreadnought* type. Who can gainsay that next year we may begin the creation of a new squadron of a new type, and since no emergency exists, no word of war, no danger to our peace, no menace to our commerce, no threatened attack upon our coast on either side—and if so, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has already stated we could divide the fleet and guard amply both coasts—why shall we burden the revenues of the nation beyond the reasonable, yea, the extravagant provision already recommended by the committee in this bill?

One point, Mr. President, has seemingly escaped the attention of Senators who have preceded me in this debate. We have talked about the character of our ships and their speed, and the character of our guns and their long range, and all features, but all will agree that in the last great naval contest, namely, that between Russia and Japan, the one thing which counted for more than battle ships or guns was the character and intelligence of the men who manned the ships and fired the guns, the spirit which animated them, the loyalty and devotion to their cause and to their country, and the matter of superior discipline and command; that in the one fleet there was mutiny and in the other there was such devotion to cause and patriotism to country that men were willing to die that the cause for which they fought might survive and succeed and their country be vindicated.

In this particular, namely, the personnel of our fleet, men and officers, I take it no one will challenge the statement that ours stands equal, if not superior, of any nation in the world. I admit, Mr. President, that it would be unfair to put such men in an unequal and unsafe position. But we are providing, and we have been providing, for the best ships and the speediest, with the largest and most effective guns, and in every way we



have been providing for the protection of the country and of the men who are counted upon to defend it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, I do not expect to be able to add anything of value to this discussion. I do not profess a wide knowledge of the subject, and I have been absent during the progress of the discussion, hence I am not advised as to the course it has taken. Indeed, I should not undertake at this time and under the circumstances to say a single word were it not for the fact that I find myself not in accord with the committee which has had this matter under consideration and has reported it to the Senate. I am as a rule very much given to supporting the committee that has had a subject, particularly one of this kind, under consideration and has given it careful thought and investigation. That is particularly true with me when a matter comes from a committee so ably constituted as is this one, and presided over by so distinguished a legislator and statesman as we know and recognize the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs to be.

I have always stood for a powerful navy. I believe it a matter of great importance and concern to the people of this country that we should maintain such a navy. I would not largely increase our Army, although I would increase some branches of it—for instance, in the matter of the Coast Artillery and in the improvement and betterment of our coast defenses. For those purposes I would make larger appropriations. But I am particularly concerned in the matter of building up and strengthening our Navy. This is a great and growing country. Our wealth to-day is more than double that of any other nation on the earth. Our foreign commerce is growing as it never has in the past and as that of no other nation has at any time. We have become the owners of possessions in far-distant seas. Our insular possessions are of vast importance. I believe that one of the first duties of this country is to establish strong fortifications in the Hawaiian Islands. One of the first duties of Congress should be to direct its efforts to that end, and it will be nothing less than a national crime if we shall fail to take that matter up and carry it on speedily. But the Pacific Ocean, where we have no navy to-day, is going to be the scene of the greatest activity commercially of this nation in the near future. We have there the Hawaiian Islands and we have, away in the Orient, the Philippine Islands, and we have gone into those islands to stay. Some men argue that we are going to abandon the Philippine Islands. We can not do it. Men may talk, men may theorize, but the fact remains that we are in those islands to stay.

Mr. President, we may as well face the responsibilities that that fact entails and provide against it. That it means much of responsibility, that it means increased care, no one will deny. But it is our duty to rise to those responsibilities and meet them.

It is important and necessary that we shall have a strong navy in the Pacific, one equally as strong as that maintained in the Atlantic. We have as great a seaboard to provide for there. We have as important ports to protect there. We have as great interests, and our interests are growing and developing there as they are not on the Atlantic coast. I see no way by which we can provide for the necessities of the conditions prevailing there except by an increased navy. I do not mean that I know of any fact which indicates war or any conditions that mean a disturbance of the peaceful and happy relations that now obtain between this nation and all the nations of the earth. But, Mr. President, no man knows the hour when a condition will exist that will demand the employment of a powerful navy to protect the great interests of this nation on the Pacific.

If there is one fact more than another that was demonstrated by the naval battles of the Russian-Japanese war it is that the battle ship is the real defense upon which we must rely when the naval battle finally comes on. Unarmored cruisers, unprotected or partially protected ships serve their purpose, but when the real battle comes they must get beyond the range of the guns, and the battle ship is the one defense upon which we may rely. That was demonstrated by the Russian-Japanese naval battles.

Then, Mr. President, I do think that we would be derelict to our duty, taking into consideration the great interests that we have on the Pacific coast and the complicated situation which our interests there have brought about, if we should not adequately prepare for it.

Senators tell us that the revenues of the Government will not justify the expenditures that this amendment contemplates. In the first place, while we propose to provide for four battle ships instead of two, it is not required that there shall be an

immediate expenditure. It may be that there will be a deficit of \$60,000,000 during the present fiscal year. I assume that is correct, because the Senator who states it as a fact is well posted and knows what he is talking about. Be that as it may, I have no fears about the ability of this country, with its great moral powers, its splendid wealth and resources, being able to provide for whatever the necessities of the Government may prove to be.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, speaking is catching. I find that I have contracted myself a very mild form of this infection, from which I hope to recover in a few moments, which I shall occupy in stating my reasons for voting against four battle ships and for two.

In the first place, Mr. President, we are in no emergency. There is no crisis on hand which portends war with any nation. We are living in the "piping times of peace," and one must be like Job's war horse, and smell battle "afar off," to get any odor of gunpowder in the air, unless he were listening to one of the speeches which advocates a vastly greater navy under the idea that there is a "possibility" of war.

There will never be a day nor an hour when we ought not to order another battle ship if the possibility of war is a reason for doing it. Never will a time come, nor has there been a time in the past, when every nation was not under the possibility of war. There is no probability of war; there is no cloud of war, and every good citizen of this country has the right to rest under his own vine and fig tree, with none to make him afraid, and without having the specter of war flamed before his eyes to disturb his slumbers.

In the second place, Mr. President, and what is a substantial reason, as I conceive, for voting against four battle ships in a lump in this bill, is I think the fact adduced to us by experience and through the voice of science that we can build a better navy at the pace which we are building it than by trying to build it more rapidly. Fashions change. I read in an international law work this pregnant sentence:

There is nothing unchangeable but change. Change is the shadow of time, and it moves, keeping step with every tick of the clock.

Men change, times change, gowns change, coats change, everything changes, and nothing is more sure to change than the best model of a battle ship. If we build a navy gradually and make each ship perfect as it can be made by the skill of man, according to the best model of this year, we will have done the very best that we can do, to arm this nation with ships that can hold their own in any line of naval battle.

If we build a cluster of ships the sooner will they go to a junk shop and the sooner will your Navy be dismantled.

The world is in a more inventive order of mind than it has ever been in the history of time. This nation is far ahead of any other nation of ancient or modern times in inventive genius. Smokeless powder has just been introduced. This is a novelty. Very many of us have never seen or experienced the discharge of smokeless powder, so little has it gone into the everyday walks of life. "Soundless" powder has just been announced as making its debut upon the stage. The electrical gun, we are told, is soon to supersede the powder-filled gun, and it is said that one great English inventor has invented a gun that will kill almost everybody at once. So war will be made a very cheap business, a very wholesale business, and a very complete business when a few more inventions are established.

Mr. President, the pace that the Naval Committee has kept is a reasonable pace, a pace already accelerated by the cry that comes from here and there for a greater navy. I put myself abreast of the front rank of those people of this country who are ready to defend it at any sacrifice of life, of property, of wealth, or what not. We are going at a pace to prepare ourselves not for a war that is on hand, not for a war that we can discern as coming, but for that remote thing which is described by gentlemen on the other side as what troubles them, and that is the possibility of war. Of course war is possible. It always has been and always will be. I will go the four-battle-ship men one better and say it is certain; but, let me remind you, it is remotely certain in the dim and distant perspective.

I take consolation also to myself, Mr. President, of a self-evident fact which has been neglected in many of the discourses we have heard, and that is this. This is just the safest nation in the world. No nation ever did in all time occupy a position amongst the clustered nations of the earth that is as safe as that which America occupies. The oceans have made it so, and what the oceans lack in making it so its great people have completed. They were never more united than they are to-day. They were never strung to a higher or purer key of sincere patriotism than they are to-day. They would all be like the

minutemen of the Revolution and turn out quickly and give what they had to meet any foe that might cast his shadow in our direction.

Does it ever occur to those gentlemen to look a little at the history of this country and the observation of some of the anterior statesmen in contemplating this subject? Abraham Lincoln said, when this nation was not half as strong as it is today, that if all the world were to attack America there is not a man of them all that could ever take a drink out of the Ohio River.

Great Britain had a great navy when they fought us *more than* a hundred years ago. We had none. They did manage to get a little partisan corps on our eastern and almost undefended shores, except with a few militia and their guns, as far up as Westham, a little above Richmond. I think they enjoyed the pleasure of spending a night there, but they went back where they came from, with no lodgment. That history of a people who had no navy and very scattered and few soldiers does not arouse my alarm as to the Japanese, or Englishmen, or Frenchmen, or Russians, or anybody else getting very far into the interior of this American country.

Some of our friends who were in the Navy of the United States during the war and some of them who took a tramp up the peninsula of Virginia along in the sixties may perhaps recall that, with all the valor of this nation, with all the guns of this nation, and with all the ships, armies, and wealth of this nation, they did not get above tide water after a four years' effort until about April, 1865.

Should a foreign foe undertake the job of assailing America, I venture to overreach the statement of Abraham Lincoln as to the Ohio, and say that not a man of them would ever take a drink out of the James River, close as it is to the Capes. Guns would cover the approaches. Mountains of defense would be raised up in front of them, and the American people, united and whole-hearted, would cover the earth with their myriads of martial men.

At peace with every nation of the earth, cultivating with everybody the arts of peace, intending neither to hurt or to wrong anybody, and provoking none to hurt or to wrong us, we stand serene, possessing our souls in peace.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, as we are to vote not simply on the question of two battle ships, but upon the entire naval bill this afternoon, I desire to say just a word upon a matter that was under discussion the other day with reference to naval armor.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] made this statement as to the cost of naval armor in this country and in other countries:

I have, Mr. President, a table of the prices per ton for furnishing armor in the European countries. In Austria it is \$449; in Italy, \$521; in Germany, \$450; in France, \$500; in England, \$625; and in the United States it is \$416.67.

That, Mr. President, is a most remarkable and startling piece of information. I have been informed that it comes from the Navy Department, and therefore I do not question its correctness. But one or two conclusions must necessarily be drawn from those figures. Either the armor plate manufactured in the United States is inferior to that manufactured in England or the cost of manufacturing armor plate in England is greater than the cost of manufacturing it in the United States. If the quality is the same in each country, we have the remarkable fact that in free-trade England it costs 50 per cent more to manufacture armor plate than it costs in protected America. We have the remarkable fact that in free-trade England it costs 33 per cent more in round numbers to manufacture armor plate than it does in protected Germany.

Mr. President, I think it important to call the attention of the country to this fact, and it is a fact which we must very carefully consider next year when we come to undertake the promised revision of the tariff, when the steel trust comes here and asks for protective duties on its steel products.

Mr. President, that is all I rose to say, but being on my feet I will add a word or two on the general subject as to the number of ships. When the debate began a few days ago, both from the message of the President and from the speeches of the Senators who argued in favor of four ships we gathered the conclusion, from the vague and uncertain outgivings, that the real reason at the bottom why four ships were demanded or desired was that there was an emergency, a danger ahead of us, which would make it unsafe for us to do less than authorize the construction of these four *Dreadnought* ships.

As the debate progressed, Mr. President, this has been practically abandoned and disclaimed by all. So that we are here considering the question whether or not, in a condition of profound peace, with nothing threatening to break into that peace,

we shall depart from a policy which for ten years past has been recognized as the correct policy in the construction each year of one or two battle ships.

I am glad of the opportunity to add my testimony, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, to that which has been given by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] and other Senators who are members of that committee, to the fact that there is literally nothing now to threaten the peace of the country, so far as the foreign relations of this country are concerned.

Mr. President, I wish to add one word to that which has been so well said, not only by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], but by other Senators, as to the character of this country, which makes the possibility of war remote. I think it is more than remote. In more than a hundred years we have never had a war but of our own making, and, in my judgment, in the next hundred years we shall never have a war except of our making. I can conceive of no question in the near future which is apt to make us seek to wage an aggressive war.

Aside from the other reasons, Mr. President, which have been mentioned, there are two considerations which render it altogether improbable that an aggressive war will ever be waged against us.

The resources of this country make it an absolute certainty that any nation that goes to war with us would in the long run have to pay the penalty for doing so. Our resources are such that in the long run we could prevail against any nation which sought war with us. Nations will count the ultimate cost before starting a war against the United States. Temporary advantage will go for nothing.

But there is another reason, which is more controlling with men than the anticipation of ultimate loss, and that is, that the business of the world will not permit a war with the United States. The business of a large part of the world would be brought almost to a standstill in any war which would paralyze or stop the industries of the United States. The exports and the imports of the United States make a commerce of \$3,000,000,000 a year—over \$1,700,000,000 of exports and over \$1,200,000,000 of imports. Commerce is largely exchange, and when you arrest the commerce of this country you arrest not only the industries of this country, but you arrest the industries of other countries which make up their part of that commerce. Why, Mr. President, even in the civil war the simple blockade which stopped the export of the single article of cotton from the Southern States almost produced a revolution in Great Britain. The cotton manufacturing industries of England were paralyzed, and her people cried for bread. That was a small figure compared with that which now represents the great commerce of this country.

Mr. President, in the absence of anything which calls for any such provision on our part, what is there to demand that there shall be four more battle ships? It seems to me that there is nothing to demand it except the desire to make a grand-stand play. There is no desire except—I possibly ought not to say what I was going to say, but I will say it occurs to me that there is no more reason for it than for the sending of this great fleet around the world—something simply to make a boastful display of our power and make a spectacular performance for the people of the United States. I can see no good result from it. My observation, Mr. President, has been that the man who buckles a pistol around his waist and swaggers down the street is the first man who gets into trouble and is not always the man who comes out of it best.

I was a little disappointed, Mr. President, when the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] stated that he could see some good which might come from this spectacular parade, this globe-circling cruise of the fleet. I have tried in vain to suggest to my mind any substantial good which can come to us from it; nor can I see any interest of the country which will be subserved in the ordering of four battle ships at this time.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, since my remarks last Friday a great deal of attention has been paid to what I then said; but that speech is not the issue. In the references to it upon Saturday, as the Record itself will show, not one quotation was correctly made. A violent attack was made in order, of course, as everyone understands, to make that utterance the issue, and thus to draw attention away from the real issue which we have to determine to-day. This statement and that statement was made; and when I called the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] to their incorrectness, he replied vaguely that it was his "impression." This morning the same thing—

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I can not yield.

This morning the same thing occurred—

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator decline to yield?

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

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I can not yield—I have no time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I hope the Senator will not make the kind of statement in which he is now indulging.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. This morning when the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] was doing the same thing, I called his attention to it; and he echoed the word of the Senator from Rhode Island, that it was his "impression." The attack was made wholly on "impressions," and when these inaccuracies were pointed out on the spot and at the moment when they were made we were answered, "Well, that was my 'impression.'" Still they are continued, and when confronted with the facts we hear again the answer, "impression."

Well, Mr. President, we understand why that was done. I would not say it if the Record itself did not show it; but it was to divert the attention of the Senate and the country from the real issue.

Mr. President, as I said, there is no use trying, by attacking any person's utterances incorrectly, to attempt to divert the attention of the Senate and of the country from the real issue. The real issue is the request of the Commander in Chief of the Navy for four battle ships.

In his special message, in which he uses the word "solemn," he gives the reasons—the failure of his efforts at The Hague, the change in the style of battle ships, and the appalling fact that we are now actually falling behind the other naval powers of the world in our actual fighting strength.

Mr. President, another mountainous consideration presents itself, and that is that it has been brought to the attention of this nation that we have two great coasts instead of one, and that hereafter we must build up two fleets, one for each of those coasts. Why is not the Pacific entitled to a fleet as well as the Atlantic? Why are their resources and their cities and their people not entitled to the same protection as the resources, the cities, and the people of the Atlantic coast? Both should be equally guarded; both equally are American.

#### NO SHIP PROVIDED FOR.

Another thing; the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] from the Naval Committee, came in after hearing what other Senators had stated as to their great anxiety to build up a great navy. We heard the same from another Senator, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY], who stated that this bill was reported by the two wisest committees of Congress; that behind it was all of their wisdom, and all that sort of thing. And yet, Mr. President, with all their "anxiety to increase our Navy," with all their "wisdom," what kind of a bill did they really bring in? Why, a bill was brought in really for no ship at all. It was brought in authorizing two ships, but making not one dollar of appropriation for either, and that appropriation had to be put in upon the floor of the Senate. The country was given to understand before that was done that we were going to build two great battle ships at once. That is what the country was given to understand, and that is what the Senate understood; and yet, according to the bill as it was brought in, not one nail could have been driven and not one bit of material could have been used nor even bought—nothing could have been done—for at least a year, and not even then unless we then should have made the appropriation which was left out of this bill when it passed the House and when, afterwards, it was reported to the Senate. That was the "anxiety" displayed for our Navy and that was the "wisdom" we hear so much about.

That does not look to me, Mr. President, like very ardently supporting the programme of a great navy, which Senators now protest they mean to do.

We have heard a great deal about appropriations. Certain Senators appear to be alarmed about making a little appropriation for the nation's defense. But nobody has stated yet that we have now in the Treasury a cash balance of \$252,000,000; whereas other nations, with statesmen as wise and people as frugal as ours, are actually borrowing money with which to build a great navy. We have unused in our Treasury at this present moment \$252,000,000 of cash, yet Senators are alarmed if we propose to use less than 3 per cent of it for peace.

We are told that our revenues are decreasing. What is the reason for the decrease of revenue? Why, Mr. President, the falling off of the revenues from the tariff is because the merchants have not paid their duties, but they have the goods in bond. The Senator from Rhode Island says there will be a deficit. He did not count that. The Senator knows there will be \$20,000,000 in just as soon as those duties are paid for the goods now in bond. Why did he not mention it?

What would the authorization of these two additional battle

ships call for? Seven million more dollars. Why, we are told that we are going to bankrupt the country with this \$7,000,000; but yet we do not hesitate to vote scores of millions of dollars for the improvement of streams, which a few years ago the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] showed were absurd, and in many instances even worse than absurd—far worse. Yet we vote such questionable appropriations without winking an eye; but when we propose to give a little money to the Navy, we are in terror of the revenue. That is strange economy.

We must take care of these streams that are not navigable and can never be made so, even if it costs the people tens of millions of dollars; but we can not give \$7,000,000 to build up a navy, which the President of the United States says he demands upon his solemn responsibility for the safety of the nation and the peace of the people. Four such battle ships would have prevented the Spanish war and saved us a billion dollars. Yet Senators whose stock in trade is a spurious economy will not take the same precaution now.

It is said that we are keeping pace with the other navies of the world. As a matter of fact, as a matter of a fighting force, with the new, great *Dreadnought* battle ship as the type of battle unit, we are rapidly falling behind. Instead of being the second nation in the world in our naval strength, we are as a fighting force actually the fourth and more nearly the fifth, and my authority for that is a high official in the Navy Department itself.

Well, Mr. President, when we are thus falling behind, when the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy asks this at our hands "solemnly"—that is the word he uses—when the committee itself brought in a bill which did not even provide for a single ship for a year, does it not occur to Senators that with over \$250,000,000 in cash in our hands we ought not to hesitate to hand over \$7,000,000 for these two extra battle ships?

I will not stop to quote what the other powers are doing. England with eight *Dreadnoughts* built, building, and authorized; France with twelve *Dreadnoughts* building and authorized; Germany with four *Dreadnoughts* building and authorized and four more every year until 1917, and ourselves with only two, and neither one completed. Senators may talk as much as they please about the impossibility of war. I call attention to the fact that every utterance of my speech was an answer to the declaration, not that we are in danger, but to the declaration of Senators that war is absolutely impossible. They have retreated from that. They now admit that war is possible. Very well! Then, if war is possible, the Navy must be on the basis of that possibility becoming a fact, which I hope never will occur. On your own statements, it is too serious a matter to haggle over.

Talk about appropriations and "this country going bankrupt." Mr. President, our enormous wealth exceeds that of any country in the world. We have \$107,000,000,000 of wealth; we have absolutely inestimable resources. We are richer than England and Germany combined. Had we not better use some of that wealth to insure the remainder?

If we build four ships, and it appears that we do not need them so rapidly, we need not build any next year, and no harm will be done; but if it should occur that we do need them, then no mistake has been made and a great disaster may be saved; in other words, there is no danger whatever from building the four ships, but there might be possible danger if we do not, and Senators admit that.

Now, Mr. President, with reference to the educational forces mentioned by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. Of course that has never yet stopped a conflict. It did not between Germany and France, it did not between Russia and Japan, and it never has done so in any war. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that, ourselves alone excepted, the greatest educational people in this world—England, Germany, France, and even Japan, which is the most modern of all nations and making the greatest advances in her educational and moral progress—are the very ones that are building the greatest navies.

I shall not detain the Senate much longer. This request for four battle ships is made, and made in unusual form. It is made by the President of the United States, and made by him as Commander in Chief of the Navy—he says so himself. Is that request entitled to any respect? I will read, Senators, just what he said. It is serious language. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] charged me with speaking for the President. I at once replied, as the Record shows I said in my original remarks, that I spoke for no one but myself; but here is what the President said, and any Senator can have the same information:

Under these conditions, to provide for but one or two battle ships a year is to provide that this nation, instead of advancing, shall go backward in naval rank and relative power among the great nations.

Such a course would be unwise for us if we fronted merely on one ocean, and it is doubly unwise when we front on two oceans. As Chief Executive of the nation, and as Commander in Chief of the Navy, there is imposed upon me the solemn responsibility of advising the Congress of the measures vitally necessary to secure the peace and welfare of the Republic in the event of international complications which are even remotely possible. Having in view this solemn responsibility, I earnestly advise that the Congress now provide four battle ships of the most advanced type.

And, Senators, if the President of this country were a Democrat instead of a Republican, and made that appeal, I would gladly yield my judgment as a patriot. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I should not have taken any of the time of the Senate if it had not been for the statement made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] that in the remarks I had made on Saturday I had misquoted his statements made on the day before. I repeat deliberately that I did not make a statement or a suggestion or draw an inference from any remarks the Senator made on Friday which was not only justified by what he said, but justified by what appears in the RECORD.

First, I stated that the Senator from Indiana said in terms that if this question were to be discussed in executive session there would be few votes against the proposition for four battle ships, the necessary inference being that that Senator had information upon this subject which other members of the Senate did not possess, but which, if known, would lead them to vote contrary to what their present judgment would be upon the question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the Senator's version.

Mr. ALDRICH. Now, let us see what the Senator's version is and what he did say, because the RECORD as made up by the Senator is much worse than the statement as I understood it at the time it was made. Let us see what the RECORD shows. The Senator from Indiana said, according to the RECORD—I do not know what the italics mean exactly, as I never happened to see them in a Senator's speech before, so I will not undertake to give any special force to them.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If the Senator reads that, he ought to read further.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator said:

*But so far as I am concerned, I do not think that in this open forum or even in executive session we ought to discuss the probability of conflict with any specific power. I think if we could freely do so there would not be very many votes against this proposition.*

Now, what does that mean? The statement is more dangerous and mischievous in its present form than it was as I understood it to have been made originally.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. I can not yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator ought to read other things that I said.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator says here that we should not mention any specific power. He did not say that, as I understood him, in his original proposition.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not a word was changed.

Mr. ALDRICH. If there was not a word changed, then I did not understand its full scope and meaning. The statement, I repeat, is much more mischievous than I had supposed.

He says we should not talk about the probability of war with any specific power. He then says if we could freely discuss that precise question there would not be very many votes against the proposition for four battle ships. What is the significance of that statement? If it has any significance at all, it means that there was some specific power the Senator has in his mind, whose attitude was such as to threaten our peaceful relations, and that if this was known by other Senators the vote would be different upon this proposition. If that was not an insinuation or an inference that there was some specific power that was menacing the United States at this time, within the Senator's knowledge, then I do not know the force of the English language.

There is another statement the Senator made as to which he thinks I misquoted him, and that was that Congress had been in the past flching from the American people the sums which have been appropriated for the American Navy. That statement has not been changed in the RECORD.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not one statement has been changed.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator says "not one statement has been changed." Then I say that I am completely justified in all the statements I made and all the inferences I have drawn. I would say to the Senate that these declarations were not only made by the Senator from Indiana on his responsibility as a Senator, but inferentially as the representative of the Administration. It is true he did not appear here in armor and with the mace of authority in his hands as a militant representative of the President, but he came as an apostolic dele-

gate [laughter] clothed in the flowing robes of peace, and demanding that we should vote for the proposition for four battle ships.

If in the face of the Senator's declaration we should now vote for four battle ships, it would be a confession to all the nations of the world that we did have some sinister purpose in making this appropriation having reference to some specific nation.

One other word, Mr. President. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] has said that he was in favor of sustaining the American Navy. So am I. I think the character and efficiency of our Navy should always be fully maintained, and I shall vote for this bill with the full knowledge that it will accomplish this purpose. I shall next year vote for two battle ships, or more than two, if they are necessary to maintain the efficiency of the American Navy. I may then vote for a different type from that being authorized to-day. As I said on Friday, this matter of building navies is a matter of evolution. There may not be a Senator here who next year will be in favor of voting for any battle ship of the *Dreadnought* type.

But whatever may be the requirements for the Navy, either for its maintenance or for its necessary extension, I shall be found among the first to vote for whatever is required to secure for the Navy the highest state of efficiency.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] has done the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] justice in his quotations. It was upon my interruption on Saturday, after I had stated my dissent entirely from the view that war was imminent or even remotely possible, that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] replied, "I do not think so either. My argument has been upon the contrary."

Mr. ALDRICH. The quotation which I read is entirely disconnected from any statement or remark of the Senator from Michigan. It had no connection with it. It is entirely in a different part of the Senator's speech.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have read the speech of the Senator from Indiana, and I listened to it with pleasure and with satisfaction.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator think that I did not read the words the Senator from Indiana used?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think you have unfairly criticized the Senator from Indiana for his utterances.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator think that the language which I used is not contained in the Senator's speech?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not dispute the Senator's quotation, but I say he put a wrong interpretation upon the language of the Senator from Indiana.

The American people are accustomed to listen to the Senator from Indiana, and recognize his brilliant attainments. There is not a Senator upon this side of the Chamber who does not recognize his ability when help is needed in elections and campaigns. He is able to state his views then to your satisfaction, and sometimes to your advantage. It is his ability and his character and courage that have again and again come to the rescue of Senators in doubtful States when their elections were pending. [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will admonish the occupants of the galleries that applause is not permitted under the rules of the Senate, and if it is repeated the Chair will entertain a motion to clear the galleries.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We have heard a great deal of talk about war in the last few days, but, so far as my ears have been my guide, there has been more talk about war by those ultra-conservative Senators opposed to this amendment than from those who favor it.

Is the President of the United States in favor of war? Everyone here knows he is not. Senators have risen here and quoted again and again, with approval, from his wise advice of two years ago. If he was wise then, may he not be wise now? He still is President of our country and fills that exalted station with a wonderful personality, and is entitled to respect, especially when he is specifically charged under the Constitution with the control and direction of the Navy.

Mr. President, I will not permit any Senator to array me against the President or against the Naval Committee. I have great respect for both. Both perform their proper functions under the Constitution. No one usually follows more willingly than I the wise counsel of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The State from which I come rejoices in his legislative achievements as much as his own. His poise, his conservatism, his great ability, and his faithfulness to duty are the common heritage of the American people; but because he finds himself in difference with the President of the United States, there is no special reason why we may not likewise differ with the

distinguished Senator, without disrespect or ill will, I have never hesitated to controvert the President's views upon questions of principle with which we were not in accord, but this is purely a question of policy and his judgment may be best.

I said last Saturday, and I repeat, that I would not vote for a single additional ship of war upon the theory that war is imminent. I do not believe it to be even remotely possible. But I am going to vote for this amendment because the President of the United States, who is deemed wise enough at least to hold his great office and fortunate enough to enjoy the respect and confidence of the American people, urges this amendment upon us. He may have some information of his own, which he has not seen fit to communicate to us, affecting the diplomatic relations of our country with the world, which he thinks this proposition may facilitate.

I will vote for it for another reason. I believe this to be the most opportune time that has existed for years to order ships of war. I believe that a better and more advantageous arrangement can be made to-day than could have been made at any previous time in a decade. Our experience with reference to public building material and work upon the Panama Canal has taught us this. Is it not the province of the Government to take advantage of the situation? Other countries are doing it. Germany's new finance minister faces a deficit as large as our own at this moment, and yet her naval programme goes on unchecked. She has just selected with great care an experienced financier to take charge of her financial affairs on the theory that he can work the country out of a large and growing deficit, but the Germans are taking no backward step.

