

22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the Sophia Yacht Club, Avalon, Catalina Island, Cal., protesting against passage of bill requiring motor boats to have both a licensed pilot and engineer; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of William Thum, mayor of Pasadena, Cal., favoring continuance of the bureau of efficiency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, protesting against passage of House bill 11372, for prohibiting the towing of log rafts in the open sea; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of the Polish Societies of Manchester, N. H., protesting against passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Daughters of Liberty of Gossville, N. H., favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Stratham, N. H., favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Storer Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Portsmouth, N. H.; Albert M. Perkins Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Epping, N. H.; and George S. Cram Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Meredith, N. H., favoring passage of House bill 14070, for increasing pensions for deafness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of the Hartford Central Labor Union, of Hartford, Conn., favoring passage of the Campbell bill (H. R. 16844), to compel manufacturers of foodstuffs to place their names and addresses upon all goods manufactured by them; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Resolutions of the Trenton (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring passage of House bill 17736 and Senate bill 4308, providing for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of Trenton, N. J., favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the congregation Anshe Chased, of Somerville, N. J., against passage of bills providing literacy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of members of Local Union No. 540, Carmen's Union, and Local Union No. 228, Journeymen Tailors, of Trenton, N. J., favoring passage of House bill 22339 and Senate bill 6172, known as the anti-Taylor system bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Petition of John O'Byrne and other citizens of Gregg and Upshur Counties, Tex., favoring passage of the old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Immigration Restriction League of Boston, Mass., favoring passage of Senate bill 3175, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 28, 1912.

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

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho suggests the absence of a quorum, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cummins	Martin, Va.	Sanders
Bacon	Curtis	Myers	Simmons
Borah	Fall	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Bourne	Foster	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Gallinger	Nixon	Smith, S. C.
Bristow	Gardner	O'Gorman	Smoot
Bryan	Gronna	Oliver	Stephenson
Burnham	Guggenheim	Overman	Sutherland
Burton	Heyburn	Page	Thornton
Chamberlain	Johnston, Ala.	Percy	Tillman
Chilton	Jones	Perkins	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Pomerene	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Rayner	Watson
Culberson	McCumber	Richardson	
Cullom	McLean	Root	

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. POINDESTER] is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 5930. An act to extend the time for the completion of dams across the Savannah River by authority granted Twin City Power Co. by an act approved February 29, 1908;

H. R. 14083. An act to create a new division of the southern judicial district of Texas and to provide for terms of court at Corpus Christi, Tex., and for a clerk for said court, and for other purposes;

H. R. 17029. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convert the regimental Army post at Fort Oglethorpe into a brigade post;

H. R. 20586. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution to declare and make certain the authority of the Attorney General to begin and maintain and of any court of competent jurisdiction to entertain and decide a suit or suits for the purpose of having judicially declared a forfeiture of the rights granted by the act entitled "An act granting the Washington Improvement & Development Co. a right of way through the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington," approved June 4, 1898.

### REPORT OF NAVAL BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 725).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 23d instant, certain information relative to the appointment of a board to consider the question of transferring certain offices of the Navy Department to the Department of Commerce and Labor, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

### JOSEPH M. PADGETT v. UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 724).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion of law filed by the court in the cause of Joseph M. Padgett v. United States (Washington Navy Yard), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 319) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1912, and for other purposes.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions of the House on the life, character, and public services of JAMES P. LATA, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the congregation of the Dingman's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Delaware, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Quincy, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the preparation and printing of a national directory of commercial organizations of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a memorial of the Silver Crown Building & Loan Association, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation levying a special excise tax on building and loan associations, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hillside, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the use of insignia and garb of any denomination in the Indian public schools, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry members of the Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, residents of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the publications of fraternal associations the privileges of second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bond County, Ill., praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-injunction bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of members of the Woman's Auxiliary of St. Paul's School, of Concord, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide medical and sanitary relief for the natives of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to maintain the present water rates in the District, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. POMERENE. I present letters from the legislative committee of the Grain Dealers' National Association and the transportation committee of the Peoria Board of Trade and sundry telegrams from chambers of commerce and commercial organizations throughout the State of Ohio in favor of Senate bill 6810, relating to bills of lading. I do not ask that they be read, but I should like to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 28, 1912.

HON. ATLEE POMERENE,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: The Grain Dealers' National Association gives its hearty support and approval to Senate bill 6810.

This association represents the entire grain interests throughout the United States in all of its branches. Its membership of more than 2,000 is composed of country shippers, receivers, and exporters. This membership makes it national in scope and thoroughly representative of the entire grain industry of the country.

The matter of bills of lading has been one of great importance and serious consideration by this organization for a great number of years, and Senate bill 6810 meets the hearty approval not only of this association itself, but of its constituent members.

It is to be hoped that this measure will receive the approval of Congress at the present session, because there is a crying necessity for remedial legislation of this character.

Respectfully submitted by the legislative committee of the Grain Dealers' National Association.

A. E. REYNOLDS, Chairman.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 28, 1912.

HON. ATLEE POMERENE,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Peoria Board of Trade I want to state that we are very much in favor of Senate bill 6810, in regard to the bill of lading matter, and believe it is the bill that should be passed.

This matter is of vital importance to the whole grain interests of the country, and we are very much in need of the protection such a bill will give us.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE PEORIA BOARD OF TRADE,  
By WM. T. CORNELISON.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, May 25, 1912.

Senator POMERENE,  
Washington, D. C.:

The Cincinnati Branch, National League of Commission Merchants, heartily indorse your amended bill S. 6810, now before the United States Senate. We trust that you will use your best efforts in urging the passage of this bill.

VIRGIL M. GERRARD, Secretary.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 22, 1912.

Senator ATLEE POMERENE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned respectfully asks that you give your support and influence to Senate bill 6810, the Pomerene bill, in contradistinction to Senate bill 957. Letter will follow.

JOHN C. SCALES,  
Chairman Refrigerator-Car Line Committee,  
National League Commission Merchants.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., May 27, 1912.

Senator POMERENE,  
Washington, D. C.:

The East Side Manufacturing Association, representing large number of shippers, favor passage Pomerene substitute Senate bill 6810, relative bill of lading, and urge upon you the importance of your support of same.

EAST SIDE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,  
P. M. HANSON, President.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., May 27, 1912.

HON. ATLEE POMERENE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Shippers and receivers of Indianapolis, represented by the Indianapolis Freight Bureau, strongly indorse Pomerene substitute Senate bill 6810, on bills of lading, and urge its adoption.

INDIANAPOLIS FREIGHT BUREAU,  
By C. C. HANCOCK,  
Chairman Executive Committee.  
J. KEAVEY,  
Commissioner.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 27, 1912.

HON. ATLEE POMERENE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Chicago Association of Commerce sent their attorney, Cornelius Lynde, to Washington to approve, with certain modifications, which Mr. Lynde reports were acceptable, the so-called Pomerene bill-of-lading bill. With these modifications acceptable to you, we favor the Pomerene substitute bill, known, we understand, as Senate bill 6810.

THE CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,  
By H. C. BARLOW, Traffic Director.

DETROIT, MICH., May 27, 1912.

Senator POMERENE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Michigan Manufacturers' Association is anxious that substitute bill lading bill becomes a law.

H. C. HERTZ, Secretary.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., May 27, 1912.

HON. ATLEE POMERENE,  
Washington, D. C.:

We indorse substitute Senate bill 6810, and earnestly urge its passage.

THE DAVIS MILLING CO.,  
ROBT. R. CLARK, President.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 27, 1912.

HON. ATLEE POMERENE,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Many members of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association are interested in the amendments to the bill of lading measure agreed upon at the conference held in Washington, May 22, and are anxious to secure the passage of the Pomerene substitute, Senate bill 6810.

JOHN M. GLENN, Secretary.

NEW YORK, May 27, 1912.

HON. ATLEE POMERENE,  
Washington, D. C.:

This organization, comprising 390 wholesale produce commission merchants, located in 29 principal cities of the United States, offers its unqualified indorsement to your substitute bill No. 6810, containing amendments agreed to by bankers and shippers at conference held at Washington on May 22, and would urge its passage on next Wednesday, at which time, we understand, this bill will come to a vote.

R. S. FRENCH, Business Manager,  
National League of Commission Merchants of the United States.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, May 27, 1912.

HON. ATLEE POMERENE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Cedar Rapids Commercial Club, representing the shipping interests of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, indorse the Pomerene substitute, Senate bill No. 6810, and urge its passage.

CEDAR RAPIDS COMMERCIAL CLUB,  
By W. G. HASKELL, President.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., May 27, 1912.

HON. ATLEE POMERENE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

This will confirm our letter to you and other Senators comprising the committee handling Senate bill 6810, on bills of lading, and will also confirm similar letter to Senators from Minnesota approving the Pomerene substitute bill and urging all to use every effort toward passing this bill without change. We, as one of largest shippers, believe this bill fits the situation and clearly places the shipper in position of knowing his rights. Hence the necessity of favorable action is not imperative, and we request such action of United States Senate.

PILLSBURY FLOUR MILLS CO.,  
By JAS. C. ANDREWS.

CHICAGO, May 27, 1912.

Senator ATLEE POMERENE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Representing the shoe wholesaling interest of the United States, we urge the passage of the Pomerene substitute Senate bill 6810, because it is a complete code on bills of lading, practically already adopted by nine States, pending in others, and the best calculated for securing uniformity in both State and Federal laws governing bills of lading.

NATIONAL SHOE WHOLESALERS' ASSOCIATION,  
S. W. CAMPBELL, Secretary.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., May 27, 1912.

HON. ATLEE POMERENE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Commerce Club of St. Joseph, Mo., strongly indorses Pomerene substitute Senate bill 6810.

H. G. KRAKE, Commissioner.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., May 27, 1912.

HON. ATLEE POMERENE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Pomerene substitute Senate bill 6810, relating to bills of lading, is indorsed by our body as the best and fairest for the shippers of the country, and, in our opinion, imposes no hardship on common carriers, and we earnestly desire its passage.

THE MINNEAPOLIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
By C. A. MAGNUSON, Chairman Committee.

OMAHA, NEBR., May 27, 1912.

ATLEE POMERENE,  
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:

Commercial Club of Omaha, representing various business interests, Omaha, South Omaha, and Council Bluffs, indorses your substitute Senate bill 6810 on behalf shipping interests of these three cities. We hope you will succeed in having same enacted into law. Bill un-

doubtedly represents best thought of all interests concerned and will give relief from many abuses now prevalent. Have advised Nebraska Senators of our position and am urging them to cooperate with you.  
E. J. McVANN,  
Manager Traffic Bureau.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 27, 1912.

Hon. ATLEE POMERENE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We strongly indorse and urge the passage of the Pomerene substitute Senate bill No. 6810, relating to bills of lading.  
NATIONAL IMPLEMENT AND VEHICLE ASSOCIATION,  
E. W. McCULLOUGH, Manager.

QUINCY, ILL., May 27, 1912.

Senator ATLEE POMERENE,  
Washington, D. C.:

This bureau approves your substitute bill 6810, relating to bills of lading, and respectfully requests its passage by the Senate.  
QUINCY FREIGHT BUREAU,  
L. B. BOSWELL, Commissioner.

ST. LOUIS, MO., May 27, 1912.

Hon. ATLEE POMERENE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We strongly indorse substitute Senate bill 6810, relating to bills of lading, and urge its passage.  
ST. LOUIS MANUFACTURERS AND EXPORTERS' ASSOCIATION,  
By JAMES A. TROY, Assistant Secretary.

MOLINE, ILL., May 27, 1912.

Hon. ATLEE POMERENE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Understanding that the Pomerene substitute Senate bill 6810, covering bills of lading, will be reached on the Senate Calendar Wednesday, the 29th, we wish to indorse this bill, it being along the lines recommended by the National Industrial Traffic League, and being, we believe, the most satisfactory for adoption.

DEERE & Co.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., May 27, 1912.

Hon. ATLEE POMERENE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The St. Joseph Board of Trade unanimously indorses Pomerene substitute Senate bill 6810. We consider it of vital importance in safeguarding our commercial interests and respectfully solicit your favorable consideration.

THE ST. JOSEPH BOARD OF TRADE,  
J. L. FREDERICK, President,  
F. FREDERICK, Secretary.

BOSTON, MASS., May 25, 1912.

Hon. A. POMERENE,  
Washington, D. C.:

The National League of Commission Merchants strongly indorse the amended Pomerene bill. It meets the needs of both banking and business interests.

EDGAR W. J. HEARTY,  
Secretary Boston Branch.

BOSTON, MASS., May 25, 1912.

Senator ATLEE POMERENE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Boston Fruit and Produce Exchange much interested in the amended Pomerene Senate bill 6810. It meets the needs of bankers and shippers. Every effort for its passage will be appreciated.  
ALTON E. BRIGGS, Exchange Secretary.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I present resolutions adopted by Masonic lodges in the State of Georgia, favoring the passage of House joint resolution No. 271 relating to the use of the insignia of fraternal or secret societies. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANDRUM LODGE, No. 48, F. AND A. M.,  
Savannah, Ga., May 18, 1912.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,  
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit to you the inclosed copy of resolution passed last night by Landrum Lodge, No. 48, Free and Accepted Masons, and to request that you give the resolution your favorable attention and exert your influence as therein urged.

Yours, very truly,

[SEAL.]

W. C. TRAVIS, Secretary.

Whereas we are informed that there is pending in the House of Representatives a resolution introduced by Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi (H. J. Res. 271) directing the Secretary of War to permit emblems or insignia of fraternal or secret societies to be inscribed on monuments, tombstones, slabs, or markers in the national cemeteries of the United States; and

Whereas many men have found both consolation and refreshment in the brotherly love and affection which such organizations are intended to promote, and naturally many such men desire to have their last resting places marked by the emblems of some beloved fraternity; and

Whereas it seems but simple justice that the wishes of the dead should be granted in this respect: Now therefore be it

Resolved by Landrum Lodge, No. 48, Free and Accepted Masons, That Congress be requested to pass this resolution and permit the placing of such emblems and insignia over the graves of members of fraternal and secret orders.

Resolved further, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary, under the seal of the lodge, to Senators for Georgia and to

the Representative from this district, and also to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives at Washington, with the request that they exert their influence to have the said resolution, No. 271, passed.  
Passed May 17, 1912.  
A true copy.

W. C. TRAVIS, Secretary.

ZERUBBABEL LODGE, No. 15, FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONS,  
Savannah, Ga., May 23, 1912.

Whereas the Declaration of Independence was drawn by Masons, and all the early struggles for the independence of this country were aided and encouraged by the Masons, who have ever stood for individual liberty and for the highest ideals in private and public life; and Whereas under a rule of the War Department no insignia or emblem of a fraternal or secret society can be placed over the grave of one buried in a national cemetery; and

Whereas many worthy and patriotic Masons have laid down their lives for their country and the members of this order still constitute a large part of the defenders of the State and Nation; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives House joint resolution No. 271, by Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi, providing for the placing of insignia or emblems of fraternal or secret societies on graves in national cemeteries: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That Zerubbabel Lodge, No. 15, Free and Accepted Masons, and the members thereof, do most heartily approve said House joint resolution No. 271, and do most earnestly request the House Committee on Military Affairs and the National Congress to pass said resolution No. 271, and we further urge upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence in favor of the same; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of this lodge forward a copy of this resolution to the two Senators from Georgia, to the Representative in Congress from this district, and to the House Committee on Military Affairs, under the seal of the lodge, and call their attention to this request.

[SEAL.]

WILLIAM A. BISHOP, Secretary.

Whereas the Junior Order United American Mechanics is a secret order in which are taught the purest patriotism and the deepest devotion to our beloved country; and

Whereas it has come to our attention that under an order or rule of the War Department it is forbidden for the emblems or insignia of secret or fraternal orders to be displayed on the graves in the national cemeteries; and

Whereas it is our understanding that a resolution has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi, known as House joint resolution No. 271, providing that the emblems and insignia of secret and fraternal orders be permitted to be placed on tombstones, monuments, slabs, and markers in national cemeteries under certain regulations: Now therefore be it

Resolved by Resolution Council, No. 2, of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, That we most heartily approve the said resolution No. 271, above mentioned, except that we favor allowing the deceased to designate, prior to his death, what emblems or insignia shall be placed over his grave, and also favor placing such insignia and emblems as the deceased may have selected when in life, without regard to the wishes of the nearest relatives; and we further favor allowing such emblems and insignia to be placed over the graves of persons leaving no near relatives when the fraternal or secret society to which such deceased person belonged or his legal representative so requests.

Resolved further, That we urge and request the Senators from Georgia, the Congressman from this district, the House Committee on Military Affairs, and all Members of Congress to use their influence toward the passage of the said resolution by Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi, No. 271, and that the secretary of this council send to each of the said Senators and to our Representative and the House Committee on Military Affairs a copy of this resolution.

Passed by Resolution Council, No. 2, Junior Order United American Mechanics, this 20th day of May, 1912.

A true copy.

[SEAL.]

ROBERT M. TENNILLE, Secretary.  
C. W. HOLLIDAY, Councilor.

Mr. SANDERS. I present a communication from the secretary of the National Federation Retail Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Associations, of Abilene, Kans., and a communication from the National Implement and Vehicle Association, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the establishment of a rural parcel-post. I ask that the communications be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the communications were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION RETAIL IMPLEMENT  
AND VEHICLE DEALERS' ASSOCIATIONS,  
SECRETARY'S OFFICE,  
Abilene, Kans., May 23, 1912.

Hon. NEWELL SANDERS,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SANDERS: It is needless to tell you the position our federation takes in regard to parcel-post matters. We have had this matter up a number of times with your association, and I am sure that it was discussed the year that you were president. We feel that the establishment of a rural parcel post would be very disastrous. I do not care to engage in a detailed discussion of the matter, because I think you know all of the arguments we have to set forth. I am simply writing you at this time to ask on behalf of the 5,000 implement and hardware dealers affiliated in our federation your influence in defeating any parcel-post legislation at this session of Congress. We believe that the only way to settle this matter now is to refer it all to a commission with power and means to make a thorough investigation. So many plans have been suggested that it seems to me it would be unadvisable to enact any legislation until due consideration has been given the subject.