Mr. President, as a Republican, believing in the principles of my party and with faith in my country, and without the slightest disposition to apologize for what we have done or to take a single backward step in our economic policy, I refuse to subscribe to the idea that the American people have entered upon a period of decay and that we must forsake the plans which seem to be wise and proper in the estimation of our Chief Executive. No, Mr. President; I will vote for four battle ships, because I have confidence in his judgment and believe in his wisdom and patriotism. I will vote for four ships because I believe this to be an opportune time to make the arrangement.

The Senator from Rhode Island knows that these ships are not to be paid for out of this year's revenue or next year's revenue or the year following. This is a mere authorization, vesting in the Secretary of the Navy large discretionary power as to when he will order the ships and the plans of construction, and I see no grim foreboding of disaster to my country if I vote in favor of the amendment.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senate, I can plainly see, desires a vote on this matter, and I shall not keep it long.

I am a little impatient at the assumption that in this matter the public sentiment, the people, the interests of the Republic demand four ships. That need not be purely a matter of conjecture. The same impassioned appeal that has been made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] for four battle ships was made by his—I will not say counterpart, but in the same way before that great tribunal which considers and acts at the other end of the Capitol. The appeal was the same; the citations were the same; the figures were the same, and that great legislative tribunal, fresh from the people, immediately to go again to the people, sounded its note of decision in no doubtful voice. I am impatient, in view of that, of the assumption that we or any of us who are opposed to four ships, are voting against the people and the interests of the people.

Mr. President, I do not need to spend any time upon the war scare that has been invoked here and has absolutely vanished and faded away in the discussion. I do not put my belief that there is no danger of conflict or friction with Japan either upon the condition of her finances or her necessities. I put it higher than that. There has been no note of expression from that great people, either by her ambassador here or by any communication with our State Department, that has not been opposed to all this. I found my belief that there is no danger of conflict with Japan upon the self-restraint and the high character and spirit of the diplomacy that Japan has shown ever since it began to be mooted that there might be danger with her, and because of this most conservative and satisfactory and peaceful attitude of Japan I do not distrust her and see no occasion to distrust her.

There is another reason why all this which has been and was at first in this debate urged has left no impression on my mind, and that is the direction of our side of the negotiations and dealings that have taken place with the Empire of Japan under that great and conservative and safe administrator, the Secretary of State. I trust him. I believe in his conservatism. I

believe that in this he meets Japan half way. He has told us, Mr. President, that not only now, but that heretofore, there has never been friction, and his last utterance is to the effect that he apprehends no danger.

Mr. President, in that great atmosphere of established peace and established peaceful relations which has been fixed by the Japanese Empire and the Secretary of State no rude voice from this Chamber can interfere that will be mischievous. It will die out because of this discussion. It has disappeared. The Senators who invoked the specter of war have disappeared from the stage. The specter of war itself has disappeared, and there is no discordant note left before the Senate.

I am glad, Mr. President, of this discussion. I think it may be a demonstration that the high-water mark of what may be called the war element, the jingo element, has been reached, and that calmness will prevail and has prevailed. I am willing, with this confidence that animates me, without taking more time of the Senate, as 6 o'clock has been reached, that the Senate shall vote upon this proposition.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair calls the attention of the Senate to an amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES]. But it is addressed to a different part of the bill than the point to which the pending amendment is directed.

Mr. HALE. I hope we may have a direct vote.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will offer the amendment at the appropriate place.

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

The SECRETARY. On page 85, line 17, before the words "first-class battle ships," it is proposed to strike out "two" and insert "four," so that if amended it will read:

The President is hereby authorized to have constructed four first-class battle ships to cost, etc.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment which has been stated.

Mr. BEVERIDGE and Mr. PILES called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLISON (when his name was called). On this vote, and I think on one other, I am paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CLAY. I have been requested to state, by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], that if he were present on this amendment he would vote "yea."

Mr. BURROWS (when his name was called). The Senator from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] was called from the Senate last Saturday, and I agreed to pair with him. I should like to inquire if a pair has been arranged for him?

Mr. ALDRICH. One has been.

Mr. BURROWS. A pair has been arranged. I want to state for the Senator that if he were present he would vote "yea" on this proposition. I vote "nay."

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]. I transfer the pair to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from North Dakota is present.

Mr. GAMBLE. The senior Senator from North Dakota is present and expects to vote.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. He expects to vote.

Mr. CULLOM. I did not know that. I withdraw my vote and will stand paired with the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DEPEW (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY.]

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am in possession of a telegram sent by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] saying "I favor four battle ships." By agreement with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] the pair of the Senator from New York is transferred to him. The Senator from Minnesota and I have agreed to that, and the Senator therefore is released, and the Senator from Minnesota, who has voted, has agreed—

Mr. ALDRICH. I would suggest that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] is absent without a pair, and he can be paired with the Senator.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM].

Mr. ALDRICH. But they would vote the same way on this proposition.

Mr. GALLINGER. Discussion is out of order, Mr. President.

Mr. KEAN. Regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Discussion is out of order.

Mr. CULLOM. I have a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and supposing the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] was not here I proposed to transfer my pair to him. But he being present, I have withdrawn my vote and stand paired with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], unless it is perfectly certain that he would vote the same way that I would.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the calling of the roll.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] stands regularly paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY]. By the transfer of the pair with the Senator from Louisiana to the Senator from Minnesota the Senator from New York is released from his pair and can vote. The Senator from Minnesota will withdraw his vote.

Mr. DEPEW. The Senator from Minnesota has voted.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; but he is willing to withdraw his vote because of the arrangement—

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator from Indiana is entirely mistaken. My pair is with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and I have voted "nay." Now, in order to facilitate the preparation of the record, and that all present may vote, I have no objection to any arrangement that may be made.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that this discussion is out of order.

Mr. ALDRICH. Regular order.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. This is a matter of personal privilege, then. I ask the Senator if I can not make this arrangement—

Mr. TELLER. I call for the regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the calling of the roll.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. DEPEW (when his name was called). I am paired, unless relieved from that pair, under a general pair covering the whole session, with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY].

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], who is detained from the Senate by illness, as we all know. But an arrangement has been made upon this vote by which my pair is transferred to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. MILTON]. I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DANIEL (when Mr. DOLLIVER's name was called). The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] authorizes me to state that he is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]. If the Senator from Maryland were here and not paired, he would vote "nay."

Mr. KEAN (when Mr. ELKINS's name was called). The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] asked me to state his pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. FRAZIER (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KITTREDGE]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I shall vote. I will therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. NELSON (when Mr. KITTREDGE's name was called). If the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KITTREDGE] were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. MILTON (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. CULBERSON (when Mr. RAYNER's name was called). The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]. If the Senator from Maryland were here he would vote "nay."

Mr. KEAN (when Mr. SCOTT's name was called). I desire to state that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN].

Mr. TALIAFERRO (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT]. That pair has been transferred to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] and I will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CULLOM. I am informed that I can transfer my pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—23.

Ankeny	Burkett	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Beveridge	du Pont	Lodge	Smoot
Borah	Flint	McCreary	Sutherland
Bourne	Fulton	Owen	Taylor
Briggs	Gamble	Paynter	Warner
Brown	Hansbrough	Piles	

NAYS—50.

Aldrich	Cullom	Gore	Perkins
Bacon	Curtis	Guggenheim	Platt
Bankhead	Daniel	Hale	Richardson
Brandegee	Davis	Hemenway	Simmons
Bulkeley	Dick	Johnston	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	Kean	Stewart
Burrows	Dixon	Long	Stone
Carter	Foraker	McCumber	Taliaferro
Clapp	Foster	Money	Teller
Clark, Wyo.	Frazier	Nelson	Warren
Clay	Frye	Newlands	Wetmore
Crane	Gallinger	Nixon	
Culberson	Gary	Overman	

NOT VOTING—19.

Allison	Elkins	McEnery	Rayner
Bailey	Hopkins	McLaurin	Scott
Clark, Ark.	Kittredge	Martin	Smith, Md.
Depew	Knox	Milton	Tillman
Dolliver	La Follette	Penrose	

So Mr. PILES's amendment was rejected.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 87, after line 5, insert:

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.

Mr. HALE. I am constrained to make the point of order against the amendment. It is a scheme of general legislation.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. MONEY. I desire to offer an amendment to be put in the bill at the proper place. I send it to the desk and ask to have it read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 88, line 3, after the word "delivery," insert:

That all material used in the construction of the vessels authorized or provided by this act, whether in Government navy-yards or by contract, may be purchased abroad and admitted free of all duty, and shall be of American product and manufacture.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I do not want to detain the Senate at this late hour—

Mr. HALE. Let me say to the Senator—

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

Mr. MONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I will not move to lay the amendment on the table, but I will ask the Senator to bear in mind that the order of the Senate provided that we should finish the bill to-day.

Mr. MONEY. I understand that, and I should like to have the amendment considered. Nevertheless, the day is not expired yet, and we can have a little more patience.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I offered this amendment as in Committee of the Whole, and I was assured by the Senator from Maine that it was substantially the law as it has been for some time.

He was sustained in that statement by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT]. I was not willing to set up my memory in opposition to the statement of two gentlemen of such distinguished character and familiar with the bill, as I was not. But, still thinking that I was right about it, I had the books consulted, and I find there is not any such law on the books, and never has been. We are acting under the act of August 3, 1886, and that positively prohibits the purchase of any material manufactured abroad. Not only that, but the act of the next year, making an appropriation for the Navy, repeated the law with some emphasis.

As the whole of the debate has turned upon the expenses of this appropriation, and you can say that the fight between four battle ships and two battle ships turned almost exclusively at its conclusion upon the point of expense, here is an opportunity for the Senate to have the battle ships built at very much less cost than if we proceed under the law as it now stands. It seems to me that every man who has made an argument in favor of economy and has cited the declining revenues of the country and also the deficit, which now amounts to \$47,000,000, and by the end of the fiscal year will amount to about sixty-eight or sixty-nine million dollars, can well consider this proposition that will relieve the bill of a great deal of expense. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. HALE. The Senator's proposition was voted down in Committee of the Whole, I understand, and the bill has not yet

reached the Senate. I suppose the Senator can offer it in the Senate.

Mr. MONEY. This proposition was not voted upon. The proposition was withdrawn, and it was not voted on at all. It was withdrawn by me in deference to the statement made by the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Nebraska.

I find that both those gentlemen were entirely mistaken. The law is exactly contrary to what they said. I will add further that, not content with that, I communicated by telephone with the Bureau of Construction, and they state that under the present law and under this bill they could not buy a pound of material abroad, even of American manufacture.

Mr. HALE. The amendment is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. MONEY. In what respect? It reduces expenditures, and it is germane to the bill.

Mr. HALE. But it changes the law. The Senator himself has made the point that the law forbids it now.

Mr. MONEY. I do not understand that the rule prohibits an amendment which reduces expenses.

Mr. HALE. Yes; if it changes the law, it does. I did not make the point of order because it was my impression that there is no existing law on the subject, and I still think so; but if the Senator is right and there is a law that it can not be done, then the amendment is clearly subject to the point of order.

Mr. MONEY. The law says that all the material purchased for the construction of the Navy must be of American manufacture, and stops at that. This is a provision permitting the products of American manufacture to be bought in any part of the world, and to be admitted free of duty, but they must be of American manufacture.

Mr. HALE. Then, Mr. President, on that statement it is a question for the Senate to decide. The Senator bears out my position the other day. There is no law on the subject, and therefore it is not subject to the point of order, but it is a matter for the Senate in its wisdom to determine. Unless the Senator desires to debate it further, I will move to lay the amendment on the table, or we can take a vote direct on his proposition.

Mr. MONEY. I have no desire to continue the debate at this late hour. The Senate understands what all this means. I ask the Senator to permit me to have a yea-and-nay vote on the proposition, and there will then be no necessity for a vote to lay it on the table.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator makes that request, it is very late, and I will agree to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. MONEY. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]. I have transferred that pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DANIEL (when his name was called). The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] seems to be absent. I decline to vote, having a general pair with him. Otherwise I would vote "yea."

Mr. DEPEW (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. MCENERY], and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Owing to my general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], as before announced, I am compelled to withhold my vote.

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. I should vote "yea" if he were present.

Mr. TALIAFERRO (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], and the transfer of my pair to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN]. Therefore I will vote. I vote "yea." The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LONG. On this vote, as on the previous vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] is paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. If he were present he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Bacon	Foster	McCreary	Paynter
Bankhead	Frazier	Milton	Simmons
Clay	Gary	Money	Taliaferro
Culberson	Gore	Newlands	
Davis	Johnston	Overman	

NAYS—41.

Aldrich	Crane	Hemenway	Smoot
Ankeny	Cullom	Heyburn	Stephenson
Bourne	Curtis	Kean	Stewart
Brandegee	Dick	Lodge	Sutherland
Briggs	du Pont	Long	Teller
Brown	Flint	McCumber	Warner
Bulkeley	Foraker	Nelson	Warren
Burnham	Gallinger	Perkins	Wetmore
Burrows	Gamble	Piles	
Carter	Guggenhelm	Richardson	
Clapp	Hale	Smith, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—33.

Allison	Dillingham	Knox	Rayner
Bailey	Dixon	La Follette	Scott
Beveridge	Dolliver	McEnery	Smith, Md.
Borah	Elkins	McLaurin	Stone
Burkett	Frye	Martin	Taylor
Clark, Wyo.	Fulton	Nixon	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Hansbrough	Owen	
Daniel	Hopkins	Penrose	
Depew	Kittredge	Platt	

So Mr. MONEY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill. It was read on Saturday last.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as a new section at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. —. 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: *Provided*, 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. HALE. I make the point of order that the amendment proposes a general scheme of legislation.

Mr. CULBERSON. I recognize, of course, that the point of order, if insisted upon, is well taken, but I hope the Senator from Maine will give us an opportunity to pass upon this question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine insist upon his point of order?

Mr. HALE. Yes, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken, and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. DICK. Mr. President—

Mr. HALE. I understand the Senator from Ohio wishes to correct an amendment that was adopted some days ago.

Mr. DICK. I do. On Thursday the Senate adopted an amendment which I sent to the desk, providing for the payment of six months' pay to the widows of enlisted men and officers of the Navy. In the amendment which I sent to the desk the enlisted men and officers of the Marine Corps were included, but upon the misapprehension that they had been provided for in a like amendment adopted on the Army appropriation bill, we struck out the Marine Corps. Upon examination we find that the Marine Corps was not provided for in the Army appropriation bill; and in order that the correction may be made, I move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 3 was agreed to as amended.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, there is no objection to that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the committee on page 3 as amended was agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DICK. I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk as an amendment to the committee amendment as amended.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "Navy," at the end of the committee amendment on page 3, line 24, it is proposed to insert the words "and Marine Corps," and after the word "Navy," where it occurs at the end of the amendment as amended, it is proposed to insert the words "and Marine Corps." The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Now, Mr. President, there is only one more formal amendment, and I offer it now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 86, at the end of line 5, it is pro-

posed to strike out the period, insert a comma and the words "to be built by contract, not more than two by any one contractor."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in order to protect our merchant marine, I move to amend the amendment of the committee on page 87, line 7, by striking out the words "of American registry."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment is not in order at the present time. The amendment will be in order when the bill reaches the Senate. It would be necessary to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the committee was agreed to in order to consider the Senator's amendment at this time.

Mr. HALE. The Senator can offer the amendment when the bill shall have been reported to the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Then I withdraw the amendment for the present.

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

Mr. GORE. I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 87 in the committee amendment, line 7, after the words "steam collars," it is proposed to strike out the words "of American registry."

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, that is the present law. I make the point of order against the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 33, line 12, after the word "dollars," it is proposed to insert the following paragraph:

Navy-yard in Key West, Fla.: For foundry, \$60,000.

Mr. HALE. There is no objection to that.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I move to strike out the words "at least one of said vessels shall be built in the navy-yard" and substitute the words "both be built."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Oklahoma please state where the proposed amendment should come in?

Mr. GORE. I move to strike out the words requiring that at least one of said vessels—I do not remember just the language now—shall be constructed in navy-yards and substitute the words "both of said vessels." I understand the bill provides that one of the vessels can be let under contract, the other to be constructed in a navy-yard of the United States.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator refer to colliers or battle ships?

Mr. GORE. To battle ships.

Mr. HALE. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

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.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 21003) fixing the compensation of certain officials in the customs service, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions commemorative of the life and public services of Hon. JOHN T. MORGAN and Hon. EDMUND W. PETTUS, late Senators from the State of Alabama.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Ohio, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 57) asking Congress to provide for a national bureau of health.

Whereas the health of the nation is of paramount importance, and "our national health is physically our greatest national asset" (President Roosevelt); and

Whereas in the growth of nations it inevitably happens that the people are massed in large centers, thereby, if uncontrolled, creating insanitary conditions destructive of life and health; and

Whereas such conditions can be removed and prevented only by the intelligent care and oversight of public-health officials endowed with broad powers and necessary means for action; and

Whereas in the prevention of disease by the enforcement of health measures by local officials in both urban and rural districts adequate results can be obtained only when such measures are soundly based

upon well-substantiated facts and observation in relation to sanitation and hygiene; and

Whereas the United States Government, in ways impossible for the State and municipality, may gather information and conduct research work to determine the causes of disease and the best measures for their prevention, and by cooperation with State and local authorities may promote the health of all the people; and

Whereas the President, in his Provincetown speech, expressed the hope "that there will be legislation increasing the power of the National Government to deal with certain matters concerning the health of our people everywhere;" Therefore be it

*Resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio,* That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized and urged to create and establish a national bureau of health, and endow it with power and funds commensurate with the highly important duties with which it will necessarily be intrusted; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from Ohio in Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested to urge the establishment of said proposed bureau of health.

*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of Ohio transmit immediately upon the passage of this resolution a copy thereof to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Representatives of Ohio therein.

FREEMAN T. EAGLESON,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*  
JAMES M. WILLIAMS,  
*President of the Senate.*

Adopted March 5, 1908.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Princeton, Ind., and a petition of sundry citizens of Akron, Ohio, 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 Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, of Athens, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the prevention of tuberculosis, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a memorial of the Doctor Douglas Hyde Branch Sinn Fein, of Lynn, Mass., 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 memorial of Kennebec Local Union, No. 73, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, of Madison, 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 the Academy of National Sciences 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. BURKETT presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for an investigation of the methods of the treatment of tuberculosis, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Grocers' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the first day of the week as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEWART presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lyndonville, Vt., and an petition of sundry citizens of Barre, Vt., 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. RAYNER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Cumberland and Baltimore, and of sundry trade and labor organizations of Cumberland, all in the State of Maryland, 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. DEPEW presented a petition 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 was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Emmet Club, of Tarrytown, N. Y., 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 Flushing Association, of Flushing, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the preservation of the natural resources of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Lancaster, Depew, New York City, Poughkeepsie, Corning, Tarrytown, and



Cohoes; of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of Iion; of the Bricklayers and Masons' International Union, of Elmira; of the Journeymen Tailors' Union, of Elmira; of the Blacksmiths' Union, of Elmira; of the Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' International Alliance, of Elmira; of the International Union of Journeymen Horseshoers, of Elmira; of the Iron Molders' Union of Elmira; of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Elmira, and of the Central Trade and Labor Council, of 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 which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HEMENWAY presented petitions of the Central Trades Council of Marion, of sundry citizens of Muncie, and of the Trades Assembly of Logansport, all in the State of Indiana, 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.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

A bill (S. 6841) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. B. McClintock;

A bill (S. 6842) granting an increase of pension to John W. Knapp;

A bill (S. 6843) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. McMaken.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 6844) to amend section 12 of an act entitled "An act to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railway Company in the city of Washington, D. C., and requiring said company to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein, and for other purposes," approved February 12, 1901, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DANIEL submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for rent of temporary quarters for post-office purposes at Richmond, Va., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment proposing to amend the act of June 22, 1874, by inserting "and the collector of customs for the district of Georgetown, in the District of Columbia," intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT TO OMNIBUS PUBLIC-BUILDINGS BILL.

Mr. HEMENWAY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$20,000 to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building at Frankfort, Ind., 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.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 21003. An act fixing the compensation of certain officials in the customs service, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. MCKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5126) to grant to the city of Seattle, in the State of Washington, certain rights of way for sewer and street purposes through and along the military reservation of Fort Lawton, Wash., and through the reservations for the Lake Washington Canal.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

S. 5262. An act to repeal an act approved April 30, 1906, entitled "An act to regulate shipping in trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes," and for other purposes;

S. 6028. An act to provide for safety of life on navigable waters during regattas or marine parades;

H. R. 603. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 15219. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, for ful-

filling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909; and S. R. 48. Joint resolution instructing the Attorney-General to institute certain suits, and so forth.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of the bill (H. R. 20063) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. The bill can be laid aside temporarily. I will call it up in the morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks that the bill be laid aside temporarily. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. I would suggest that the reading of the message go over until to-morrow morning, as the hour is late and there are but few Senators now present.

Mr. LODGE. It has been given to the press.

Mr. TELLER. That will not make any difference.

Mr. FORAKER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 28, 1908, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 27, 1908.

[Continuation of the legislative day of Monday, April 20, 1908.]

The recess having expired, at 11.30 o'clock a. m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

#### FORT LAWTON MILITARY RESERVATION, WASH.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 5126), to grant to the city of Seattle, in the State of Washington, certain rights of way for sewer and street purposes through and along the military reservation at Fort Lawton, Wash., and through the reservations for the Lake Washington Canal.

The question was taken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of no quorum. The point is sustained. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absentees, and the question will be taken on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 250, nays 2, answered "present" 17, not voting 118, as follows:

#### YEAS—250.

Adair	Cook, Colo.	Foulkrod	Howell, N. J.
Adamson	Cooper, Pa.	Fowler	Howland
Aiken	Cooper, Wis.	French	Hubbard, W. Va.
Alexander, Mo.	Cousins	Fuller	Hughes, N. J.
Allen	Cox, Ind.	Fulton	Hull, Tenn.
Ames	Cravens	Gaines, Tenn.	Humphrey, Wash.
Andrus	Crawford	Gardner, Mich.	James, Ollie M.
Ansberry	Crumpacker	Garner	Jenkins
Anthony	Currier	Gilhams	Johnson, Ky.
Bartholdt	Cushman	Gill	Johnson, S. C.
Bates	Dalzell	Gillespie	Jones, Wash.
Beale, Pa.	Darragh	Godwin	Kahn
Beall, Tex.	Davenport	Gordon	Kelher
Bell, Ga.	Davidson	Graff	Kennedy, Iowa
Birdsall	Davis, Minn.	Granger	Kennedy, Ohio
Bonyng	Dawson	Gregg	Kinkaid
Booher	De Armond	Griggs	Knapp
Bowers	Denver	Gronna	Knopf
Boyd	Diekema	Hackett	Knowland
Brantley	Dixon	Hackney	Kuftermann
Brownlow	Douglas	Hale	Lamar, Mo.
Brundidge	Draper	Hall	Lamb
Burgess	Driscoll	Hamill	Laning
Burleigh	Durey	Hamilton, Iowa	Lawrence
Burleson	Dwight	Hamilton, Mich.	Lee
Burnett	Ellerbe	Hammond	Lenahan
Burton, Del.	Ellis, Mo.	Harding	Lever
Byrd	Englebright	Haskins	Lewis
Calder	Esch	Haugen	Lindbergh
Calderhead	Fairchild	Hawley	Lloyd
Campbell	Favrot	Hay	Loudenslager
Candler	Ferris	Hayes	Lovering
Capron	Finley	Heflin	McGavin
Carter	Fitzgerald	Helm	McKinney
Chaney	Flood	Henry, Conn.	McLachlan, Cal.
Chapman	Floyd	Henry, Tex.	McMillan
Clark, Fla.	Fordney	Higgins	McMorrin
Clark, Mo.	Fornes	Hinsshaw	Macon
Clayton	Foss	Hitchcock	Madden
Cole	Poster, Ill.	Holliday	Madison
Conner	Poster, Ind.	Houston	Malby

Mann	Payne	Saunders	Sulzer
Marshall	Perkins	Scott	Tawney
Miller	Pollard	Sheppard	Taylor, Ala.
Moon, Pa.	Porter	Sherley	Taylor, Ohio
Moon, Tenn.	Pray	Sherwood	Thistlewood
Moore, Pa.	Prince	Sims	Thomas, N. C.
Moore, Tex.	Pujo	Slemp	Tou Velle
Morse	Rainey	Small	Townsend
Mouser	Randell, Tex.	Smith, Cal.	Underwood
Murdock	Ransdell, La.	Smith, Iowa	Volstead
Needham	Rauch	Smith, Mo.	Wanger
Nelson	Reeder	Smith, Tex.	Watson
Norris	Reid	Southwick	Webb
Nye	Reynolds	Sparkman	Weeks
O'Connell	Richardson	Sperry	Wheeler
Olcott	Robinson	Spight	Williams
Overstreet	Rodenberg	Stafford	Wilson, Ill.
Page	Rothermel	Steenerson	Wilson, Pa.
Parker, N. J.	Russell, Mo.	Stephens, Tex.	Wood
Parker, S. Dak.	Russell, Tex.	Sterling	Young
Parsons	Ryan	Sturgiss	
Patterson	Sabath	Sulloyway	

## NAYS—2.

Ashbrook Cooper, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—17.

Bartlett, Ga.	Hamlin	Kimball	Slayden
Bennet, N. Y.	Hardwick	McDermott	Talbott
Gaines, W. Va.	Hardy	McGuire	
Garrett	Harrison	Shackleford	
Goebel	Humphreys, Miss.	Sherman	

## NOT VOTING—118.

Acheson	Edwards, Ga.	Kitchin, Claude	Olmsted
Alexander, N. Y.	Edwards, Ky.	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Padgett
Bannon	Ellis, Oreg.	Lafean	Pearre
Barchfeld	Fassett	Lamar, Fla.	Peters
Barclay	Focht	Landis	Pou
Bartlett, Nev.	Foster, Vt.	Langley	Powers
Bede	Gardner, Mass.	Lassiter	Pratt
Bennett, Ky.	Gardner, N. J.	Law	Rhinock
Bingham	Gillett	Leake	Riordan
Boutell	Glass	Lezare	Roberts
Bradley	Goldfogle	Lilley	Rucker
Brodhead	Goulden	Lindsay	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Graham	Littlefield	Snapp
Brumm	Greene	Livingston	Stanley
Burke	Haggott	Longworth	Stevens, Minn.
Burton, Ohio	Hepburn	Lorimer	Thomas, Ohio
Butler	Hill, Conn.	Loud	Tirrell
Caldwell	Hill, Miss.	Lowden	Vreeland
Carlin	Hobson	McCall	Waldo
Cary	Howard	McCreary	Wallace
Caulfield	Howell, Utah	McHenry	Washburn
Cockran	Hubbard, Iowa	McKinlay, Cal.	Watkins
Cocks, N. Y.	Huff	McKinley, Ill.	Weems
Cook, Pa.	Hughes, W. Va.	McLain	Weisse
Coudrey	Hull, Iowa	McLaughlin, Mich.	Wiley
Craig	Jackson	Maynard	Willett
Davey, La.	James, Addison D.	Mondell	Wolf
Dawes	Jones, Va.	Mudd	Woodyard
Denby	Kelfer	Murphy	
Dunwell	Kipp	Nicholls	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the day:

Mr. POWERS with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. MCGUIRE with Mr. STANLEY.

Until April 28:

Mr. LOWDEN with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. CAULFIELD with Mr. HARDY.

Until Wednesday:

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. PADGETT.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut with Mr. GLASS.

Until further notice:

Mr. BARCHFELD with Mr. CARLIN.

Mr. BARCLAY with Mr. COCKRAN.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. CRAIG.

Mr. CARY with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. COOK of Pennsylvania with Mr. JONES of Virginia.

Mr. DENBY with Mr. KIPP.

Mr. GILLETT with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. LEAKE.

Mr. DAWES with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. HUFF with Mr. McLAIN.

Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. LAFEAN with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. NICHOLLS.

Mr. MCKINLEY of Illinois with Mr. RHINOCK.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. WALDO with Mr. WOLF.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York with Mr. BRODHEAD.

Mr. DENBY with Mr. WILLETT.

Mr. BEDE with Mr. HILL of Mississippi.

Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi.

Mr. HAGGOTT with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.

Mr. FASSETT with Mr. HARDWICK.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. WALLACE.  
 Mr. ADDISON D. JAMES with Mr. KIMBALL.  
 Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky with Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia.  
 Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. McHENRY.  
 Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. Pou.  
 Mr. COUDREY with Mr. HOBSON.  
 Mr. GREENE with Mr. LAMAR of Florida.  
 Mr. McCREARY with Mr. HOWARD.  
 Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota with Mr. WEISSE.  
 Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. PETERS.  
 Mr. MCKINLAY of California with Mr. GARRETT.  
 Mr. DUNWELL with Mr. WATKINS.  
 Mr. FOCHT with Mr. BARTLETT of Nevada.  
 Mr. BUTLER with Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia.  
 Mr. PEARRE with Mr. TALBOTT.  
 Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. LEGARE.  
 Mr. COCKS with Mr. LASSITER.  
 Mr. BANNON with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.  
 Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. SLAYDEN.  
 Mr. HEPBURN with Mr. LIVINGSTON.  
 Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. HAMLIN.  
 Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. WILEY.  
 For the session:  
 Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.  
 Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RIORDAN.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
 The doors were opened.

## ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 603. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

H. R. 12773. An act granting to the city of Woodward, in the State of Oklahoma, lot 2, in block 48, for park and other public purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to the enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 5262. An act to repeal an act approved April 30, 1906, entitled "An act to regulate shipping in trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes," and for other purposes.

S. 6028. An act to provide for safety of life on navigable waters during regattas or marine parades.

S. R. 48. Joint resolution instructing the Attorney-General to institute certain suits, and so forth.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. A. P. GARDNER of Massachusetts for the remainder of the session on account of ill health.

## INVESTIGATION OF WOOD PULP AND PRINT PAPER.

Mr. CURRIER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the following resolution with a committee amendment. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

## Resolution 350.

Resolved, That the select committee to investigate as to wood pulp and print paper, and for other purposes, shall have authority to have such printing and binding done as it may consider necessary in the conduct of its business; to employ a clerk, messenger, and stenographers, and to incur such other expenses as may be deemed necessary by said committee, and all the expenses of said committee shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on the usual vouchers, approved as now provided by law.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules a second is ordered.

The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CURRIER] is entitled to twenty minutes, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is entitled to twenty minutes.

Mr. CURRIER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution explains itself. On April 21 the House adopted a resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the wood-pulp and print-paper matter, and this resolution simply provides the money absolutely essential to carry on that investigation. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, from this side of the Chamber I think we agree that this committee has been created for the purpose of delay—for dilatory, filibustering purposes, in

order to prevent quick legislative action in producing relief in connection with the wood-pulp and print-paper situation. That quick legislative remedy could be obtained if the Speaker would recognize anybody upon the floor, upon either side, to move to suspend the rules and discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from the further consideration of either of the several bills having free pulp and paper in view, and putting it under suspension of the rules upon its passage through the House. There is not a Member of the House on either side of the Chamber who is not aware of that fact. I think we Democrats agree with the substance of the resolution passed at the annual meeting of the Associated Press held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on Tuesday April 21. That resolution read as follows:

Representatives of 774 daily newspapers gathered at the annual meeting of the Associated Press, respectfully ask the President and Congress to grant immediate relief from the exactions of combinations of paper makers. In September, 1907, and again in November, 1907, the attention of the authorities was directed to the excessive prices then demanded by the paper combinations. Immediately upon the assembling of Congress, twenty or more bills aiming to correct these conditions and to put paper and pulp on the free list were introduced and referred to the Ways and Means Committee. Persistent efforts to obtain a hearing have been refused. Dilatory tactics have been employed to prolong present conditions and to carry over to another session of Congress every proposition designed for relief. All newspapers here represented protest against delay.

Attention is also directed to the false reports of news-print paper prices which were recently furnished to Congress by the Director of the Census Bureau. The newspapers here represented use approximately 80 per cent of the news-print paper consumed in the United States. We denounce the quotations as submitted to Congress as misleading and unworthy of credence. The reiteration of the accuracy of these figures of the Director after the error had been called to public attention tends to shake public confidence and respect for statistics thus compiled.

Notwithstanding that fact, however, Mr. Speaker, the committee has been organized. There is at least an allegation to the country that this committee is going to examine into this wood-pulp question with the sincere desire to arrive at the truth. It would ill become us, therefore, to refuse to the committee the instrumentalities for taking down and publishing the testimony of men who are ready to show that this tariff upon wood pulp and print paper has had very much to do with the rise in the price of paper and that behind that tariff as a shelter a combination has become possible and that both the combination and the tariff as cause of monopolistic exploitation exist. If you could get any other result from it or if the committee can, they will have to indulge in a degree of intellectual gymnastics that will astonish the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, how much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. Five minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask the Clerk to read this during that time. It is a continuation of a paper part of which was read the other day and the reading of which was stopped by the expiration of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

At whose expense? Solely at the expense of the most unprotected among all manufacturing industries in the United States—the printing and publishing industry, more especially the newspapers. The latter insist that the paper manufacturers, in view of the protection granted them against competition from abroad, are at least under so much obligation as to provide for the demands of consumers in this country. Have they lived up to the fulfillment of this just expectation?

When the paper manufacturers got together for the purpose of bettering their conditions, they accomplished the first step through the Dingley tariff, which put a minimum duty of \$6 per ton on news-print paper valued at not above 2 cents per pound, and \$8 per ton on paper valued above 2 cents per pound, and raised the duty on wood pulp from \$1.20 to \$1.67 per ton. The next step, although encountering many delays, was finally consummated by creating a combination to exhaust the surplus stock of paper, to cause a paper famine, and to raise prices. From \$35 per ton, in 1906, the price has been raised to \$40 in 1907, and to \$50 in the present year, being an increase of 25 to 40 per cent, respectively. The pretext put forward by the manufacturers for their advance in prices is the increased cost of wood and labor. Now, let us look into that a little closer. Government records show that paper mills in the United States and Canada are making paper at a cost of less than \$28 per ton at the mill, and that American mills can and do make paper more cheaply than Canadian mills by reason of a better supply of skilled labor, cheaper coal, and an adequate home market for their product; also lower ocean rates and lower marine insurance on their exports. Furthermore, it is a fact that Canadian paper manufacturers, after paying the duty, have profitably undersold American manufacturers in the American market, and that American paper makers have with profit disposed of their product abroad in competition with Canada, Great Britain, Norway, and Germany at prices considerably below those maintained in the American market.

As to the increased cost of labor, figures printed in the Paper Mill Directory for 1907 show an increase of only 1 per cent in labor cost of a news-print paper mill, modern machinery and other improvements having offset the increased pay of the paper-mill employee. The labor employed in news-print paper mills is not the beneficiary of the oppressive advances that have been made in paper prices. Not one-twentieth of the advance in paper prices goes to labor.

At the beginning of the year 1907 there was a stock of 60,000 tons of news-print paper on hand. Owing to increased activity at the mills and decreased consumption on the part of the newspapers during the summer months, there should have been an accumulation of stock at

the beginning of the fall season, but at that time the announcement came from the paper makers that a paper famine was imminent and that prices must be raised. It was difficult to reconcile this statement with the increased shipments of paper to Mexico, Cuba, Chile, Argentina, and Japan and an export of 60,000 tons of news-print paper during the year ending June 30, 1907, in disregard of the depleted condition of the domestic market.

In May, 1906, the United States Government dissolved the General Paper Company as an unlawful combination and warned its subsidiary corporations to avoid certain forms of combination. These prohibitions have been disobeyed in such a flagrant manner as to enable the American Newspaper Publishers' Association to lay before the Attorney-General of the United States incontrovertible proof of the efforts made by the seven groups of the American Paper and Pulp Association—under which guise the paper trust is operating—to stifle competition, to increase prices, and to put an additional burden amounting yearly to many millions upon the printing and publishing interests of the country. One of these groups centers about the International Paper Company, which operates in the Eastern market. It was organized nearly ten years ago by a consolidation of thirty mills, most of them in bad condition, with antiquated machinery, half of which was no better than junk. During the ten years since that consolidation was made the old machinery has not improved with age. The company's capacity to make paper is less to-day than it was rated at the time of the consolidation. Not one new machine has been added to the equipment until within a recent period, while one or more of the original plants have been dismantled and abandoned. The International Paper Company has not grown with the demands of business. It has remained stationary. It has squeezed out of the paper consumers all it could without developing manufacture, meanwhile pouring millions of dollars into speculative investments in Canadian forests, although the company previously held woodland that would produce forever a supply of spruce pulp wood sufficient to make twice the quantity of pulp it now uses.

Contrast the paper manufacture with the printing and publishing industry. The newspapers and periodicals had in 1905 a reported capital invested of \$239,000,000. They paid salaries and wages amounting to \$106,000,000 per annum to 160,000 workers. They paid \$58,000,000 per annum for their principal article of use, white paper. The printing and publishing business as a whole turns over its capital in about ten months; large department stores that advertise energetically will turn over their stock about seven times a year, but the largest paper manufacturer in the world, the International Paper Company, with a capital exceeding \$60,000,000, does a gross annual business of only \$21,000,000, thus requiring three years to turn over its capital. To maintain that concern and its allied combinations with their oppressive weight of overcapitalization and to provide a pretext for protecting the labor of 15,000 paper-mill employees receiving less than \$9,000,000 per annum, the publishing business has been subjected to a series of deliberately planned schemes of extortion.

The printing business stands for the intellectual growth of the country, and it is helpful to good government in that it promotes intelligence and raises the standard of citizenship. If the combination of paper makers can succeed in its course it will cripple the publishing business, it will tax intelligence, because the newspapers and the periodicals are the people's school and library. Under any government such a tax would be oppressive and proscriptive. In a government, based as ours is, upon the intelligence and resultant virtues of the people, it is anomalous and monstrous. In recognition of this fact President Roosevelt in his recent special message to Congress has recommended the immediate repeal of the duty on wood pulp, with a corresponding reduction of the duty upon paper made from wood pulp.

The Reform Club will undoubtedly lend its weighty and influential aid to the President so that at least this one revision of the tariff may be accomplished—before the Presidential election.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Does the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CURRIER] desire to use any of his time now?

Mr. CURRIER. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read in my time an editorial from the New York Herald of April 22. I hope we may have order.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ONE-CENT NEWSPAPERS AND THE "PAPER TRUST."

[New York Herald, April 22, 1908.]

"Be sure you are right—and then go ahead."

The famous motto of David Crockett has not been much in favor during the present Administration, which has too often acted as if its device were, "Go ahead—and then find out whether we are right."

There has been great complaint about an advance during recent years in the price of the sort of paper on which newspapers are printed. All other grades of paper, in common with all commodities and the wages of all grades of labor, also advanced during the period of expansion, and prosperity had also risen.

Manufacturers generally adopted the businesslike plan of raising the price of their finished products to meet this increased cost of raw material. A great many publishers of 1-cent morning newspapers in various parts of the country, finding that the raw paper in their sheets cost more than they were sold for at wholesale rates to newsdealers, adopted the same simple plan and raised the price of their papers.

A considerable number of publishers, however, fearing that higher prices would result in decreased circulation, have continued to sell their wares at less than cost, and clamorously insist that the community in general and the paper makers in particular must be compelled to bear the expense of enabling them to persist in their unbusinesslike course. With all their facilities for giving publicity to their views, they have raised such a loud and protracted wail that the community, which has heard little or nothing about advances in other commodities, has its ears deafened with complaints about the high price of news print paper and clamorous demands that Congress compel the paper makers to sell cheaper under penalty of having the tariff removed from this kind of paper and the wood pulp of which it is made.

The plea of the paper makers that the cost of their wood and chemicals and labor—all the elements of manufacture—had advanced was ignored and the Attorney-General was asked to investigate the largest manufacturers. He recently decided that there was not sufficient evidence upon which to base an investigation, whereupon extraordinary pressure was brought to bear upon the President and upon Congress to remove the tariff from pulp and paper. In his message of March

25 Mr. Roosevelt yielded so far as to express the opinion that "one change in the tariff could with advantage be made forthwith," namely, to make wood pulp free, "with a corresponding reduction upon papers made from wood pulp when they come from any country that does not put an export duty upon them." The suggestion that this great American industry be arbitrarily singled out for such savage attack has not been followed by the Committee of Ways and Means, which has in its hands more than a score of bills aimed against the paper makers.

Common justice requires that no such invidious action be taken without investigation to ascertain the facts. The House has wisely rejected the President's suggestion to "go ahead and then find out whether he was right," and if yesterday adopted Speaker Cannon's resolution authorizing the appointment of a commission to inquire into the reasons for the existing price of white paper. The facts, when elicited, may convince the complaining publishers that their energies would be more profitably employed in revising their own business methods than in dragging the paper makers.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. A minute and a half.

Mr. CURRIER. I will yield three minutes more to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I will send to the Clerk's desk and ask to be read in my time an editorial from the New York American of April 25.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LET THE PUBLISHERS BE CONSISTENT.

It seems to the American that the publishers of this country are placing themselves in a peculiarly narrow position and in a peculiarly selfish light before the community when they urge Congress to adopt a free-trade policy in regard to certain products which affect only the publishers themselves.

The conception of their duty that newspaper publishers ought to have is that they are attorneys for the people, and represent the readers of their publications and employ the power of their publications in the interest of those readers and of the whole community. If the publishers maintain that standard of professional ethics, they would conclude either that protection was a beneficial policy and that they were willing to pay their tax along with the rest of the people to maintain that policy, or else that a reduction of the tariff was desirable and that it was their duty to secure the benefits of such a reduction for all the people and not merely for themselves.

The present attitude of the publishers appears to be that they are ready to use the power of their papers to secure every benefit for themselves without regard for the interests of the rest of the community. There seems to be no consideration of how protection or how tariff revision may affect the working people or how it may affect the consumers generally, but merely of how the particular matter of wood pulp may effect the publishers. This is an attitude which lays the publishers open to rather more than a suspicion of sordid self-interest.

The American recommends to the publishers of this country the tariff-reform plank of the Independent party platform: "No protection for oppressive trusts." Not merely no protection for the one oppressive trust that has its grip upon the publishers' personal pocketbook, but no protection for any of the oppressive trusts that rob the people, the clients whom the publishers are presumed to protect.

Mr. CURRIER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KÜSTERMANN].

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the good shepherd of my friends, the Democrats, whose flock follows him blindly, looked straight into my face—something that is to be wondered at when you consider what he has been doing here for the past few weeks—and said that "that gentleman would be the right one to force this pulp and paper business onto the floor of the House."

Now, while it is true that I thought it would be well to correct the mistake made as to petroleum, an error made by both Democrats and Republicans, and to take the little joker out of the Dingley tariff, I am far from saying that the tariff on pulp and paper should be removed without a thorough investigation.

I am representing a district whose leading industry is the manufacture of paper and pulp, and I believe to-day that our paper and pulp manufacturers would have done better if they had invested in other industries. They have not made any great fortunes. I had the misfortune of investing \$4,000 in a pulp factory six years ago, and I can assure you, gentlemen, that with the best of management and the best of machinery I have not realized more than 1½ per cent a year on my investment. So I say it is no more than fair and just that we should have an investigation of this and not act in this matter blindly. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am very glad the commission was appointed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CURRIER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] desire to use the balance of his time?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans say that the "friends of protection" must, and will, make the next tariff to suit themselves. Why do you not do it now, gentlemen? Why defer? You have the House, you have the Senate, and you have the President—a Republican Administration out

and out. You know that the next House may not be controlled by the Republicans, the chances, to say the least, are favorable to the Democrats, the enemies of protection. If you are sincere protectionists and feel that protectionists only should remodel the tariff, why do you not proceed at once to do so? The power is within your grasp, and you know it.

If you are sincere in your statement that protectionists only must refix the tariff, why, I submit, in all seriousness, do you not proceed to do so while the Democrats are in the minority? The Democrats may have the next House and the White House, and you know it. You know, gentlemen, that there is more than "probable cause to believe" a monopoly is controlling the wood pulp industry, and the President thinks so, and you know that. You know the Department of Justice thinks so and filed a bill against the paper trust, against which trust the people are protesting, and you know the Federal judge trying that case rendered a decree entering an injunction against that trust.

When Mr. Blaine was Speaker of the House a resolution was passed by the House directing the Ways and Means Committee "at its earliest practical moment to report a bill to this House abolishing the tariff on coal, so as to secure that important article of fuel to the people free from taxation." Note the language, "at its earliest practical moment." That resolution was passed by the House, Mr. Speaker, and a little later a similar resolution as to salt was passed, in these words:

That the Committee on Ways and Means are hereby instructed to report to this House forthwith a bill reducing the present duties on all classes of salt 50 per cent.

Why do you not "forthwith" act in this matter of wood pulp, at least? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why does not the Speaker of this House follow the illustrious example of Speaker Blaine, the "Plumed Knight," and permit some one to call up a wood pulp resolution or a bill—to free list wood pulp? Why can not the Republican Congress of 1908 follow the shining example set by the great Congress of 1870? Why do not you Republicans follow the prescription which Senator John Sherman said was his cure for the "monopolized articles." He said that the moment such a fact was called to his attention, that is that a tariff duty protected a monopoly, he would "without a moment's hesitation" put that monopolized article on the free list.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you and your great party that here are precedents, wise and sane, but which this Republican House refuses to follow, although the people are clamoring for relief. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I agree that this resolution should be adopted, because it provides means and facilities to enable the committee of the House created for the purpose of inquiring into the extortions charged against the "wood pulp and paper trust;" that is, that this trust has, by reason of the protective tariff, been enabled to extort from those who use print paper the additional sum of nearly \$65,000,000 in a very short period. I want to remove this tariff duty. I am ready to vote for it now, to-day, but if I can not be permitted to do that, then I want this committee to have all the means necessary to find the facts.

It is true that the Department of Justice has been investigating this matter after a fashion, but the Department of Justice has not yet arrived at any conclusion; and, so far as we are informed, found nothing; and I thought that this House ought to act without taking intermediate steps, like the appointment of this committee, that seems to block the removal of this unjust and unnecessary tariff on wood pulp and print paper. Such a tariff is a tax on intelligence; we ought to repeal it now. In my opinion, if this House had an opportunity to vote here and now on the matter, it would repeal this tariff on wood pulp and print paper by an overwhelming majority. This opportunity is denied and, because this is the only means left to us under the direction of the majority, therefore I am willing, cheerfully, to grant to that committee who are investigating the question the power, the money, and the means to investigate and find out all the facts so that we may as soon as possible force the majority to act.

THE BARTLETT AMENDMENT.

Mr. Speaker, on the 17th of December, 1902, the first action was taken to provide a specific sum to prosecute the trusts, although in 1901 and in 1902 the President had sent messages to this House asking for specific appropriations to prosecute the trusts; yet these had lain here before the House for nearly a year. These two messages from the President, requesting Congress, then largely Republican as now, for a special fund to be appropriated for the purpose of prosecuting violators of the antitrust law, were unheeded; Congress refused to do anything about it.

On the 17th of December, 1902, I had the honor to offer an amendment to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, then being considered, an amendment which will appear on page 411 of the Record of December 17, proposing to appropriate \$250,000 for the purpose of making these prosecutions and directing the Attorney-General to proceed to prosecute all violators of the antitrust laws; and since that day all these prosecutions against the beef trust, the Standard Oil, and all other trusts have been carried on under that appropriation, offered by myself, supported by Democratic colleagues, and forced in the bill over the protests of a very reluctant Republican majority. And while this fund has been added to, it may be truly stated that the Democratic minority forced this amendment on this bill when I offered that amendment, which I will read:

For the purpose of enforcing the antitrust laws of the United States, and to enable the Attorney-General of the United States to prosecute suits and legal proceedings against persons or corporations who shall violate the antitrust laws of the United States now in force, or that may hereafter be enacted, the sum of \$250,000, or so much thereof as may, in the judgment of the Attorney-General be necessary, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney-General; and he is hereby directed to proceed against any and all persons or corporations who may have violated or may violate any of the provisions of the antitrust laws of the United States.

There was a point of order made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], then in charge of the bill, but at the suggestion of the present Speaker of the House, then Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the point of order was not insisted upon. It is true, in order to get some credit of carrying out the suggestion of the President, and that all the credit might not go to a Democrat, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] offered an amendment increasing the amount to \$500,000, which I promptly accepted, and in that shape it was passed and became the law. The amendment was put upon that bill on the 17th day of December, 1902, and the money that was furnished to the Department of Justice for all these prosecutions, \$500,000, was first inaugurated, first proposed, and first placed upon that bill in this House by myself, supported by the Democrats, as will appear by reference to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day.

In fact, for several years the Department of Justice had more money than was needed, and my first amendment of \$250,000 was ample for all the needs of the prosecutions at that time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what will be the result of this investigation. The New York Sun says:

The House leaders are inclined to blame the Administration for the position of the party in the lower branch of Congress. The House Republicans are facing angry publishers in nearly every district in the United States. They want the duty on wood pulp and print paper removed, and if it is not removed they threaten reprisals at the coming elections. The House would, therefore, like to go before the country as a more effective trust buster than the Department of Justice, just to get even with the Administration.

I do not know whether that is true or not. It is true, however, that the Department of Justice, even with all this money at its disposal, has not done anything to reveal and disclose or prosecute effectively this trust, which, it is charged, have in the past year increased the price of print paper nearly \$50,000,000 to the consumer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to say on this, except it is a resolution in the usual form, providing means to carry on this investigation, and we have been compelled to adopt this plan, because of the refusal of the majority to do anything else. This is the only relief we could afford the people from the oppressions of this trust. The members of that committee to which this resolution was referred, and the members of the minority on this side, as we were when we appropriated the \$500,000 in 1902 on the amendment I suggested at that time, are willing to-day to give all the money and all the means that are necessary in order to find out the truth and to prosecute, if necessary, and destroy, if possible, this iniquitous trust known as the paper trust, and all such trusts and combinations.

Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, I know no difference between a good trust and a bad trust. "Monopolies are odious" to the English-speaking people, as was stated by Lord Coke in his decision in the Card monopoly case in 6 Coke Reports. The feeling has come down to us from our English ancestors; every man who draws inspiration from the battles of our English-speaking ancestors for the rights of the people, and from the decisions of those great judges of the courts of England, feels "that monopolies, private monopolies, are odious" to the American people. A private monopoly is indefensible, and whether it be of "wood pulp or print paper" or of any other commodity, should be destroyed. Certainly it should not be protected by the tariff.

For one, I repeat I think that all trusts, whether the gigantic ones like the steel trust, the Standard Oil, the beef trust,

all monopolies which oppresses the people, or whether they be what the President and some of his followers have chosen to call a "good trust," or "innocent trusts," are bad trusts in my opinion. They differ only in the degree of harm they may do. None are good; they are all bad, and I would destroy them all; right now I would endeavor to destroy the paper trust by making wood pulp and print paper free of tariff duty. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CURRIER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution is one to authorize the select committee appointed under the recent resolution of the House to carry on its necessary work. Ordinarily such a resolution would pass in the House without debate and without a roll call; but I suppose it is the intention of my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], after causing the exhaustion of practically forty minutes of time in debate, to exhaust or waste thirty minutes more time in a roll call on this resolution. Our committee was in session this morning, engaged in hearing a very distinguished representative of the American Publishers' Association, but was compelled to adjourn because of the obstructive tactics of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Did the gentleman from Mississippi make the point of no quorum?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have never had occasion—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. I have never had occasion to seek work from the Speaker of the House or from the House itself. It has fallen to my lot to be appointed chairman of this special committee, and I think I can say, without unjust reflection, or any reflection upon the other Members of the House, that the other members of that committee are known to be as industrious and as fair-minded as any gentlemen who have ever sat upon the floor of this House. [Applause.] That committee, Mr. Speaker, was not appointed, as I understand it, for the purpose of prejudging the case. It was not appointed for the purpose of bringing in a report fixed in advance. It was appointed by this House under the resolution for the purpose of honestly and fairly ascertaining the facts, so far as they could be ascertained, and of making a fair and honest report to this House as speedily as can be done. It is the desire of the committee, if the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] will not insist that the members of the committee shall be constantly on the floor of this House, that the committee shall keep in session from now until it shall finish its labors. It is the hope of the committee and my own expectation that the committee will be able to make a report to this House before the final adjournment of this session of Congress. I do not know how much of our time may be uselessly wasted through the obstructive efforts of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. But I dare say that if we are not obstructed by the efforts of the gentleman from Mississippi we will be able to bring in a report, and I hope and believe that in spite of his efforts we will be able to bring in a report. Now I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman says his work was interrupted by the obstructive tactics of the gentleman from Mississippi to-day. How?

Mr. MANN. Oh, I do not propose to bandy words with my friend from New York, who is one of the keenest-minded men in this House and who is about the last man in the House I would endeavor to instruct upon that point, because he knows as well as I know that the present condition in the House is owing to the obstructive, the deliberately obstructive, tactics of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the gentleman from Illinois knows that the committee has no right to sit during the sessions of the House, and when the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] made the point of no quorum and there was a call of the House the gentleman was compelled to come here to help make a quorum.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me half a minute?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] knows, in the first place, so far as that is concerned, that this committee is authorized to sit during the sessions of the House. That nails the first proposition of the gentleman from New York. The resolution provides for that. Secondly, anybody in the House knows, and I think nearly everybody in the country who pays any attention to the matter—unless it be my friend from New York—knows that the point of no quorum was made because of the obstructive tactics of the gentleman from Mississippi. That is exactly what I am complaining about.

Everybody in this House knows that ordinarily business in this House is carried on, and has to be carried on, without the presence of a quorum; but because the demand for a call of the roll by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] precipitated a case where it would either take probably two hours' time, or under the point of no quorum half an hour's time, that point was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. That demand was made for the purpose of shortening the delay caused by the gentleman from Mississippi. Nobody knows that better than my friend from New York. Now, that is neither here nor there. What I want to say to the House is that notwithstanding the tactics of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] it is the intention of the special committee to give just as full and fair hearings to everybody as can be given. We shall do our duty as well as we know how, regardless of the attitude of the newspapers on the one side or the paper manufacturers on the other side. [Applause on the Republican side.] Feeling that the House has placed upon us a trust and that we must be bound to deal fairly and honestly with the House, the committee will endeavor to do that.

All of the reflections which the gentleman from Mississippi makes, purely partisan, purely prejudged, without regard to his knowledge of the facts, I leave to himself. If he has any information the committee will be glad to have him lay it before it. If the gentleman from Tennessee has any facts in his possession, if he knows anything except mere talk, the committee will be glad to hear from him. [Applause.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will tell the gentleman where he can find some information, and that is in the Federal court of Minnesota.

Mr. MANN. We will have the gentleman from Tennessee come before the committee and testify under oath where it can be found.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I can tell the gentleman that there is proof there and that an injunction was had upon it.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman from Tennessee can tell more things without being placed under oath than any man I know of.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will swear that your Attorney-General said that he filed the evidence there and got the injunction. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am ready to do it now.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Tennessee is always the same yesterday, to-day, and to-morrow; he never varies, and so I can not help yielding to him.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, the gentleman from Illinois called my name; he attacked me first. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I always notice, Mr. Speaker, that wherever a matter of partisanship comes up in the House and an assault is made, you can get plenty of applause on that side of the House. All that is needed on that side of the House to obtain applause is for somebody to attack some gentleman upon this side and apply to him an opprobrious epithet; but so far as that is concerned, it has no effect upon me.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman certainly does not mean to say that I have applied any opprobrious epithet to him?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; I did not say that.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Because I am wholly incapable of doing such a thing.

Mr. MANN. I admit everything the gentleman from Tennessee says for the sake of argument so that he will leave me alone. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Tennessee and I can never have any personal difficulty because we have such a high personal regard for each other.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to argue any further in this matter. It is for the House to determine. Gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have said that the committee was not appointed in good faith. Some newspapers have said that the committee was not appointed in good faith, but they are now before us in good faith, and we are endeavoring to deal in good faith with the House and with the country. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAINES of West Virginia). Debate is exhausted, and the question is on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution with the committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 263, nays 1, answered "present" 10, not voting 113, as follows:

YEAS—263.

Adair	Ames	Beale, Pa.	Boyd
Adamson	Andrus	Beall, Tex.	Brantley
Alken	Ansberry	Bell, Ga.	Broadhead
Alexander, Mo.	Ashbrook	Bennet, N. Y.	Brownlow
Alexander, N. Y.	Bartholdt	Bonyng	Burgess
Allen	Bartlett, Ga.	Bowers	Burleigh

Burnett	Foster, Ind.	Kennedy, Ohio	Pujo
Burton, Del.	Foulkrod	Kinkaid	Rainey
Burton, Ohio	Fowler	Kipp	Randell, Tex.
Butler	French	Knapp	Ransdell, Ia.
Byrd	Fuller	Knopf	Rauch
Calder	Fullon	Knowland	Reeder
Calderhead	Gaines, Tenn.	Küstermann	Reid
Campbell	Gardner, Mich.	Lanier, Mo.	Reynolds
Candler	Gardner, N. J.	Laning	Richardson
Capron	Garner	Lassiter	Robinson
Carlin	Gilhams	Leake	Rodenberg
Carter	Gill	Lee	Rothermel
Caulfield	Gillett	Lenahan	Russell, Mo.
Chaney	Godwin	Lever	Russell, Tex.
Chapman	Goebel	Lewis	Ryan
Clark, Fla.	Gordon	Lindbergh	Sabath
Clark, Mo.	Graff	Littlefield	Scott
Clayton	Granger	Lloyd	Shackleford
Cole	Gregg	Loud	Sheppard
Conner	Griggs	Loudenslager	Sherley
Cook, Colo.	Gronna	Lovering	Sherwood
Cooper, Pa.	Hackett	McKinney	Sims
Cooper, Tex.	Hackney	McLachlan, Cal.	Slemp
Cooper, Wis.	Hale	McLain	Small
Cousins	Hall	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Cal.
Cox, Ind.	Hamill	McMillan	Smith, Iowa
Cravens	Hamilton, Iowa	Macon	Smith, Mo.
Crawford	Hamilton, Mich.	Madden	Smith, Tex.
Crumpacker	Harding	Madison	Southwick
Currier	Hardy	Malby	Sparkman
Cushman	Haskins	Mann	Sperry
Dalzell	Haugen	Marshall	Spight
Davenport	Hawley	Maynard	Stafford
Davidson	Hayes	Miller	Steenerson
Davis, Minn.	Heflin	Mondell	Sterling
De Armond	Helm	Moon, Pa.	Sulloway
Denby	Henry, Conn.	Moon, Tenn.	Sulzer
Denver	Henry, Tex.	Moore, Tex.	Tawney
Diekema	Higgins	Morse	Taylor, Ala.
Dixon	Hinshaw	Mouser	Taylor, Ohio
Douglas	Hitchcock	Murdock	Thistlewood
Draper	Holliday	Murphy	Thomas, N. C.
Driscoll	Houston	Nedham	Tou Velle
Durey	Howell, N. J.	Nelson	Townsend
Dwight	Howell, Utah	Nicholls	Volstead
Ellerbe	Howland	Norris	Waldo
Ellis, Mo.	Hubbard, Iowa	Nye	Wanger
Englebright	Hubbard, W. Va.	O'Connell	Washburn
Esch	Huff	Olcott	Watkins
Fairchild	Hughes, N. J.	Overstreet	Watson
Favrot	Hull, Tenn.	Page	Webb
Ferris	Humphrey, Wash.	Parker, N. J.	Weeks
Finley	Johnson, Ky.	Parker, S. Dak.	Wheeler
Fitzgerald	Johnson, S. C.	Parsons	Williams
Flood	Jones, Va.	Patterson	Wilson, Ill.
Floyd	Jones, Wash.	Payne	Wilson, Pa.
Fordney	Kahn	Pollard	Wolf
Fornes	Keifer	Porter	Wood
Foster, Ill.	Kelher	Pray	Young
	Kennedy, Iowa	Prince	

NAYS—1.

Hammond

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 10.

Bradley	Hardwick	Humphreys, Miss.	Slayden
Gaines, W. Va.	Harrison	Kimball	
Garrett	Hay	Pou	

NOT VOTING—113.

Acheson	Edwards, Ga.	Lafean	Peters
Anthony	Edwards, Ky.	Lamar, Fla.	Powers
Bannon	Ellis, Oreg.	Lamb	Pratt
Barchfeld	Fassett	Landis	Rhinock
Barclay	Focht	Langley	Riordan
Bartlett, Nev.	Foss	Law	Roberts
Bates	Foster, Vt.	Lawrence	Rucker
Bede	Gardner, Mass.	Legare	Saunders
Bennett, Ky.	Gillespie	Lilley	Sherman
Bingham	Glass	Lindsay	Smith, Mich.
Birdsall	Goldfogle	Livingston	Snapp
Booher	Goulden	Longworth	Stanley
Boutell	Graham	Lorimer	Stephens, Tex.
Broussard	Greene	Lowden	Stevens, Minn.
Brumm	Haggott	McCall	Sturgiss
Brundidge	Hamlin	McCreaery	Talbot
Burke	Hepburn	McDermott	Thomas, Ohio
Burleson	Hill, Conn.	McGavin	Tirrell
Caldwell	Hill, Miss.	McGuire	Underwood
Cary	Hobson	McHenry	Underwood
Cockran	Howard	McKinlay, Cal.	Wallace
Cocks, N. Y.	Hughes, W. Va.	McKinley, Ill.	Weems
Cook, Pa.	Hull, Iowa	McMorran	Weisse
Coudrey	Jackson	Moore, Pa.	Wiley
Craig	James, Addison D.	Mudd	Willitt
Darragh	James, Ollie M.	Oldsted	Woodyard
Davey, La.	Jenkins	Padgett	
Dawes	Kitchin, Claude	Pearre	
Dunwell	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Perkins	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

For the day:

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. BOOHER.

Until further notice:

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. SAUNDERS.

Mr. MCGAVIN with Mr. LAMB.

Mr. MCCALL with Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. HAY.

Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. GILLESPIE.

Mr. LANDIS with Mr. BURLESON.

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

For the session:

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

TORNADO IN GEORGIA, ALABAMA, MISSISSIPPI, AND LOUISIANA.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following joint resolution be read and agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAINES of West Virginia). The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the following resolution be read and agreed to. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on the 25th day of April, 1908, there occurred in the States of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana a disastrous cyclone or tornado, causing the loss of hundreds of lives and the destruction of much property and rendering many persons homeless and temporarily without means of support: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to use such means as he has at hand, or that may be furnished to him, in the way of tents, provisions, and supplies to relieve the distress occasioned by such storm or cyclone, and that he take such steps as he may deem proper for the relief of such distress and need among the people who have suffered from the results of said storm or cyclone.

Resolved, That the Congress has heard with much regret and profound sorrow of the terrible loss of life and destruction of property attendant upon the disastrous storm or cyclone which visited the States of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana on the 25th day of April, 1908, and hereby extends its sympathy to the sufferers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. What is the request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request is that the resolution just read be agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, I have no objection to that; but I wanted to see what it was, so that there would not be any roll call on it.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. There will not be any roll call on this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the resolution is agreed to.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the following order, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That immediately on the adoption of this order the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 21260, the sundry civil appropriation bill, that general debate thereon be closed in eight hours, and that the first reading of the bill in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule a second is ordered. The gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to twenty minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi to twenty minutes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate the adoption of the rule and that we may proceed to the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill, I shall not occupy any of my time now. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that in the gentleman's time he would give some explanation of the bill. The bill is a long one, stretching over very many items, and I think it is due to the House that such new legislation as the bill may carry should at least be stated and explained to the House. I shall yield to the gentleman from New York, Mr. FITZGERALD, a member of the committee, five minutes, reserving the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I regret that this resolution was not referred to the Committee on Rules. If it had been, it would have been perfected so that the usual course adopted in the consideration of appropriation bills would have been followed. The universal practice has been to divide the time equally between the two sides of the House and to have it controlled by members of the committee. In the consideration of this bill it so happens that under the usual practice of the House the request would have been made that I should have control of the time on behalf of the minority. I regret that the chairman of the committee did not, in preparing the resolution, arrange to protect his rights and my rights under the usual practice of the House. I know that if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] had reported this resolution from the Committee on Rules, he would not have overlooked either the gentleman from Minnesota or myself. The adoption of this rule will be most embarrassing to me. Assuming that the usual practice would be followed, a number of gentlemen upon this side of the House have requested me to obtain time for them under general debate. In my innocence, assuming that the House would proceed in the orderly manner under its rules to

consider this great bill, I foolishly agreed to allot to several gentlemen the time requested by them. I find now that the chairman of the committee proposes the adoption of a rule which strips both from myself and himself the ordinary privilege accorded to Members who have charge of appropriation bills. For that reason those gentlemen upon this side whom I have assured would have time will have to understand that if I am unable to carry out the assurance given them it is not through any fault of mine, but because of the tyrannical manner in which the House is now being handled by the majority.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from New York permit an interruption?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say to the gentleman from New York that it is not the purpose of the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill to deny to the minority the right to control one-half of the time, and I intend to follow the adoption of the rule with a request that the usual division between the minority and the majority be allowed; and if the gentleman will consent, that division will be made; on the contrary, if the gentleman or any Member on his side objects to it, then the division of time will be with the Chair, as it has always been.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Of course, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt I shall assent to the request, but I can not make any promises for my colleague from New York [Mr. PAYNE] when unanimous consent is asked; and I doubt very seriously whether, in view of the statements that he has made during the past few weeks, he will consent that, by unanimous consent, any Member on this side of the House shall obtain privileges under the peculiar rules under which we are now operating. So I have again to express my regrets that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations after preparing this rule did not ask that it be sent in the usual way to the Committee on Rules, to be perfected in the ingenious rule hopper there, so our rights would be protected without having to depend upon the generosity of my colleague, the leader of the majority.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to remind my colleague also of the fact that if this bill had been taken up under the ordinary rules of the House, a request would have been made for a division of time, and the gentleman would have the same opportunity to make the request and submit himself to the mercy of his colleague from New York upon that question that he has now under this order of the House, so that he loses nothing because of this proposition of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I only want to console him before he yields—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Accepting the statement of my colleague in the spirit in which it is offered, it is nevertheless true that the gentleman from Minnesota evidently did not have the same confidence in the gentleman from New York that I have, because if he had, he would have asked, under the rules, that this bill be taken up in the ordinary way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield three or five minutes more, as the gentleman may desire.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to call attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this is the second time the Committee on Rules has been set aside within a week. I expect the next time that is done to see the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] sorrowfully and dejectedly march down the aisle, walk up the steps, address the Speaker, remove from his lapel the carnation which he wears with so much grace, and lay it there as they were accustomed to lay the heads of victims before the imperial Caesars in the past. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Of what use is it to occupy the distinguished position of senior member of the majority upon the Committee on Rules if he is to be passed over and all of these intruders, these outsiders, are given the little glory of moving to suspend the rules and adopt a special rule? Mr. Speaker, it should be called to the attention of the House that a number of these special rules have been adopted here without justification. A rule was adopted providing for the passage of appropriation bills under a suspension of the rules, not because of anything that had happened, but because of a nightmare with which some men of this House are afflicted. I happened to go to a playhouse the other night, and there a scene was enacted that depicted accurately the condition in which the Speaker finds himself. A gentleman having been caught in a very unpleasant situation pretends that he is asleep, and picking up a lighted candle he goes about reciting praises of his devoted wife. The Speaker here a short time ago imagined that he had been caught asleep. The minority did not demand separate votes upon amendments of the Senate to the deficiency bill, but the Speaker with his candle imagined that would

happen to some other bill, and ever since then he has been going around with a lighted candle in a dream; and unless the gentleman from Pennsylvania blows that candle out and wakes the Speaker up, this House is not able to tell what outrages will be perpetrated by the sleeping Speaker in his dreams. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that some time the candle will come sufficiently near me, and if it does I hope to be able to accumulate sufficient wind to blow it out, let the Speaker wake, and let the House do business in an orderly and proper manner. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not accumulate wind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, my friend from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has made the situation perfectly clear. The whole country understands it. The country understands the difference between "filibustering," which means taking up time to prevent legislation by a majority, and calling the roll for the purpose of focusing public attention upon legislation in order that a majority of the House may have an opportunity to consider legislation that it may wish to be enacted.

One of the gentlemen this morning for a while talked about being compelled to be here for fear there might be no quorum instead of sitting as member of a committee to "investigate" the paper trust. I have not made the point of no quorum. On the contrary, the Democratic side of this Chamber has furnished you with a quorum to do business, and it is likely to continue to furnish you with a quorum to do business. If this special committee desires to sit during the recess of the House and really to work, it will find plenty of time; and if the point of no quorum is made at all, it will probably be made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the leader of the majority. There have been several times when you had no quorum, and this side did not raise the point, because it wanted to emphasize the difference between obstruction and focusing public attention upon desired legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], instead of putting in his special order the programme that the time should be equally divided between the two sides, has chosen rather to put everything else in his order and to leave himself to ask unanimous consent that the time may be divided between the two sides. He has thought by that, doubtless, to "deposit me in a cavity," or to put me in a hole. The gentleman has not watched very clearly what has been going on on the floor of the House. I have thus far not objected to any request for debate. That is one of the arrows held in the quiver in reserve, that may or may not be used hereafter. I have not objected to any Member's desire to extend his time to speak upon the floor. I have objected to inserting things in the RECORD and to extending or printing in the RECORD what has not been said on the floor.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say, if the gentleman will permit me, it was because I knew of that fact that I knew the gentleman would not object to an equal division of the time between the two sides of the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. Now, if it were an ingenious scheme to have the appearance of putting this side in a light of seeming inconsistency because I would not object, the gentleman's scheme has failed, because I should be inconsistent if I did object. I am perfectly willing to have all the light that debate from that side of the House can shed upon any matter. In fact, I have been so anxious to have debate that I have invariably demanded a second upon every motion to suspend the rules in order that that side might furnish light, if it had any light to furnish. Sometimes I have found they had no light to furnish. This morning, for example, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] reserves his time and does not enlighten the House even as to so much of this bill as is a change of existing law. That much, at least, is due to the House before we go to a consideration of the bill. Especially is it due in a case like this where the first reading of the bill is dispensed with, so that Members can not learn what is in the bill by hearing and must send out and get the bill and learn its contents by reading it before it comes up—a rather difficult operation with gentlemen upon the floor who are constantly interrupted in every imaginable way.

Mr. Speaker, the great supply bills of the country have not been interfered with, will not be interfered with, and all attempts to lead the country to suppose that there has been or will be any effort of that sort is a part of a programme of idle pretense. The supply bills are further ahead right now than they ever have been in my recollection at this time of the year at the long session of Congress. And there will be a continuation of the policy of focusing public attention by demanding a roll call on every affirmative proposition and refusing unanimous consent, except in certain delicate matters, death, suffering, and public calamity, and so forth; and every time that

roll is called it will be understood—no fear of it—that it merely means that the minority upon the floor calls once more attention to the fact that that part of the President's message demanding remedial legislation, in so far as it is good, in the minority's opinion, and in the interest of the public, in their opinion, has not yet been permitted to be considered by the House. [Applause on Democratic side.] That is what it means, and there is no danger of its being misunderstood. It was misunderstood in the "way-back corners" just a little bit at the beginning. It is not being misunderstood now. And if any of you have any doubt about that read your morning's papers, Republican as well as Democratic. Read the Record-Herald, of Chicago. Read nearly every paper in New York, except the Tribune, and, of course, nobody expects much from the Tribune in the way of nonpartisan or impartial and just consideration of any question. The whole country understands the situation, and you of the Republican side are not going to be wise enough, you are not going to be subtle enough, you are not going to be acute enough, you are not going to be intelligent enough, to deceive the country one moment about the actual situation.

The country knows that this movement upon this side will stop the very minute the House is permitted to consider, not to enact (we do not care whether you pass a law or not, so far as our programme goes, though as good citizens we want the legislation), but the country knows that the minute you permit the majority of this House to express its opinion upon the passage of a campaign publicity bill, upon the passage of a bill to put wood pulp and print paper upon the free list, upon the passage of a bill to modify the use of injunctions so that they can not be used on an ex parte hearing before one judge and without notice to invalidate a solemn State law; upon the passage of a bill to conserve the rights of labor in connection with the injunction laws as now administered, affording some protection, giving at least notice to the defendant in the case; that the moment that you give the House the right to consider a bill denying to a judge of a Federal court the right upon the equity side of the court to send a man to jail, to deprive him of his liberty or to fine him or to deprive him of his property without recourse to a jury without notice and on ex parte hearing, in cases of mere constructive contempt, not direct contempt—the moment this House gets permission even to consider these propositions, that minute this movement will stop [applause on the Democratic side], and until that moment this movement will not stop. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Go right ahead; we are getting on with business.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, you need not believe that you are deceiving the country about what you are doing. It is not my movement, though inaugurated on my initiating; it is a movement made at the request of almost the unanimous voice on this side of the House. It is a Democratic movement; it is a minority attempt to exhaust what little power it has—which is not much, merely the power to rivet attention, merely the power to focus public attention and to arouse public opinion, with the view of securing consideration of each of these measures. Are they treasonable, are they wrong, are they anarchistic? Why, your own President has recommended every one of them. I know some things that are better to be done than any he has recommended. I know of some things that I would rather see passed; but I did not want to put you in the attitude or ourselves in the attitude of going outside of the things recommended by the head of your own party. Otherwise you might plausibly charge that we were trying to "run the House." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We follow him when he is right. We do not follow him when he is wrong. This side of the House belongs to nobody. We belong neither to the Speaker nor to the Committee on Rules on the one side nor the Committee on Ways and Means on the other, and we do not belong to the White House either. Whenever the White House is wrong, as we thought the White House was when it wanted to begin a great era of militarism with the time-worn fallacy of "national prestige," when it in that spirit wanted four battle ships, we cooperated with those who are conservative on your side, and nearly all on this side voted in the negative, not as a party, because the party whip was not drawn nor the party lash inflicted upon anybody. A majority of us, each voting upon his individual conscience and conviction, voted for a conservative naval increase.

Now, then, what sort of an attitude do you stand in? You tell the country that I am responsible, that the minority is responsible, for your not getting unanimous consent for legislation and having to have roll calls for legislation. The truth is that everybody knows—the President knows, the newspapers know, and you know—that all we on this side want is a chance



for the House to consider these measures. [Applause on the Democratic side.] All we want is an opportunity for a majority of this House—constituted by those on that side and those on this side—to express its opinion upon these several questions by a vote. That is all. Take the responsibility for defeating them if you will or if you dare, but at least step up to the line like men and vote and let us vote. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the adoption of the order.

The question was taken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in order to show my desire to expedite public business, I desire the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 136, nays 97, answered "present" 12, not voting 142, as follows:

YEAS—136.

Acheson	Durey	Huff	Nye
Adair	Dwight	Humphrey, Wash.	Olcott
Allen	Ellerbe	Jones, Wash.	Overstreet
Ames	Ellis, Mo.	Kahn	Parker, S. Dak.
Andrus	Ellis, Oreg.	Kelfer	Parsons
Beale, Pa.	Englebright	Kennedy, Iowa	Payne
Bennet, N. Y.	Esch	Kennedy, Ohio	Perkins
Birdsall	Fairchild	Kinkaid	Pollard
Bonyage	Fitzgerald	Knapp	Porter
Boyd	Foster, Ind.	Knopf	Pray
Brownlow	Foulkrod	Knowland	Reynolds
Burleigh	Fowler	Küstermann	Rudenberg
Burton, Del.	French	Laning	Slomp
Butler	Fuller	Lee	Smith, Cal.
Calder	Gardner, N. J.	Lindbergh	Smith, Iowa
Calderhead	Gilhams	Littlefield	Snapp
Campbell	Goebel	Loud	Southwick
Capron	Graff	Loudenslager	Sperry
Caulfield	Greene	Loving	Stafford
Chaney	Gronna	McGavin	Sterling
Chapman	Hale	McKinney	Sulloway
Cole	Hamilton, Mich.	McLachlan, Cal.	Tawney
Conner	Harding	Madden	Thistlewood
Cooper, Pa.	Haskins	Malby	Tirrell
Cooper, Wis.	Hawley	Mann	Townsend
Cousins	Hayes	Marshall	Volstead
Crumpacker	Higgins	Miller	Waldo
Currier	Hinsbaw	Mondell	Wanger
Cushman	Holliday	Moore, Pa.	Watson
Dalzell	Howell, N. J.	Morse	Weeks
Darragh	Howell, Utah	Mouser	Wheeler
Dawson	Howland	Needham	Wilson, Ill.
Douglas	Hubbard, Iowa	Nelson	Wood
Draper	Hubbard, W. Va.	Norris	Young

NAYS—97.

Adamson	Ferris	Johnson, S. C.	Russell, Mo.
Aiken	Finley	Jones, Va.	Russell, Tex.
Alexander, Mo.	Floyd	Kellher	Ryan
Ansberry	Fornes	Kipp	Saunders
Ashbrook	Foster, Ill.	Lamar, Mo.	Shackleford
Bartlett, Ga.	Garner	Lamb	Sherley
Beall, Tex.	Gill	Lassiter	Shirwood
Bell, Ga.	Gillespie	Lenahan	Sims
Bowers	Godwin	Lever	Small
Brodhead	Granger	Lloyd	Smith, Mo.
Burgess	Gregg	Macon	Smith, Tex.
Burleson	Griggs	Maynard	Sparkman
Burnett	Hackney	Moon, Tenn.	Stephens, Tex.
Candler	Hamill	Moore, Tex.	Sulzer
Clark, Mo.	Hamilton, Iowa	Murphy	Taylor, Ala.
Clayton	Hammond	Nicholls	Thomas, N. C.
Cooper, Tex.	Hardy	O'Connell	Tou Velle
Cox, Ind.	Hay	Page	Watkins
Cravens	Hefflin	Rainey	Webb
Crawford	Helm	Randell, Tex.	Williams
Davenport	Henry, Tex.	Ransdell, La.	Willson, Pa.
De Armond	Hitchcock	Rauch	Wolf
Denver	Houston	Richardson	
Dixon	Hughes, N. J.	Robinson	
Favrot	Johnson, Ky.	Rothermel	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—12.

Bradley	Hamlin	Humphreys, Miss.	Pou
Gaines, W. Va.	Hardwick	Jenkins	Slayden
Garrett	Harrison	Kimball	Talbot

NOT VOTING—142.

Alexander, N. Y.	Clark, Fla.	Gaines, Tenn.	James, Olle M.
Anthony	Cockran	Gardner, Mass.	Kitchin, Claude
Bannon	Cocks, N. Y.	Gardner, Mich.	Kitchin, Wm. W.
Barchfeld	Cook, Colo.	Gillett	Lafean
Barclay	Cook, Pa.	Glass	Lamar, Fla.
Bartholdt	Coudrey	Goldfogle	Landis
Bartlett, Nev.	Craig	Gordon	Langley
Bates	Davey, La.	Goulden	Law
Bede	Davidson	Graham	Lawrence
Bennett, Ky.	Davis, Minn.	Hackett	Leake
Bingham	Dawes	Haggott	Legare
Booher	Denby	Hall	Lewis
Boutell	Diekema	Haugen	Lilley
Brantley	Driscoll	Henry, Conn.	Lindsay
Broussard	Dunwell	Hepburn	Livingston
Brumm	Edwards, Ga.	Hill, Conn.	Longworth
Brundidge	Edwards, Ky.	Hill, Miss.	Lorimer
Burke	Fassett	Hobson	Lowden
Burton, Ohio	Flood	Howard	McCall
Byrd	Focht	Hughes, W. Va.	McCreary
Caldwell	Fordney	Hull, Iowa	McDermott
Carlin	Foss	Hull, Tenn.	McGuire
Carter	Foster, Vt.	Jackson	McHenry
Cary	Fulton	James, Addison D.	McKinlay, Cal.

McKinley, Ill.	Patterson	Rucker	Thomas, Ohio
McLain	Pearre	Sabath	Underwood
McLaughlin, Mich.	Peters	Scott	Vreeland
McMillan	Powers	Sheppard	Wallace
McMorran	Pratt	Sherman	Washburn
Madison	Prince	Smith, Mich.	Weems
Moon, Pa.	Pujo	Spight	Weisse
Mudd	Reeder	Stanley	Willey
Murdock	Reid	Steenerson	Willett
Olmsted	Rhinock	Stevens, Minn.	Woodyard
Padgett	Riordan	Sturgiss	
Parker, N. J.	Roberts	Taylor, Ohio	

So the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

- Mr. ALEXANDER of New York with Mr. BRANTLEY.
- Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.
- Mr. PRAY with Mr. BYRD.
- Mr. BURTON of Ohio with Mr. CARTER.
- Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.
- Mr. HENRY of Connecticut with Mr. McLAIN.
- Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. HACKETT.
- Mr. LANDIS with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.
- Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. LEWIS.
- Mr. LILLEY with Mr. McDERMOTT.
- Mr. McMILLAN with Mr. PATTERSON.
- Mr. McMORRAN with Mr. PUJO.
- Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. REID.
- Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio with Mr. RHINOCK.
- Mr. THOMAS of Ohio with Mr. SHEPPARD.
- Mr. WASHBURN with Mr. SABATH.
- Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. SPIGHT.
- Mr. LAW with Mr. ELLERBE.

For the remainder of this day:

Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. FULTON.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, pending the announcement, I ask that the time for general debate be equally divided between the two sides of the House, and that the gentleman from New York, my colleague on the committee [Mr. FITZGERALD], may control one half of the time and that I myself may control the other half.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided between the two sides, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with the order just adopted the House will resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21260) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] will please take the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SHERMAN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 12773. An act granting to the city of Woodward, in the State of Oklahoma, lot 2, in block 48, for park and other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 40. An act to correct the military record of Mirrick R. Burgess;

S. 643. An act for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. Patrick Edward Connor;

S. 890. An act for the relief of William Boldenweck, assistant treasurer of the United States at Chicago;

S. 2734. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Milledgeville, Ga.;

S. 4134. An act to correct the military record of Thomas Smith;

S. 4242. An act 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;

S. 4451. An act to amend record and grant honorable discharge to Joseph S. Oakley;

S. 5883. An act to correct the military record of John Oates; and

S. 6033. An act to provide for the resurvey of certain townships in Colorado.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 19541. An act to authorize the drainage of certain lands in the State of Minnesota.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 40. An act to correct the military record of Mirrick R. Burgess—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 6033. An act to provide for the resurvey of certain townships in Colorado—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 5883. An act to correct the military record of John Oates—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 4451. An act to amend record and grant honorable discharge to Joseph S. Oakley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 4242. An act 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—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 4134. An act to correct the military record of Thomas Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2734. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Milledgeville, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 643. An act for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. Patrick Edward Connor—to the Committee on the Library.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 15219. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909; and

H. R. 15852. An act to confer title in fee and to authorize the disposition of certain lots now situate on Hot Springs Reservation, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, in presenting to the House the sundry civil appropriation bill, the last bill the Committee on Appropriations is charged with the duty of preparing and reporting which carries appropriations for expenditures during the fiscal year 1909, I desire to refer briefly to what I said early in this session regarding the necessity of the committees of the House having appropriating jurisdiction revising the estimates sent to Congress at the beginning of this session. At that time I called attention to the aggregate estimated expenditures for the next fiscal year and the estimated revenues. A comparison of these estimates showed that the expenditures estimated for exceeded the estimated revenues by \$118,000,000, and that the estimated revenues exceeded the revenues of the last fiscal year in the neighborhood of \$32,000,000.

While addressing the House upon this subject at that time the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] asked whether I thought these estimated expenditures could be materially reduced without injury to the public service. In reply I stated that, in my judgment, they could be reduced at least to the extent of \$100,000,000 without retarding the progress of any public work heretofore authorized and without detriment to the public service. Now, that all the bills carrying appropriations for expenditures during the next fiscal year have been reported to the House, except the Military Academy appropriation bill, which will carry less than \$1,000,000, and all of them have passed the House with the exception of the sundry civil bill, now under consideration, I am able to show to the House and to the country the exact amount by which the estimated expenditures for the next fiscal year have been reduced as a result of the practical revision of the estimates which was recommended at the beginning of this session.

The Committee on Appropriations had submitted to it estimates for appropriations amounting to \$379,609,504.64. This includes the regular annual estimates and the supplemental estimates submitted during the session. The five regular annual appropriation bills reported to the House from the Committee on Appropriations carry appropriation aggregating \$306,693,002.83, being a net reduction in the estimates as submitted by the Departments under the District of Columbia, fortifications,

legislative, executive, and judicial, the pension, and the sundry civil appropriation bills of \$72,916,501.81, and I will submit and print in the RECORD the detailed statement of the estimates and reductions in each of the foregoing bills.

Upon comparing all the estimates with the amounts carried in all the appropriation bills reported from the several committees having appropriating jurisdiction we find that there has been a total reduction by the House of the regular estimates, not including the supplemental, of \$99,948,098.37. Sixty-six million two hundred and eighty-five thousand three hundred and sixty-eight dollars and eighty-one cents of this reduction was made by the Committee on Appropriations, and \$33,662,729.56 of this total reduction of practically \$100,000,000 was made by the other committees of the House having jurisdiction of appropriations. This, as I have said before, does not include the supplemental estimates. Including these, the aggregate reductions in all the estimates equals in round numbers more than \$110,000,000.

The following is the statement of the estimates for expenditures under the five regular annual appropriation bills of which the Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction, the amounts reported to the House in each bill, and the amount of reduction of the estimates:

	Estimates.	Reported.	Reduction.
District of Columbia.....	\$13,798,126.35	\$9,561,449.35	\$4,236,677.00
Fortification.....	38,443,945.30	8,210,611.00	30,233,334.30
Legislative.....	35,040,066.13	32,336,573.00	2,703,493.13
Pension.....	151,043,000.00	150,869,000.00	174,000.00
Sundry civil:			
Regular estimates.....	\$134,618,623.80		
Supplemental estimates.....	6,665,743.00		
	141,284,366.80	105,715,369.48	35,568,997.32
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>379,609,504.64</b>	<b>306,693,002.83</b>	<b>72,916,501.81</b>

For the information of the House I desire also to insert in the RECORD here a statement of the appropriation bills as passed by the House compared with the regular estimates as submitted to Congress:

Appropriation bills as passed by the House compared with regular estimates as submitted to Congress.

[From Committee on Appropriations.]

	Estimates.	As passed by the House.
District of Columbia.....	\$13,798,126.35	\$9,560,499.35
Fortification.....	38,443,945.30	8,210,611.00
Legislative.....	35,040,066.13	32,332,913.00
Pension.....	151,043,000.00	150,869,000.00
Sundry civil.....	134,618,623.80	105,715,369.48
	\$72,913,761.64	306,668,332.83
Reduction of regular estimates under control of Committee on Appropriations.....		66,285,368.81
Agriculture.....	10,666,351.00	11,508,806.00
Army.....	89,755,833.75	84,207,566.50
Diplomatic and consular.....	3,900,320.91	3,513,483.91
Indian.....	8,219,272.87	8,179,097.87
Military Academy.....	977,087.87	977,087.87
Navy.....	125,791,349.80	105,405,768.43
Post-Office.....	230,441,016.00	222,356,692.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>469,811,232.20</b>	<b>436,148,502.64</b>
Reduction of regular estimates under control of other committees.....		33,662,729.56

Total reduction in regular estimates in bills controlled by the Committee on Appropriations..... \$66,285,368.81  
 Total reduction in regular estimates in bills controlled by other committees..... 33,662,729.56

Grand total..... 99,948,098.37

In the foregoing statement the figures of the sundry civil bill are those of the report to the House, and the sums for the Military Academy bill are those as submitted in the estimates, the bill not yet being reported.