Wishing you abundant success, and assuring you of my esteem, I remain,

Sincerely, yours,

H. J. HODGE, Secretary.

NATIONAL IMPLEMENT AND VEHICLE ASSOCIATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.  
Chicago, May 25, 1912.

Hon. NEWELL SANDERS,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SANDERS: I have a letter from our mutual friend, Mr. H. J. Hodge, of the National Federation of Retail Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Associations, relative to parcel post, to the inauguration of which you are aware that the retail dealers in our lines are strongly opposed.

You will also recall that the old Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers were also on record against it, and while our present association has given no official expression on the subject, yet a great many of our members stand with the dealers in their position.

We believe the attitude they now take is a reasonable one, inasmuch as they suggest referring the whole question to a commission with power and means to make a thorough investigation. This certainly ought to bring valuable facts to light, and as the question has been before the public many years and will have a most important bearing on the retailing of merchandise throughout the country a little further delay pending the report of such a commission can not possibly be seriously detrimental to any interest, and we hope it will be your pleasure to take the same view of it and support any bill which will secure the desired result.

With the kindest personal regards, I beg to remain,  
Yours, truly,

E. W. McCULLOUGH.

Mr. GRONNA presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Larimore, N. Dak., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to restrict the free and open marketing of grain, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Kintyre, N. Dak., remonstrating against the adoption of certain amendments to the patent laws, which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. ASHURST presented a petition of Grand Canyon Lodge, No. 249, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, of Winslow, Ariz., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit fraud upon the public by requiring manufacturers to place their own names upon manufactured articles, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. ROOT presented a petition of sundry members of the Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, residents of Hudson, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the publications of fraternal associations the privileges of second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 6925) to authorize the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River near the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 803) thereon.

Mr. GRONNA, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 93) to establish a botanical laboratory at Denver, Colo., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 804) thereon.

Mr. BRISTOW, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (S. 5790) for the relief of C. E. Moore, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 805) thereon.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which were referred certain bills granting pensions and increase of pensions, submitted a report (No. 807) accompanied by a bill (S. 6977) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to the committee:

- S. 53. William H. Wyatt.
- S. 714. Eliza J. Anderson.
- S. 1033. Charles E. Young.
- S. 1138. William H. Power.
- S. 1716. Nancy J. Tolfree.
- S. 1950. William R. Amen.
- S. 2102. Abner K. Gray.
- S. 2651. William P. Gilbert.
- S. 2861. Daniel Davenport.
- S. 3094. Wesley Hunt.
- S. 3107. Sue B. Merrill.
- S. 3184. Godfrey Hammarberg.
- S. 3259. Joseph S. Ewing.
- S. 3460. Mary Ann Babcock.
- S. 3554. Henry M. Dunlap.
- S. 3577. Clyde W. Duvall.
- S. 3690. Henry C. Carbee.
- S. 4016. James S. Evans.
- S. 4088. Levi Wilt.
- S. 4090. Hamilton E. Turner.

- S. 4299. Francis M. Berry.
- S. 5252. Marcus Connelly.
- S. 5289. Allen M. Ripley.
- S. 5311. Orlando C. Beck.
- S. 5447. Thomas E. Ellis.
- S. 5448. Calvin E. Barney.
- S. 5664. Etta B. Stewart.
- S. 5807. Theodore H. Wilson.
- S. 5951. Mary Agnes Drumgoold.
- S. 5967. John T. Allen.
- S. 6019. Robert Ashurst.
- S. 6024. Marion H. Bolerjack.
- S. 6025. James McDaniel.
- S. 6026. John W. Webb.
- S. 6083. Edward Murphy.
- S. 6119. Robert H. Overley.
- S. 6120. Samuel P. Murrell.
- S. 6137. Reason Walker.
- S. 6285. Martha L. Perry.
- S. 6390. Rachel Ann Bovee.
- S. 6395. Eliza T. Eastin.
- S. 6396. Howard Mobley (known as Howard Miller).
- S. 6434. John A. Camp.
- S. 6448. Palmer Atkinson.
- S. 6451. Robert Wood.
- S. 6491. Alexander Harris.
- S. 6510. Edward H. Baker.
- S. 6588. Frederick O. Nims.
- S. 6635. Margaret J. Grable.
- S. 6645. William Dawson.
- S. 6679. Thomas Mauph.
- S. 6690. Edwin W. Johnson.
- S. 6706. James Sweet.
- S. 6708. Thomas McCarty.
- S. 6752. George B. Turney.
- S. 6754. George Elliott.
- S. 6770. Robert W. Shaffer.
- S. 6783. Thomas B. Rand.
- S. 6804. Thomas A. Christy.
- S. 6805. Michael McNulty.
- S. 6806. George W. St. Clair.
- S. 6807. Henry H. Bowman.
- S. 6811. Henry Johnson.
- S. 6816. Jeremiah Williams.
- S. 6817. William Kenoyer.
- S. 6831. Addie E. Ferrell.
- S. 6832. Sarah D. Shaw.
- S. 6849. Melissa J. Sheffield.
- S. 6854. Smith Whitman.
- S. 6856. Charles F. Wellman.
- S. 6858. Cyrus E. Prindle.
- S. 6859. Frederick Richards.
- S. 6860. Elroy S. Jennings.
- S. 6865. Lyman C. Putman.
- S. 6866. James A. Duntun.
- S. 6867. Elias H. Davis.
- S. 6888. Charles H. Robinson.
- S. 6889. Martin O'Dowd.
- S. 6895. Lydia M. Cole.
- S. 6917. Oliver C. Swarouth.
- S. 6923. Frederick Braun.
- S. 6924. Jennie Bassett.
- S. 6937. Emma L. Tappan.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which were referred certain bills granting pensions and increase of pensions, submitted a report (No. 808), accompanied by a bill (S. 6978) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to the committee:

- S. 152. Grant Noble.
- S. 350. Edward F. Shaughnessy.
- S. 428. Gust Carlson.
- S. 451. Ira Howell.
- S. 4763. Jethro J. T. Garde.
- S. 5324. William Buck.
- S. 5393. Anna E. R. Webb.
- S. 6676. Marion Franklin.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21478) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 809) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 22194. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors (Rept. No. 810);

H. R. 22261. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war (Rept. No. 811);

H. R. 22867. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors (Rept. No. 812);

H. R. 23515. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors (Rept. No. 813); and

H. R. 23765. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors (Rept. No. 814).

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 6965) making it unlawful for any society, order, or association to send or receive through the United States mails, or to deposit in the United States mails, any written or printed matter representing such society, fraternal order, or association to be named or designated or entitled by any name hereafter adopted, any word or part of which title shall be the name of any bird or animal, the name of which bird or animal is already being used as a part of its title or name by any other society, fraternal order, or association; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. LIPPITT:

A bill (S. 6966) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Viall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS:

A bill (S. 6967) to amend an act entitled "An act to revise, consolidate, and amend the statutes relating to patents and copyrights"; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 6968) granting an increase of pension to James Luther Justice; and

A bill (S. 6969) granting a pension to Barbara Haws (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 6970) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jose G. Griego; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 6971) granting a pension to Corda P. Gracey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 6972) for the relief of John I. Brown & Son and others (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROOT:

A bill (S. 6973) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Crocker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER:

A bill (S. 6974) for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Esparta*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 6975) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Marie L. Hermance, administratrix of Jeremiah Simozson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURTON:

A bill (S. 6979) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Myers (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) for the appointment of three members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,500 for the construction of a sidewalk bordering the

property of the Government at Fort Banks, Mass., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 25069), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURTON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,000 for the salary of a chief of division of compilation in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 24023), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the pay teller in the office of the assistant treasurer at Cincinnati, Ohio, from \$1,800 per annum to \$2,000 per annum, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 24023), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,500 for civilian assistant in the Bureau of Yards and Docks, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 24023), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### JOHN T. M'CROSSON AND OTHERS.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 11628) authorizing John T. McCrosson and associates to construct an irrigation ditch on the island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—GEORGE B. DUNCAN.

On motion of Mr. BRADLEY, it was

*Ordered*, That there be withdrawn from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of Senate bill 182, Sixty-second Congress, for the relief of George B. Duncan, there having been no adverse report thereon.

#### PROPOSED TARIFF LEGISLATION.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I submit a proposed amendment to the pending tariff bill, which I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the proposed amendment will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. NEWLANDS to the bill (H. R. 18642) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenues, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909:

Whereas certain of the duties heretofore levied by law on articles imported from foreign countries into the United States are so high as to encourage and facilitate the imposition of excessive prices for similar articles of domestic production; and

Whereas such excessive duties fail to produce sufficient revenue; and

Whereas both the Republican and Democratic Parties have, by declarations in their respective platforms, committed themselves to a revision of tariff duties, the former to a revision based on the ascertainment of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad with a fair profit to the manufacturer, and the latter to a revision and gradual reduction of the tariff to a revenue basis; and

Whereas both parties have declared that such revision should be accomplished with a due regard to the interests of domestic workers and without destructive readjustments of domestic industries; and

Whereas neither of such parties is in complete control of legislation and either party is able to prevent the other from carrying out completely its principles and policies, and compromise is therefore desirable and necessary in order to prevent a deadlock in legislation prejudicial to the interests of the United States: Now therefore

*Be it enacted:*

SECTION 1. That on the 1st day of January, 1913, a reduction of 10 per cent shall be made in the duties now imposed by law on articles imported into the United States from foreign countries, and that on the 1st day of January of each year thereafter for the period of four years a further reduction of 5 per cent shall be made on such duties until a total reduction of 30 per cent in such duties shall be made: *Provided, however*, That such reductions shall not apply to duties on articles which have been specifically fixed by law at this session of Congress or shall be hereafter specifically fixed by law: *And provided further*, That such reduction shall not apply to duties on articles the importations of which during the previous fiscal year have equaled one-tenth of the production of similar articles and products in the United States.

SEC. 2. That the ascertainment of the facts upon which the foregoing provisions shall take effect shall be made by a tariff commission consisting of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of whom no more than three shall belong to the same party; that the terms of the commissioners shall be one, two, three, four, and five years, respectively; and that the President, in appointing such commissioners, shall designate the term of each; that at the expiration of such terms the term of each successor shall be for the period of five years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to have the proposed amendment referred to the Committee on Finance?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will take action in regard to that later on. Let the proposed amendment lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the proposed amendment will lie on the table for the present.

#### PUBLIC-LAND ENTRIES.

Mr. SMOOT. I submit a conference report and ask that it be considered immediately.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3367) to amend section 2291 and section 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to homesteads, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: On page 2, line 7, of the House amendment, strike out the word "any" and insert in lieu thereof the word "that."

Amendment numbered 2: On page 2 of the House amendment strike out the following words: "That the entryman may be absent from the land for not more than five months in each period of one year after establishing residence," and in lieu of the words stricken out insert the following: "That upon filing in the local land office notice of the beginning of such absence, the entryman shall be entitled to a continuous leave of absence from the land for a period not exceeding five months in each year after establishing residence, and upon the termination of such absence the entryman shall file a notice of such termination in the local land office."

Amendment numbered 3: After the word "shown," on page 2, line 12, of the House amendment, strike out the semicolon and insert a comma and the following: "and the person commuting must be at the time a citizen of the United States."

Amendment numbered 4: On page 2 of the House amendment, at the end of section 2291, insert the following: "Provided further, That the entryman shall, in order to comply with the requirements of cultivation herein provided for, cultivate not less than one-sixteenth of the area of his entry, beginning with the second year of the entry, and not less than one-eighth, beginning with the third year of the entry, and until final proof, except that in the case of entries under section 6 of the enlarged-homestead laws double the area of cultivation herein provided shall be required, but the Secretary of the Interior may, upon a satisfactory showing, under rules and regulations prescribed by him, reduce the required area of cultivation: *Provided*, That the above provision as to cultivation shall not apply to entries under the act of April 28, 1904, commonly known as the Kinkaid Act, or entries under the act of June 17, 1902, commonly known as the reclamation act, and that the provisions of this section relative to the homestead period shall apply to all unperfected entries as well as entries hereafter made upon which residence is required: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall, within 60 days after the passage of this act, send a copy of the same to each homestead entryman of record who may be affected thereby, by ordinary mail to his last known address, and any such entryman may, by giving notice within 120 days after the passage of this act, by registered letter to the register and receiver of the local land office, elect to make proof upon his entry under the law under which the same was made without regard to the provisions of this act."

That the House agree to the same.

REED SMOOT,  
W. L. JONES,  
FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

SCOTT FERRIS,  
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,  
FRANK W. MONDELL,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask that the conference report be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the conference report will be printed and lie over.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho if he would not allow us to consider the report to-day?

Mr. HEYBURN. If I had time to see how much new legislation is in the bill as reported by the conferees that was not in it when it was before our committee, I would be ready to consider the bill to-day. I have no desire to delay it; but, of course, I have not had time to read the report. There are certain provisions in it that are very radical. I merely want to look at the report, and that is only a fair request.

Mr. SMOOT. I had hoped, Mr. President, that we could have the matter considered and disposed of to-day.

Mr. HEYBURN. I know; I do not quarrel with that sentiment of getting things through, but I have some responsibility;

I served on the committee which reported the bill, and I want to know how much change has been made in it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement regarding this report. The bill has been in conference for two months. The original bill was passed in the Senate; it went to the House, where a new bill was substituted for it. The debate in the House showed that they expected the conferees to fully consider the question of reservations embraced in the conservation policy relating to minerals, timber, and water power. The Secretary of the Interior was desirous that these reservations should be put into the bill. I was in sympathy with the Secretary of the Interior in that contention. It was the contention over that question which kept the bill so long in conference. The House conferees refused to make these reservations, contending that they should be considered in a separate bill, and at the last moment I have yielded and signed the report, because I am unwilling to withhold from the homesteaders of the country the relief to which I think they are entitled.

I favored a reduction of the period of residence from five years to three years; I favored the allowance to homesteaders of a period of absence of five months, during which they could pursue vocations that would enable them to obtain a livelihood; but I was desirous of opening up the entire surface of the public domain to homestead entries, with certain reservations from the grant as to timber, water power, and minerals, so that the entrymen would be free from vexatious investigations and inquiries regarding the character of their land, compelling the investigation of numerous special agents and delay in the ripening of their titles. I wished not only to protect the homesteader in securing for him a wider range of entry upon public lands, but I also wished to protect the future homesteader from the monopolization of the public domain likely to result from the enactment of a law which would be used for purposes of evasion and not for the purpose of settlement.

We all know that, under the existing misfit land laws of the United States, great monopolies have been created in the West in the shape of forests, ownership to the extent of a million acres having drifted into the hands of one firm, and also in coal, iron, and water power. The conservation movement was designed to protect these natural resources in land, in water, in minerals, and in timber from spoliation and monopoly.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state to the Senator that I would be glad to yield, and to-morrow I will—

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not desire the Senator to yield that I may speak upon this report. I desire to withdraw my objection to the present consideration of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further objection to the present consideration of the report? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to go on with my statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I was stating that the purpose of this conservation movement was to protect the natural resources in land, in water, in minerals, and in forests from spoliation and from monopoly, and to offer that protection in the interest of the real homeseeker and homesteader; and, so far as I am concerned, I am unwilling to cease my efforts in that direction until this purpose is fully accomplished by law.

Reference frequently is made, Mr. President, to the Canadian law as a more liberal land law for the homesteader than that on the statute books of the United States. With regard to that I have to say that whilst the Canadian land laws are liberal they absolutely exempt from the grant to the homesteader the water power, the minerals, and the timber; and the Secretary of the Interior, whilst in favor of liberalizing our land laws and our homestead laws so far as residence and absence from actual occupation are concerned, and patterning them after the Canadian land laws in that direction, was simply desirous that the restrictions upon the grant imposed by the Canadian land laws should be inserted in our law. I regarded that as a reasonable suggestion, and I contended through long weeks of discussion upon this subject in favor of making such a reservation.

Mr. President, the home seeker is interested only in securing the surface of the land; that is all he wants for a home; that is all he wants for cultivation. The possible minerals in the shape of coal and iron that may be beneath the surface are of no concern to him, nor is he engaged in entering upon land for the purpose of creating water power or of engaging in the lumber business. He wishes land simply for cultivation and for a home. The solicitude which has been shown for the home seeker

in this effort to withhold from the grant these resources is, in many cases, a hypocritical solicitude, a solicitude ostensibly urged in the interest of the home seeker and the homesteader, but really asserted in the interest of the concentration of these natural resources, the monopoly of these natural resources, and the exploitation of these natural resources by the great combinations of the country. It arises from the deadly hostility to the declared policy of both parties that the natural resources of the country should be protected from monopoly.

Mr. President, whilst I have been desirous that the grant should be restricted so far as the natural resources are concerned, I have not been in favor of a great national landlordship, of concentrating the administration of the public domain in Washington for all time. Legislation upon that subject will come hereafter when we have settled the crucial question as to whether these natural resources shall be retained for the benefit of all the people or whether they shall be turned over to monopoly. That question will then be discussed and disposed of in a manner satisfactory to the people of the Western States.

The Nation has always dealt fairly with the people of the West. The Nation has never regarded itself as the owner of these lands in the sense that they constitute a national asset. The Nation has always regarded itself as the trustee of these great natural resources, holding that trusteeship for the interest of the settlers of the West, both those who are there now and those who are to come, and it will, doubtless, when the beneficiaries show by their laws that they also propose to protect the people's rights, that they also intend to guard these natural resources against combination and monopoly—the Nation will doubtless turn them over to the States under some restrictions that will require a fair discharge of the trust by the States, substituted for the Nation as the trustee for the people of the States.