In respect to the amount carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill I desire to say that the regular estimates for the sundry civil expenditures were \$134,618,623.80. These were increased by supplemental estimates aggregating \$6,665,743, making the total estimates \$141,284,366.80. The amount carried in this bill as recommended to the House by the committee is \$105,715,369.48, being a reduction of \$35,568,997.32.

The title of all the appropriation bills, except the one now under consideration, conveys a very accurate idea of the scope

of the public service provided for by the appropriations carried in each bill. But the title to the sundry civil appropriation bill does not give any adequate idea of the scope of its provisions or the importance of the various public works and branches of the public service included under its title.

It carries the appropriations for all of our insular possessions, including Samoa, the Philippine Islands, Hawaii, Alaska, and Porto Rico. It would be impossible for any man to give an adequate explanation of the provisions of the bill in the time that is usually occupied in presenting other appropriation bills, and for personal and other obvious reasons I shall not attempt to do so at this time. I will say, as I said a year ago in presenting this bill to the House, that in view of the diversity of objects for which appropriations are recommended, and in view of the fact that it is a bill in which almost every Member of the House has some direct interest, there will be no disposition on my part to restrict debate under the five-minute rule when provisions of that character are reached in the reading of the bill.

The general provisions of the bill may be divided into two parts, namely, appropriations for public works, and second, for administrative purposes. The principal items under the head of public works are appropriations for the continuation of work on public buildings and rivers and harbors. Your Committee on Appropriations has allowed all the recommendations submitted by the Supervising Architect of the Treasury and by the engineers of the War Department as to the amount needed and which can be expended on public buildings and river and harbor improvements heretofore authorized. We have accepted their estimates without change, and the bill provides for all the money that, in the judgment of these two Departments, can be expended until the next appropriation bill becomes available for these purposes.

Appropriations for public works made under previous authorization and limit of cost become available when made. With the unexpended balances that will remain July 1 next and the amounts recommended in this bill there will be ample funds for all public work heretofore authorized until the next appropriations become available, which will be not later than the 4th of March next.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of provisions recommended in this bill which are legislative provisions and are therefore obnoxious to the rules of the House. But I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact—and I trust that the members of the committee will carefully examine these various provisions—that all these provisions are necessary limitations upon the administration and expenditure of appropriations made for the public service. They are not only deemed necessary but under the circumstances the necessity for their enactment would not come to the attention of any other committee. All of them originate with the committee and not with the Departments. If agreed to by the House they will safeguard public expenditures and prevent abuses in public administration.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes his seat, can he tell the committee how much the reduction has been due to the elimination of that part of the estimates which contemplates expenditures between the 4th of March and the 1st of July next?

Mr. TAWNEY. I can not. There are only two items, however, that come under that head. One is in respect to the public buildings, which I think is about \$2,000,000, if I am not mistaken, and the other is the river and harbor appropriation, and the amount carried in this bill for river and harbor appropriation is \$11,000,000, as I recall it, in excess of the current river and harbor appropriations or the appropriation for the continuation of river and harbor work. Those are the only two items that I recall that come under the head referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Now, Mr. Chairman, unless some Member desires an explanation of some particular provision of the bill, I will defer all further explanation until the various items are read under the five-minute rule.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON].

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, not having had the opportunity at any other time, I avail myself of the courtesy just now extended to me to make some remarks on a subject that I believe to be of interest to the membership of this House and to the thoughtful people of the country. Inasmuch as this is a Presidential year, as it is usually termed, inquiries as to the qualifications of Presidential electors have been made of some of the Members here, and editorials voicing the desire for information on the same subject have appeared from time to time in some of the leading papers of the country. These inquiries and editorials have been directed to obtaining an answer to the proposition of what qualifies a man for and what disqualifies a man from being a Presidential elector.

There has never been very much said or written on this subject, and that is true because, naturally, the rivalry and jealousy existing between the great political parties has forced the leaders of the respective sides to insist in any case of doubt of the qualification of a proposed candidate for elector that he stand aside and let some one else be voted for about whose eligibility there could be no dispute.

I received recently from one of the leading citizens of Alabama, prominent at the bar and in the politics of that Commonwealth, Hon. H. S. D. Mallory, this inquiry:

Ascertain accurately and inform me of the qualifications of Presidential electors and what disqualifies.

I have, Mr. Chairman, made careful examination, and I beg leave to submit the result of that examination to the membership of this House, to the lawyers here, and I know from personal conversation with more than a few of them that they have had the same question propounded to them by some of their constituents.

#### MODE OF SELECTION.

The selection, qualifications, and duties of Presidential electors are regulated in part by Federal and in part by State constitutions and laws.

#### THE PROVISIONS OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

And statutes bearing thereon are as follows:

2. Each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.

3. The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors and the day in which they shall give their votes, which shall be the same throughout the United States. (U. S. Constitution, Art. II, sec. 1.)

#### THE FEDERAL LAWS

Bearing upon the matter of electors are to be found in sections 131 to 151, inclusive, of the United States Revised Statutes, of which it is necessary to cite only:

SEC. 131. Revised Statutes. Except \* \* \* the electors of President and Vice-President shall be appointed, in each State, on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in every fourth year succeeding every election of a President and Vice-President. (Act March 1, 1792, c. 8, sec. 1, Stat., 293; act January 23, 1845, c. 1, 5 Stat., 721.)

SEC. 132. R. S. The number of electors shall be equal to the number of Senators and Representatives to which the several States are by law entitled at the time when the President and Vice-President are to be chosen come into office, except that where no apportionment of Representatives has been made after any enumeration, at the time of choosing electors the number of electors shall be according to the then existing apportionment of Senators and Representatives. (Act Mar. 1, 1792, ch. 8, sec. 1, 1 Stat., 239.)

SEC. 133. R. S. Each State may, by law, provide for the filling of any vacancies which may occur in its college of electors when such college meets to give its electoral vote. (Act Jan. 23, 1845, ch. 1, 5 Stat., 721.)

SEC. 134. R. S. Whenever any State has held an election for the purpose of choosing electors, and has failed to make a choice on the day prescribed by law, the electors may be appointed on a subsequent day in such manner as the legislature of such State may direct. (Act Jan. 23, 1845, ch. 1, 5 Stat., 721.)

Section 135, Revised Statutes, superseded by—  
*Be it enacted, etc.* That the electors of each State shall meet and give their votes on the second Monday in January next following their appointment, at such place in each State as the legislature of such State shall direct. (Act Feb. 3, 1887, ch. 90, sec. 1, 24 Stat., 373.)

SEC. 2. That if any State shall have provided by laws enacted prior to the day fixed for the appointment of the electors, for its final determination of any controversy of contest concerning the appointment of all or any of the electors of such State, by judicial or other methods or procedures, and such determination shall have been made at least six days before the time fixed for the meeting of the electors, such determination made pursuant to such law so existing on said day, and made at least six days prior to the said time of meeting of the electors, shall be conclusive, and shall govern in the counting of the electoral votes as provided in the Constitution, and as hereinafter regulated, so far as the ascertainment of the electors appointed by such State is concerned. (Act Feb. 3, 1887, ch. 90, sec. 2, 24 Stat., 373.)

Now, I turn from the Federal provisions on this subject to the State provisions, for, as I said in the beginning, this matter is controlled in part by the Federal Constitution and laws, and in part, in every case, by the State constitution and statutes of the particular State where the elector is chosen. What I shall say generally of the laws of Alabama, both organic and statutory, are but illustrative of what could be said in a given case of the qualifications and disqualifications of an elector that might arise in the case of an elector chosen or appointed by any other State.

The Alabama State provisions are as follows:

ARTICLE XVII. Constitution of Alabama, 1901:

"SEC. 280. No person holding an office of profit under the United States, except postmasters whose annual salary does not exceed \$200, shall, during his continuance in such office, hold any office of profit under this State; nor unless otherwise provided in this constitution, shall any person hold two offices of profit at one and the same time under this State, except justices of the peace, constables, notaries public, and commissioners of deeds."

"SEC. 282. It is made the duty of the general assembly to enact all laws necessary to give effect to the provisions of this constitution."

ARTICLE VIII. Constitution of Alabama, 1901:  
 "SEC. 183. No person shall be qualified to vote or participate in any primary election, [a] party convention, mass meeting, or other method of party action of any political party or faction who shall not possess the qualifications prescribed in this article for an elector or who shall be disqualified from voting under the provisions of this article."

ARTICLE V. Constitution of Alabama, 1901:  
 "SEC. 132. No person shall be eligible to the office of attorney-general, State auditor, secretary of state, State treasurer, superintendent of education, or commissioner of agriculture and industries unless he shall have been a citizen of the United States at least seven years and shall have resided in this State at least five years preceding his election and shall be at least 25 years old when elected."

ARTICLE VI. Constitution of Alabama, 1901:  
 "SEC. 154. Chancellors and judges of all courts of record shall have been citizens of the United States and of this State five years next preceding their election or appointment and shall be not less than 25 years of age and, except judges of probate courts, shall be learned in the law."

ARTICLE IV. Constitution of Alabama, 1901:  
 "SEC. 47. [State] Senators shall be at least 25 years of age and representatives 21 years of age at the time of their election. They shall have been citizens and residents of this State for three years and residents of their respective counties or districts for one year next before their election if such county or district shall have been so long established, but if not, then of the county or district from which the same shall have been taken, and they shall reside in their respective counties or districts during their term of office."

#### THE STATE LAW.

Chapter 33, Art. II, Code of Alabama, 1907:  
 "SEC. 1467. (3056), (241), (149), (144), (105)." Persons ineligible to office.

The persons who are ineligible to and disqualified for holding office under the authority of this State are:

"1. Those who are not qualified electors, except as otherwise expressly provided.

"2. Those who have not been inhabitants of the State, etc., the period required by the constitution and laws of the State.

"3. Those who shall have been convicted of treason, embezzlement of public funds, malfeasance in office, larceny, bribery, or any other crime punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary and those who are idiots or insane.

"4. Those who have given, accepted, or knowingly carried a challenge.

"5. Those against whom there is a judgment unpaid for any money received by them in any official capacity, due to the United States, the State of Alabama, or any county or municipality thereof.

"6. Soldiers, seamen, or mariners in the Regular Army or Navy of the United States.

"7. No person holding an office of profit under the United States shall, during his continuance in such office, hold any office of profit under this State; nor shall any person hold two offices of profit at one and the same time under this State, except notaries public."

It will be noted that under the constitution justices of the peace, constables, and commissioners of deeds also are excepted, but by the above paragraph of section 1467 they are made ineligible to hold any other office.

SEC. 1468. (3057), (244), (152), (147), (108). Code of Alabama, 1907:

"All officers must reside in this State."

ART. IV, SEC. 331. (1573), (338), (243). Code of Alabama, 1907:

"The following officers in the State shall be elected by the qualified electors thereof \* \* \* electors for President and Vice-President of the United States. (Mar. 6, 1876, p. 103.)"

SEC. 332. (1574), (339), (244). Code of Alabama, 1907:

"General Election.—General elections throughout this State shall be held for \* \* \* electors for President and Vice-President of the United States. (Mar. 6, 1876, p. 103.)"

SEC. 338. (1579), (343), (248). Code of Alabama, 1907:

"Electors for President and Vice-President of the United States shall be elected on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, 1902, and every fourth year thereafter. (Mar. 6, 1876, p. 103.)"

ART. XX, SEC. 446. (1653), (435), (342), (388), (339). Code of Alabama, 1907:

"On the day prescribed by this Code there are to be elected, by a general ticket, a number of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States equal to the number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the State is entitled at the time of such election. (Mar. 3, 1875, p. 76.)"

SEC. 450. (1657), (439), (346), (394), (345). Code of Alabama, 1907:

"The electors of President and Vice-President are to assemble at the office of the secretary of state at the seat of government at 12 o'clock noon on the second Monday in January next after their election, or on that hour on such other day as may be fixed by Congress, to elect such President and Vice-President; and those of them present at that hour must at once proceed by ballot and plurality of votes to supply the places of those who fail to attend on that day and hour. (March 3, 1875, p. 76.)"

SEC. 451. (1658), (440), (347). Code of Alabama, 1907:

"Each elector for President and Vice-President shall receive \$8 for each day he necessarily attends at the seat of government, and 20 cents for every mile traveled to and from the same, to be estimated in the same manner as is provided by law in relation to members of the general assembly from his county, to be paid on oath of each elector, by warrant on the State treasurer. (March 6, 1876, p. 103.)"

#### ELECTOR IS STATE OFFICER.

It is clear, therefore, from the foregoing, that the Presidential elector is an officer of the State, holding an office of profit, and that the determination of the State, in the manner provided by law (act of Congress, February 3, 1887, 24 Stat., 373), of any controversy or contest concerning the appointment of any or all of the electors of such State is conclusive.

This view is confirmed by the decisions of Federal and State courts in which the question has arisen.

The office of Presidential elector is a State and not a Federal office. (In re Green, 134 U. S., 377, 379; McPherson v. Blacker, 146 U. S., 1, 35.)

With the exceptions of the provisions as to the number of electors and the ineligibility of certain persons, which provisions are so framed that Congressional and Federal influence might be excluded, the appointment of electors belongs exclusively to the States, under the Constitution of the United States. (McPherson v. Blacker, 146 U. S., 1, and bottom of page 35.)

Mr. HARDWICK. Before the gentleman leaves that point, will it disturb the gentleman if I ask him a question?

Mr. CLAYTON. Not at all.

Mr. HARDWICK. In the decision to which the gentleman has just referred—

Mr. CLAYTON. I have it here on my desk—

Mr. HARDWICK. Is not it true that Congress would have no power whatever to direct the manner in which Presidential electors should be selected in the several States except as to the time of choosing them and that the time of choosing them should be uniform?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; I think the gentleman is entirely correct, but no person declared ineligible by the provisions of Federal law that I have just referred to can be a Presidential elector.

#### PERSONS DISQUALIFIED.

The Federal exceptions are Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, Article II, Constitution of the United States.

The State laws exclude every person holding an office of profit under the United States, except postmasters receiving less than \$200 per annum compensation, who are ineligible under the Federal Constitution, and every person holding any other office of profit at the same time under the State, except notaries public.

ART. XVII. Constitution of Alabama, 1901.

SEC. 1467. Page 7, Code of Alabama, 1907.

In addition to the above all the persons disqualified by section 1467, Code of Alabama, 1907 (1-6), are made ineligible to any office.

And the following under Article IV, constitution of Alabama, 1901:

SEC. 60. No person convicted of embezzlement of the public money, bribery, perjury, or other infamous crime, shall be eligible to the legislature or capable of holding any office of trust or profit in this State.

#### WHO ARE OFFICERS.

The only question open for discussion is what is an office and who are officers in the meaning of the Federal and State constitutions and laws governing such election.

A United States Senator or Representative in Congress is not an officer of the United States, therefore is provided for *eo nomine* in the Federal constitutional and statutory exclusions.

Federal officers are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, by the courts of law and the heads of Departments where Congress has, by law, vested the appointment of such inferior officers.

Article II, Section 2 (2) U. S. Constitution.

As examples, it has been held that an officer of a national bank is not an officer of the United States. He is elected by his fellow-stockholders, and his duties are not public. He is not a part of the Government, albeit executing certain functions under his authority. (Branch v. United States, 12 C. Cls., 286, affirmed in 100 U. S., 673.)

On the other hand, the receiver of a national bank has been held to be such officer, because appointed by the Treasury Department. (In re Chetwood, 165 U. S., 443.)

A member of a board of examining surgeons appointed by the Commissioner of Pensions (not the Department) is not an officer. (United States v. Van Leuven, 62 Fed. Rep., 62.)

Curiously enough, it may be remarked that a sailmaker at a navy-yard, appointed by a warrant under the hand of the Secretary of the Navy and seal of the Department, is an officer of the United States. (Sanford v. Boyd, 2 Cranch, C. C., 671.)

A United States commissioner is an officer duly appointed by the United States circuit court, under authority of the Constitution, therefore undoubtedly disqualified, although it has been held that a State justice of the peace, while authorized to arrest and commit persons violating the Federal laws, does not thereby become an officer of the United States (Ex parte Gist, 26 Ala., 156), and such justice of the peace is especially excepted by the State constitution, but disqualified by the code of 1907.

A notary public is not such officer and therefore not disqualified under the State constitution. (Kirksey v. Bates, 7 Porter, 529; Governor v. Gordon, 15 Ala., 72.)

The enrolling clerk of the legislature is only an employee, and not an officer; neither is an attorney.

A special deputy employed and authorized by the sheriff to execute a particular process is an officer of the State within the generic meaning of the term and of the statute against resisting

an officer in the discharge of his duty. (*Andrews v. State*, 78 Ala., 483; *Pentecost v. State*, 107 Ala., 91.)

Mayors of cities and incorporated towns have ex officio powers of justice of the peace, and usually hold the police courts; therefore doubtless ineligible on account thereof.

It has been held that the following are officers within the meaning of the Constitution and laws:

A police judge, in *Montgomery v. State* (107 Ala., 372).

A State printer, in *Ex parte Screws* (49 Ala., 64).

County solicitor, in *Diggs v. State* (49 Ala., 326).

It has been held that administrators, general or special, are not such officers, in *Michell v. Nelson* (49 Ala., 90).

These exceptions are so plain and explicit as to need no elaboration.

The definition of office and officer are many in number, but uniform in character. They will be found collected at pages 4920-4923, Volume VI, Words and Phrases Judicially Defined, and their general tenor is as follows:

(1) A right to exercise a public function or employment and to take the fee belonging to it. *Olmstead v. City of New York* (42 N. Y., Sup. Ct. (10 Jones & S.), 481, 487).

Quoting 7 Bac. Abr. (Ed. 1879), p. 279. (Office.)

(2) An office consists in a right, and correspondent duty, to exercise a public trust, and to take the emolument belonging to it. (Kent citing *Blair v. Marye*, 80 Va., 485, and numerous cases.)

(3) It is a right to exercise a public or private employment and to take the fees and emoluments in which one has a property and to which there are annexed duties, and oaths to support the constitutions of the State and United States. *Worthy v. Barrett* (63 N. C., 199).

#### ALL STATE AND FEDERAL OFFICEHOLDERS INELIGIBLE.

Every person holding any office of trust or profit under the United States, or of profit under the State, except notaries public, is specifically excluded from serving as Presidential elector. Under the general provision that inhibits any person from holding two offices of profit at one and the same time in Alabama, every other officeholder is made ineligible for elector.

A notary public who is at the same time an ex officio justice of the peace probably would be held to be disqualified also.

In addition to officeholders of every description under the State and the United States, all the persons mentioned in section 60 of the constitution of 1901 and section 1467 of the code of 1907 are disqualified. These embrace all persons not entitled to vote, who have been convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude, who have been concerned in challenges to fight, and against whom is an unpaid judgment for public moneys.

#### ELECTOR'S QUALIFICATIONS.

For all executive, legislative, and judicial officers in Alabama, the constitution or code seems to require certain age, residence, etc., qualifications, but for the office of Presidential elector I find no regulation other than that the elector shall be duly qualified to vote at general elections in the State, shall not be within any of the inhibited classes under either Federal or State constitution or laws herein-above mentioned, and shall not have been convicted of certain classes of crimes named, owe unpaid public moneys reduced to judgment, nor been concerned in a challenge.

#### SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS AND DISQUALIFICATIONS.

Without further amplification, the conclusion is that only a person duly qualified to vote in a general election of the State is eligible to be a Presidential elector, or to be voted for as such, in the State of Alabama; that United States Senators and Representatives in Congress and every person holding any office of profit or trust under the United States or any office of profit under the State, which includes every person required to take and subscribe to an oath to support the constitution of the State or the United States, is disqualified by law from holding or being voted for for elector for President and Vice-President as well as all the other persons disqualified from holding office generally.

#### ADVICE.

As even one vote may be important, the least risk should not be taken, but only private citizens, unquestionably disconnected from public office or employment, fully qualified to vote and hold office at the election, should be voted for as elector for President and Vice-President.

I thank the House for its considerate attention. [Applause.] Mr. RODENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am now serving my fourth term as a Member of the House of Representatives, and unless all signs fail or the people of my district make a most serious mistake I fully expect to continue my services in this body for many years to come. [Applause.] When I first became a Member of the House I possessed all the credulity that attaches to the innocence and inexperience of youth.

So guileless and gullible was I that I actually believed everything that was said on this floor. Even a Democratic speech, intended strictly for home consumption, was received by me at par, without discount or allowance for campaign shrinkage. My preconceived faith in the absolute truth and reliability of all Congressional humanity would not permit me to accept any part of any statement made by any Member on any subject cum grano salis.

Well do I recall how I trembled with fear as some Democratic Member, in deep sepulchral tones that smacked of the gloomy depths of the cheerless tomb, arose in his seat and, assuming the attitude of Ajax defying the lightning, hurled anathemas upon anathemas at our devoted heads and predicted the overthrow, swift, sure, and immediate, of the Republican majority in this House. A speech of that kind always struck terror to my youthful soul. It "froze the blood in my young veins" and made my hair stand on end like "quills upon the fretful porcupine." Like Eugene Aram—

All night I lay in agony,  
In anguish dark and deep;  
My fevered eyes I dared not close,  
But stared aghast at sleep.

In the still small hours of the slumberless night my tortured soul cried out aloud, again and again, with the penitent sinner of old, "O, Lord, what must I do to be saved?"

Perhaps my genial and tender-hearted friend from Missouri, CHAMP CLARK, was not aware of it, but he certainly caused me no end of tribulation and vexation of spirit in the early days of my service here. But it is quite different now. Democracy's dismal and doleful note of warning, which from time immemorial has been sounded in this Chamber at regular intervals of two years, no longer terrifies—it simply amuses. What was once high tragedy is now comic opera. I have long since learned that giving gratuitous advice to the Republican party is an inalienable Democratic right, and prophesying Republican defeat an irrepressible Democratic habit. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I, for one, refuse to accept the advice, and the biennial prophecy now has no other effect on my mental composure and political equanimity than to produce a sort of tired feeling, which is wholly ephemeral. In the light of my own experience I would bid my Republican colleagues who are serving their first terms here to be of good cheer. You are in no danger. Be steadfast, keep the faith, hew to the line, and you will continue to assist in making the laws of the land while our friends on the other side of the aisle will continue their ancient and harmless pastime of beating tom-toms, demanding senseless roll calls, and dancing the political hoochie-koochie. [Applause.]

Why, Mr. Chairman, we had a special election for Congress in Illinois since the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] delivered his great speech, in which his enraptured soul beheld a vision of the Democratic party clothed with the emblem of official authority and political power; and, notwithstanding the fact that the Democrats were united on one candidate, and an independent Republican candidate polled 4,000 votes, the regular Republican nominee, Colonel THISTLEWOOD, increased the plurality given his popular Republican predecessor in the regular election two years ago over 25 per cent. [Applause on the Republican side.] The result of the recent election in the Twenty-fifth district of Illinois—the only one that has been held this year—is a complete and effective answer to the gentleman's predictions, and it indicates in language so plain that he who runs may read that when the roll of the Sixty-first Congress is made up the Republican party will be found doing business at the old stand with the same old-time majority. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, the average Democratic statesman has always been a disciple of the doctrine of despair. His is the philosophy of pessimism. To him the Lamentations of Jeremiah are an inspiration, an exhilaration. His face is ever turned toward the setting and not the rising sun. He is never so much at peace with himself as when he is quarreling with some one else. Instinctively, he prefers a funeral dirge to a wedding march, and believes that the song of the dying swan would make a most glorious national anthem. [Applause on the Republican side.] When camping out, purely as a matter of choice, he always pitches his tent amid the somber surroundings of a cemetery, in the cheerless shade of a weeping willow. [Laughter.] He is happy only when his fellow-man is sad. Night after night he sends up a fervent petition to the Great White Throne, asking the good Lord above to visit his children with some great disaster, such as fire or fever, flood or famine, drought or death, earthquake shock or ocean storm, for in a visitation of that kind his morbid and melancholy mind thinks it sees some promising political possibilities. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It does not take much to encourage him, however. When he picks up his morning paper and reads of a defaulting bank cashier, he at once grows hopeful; when he scans the market reports and finds that the price of wheat has dropped 1 cent, he actually becomes cheerful; and when he learns that cholera, or some other contagion, has broken out in one of our insular possessions, he simply grows delirious with joy, and forthwith proceeds to gather together all manner of indorsements for a political job under a Democratic administration. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

Our Democratic friends are even now trying to extract some comfort out of the fact that the Republicans are not an absolute unit as to who should lead us to victory in November next. Get all of the comfort and satisfaction out of that situation that you possibly can, gentlemen, but I want to say to you that I am proud of the fact that the Republican party is not the personal asset of any individual. [Applause.] No man holds a mortgage on its principles, its policies, or its purposes. It has never issued a commission in perpetuity to anyone to write its platforms and to do all its thinking. [Applause.] Thank God, it has never been afflicted with a political Old Man of the Sea, who has secured a strangle-hold on its windpipe and choked it into abject submission to his every whim and caprice. [Renewed applause.] In all its history, the Republican party has never developed, and I hope it never will develop, a perennial "disappearless leader," who arrogates to himself the sole power of political excommunication. [Laughter and applause.] I say it more in sorrow than in anger, but it is true, nevertheless, that you on that side have long since lost your courage, your independence, your political manhood. You have been compelled, nolens volens, to submit to the inevitable and to accept Bryan with all his idiosyncracies or suffer the consequences of his mighty wrath.

There is not a Rienzi among you. There is not one among you, unless perchance it be the eloquent young gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEAKE], and it is doubtful if even he would have the temerity to do so now after sitting for four months at the feet of the minority leader, in close proximity to the "heir apparent," CHAMP CLARK, and the "heir presumptive," OLLIE JAMES [laughter]—there is not one among you who would have the courage to-day to even protest against the story of your thralldom.

But try as you may to create the impression that you are sincerely united on the candidacy of your self-appointed and self-anointed leader, whose knowledge of political generalship seems to embrace only an elaborate and comprehensive plan of retreat [applause], yet the fact remains, and is known of all men, that the great majority of you have simply taken counsel of your fears and that your simulated enthusiasm is in reality the hysteria of a crushed and conquered hostage. No real change has come over the spirit of your opposition to Bryan and Bryanism. You have not been converted; you are still the same old Saul of Tarsus. But your feigned loyalty will not last. You can not keep up the delusion. The history of the Democratic party teaches us that the glory of to-day is the pathos of to-morrow. Only a few short years ago you had another idol to whom you swore undying fealty and devotion. Grover Cleveland was once your uncrowned hero, your man of destiny. Around his massive brow you twined the wreath of immortality, and in his mighty presence you "crooked the pregnant hinges of the knee that thrift might follow fawning." Where, oh where is that idol now? Ask of the populistic winds that blow from the sand dunes of the River Platte, and that have grown in volume and velocity since 1896, until to-day they have reached the menacing proportions of a cyclone of socialism! In the language of Mark Antony:

But yesterday he might have stood against the world,  
Now lies he there with none so poor to do him reverence!

During the four terms of my service in this body I have yet to hear for the first time a single word of praise or commendation from the lips of any Democrat in behalf of the only Democrat who has occupied the Presidency since 1860, and to whom you once ascribed powers supernatural and wisdom infinite. Mr. Chairman, when I contemplate the fate of Grover Cleveland, when I recall the once high estate of that discarded and forgotten idol of democracy, then, indeed, do I feel sorry for one William Jennings Bryan. The day will come, and it is not far distant, when he, too, will be made to walk the gang plank of Democratic execration and go to his political grave "unhonored, unwept, and unsung."

I repeat, gentlemen, and I take pride in the statement, that the Republican party has always been opposed on principle to the incorporation of a Presidential nominating trust, in which one man enjoys a monopoly of all the stock, both common and preferred. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I glory in the

fact that there is a division of sentiment among Republicans as to the personality of our candidate for the Presidency, but, whoever he may be, whether that splendid rugged type of old-fashioned American manhood, that man whose every heart-beat has been in sympathy with the best aspirations of the common people, and who gained his education in the great school of human experience, the school that has given to the world's heritage of true nobility its best and brightest men, that man who presides over the deliberations of this House with firmness and fairness, and who lives in the hearts of his fellow-members, JOSEPH G. CANNON [great applause on Republican side]; whether it be that brave and manly man of magnificent judicial poise, who in the far-off Philippines has reared a monument to his own greatness of intellect and genius of organization that will endure until time shall be no more; whether it be the distinguished son of Indiana who is to-day Vice-President of the United States, and who has brought to the discharge of his every duty the highest ideals of intelligent and patriotic citizenship; whether it be the governor of the Empire State of the Union, who drove the money changers from the temple and is to-day cleaning out the Augean stables of questionable finance—whichever it may be, the man who receives the Republican nomination at Chicago in June will receive the united support of the Republicans of the nation in November [applause on the Republican side], and will succeed Theodore Roosevelt in the White House on March 4, 1909. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

The Republican party deserves success and will succeed because it has been right on all of the great questions that have confronted the American people since the foundation of the Republic. It was right when, as the old Federal party, in the days of Alexander Hamilton, it advocated the formation of a Government big enough and strong enough and grand enough to protect the humblest citizen of the land. It was right when, as the old Whig party, in the days of Daniel Webster and Henry Clay, it made the protection of American industries the cornerstone of American greatness. It was right when, in the days of Abraham Lincoln, it said that this Republic could not endure half slave, half free. It was right when, in the days of Ulysses S. Grant, it dealt a death blow to the Democratic doctrine of repudiation and said that every bond of this Government should be held as sacred as a soldier's grave. It was right when, in the days of William McKinley, it said that the laborer was worthy of his hire, and that the man who performed honest work was entitled to honest money for that work. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is right to-day when it says with Theodore Roosevelt that no man or combination of men is greater than the law of the land, and that he that transgresses, be he rich or poor, shall be made to pay the penalty of his transgressions. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The history of the Democratic party, on the other hand, is an unbroken record of incoherent inconsistencies. The Democratic party has demonstrated a capacity only for mischief and mistake. It has been so persistently and insistently wrong on all of the great social and economic questions of modern times that every thinking citizen instinctively looks upon its promises and professions with doubt and misgiving.