I am aware that the West is restive under present conditions; that it does not like this espionage of officials two or three thousand miles away; that it resents the presence of special agents, who are charged by the national laws which we have enacted with responsibility regarding the classification of these lands; that they do not like the idea of national landlordism, of the payment of royalties upon timber and coal and iron. That can be easily obviated if we will simply turn over to the States the royalties collected by the Nation, with the intention later on of turning over the entire control of these great resources to the States as soon as by their laws they show that they are strong enough to maintain their trusts; but no one will contend, at all events I will not contend, that States in a condition of infancy possess the strength to resist the great exploiting combinations which have sought to control the legislation of the country and the administration of the country, and which will find the States weaker agencies in their hands.

So, Mr. President, my contention involves nothing but loyalty to the West, nothing but loyalty to the people of the West, nothing but loyalty to the States of the West. My contention involves the protection and preservation of these great natural resources for all the people of the West, and it is against the policy which will permit them gradually to drift, as they have in the past been drifting until checked by the conservation policy, into the hands of combinations and monopolies.

Mr. President, I should like to speak more at length upon this subject, but I know that other matters are pressing, and I shall simply content myself with asking the privilege of inserting in the Record my letter to the conferees upon this subject and certain other letters and documents relating to the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Without objection, the request of the Senator from Nevada is granted.

Some of the letters and papers referred to are as follows. The rest will be printed hereafter:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, May 3, 1912.  
Hon. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: By direction of Secretary Fisher I inclose herewith a copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office addressed to the Secretary, quoting the exact wording of the Canadian statutes upon which the "three-year homestead law" of that country is based.

The provisions quoted are from the Canadian Dominion Lands Act, and there is also attached to the letter a copy of the report of the American consul general at Vancouver, British Columbia, on the subject of "Homesteading Regulations for the Province of British Columbia." There is also inclosed a copy of a memorandum furnished by Senator JONES in connection with the proposed three-year homestead law.

Yours, very truly,

H. A. MEYER,  
Private Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
GENERAL LAND OFFICE,  
Washington, April 30, 1912.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,  
SIR: In department letter of February 15, 1912, to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives,

which was in the nature of a supplemental report on H. R. 17218 and S. 3367, being the proposed "Three-year homestead law," it was suggested that if such a law was enacted that it should embody, in addition to the liberal provisions modeled upon the Canadian Dominion Lands Act, the provisions and restrictions of that law, and these restrictions were specified.

In order that the exact wording of the provisions referred to, contained in 7-8 Edward VII, chapter 20, entitled, "An act to consolidate and amend the acts respecting the public lands of the Dominion," assented to July 20, 1908, may be presented, I set forth the same in full, numbering each to correspond with the numbering used in the different paragraphs of said letter of February 15:

"(1) All unoccupied surveyed agricultural lands to which this act applies that are not reserved or that have not been disposed of shall be open to entry for homestead: *Provided*, That no entry for a homestead shall convey any right to salt, coal, petroleum, natural gas, gold, silver, copper, iron, or other minerals within or under the land covered by the entry, or any exclusive or other property or interest in, or any exclusive right or privilege with respect to any lake, river, spring, stream, or other body of water within or bordering on or passing through the land covered by the entry. (Sec. 8, p. 3, the Dominion lands act.)

"(2) The minister may, if he deems it necessary, require the holder of a homestead entry to furnish proof by declaration or otherwise that he is duly performing his homestead duties in each year subsequent to the date of his entry. (Par. 2, sec. 13, p. 7.)

"(3) If an entrant for a homestead fails in any year to fulfill the requirements of this act in respect to homesteads, or the requirements of the laws in force in respect thereto when the entry was obtained, the minister may cancel the entry and all rights of the entrant in virtue thereof shall thereupon cease and determine: *Provided*, That any subsequent entrant for the same land may be required by the minister to pay in cash reasonable compensation for the improvements, if any, of the person whose entry is canceled, and that the minister may, in his discretion, pay to the latter the amount of such compensation, in whole or in part. (Par. 2, sec. 15, p. 7.)

"(4) If entry is obtained for land which, though not reserved at the time, is ascertained to be valuable on account of merchantable timber upon it, the minister may, within six months of its date, cancel the entry. (Par. 4, sec. 15, p. 8.)

"(5) If, after entry is obtained, it is ascertained that the land entered for, or any portion thereof, is necessary for the protection of any water supply, or for the location or construction of any works necessary to the development of any water power, or for the purposes of any harbor or landing, the minister may, at any time before the issue of letters patent, cancel the entry or withdraw from its application any portion of the land entered for, but where the land is required for the location or construction of works necessary to the development of any water power, only in so far as the land is necessary for that purpose. (Par. 6, sec. 15, p. 8.)

"(6) Everyone is guilty of an indictable offense and liable to two years' imprisonment who buys, trades, or sells, or professes to buy, trade, or sell, land or any interest in or control of land open to homestead entry, or for which homestead entry has been granted, before patent therefor has been issued. (Par. 9, sec. 15, p. 8.)

"(7) Every entrant for a homestead shall, except as hereinafter otherwise provided, be required, before the issue of letters patent therefor, (a) to have held the homestead for his own exclusive use and benefit for three years from the date of entry; (b) to have resided thereon at least six months in each of three years from the date of entry or the date of commencement of residence; (c) to have erected a habitable house thereon; (d) to have cultivated such an area of land in each year upon the homestead as is satisfactory to the minister; and (e) to be a British subject. (Sec. 18, p. 8.)

"(8) Proof under this section shall be in the form of a sworn statement by the applicant, corroborated by the sworn statements of two disinterested parties resident in the vicinity, which statements shall be made before the local agent, or the officer acting for him, or such other person as is thereunto authorized by the minister: *Provided*, That on any application for letters patent by the legal representative of the entrant, or by his assignee, or by the guardian or committee of an entrant who has become insane or mentally incapable, or by a person who in the event of such an insane entrant's death would be his legal representative, the minister may receive proof of the facts in such manner as he sees fit to require, and, upon being satisfied that the claim has been proved, may allow the claim and cause letters patent to issue accordingly. (Par. 2, sec. 23, p. 11.)

"(9) Any person who receives consideration for abandoning a homestead, or who pays consideration for such abandonment, shall forfeit the right of homestead entry at the minister's discretion." (Par. 2, sec. 31, p. 17.)

The statement in the last paragraph of the letter of February 15, 1912, as to the requirements as to residence and the amount of land enterable in the Province of British Columbia is taken from a report dated Vancouver, B. C., August 29, 1910, made by the American consul general to the Secretary of State, on the subject of "Homesteading regulations for the Province of British Columbia." A copy of this is inclosed for your information.

Very respectfully,

FRED DENNETT, Commissioner.

OFFICE OF THE AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,  
Vancouver, B. C., Canada, August 29, 1910.

Subject: "Homesteading regulations for the Province of British Columbia."

SIR: I have the honor to quote below the homesteading regulations of British Columbia promulgated by the Dominion Government covering the homesteading of lands in the railway belt in this province:

"Regulations for the administration and disposal of Dominion lands in the railway belt of British Columbia have been passed by the governor in council.

"The belt is divided by the regulations into five main divisions dominated by the topography of the country, comprising, from east to west, upper Columbia division, lower Columbia division, Shuswap division, Kamloops division, and coast division.

"The regulations provide for the classification of the lands remaining undisposed of according to their character, location, and altitude. Considerable divergence in climate, timber, and soil conditions exists in the different divisions of the belt.

"In each division the disposal of lands will be in accordance with conditions prevailing therein. In the coast division the settler will be entitled to enter for 40 acres of bench lands as a homestead and pre-emption. If the settler is prepared to cultivate a larger area than is required in connection with a half legal subdivision entered as a homestead, he is permitted to preempt the adjoining 20 acres in the legal subdivision.

"The same provisions will apply to bench lands in the lower Columbia division and the Shuswap division. It is required in this case that the settler should clear a total of 10 acres and cultivate a total of 6 acres before patent, and double that amount if preemption is also taken.

"In the upper Columbia division, on account of the very high altitude of the lands and the character of the country, the area of the homestead is fixed at 40 acres, with preemption privilege on any adjoining 40 acres, and the area to be cultivated is slightly more. In the Kamloops division the area of homesteads is fixed at 160 acres, or a quarter section.

"The lands are divided into flooded lands, bench lands, and uplands. Flooded lands are lands subject to overflow at high water and are largely valuable for hay purposes, and will be administered as such; and where not reserved for hay by settlers will be disposed of only on lease.

"Uplands are lands which are for the most part at too great an elevation to admit of the successful cultivation of fruit. They may be disposed of as homesteads of one quarter section each, excepting in the lower Columbia division, where, on account of special conditions obtaining in that valley, they will be open as homesteads and preemptions in areas of 40 acres each. Uplands may also be leased to actual settlers for grazing purposes in areas of one quarter section each.

"Bench lands are deemed to include bottom lands not subject to overflow and vary in altitude in different divisions. In the upper Columbia division they comprise lands below 1,000 feet above the Columbia River, in the lower Columbia below 800 feet above the Columbia, in the Shuswap division below 1,200 feet above the Shuswap Lake, in the coast division below 2,500 feet above sea level. Above these altitudes all land is classified as upland.

"The terms of residence in all divisions for entries granted under the new regulations is fixed at five years and a residence of at least six months is required in each year.

"Provision is made for a conditional purchase entry in the case of bench lands in all divisions excepting the Kamloops division. The conditional purchase entry will be permitted for an entry of 20 acres in each of the other divisions except the upper Columbia, where the area will be 40 acres.

"Residence is not required except for six months during the fifth year after the date of entry, but the entrant is required to clear and cultivate the land each year for five years from the date of entry at a greater rate than is required for homestead and to pay for land at the rate of \$10 per acre in five installments. The conditional purchase privilege and preemption privilege do not apply to the Kamloops division nor to the uplands in other divisions, where entry of 160 acres is permitted. The price of preemptions is \$5 per acre, payable in five yearly installments, additional residence not required.

"Entry on land remaining in timber berths will not be permitted. Timberlands which are not in timber berths are defined. While the area of homesteads, preemptions, and conditional purchases is limited, as above stated, to 20 or 40 acres, as the case may be, it is not proposed to limit the right of any one person to acquire a total area of 160 acres, but only to limit his right to acquire more than he can cultivate at one time under ordinary conditions. Thus, after an entrant has secured patents for land first entered for, he may make another entry, and so on, until he has secured a total of 160 acres; but no person will be allowed to secure under homestead preemption or conditional purchase entry more than a total of 160 acres.

"The present regulations are the result of careful study by the department of the interior of conditions in the railway belt. The cultivatable land which may hereafter become available for settlement consists for the most part of bottom and bench lands rising from the large river and lake systems and constitute only a small fraction of the mountainous area. Such cultivatable lands are therefore very scarce and are very productive, and since the inauguration of the fruit industry in British Columbia they have attained high values. Twenty acres of such land properly cultivated will yield larger returns than a quarter section of prairie land, and there is similarly proportionate difference in the cost of preparing it for crop.

"It has therefore become apparent to the department that the homestead law which is suitable for the settling up of the prairie country is not adapted to conditions such as obtain in the railway belt of British Columbia, and that the successful development and settlement of respective districts in proportion to their productive capacities can only be effected by applying a homestead law such as the new regulations provide."

Respectfully submitted,

I am, sir, your obedient servant, GEO. N. WEST,  
American Consul General.

The honorable SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, D. C.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, May 23, 1912.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As requested by you, I have examined the basis of agreement on the pending three-year homestead bill (S. 3367), which has been suggested by the House conferees in a communication to the conferees on the part of the Senate, and I return the same herewith.

I have already expressed very fully to you and to the other members of the conference committee the reasons why the first and third suggestions of the House conferees should not be adopted. I assume from what you and Congressman TAYLOR tell me, and also from the present communication from the House conferees, that the second suggestion made in this communication offers in substance the basis upon which alone there is any prospect of agreement. I regret very much the definite refusal to adopt the proposed amendments with regard to the reservation of minerals and of tracts necessary for future development of water power and reservoir sites. I believe that these amendments would enable us to establish more liberal rules for the benefit of the genuine homesteader, to reduce materially the work of the special agents, and to expedite the work of passing upon claims and issuing patents. I believe that you concur substantially in the reasons I have urged for inserting provisions upon these subjects for the protection of public rights, and also in the opinion that they are directly in the interests of the Western States and of the homesteaders themselves.

If, however, the House conferees compel the continuance of the system heretofore prevailing, under which the mineral or nonmineral character of the land must be determined as a question of fact at the time of patent, and lands suitable for water power or reservoir sites must be withdrawn from homestead entry, it becomes the more important to have the provisions with respect to residence and cultivation such as to remove as far as possible the temptation to acquire mineral lands and water power or reservoir sites under the homestead law. The purpose of the homestead law is to encourage and promote the actual settlement

and agricultural development of those portions of the public domain that are suitable for homes. The real homesteader is the home maker. His object is not to acquire timber or minerals or water power. He intends to live upon the land and to cultivate it. Reasonable requirements as to residence and cultivation are therefore no obstacle to him. They protect him against those who seek to acquire the land to sell and not to settle. The requirements which the law imposes upon him should be such, and only such, as can readily be complied with by the genuine homesteader and with which it is to the real interest of the genuine homesteader to comply. It is not to his interest to make the provisions of the law so lenient that the public lands may be acquired by those who do not wish to utilize and develop them, but to sell them at a profit to real settlers like himself, who really desire them for homes for themselves. Such a profit represents merely an added burden which the real settler must carry. It is for this reason, and for this reason alone, that I have urged the amendments to the pending bill. You will find the exact language of the Canadian statutes in a communication from this department, which has been printed as Senate Document No. 644. I believe that the provision of the Canadian law requiring proof of annual cultivation to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior would give greater flexibility to administration and would enable the Secretary to fit the law to the facts in each case under general regulations which he could prescribe.

If a limit is to be fixed in the statute I prefer a maximum limit of one-quarter, with power to accept less under general administrative regulations. I recognize, however, that the present suggestion of the House conferees permits a certain degree of flexibility in providing that the entryman shall "cultivate not less than one-sixteenth of the area of his entry beginning with the second year of the entry, and not less than one-eighth beginning with the third year of the entry," with a provision reducing this requirement upon a showing satisfactory to the Secretary. I assume that the effect of those provisions and of the words "not less than" would be to establish the requirement of one-sixteenth and one-eighth, respectively, as the general rule, and that to justify a different requirement exceptional circumstances would have to be shown, but could be shown. I believe the department can work out feasible regulations with respect to cultivation under such a statute. In view, however, of the fact that the provision is extended to apply to entries under the enlarged homestead laws, the character of the cultivation required should be made to conform to the language used in the enlarged homestead act, so that after the word "cultivate," in the fourth line of the suggested proviso, there should be inserted the words "to agricultural crops other than native grasses." Indeed, this language should be inserted in any event so as to make certain that such cultivation as is required includes seeding as well as plowing and excludes mere summer fallowing.

After the words "beginning with the third year of the entry" there should be inserted the words "and until final proof." If we are to reduce the period of residence and the period and extent of cultivation generally required the entryman should continue to cultivate whatever is in fact required of him until he makes his final proof. Otherwise we will be in the position of having only a single season's cultivation of any substantial part of the entry. No bona fide entryman can possibly object to such a requirement, but, on the other hand, it would constitute a real obstacle to the perversion of the law.

I suggest also that it might be well to insert after the words "upon a satisfactory showing," toward the end of the suggested proviso, the words "and under regulations prescribed by him," so that it may be clear that regulations are to be issued under which the entryman may know in advance at least the general rules upon which modifications of the cultivation requirements would be made.

I wish also to call your attention to the fact that in the copy of the bill printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Public Lands, showing proposed changes by the House, there has been an important change from the existing law, in line 7, on page 2, where the word "any" has been substituted for the word "that." The present law reads, "if at that time citizens of the United States shall be entitled to a patent"; the bill reads, "if at any time citizens of the United States shall be entitled to a patent."

In the bill introduced by Senator BORAH the word "that" is used. An examination of the proceedings of the Senate on February 5, when the bill passed, fails to disclose any motion substituting the word "any." Nevertheless, the bill as printed in the House of Representatives, as coming from the Senate and referred to the House Committee on the Public Lands, shows the change from "that" to "any," and this appears to have remained in the bill ever since. I have no means of ascertaining how it got there. It would tend to encourage the very thing of which bitter complaint is being made, namely, the exodus of American farmers to Canada, for under the bill as it now reads a homesteader in this country could remove to Canada at any time after the three-year period of residence, and upon completing his final proof could forewear his allegiance to this country, become a citizen of Canada, and at the same time obtain a patent in the United States, where he might avoid the payment of taxes upon his land until he applied for and received his patent.

The further proviso which is suggested by the House conferees to give the entryman of an unperfected entry the full period now allowed by law within which to make final proof seems to me open to serious objection from the point of view of those who are interested in local taxation. Much complaint has reached the department with regard to settlers who postpone making proof upon their entries so as to avoid taxation. The suggested proviso would enable an entryman who had made his entry during the current year to perfect it within the next two years, and yet he would be allowed to wait until the expiration of seven years before making final proof, during all of which period the land would not be taxable. Would it not be well to permit the entryman under entries pending at the time of the passage of the act to elect whether to make proof under the new or the old law, but to require him to perfect his entry within not more than five years from the date of the entry if he elects to act under the new law?

With regard to the further suggestion as to the five months' absence, I believe the language suggested by the House conferees is an improvement upon that now in the bill, and I wish to call your attention to the fact that the proponents of this bill in the Senate—Senators JONES and BORAH—have expressed their willingness to reduce the period to four months instead of five.

I think the Senate conferees should accept the proposal of the House conferees to agree to the amendment providing that no patent shall issue to any subdivision of land more valuable for the timber it contains than for agricultural purposes.

The amendment, however, should read "no entry shall be made on nor shall any patent issue to any subdivision of land more valuable for the timber it contains than for agricultural purposes." The mere prohibition of the patent might encourage entries for the sake of cutting



timber, and thus perpetuate the very evil which the amendment is chiefly intended to prevent.

Contrary to representations that are frequently made, the general homestead law continues to be of the greatest importance, and immense areas of the public domain are being acquired under its provisions. The Commissioner of the General Land Office informs me that during the last fiscal year there were 44,300 original entries made under this law, not including those under reclamation projects or those under the enlarged homestead act or the Kinkaid Act.

Respectfully, yours,

WALTER L. FISHER, *Secretary.*

HON. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,  
*United States Senate.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to give notice that to-morrow, immediately following the routine morning business, I shall ask the Senate to consider and dispose of the bill (S. 6964) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain provisions for the care of the participants in the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, at Gettysburg, Pa., on the 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th days of July, 1913, and making appropriation of a sum sufficient to carry out the provisions of this bill.

#### EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

Mr. BORAH. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9061) limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States or for any Territory or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] both gave notice some time ago that they would speak this morning. They can hardly be expected to speak on this bill.

Mr. BORAH. I observe that the Senator from Michigan is not present, and I had not noticed that the Senator from Maryland was. If the Senator from Maryland desires to proceed, I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. RAYNER. I should like to see this bill proceeded with. Although the Senator from Michigan is not present, I am ready to go ahead. I will not take over half an hour or 25 minutes of the time of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Under the circumstances I shall not press the motion.

Mr. RAYNER. The Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the subcommittee, is not present.

Mr. LODGE. I have been informed that he will be here in a few moments.

Mr. RAYNER. Shall I go ahead or wait for the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SWANSON. No; go ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho withdraws the request, and the Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. RAYNER. I will proceed, but if the Senator from Michigan comes in, I will stop and let him go along. He is chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Michigan has been sent for, and probably will be here very soon.

Mr. NELSON. I observe on the calendar of to-day that a notice has been given by "Mr. SMITH of Michigan, that on Tuesday, May 28, 1912, immediately after the morning business is disposed of, the subcommittee, appointed to investigate the causes leading up to the disaster of the steamship *Titanic*, will make its report, preceding which he would address the Senate thereon."

What I desire to say is that the subcommittee made its report to the full committee, and the report expected to be presented to-day is the report of the Committee on Commerce and not of the subcommittee.

Mr. BORAH. What is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nothing is before the Senate.

Mr. RAYNER. I shall proceed with the understanding that when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] comes in he may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. HEYBURN. Is the report of the committee before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report has not been submitted, the Chair will state to the Senator.

Mr. HEYBURN. I suggest we should have the report read. We could then more readily apply the Senator's remarks to it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum. That will consume some time.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, MINN.

Mr. NELSON. In order to give the Senator from Michigan time to appear, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bridge bill. It is the bill (H. R. 23634) to authorize the village of Oslo, in the county of Marshall, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

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

#### AGRICULTURAL ENTRIES ON ALASKA COAL LANDS.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5800) to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands in Alaska.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask that the matter go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING AT WAYNESVILLE, N. C.

Mr. OVERMAN. While we are waiting, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (S. 6459) for the erection of a public building at Waynesville, N. C.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "exceed," to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "sixty," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be erected, on a lot now owned by the Government of the United States at Waynesville, N. C., a suitable building to accommodate the needs of the United States post office at that place, and for other purposes, at a total cost not to exceed \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

#### LOSS OF STEAMSHIP "TITANIC."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I had expected to send to the Clerk's desk this morning the unanimous report of the Committee on Commerce. For the purpose of verifying some figures it will be delayed a few moments. I shall not detain the Senate, but will proceed with my address.

Mr. President, my associates and myself return the commission handed to us on the 18th day of April last, directing an immediate inquiry into "the causes leading up to the destruction of the steamship *Titanic*, with its attendant and unparalleled loss of life, so shocking to the people of the world." Mindful of the responsibility of our office, we desire the Senate to know that in the execution of its command we have been guided solely by the public interest and a desire to meet the expectations of our associates without bias, prejudice, sensationalism, or slander of the living or dead. That duty, we believed, would be best performed by an exact ascertainment of the true state of affairs.

Our course was simple and plain—to gather the facts relating to this disaster while they were still vivid realities. Questions of diverse citizenship gave way to the universal desire for the simple truth. It was of paramount importance that we should act quickly to avoid jurisdictional confusion and organized opposition at home or abroad. We, of course, recognized that the ship was under a foreign flag; but the lives of many of our own countrymen had been sacrificed and the safety of many had been put in grave peril, and it was vital that the entire matter should be reviewed before an American tribunal if legislative action was to be taken for future guidance. Therefore, we determined that the testimony of British officers and crew and English passengers temporarily in the United States should be first obtained. We deemed it important to have the surviving officers and sailors of this ship meet the passengers of all classes before our committee. Without any pretension to experience or special knowledge of nautical affairs, nevertheless I am of the opinion that very few important facts which were susceptible of being known escaped our scrutiny. Energy is often more desirable than learning, and the inquisition serves a useful purpose to the State.

We went to the side of the hospital ship with purpose and pity and saw the almost lifeless survivors in their garments of woe—joy and sorrow so intermingled that it was difficult to discern light from shadow, and the sad scene was only varied

by the cry of reunited loved ones whose mutual grief was written in the language of creation.

At 10 o'clock on that fateful Sunday evening this latest maritime creation was cutting its first pathway through the North Atlantic Ocean with scarcely a ripple to retard its progress.

From the builders' hands she was plunged straightway to her fate and christening salvos acclaimed at once her birth and death. Builders of renown had launched her on the billows with confident assurance of her strength, while every port rang with praise for their achievement; shipbuilding to them was both a science and a religion; parent ships and sister ships had easily withstood the waves, while the mark of their hammer was all that was needed to give assurance of the high quality of the work. In the construction of the *Titanic* no limit of cost circumscribed their endeavor and when this vessel took its place at the head of the line every modern improvement in shipbuilding was supposed to have been realized; so confident were they that both owner and builder were eager to go upon the trial trip; no sufficient tests were made of boilers or bulkheads or gearing or equipment and no life-saving or signal devices were reviewed; officers and crew were strangers to one another and passengers to both; neither was familiar with the vessel or its implements or tools; no drill or station practice or helpful discipline disturbed the tranquillity of that voyage, and when the crisis came a state of absolute unpreparedness stupefied both passengers and crew and, in their despair, the ship went down, carrying as needless a sacrifice of noble women and brave men as ever clustered about the Judgment Seat in any single moment of passing time.

We shall leave to the honest judgment of England its painstaking chastisement of the British Board of Trade, to whose laxity of regulation and hasty inspection the world is largely indebted for this awful fatality. Of contributing causes there were very many. In the face of warning signals, speed was increased and messages of danger seemed to stimulate her to action rather than to persuade her to fear.

At noon on that fatal Sunday the steamship *Baltic* warned her of ice within 5 miles of her track and near the place where the accident occurred; at 5 o'clock in the afternoon and again, an hour before the accident, when but a few miles away, the steamship *Californian* signaled the *Titanic* to beware of danger, which her operator curtly acknowledged; the same evening the *Titanic* transmitted to the Hydrographic Office in Washington a message from the steamship *Amerika*, saying she had passed "two large icebergs" near the track of the ill-fated ship. In the face of these warnings, each revolution of her engines marked at the moment of the collision her highest speed of 24½ miles per hour.

The *Titanic* rushed onward on her true course—one recognized as appropriate and agreed upon by mariners as the international highway for westbound vessels, yet dangerous at this season of the year, when the Labrador current may be bearing vast masses of ice across the track of ships. Scores of these towering glaciers planted themselves in the very pathway of this ship and were so large and so numerous that, in the absence of fog, they should have been easily discernible by the lookout, who says in his testimony that if he had been supplied with glasses, such as he had been accustomed to on the *Oceanic* and on this vessel, between Belfast and Southampton, but which were denied him by Second Officer Lightoller between Southampton and the place of this accident, he could have seen the iceberg with which this ship collided "soon enough to get out of the way." One of these icebergs was nearly 200 feet above the level of the sea, with seven-eighths of its ponderous bulk hidden beneath the surface. They are composed of ice and earth and rock, and old sailors of the coast of Newfoundland usually give them a wide berth. Land has been formed by these deposits, and icebergs have frequently grounded in 20 fathoms of water with protruding spires more than a hundred feet in height. As they go southward their journey is slow and erratic, and the influence of spring often causes explosions in the ice, which frequently serve to warn sailors of danger; sometimes the drift of field ice, led by a great berg, has been known to convoy schooners in a calm, while shipwrecked sailors have drifted hundreds of miles in safety upon the irregular surface of the ice. Skillful seamanship finds little difficulty in avoiding these obstacles, and those most familiar with the North Atlantic are usually alert at this season of the year to avoid unnecessary peril.

Capt. Smith knew the sea and his clear eye and steady hand had often guided his ship through dangerous paths. For 40 years storms sought in vain to vex him or menace his craft. But once before in all his honorable career was his pride humbled or his vessel maimed. Each new advancing type of ship built by his company was handed over to him as a reward

for faithful services and as an evidence of confidence in his skill. Strong of limb, intent of purpose, pure in character, dauntless as a sailor should be, he walked the deck of this majestic structure as master of her keel.

*Titanic* though she was, his indifference to danger was one of the direct and contributing causes of this unnecessary tragedy, while his own willingness to die was the expiating evidence of his fitness to live. Those of us who knew him well—not in anger, but in sorrow—file one specific charge against him: Overconfidence and neglect to heed the oft-repeated warnings of his friends. But in his horrible dismay, when his brain was afire with honest retribution, we can still see, in his manly bearing and his tender solicitude for the safety of women and little children, some traces of his lofty spirit when dark clouds lowered all about him and angry elements stripped him of his command. His devotion to his craft, even "as it writhed and twisted and struggled" for mastery over its foe, calmed the fears of many of the stricken multitude who hung upon his words, lending dignity to a parting scene as inspiring as it is beautiful to remember.

The mystery of his indifference to danger, when other and less pretentious vessels doubled their lookout or stopped their engines, finds no reasonable hypothesis in conjecture or speculation; science in shipbuilding was supposed to have attained perfection and to have spoken her last word; mastery of the ocean had at last been achieved; but overconfidence seems to have dulled the faculties usually so alert. With the atmosphere literally charged with warning signals and wireless messages registering their last appeal, the stokers in the engine room fed their fires with fresh fuel, registering in that dangerous place her fastest speed.

President Ismay testified: "My recollection is that between Southampton and Cherbourg we ran at 60 revolutions, from Cherbourg to Queenstown at 70 revolutions, and when we left Queenstown we were running at 72 revolutions, and I believe that the ship was worked up to 75 revolutions, or about 22 knots per hour, but I really have no accurate knowledge of that." And he again said, when asked if she was running at her maximum speed at the time she was making 75 revolutions: "No, sir; my understanding is, or I am told, that the engines were balanced and would run their best at 78 revolutions."

It has been said many times—often in my hearing and often by letter—that the last dinner which he had partaken in the café of his ship, given by Mr. and Mrs. Widener, of Philadelphia, might have had some influence upon the action of the captain, but I have the word of the hostess, whose husband was lost in this catastrophe, that at that dinner Capt. Smith touched no liquor of any kind; indeed, that he asked that all glasses be removed from his plate. I make this statement because I think it is due to the memory of the dead, whose habits of life are worthy the highest praise.

Last Saturday, in company with Admiral Watt, of the Navy, I visited the *Olympic*, a sister ship of the *Titanic*, just before she sailed from New York. Down deep in the bottom of that ship, 24 feet below the level of the sea, I found the head fireman of the *Titanic*, and there in the grease and the heat, by a dim light and surrounded by his companions, he swore that he was the first man to see the water come through the sides of the stricken ship. He said that the tear extended through the side of the forward fireroom, that the water came from a point about 20 feet below the sea level, and rushed like a mighty torrent into the ship.

We know from those who gave the order to construct the ship that the designer of the *Titanic* and *Olympic*, who was himself aboard the *Titanic* and did not survive, a young man but 39 years of age, designed the ship to carry safely two of her water-tight compartments full of water in case of accident, the presumption being that by collision but one bulkhead and at most two of her water-tight compartments would be injured, in which event, the water-tight doors being closed, the ship could carry this additional weight without serious danger.

By the supplementary testimony of this head fireman I am able to say that five compartments filled almost instantly. He also said that at the time the ship struck the iceberg the indicator in the fireroom displayed the letters "full speed," and that the ship had been running full speed during the entire afternoon and evening; that 24 of her boilers were lighted out of the 29, and at no other time on the voyage were so many boilers lighted; that when he received a bell signal he looked hastily to the indicator and found that the white light, "full speed," had been taken from the indicator and the red light, "stop," had been substituted in its place. Instantly the water-tight doors between the firerooms were closed, but the danger had been accomplished, the harm had been done, and through a space extending past four bulkheads a tear had been made in that steel

bottom admitting more water than the ship was able to carry. The water came in with tremendous force, and within five minutes after she struck the ship listed about 5 degrees.

I then reached a conclusion which, in my opinion, accounts for the small proportion of steerage passengers who were saved. The occupants of the forward steerage were the first of the passengers to realize the danger. One or two witnesses said they stepped out of their berths into water probably an inch or two inches deep. Those in the forward steerage knew directly of the impact and of the presence of water, which came up from the lower part of the ship into the mail room and the forward steerage. Those steerage passengers went on deck and as fast as they were able took places in the lifeboats, while the after steerage, more than an eighth of a mile away, was by the operation of the added weight raised out of the water. That after steerage was a deck higher than the forward steerage, and was lifted higher and higher until the ship finally disappeared, so that these steerage passengers got their first warning of real danger as the angle of the deck became very great. I feel that the small number of steerage survivors was thus due to the fact that they got no definite warning before the ship was really doomed, when most of the lifeboats had departed.

At 12.55 Sunday afternoon, answering the warning of Capt. Ranson, of the steamship *Baltic*, at whose christening he had taken such a proud part, and on whose bridge he had so often braved the perils of the Atlantic, Capt. Smith only replied, "Thanks for your message and good wishes. Had fine weather since leaving." The soft warmth from the Gulf Stream, through which they had passed during the day, gave way at night to chill and cold; the air and water registered their lowest point an hour before the collision. The warnings of shipmasters fell upon deaf ears and officers and crew seemed to have regarded the paper bulletins of danger with absolute indifference and, as if to stir their laggard spirits, nature gave a warning of approaching peril so significant that passengers in stateroom and steerage shut out the chill and spoke to one another of the sudden cold. Sailors off the Grand Banks know the importance of the thermometer, which is almost as necessary to their safety as is the compass. Even the quartermaster, Hichens, who regularly took the temperature of the water from the sea, says, "It suddenly became bitter cold," and added that the first order received by him from Second Officer Lightoller at 8 o'clock Sunday evening was "to take his compliments down to the ship's carpenter and inform him to look to his fresh water; that it was about to freeze," and he says he was also directed by the same officer to find the deck engineer and bring him the key to open the heaters in the corridor and officers' quarters, wheelhouse, and chart room on account of the intense cold. He also said he took the temperature of the air and water just before he went to the wheel, at 8 o'clock, and that the bucket, with which he dipped the water to make the tests "was a small paint tin," an old one, only improvised for the occasion; that the new one, a long piece of leather, leaded, was not furnished him; while Mrs. Walter Douglas, of Minneapolis, asserts under oath that both she and her husband, who went down with the ship, saw the quartermaster Saturday afternoon attempt to reach the water with this bucket and says that he was unable to do so and that both she and Mr. Douglas saw him fill the bucket from a hydrant on the deck and take that water to be tested.

Hichens then said:

At 10 o'clock I went to the wheel. \* \* \* All went along very well until 20 minutes to 12, when three gongs came from the lookout, and immediately afterwards a report on the telephone, "Iceberg right ahead." The chief officer rushed from the wing to the bridge. \* \* \* He rushed to the engines. I heard the telegraph bell ring; also give the order, "Hard astarboard." Repeated the order, "Hard astarboard." "The helm is hard over, sir." \* \* \* The captain \* \* \* came back to the wheelhouse and looked at the commutator (clinometer) in front of the compass, which is a little instrument like a clock to tell you how the ship is listing. The ship had a list of 5° to the starboard \* \* \* about 5 to 10 minutes after the impact.

At that moment the ice, resistless as steel, stole upon her and struck her in a vital spot, while the last command of the officer of the watch in his effort to avert disaster, distracted by the sudden appearance of extreme danger, sharply turned aside the prow, the part best prepared to resist collision, exposing the temple to the blow; at the turn of the bilge the steel encasement yielded to a glancing blow so slight that the impact was not felt in many parts of the ship, although representing an energy of more than a million foot tons, said to be the equivalent of the combined broadsides of 20 of the largest guns in our battleship fleet fired at the same moment, with a blow so deadly many of the passengers and crew did not even know of the collision until tardily advised of the danger by anxious friends, and even then official statements were clothed in such confident assurances of safety as to arouse no fear.

The awful force of the impact was well known to the master and bulder, Mr. Andrews, who, from the first, must have known the ship was doomed and never uttered an encouraging sign to one another. Neither ever adjusted a life belt to himself. The bulder, whose heart must have broken when he realized he had not prepared that ship to resist a blow so dangerous, seemed to have been quite willing to go down with the ship. There is evidence to show that no final warning was given by any officer. President Ismay asked the captain whether he thought the blow was serious. The captain only replied, "I think it is." Col. Astor, at the request of his wife and others who stood near him on the boat deck, was asked to make the same inquiry, and did; and to that inquiry the captain replied, "I think it is dangerous."

There is evidence tending to show that even the water-tight compartments were not successfully closed either above or below. No general alarm was given, no ship's officers formally assembled, no orderly routine was attempted or organized system of safety begun. Haphazard they rushed by one another on staircase and in hallway, while men of self-control gathered here and there about the decks, helplessly staring at one another or giving encouragement to those less courageous than themselves.