In 1892 we were told by the Democratic party that the one great, overwhelming, paramount issue before the American people was the question of the tariff. Protection was denounced as robbery of the many for the benefit of the few. War, fierce and unrelenting, was declared on the protected industries of the country, and it was to be a war to the death. Import duties were to be abolished, custom-houses were to be scattered to the four winds of the heavens, our home market was to be opened to all the world, and every citizen, without regard to creed, color, or previous condition of servitude, was to be accorded the proud and priceless privilege of buying where he could buy the cheapest and selling where he could sell the dearest. The golden era was to be ushered in. Our cup of national happiness was to be filled to overflowing with the untold blessings that were sure to gush forth in never-ending abundance from a tariff for revenue only. Aye, we were told that the protective system of the Republican party was a delusion and a snare, a miserable mockery, a travesty on truth, and God alone knows what not. They told us that we were taxed from the cradle to the grave and that even death brought no surcease from sorrow, for the wicked Republican party had placed a tariff on tombstones. I almost shudder, even at this late day, as I recall the harrowing and grewsome picture that was painted by the Democratic spellbinder of 1892.

Well, the American people, like Ulysses of old, finally succumbed to the song of the siren. Grover Cleveland was elected President and with him came into power a Congress Democratic in both branches. And then came the deluge. The Wil-

son bill, that bright and shining example of Democratic constructive statesmanship, was enacted into law—and you know the rest. It is not necessary for me to-day to lift the veil that hangs over that darkest period of our national industrial life. The farmers, the merchants, and the mechanics of this generation have not forgotten, and they never will forget, their one sad experience with a tariff for revenue only. Nor will they forget that William Jennings Bryan, as a Member of Congress, was one of the most eloquent champions of that measure. It was then that the farmer's wheat brought 40 cents a bushel, his corn 10 cents, his oats nothing, and his potatoes considerably less than nothing. It was then that the merchant turned prematurely gray and the deep furrows of care and trouble appeared on his brow. It was then, too, that labor walked the streets night and day searching in vain for work. The mills and factories throughout the length and breadth of the land closed their doors, and across their silent and smokeless chimneys was written the epitaph:

Died of an overdose of Democracy.

[Laughter and applause.]

For four long and weary years, years that were lean and barren, years of sorrow and of suffering, of poverty and of pain, we struggled on and on under this weight of woe, hoping against hope, but relief came only when the Republican party was restored to power and the Dingley Republican protective tariff bill was enacted into law, for when that great constructive statesman of the Fifty-fifth Congress touched the buried industries of the nation with the magic wand of protection, Phoenix like, they sprang forth from their ashes, their Democratic tombs.

In the wealth of the products of field and factory, of mill and mine, and in the magnificent growth of our export trade, far exceeding that of any other nation on earth and reaching every part of the civilized world, we behold an enduring monument to that great cardinal principle of the Republican creed—protection to the products of American genius, American brain, and American industry. [Applause.]

Our Democratic friends say that they intend to make the tariff an issue in this campaign. I suppose this is their intention, for the Peerless One has spoken, and "I am Sir Oracle; when I ope' my lips let no dog bark." I hope it is true and that they will make it the paramount issue. I for one shall welcome an opportunity to contrast the barrenness of yesterday with the bounty of to-day. I shall be glad to match Democratic fancy with Republican fact, Democratic promise with Republican performance, Democratic expectation with Republican realization. [Applause.]

Ah, my countrymen, the protective policy of the Republican party needs no defense. It has stood the test of time and experience. Its manifold benefits are altogether too apparent to admit of the possibility of successful attack. It constitutes the proudest boast of our civilization and finds its glorious justification to-day in the strength and power and prestige of the nation and in the prosperity and happiness of all the people. [Applause.] It is possible that new conditions have made necessary some changes in our present tariff law, as no law devised by mortal man ever possessed the element of perfection, but the time will never come when the great body of the American people, remembering the disastrous experience of twelve years ago, will ever be willing to surrender any part of their loyalty to the great principle of protection. Whenever a revision of existing tariff schedules shall become necessary that work must and will be done by the friends of the protective system, and not by its enemies. The wage-earners of America prefer the practical patriotism and the good common sense of Republicans like JOSEPH G. CANNON and JOHN DALZELL to the violent vapors and visionary vagaries of any Democrat in the United States. [Great applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in 1892, as I have just stated, tariff for revenue only was Democracy's battle cry, but four years later they tried their very best to have the people forget all about the tariff. In 1896 the Democrats discovered their second paramount issue. In that year, when every one of them had taken to the woods to escape the righteous wrath of an indignant and impoverished people, a new Moses appeared upon the political horizon who thought that he held a commission from on high to lead the forlorn and scattered children of Democracy out of the wilderness and back into the promised land of official plenty. It was then that you on the other side of the House made the discovery that the one panacea for all the ills that the body politic was heir to, the one sure, never-failing remedy for every real and imaginary political disease, was the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the heaven-born ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation on earth. It was then that you spread the doctrine of discontent, the pessimistic propa-

ganda of Populism. Class was arrayed against class, and inflammatory appeal was made to passion and to prejudice. You denounced those of us who believed in preserving the financial integrity of the nation as enemies of the plain people, tools of Wall street, goldbugs, oppressors of the poor. You completely exhausted the vocabulary of vituperative abuse in your characterization of the friends of honest money as the unscrupulous hirelings of plutocracy. Why, a young Democratic friend of mine actually became so wrought up in that campaign that he had the gold fillings removed from his teeth as a practical evidence of his uncompromising hostility to the gold standard. [Laughter and applause.]

And then there was the awful, awful "crime of '73." You remember that phrase, don't you? You remember how our Democratic friends used to roll it under their tongues like a sweet morsel, and how throughout that frenzied campaign they clung to it closer than to a brother. They told us in lurid and bloodcurdling language how, one dark and stormy night, while the owls were hooting and the spooks and hobgoblins were abroad in the land, old John Sherman, than whom a better patriot never lived, arose from his slumbers at midnight and "with Tarquin's ravishing strides toward his design moved like a ghost," and how, before he returned to his plutocratic bed, murder, "murder most foul" had been committed. The dollar of our daddies had been slain, and Democracy shrieked out aloud against the "deep damnation of his taking off." [Laughter.] Oh, you remember that, don't you? You also remember Coin's Financial School. By the way, what has become of that famous publication, which in 1896 supplanted the family Bible in every well-regulated Democratic household? [Renewed laughter and applause.] You recall the ingenuity of the author's argument, that the price of wheat and silver rose and fell together, and how he succeeded in proving, to his own satisfaction at least, that the American farmer would never again receive more than 50 cents for a bushel of wheat until the old ratio of 16 to 1 were reestablished. In that campaign Mr. Bryan told the American people that if McKinley were successful, and the gold standard were continued as the monetary standard of this country, the farmers and the wage-earners of the nation would be unable to educate their children, because they would not have sufficient means with which to purchase schoolbooks and clothing for them.

From the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, in every city, in every village, in every hamlet, his matchless voice sounded the note of loud alarm, calling upon bewildered Democrats and bewhiskered Populists to storm the citadel of our financial honor and to overthrow the nation's credit. But the Republican party met the attack boldly and fearlessly. We pointed out the dangers of an inflated and debased currency and proved by the experience of mankind that free silver and fiat money meant national dishonor and national disaster. To the eternal credit of the American people be it said that they awoke to a full realization of the impending danger and buried this Democratic financial fallacy so deep that it will never hear the blast of Gabriel's trumpet on the morning of the resurrection. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

I would like to know why it is that the mere mention of free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 or at any other old ratio to-day throws the Democratic party into convulsions. I would like to know what has become of the "crown of thorns" and the "cross of gold." The peerless leader said in 1896 that no question is ever settled until it is settled right. If he still believes that he was right in 1896, and in his recent speech at Freeport, Ill., he maintains that he was, why is it that the Democratic party seems so anxious to abandon the silver question without waiting for its settlement in accordance with the declaration contained in the Democratic platform of that year? I leave this for them to ponder over.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the campaign of 1900, our Democratic friends maintained a discreet and dignified silence on the question of free trade and free silver. In that year they discovered another paramount issue. The thought has occurred to me that perhaps after all the Democratic party was created for a good purpose. It seems to be their special mission on earth to make original discoveries, and if, perchance, they should ever start out in search of the North Pole, that elusive and much-sought-for place might just as well make up its mind to allow itself to be discovered. In 1900 the Democratic party found the issue of imperialism. In that year they made the startling discovery that the foundations of the Republic were slipping away. They said that William McKinley—the gentle, loving, gracious McKinley, who, in the dark days that tried men's souls, gave practical proof of his patriotic love of country, and whose every heartbeat was in sympathy with the oppressed of all mankind—they said that he was a tyrant, a despoiler of human liberty, an oppressor of his fellow-man.

They accused him of trying to establish a monarchy on the ruins of our once glorious Republic. They talked about the "man on horseback," the modern Napoleon, about dynasties, and kingdoms, and empires. They said that the American flag in the Philippines was an emblem of tyranny and oppression. In the frenzy of their hypocritical fears they heard the death knell of human liberty and beheld the downfall of the Republic. They even surrounded the retreating brow of Aguinaldo with a halo of imperishable glory and, but for the vigilance of the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. JOHN WESLEY GAINES, the holy trinity of Democracy would certainly have been recast and remodeled; brave old Andrew Jackson would have been compelled to surrender his time-honored place between Thomas Jefferson and William Jennings Bryan to make way for the little Filipino.

But the Republican party, true to its magnificent record of courageous performance of every public duty, was not dismayed. With full confidence in the righteousness of our cause, we appealed again to the conscience of the nation, and we did not appeal in vain. We showed that the Philippines had come into our possession as the result of a war that was sanctioned by every American citizen, a war that was waged for humanity and Christianity, and that, having supplanted the sovereignty of Spain in the islands, it was a duty we owed to civilization itself to establish a government there that was fully capable of enforcing the fundamental guaranties of every civilized government—the protection of life, liberty, and property. This, we proceeded to do, and thank God, this we have done. When the impartial historian of the future shall record the achievements of the Republican party, among the brightest and most inspiring pages of that history will be the record of our great and benevolent work in the Philippines. The bolo has been beaten into a plowshare, the blockhouse and the fort have been supplanted by the schoolhouse and the church; anarchy has made way for law and order, and the American flag, whose stars and stripes have been baptized in the best blood of American patriotism, is still the emblem of liberty and equality wherever it floats, whether from the Dome of the nation's Capitol or over the humblest hut in far-off Luzon. [Loud applause.] Ah, my Democratic brethren, you can not stop the wheels of progress. You might just as well attempt to stem the resistless tide of the mighty Mississippi at high flood as the river rolls on majestically to the sea as to try to interfere with the manifest destiny of the American Republic in the great work of the world's civilization.

You may carp and you may criticize, you may fret and you may fume, you may prate in ponderous platitudes about invasion and usurpation, but the fact confronts you nevertheless that our occupation of the Philippines is in full accord with that splendid spirit of progress that has characterized the history of the Anglo-Saxon race the world over, and before whose victorious advance the idols of paganism fall and lie shattered in the dust. Ignorance must give way to intelligence, superstition to enlightenment, lawlessness to ordered liberty. [Applause.]

And now, Mr. Chairman, we come to the never-to-be-forgotten campaign of 1904. In the beginning of this campaign it looked very much as though our Democratic friends had at last run short of paramount issues. Experience had taught them that it was the part of political wisdom carefully to eschew all reference to the tariff, finance, and imperialism, and whatever other mistakes the Democratic party has made in the past, no one can ever truthfully accuse its leaders of failing to show at all times a quick appreciation of the exigencies of party expediency. A new paramount issue had to be discovered at any cost, and so, after calling into conference those four great champions of the rights of the plain people, those brave and valiant knights who had always eagerly welcomed every opportunity to engage the octopus in mortal combat—those four pure and undefiled patriots, Thomas Ryan, August Belmont, Augustus Van Wyck, and "Blue-Eyed Billy" Sheehan [Laughter]—it was unanimously decided that the question of the trusts and their regulation should be the paramount issue. Every Democrat at once became infused with the zeal and enthusiasm that inspired the brave young knights of Scotland, who followed the Black Douglas as he carried the casket containing the heart of Bruce to the sacred sepulcher of the Savior. He buckled on his shield, drew his sword, and swore by all the patron saints of Democracy never to sheath his trusty blade until he had lopped off at least a dozen of the tentacles of the octopus. Oh, it was to be a battle royal! The country was to be freed for all time to come from the cold and cruel grasp of monopoly and predatory wealth. The American people were to be redeemed, rejuvenated, and sent on their way rejoicing.

But just as enthusiasm was running highest somebody made a discovery that sent the cold shivers down the back of every

Democratic knight who had enlisted in the holy war and caused this latest crusade to end much the same way as Don Quixote's famous and heroic attack on the windmill. Some one pointed out that the Republican party had years before provided the people with an adequate remedy against corporate oppression in the shape of the Sherman antitrust law, a law that was framed by a Republican Senator, passed by a Republican Congress, and signed by a Republican President. It was also pointed out that during the Democratic Administration of Grover Cleveland this wise and salutary law, which was designed to curb the power of corporate greed and to protect the consumer against the extortions of monopoly, lay dormant upon our statute books because Richard Olney, a Democratic Attorney-General, by a peculiar process of reasoning which was satisfactory to himself and to the Administration of which he was a part, concluded that the law was unconstitutional and positively declined to bring any prosecutions under it. It remained for that matchless champion of the rights of the people, that great exponent of the enforcement of both the letter and the spirit of the law, Theodore Roosevelt, to carry to a successful conclusion the first prosecutions under that law, prosecutions that were begun under the Administration of his Republican predecessor. To-day the great combinations of capital realize as they never realized before that their power is not as great as the power of the Government, that their rights are not superior to the rights of the public, and that they will not be permitted to show less regard for the majesty of the law than the humblest citizen of the land.

If Theodore Roosevelt had accomplished nothing more than the awakening of the public conscience to a realization of the dangers of corporate encroachment, if he had done nothing more than to enforce without fear or favor the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law, he would still lead all of the men of his day and generation in the great work of practical and permanent reform. [Applause on the Republican side.] And that work so vigorously prosecuted under his Administration will be continued in 1909 under the Administration of his Republican successor. [Applause.] The Republican party was conceived in a spirit of justice and dedicated to the proposition of equality, and a party so conceived and so dedicated, and imbued as it has always been with the true spirit of progress and reform will never turn a deaf ear to the demands of the people.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we are about to enter upon another Presidential campaign. I do not know just what the paramount issue will be this year, as I am not in the confidence of the Democratic party. But I am prepared for almost any old thing. I would not be surprised to find in the Democratic platform this year a declaration to the effect that the only clean, legitimate, untainted money in the United States is that which is derived from the lecture platform and from the publication of the Commoner, a newspaper which, with a becoming sense of modesty, seldom mentions the name of its editor oftener than one hundred times in any one issue. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I happen, however, to have here a copy of the issue of the Commoner of February 28 and March 6, 1908, in the first of which Mr. Bryan's name appears by actual count exactly 135 times [laughter], and in the latter 108 times, and it isn't a very large paper at that—only sixteen pages, with one name ever present. [Renewed laughter.] But so intent is the editor on keeping that name before the public that even the advertising column does not escape, as is evidenced by the following notice:

FOR SALE.—An excellent registered shorthorn bull, 1 year old. In fine condition; color, red. W. J. Bryan, Lincoln, Nebr.

[Loud laughter on the Republican side.]

The pedigree of this "excellent registered shorthorn bull" is not given, but in all probability he is a lineal descendant of the fifteen-hundred-dollar blooded heifer which we are told Mr. Bryan purchased shortly after he was overtaken by the prosperity that followed the election of his Republican opponent in 1896. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

Then, of course, we can expect in this year's platform the usual stereotyped declaration in favor of adhering rigidly to the Constitution as interpreted by the fathers and that, too, in face of the admitted fact that the only States in this Union in which, according to Democratic authority, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], the Constitution has been lynched, and where the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to that great "sheet anchor of our liberties" are violated with absolute impunity are the States that habitually give their electoral votes to the Democratic candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. Chairman, much stress will no doubt be laid on Democracy's pretended friendship for labor. Crocodile tears will be shed in great abundance by the Democratic spellbinder of 1908 as he tells of the heroic efforts of the minority in this House to



enact legislation in behalf of the horny-handed sons of toil, and yet an examination of the record will disclose the fact that the only place in this country where labor is underpaid, where the efforts of workmen to organize themselves into unions meet with determined opposition, and where few laws favorable to the cause of toil have been incorporated into the statutes, are the States that have never given an electoral vote to the Republican party. [Applause on the Republican side.] Organized labor to-day has a membership of approximately three million and, while I have no statistics at hand, I undertake to say that less than 5 per cent of this great army of workers is to be found in the Democratic States of the South. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we will be told in this campaign that the Republican party has appropriated Democracy's ideas and that Theodore Roosevelt is masquerading in the garments of William Jennings Bryan. The claim will be put forth that Roosevelt stands for the same principles of government that Bryan stands for; but when this claim is made we will ask for a bill of particulars. For instance, we will ask them to show when and where Theodore Roosevelt ever advocated the destruction of the protective policy of the Republican party; we will ask them to show when and where he ever favored the heresy of free and unlimited coinage of silver; we will ask them to show when and where he ever expressed contempt for the Supreme Court of the United States; we will ask them to show when and where he so far forgot his Americanism as to question the integrity of the flag of his country; we will ask them to show when and where he became inoculated with the populistic virus of initiative and referendum; we will ask them to show when and where he ever advocated a Government guaranty of bank deposits; we will ask them to show when and where he became a convert to the damnable and socialistic doctrine of Government ownership of railroads. No, no, my friends, Theodore Roosevelt and William Jennings Bryan are not one and identical. They have nothing whatever in common. One is the direct antithesis of the other. One is a practical statesman, the other an impractical dreamer; one is patriotic, the other is plitudinous; one is constructive, the other destructive; one believes in intelligent action, the other in unintelligible agitation. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the Republican party has now been in continuous control of the destinies of this nation for eleven years. This is not a long period of time in the life of a nation. It is not a long period of time in the life of a political party that has the courage of initiative and the genius of constructive statesmanship. It has been long enough, however, for the Republican party to present to the people a record of achievement unparalleled in all the annals of political history. In that time we have settled forever the question of our monetary standard and have strengthened and securely fortified the national credit. We have raised the standard of freedom and independence in the little island of Cuba and have banished forever from the Western Continent the last vestige of monarchical misrule and oppression. We have carried the blessings of American civilization, with its Christianizing, harmonizing, and elevating influence to the people of the Philippines and have pointed out to the Filipinos the path that leads to constitutional self-government. We have repealed the Democratic Wilson tariff law, that debt-producing measure of odious memory, and have dispelled the clouds of doubt and disaster that for four long years obscured our industrial horizon. We have strengthened the hands and enlarged the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission by enacting a railroad-rate bill, which does away forever with unjust and unfair discriminations in the matter of freight rates. We have given life and force and effect to the Sherman antitrust law and made it a power for good in the land. We have passed a national pure-food law to protect the lives and the health of our citizens. We have established the most cordial relations with the Republics of South America and have placed our trade with them on a firm and lasting foundation. Under the masterful genius of the Republican party the dream of a century will soon be an actual living reality.

The work of constructing the Panama Canal is being pushed forward with vigor and enthusiasm, and when this, the greatest of all modern undertakings, shall have been completed, there will follow as its natural and logical sequence the deepening of our waterways from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, and the multiplied products of the valleys of the Ohio and the Mississippi will soon be transported by water to the teeming millions of the Orient. Before this Congress shall have concluded its labors other great measures of progress and reform will be placed upon the statute books by the Republican party. An employers' liability law which will bear the test of constitutionality, and which effectually destroys the barbarous doctrine of "fellow-servant," has already been enacted; the other de-

mands of labor will be given full and fair recognition, and a system of finance will be inaugurated that will make impossible all future speculative panics.

This is our record.

It is a record of patriotic achievement and true Americanism. On this record we stand and ask a continuation of Republican control. We do not go into this campaign with an apology on our lips. Unlike our opponents, we have nothing to apologize for, nothing to explain, nothing to take back. The Republican party to-day stands, as it has always stood, for home and fire-side, for law and order, for the dignity of labor, for the elevation of citizenship, for the extension of commerce, for the development and protection of industry, for America against all the world. [Loud and long-continued applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD].

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, \$61,500 is a large sum. That amount was stolen from the United States sub-treasury at St. Louis. Nobody had any opportunity to take it but the United States officers in charge. This money had been wrung from the people by the inexorable processes of taxation. It was the people's money. Mr. Chairman, who got it?

That subtreasury was under the control of Hon. Thomas J. Akins, Assistant United States Treasurer. The money was in the immediate hands of two tellers, D. P. Dyer and M. B. Ferguson.

Mr. Akins and both of these tellers were under bond. Under the law it is the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to proceed against these officers on their bonds to recover the loss which the Government has sustained by their criminality or carelessness as the case may be. Instead of commencing action as the law provides, the Secretary of the Treasury has been waiting nearly two years for Congress, on insufficient data, to relieve Mr. Akins from his legal liability.

Mr. BURLESON. Does this man Akins hold any position in the Republican party organization?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Yes; that will appear later. A bill for the purpose of relieving him of his legal responsibility was introduced in the last Congress, but failed to pass. It has been reintroduced in this Congress and is now pending in the Committee on Claims.

I introduced a resolution calling on the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to Congress all the facts in the case that the bill might be considered on its merits. I called my resolution up a few days ago, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] moved to lay it on the table, which was done by a vote of 126 to 123. I was astonished that the gentleman from New York was willing to smother the facts, even though Mr. Akins is of his party and a member of the national committee. But, Mr. Chairman, I shall not be put down so easily. I shall at the proper time move to take my resolution from the table and put it upon its passage.

In pressing this resolution I am not assuming to be more watchful than other members of the committee. This loss occurred in Missouri, and as I am the only Missourian on the committee it seemed to me to be my peculiar duty to call for the facts surrounding the unfortunate and discreditable affair.

I am personally acquainted with Mr. Akins. I esteem him highly. He has always enjoyed an enviable reputation for integrity. I should be greatly surprised if an investigation should show that he got any of the loot. But did he carefully look after his charge? He says he did. The circumstances indicate that he did not. Let us have the facts.

I believe Mr. Akins would not, and certainly he should not, object to the most searching investigation. He has in the past been an ardent advocate of investigations. Only a few years ago, as the manager of a Missouri campaign, his battle cry was "Let us see the books!" He and his coadjutors insisted that the Democrats had looted the school funds of many thousands of dollars, and from every hilltop they shouted "Let us see the books!" By a strange turn of fortune they were permitted to see the books, but they found them correct.

Now, by the same token, I demand, "Let us see the books." If they show Mr. Akins blameless we will all rejoice with him, but, Mr. Chairman, "let us see the books."

In a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Akins says:

As to the charges against Teller Dyer, I have to say that the examination of the office disclosed a shortage in his accounts of \$61,500, and Mr. Dyer has admitted to me personally the existence of the shortage. He also admitted that he knew of the existence of the shortage on September 27, and therefore the entries in his books from that date until October 5, showing that his accounts were correct and that no shortage existed, were false entries. He also admitted to me that on October 5 he got \$61,500 from Teller Ferguson to make his accounts balance when

Cashier Johnson was about to check them up. The evidence gathered by the Secret Service shows clearly that for the last three years Mr. Dyer has been given to frequent and excessive indulgence in intoxicating liquors and has been a frequent visitor to houses of ill repute.

As to the charges against Teller Ferguson, I am advised that the evidence conclusively shows that he was an intimate acquaintance and constant companion of Mr. Dyer and thoroughly familiar with his personal habits, and, like Mr. Dyer, he has for the last three years been given to frequent and excessive indulgence in intoxicating liquors and has been a frequent visitor to houses of ill repute, and that he usually accompanied Mr. Dyer in his dissipation.

Then, according to Mr. Akins's own admissions, these two tellers had for three years been leading lives of drunken debauchery. We should have the facts, that it may appear whether Mr. Akins has any excuse for not knowing the habits of these young men and having them discharged before such a large sum had been lost.

Mr. Akins says in the letter from which I have just read that Mr. Dyer admitted that he knew of the shortage in his accounts for nearly two weeks and that he altered his books to conceal it. Is there no penalty for a public officer altering his books to force a balance? If there is, why has it not been enforced against this recreant teller?

It appears from Mr. Akins's letter from which I have just read that Mr. Dyer admitted that when he found his cash was to be counted and his accounts checked up he got \$61,500 from Teller Ferguson to conceal his shortage. What was this but a conspiracy between these two tellers to defraud the Government? Let the Secretary of the Treasury tell us why they have not been prosecuted for their crime.

These tellers were under bond, making them liable for this shortage. Why has not the Secretary of the Treasury proceeded against them to collect it? Let him tell us why.

The letter of Mr. Akins, from which I have just read, discloses that Mr. Dyer admitted that he knew of his shortage for nearly two weeks before his accounts were checked up. Why was it not discovered sooner? Where was Mr. Akins during these two weeks? I have heard that he was out in the State making political speeches and directing a political campaign. Let us have the facts, so that we may know whether this is true. One put in charge of the funds of the Government amounting to many millions of dollars ought not to leave those vast sums of public treasure in the hands of minor employees while he goes on extended tours of campaign speaking and political intrigue. Did Mr. Akins do this?

It may be argued that Mr. Akins was a member of the Republican national committee, and that when he was appointed United States Treasurer it was intended that he should continue active political work. Sir, there are some questions which every man should settle for himself. He ought to have frankly told the President that he could not properly fill the office of subtreasurer and at the same time conduct an active political campaign. He either should have given up the one position or not have accepted the other. Indeed, the President ought not to have saddled both places upon him.

Mr. Chairman, what a melancholy chapter in the history of our State is the account of the participation of Mr. Akins and other Federal officeholders in the politics of Missouri. This loss of public money happened in the midst of a strenuous political campaign of which Mr. Akins was manager. Mr. Bloebaum, postmaster at St. Charles, for months at a time left his office in the hands of minor employees while he went to St. Louis to assist Mr. Akins in the campaign. Hon. A. F. Shriener, from the office of the surveyor of customs, devoted much time to the same purpose. Other Federal officers were equally busy. With what result? A shortage in the St. Charles post-office—a shortage in the office of the surveyor of customs, and a \$61,500 shortage in Mr. Akins's office. At the time these Federal officers were neglecting their offices to carry on political work the present Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Cortelyou, was chairman of the Republican national committee and in supreme command of the campaign in every State in the Union. Now he comes and recommends that his faithful lieutenant, Mr. Akins, be relieved from his legal liability for the money which has been lost. Why does not he furnish us with the facts upon which he bases his remarkable recommendation?

Under the peculiar circumstances surrounding this case, to relieve this man without an investigation would be to establish a very dangerous precedent. A United States treasurer has access to the money under his control. He may put his hands on it when nobody sees. If he happens to be at once both United States Treasurer and head boss of a political machine what temptation and what facility for securing campaign funds is presented. Men have been known to take money from the coffers of insurance companies to be used to control the ballot box. Mr. Cortelyou ought to know that whoever would take the money of widows and orphans to carry elections would not hesi-

tate to take it from the Government for a similar purpose, if only we establish a precedent that Congress will relieve them from liability because nobody saw them take it.

It is rumored that Mr. Akins and both of these tellers were in the habit of running "snakes" in the cash. That when one of them wanted money he wrote his name and the amount on a slip of paper, put it in, and took the cash out. Such a practice is not only a clear violation of law, but it tempts employees to take out beyond their ability to replace. I hope an investigation will show that Mr. Akins neither did this himself, nor permitted any employee to do it. But, sir, let us know whether he did or not. Let the Secretary of the Treasury furnish us the facts.

Mr. Cortelyou has recommended that Mr. Akins's bill do pass, but he does not explain to us upon what he bases his recommendation. I know there are those who believe that Congress ought to legislate upon the mere recommendation of the President, or the head of one of the Executive Departments. I do not concur in that view. Congress is one of the coordinate branches of the Government, and should not be driven or dictated to by the President or his Secretaries. Congress should legislate upon its own judgment. We come direct from the people to represent them. It is our duty to obey their will—not that of the executive department. If we surrender our power we betray the people whose representatives we are.