Life belts were finally adjusted to all. Only Saturday night I gathered from one who rescued the bodies brought in by the Mackay-Bennett ship that, while he found 190 bodies in one "pack," as they call it at sea, 62 miles from the place where the ship went down and within 500 yards of the iceberg which is supposed to have done the damage, all of these 190, with the exception of a little child 2 years of age, were well fitted with life belts, and it is the testimony of the surgeon who accompanied the ship that in the position in which he found them he is of the opinion that many of them lived at least four hours after they were thrown into the water, and were killed by the cold, and yet no relief came. The lifeboats were cleared away, and although strangely insufficient in number—and right here I want to say that my observations on the steamship *Olympic* on Saturday were most gratifying. I saw the voluntary double equipment of lifeboats. Where they had formerly carried 20 they now carry 42, leaving ample room for passengers who desire to use her decks for other purposes and affording better protection to passengers and crew.

The *Titanic* boats were only partially loaded and in all instances unprovided with compasses and only three of them had lamps. They were manned so badly that, in the absence of prompt relief, they would have fallen easy victims to the advancing ice floe, nearly 30 miles in width and rising 16 feet above the surface of the water. Their danger would have been as great as if they had remained on the deck of the broken hull, and if the sea had risen these toy targets, with over 700 exhausted people, would have been helplessly tossed about upon the waves without food or water. One witness swore that two of the three stewards in her boat admitted that they had never had an oar in their hands before and did not even know what the oarlock was for. The lifeboats were filled so indifferently and lowered so quickly that, according to the uncontradicted evidence, nearly 500 people were needlessly sacrificed to want of orderly discipline in loading the few that were provided. There were 1,324 passengers on the ship. The lifeboats would have easily cared for 1,176 and only contained 704, 12 of whom were taken into the boats from the water, while the weather conditions were favorable and the sea perfectly calm. And yet it is said by some well-meaning persons that the best discipline prevailed. If this is discipline, what would have been disorder?

Among the passengers were many strong men who had been accustomed to command, whose lives had marked every avenue of endeavor, and whose business experience and military training especially fitted them for such an emergency. These were rudely silenced and forbidden to speak, as was the president of this company, by junior officers, a few of whom, I regret to say, availed themselves of the first opportunity to leave the ship. Some of the men, to whom had been intrusted the care of passengers, never reported to their official stations, and quickly deserted the ship with a recklessness and indifference to the responsibilities of their positions as culpable and amazing as it is impossible to believe. And some of these men say that they "laid by" in their partially filled lifeboats and listened to the cries of distress "until the noise quieted down" and surveyed from a safe distance the unselfish men and women and faithful fellow officers and seamen, whose heroism lightens up this tragedy and recalls the noblest traditions of the sea.

Some things are dearer than life itself, and the refusal of Phillips and Bride, wireless operators, to desert their posts of duty, even after the water had mounted to the upper deck,

because the captain had not given them permission to leave, is an example of faithfulness worthy of the highest praise, while the final exit of the Phillips boy from the ship and from the world was not so swift as to prevent him from pausing long enough to pass a cup of water to a fainting woman, who fell from her husband's arm into the operator's chair, as he was tardily fleeing from his wireless apparatus, where he had ticked off the last message from his ship and from his brain.

Even the electric signal of distress was only sent upon its unseen search for help after a delay of nearly 20 minutes, and its spark was arrested by an accident so providential as to excite wonder. In five minutes more the ill-paid operator on the *Carpathia*, who snatched this secret from the air, would have forgotten his perplexities in slumber, and no note would have been taken of the awful importance of the passing hour. Partially undressed, he had left the telephone receiver upon his head, and through it heard the call for help. On the instant the ship's course was changed and the captain replied: "We are coming to your relief." The elements of nature have chosen darkness as the most helpful medium of radiocommunication, and operators should be at their posts at that time of the voyage, ready to catch every unfavorable sign and to apprise officers and crew of dangers besetting the ship. Neither timber nor iron nor steel are impervious to its secrets; in its limitless quest no barrier seems insurmountable, and distance is annihilated as by the lightning's flash; schoolboys toy with its mysteries and catch its lessons from the house-tops. Marconi, genius and gentleman, sitting in his office in the capital of the Argentine Republic, read, as in an open book, a wireless message direct from the coast of Ireland. When the world weeps together over a common loss, when nature moves in the same direction in all spheres, why should not the nations clear the sea of its conflicting idioms and wisely regulate this new servant of humanity? To that end wages must be increased in proportion to the responsibility assumed, and service, to be useful, must be made continuous night and day, while this new profession must rid itself of the spirit of venality, to which, in my opinion, the world is indebted for a systematic reign of silence concerning the details of this disaster, so apparent as to excite international concern, and should be discouraged.

It is no excuse that the apparatus on the *Carpathia* was antiquated; it easily caught the signal of distress and spoke with other ships nearly 200 miles away, both before and after the accident, while the operator says it was good for 250 miles. The steamship *Californian* was within easy reach of this ship for nearly four hours after all the facts were known to Operator Cottam. The captain of the *Carpathia* says he gave explicit directions that all official messages should be immediately sent through other ships, and messages of passengers should be given preference. According to "Jack" Bluns, the inspector, the apparatus on the *Californian* was practically new and easily tuned to carry every detail of that calamity to the coast stations at Cape Sable and Cape Race, and should have done so. The course taken was singularly in accord with the reticence of the officials of the White Star Co., who knew at 2.30 Monday morning, through the steamship *Virginian* and their office in Montreal, what was supposed to have occurred. I recognize that this was not official and that they would insist upon confirmation because of their faith in the vessel, but it was the truth, nevertheless, and, according to their own admission, the information then given and which they battled against during all of that day, contained absolutely the entire story, and yet, at 7.51 Monday evening, a message from their own office, officially signed, contained the positive assurance of the safety of the passengers, was sent to a half-crazed father at Huntington, W. Va., nearly two hours after their admitted familiarity with the details of the disaster. Possibly this was an accident, and I know it is greatly deplored by the managing officer of that company. But it is little wonder that we have not been able to fix with definiteness the author of this falsehood.

It is not a pleasant duty to criticize the conduct or comment upon the shortcomings of others, but the plain truth should be told. Capt. Lord, of the steamship *Californian*, sailing from London to Boston, who stopped his ship in the same vicinity where the *Titanic* is supposed to have met with the accident, passed two large icebergs at 6.30 p. m. Sunday evening, April 14; at 7.15 he "passed one large iceberg and two more in sight to the southward." Because of ice he stopped his ship for the night in latitude 42° 5' N., longitude 50° 7' W., and at 10.50 (ship's time and 9.10 New York time) he sent a wireless message to the *Titanic*, telling them he was "stopped and surrounded by ice." The *Titanic* operator brusquely replied to "shut up," that he was "busy." Capt. Lord stated that "from the position we stopped in to the position in which the *Titanic* is supposed to have hit the iceberg was 10½ miles," and the course

south, 16 west. I am of the opinion it was much nearer than the captain is willing to admit, and I base my judgment upon the scientific investigation of the Hydrographic Office of our Government. He says this was the last communication he had with the *Titanic*. He also says, "We doubled the lookout from the crew, put a man on the fore-castle head—that is, right at the bow of the ship—and I was on the bridge myself with an officer" until half past 10, "which I would not have been under ordinary conditions." He thus admits extraordinary conditions, and that he received reports of icebergs, growlers, and field ice 42° north from 40° 50' west from Capt. Barr, of the steamship *Coronian*, the day before, and also from the steamship *Parisian* on that Sunday, while the steamship *New Amsterdam* reported to him several days before that they had seen field ice "extending as far to the northeast as horizon is visible."

He also admits that the morning after this accident he "was practically surrounded by icebergs, the largest from 100 to 150 feet high and from 700 to 800 feet in width above the water." He admits that the officer on watch on the steamship *Californian* saw some signals and that when he (the captain) came off the bridge at half past 10 he said: "I pointed out to the officer that I thought I saw a light coming along, and it was a most peculiar light." He also said that he went below and told the engineer to keep the steam ready, saying that he saw these signals, and then said: "There is a steamer coming. Let us go to the wireless and see what the news is." He says he "met the operator coming" and said: "Do you know anything?" The operator replied: "The *Titanic*."

I call attention to the fact that the last communication with the *Titanic* was the one to which I have referred, which occurred at 10.50 ship time, or nearly an hour before the accident occurred.

And the captain said: "I gave him instructions to let the *Titanic* know," which he did, and found that it was the *Titanic*, although the captain said: "This is not the *Titanic*; there is no doubt about it." He then says: "She came and lay, at half past 11, alongside of us until, I suppose, a quarter past 1, within 4 miles of us. We could see everything on her quite distinctly; see her lights. We signaled her at half past 11, with the Morse lamp. She did not take the slightest notice of it. That was between half past 11 and 20 minutes to 12. We signaled her again at 10 minutes past 12, half past 12, a quarter to 1, and 1 o'clock with a very powerful Morse lamp, which you can see about 10 miles."

He further says that "when the second officer came on the bridge at 12 o'clock, or 10 minutes past 12, I told him to watch that steamer which was stopped. I pointed out the ice to him; told him we were surrounded by ice; to watch the steamer, that she did not get any closer to her."

I call attention to the fact that from the chart you can readily see the position of the *Californian*, and that to the eastward there is no ice, to the southward of her there is no ice, and to the northward there is no ice; this ship was not surrounded by ice. She was against the ice in her westward course, and was in exactly the same situation as the *Titanic* before the impact.

"At 20 minutes to 1 I whistled up the speaking tube and asked if she was getting any nearer. He said, 'No; she is not taking any notice of us;' so I said, 'I will go and lie down a bit.' At a quarter past 1 he said, 'I think she has fired a rocket,' and, continuing, 'She did not answer the Morse lamp'—this is the officer on the bridge, who continued, "and she has commenced to go away from us."

Indeed, she had commenced to go away, never to return. "I then said, 'Call her up and let me know at once what her name is.' So he put the whistle back, and, apparently, he was calling. Then I went to sleep." Capt. Lord then says, "Rockets are used as signals of distress and can not be mistaken." He does not believe that he could have seen the *Titanic* Morse signals, but is not quite so doubtful about being unable to see rockets that distance.

Most of the witnesses of the ill-fated vessel before the committee saw plainly the light, which Capt. Lord says was displayed for nearly two hours after the accident, while the captain and some of the officers of the *Titanic* directed the lifeboats to pull for that light and return with the empty boats to the side of the ship.

Ernest Gill, a member of the crew of the *Californian*, says that he came on deck from the engine room at 11.56, ship's time, and just before the accident that fatal Sunday evening, and saw plainly over the rail on the starboard side "the lights of a very large steamer about 10 miles away," and that he "could see her port side lights"; that he then went to his cabin and said to his mate, William Thomas, that it was "clear off to the starboard, for I saw a big vessel going along at full speed";

that he could not sleep and went on deck again and "saw a white rocket about 10 miles away on the starboard side and in seven or eight minutes saw distinctly a second rocket in the same place," saying to himself "that must be a vessel in distress."

Why did the *Californian* display its Morse signal lamp from the moment of the collision continuously for nearly two hours if they saw nothing? And the signals which were visible to Mr. Gill at 12.30 and afterwards, and which were also seen by the captain and officer of the watch, should have excited more solicitude than was displayed by the officers of that vessel, and the failure of Capt. Lord to arouse the wireless operator on his ship, who could have easily ascertained the name of the vessel in distress and reached her in time to avert loss of life, places a tremendous responsibility upon this officer from which it will be very difficult for him to escape. Had he been as vigilant in the movement of his vessel as he was active in displaying his own signal lamp, there is a very strong probability that every human life that was sacrificed through this disaster could have been saved. The dictates of humanity should have prompted vigilance under such conditions. And the law of Great Britain giving effect to article 2 of the Brussels Convention in regard to assistance and salvage at sea is as follows:

The master or person in charge of a vessel shall, so far as he can do so without serious danger to his own vessel, her crew, and passengers (if any), render assistance to every person, even if such person be a subject of a foreign State at war with His Majesty, who is found at sea in danger of being lost, and if he fails to do so, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

The Senate passed, on the 18th day of April last, a bill giving effect to the same treaty, which clearly indicates the disposition of the Government of England, and our own as well, in matters of this character.

I am well aware from the testimony of the captain of the *Californian* that he deluded himself with the idea that there was a ship between the *Titanic* and the *Californian*, but there was no ship seen there at daybreak and no intervening rockets were seen by anyone on the *Titanic*, although they were looking longingly for such a sign and only saw the white light of the *Californian*, which was flashed the moment the ship struck and taken down when the vessel sank. A ship would not have been held there if it had been eastbound, and she could not have gone west without passing the *Californian* on the north or the *Titanic* on the south. That ice floe held but two ships—the *Titanic* and the *Californian*. The conduct of the captain of the *Californian* calls for drastic action by the Government of England and by the owners of that vessel, who were the same owners as those of the ill-fated ship.

Contrast, if you will, the conduct of the captain of the *Carpentia* in this emergency and imagine what must be the consolation of that thoughtful and sympathetic mariner, who rescued the shipwrecked and left the people of the world his debtor as his ship sailed for distant seas a few days ago. By his utter self-effacement and his own indifference to peril, by his promptness and his knightly sympathy, he rendered a great service to humanity. He should be made to realize the debt of gratitude this Nation owes to him, while the book of good deeds, which had so often been familiar with his unaffected valor, should henceforth carry the name of Capt. Rostron to the remotest period of time. With most touching detail he promptly ordered the ship's officers to their stations, distributed the doctors into positions of greatest usefulness, prepared comforts for man and mother and babe; with foresight and tenderness he lifted them from their watery imprisonment and, when the rescue had been completed, summoned all of the rescued together and ordered the ship's bell tolled for the lost, and asked that prayers of thankfulness be offered by those who had been spared. It falls to the lot of few men to perform a service so unselfish, and the American Congress can honor itself no more by any single act than by writing into its laws the gratitude we feel toward this modest and kindly man. The lessons of this hour are, indeed, fruitless and its precepts ill-conceived if rules of action do not follow hard upon the day of reckoning. Obsolete and antiquated shipping laws should no longer encumber the parliamentary records of any Government, and overripe administrative boards should be pruned of dead branches and less sterile precepts taught and applied.

Upon the bosom of the sea the nations have for ages commingled together, arts and manufactures have been exchanged freely, and the knowledge of language spread to the remotest limit of civilization. The sea, once a torment to primitive man, has long since given way to his intelligent mastery, and in its changing moods there is real glamour; there the daring spirit of the explorer and trader still lingers in this period of sharpest rivalry; there prizes await the fleetest skipper.

I think the presence of Mr. Ismay and Mr. Andrews stimulated the ship to greater speed than it would have made under

ordinary conditions, although I can not fairly ascribe to either of them any instructions to this effect.

The very presence of the owner and builder unconsciously stimulates endeavor, and the restraint of organized society is absolutely necessary to safety. As men have re-formed anew the natural banks of the ocean and struck the shackles from its contracted bounds, dedicating its bays and shores to commerce, so must we do our utmost to overcome its perils.

Piracy and pillage are twin trophies of international concern and, under the same searching scrutiny, modern shipping should be free from every inherent defect.

The calamity through which we have just passed has left traces of sorrow everywhere; hearts have been broken and deep anguish unexpressed; art will typify with master hand its lavish contribution to the sea; soldiers of state and masters of trade will receive the homage which is their honest due; hills will be cleft in search of marble white enough to symbolize these heroic deeds and, where kinship is the only tie that binds the lowly to the humble home bereft of son or mother or father, little groups of kinsfolk will recount, around the kitchen fire, the traits of human sympathy in those who went down with the ship. These are choice pictures in the treasure house of the affections, but even these will sometime fade; the sea is the place permanently to honor our dead; this should be the occasion for a new birth of vigilance, and future generations must accord to this event a crowning motive for better things.

Recently we have witnessed a marked concentration of control of ocean transportation. Three companies—the International Mercantile Marine Co., the Hamburg-American Co., and the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co.—control 604 ocean steamers with a gross tonnage of 3,632,233 tons. These companies control more tonnage than the total American tonnage of all classes on the Great Lakes—2,943,523 tons. Any one of these companies controls tonnage nine times as great as the over-sea steam tonnage of the United States, and twice as great as the total registered steam tonnage of the merchant marine of the United States.

Regulation of steamship transportation is as necessary as regulation of railroad transportation, and less difficult to obtain. Transportation by rail is conducted through settled localities, where many residents would quickly discover and immediately report any irregularities or disregard of safety requirements, while by water it is conducted beyond the criticism of any except the actual passengers on the ship, making it all the more necessary for definite regulations.

Lanes of travel must be more carefully defined, strength of bow more positive and water-tight subdivision to limit submergence, life-saving equipment better and numerous enough for all, discipline and practice a rudimentary exaction, eye more keen and ear alert to catch the warning cry; as on British battleships as well as on our own, powerful lights should be provided for merchant vessels to search out the partially submerged derelict; buoys should be carried by every ship to mark temporarily the place of the ship's burial in case of accident; and men of strength and spirit there must be, won back to a calling already demoralized and decadent. But 10 per cent of the men before the mast in our merchant marine are natives or naturalized Americans; even England, that 20 years ago had barely 7,000 Orientals on her merchant ships, now carries over 70,000 of that alien race. Americans must reenlist in this service, they must become the soldiers of the sea, and, whether on lookout, on deck, or at the wheel, whether able or common seamen, they should be better paid for their labor and more highly honored in their calling; their rights must be respected, and their work carefully performed; harsh and severe restraining statutes must be repealed, and a new dignity given this important field of labor.

"In our imagination we can see again the proud ship instinct with life and energy, with active figures again swarming upon its decks; musicians, teachers, artists, and authors; soldiers and sailors and men of large affairs; brave men and noble women of every land. We can see the unpretentious and the lowly, progenitors of the great and strong, turning their back upon the Old World, where endurance is to them no longer a virtue, and looking hopefully to the new. At the very moment of their greatest joy the ship suddenly reels, mutilated and groaning." With splendid courage the musicians fill the last moments with sympathetic melody. "The ship wearily gives up the unequal battle. Only a vestige remains of the men and women that but a moment before quickened her spacious apartments with human hopes and passions, sorrows, and joys." Upon that broken hull new vows were taken, new fealty expressed, old love renewed, and those who had been devoted in friendship and companions in life went proudly and defiantly on the last life pilgrimage together. In such a heritage we must feel ourselves more intimately related to the sea than ever

before, and henceforth it will send back to us on its rising tide the cheering salutations from those we have lost.