Mr. Chairman, aside from the Speaker's unwarranted repression of the will of the people as it is sought to be expressed by their representatives upon this floor, nothing so threatens our system of representative government as Executive encroachment. As an illustration, let us contemplate what has occurred here within the past few days. The President has caused to be prepared a bill, introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Herburn], the effect of which is to make trusts and monopolies lawful and to authorize the big corporations to enter into and carry out contracts in restraint of trade. Under such a law every State would have taken away from it all power to prevent trusts and monopolies from oppressing and outraging the people.

Not even Congress would have any control over the subject. All of the vast interests of the people would be committed absolutely to one man—the Commissioner of Corporations. If, as in Mr. Akins's case, this Commissioner of Corporations should also be a member of the national committee what marvelous opportunities would he have for collecting campaign funds. The people do not favor such a law. A majority of the Members of this House are opposed to it. But, sir, it has been prepared and introduced at the direction of the President. He is furiously brandishing his club and demanding its passage. You Republicans have the majority and can pass the measure if you so determine. You do not want to do it. You know very well you ought not to do it. But there is the "big stick." If you fail to pass the bill, you may be banished from the "Federal pie counter," and what Republican could live without "pie?" If you do not pass the bill, an army of Federal officeholders may get busy and nominate in your places men who will be more placable. I know your situation is a hard one. Nevertheless, I would encourage you to stand up with us for the doctrines of representative government as they were delivered to us by the fathers of our glorious Constitution. Let us zealously defend the powers of Congress, for they are the powers of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman from Missouri use all his time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the gentleman used practically all of his fifteen minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, the most striking feature of our history is that in this Republic "the man of the hour" has always been forthcoming, and our most reliant hope for the future lies in the perfect faith that "the man of the hour" will always be forthcoming.

The fact that for many years these men have come up from the ranks of the Republican party is neither incidental nor accidental, but a logical outcome, a plain proof that the principles of the Republican party are in tune with and keep abreast of the best thought of the times and that the best citizenship of the country falls into the ranks of the Republican party.

Theodore Roosevelt is the best illustration of "the man of the hour" this country has ever produced. He came into command when, out of the development of our great resources, a prosperity had come which aroused and challenged the wonder of the world.

Great factors in this development were the corporations and the combinations of corporations, representing vast aggregations

of wealth which became arrogant and drunk with power, controlling with iron hand our transportation facilities and industries, annihilating competition, overriding laws, and undertaking, through this tremendous power, the domination of our politics, State and national, until the issue became, Shall the people or the interests rule?

Such, in a word, were the conditions when that "man of the hour," Theodore Roosevelt, came into power, with his slogan, "A square deal for all."

And running through all the years of President Roosevelt's Administration his mighty influence in this battle has been with the people, and the most flagrant of the offenders have been brought to a partial realization that they are the creatures and not the masters of the Government. But let no man make the mistake of counting the battle won; it is only begun, and to halt now means defeat for years to come. Somewhat disabled, but nothing daunted, the ranks of the predatory interests are closed up, and they stand ready at every opportunity to regain any lost ground by taking advantage of every condition.

Growing out of the panic, for which they were the most directly responsible, their latest move is to come to Congress for relief, through currency legislation, because they have been brought face to face with a period of liquidation.

Let me ask, What relief did the farmers of the West get from Congress, when, after a period of inflation of land values, they were compelled to face liquidation and see their homes sold under the hammer for a mere song? They coaxed relief from the soil by tireless energy and patient toil rebuilding their fortunes by the slow process of self-denial and rigid economy.

It is of currency legislation that I want in part to speak.

The currency question used to be looked upon as purely technical and was discussed largely by experts along theoretical lines, more or less in the air, over the heads of the people. Growing out of the recent stringency, the question seems to have been brought down to earth. It has come home to every man and become a practical question, and is being thought out and discussed by practical men along practical lines. This is encouraging, for when the combined—perhaps I might be permitted to say, composite—common sense of the people contribute from day to day their full share to the general welfare and it is brought to bear on a matter like this, it is in a fair way to be settled, and settled right.

Our currency and banking system was doubtless admirable in its time, but that is faulty now and has outlived the conditions for which it was devised most men will concede. It saddles an enormous unnecessary tax on the people for interest on the bonds that should and would have been paid long ago but for the necessity of these bonds as security for national-bank currency.

Our currency and banking system, when coupled with the pernicious system of stock gambling on Wall street, tends to put the agricultural interests and industrial business of the country under the domination of a few. I do not mean to imply that the laws were intended to bring about such results, but rather to emphasize the fact that out of our wonderful progress have come such entirely new conditions that our systems are a misfit.

Currency laws which fail to properly—I might say automatically—distribute our money over the country according to its needs, coupled with banking laws and regulations which permit vast sums of the people's savings, accumulated through legitimate business methods, to be used for the illegitimate business of stock gambling are wrong and a serious menace to the prosperity of our country.

It was no surprise that out of the panic came a cry from all over the land for a change in the currency and banking systems that would prevent a repetition of the disaster. Neither need there be surprise that there were those who stood ready to take advantage of the conditions—to capitalize the needs of the people, so to speak—believing that the masses, in their desire for a change, would accept anything rather than nothing. Out of these propitious conditions came the now well-known Aldrich bill, devised to still further centralize the money and wealth of the country in New York by adding and giving greater scope to an already bad system.

Years ago it might have been fairly safe to calculate that when public clamor ran high you could hand the people a gold brick, but not so to-day. Thanks to our printing presses, our rural free-delivery facilities, our telegraph and telephones, our intellectual growth has kept pace with our grand industrial and physical progress, and the men on our farms and in villages not only know full well what they want, but they want what they want when they want it.

The big banks were the first to get frightened when the stringency came; and they, in turn, frightened the smaller ones, but

the masses of the people were cool; they kept their heads, and if they had not, three-fourths of the banks in the country would have closed their doors. This splendid demonstration of the superior intelligence and confidence of the people showed a remarkable knowledge of conditions and marked a new era in our progress. Such superior citizenship has earned the right to the best and safest currency and banking systems and the wisest protection that the law can give them. In the face of this, it is worse than a mistake to undertake to force on them such a proposition as the Aldrich bill. The people have condemned it; the composite common sense of the people turns against it. Its sponsors claim for it that it is only a makeshift. Its passage will result in no better legislation for years to come.

I have no intention in the brief time I have to discuss in detail the faults of this measure or the good features of any other; but let me say, its main feature is that it creates a new kind of bond-secured currency which will necessarily add a speculative value to the bonds affected and opens a new fertile field of exploitation to the bond-dealing and stock-gambling banks and their allied trust companies; and, while it adds to the currency with one hand, it reduces the reserves and depletes the loanable funds of the banks with the other.

The other features still further contract the loanable funds of the banks—all this at a time of stringency. When it is considered that our recent panic was, in fact, a credit panic, rather than a currency panic, the full force and weight of these objections can be realized.

It is well calculated to sound an alarm when a panic is approaching, and its practical workings would do more harm than good to the country, as a whole. A full and free discussion has failed to disclose a single valuable feature; it is truly astonishing that such an indefensible measure should have commanded so much serious attention and consideration at the hands of Congress and the country.

I make no pretense of undertaking to discuss the technicalities of the money question, but to my mind it is plain that the fewer kinds of money we have, the better; it is equally clear that a currency secured on bonds, and especially which are subject to violent fluctuations in the market, is a mistake. Under present conditions the Government is obliged to keep out hundreds of millions of dollars of its bonds to make it possible for the banks to procure them, thus entailing expense for interest running into millions.

The centralization of our money and credits is clearly wrong, and that the money and credits of the people should be spread out over the whole country according to its needs to facilitate the exchange and transportation of our commodities is plain to all. This calls for a currency that will ebb and flow and stay where it is needed, and come home and go out of use when it is not needed.

#### SECURITY FOR BANK DEPOSITS.

Our people should be encouraged to save, and their savings sacredly safeguarded by every means in our power.

Ten years ago in the senate of the State of North Dakota I introduced a bill to provide for the security of deposits in banks and ever since have advocated that system. To me the evils of a system where the savings of the people are not properly safeguarded are inexcusable, and are something appalling and the system is far behind our progress in other lines. The evils to the depositors attending such a system, to say nothing of the bankers, are so great that they fully justify a change, even at some considerable risk. The question of security for bank deposits resolves itself on final analysis to this: That the banks, through systems of rigid inspection and supervision, are better able to protect against each other than the people are to protect themselves against the banks, and most certainly the banks are better able to stand the losses.

It is said that the man who deposits money in a bank does so voluntarily. True. He is therefore all the more a public benefactor, because every dollar of his money deposited creates a reserve for \$4 or \$5 put into the working channels of trade. Tell me, then, why should he not be protected?

The Government and the States—in my State the counties, townships, and school districts—demand security for the deposit of public moneys; then why should not the individual be secured?

The Government owes this protection to the people. The masses of the people, in their splendid confidence and courage, saved the country from a financial crash, while the banks of New York held up the money of the people, and that of the Government as well, and the rich men were locking up immense sums of money in safety-deposit boxes.

It is due to the people that Congress legislate to protect their savings, and they demand it. It is not, however, my purpose, in the time allowed me, to undertake an argument for, but

rather to put myself on record as favoring a fund to guarantee bank deposits, preferably created and maintained by the banks, under rigid supervision of the Government.

#### POSTAL SAVINGS BANKS.

One way of perfecting security of small deposits would be by the creation of a postal savings bank. With this system properly established confidence would be restored and the country at large greatly benefited, as all the money would be at work all the time and we would hear nothing more of a demand for more currency. I think an ideal plan would be a system of postal savings banks, where the savings of the people would be gathered in by the Government and returned to the public use by the Government depositing the postal savings funds in the banks in the community where they accumulate. The banks in turn might be authorized to loan these moneys on real estate under stringent regulations, and in this way the small savings would be made to do a large service in the development of the country, and great sums sent away for interest could be kept at home, and much would be done to prevent the centralization of money and credits which we have under present conditions.

By all means let us provide a safe place for the people's savings—the fruits of the toil, economy, and energy of those who make this country what it is.

The business man's savings go, generally, to increase his business, and he is apt to be a borrower as well as a depositor. I am speaking more particularly for the laborer, the farmer, the mechanic, and the professional man—the thousands who do not employ their savings in active business, but deposit them in banks, providing the sinews of war for the business world.

By encouraging and protecting them you will protect all, for their savings are the corner stone for the foundation of our business prosperity.

#### STOCK GAMBLING IN WALL STREET.

The right kind of currency and banking laws and systems will do much for the business prosperity of the country and toward the prevention of panics, but with this the work will be only half done. The legitimate business of the country must be separated from the illegitimate; the commercial business as distinct from the stock gambling as from horse racing and card games.

The business of the country can not prosper part dishonest and part honest. Our currency and banking systems can not perform their full and rightful functions serving at the same time both stock gambling and legitimate commerce, nor can wealth be equitably disturbed when the business of the country giving value received, based on actual values of commodities, is brought into competition with gambling business, which creates nothing, gives nothing, and takes everything. It is evident that under such a condition the wealth of the many will pour into the coffers of the few.

The time has come when the business of stock gambling and the legitimate business of the country must be divorced and the banks confined to their legitimate functions.

Let me quote from an editorial in the New York World:

This system drains the reserve money of the United States to Wall street. A commercial bank charging merchants and manufacturers 6 per cent interest can not afford to pay interest on deposits in competition with the Wall street banks, which can frequently get 20 to 50 per cent on the stock exchange for the use of their deposits. Thus these reserve moneys gravitate to the banks which can afford to pay high interest on them.

Wall street thus became a great funnel into which the savings of the people, instead of being available to the local manufacturer or the local storekeeper, were driven by higher rates of interest to the stock exchange.

Again the editorial says:

#### DEPOSITS AND LOANS.

When the recent panic became acute in November the clearing-house banks reported deposits of over \$1,000,000,000. Of these deposits, one-half were due to other banks. Of the loans, which slightly exceeded the deposits, over half were on stock exchange collateral. That is, the money collected from millions of depositors throughout the country by their local banks was used as the basis of Wall street credit, and was the real money in the stock exchange game.

#### BANKS AS GAMBLING TOOLS.

In no other country than the United States are incorporated banks part of the machinery of stock gambling. In no other country are the methods of stock gamblers such as to require the constant use for that sole purpose of hundreds of millions of dollars of other people's money. In no other country is the National Treasury called upon to turn over the public revenues for the use of members of a stock exchange. In London, Paris, Berlin, Frankfurt, and Amsterdam gamblers in stock must use their own money and their own credit as if they were playing at Monte Carlo instead of on a stock exchange.

This difference in stock gambling accounts for the great fluctuations in the rates of interest in New York as compared with the stability of European financial centers. In New York call money may be 3 per cent one day and 50 per cent the next day, something unknown in Europe.

The banking laws and the banking system of the United States concentrate the fluid capital of the country in Wall street. By bidding up the rate of interest higher than legitimate business can pay, stock gamblers are able to draw from productive industry its means for supplying pay rolls, for carrying on manufacturing, for distributing goods, and for moving the crops.

In Great Britain an increase of 1 per cent in the discount rate of the Bank of England is regarded as a serious fluctuation. For the Bank of France to alter its rate one-half of 1 per cent is a matter of international finance. For the Bank of Germany to charge a third of last week's highest rate in Wall street is done only after serious consultation with the Government, with great capitalists, and with business interests.

And the Herald says further:

These gambling transactions amount to over \$30,000,000,000—four times the value of the products of all the farms of the United States, half the value of all the land and buildings, one-third the census valuation of all the wealth of every kind in the country.

Let me say that in stock speculating the buyer puts up only a small margin and the broker furnishes the balance by borrowing from the bank and paying interest on the whole amount, involving the use of vast sums of money. Of all the stock deals on Wall street more than 99 per cent are nothing but bets that the price will go up or down. They are as much gambling as betting on a horse race or a card game. Emphatically, our national banks should not be allowed to loan the money of our people to these gamblers. Many New York banks not only loan money on these stocks and bonds, but often buy them outright, and when a stringency comes they are obliged to hold up the stock gamblers by sustaining the price of stocks or they will endanger the banks, and the commercial customer is thus made to suffer.

#### CORPORATIONS AND POLITICS.

Through the machinery of stock speculations and by the use of the accumulated millions of the country's savings a few men are enabled to control public service and industrial corporations of the country, more or less, in defiance of the laws, and with this tremendous power undertake to dictate our politics.

The work of bringing the corporations doing an interstate business under Government control and supervision must go steadily on until all are brought onto the same common plane of honesty with other business enterprises, until every dollar of capitalization stands for a dollar of actual value, and the people are no longer compelled to pay tribute in the way of interest and dividends on watered and inflated stocks and bonds. When this is accomplished it will assure stocks a stable value from day to day and year to year; thus they will become current and command the confidence of the people.

This must be done more and more. The influence of the corporations must be eliminated from politics. They will take their hands off our politics no more graciously than they loosen their iron grip on our industries and commerce. The taint of corporate influence is a disgrace to American politics and must be wiped out.

In my own State there is a bold attempt by the agents of these corporations to thwart the will of the people by the use of all the methods known to experienced politicians, and so much are the people aroused that the issue is no longer one of candidates, but whether the people or the corporations shall rule. Instead of permitting the voters to go to the primaries and register their wills, these men who make politics a business, and live and grow wealthy by the favors of corporations, are engaged in a determined effort to fool and, if possible, stampede the people, in order to perpetuate their hold on the politics of the State.

So let no man make the mistake of counting the battle won. To stop now is to lose all the ground gained.

The founders of the Government made it purely representative in form; it rests with the people to make it representative in fact, by freeing themselves from domination of any kind. This Government is in its infancy. To survive we must progress. What was radical ten years ago is conservative and imperatively necessary to-day. A conservatism which blocks progress is radical in its effects. Inaction means dry rot. New conditions demand new measures and new methods. Old methods of warfare are obsolete and inefficient to win battles now, but not more so than old laws and old methods to cope with new conditions. Growth and advancement must be coupled with progress in legislation in order that the people may be benefited in full measure.

The people demand legislation along progressive lines. I for one am committed to progressive policies, and firmly believe that progress along political lines is the first and most imperative essential to progressive legislation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield forty minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SPIGHT].

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read in my time a letter from the secretary of the senate of the Mississippi legislature, transmitting a memorial addressed to the Congress of the United States. I ask also that the memorial be read:

MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE,  
SENATE CHAMBER,  
Jackson, Miss., February 27, 1903.

Hon. THOMAS SPIGHT,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith a copy of the resolution adopted by the senate and house of representatives of the State of Mississippi, which is self-explanatory.

Yours, very truly,

FRANK ROBBERSON,  
Secretary of the Senate.

A joint resolution memorializing Members of Congress to pass a law appropriating cotton-tax fund now in the United States Treasury to pension ex-Confederate soldiers and their widows and orphans.

Whereas there has remained in the United States Treasury for a number of years a sum approximating \$60,000,000 illegally collected as a tax on cotton produced and marketed in Southern States during the years 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868; and

Whereas after the passage of so many years it becomes impossible to secure the return of this tax in an equalized manner to the greater number of those who paid this illegal tax; and

Whereas recognizing it is the wish and desire of the people of the southern cotton-growing States who paid this tax and their descendants that this fund now held by the United States Treasury be paid out for the pensioning of old ex-Confederate soldiers, their widows and orphans, and understanding that by this method it would, in a practicable way, reach the class of people who bore this injustice: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to pass a law authorizing and instructing the Treasurer of the United States to pay over this cotton-tax fund to the treasurers of the different southern cotton-growing States in the proportion as each State contributed and paid this tax that constitutes this fund, for the purpose of distributing the same as pensions to the old Confederate soldiers as the legislatures of the different States may deem proper. Be it further

Resolved, That the Members of Congress from Mississippi are earnestly requested to take such steps as will aid in accomplishing this end.

Mr. Chairman, a similar communication was sent to every Member of Congress from Mississippi. Immediately after its reception the Representatives in this House from that State had a meeting and unanimously conferred upon me the honor of presenting this memorial to the House. This action was taken, first, because I am the only ex-Confederate soldier in the delegation, and secondly, because I am the only man from any State who has ever introduced a bill in either House of Congress for the specific purpose mentioned in this memorial.

In explanation of the delay in presenting it, I may properly say that as soon as I was notified of the action of my colleagues I sought recognition from the Speaker for that purpose. He very courteously agreed to recognize me, but at the same time informed me that the Republican floor leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], had been objecting to everything of the kind and that I would better see him. I did this, with the result that I was told by the gentleman from New York that if I offered it he would object, as he had been doing in all other cases. I will do him the justice to say that I did not understand that he took this course out of any spirit of hostility to the purpose of the memorial, but in order to be consistent with himself. I can not yet understand, however, why a respectful memorial of the legislature of a sovereign State of the Union should be denied recognition on the objection of a single Member. But inasmuch as, under the rules, this one objection would prevail, I had no alternative but to accomplish the purpose in this indirect manner.

In connection with the presentation of this memorial of the Mississippi legislature, it may not be improper for me to state that the disposition of this cotton tax in the manner indicated in this memorial has been indorsed by the Mississippi Division of United Confederate Veterans, commanded by Gen. Robert Lowry, an ex-governor and one of the noblest and purest men in the State, and by other Confederate organizations all over the country. It is based upon no partisan or sectional feeling, or any plea for charitable consideration, but alone upon the incontrovertible proposition that the Government of the United States has, for more than forty years, enjoyed the use and benefits of this money unjustly, illegally, and unconstitutionally collected, almost entirely, from the Confederate soldiers and their families, and that the living few of those grand old men and the widows of those who are dead, should, in their last days, have the help which this pittance of their own money would bring them. These gallant old men, who are so few in number and who are so rapidly approaching the sunset of life, do not ask for themselves and the incomparable women who have shared with them the hardships of so many years, any pensions from the Federal Government. They recognize that

they are not entitled to that consideration, and, poor as they are, they are too proud to ask for it. Without a murmur they have contributed their share of the billions of dollars which have been given to Union soldiers by way of pensions.

In asking Congress to refund this money to the cotton States with authority to use it for Confederate pensions, they do not feel that they are putting themselves in the attitude of suppliants, but are only demanding of the Government a restoration of that which of right belongs to them. At the time of the collection of this tax the South was utterly impoverished as the result of four years of devastating war. After the surrender of her armies, her surviving soldiers returned to their once prosperous homes to find them desolate. The accumulations of generations of industry were gone. They accepted the situation with the manhood and courage which has ever characterized them and went to work to rebuild their lost fortunes. In their poverty-stricken condition the Government of the United States, whose power they had resisted for four years, met them upon the very threshold of their new life with this tax upon their only money-producing crop and subjected them to burdens imposed upon no other section of the country. In the years 1866, 1867, and 1868, when nearly all of this tax was collected, the war had ended and peace prevailed in every part of our domain. Of the total of a little more than \$68,000,000 in the six years from 1863 to 1868, each inclusive, nearly \$65,000,000 were collected in the three years, 1866, 1867, and 1868. Portions of Kentucky, Louisiana, Tennessee, and Virginia being within the Federal lines, there was collected from these States during the years 1863, 1864, and 1865 nearly \$3,000,000, but not a dollar was collected except in 1866, 1867, and 1868 from the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas. There is no disguising the fact that this tax was a punitive one and levied and collected from the principal agricultural product of the South as a punishment of our people for having engaged in open, honorable warfare against the United States.

I have never been ashamed of the part our people played in that momentous struggle, nor do I ever expect to be in the frame of mind to apologize for it. We believed we were right. We submitted the questions at issue to the arbitration of arms and lost. We accepted the result in good faith, and to-day Mississippi is as loyal to the Union as Massachusetts. But no matter whether in the estimation of the Federal authorities we were right or wrong, it was distinctly declared by the Federal Government that the Southern States were never out of the Union. The acts of their conventions in adopting ordinances of secession and the organization of the separate government of the Confederate States of America were all held to be null and void. The fearful and humiliating period of reconstruction through which we passed was not excused upon the ground that our Southern States were conquered provinces, but because it was claimed to be necessary to reestablish the Federal authority and "guarantee to the States lately in rebellion a republican form of government." If this was true, then we were entitled to the protection of every provision of the Constitution of the United States. In section 8, Article I, of the Constitution, it is declared that—

All duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Can it be said that a tax is "uniform throughout the United States" which is levied upon an agricultural product which was confined to eleven States of the Union?

Another clause of the Federal Constitution declares that—

Direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included in this Union according to their respective numbers.

The Supreme Court has said:

Taxes on real estate being indisputably direct taxes, taxes on the lands or incomes of real estate are clearly direct taxes. \* \* \* Taxes on personal property are likewise direct taxes.

This cotton tax was a tax "upon the income of real estate." The merest tyro knows that cotton is "personal property." Then, according to the Supreme Court, in either case it was a direct tax.

The Supreme Court says further:

The tax, so far as it applies to the income of real estate and personal property, being a direct tax within the meaning of the Constitution, and therefore unconstitutional and void, because not apportioned according to representation \* \* \* is necessarily invalid.

There are other equally cogent arguments against the constitutionality of this tax, and while the Supreme Court of the United States has never directly decided the question, it is generally conceded that the levying and collection of this tax was without constitutional authority. The immediate question was never before the Supreme Court but once. This was on appeal from a judgment of the circuit court of the United States for

the western district of Tennessee. Unfortunately, this judgment was rendered in 1868, before the passions incident to the war had cooled. The circuit court held the law under which the tax was collected to be constitutional. The Supreme Court, on appeal, divided equally—four in favor and four against its constitutionality, one judge being absent. This operated as an affirmation of the judgment of the lower court.

In the recent decisions of what are known as the "income-tax cases," from which above quotations are made, the Supreme Court has settled the very principles involved in this case, and it is no longer an open question. I do not believe that any court, State or Federal, would now hold that the cotton tax was constitutionally collected. If not, then simple honesty would require that this money should be refunded. It is not a question of law, but of good morals. The only remaining thing to be determined is, How shall it be done? Beyond doubt the proper thing to do, if it were practicable, would be to refund it to those who paid it or to their legal representatives. In the very nature of the case, after the lapse of more than forty years, this would be almost impossible in most cases. The difficulty in making the proof would be well-nigh insurmountable. Receipts are lost or destroyed, witnesses cognizant of the facts dead or inaccessible, and in nearly every case the only evidence would be the meager and unsatisfactory records in the Treasury Department. As a matter of interest to those now living who paid this tax, and to the representatives of those who are dead, I submit the following letter from the Secretary of the Treasury:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, February 12, 1908.

HON. THOMAS SPIGHT, M. C.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Sir: Replying to your letter of the 5th instant, asking whether or not there is any record from which can be ascertained the names of persons who paid cotton tax under civil war tax acts, I have the honor to advise you that the assessment lists in the Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue contain the names of persons, firms, or corporations who paid the tax aforesaid, with the amount paid by each. This Department will take pleasure in supplying you with any information that you desire that is contained in these records, so far as it is possible to do so.

The statement containing the amount of cotton tax collected, inclosed by you, is herewith returned.

Respectfully,

GEO. B. CORTELYOU,  
Secretary.

While this of itself would fall far short of what would be required to enable the Treasury Department to refund to those who paid, it could, by appropriate legislation, be made very helpful to claimants in identification of the persons, firms, and corporations from whom the tax was collected and the amount paid by each. If it should ever be determined to repay this money there ought to be an act of Congress making these records competent evidence of what they contain, and prescribing the method of obtaining the same. In view of the information contained in these records, which I did not have when I introduced former bills on this subject in the Fifty-ninth Congress and in this, I shall, at an early day, prepare and present to Congress another bill providing that the amounts, shown by the records to have been collected from each State, be turned into the treasuries of such States, to be paid to such claimants as present their demands within a prescribed period of time and upon certain defined rules of evidence, giving to the records in the office of the internal-revenue collector full faith and credit as to what they contain, and after the expiration of that time, whatever balance remains, to be used for Confederate pensions, or in such other manner as may be directed by the legislatures of the respective States. I am sure the rights of parties interested can be far more readily and cheaply ascertained by the States than by the officials of the United States Treasury.

It may be interesting to call attention to the fact that in August, 1861, after armed hostilities had actually begun and some bloody battles had been fought, Congress enacted a law levying an annual tax of \$20,000,000 to be collected from the States. This was a war measure and the tax was apportioned among the States according to population as required by the Constitution. In October, 1862, the law was so amended as to make this tax a charge upon the land in the "insurrectionary States" to be defined by the proclamation of the President. This was a direct tax and the law imposing it was within the purview of the Constitution.

Of course this tax was not collected from the States composing the Confederate government, for obvious reasons, but it was collected from those denominated "loyal States." Later this tax was remitted to the States that had not paid it and refunded to those which did pay it. Now, then, if it was right to refund this tax constitutionally levied and collected, why, in all reason and fairness, is it not right to refund this tax collected from certain other States which was collected without constitutional authority? No other answer can be

given to this question than that every principle of right, fair dealing, and governmental honesty requires that it should be done. The question is, Will Congress do it?

I give here the respective amounts collected from the nine principal cotton-growing States. None of the other collections run as high as \$1,000,000 from any State.

Statement of amount of internal-revenue tax on raw cotton collected in each State during the fiscal years 1863 to 1868, inclusive.

	1863.	1864.	1865.	1866.	
Alabama.....				\$3,733,620.25	
Arkansas.....				203,073.84	
Georgia.....				3,554,544.38	
Louisiana.....	\$19,920.93	\$436,044.52	\$593,108.02	4,390,150.17	
Mississippi.....				756,629.27	
North Carolina.....				211,658.57	
South Carolina.....				731,939.67	
Tennessee.....		488,325.80	877,901.09	2,148,437.98	
Texas.....				1,395,524.17	
			1867.	1868.	Total.
Alabama.....			\$3,040,868.01	\$3,604,583.84	\$10,388,072.10
Arkansas.....			1,641,342.22	711,222.37	2,555,688.43
Georgia.....			3,283,276.36	5,069,274.24	11,897,094.98
Louisiana.....			2,971,708.19	1,777,569.17	10,098,501.00
Mississippi.....			4,464,664.40	3,521,702.26	8,742,965.93
North Carolina.....			860,704.55	887,341.75	1,969,704.87
South Carolina.....			1,429,281.10	2,011,199.39	4,172,420.16
Tennessee.....			1,929,301.72	2,429,494.12	7,873,460.71
Texas.....			2,780,307.31	1,326,569.76	5,502,401.24

NOTE.—The tax on raw cotton was levied by act of July 1, 1862 (12 Stat., 465), and repealed by act of February 3, 1868 (15 Stat., 34).

I confess that I am not so much concerned about how this money, when refunded, shall be employed as I am about its actual repayment. Various propositions have been presented to Congress as to how this money ought to be apportioned. Most of them have asked that it be applied to the common-school fund. After the most earnest consideration of this question in all its bearings, I have been unable to bring myself to the conclusion that this would be the most equitable disposition of this money. I yield to no man in my desire to have the benefits of a common-school education extended to the children of the whole country, but there are limitations beyond which I can not go without violence to honest convictions. The conditions existing in Southern States are peculiar and not well understood in some other sections of the country. With a white native population there is no material blessing comparable to that of the education in substantial matters of the rising generation. We want them fitted not only for enlightened citizenship, but also for the intelligent direction of public affairs, municipal, State, and national. While this is true, it must be admitted that distinctions should be made along racial lines based upon peculiar characteristics.