During the delivery of the speech of Mr. SMITH of Michigan, THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan will suspend for a moment. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

THE SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 18642) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1900.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid aside until the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Maryland have finished the speeches of which they have given notice.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from North Carolina is complied with.

At the conclusion of his speech, Mr. SMITH of Michigan said: Mr. President, I send to the Clerk's desk a joint resolution, which I desire to have read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) to convey the thanks of Congress to Capt. Arthur Henry Rostron, and through him to the officers and crew of the steamship *Carpathia*, of the Cunard Line, for the prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing 704 lives from the wreck of the steamship *Titanic* in the North Atlantic Ocean, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the thanks of Congress be, and the same are hereby, presented to Capt. Arthur Henry Rostron, and through him to the officers and crew of the steamship *Carpathia*, of the Cunard Line, for promptly going to the relief of the steamship *Titanic* and heroically saving the lives of 704 people who had been shipwrecked in the North Atlantic Ocean.

SEC. 2. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to cause to be made and presented to Captain Rostron a suitable gold medal appropriately inscribed, which shall express the high estimation in which Congress holds the service of this officer, to whose promptness and vigilance was due the rescue of 374 women and children and 330 men.

SEC. 3. That the sum of \$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase or manufacture of said medal is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). To what committee does the Senator desire to have the joint resolution referred?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, this recognition is so highly deserved, the valor shown by this officer is so marked and worthy of emulation, I am going to ask Senators to give unanimous consent for immediate consideration and that the joint resolution be put on its passage without a reference to committee.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Out of order I desire to introduce a bill and joint resolution, and I will ask their reference to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 6976) to regulate navigation by steam passenger vessels, to amend sections 4400, 4471, 4488, 4490, section 3 of act of July 9, 1886, section 1 of act of June 24, 1910, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 112) providing for the creation of a commission to investigate the laws and regulations for the construction and equipment in the navigation of vessels, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The report of the Committee on Commerce has been unanimously agreed upon, and I am directed to make the report which I send to the Clerk's desk. We have thought it desirable to give the full sailing list as well as the full list of the crew from Southampton, Cherbourg, and Queenstown, also a full and complete list of those rescued and of those lost. I will ask that the report be read following the speech of the Senator from Maryland, who has given notice of his desire to proceed now, and when it is read that it be printed in full in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the attention of the Senate briefly to the subject matter indicated in my notice in reference to the disaster to the *Titanic*.

I shall not bring to your attention the harrowing details of this overwhelming calamity, but my purpose is to ascertain what lessons this disaster teaches us and what legislation, if possible, can be framed in order to avoid its recurrence.

Mr. President, we must change the admiralty and navigation laws of this country. They consist of an incongruous collection of antiquated statutes which should be repealed and reenacted so as to meet the necessities of ocean intercourse of the present day. This is surely one lesson that has been taught us by this dreadful calamity. Without entering into minute details, I submit to the Senate the following suggestions for its consideration. In the first place, let me say a word about the investigation by the Senate committee. The committee of the Senate has no power beyond that which it has exercised. In conducting the investigation it acquired its jurisdiction under the constitutional clause to regulate commerce. It is because Congress has jurisdiction to regulate commerce between the States and foreign countries that the committee had the right to undertake this investigation. It would have had no right whatever to summon and examine witnesses unless it had jurisdiction over the subject matter, and the jurisdiction that it has is based upon the fact that by virtue of this examination it is able to recommend to the Senate, under this clause of the Constitution, such improvement in our laws as will enable us to avoid a recurrence of this accident. Therefore the Senate was perfectly right in appointing this committee, and the committee, acting strictly within its jurisdiction and the decision of our courts under a case that I read to the Senate a few weeks ago, has done its full duty in the premises and has done it well, and the committee, and especially its able chairman, deserves not only the gratitude of the Senate but the commendation of the country for the impartial performance of their delicate and arduous duties. If it had not been for the prompt action of the senior Senator from Michigan there would have been no investigation, and his analysis and conduct of the case, thorough in every respect, deserves the appreciation of the Senate and the approval of the people in the highest degree.

I come now to the second proposition. It seems to be universally conceded that this ship was not equipped with a sufficient number of lifeboats to provide for the safety of its passengers. There may have been a sufficient number in accordance with the rules of the British Board of Trade, but it is a conceded fact that the great loss of life occurred because there was an insufficient number to meet the necessities of the case and rescue the passengers and crew.

Third. The failure of foreign steamships to carry searchlights is utterly inexcusable, and if a proper searchlight had been upon this vessel, in my judgment, the accident could have been avoided.

Fourth. The failure to supply the proper officers with binoculars was unquestionably an act of negligence, especially as I gather from the testimony that a demand had been made by the proper officers for them, and the demand had been refused.

Fifth. There was not the proper attention paid to the wireless messages that the ship received. This appears to me to have been an inexcusable act of negligence.

Sixth. The speed of the vessel was not lowered, as it should have been, when notice was received that she was in a dangerous zone. My own judgment therefore is that there was negligence in this case and that the disaster was attributable to the want of due care upon the part of the company and of those in charge of the ship. The proper tribunals will determine upon this question unaffected by any conclusion that we may arrive at in the premises.

I have said that the navigation and admiralty laws of the United States ought to be changed. Now, in what respects ought the proper amendments to be made?

First. In the first place, we can not change the criminal features so far as crimes and criminal negligence occur upon a foreign ship on the high seas. Prosecution for criminal negligence in the *Titanic* disaster can only be brought in the British courts, as a British ship upon the high seas is British territory. This is an unbending rule, and, as announced by the Federal courts is stated as follows:

The general rule is that such courts have no jurisdiction of the offense even when committed upon the high seas, except when committed on board of a ship or vessel of the United States, unless it appears that the vessel was sailing under no national flag.

The only exception to the rule is that where death occurs in one of our States as the direct result of injuries or exposure resulting from criminal negligence of some one on the ship. Such a prosecution, as has been decided by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, might be sustainable upon the theory that the crime was committed where it took effect.

Second. There ought to be a remedial statute providing that a civil action for personal damages against the owners of the ship could be brought in either the Federal or State courts, and the limited liability statutes of the United States should be repealed.

Third. There ought to be a statute providing that surviving relatives under Lord Campbell's Act can bring suit either in the State or Federal courts, and the limited liability statutes should be repealed so as not to apply to a case of this sort.

Fourth. There ought to be a statute providing for a sufficient number of lifeboats and for the adequate equipment of ships with wireless telegraph. There is no doubt about our right to pass such a statute, even as to foreign ships, because we have full authority to say that foreign ships shall not enter or leave our ports unless they are properly supplied in this particular, and even our statutes now are supposed to furnish that remedy.

Fifth. The doctrine of "knowledge or privity of the owner" should be swept from the statute book, and it should not be necessary in order to hold the owners to a full responsibility to prove that the negligence occurred with the privity or knowledge of the owners. There is no reason why owners of ships should not be responsible for the negligence of the crew in the same way that railroad corporations are held responsible for the negligence of their employees. The whole subject is largely in our own hands. We should, without delay, pass a system of laws that, in my judgment, would be sufficient to avoid a repetition of this heart-rending disaster. For a full discussion of the law as it now stands I refer the Senate to the following cases: *Schoemaker v. Gilmore* (102 U. S., 118); *Richardson v. Harmon* (222 U. S., 96); the case of *La Bourgogne* (210 U. S., 97); and *Commonwealth v. MacLoon* (101 Mass., 1).

And the cases I have already referred to in Thirteenth Wallace and One hundred and ninth and One hundred and thirtieth United States.

Now, just let me explain to Senators how the law stands. I think I can do it in a few moments.

At present you can not recover in the Federal courts for the death of a passenger. There is no recovery at all by the surviving family or the surviving relatives in the Federal courts for the death of a passenger. In these accidents the British law provides, under Lord Campbell's Act, that recovery can be had, and in the case that I have cited, in Two hundred and tenth United States, the Supreme Court held that it would administer the French law; that the law which governs a casualty of that sort is the law of the country to which the ship belongs, and therefore France having a law providing for recovery in case of death, the Supreme Court, in the case I have quoted, the *La Bourgogne* case, held that the Supreme Court of the United States would administer the French law in the Federal tribunal. This ought to be changed, and we ought to be able to administer American law in American tribunals and not have to resort to the law of the country that owns the ship upon which the accident takes place.

Now, in the second place, I want to say that you can not recover at all if the owner of the ship surrenders the ship and surrenders the freight. We have an old statute here that is a reenactment of an English statute, passed 175 years ago, and we have never changed it. It was passed during the reign of George II, in 1734. It was improved upon in the reign of George III, in 1786, and again in 1813. That is the limited-liability statute. Look at it for a moment. The owners of the *Titanic* can come into court and surrender their freight money, the pending freight, and there is no recovery against them in any State or Federal court. No matter how many suits are brought in the State court, no matter how many suits are brought in the Federal courts, the owners of that ship, no matter how able they may be financially to answer in damages, can go into the Federal courts, sue out an injunction, have a trustee appointed, bring the ship if it exists—of course in this case the ship is gone—bring pending freight into court, and escape all liability whatever for injury to passengers, for injury to goods, or for any cause whatever.

That is the statute that is now upon the statute books of the United States. It ought to be repealed or modified. There is no reason on earth why it should continue. When it was passed it was thought to afford an invitation to shipowners to take to the sea and risk the hazardous character of the adventure, but I apprehend there is no more danger on the sea now than there is on land; and if these statutes are not repealed there certainly ought to be some modification of them.

Now, if you can prove the privity of the owner you can recover, and the only question of privity which arises in the *Titanic* case is whether the presence of Mr. Ismay on board this vessel carries with it the privity and knowledge of the

owner. You can recover full damages if you can prove privity and knowledge of the owner, but if you can not prove the privity and knowledge of the owner then the company is not responsible for the negligence of its crew, and all that can be recovered is the ship if it exists and the freight money if it is brought into court.

The only open question in this case is whether or not the presence of Ismay on the ship makes the owners responsible. I am inclined to think his presence on the ship would not have this effect. He was one of the trustees of the line. He was one of the directors of the line. He was upon the executive committee of the line. He was chairman of the finance committee or upon the finance committee, and he was president of the line. In fact, he was almost the line itself. But, nevertheless, I doubt very much whether as a proposition of law his mere presence on the ship itself, admitting that he was not present as a passenger, would come within the Federal statute, which holds that damages can only be recovered where there is a privity or knowledge of the owner. Thus stands the law, and the law ought to be changed.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. RAYNER. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me a question? I presume the Senator refers to what is commonly called the Harter law. Under that law if the ship is properly equipped and seaworthy the owners are not liable for any mistake of the master in navigating the ship, and in case of damage occurring they are only liable for the value of the ship and the freight earned.

Now, the question I put to the Senator is whether under that law in a case of this kind where there is a total loss the insurance would not be available under that law?

Mr. RAYNER. I think not, Mr. President. It ought to be made available, but there is a decision of the Supreme Court (I can not give my friend from Minnesota the case) in which the point came up involving the question the Senator has asked, and, I believe, though I am not certain, that the court held that insurance was not counted.

In Great Britain, I believe, the law provides that the freight money shall be equal to £15 to the registered ton; and in the loss of the *Titanic* that would amount to a great deal; but we have not any such statute, and there is no recovery here at all. There is no recovery for death, because it does not come within the admiralty laws, and there is no recovery for damages against the company unless you can prove the privity and the knowledge of the owner. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] will notice the last case on the subject is the case in Two hundred and tenth United States Reports, which is one of the best opinions, in my judgment, that was ever delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States. Chief Justice White goes into an elaborate and exhaustive discussion of all the questions that are involved in that disaster in case of a collision, and he administered the Code Napoleon in the Supreme Court of the United States, where it required a very thorough investigation to discover what the French law upon this ruling was. The Supreme Court came to the conclusion that under the French code you could recover for death; but they came to the further conclusion that there was no privity or knowledge of the owners, and that, therefore, they had a right in the *Bourgogne* case, in the case of the collision of a French with a British ship, to go into the Federal courts, surrender freight money, and escape all liability. These provisions have been on the statute books from time immemorial. We have a bill now in the Judiciary Committee attempting to remedy these obsolete provisions of our navigation laws, and they ought to be remedied, because nearly every other civilized government has adopted statutes in reference to them.

There is another lesson that this disaster teaches us and which ought to be one of general application, and that is the lesson of corporate responsibility. We must enact legislation that will make the controlling and superior officers of corporations within our own jurisdiction criminally responsible for the careless and negligent management of the public-service corporations which they control. I have made this suggestion over and over again, and I repeat it now in the most emphatic way that I can, that it is a shame and an outrage that the criminal statutes of this land permit the men who are really responsible absolutely to escape from the penalties of the law, and inflict penalties and punishments upon those who are simply acting under their superior orders. We know how a large number of these corporations are organized, and what I have reference to now are American corporations, because in

Great Britain corporations are controlled by laws that are more efficient and severe than ours. Let us look at the scheme a minute.

A number of individuals organize a trust. We call these companies trusts for want of a better name. The promoters absorb and consolidate a number of competing companies, and then, in order to promote the scheme, a bonded indebtedness is created. The promoters in almost every instance get the bonds and the public gets the stock. Then the consolidated company goes into operation and, as a rule, the bondholders, who consist of the individuals who practically own the constituent companies, have very little, if any, interest in the active management of the concern. The president and managing officers—I will not say in all cases, but in a great many instances of the administration of public-service corporations—perform simply perfunctory duties, their position being largely a sinecure, and the management being left to other hands. I know of one railroad accident after another and one steamship accident after another that are entirely due to the negligence of the directorate of the respective companies. Did we ever hear of a director or a president of any public-service corporation being indicted for manslaughter in an American court in any case whatever where the accident was directly attributable to the oversight, neglect, or carelessness of the company's management? American corporations in a number of instances are running loose and wild without curb and without reins. Take the street railroads of Washington. I have never in any city in the Union seen such an utter disregard of the people's rights. I have time and time again intended to offer some measure here to bring them to bay and call them to terms, and I expect to follow up this purpose. They are violating their charters and they are not giving the people proper accommodations and facilities. I have been in these cars hundreds of times when afflicted and helpless people have been made to stand from almost terminus to terminus simply because the management of these railroads will not run a sufficient number of cars and will not give to the people of this District the rights that they are entitled to. They forget that they are the trustees of the public as well as the trustees of their stockholders.

It is a delusion that these gentlemen are laboring under that they represent private stockholders alone and that their duty ceases when they pay their own salaries and interest upon their bonds and a dividend upon their stock. They owe just as great a duty to the public as they do to the private interests that they represent, and I think the time has come when we must lock hands in this Congress of the United States and demand of these public-service corporations, interstate and in the District of Columbia, that under the heaviest penalties they must properly administer their charter obligations and that the public will no longer stand by and permit the gross violation of their public duty to take place from day to day as it is now doing in this District and elsewhere. What occurs here occurs all around us, and I call upon Congress, taught the lesson as it is by this terrible disaster, to fix the standard and the measure of responsibility, not against sailors and captains and conductors and brakemen and motormen, unless where they are personally negligent, but upon the heads of these corporations, where the responsibility attaches to them for the proper direction and management of the interests that they represent.

There is another lesson, however, Mr. President, that this disaster has taught us, of more importance than a change in our admiralty and navigation laws, and of far greater and more overwhelming significance than the lesson of corporate responsibility, and that is the lesson of religious faith. Disasters like this, instead of weakening, should strengthen the faith of the Nation. There is no use of appealing to reason or to philosophy in a case of this sort. The mind stands aghast and appalled as these calamities come thick and fast. We forget in our moments of sorrow that it never was intended that the intellect of man should reason out such a problem. Suffering and affliction, as they come to the pure and the innocent in a hundred forms, are inexplainable.

The convulsions of nature alone that have swept myriads of human beings to an untimely death can not be reconciled by any process of human reasoning. When reason halts, the Creator has implanted in the soul another faculty, however, that gives us light in the hours of tribulation. It is the light of faith, a pillar of fire in the night of our darkness and despair. Throughout my life I have spent many hours of the day, and many silent and sleepless hours of the night, in the struggle for the light of reason, but in my advancing years the light that gives me fortitude and courage is the sublime light of faith, that never dims nor wanes, and at the supreme moment when reason vanishes, breaks in upon us with all the radiance of the morning sun. We can reason out the negligence of man, but

we can not reason out why, in the course of nature, an iceberg from the Arctic Zone should just at this very moment have taken its course upon the path of desolation and of death. Upon all this and kindred subjects the most profound intellect of the greatest philosophers who ever lived have illumined the world just about as much as the credulity of the earliest races, who attributed every phenomenon of nature to the interposition of Divine Providence. What this Nation needs are some severe lessons that will strengthen the pillars and the altars of its faith. We are to a large extent to-day defying the ordinances of God, and the sooner we awaken to a realizing sense of our responsibility the better it will be for the spiritual elevation of the country. We are running mad with the lust of wealth, and of power, and of ambition. We are separating society into castes, with fabulous fortunes upon the one side and destitution and poverty on the other. It takes a terrible warning to bring us back to our moorings and our senses. We are abandoning the devout and simple lives of our ancestors, and the fabric of our firesides is weakening at the foundation. If this disaster teaches no lesson or points no moral, then let us pass it by with stoical indifference, until the next disaster comes, and in the meantime let the carnival go on. May the heart-rending scenes upon this night of anguish and of woe give us faith and lead us back to the altars of our fathers. I will not rehearse the agonies of this midnight sacrifice. I can not afford to dwell upon them or listen to the details that almost distract the mind and break the heart. It is the lesson and the moral that I am searching for.