I assume that no true American citizen will insist that Asiatic peoples and other foreign elements, whether of one color or another, from which anarchists are recruited, constitute the sources from which we may expect to evolve the truest citizenship of the nation. From England, from Scotland, from Ireland, from Germany, from Norway and Sweden, and from other European countries, we have inherited some of our richest and noblest blood, but we never got any of it from Africa. Having been born and raised on a Southern plantation, surrounded by a multitude of little negroes who were my earliest playmates, I have nothing but the kindest feeling for them. But while this is true, I know, from a long and intimate association with them, that the negro, neither of the pure or mixed blood, can ever become a safe and trusted American citizen in the broadest sense. This feeling must be shared by every unbiased man who has had the opportunity of forming an impartial opinion. I am far from wishing to deny the negro any and every possible growth and development mentally and morally which he is capable of using advantageously to himself and the community in which he may live; but when we undertake, by law, to make him the equal of the white man, we essay the impossible. I have always been willing to give him such rudimentary education and manual training as will fit him for his station in life, and to this end our Southern States have voted liberal appropriations of money raised by taxation from the white people. Beyond this I am not willing to go. There is nothing truer than—

A little learning is a dangerous thing;  
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring.

The negro as a race, with rare exceptions, is not capable of this "deep drinking," and the effort only serves to make him a more "undesirable citizen." I want to help him to be useful in

his sphere, and there his greatest happiness lies. It is worse than idle to talk about making him equal to the white man.

This is not a digression from my subject, but leads up to the fundamental objection to the use of this cotton-tax money, if it should ever be refunded to the States, for school purposes. We are taxing ourselves in an increasing ratio for educational objects, and we are willing to bear it under directions prescribed by our State legislatures. This we have done and are now doing cheerfully, and are giving the negro children a full benefit. We will continue to do this from a humanitarian and Christian standpoint, and because it is to the interest of all alike that the negro, whose home must always be in our midst, shall be prepared for the greatest degree of happiness and usefulness of which he is capable. That he ought not to be encouraged to figure as a prominent factor in the domain of politics his best friends must admit. Eliminated from the political equation, as he is now in the South, every man familiar with the situation knows that he is happier, better contented, and more prosperous than ever before since his emancipation. There are two controlling reasons, therefore, why I believe that so much of this money as can not be refunded direct to parties entitled to it should not be used as a common-school fund. One of these I have just given. The other is that, next to the people who actually paid it, the Confederate soldiers and their widows have the strongest equitable claim.

They represented the wealth-producing power of their section, and this tax was so much subtracted from the product of their toil. They and their families owned the land upon which the cotton was grown. They are all old, and very many of them are feeble and poor. Our State governments are doing what they can to relieve their necessities and smooth the short pathway that lies between them and the grave. We do not intend that any of them shall ever die in the poorhouse. We are giving them all the pension we are able to provide, but in most cases the annual allowance does not amount to more than the monthly pensions to Federal soldiers. We do not ask that they be placed on the pension rolls of the Government, already so heavily burdened, but I thought it might appeal with special force to the gallant old men in Congress who "wore the blue" in the bloody days from 1861 to 1865, when the equally gallant "wearers of the gray" appeal to them to be allowed to use their own money to help the needy of their comrades. Under the act of Congress of February, 1907, every Federal soldier who served ninety days, without regard to physical or financial ability is allowed a pension of from \$12 to \$20 per month, according to age. No such rule will ever prevail in the case of the Confederate soldier. We can provide only for those who need the help.

The time is rapidly approaching when pensions will no longer be needed for either Federal or Confederate soldiers of the civil war. It will be but a few years until the last one shall have crossed the unseen boundary line which separates time from eternity. I trust that there are few animosities now. On that other shore there will be none. We can well afford to be generous to each other here, and remember that, with the lights before us, we all did what we thought was right. Whatever may be the judgment of future generations as to the rightfulness or wrongfulness of our great conflict, based upon the researches of impartial historians, all will know that the armies of the North and of the South, in four years of fearful conflict, wrote the brightest pages in the martial annals of the world. We fought, some under the Southern Cross, some under the Stars and Stripes, but we were all American soldiers and all contributed to the glory of American arms. Now comes the remnant of the armies of the South and asks, as a matter of simple justice, that the soldiers of the North and their descendants who are in Congress meet us upon the broad plane of comradeship and fair dealing and give us back our own. I believe you will do it; and may the spirit of our heroic dead and of Him who came to bring "peace on earth, good will to men" guide us in our determination. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. DALZELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CRUMPACKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 21260, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, pending that I move that the House do now take a recess until 11.30 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify Members.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully raise the point of order that the gentleman's suggestion at this time is dilatory.

Mr. PAYNE. On that point of order I want to say this, to explain it to the gentleman from Mississippi (the rest of the House understands), that the point is not dilatory, but facilitates business, because it enables the Sergeant-at-Arms to bring in the Members of the House on this roll call, and we probably will get a quorum. Otherwise—

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Regular order!

Mr. PAYNE. I am addressing myself to the point of order. Otherwise we might have a roll call, and at the end of it find we were two or three short of a quorum, and then we would have to call the roll again. I hope I have made it so clear that even the gentleman from Mississippi may have a glimmering idea of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on the point of order I desire to be heard. I make the point of order that the gentleman is dilatory, because he has no reason to know, nor has he any reason even to expect, that the point of no quorum would be raised by anybody except himself. The House can recess without a quorum, provided the point of order that a quorum is not present is not made.

Mr. PAYNE. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the House could take a recess without a quorum?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Provided the point of order is not made.

Mr. PAYNE. Provided the point of order is not made. Mr. Speaker, I hope that a copy of the rules will be furnished the gentleman from Mississippi and that he will devote some time to a careful and prayerful study of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not yield to the gentleman from New York. I am discussing the point of order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course we can not look to the minority all the time to furnish a quorum for the House. We furnish our share of it and a little bit more, as the Record will show.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is not speaking to the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In my service in the House, many and many a time a thing has been passed without a quorum when the point of no quorum was not made. I respectfully submit without further argument of the question as to whether or not the suggestion of the gentleman from New York is not fully as dilatory as the suggestion of mine the other day that there was no quorum, after the Members had passed through the tellers and disclosed the fact that there was no quorum.

Mr. PAYNE. I would test the gentleman's good faith if it could be done, but, as the Speaker knows and as every other gentleman except the gentleman from Mississippi knows, if the roll call discloses the fact that no quorum is present, that of itself stops the proceedings of the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Chair announces the fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DALZELL). The Chair was endeavoring to get the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to state to him that having demanded the yeas and nays, if it should turn out after the roll call that no quorum was present, the Speaker must officially take notice of it, and a point of order is not necessary to be made. The Chair thinks the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand the Chair can interpose and take notice of it, and I express my gratification that there is a justification of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair not only can take notice of it, but he must take notice of it. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and as many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from New York will, when their names are called, answer "aye," as many as are opposed will answer "no," those present and not voting will answer "present," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 113, nays 75, answered "present" 14, not voting 185, as follows:

YEAS—113.

Allen	Dwight	Huff	Parsons
Ames	Ellis, Oreg.	Humphrey, Wash.	Payne
Andrus	Englebright	Jenkins	Pollard
Barchfield	Esch	Jones, Wash.	Porter
Bennet, N. Y.	Fordney	Kahn	Pray
Birdsall	Foss	Keifer	Rainey
Bonyng	Foulkrod	Kennedy, Iowa	Rauch
Boyd	French	Kennedy, Ohio	Reynolds
Furleigh	Fuller	Kinkaid	Rodenberg
Burton, Del.	Gardner, Mich.	Knapp	Scott
Calder	Gardner, N. J.	Knopf	Smith, Cal.
Calderhead	Gilhams	Küstermann	Smith, Iowa
Campbell	Goebel	Lawrence	Snapp
Capron	Graff	Lindbergh	Southwick
Caulfield	Greene	Loudenslager	Stafford
Chaney	Gronna	McGavin	Steenerson
Chapman	Hale	McKinney	Sterling
Cole	Hamilton, Mich.	McMorran	Suloway
Cook, Colo.	Haskins	Madden	Taylor, Ohio
Cooper, Pa.	Haugen	Madison	Thistlewood
Cooper, Wis.	Hawley	Mann	Townsend
Crumpacker	Hayes	Marshall	Voistead
Currier	Henry, Conn.	Miller	Waldo
Dalzell	Higgins	Moore, Pa.	Washburn
Dawson	Hinshaw	Morse	Wheeler
Diekema	Howell, N. J.	Mouser	Young
Douglas	Howell, Utah	Needham	
Draper	Hubbard, Iowa	Nye	
Durey	Hubbard, W. Va.	Olcott	

NAYS—75.

Adair	Dixon	Henry, Tex.	Robinson
Alken	Ellerbe	Hughes, N. J.	Russell, Mo.
Alexander, Mo.	Ferris	Hull, Tenn.	Russell, Tex.
Ansberry	Fitzgerald	Johnson, Ky.	Sabath
Asbrook	Floyd	Johnson, S. C.	Sheppard
Beall, Tex.	Fornes	Kellher	Sherwood
Bell, Ga.	Foster, Ill.	Lamar, Mo.	Sims
Booher	Garner	Lamb	Slayden
Burgess	Godwin	Lloyd	Smith, Mo.
Burleson	Goulden	McDermott	Sparkman
Burnett	Hackett	Griggs	Spitzer
Candler	Hackney	Maynard	Sulzer
Carter	Hamill	Moon, Tenn.	Thomas, N. C.
Clark, Fla.	Hamilton, Iowa	Murphy	Tou Velle
Clark, Mo.	Hardy	O'Connell	Watkins
Clayton	Hay	Patterson	Webb
Cox, Ind.	Healin	Randell, Tex.	Williams
Davenport	Helm	Reid	Wilson, Pa.
Denver		Richardson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—14.

Bartlett, Ga.	De Armond	Humphreys, Miss.	Wreeland
Bradley	Garrett	Lowden	Wanger
Brownlow	Hamlin	Shackleford	
Caldwell	Harrison	Taylor, Ala.	

NOT VOTING—185.

Acheson	Ellis, Mo.	Knowland	Pearre
Adamson	Fairchild	Lafean	Perkins
Alexander, N. Y.	Fassett	Lamar, Fla.	Peters
Anthony	Favrot	Landis	Pou
Bannon	Finley	Langley	Powers
Barclay	Flood	Langing	Pratt
Bartholdt	Focht	Lassiter	Prince
Bartlett, Nev.	Foster, Ind.	Law	Pujo
Bates	Foster, Vt.	Leake	Ransdell, La.
Beale, Pa.	Fowler	Lee	Reeder
Bede	Fulton	Legare	Rhinoek
Bennett, Ky.	Gaines, Tenn.	Lenahan	Riordan
Bingham	Gaines, W. Va.	Lever	Roberts
Boutell	Gardner, Mass.	Levis	Rothermel
Bowers	Gill	Lilley	Rucker
Brantley	Gillespie	Lindsay	Ryan
Broadhead	Gillett	Littlefield	Saunders
Broussard	Glass	Livingston	Sherley
Brumm	Goldfogle	Longworth	Sherman
Brundidge	Gordon	Lorimer	Slomp
Burke	Graham	Loud	Small
Burton, Ohio	Granger	Lovering	Smith, Mich.
Butler	Gregg	McCall	Smith, Tex.
Eyrd	Haggott	McCreary	Sperry
Carlin	Hall	McGuire	Stanley
Cary	Hammond	McHenry	Stephens, Tex.
Cockran	Harding	McKinlay, Cal.	Stevens, Minn.
Cocks, N. Y.	Hardwick	McKinley, Ill.	Sturgiss
Conner	Hepburn	McLachlan, Cal.	Talbott
Cook, Pa.	Hill, Conn.	McLain	Tawney
Cooper, Tex.	Hill, Miss.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Thomas, Ohio
Coudrey	Hitchcock	McMillan	Tirrell
Cousins	Hobson	Malby	Underwood
Craig	Holliday	Mondell	Wallace
Cravens	Houston	Moon, Pa.	Watson
Crawford	Howard	Moore, Tex.	Weeks
Cushman	Howland	Mudd	Weems
Darragh	Hughes, W. Va.	Murdock	Weisse
Davey, La.	Hull, Iowa	Nelson	Wiley
Davidson	Jackson	Nicholls	Willett
Davis, Minn.	James, Addison D.	Norris	Wilson, Ill.
Dawes	James, Ollie M.	Olmsted	Wolf
Denby	Jones, Va.	Overstreet	Wood
Driscoll	Kimball	Padgett	Woodyard
Dunwell	Kipp	Page	
Edwards, Ga.	Kitchin, Claude	Parker, N. J.	
Edwards, Ky.	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Parker, S. Dak.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:  
For the vote:

Mr. WOOD with Mr. WOLF.  
Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. WILLETT.  
Mr. WEEKS with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.  
Mr. WATSON with Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
Mr. TIRRELL with Mr. SMALL.  
Mr. STURGISS with Mr. SHERLEY.  
Mr. SPERRY with Mr. RYAN.  
Mr. PERKINS with Mr. ROTHERMEL.  
Mr. NORRIS with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana.  
Mr. MONDELL with Mr. PAGE.  
Mr. MALBY with Mr. MOORE of Texas.  
Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan with Mr. LEVER.  
Mr. LOVERING with Mr. LENAHAN.  
Mr. LOUD with Mr. LEE.  
Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. HITCHCOCK.  
Mr. LANING with Mr. HAMMOND.  
Mr. HOWLAND with Mr. GREGG.  
Mr. HARDING with Mr. GORDON.  
Mr. FOSTER of Indiana with Mr. GILLESPIE.  
Mr. FAIRCHILD with Mr. GILL.  
Mr. MURDOCK with Mr. FINLEY.  
Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. FAVROT.  
Mr. CUSHMAN with Mr. DE ARMOND.  
Mr. COUSINS with Mr. CRAWFORD.  
Mr. CONNER with Mr. CRAVENS.  
Mr. BUTLER with Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia.  
Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.  
Mr. BEALE of Pennsylvania with Mr. CARLIN.  
Mr. BATES with Mr. BRODHEAD.  
Mr. ACHESON with Mr. BOWERS.

Until further notice:

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. BYRD.

For the session:

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 11.30 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the president of the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission submitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of certain awards of the Commission (H. R. Doc. 889)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims (H. R. Doc. 888)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a schedule of claims allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury under appropriations, the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund (H. R. Doc. 887)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of A. S. McDaniel, administrator of estate of J. V. McDaniel, against The United States (H. R. Doc. 892)—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Augustus B. Miller against The United States (H. R. Doc. 891)—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of W. W. Wise, administrator of estate of David N. Wise, against The United States (H. R. Doc. 893)—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Daniel M. Dempsey, administrator of estate of Berryman S. Dempsey, against The United States (H. R. Doc. 894)—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a



letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of reexamination of Cape Fear River (H. R. Doc. 890)—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20247) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the keeping of employment agencies in the District of Columbia where fees are charged for procuring employment or situations," approved June 19, 1906, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1526), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 394) setting aside a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands in the Philippine Islands for school purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1527), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Private Land Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15442) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a court of private land claims and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories," approved March 3, 1891, and the acts amendatory thereto, approved February 21, 1893, and June 27, 1898, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1528), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 213) for the relief of S. R. Green, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1529), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. TIRRELL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 879) for the relief of John S. Higgins, paymaster, United States Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1530), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13816) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Handran, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 21302) to aid in the conservation of the headwaters of the Mississippi River and certain forests in northern Minnesota for said purpose, all to improve the navigation of said river—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COUDREY: A bill (H. R. 21303) providing for the appointment of an Inland Waterways Commission and for the improvement and development of the inland waterways of the country—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 21304) to extend the pension laws of the United States to the soldiers engaged in the Utah expedition of 1857 and 1858, and to the widows and children of such soldiers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 21305) to authorize the St. Louis, Brownsville and Mexico Railway Company, of Texas, to construct a bridge across the Rio Grande, connecting the city of Brownsville, Tex., with the city of Matamoros, Mexico—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 21306) to amend section 23 of the act approved June 22, 1874, entitled "An act to amend customs-revenue laws and to repeal moieties"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 21307) to amend an act approved August 15, 1894, an agreement with the Alsea and other Indians on the Siletz Indian Reservation, in Oregon—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 21308) granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 21309) for the support of school of mines and mining at Miami, Okla.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 21310) to promote the safety of passengers and employees of railroads by compelling railroads and railways engaged in interstate commerce to equip their passenger cars with electricity for heating and lighting purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: A bill (H. R. 21311) to ratify and confirm an act of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, authorizing the manufacture and distribution of electric light and power in the district of Wailuku, on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21312) to ratify an act of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, authorizing the manufacture, distribution, and supply of electric light and power in the district of Lahaina, county of Maui, Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 21313) to establish a naval station at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 21314) granting condemned ordnance to the St. Bartholomew's Battalion, of the city of New York—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon (by request): A bill (H. R. 21315) to relieve the Copper River Railway Company of Alaska from taxation—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 21316) to relieve the Copper River and Northwestern Railway Company in Alaska from taxation—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 21317) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside a certain tract of land for town-site purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LOWDEN: A bill (H. R. 21318) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded fungicides, paris greens, lead arsenates, and other insecticides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 377) increasing compensation of C. O. Houk—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Resolution (H. Res. 378) increasing compensation of messenger to Committee on Pensions—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolution (H. Res. 379) providing for compensation of a messenger to the Clerk of the House in lieu of a janitor now provided for—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Resolution (H. Res. 380) providing additional compensation to the clerk of Committee on the Census—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Resolution (H. Res. 381) for an additional clerk to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HASKINS: Resolution (H. Res. 382) for extra compensation to the members of the United States Capitol police force—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KEIFER: Memorial of the legislature of Ohio asking Congress to provide for a national bureau of health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 21319) granting an increase of pension to John H. Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: A bill (H. R. 21320) granting an increase of pension to Carey W. Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21321) granting an increase of pension to John Stafford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 21322) granting an increase of pension to John Mahuken Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 21323) for the relief of Mrs. Ella V. Gordon, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COUDREY: A bill (H. R. 21324) granting a pension to Patrick Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 21325) granting an increase of pension to Henry Loucks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 21326) granting a pension to C. C. Dearing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILL: A bill (H. R. 21327) for the relief of Philip Berger—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 21328) granting an increase of pension to Michael Coplinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 21329) granting a pension to J. P. Bloodworth—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 21330) granting an increase of pension to Racine D. Kellogg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21331) granting an increase of pension to J. F. Bishop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21332) granting an increase of pension to William Bagley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21333) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LASSITER: A bill (H. R. 21334) for the relief of the infant heirs of William Francis Gill, deceased, of Chesterfield County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 21335) for the relief of Walter F. Rogers, executor of the estate of Sarah Edwards, late owner of lot numbered 116, square numbered 628, Washington, D. C., with regard to assessment and payment of damages on account of changes of grade due to construction of the Union Station, District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANSELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 21336) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Whatley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 21337) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Austin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: A bill (H. R. 21338) granting an increase of pension to Elias Gerberich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 21339) granting an increase of pension to Frank Brounlow—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 21340) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Townsend—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 21341) for the relief of John I. Conroy and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 21342) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Cavitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 21343) granting an increase of pension to John Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 21344) granting an increase of pension to John S. Worrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 21345) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bradfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILHAMS: A bill (H. R. 21346) granting an increase of pension to Franklin King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 21347) granting an increase of pension to Harry L. Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21348) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Haley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petition of Knights of Columbus of Tonawanda, N. Y., for H. R. 18517, for making October 12 a holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Lancaster and Depew, for amendment proposed by American Federation of Labor confer-

ence to the Sherman antitrust law, and for the Pearre bill, the employers' liability bill, and the national eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of banking committee of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, against S. 3025—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDRUS: Petition of citizens of Tarrytown and New Rochelle, N. Y., for amendment proposed by American Federation of Labor conference to the Sherman antitrust law, and for the Pearre bill, the employers' liability bill, and the national eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of Chicago City Club, for H. R. 10457, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Harry Remer (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Hiram J. Vance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Ohio general assembly, for a national bureau of health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Coshocton, N. Y., for H. R. 20584, amendment to Sherman antitrust law, and for the Pearre bill (H. R. 94), employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Mahken Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers of Millinocket, Me., against removal of tariff on paper and pulp—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Maine, for a national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of Iron Molders' Union of Gadsden, Ala., for amendment to Sherman antitrust law, and for Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, papers to accompany H. R. 21271, for the relief of George F. Amos—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition favoring remedial legislation excluding labor unions from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Davis Thomas, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for amendment to Sherman antitrust law, Wilson bill (H. R. 20584), the Pearre bill (H. R. 94), employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of citizens of Illinois, 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. CALDERHEAD: Paper to accompany H. R. 4020, for relief of the Kansas State Militia of 1864—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of D. Firth and other citizens of the State of Florida, for H. R. 20584, H. R. 94, and other legislation in the interest of labor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOK of Pennsylvania: Petition of City Club of Chicago, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring plans of President Roosevelt for conserving forestry, agricultural, mineral, and other natural resources of the United States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of citizens of the United States, for concurrent resolution 28, against the atrocities practiced by the Russian Government—to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Resolution of the legislature of the State of Oklahoma, to accompany a bill for the appropriation of money to improve the Arkansas River in the State of Oklahoma—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of citizens of Troy, N. Y., for amendment to Sherman antitrust law, for the Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of Typothetæ of New York, against application to labor unions of the provisions of amendments to the Sherman antitrust law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of American Newspaper Publishers' Association, for immediate consideration of the Stevens bill relative to wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Board of Trade of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against removal of duty on wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Also, petition of New York Board of Trade and Transportation, against the Hepburn amendment to the Sherman antitrust act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of International Congress of Tuberculosis, of Philadelphia, for a building in Washington for the Tuberculosis Congress to be held in September—to the Committee on Disposition of Rooms.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: Paper to accompany bill for relief of G. R. Baker (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of O. F. Bird and others, against the further diversion of waters of Lake Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Dr. J. F. Stokes, of Rockford, Ill., for H. R. 4432 (reorganization of Dental Corps in the Army)—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Baltimore Clearing House against the Aldrich bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILL: Petition of trades labor organizations of Cumberland, Md., for amendment to Sherman antitrust law and for Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petitions of Plumbers' Union and Cotton Weavers' Association, of Woonsocket, R. I., and Musicians' Protective Union, of Providence, R. I., for amendment to Sherman antitrust law, for the Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Council, No. 1260, Knights of Columbus, for the Goulden bill, making October 12 a national holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Petition of citizens of Sedalia, Mo., for amendment to Sherman antitrust law (H. R. 20584) and for Pearre bill (H. R. 94), employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of Warren Grange, of Warren, Vt., for a national highways commission and Federal aid in road construction (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Barre and Lindonville, Vt., for amendment to Sherman antitrust law, and for Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Iowa: Papers to accompany H. R. 20859, for the relief of John J. Chance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 457, of St. Joseph and Benton Harbor, Mich., for exemption of labor unions from the operations of the Sherman antitrust law; for the Pearre bill, regulating injunctions; for the employers' liability act, and for the eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWLAND: Petitions of William Mitchell and other citizens, of Cleveland, Ohio, and Frank Sweet and 4 other citizens of Painesville, Ohio, for exemption of labor unions from the operations of the Sherman antitrust law; for the Pearre bill, regulating injunctions; for the employers' liability act, and for the eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of citizens of Washington, against religious legislation for the District of Columbia (H. R. 4897)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Washington, for H. R. 40, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Washington, favoring H. R. 15837, for a national highways commission and appropriation for Federal aid in road building—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KELIHER: Petitions of Northeast Water Works Association and board of directors of the Trades League of Philadelphia, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of Boston Clearing House Association and Worcester Clearing House, against the Aldrich bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of labor organizations of Keokuk, Iowa, favoring bills affecting labor, amendment to

Sherman antitrust law, the Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petitions of citizens of Adams, Mass., and Carpenters' Union of Pittsfield, 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. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Burrell C. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of American Paper and Pulp Association, against the repeal of the duty on wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William S. Aldrich, of Potsdam, N. Y., for H. R. 9230, for engineering experiment station; H. R. 10457, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains, and other measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Kings County, favoring bills affecting labor, amendment to Sherman antitrust law, the Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petition of citizens of Rock Island, Ill., for making October 12 a holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens and Carpenters' Union of Moline, Ill., for amendment proposed by American Federation of Labor conference to the Sherman antitrust law, and for the Pearre bill, the employers' liability bill, and the national eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Petition of citizens of Portsmouth, Va., for the amendment to the Sherman antitrust law known as the "Wilson bill" (H. R. 20584), for the Pearre bill (H. R. 94), the employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Philadelphia Association of Retail Druggists, relative to H. R. 14639 and S. 4700, to classify certain grades in numbered post-office stations—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PEARRE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth S. Gannon—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of Local Union No. 209, Hod Carriers and Building Laborers of Boston, Mass., for exemption of labor unions from the operations of the Sherman antitrust law; for the Pearre bill, regulating injunctions; for the employers' liability act, and for the eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER: Petitions of citizens of Batavia, North Tonawanda, and Lockport, N. Y., for amendment to Sherman antitrust law, Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Knights of Columbus of North Tonawanda, N. Y., for making October 12 Columbus holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petitions of organized labor in Canton, Quincy, Kewanee, and Galesburg, Ill., for the amendment to the Sherman antitrust law known as the "Wilson bill" (H. R. 20584), for the Pearre bill (H. R. 94), the employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of Board of Trade of Niagara Falls, against repeal of duty on wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of New Brighton, for the amendment to the Sherman antitrust law known as the "Wilson bill" (H. R. 20584), for the Pearre bill (H. R. 94), the employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York City, against the Vreeland currency bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of City Club of Chicago, for H. R. 10457, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of John H. Austin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Angus Gillis (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John J. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Buffalo Lumber Exchange, approving resolutions of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., for conference called by the President for conserving natural resources of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of banking committee of Chamber of Commerce of Buffalo, N. Y., against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Petition of Polish Alliance of Toledo, Ohio, expressing sympathy for the Poles in Prussia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: Petition of citizens of Cohoes, N. Y., for exemption of labor unions from operations of the Sherman antitrust law, for the Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of Crown West Lodge, No. 135, I. O. B. A., of St. Paul, Minn., against legislation providing for an educational test, certificate of character, and money-in-the-pocket feature, as outlined in the Latimer or Gardner bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of John J. Conroy and others—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of City Club of Chicago, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains (H. R. 10457)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of many citizens of New York City, favoring bills affecting labor, amendment to Sherman antitrust law, the Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of New York City, for exemption of labor unions from the operations of the Sherman antitrust law, for the Pearre bill regulating injunctions, for the employers' liability act, and for the eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Joint resolution by the Ohio general assembly, for establishment of a national bureau of health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of citizens of Massachusetts, for exemption of labor unions from operations of the Sherman antitrust law, for the Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of national banks of Chicago, Ill., against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 28, 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. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

### FOREST SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, stating, by the direction of the President and in response to a resolution of the 22d instant, that a statement showing in full the attendance of members of the Forest Service at meetings in conventions during the year 1907, with full details as called for by the resolution, is being prepared as rapidly as possible, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

### RAILROAD DISCRIMINATIONS AND MONOPOLIES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in response to joint resolution of the Senate approved March 7, 1906, a report relative to the investigation made by the Commission into the subject of railroad discriminations and monopolies in coal and oil, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce 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 passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) providing for assistance to the people of the storm-swept States of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Central Trades and Labor Assembly of Corinth, N. Y., 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.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bath, Me., and a petition of sundry citizens of Hall Quarry, Me., 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 Board of Trade of Lewiston, Me., praying for the passage of the so-called "Burnham rural parcels-post bill," which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of Kennebec Local Union, No. 73, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, of Madison, 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.

Mr. PLATT presented petitions of sundry citizens and local labor organizations of Batavia, Buffalo, Brooklyn, Elmira, Cohoes, Ithaca, Lancaster, Corning, Depew, New Brighton, Newburgh, Olean, Oneonta, Poughkeepsie, Troy, Utica, and Schenectady, 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.

He also presented a petition of Twin City Council, No. 413, Knights of Columbus, of Tonawanda, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation making October 12 a national holiday, to be known as "Discovery Day," which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Flushing Association, of Flushing, N. Y., and a petition of the Buffalo Lumber Exchange, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to conserve the natural resources of the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Royal Brewing Company, of Kansas City, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DICK presented a petition of Franklin Lodge, No. 9, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Columbus, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to promote the safety of employees upon railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, of Warren, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Ladies' Aid Society of Mechanicsburg, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

He also presented a memorial of the Cleveland Paper Manufacturing Company, of Cleveland, Ohio, and a memorial of the American Paper and Pulp Association, of New York City, 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.

He also presented a petition of Central Labor Union of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the disfranchisement of citizens of the United States on account of sex, which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a petition of the National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, American Federation of Labor, of East Liverpool, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called "anti-injunction," "employers' liability," and "eight-hour" bills, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Reinhold Richter Camp, No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to authorize the Secretary of War to issue discarded arms to camps of the United Spanish War Veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Central Federated Union of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of at least one of the proposed new battle ships at a Government navy-yard, which was ordered to lie on the table.