I will say this, however, in closing. The agonies of separation at this scene, that palsy the tongue when it attempts to describe them, were worse than the agonies of death. I knew well one of the courageous passengers who, with his wife, yielded up their lives on this occasion. The man was a splendid type of American citizenship. I served with him in the House of Representatives, and he was esteemed and beloved by all who knew him. In private life he was a benefactor of the human race. In public life he was an unpurchasable tribune of the people. His heroic wife had the blood of martyrs in her veins, and from the most authentic account that I can obtain, the account of a witness who was not examined by the committee, because her testimony was not necessary for the purposes of the investigation, she went to her death with the same spirit of heroic fortitude with which her ancestors went to the fagot and the flame.

A harrowing thought flashes across my mind, and that is, it might possibly have been unnecessary to have presented to this devoted man and woman the terrible alternative that confronted them, and it might have been possible that both of them could have been rescued. I shall dwell upon this incident no longer.

I shall close my brief remarks with this remembrance. As the ship was sinking, the strains of music were wafted over the deck. It was not the note of any martial anthem that had in days gone by led embattled legions on to victory. It was a more inspiring stanza than this. It was a loftier and holier melody amid the anguish and the sublime pathos of that awful hour that swept through the compartments of the sinking ship. It was a rallying cry for the living and the dying, to rally them not for life, but to rally them for their awaiting death. Almost face to face with their Creator, amid the chaos of this supreme and solemn moment, in inspiring notes the unison resounded through the ship. It told the victims of the wreck that there was another world beyond the seas free from the agony of pain, and, though with somber tones, it cheered them on to their untimely fate. As the sea closed upon the heroic dead, let us feel that the heavens opened to the lives that were prepared to enter.

Father of the Universe, what an admonition to the Nation! The sounds of that awe-inspiring requiem that vibrated o'er the ocean have been drowned in the waters of the deep, the instruments that gave them birth are silenced as the harps were silenced on the willow tree, but if the melody that was rehearsed could only reverberate through this land, "Nearer, my God, to Thee," and its echoes could be heard in these halls of legislation, and at every place where our rulers and representatives pass judgment and enact and administer laws, and at every home and fireside, from the mansions of the rich to the huts and hovels of the poor, and if we could be made to feel that there is a divine law of obedience and of adjustment and of compensation that should command our allegiance, far above the laws that we formulate in this presence, then, from the gloom of these fearful hours we shall pass into the dawn of a higher service and of a better day, and then, Mr. President, the lives that went down upon this fated night did not go down in vain. [Applause in the galleries.]



The VICE PRESIDENT. Visitors in the gallery will please refrain from manifestations of applause, which are in violation of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I ask that the report be read and that the names contained at the back part of the report be printed in the Record as a part of the report, but not read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the report can not be read except by unanimous consent. The Senate has given consent to lay aside the unfinished business until the conclusion of the speeches delivered by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Maryland. The report can be printed, but the Chair thinks, under that unanimous-consent agreement, it can not now be read.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside until the report can be read—not the names, but simply the report.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Minnesota how long he thinks it will take to read the report?

Mr. NELSON. I do not think it will take over 15 or 20 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are 19 pages of printed matter in the report, aside from exhibits and addenda, which the Senator from Michigan does not care to have read. Without objection, the Secretary will read the report, and the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside for that purpose.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent that the speech of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], delivered this morning, be printed as a part of the report when the report is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the Senator from Washington desires that the report and the speech of the Senator from Michigan be printed together as a Senate document?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes, sir.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order therefor is entered.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] be included in the document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that modification of the order will be made.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report submitted this day by Mr. SMITH of Michigan from the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the report be dispensed with and that the entire report, with illustrations, including the names of passengers, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and an order is entered as requested.

The report in full is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 806, Sixty-second Congress, second session.]

INVESTIGATION INTO LOSS OF STEAMSHIP "TITANIC."

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Commerce, submitted the following report.

The Subcommittee on Commerce, to whom was referred the resolution of inquiry into the loss of the British steamship *Titanic*, respectfully reports that that duty has been performed, and the committee has reached its conclusions thereon.

The resolution is as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Commerce, or a subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to investigate the causes leading to the wreck of the White Star liner *Titanic*, with its attendant loss of life, so shocking to the civilized world.

*Resolved further*, That said committee or a subcommittee thereof is hereby empowered to summon witnesses, send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as may be necessary to determine the responsibility therefor, with a view to such legislation as may be necessary to prevent, as far as possible, any repetition of such a disaster.

*Resolved further*, That the committee shall inquire particularly into the number of lifeboats, life rafts, and life preservers, and other equipment for the protection of the passengers and crew; the number of persons aboard the *Titanic*, whether passenger or crew, and whether adequate inspections were made of such vessel, in view of the large number of American passengers traveling over a route commonly regarded as dangerous from icebergs; and whether it is feasible for Congress to take steps looking to an international agreement to secure the protection of sea traffic, including regulation of the size of ships and designation of routes.

*Resolved further*, That in the report of said committee it shall recommend such legislation as it shall deem expedient; and the expenses incurred by this investigation shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of said committee.

Attest:

CHARLES G. BENNETT, Secretary,  
By H. M. ROSE, Assistant Secretary.

Accordingly the following Senators were appointed as members of the subcommittee: WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH, Michigan, chairman; GEORGE C. PERKINS, California; JONATHAN BOURNE, Jr., Oregon; THEODORE E. BURTON, Ohio; F. M. SIMMONS, North Carolina; FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, Nevada; DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, Florida.

WITNESSES EXAMINED.

We examined 82 witnesses upon various phases of this catastrophe, including the examination 53 British subjects or residents of Great Britain and 29 citizens of the United States or residents thereof.

We interrogated 2 general officers of the International Mercantile Marine Co., which owned the steamship *Titanic*—J. Bruce Ismay, of Liverpool, England, president, also a passenger on the ship on this voyage, and P. A. S. Franklin, of New York, vice president in the United States of the International Mercantile Marine Co.; all the surviving officers, 4 in number—Charles Herbert Lightoller, second officer, of Netley Abbey, Hampshire, England; Third Officer Herbert John Pitman, of Somerset, England; Fourth Officer Joseph Groles Boxhall, of Hull, England; and Fifth Officer Harold Godfrey Lowe, of North Wales; and 34 members of the crew, whose names are as follows:

Andrews, C. E., assistant steward, 145 Millbrook Road, Southampton.  
Archer, Ernest, seaman, 59 Porchester Road, Southampton.  
Barrett, Frederick, leading fireman, Southampton.  
Brice, W., seaman, 11 Lower Canal Walk, Southampton.  
Bride, H. S., telegrapher, London, England.  
Bright, A. J., quartermaster, 105 Firgrove Road, Southampton.  
Buley, E. J., seaman, 10 Cliff Road, Woolston, Southampton.  
Burke, W., saloon steward, 57 Bridge Road, Southampton.  
Clench, F., seaman, 10 The Flats Chantry Road, Southampton.  
Collins, J., assistant cook, 65 Ballycarry, Belfast.  
Crawford, A., bedroom steward, 22 Cranbury Avenue, Southampton.  
Crowe, G. F., steward, 89 Milton Road, Southampton.  
Cunningham, A., bedroom steward, 60 Charlton Road, Southampton.  
Evans, F. O., seaman, 14 Bond Street, Southampton.  
Etches, H. S., bedroom steward, 23a Gordon Avenue, Southampton.  
Fleet, F., lookout (sailor), No. 9 Norman Road, Southampton.  
Haines, Albert, boatswain's mate, No. 52 Groves Street, Southampton.  
Hardy, J., steward, Oakleigh Holyrood Avenue, Highfield, Southampton.

Hemming, Samuel S., lamp trimmer, 31 Kingsley Road, Southampton.  
Hitchens, Robert, quartermaster, 43 James Street, Southampton.  
Hogg, G. A., lookout (sailor), 44 High Street, Southampton.  
Jones, Thomas, seaman, 68 Westfield, Liverpool.  
Moore, G., seaman, 51 Graham Road, Southampton.  
Olliver, A., quartermaster, 38 Anderson Road, Southampton.  
Osman, F., seaman, 43 High Street, Itchen, Southampton.  
Perkis, W. A., quartermaster, Victoria Road, Bitterne, Southampton.  
Pitman, H. J., third officer, Castle Carry, Somerset, Southampton.  
Ray, F. D., saloon steward, Palmer Park Avenue, Reading.  
Rowe, G. T., quartermaster, 63 Henry Street, Gosport.  
Symons, G., lookout (sailor), 55 Franchise Street, Weymouth.  
Taylor, W. H., fireman, No. 2 Broad Street, Southampton.  
Ward, W., saloon steward, 107 Millbrook Road, Southampton.  
Wheelton, E., saloon steward, Norwood House, Shireley, Southampton.  
Widgery, J. (baths), 25 Rokeby Avenue, Redland, Bristol.

We took the testimony of 21 passengers of all classes (including President Ismay) and of 23 other witnesses on subjects related to our inquiry (including Vice President Franklin).

We held our sessions in New York and in Washington, and took testimony by deposition in other parts of the country and in the Dominion of Canada.

The results of our investigation may be stated as follows:

OWNERSHIP OF STEAMSHIP "TITANIC."

We find that the *Titanic* was a White Star steamer and was owned by the Oceanic Steam Navigation Co., of England, all the stock of which company is in turn owned by the International Navigation Co. (Ltd.), of England, and the stock of that company, in turn, is owned by the International Mercantile Marine Co., an American corporation organized under the laws of New Jersey.

INTERNATIONAL MERCANTILE MARINE CO.

Mr. J. Bruce Ismay, of Liverpool, England, is president of the International Mercantile Marine Co., and Mr. P. A. S. Franklin, of New York City, is vice president of that company in the United States.

The board of directors of the International Mercantile Marine Co. is composed of the following persons:

C. A. Griscom (chairman), E. C. Grenfell, John F. Archbold, John I. Waterbury, the Right Hon. Lord Pirrie, George W. Perkins, Charles Steele, J. Bruce Ismay (president), Percy Chubb, E. J. Berwind, Harold A. Sanderson, F. A. B. Widener, Charles F. Torrey, and J. P. Morgan, Jr.

The International Mercantile Marine Co., through its various ramifications and constituent companies, owns the White Star Line, the American Line, the Red Star Line, the Atlantic Transport Line, the National Line, and the majority of the stock of the Leyland Line.

This company is capitalized as follows (in round numbers): \$102,000,000 between the preferred and common shares; \$52,000,000 of 4½ per cent bonds; \$19,000,000 (about) of 5 per cent bonds; \$7,000,000 (about) of underlying bonds.

The total stock and bonded liability is about \$180,000,000.

This company owns and operates a fleet of about 125 vessels, with a total of about 1,150,000 tons register, doing a general transoceanic transportation business throughout the world.

GENERAL PARTICULARS OF STEAMSHIP "TITANIC."

The *Titanic* was built by Harland & Wolff, of Belfast, Ireland. No restriction as to limit of cost was placed upon the builders. She was launched May 31, 1911. She was a vessel of 46,328 tons register; her length was 882.6 feet, and her breadth was 92.6 feet. Her boat deck and bridge were 70 feet above the water line. She was, according to the testimony of President Ismay, "especially constructed to float with her two largest water-tight compartments full of water."

The vessel, fully equipped, cost £1,500,000 sterling, or about \$7,500,000.

At the time of the accident the vessel carried insurance of £1,000,000 sterling, or about \$5,000,000, the remaining risk being carried by the company's insurance fund.

The *Titanic* was a duplicate of the *Olympic*, which is owned by the same company, with the single exception of her passenger accommodations, and was built to accommodate 2,539 passengers, with additional accommodations for officers and crew numbering 903 persons.

TRIAL TESTS OF STEAMSHIP "TITANIC."

The committee finds from the evidence that between six and seven hours was spent in making trial tests of this vessel at Belfast Lough on Monday, the 1st day of April last. A few turning circles were made, compasses adjusted, and she steamed a short time under approximately a full head of steam, but the ship was not driven at her full speed. One general officer of the steamship company was on board during the trial tests, while the builders were represented by Mr. Thomas Andrews, who had superintended the building of the vessel. Mr. Andrews conducted certain tests at Southampton and represented the builders both at Southampton and on the first voyage.

With a partial crew, the ship sailed from Belfast immediately after the trial, for Southampton, where she arrived on Wednesday, April 3, about midnight. She made fast with her port side to the wharf, where she remained until April 10, about 12 o'clock noon, when she sailed for Cherbourg, Queenstown, and New York.

ONLY TWO LIFEBOATS LOWERED.

Many of the crew did not join the ship until a few hours before sailing, and the only drill while the vessel lay at Southampton or on the voyage consisted in lowering two lifeboats on the starboard side into the water, which boats were again hoisted to the boat deck within a half hour. No boat list designating the stations of members of the crew was posted until several days after sailing from Southampton, boatmen being left in ignorance of their proper stations until the following Friday morning.

CERTIFICATE OF BRITISH BOARD OF TRADE.

On Wednesday morning, the day the ship sailed from Southampton, Capt. Clark, a representative of the British Board of Trade, came aboard and, after spending a brief time, issued the necessary certificate to permit sailing.

BOAT DAVITS AND LIFEBOATS OF THE STEAMSHIP "TITANIC."

The *Titanic* was fitted with 16 sets of double-acting boat davits of modern type, capable of handling 2 or 3 boats per set of davits. The davits were thus capable of handling 48 boats, whereas the ship carried but 16 lifeboats and 4 collapsibles, fulfilling all the requirements of the British Board of Trade. The *Titanic* was provided with 14 lifeboats, of capacity for 65 persons each, or 910 persons; 2 emergency sea boats, of capacity for 35 persons each, or 70 persons; 4 collapsible boats, of capacity for 49 persons each, or 196 persons. Total lifeboat capacity, 1,176. There was ample life-boat equipment for all.

DEPARTURE OF THE STEAMSHIP "TITANIC."

The ship left Southampton Wednesday, April 10, at 12.15 p. m., with the ship's complement of officers and crew (see Exhibit A) numbering 899 persons. As the *Titanic* left the wharf at Southampton the moorings of the *New York* were carried away by the backwash from the *Titanic's* starboard propeller, causing a delay of about half an hour.

PASSENGER LIST AND SURVIVORS OF STEAMSHIP "TITANIC."

The *Titanic* arrived at Cherbourg late the same afternoon. The *Titanic* left Cherbourg and proceeded to Queenstown, Ireland, arriving there on Thursday about midday, departing for New York immediately after embarking the mails and passengers. Her passenger list was made up as follows:

First-class passengers who sailed on the <i>Titanic</i> :		
Women and children	-----	156
Men	-----	173
Total	-----	329

First-class passengers, survivors:		
Women and children	-----	145
Men	-----	54
Total	-----	199
First-class passengers lost:		
Women and children	-----	11
Men	-----	119
Total	-----	130
Second-class passengers who sailed on the <i>Titanic</i> :		
Women and children	-----	128
Men	-----	157
Total	-----	285
Second-class passengers, survivors:		
Women and children	-----	104
Men	-----	75
Total	-----	119
Second-class passengers lost:		
Women and children	-----	24
Men	-----	142
Total	-----	166
Third-class passengers who sailed on the <i>Titanic</i> :		
Women and children	-----	224
Men	-----	486
Total	-----	710
Third-class passengers, survivors:		
Women and children	-----	105
Men	-----	69
Total	-----	174
Third-class passengers lost:		
Women and children	-----	119
Men	-----	417
Total	-----	536

SUMMARY OF PASSENGERS AND SURVIVORS.

Including the crew, the *Titanic* sailed with 2,223 persons aboard, of whom 1,517 were lost and 706 were saved. It will be noted in this connection that 60 per cent of the first-class passengers were saved, 42 per cent of the second-class passengers were saved, 25 per cent of the third-class passengers were saved, and 24 per cent of the crew were saved.

	On board.			Saved.			Lost.			Per cent saved.
	Women and children.	Men.	Total.	Women and children.	Men.	Total.	Women and children.	Men.	Total.	
Passengers:										
First class	156	173	329	145	54	199	11	119	130	60
Second class	128	157	285	104	15	119	24	142	166	42
Third class	224	486	710	105	69	174	119	417	536	25
Total passengers	508	816	1,324	354	138	492	154	678	832	.....
Crew	23	876	899	20	194	214	3	682	685	24
Total	531	1,692	2,223	374	332	706	157	1,360	1,517	32

(See Exhibit B for full names and addresses of passengers rescued and passengers lost.)

WEATHER CONDITIONS DURING VOYAGE.

During the entire voyage the weather was clear, with the single exception of 10 minutes of fog, and the sea was calm throughout the voyage, with sunshine the whole of each day and bright starlight every night. No untoward incident marred the trip. Greetings were frequently exchanged with passing vessels by appropriate signals.

ICE WARNINGS.

On the third day out ice warnings were received by the wireless operators on the *Titanic*, and the testimony is conclusive that at least three of these warnings came direct to the commander of the *Titanic* on the day of the accident, the first about noon, from the *Baltic*, of the White Star Line. It will be noted that this message places icebergs within 5 miles of the track which the *Titanic* was following, and near the place where the accident occurred. The message from the commander of the *Baltic* is as follows (p. 1058):

STEAMSHIP "BAL TIC," April 14, 1912.

Capt. SMITH, *Titanic*:

Have had moderate variable winds and clear fine weather since leaving. Greek steamer *Athina* reports passing icebergs and large quantity of field ice to-day in latitude 41.51 north, longitude 49.52 west. Last night we spoke German oil tank *Deutschland*, Stettin to Philadelphia, not under control; short of coal; latitude 40.42 north, longitude 55.11. Wishes to be reported to New York and other steamers. Wish you and *Titanic* all success.

COMMANDER.

The second message was received by the *Titanic* from the *Californian*, of the Leyland Line, at 5.35 p. m. New York time, Sunday afternoon, reporting ice about 19 miles to the northward of the track which the *Titanic* was following. This message was as follows (p. 733):

Latitude 42.3 north, longitude 49.9 west. Three large bergs 5 miles to southward of us. Regards. (Sig.) Lord.

The third message was transmitted from the *Amerika* via the *Titanic* and Cape Race to the Hydrographic Office in Washington, D. C., reporting ice about 19 miles to the southward of the course being followed by the *Titanic*, and reads as follows (p. 507):

STEAMSHIP "AMERIKA," VIA "TITANIC" AND CAPE RACE, N. F., April 14, 1912.

HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE, Washington, D. C.:

*Amerika* passed two large icebergs in 41.27 N., 50.8 W., on the 14th of April.

K. N. U. T.

This message was actually received at the Hydrographic Office in Washington at 10.51 p. m., April 14.

The fourth message was sent to the *Titanic* at 9.05 p. m. New York time, on Sunday, the 14th of April, approximately an hour before the accident occurred. The message reads as follows:

"We are stopped and surrounded by ice."

To this the operator of the *Titanic* replied:

"Shut up. I am busy. I am working Cape Race."

While this was the last message sent by the *Californian* to the *Titanic*, the evidence shows that the operator of the *Californian* kept the telephones on his head, and heard the *Titanic* talking to Cape Race up to within a few minutes of the time of the accident, when he "put the phones down, took off his clothes, and turned in."

The *Baltic's* operator on that Sunday overheard ice reports going to the *Titanic* from the *Prinz Friedrich Wilhelm*, and from the *Amerika* (p. 1059), while the *Carpathia* on the same day overheard the *Parisian* talking about ice with other ships (p. 497).

ICE BOTH TO NORTHWARD AND SOUTHWARD STEAMSHIP "TITANIC'S" TRACK.

This enables the committee to say that the ice positions so definitely reported to the *Titanic* just preceding the accident located ice on both sides of the track or lane which the *Titanic* was following, and in her immediate vicinity. No general discussion took place among

the officers; no conference was called to consider these warnings; no heed was given to them. The speed was not relaxed, the lookout was not increased, and the only vigilance displayed by the officer of the watch was by instructions to the lookouts to keep "a sharp lookout for ice." It should be said, however, that the testimony shows that Capt. Smith remarked to Officer Lightoller, who was the officer doing duty on the bridge until 10 o'clock ship's time, or 8.27 o'clock New York time, "If it was in a slight degree hazy there would be no doubt we should have to go very slowly" (p. 67) and "If in the slightest degree doubtful, let me know." The evidence is that it was exceptionally clear. There was no haze, and the ship's speed was not reduced.

## SPEED.

The speed of the *Titanic* was gradually increased after leaving Queenstown. The first day's run was 464 miles, the second day's run was 519 miles, the third day's run was 546 miles. Just prior to the collision the ship was making her maximum speed of the voyage—not less than 21 knots, or 24½ miles per hour.

## THE COLLISION.

At 11.46 p. m. ship's time, or 10.13 p. m. New York time, Sunday evening, April 14, the lookout signaled the bridge and telephoned the officer of the watch, "Iceberg right ahead." The officer of the watch, Mr. Murdoch, immediately ordered the quartermaster at the wheel to put the helm "hard astarboard," and reversed the engines; but while the sixth officer standing behind the quartermaster at the wheel reported to Officer Murdoch "The helm is hard astarboard," the *Titanic* struck the ice (pp. 229 and 450). The impact, while not violent enough to disturb the passengers or crew, or to arrest the ship's progress, rolled the vessel slightly and tore the steel plating above the turn of the bilge.

## FIRST DAMAGE REPORTED.

The testimony shows that coincident with the collision air was heard whistling or hissing from the overflow pipe to the forepeak tank, indicating the escape of air from that tank because of the inrush of water. Practically at once, the forepeak tank, No. 1 hold, No. 2 hold, No. 3 hold, and the forward boiler room, filled with water, the presence of which was immediately reported from the mail room and the racquet court and trunk room in No. 3 hold, and also from the firemen's quarters in No. 1 hold. Leading Fireman Barret saw the water rushing into the forward fireroom from a tear about 2 feet above the stokehold floor plates and about 20 feet below the water line, which tear extended 2 feet into the coal bunker at the forward end of the second fireroom.

## SERIOUS NATURE OF DAMAGE REALIZED.

The reports received by the captain after various inspections of the ship must have acquainted him promptly with its serious condition, and when interrogated by President Ismay, he so expressed himself. It is believed, also, that this serious condition was promptly realized by the chief engineer and by the builders' representative, Mr. Andrews, none of whom survived.

## FLOODING OF THE VESSEL.

Under this added weight of water the bow of the ship sank deeper and deeper into the water, and through the open hatch leading from the mail room, and through other openings, water promptly overflowed E deck, below which deck the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth transverse bulkheads ended, and thus flooded the compartments abaft No. 3 hold.

## WATER-TIGHT COMPARTMENTS.

The *Titanic* was fitted with 15 transverse water-tight bulkheads, only 1, the first bulkhead from forward, extended to the uppermost continuous deck, C; bulkheads Nos. 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 extended to the second continuous deck, D; and bulkheads Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 extended only to the third continuous deck, E. The openings through deck E were not designed for water-tight closing, as the evidence shows that flooding over deck E contributed largely to the sinking of the vessel. The bulkheads above described divided the ship into 16 main water-tight compartments, and the ship was so arranged that any 2 main compartments might be flooded without in any way involving the safety of the ship. As before stated, the testimony shows that the 5 extreme forward compartments were flooded practically immediately, and under such circumstances, by reason of the nonwater-tight character of the deck at which the transverse bulkheads ended, the supposedly water-tight compartments were not water-tight, and the sinking of the vessel followed.

## DISTRESS CALLS SENT OUT.

No general alarm was sounded, no whistle blown, and no systematic warning was given the passengers. Within 15 or 20 minutes the captain visited the wireless room and instructed the operator to get assistance, sending out the distress call, C. Q. D.

## DISTRESS CALLS HEARD.

This distress call was heard by the wireless station at Cape Race that evening at 10.25 p. m. New York time, together with the report that she had struck an iceberg, and at the same time was accidentally overheard by the *Mount Temple*, which ship was immediately turned around (p. 760) toward the *Titanic*. Within two or three minutes a reply was received from the *Frankfurt*. Within 10 minutes the wireless operator of the *Carpathia* fortunately and largely by chance heard the *Titanic's* C. Q. D. call (pp. 901 and 929), which he reported at once to the bridge and to the captain. The *Carpathia* was immediately turned around (p. 19) and reported her latitude and longitude to the *Titanic*, together with the fact that she was steaming full speed toward the stricken ship (pp. 148 and 901). The *Frankfurt*, however, did not give her latitude or longitude, and after waiting 20 minutes asked the operator of the *Titanic*, "What is matter?" To this the *Titanic* operator replied that he was a fool (pp. 151 and 153).

In view of the fact that no position had been given by the *Frankfurt*, and that her exact distance from the *Titanic* was unknown at that time, the answer of the operator of the *Titanic* was scarcely such as prudence would have dictated. Notwithstanding this, however, the *Frankfurt* was overheard by the *Mount Temple* to report, "Our captain will go for you" (p. 929). Communication was promptly established with the *Olympic* and the *Baltic* (pp. 151, 158, and 901), and the *Caronia*, some 800 miles to the eastward, overheard the *Titanic's* C. Q. D. call. The wireless messages of the *Titanic* were recorded in part by the Cape Race station (p. 175) and by the *Mount Temple* (p. 929), and in part by the *Baltic* (pp. 1059 and 1060). The *Mount Temple* last heard the *Titanic* after the accident at 11.47 p. m. New York time (p. 929).

The *Baltic* and the *Carpathia* lost touch about the same time, the last message they received being "Engine room getting flooded" (pp. 107 and 1060). The *Virginian* last heard the *Titanic's* signals at 12.27 New York time, and reported them blurred, and ending abruptly (p. 175).

## FIRST PRESS REPORT.

This information is contained in a report received by the Associated Press from Cape Race, and communicated by them to the public and also to Vice President Franklin of the White Star Line, and later verified from his office in Montreal, as follows (p. 1022):

CAPE RACE, NEW BRUNSWICK,  
Sunday night, April 14.

At 10.25 o'clock to-night the White Star Line steamship *Titanic* called "C. Q. D." to the Marconi wireless station here and reported having struck an iceberg. The steamer said that immediate assistance was required.

Half an hour afterwards another message came, reporting that they were sinking by the head, and that women were being put off in the lifeboats.

The weather was calm and clear, the *Titanic's* wireless operator reported, and gave the position of the vessel as 41.46 north latitude and 50.14 west longitude.

The Marconi station at Cape Race notified the Allan liner *Virginian*, the captain of which immediately advised that he was proceeding for the scene of the disaster.

The *Virginian* at midnight was about 170 miles distant from the *Titanic* and expected to reach that vessel about 10 a. m. Monday.

2 A. M. MONDAY.

The *Olympic* at an early hour this (Monday) morning was in latitude 40.32 north and longitude 61.18 west. She was in direct communication with the *Titanic* and is now making all haste toward her.

The steamship *Baltic* also reported herself as about 200 miles east of the *Titanic* and was making all possible speed toward her. The last signals from the *Titanic* were heard by the *Virginian* at 12.27 a. m.

The wireless operator on the *Virginian* says these signals were blurred and ended abruptly.

## VESSELS IN VICINITY OF STEAMSHIP "TITANIC."

At this time the committee thinks it advisable to invite attention to the reported positions of the vessels in the vicinity of the *Titanic* when her calls of distress were being sent out.

The *Californian*, of the Leyland Line, west bound, was in latitude 42° 05' north, longitude 50° 07' west, and was distant in a northerly direction 19½ miles according to the captain's figures (p. 716).

The *Mount Temple*, of the Canadian Pacific Railroad line, west bound, was in latitude 41° 25' north, longitude 51° 14' west, and was about 49 miles to the westward of the *Titanic* (pp. 759 and 760) and on her return to the *Titanic's* position passed an unknown schooner.

The *Carpathia*, of the Cunard Line, east bound, was 58 miles away, and she steered a course north 52° west to reach the *Titanic* (p. 20).

The *Birma*, a Russian ship, was 70 miles off at 12.25 a. m. on Monday, the 15th of April (pp. 780 and 929).

The *Frankfurt*, of the North German Lloyd Line, east bound, was in latitude 39° 47' north, longitude 52° 10' west, 153 miles to the southwest (p. 772).

The *Virginian* at midnight was about 170 miles distant from the *Titanic* (p. 175).

The *Baltic*, of the White Star Line, east bound, was about 243 miles southeast of the *Titanic's* position at about 11 o'clock Sunday evening, New York time (p. 1053).

The *Olympic*, of the White Star Line, east bound, at 12.14, New York time, was about 512 miles to the westward, in latitude 40° 22' north, longitude 61° 18' west (p. 771).

## STEAMSHIP LIGHT SEEN FROM STEAMSHIP "TITANIC."

Sixteen witnesses from the *Titanic*, including officers and experienced seamen, and passengers of sound judgment, testified to seeing the light of a ship in the distance, and some of the lifeboats were directed to pull for that light to leave the passengers, and to return to the side of the *Titanic*. The *Titanic* fired distress rockets and attempted to signal by electric lamp and Morse code to this vessel. At about the same time the officers of the *Californian* admit seeing rockets in the general direction of the *Titanic* and say that they immediately displayed a powerful Morse lamp, which could be easily seen a distance of 10 miles, while several of the crew of the *Californian* testify that the side lights of a large vessel going at full speed were plainly visible from the lower deck of the *Californian* at 11.30 p. m., ship's time, just before the accident. There is no evidence that any rockets were fired by any vessel between the *Titanic* and the *Californian*, although every eye on the *Titanic* was searching the horizon for possible assistance.

## THE STEAMSHIP "CALIFORNIAN'S" RESPONSIBILITY.

The committee is forced to the inevitable conclusion that the *Californian*, controlled by the same company, was nearer the *Titanic* than the 19 miles reported by her captain, and that her officers and crew saw the distress signals of the *Titanic* and failed to respond to them in accordance with the dictates of humanity, international usage, and the requirements of law. The only reply to the distress signals was a counter signal from a large white light which was flashed for nearly two hours from the mast of the *Californian*. In our opinion such conduct, whether arising from indifference or gross carelessness, is most reprehensible and places upon the commander of the *Californian* a grave responsibility. The wireless operator of the *Californian* was not aroused until 3.30 a. m., New York time, on the morning of the 15th, after considerable conversation between officers and members of the crew had taken place abroad that ship regarding these distress signals or rockets, and was directed by the chief officer to see if there was anything the matter, as a ship had been firing rockets during the night (p. 736). The inquiry thus set on foot immediately disclosed the fact that the *Titanic* had sunk. Had assistance been promptly proffered, or had the wireless operator of the *Californian* remained a few minutes longer at his post on Sunday evening, that ship might have had the proud distinction of rescuing the lives of the passengers and crew of the *Titanic*.

## INTERNATIONAL SIGNALS OF DISTRESS AT SEA.

The committee deems it important to emphasize the meaning of signals of distress and includes in its report the international code, which is as follows.

## Signals of distress.

When a vessel is in distress and requires assistance from other vessels or from the shore, the following shall be the signals to be used or displayed by her, either together or separately:

## In the daytime.

- (1) A gun or other explosive signal fired at intervals of about a minute.
- (2) The international code signal of distress indicated by NC.
- (3) The distant signal, consisting of square flag, having either above or below it a ball or anything resembling a ball. (This is purely a code signal, and is not one of the signals of distress given in the Rules of the Board, the needless exhibition of which entails penalties upon the master of the vessel displaying it.)
- (4) The distant signal, consisting of a cone, point upward, having either above it or below it a ball or anything resembling a ball.
- (5) A continuous sounding with any fog-signal apparatus.

## At night.

- (1) A gun or other explosive signal fired at intervals of about a minute.
- (2) Flames on the vessel (as from a burning tar barrel, oil barrel, etc.).
- (3) Rockets or shells, throwing stars of any color or description, fired one at a time at short intervals.
- (4) A continuous sounding with any fog-signal apparatus.

## STEAMSHIP "TITANIC'S" LIFEBOATS CLEARED AWAY.

When Capt. Smith received the reports as to the water entering the ship he promptly gave the order to clear away the lifeboats (p. 233), and later orders were given to put women and children into the boats. During this time distress rockets were fired at frequent intervals.

The lack of preparation was at this time most noticeable. There was no system adopted for loading the boats; there was great indecision as to the deck from which boats were to be lowered; there was wide diversity of opinion as to the number of the crew necessary to man each boat; there was no direction whatever as to the number of passengers to be carried by each boat, and no uniformity in loading them. On one side only women and children were put in the boats, while on the other side there was almost an equal proportion of men and women put into the boats, the women and children being given the preference in all cases. The failure to utilize all lifeboats to their recognized capacity for safety unquestionably resulted in the needless sacrifice of several hundred lives which might otherwise have been saved.

## CAPACITY OF LIFEBOATS NOT UTILIZED.

The vessel was provided with lifeboats, as above stated, for 1,170 persons, while but 706 were saved. Only a few of the ship's lifeboats were fully loaded, while others were only partially filled. Some were loaded at the boat deck and some at the A deck, and these were successfully lowered to the water. The twentieth boat was washed overboard when the forward part of the ship was submerged, and in its overturned condition served as a life raft for about 30 people, including Second Officer Lightoller, Wireless Operators Bride and Phillips (the latter dying before rescue), passengers Col. Gracie and Mr. Jack Thayer, and others of the crew, who climbed upon it from the water at about the time the ship disappeared.

## LIFEBOAT DEVICES.

Had the sea been rough it is questionable whether any of the lifeboats of the *Titanic* would have reached the water without being damaged or destroyed. The point of suspension of the *Titanic's* boats was about 70 feet above the level of the sea. Had the ship been rolling heavily the lifeboats as they were lowered would have swung out from the side of the ship as it rolled toward them and on the return roll would have swung back and crashed against its side. It is evident from the testimony that as the list of the *Titanic* became noticeable the lifeboats scraped against the high side as they were being lowered. Every effort should be made to improve boat-handling devices and to improve the control of boats while being lowered.

## CONFLICT IN LIFEBOAT REPORTS.

In the reports of the survivors there are marked differences of opinion as to the number carried by each lifeboat. In lifeboat No. 1, for instance, one survivor reports 10 in all. The seaman in charge reports 7 of the crew and 14 to 20 passengers (p. 574). The officer who loaded this boat estimated that from 3 to 5 women and 22 men were aboard (pp. 404 and 405). Accepting the minimum report as made by any one survivor in every boat, the total far exceeds the actual number picked up by the *Carthage*.

## NO DISTINCTION BETWEEN PASSENGERS.

The testimony is definite that, except in isolated instances, there was no panic. In loading boats no distinction was made between first, second, and third-class passengers, although the proportion of lost is larger among third-class passengers than in either of the other classes. Women and children, without discrimination, were given preference.

Your committee believes that under proper discipline the survivors could have been concentrated into fewer boats after reaching the water, and we think that it would have been possible to have saved many lives had those in charge of boats thus released returned promptly to the scene of the disaster.

## CONDUCT ON LIFEBOATS.

After lowering, several of the boats rowed many hours in the direction of the lights supposed to have been displayed by the *Californian*. Other boats lay on their oars in the vicinity of the sinking ship, a few survivors being rescued from the water. After distributing his passengers among the four other boats which he had herded together, and after the cries of distress had died away, Fifth Officer Lowe, in boat No. 14, went to the scene of the wreck and rescued four living passengers from the water, one of whom afterwards died in the lifeboat, but was identified. Officer Lowe then set sail in boat No. 14, took in tow one collapsible boat, and proceeded to the rescue of passengers on another collapsible lifeboat.

The men who had taken refuge on the overturned collapsible lifeboat were rescued, including Second Officer Lightoller and passengers Gracie and Thayer, and Wireless Operators Bride and Phillips, by lifeboats No. 4 and No. 12, before the arrival of the *Carthage*. The fourth collapsible lifeboat was rowed to the side of the *Carthage*, and contained 28 women and children, mostly third-class passengers, 3 firemen, 1 steward, 4 Filipinos, President Ismay, and Mr. Carter, of Philadelphia, and was in charge of Quartermaster Rowe.

## SHIP SINKING.

The ship went down gradually by the bow, assuming an almost perpendicular position just before sinking at 12.47 a. m., New York time, April 15. There have been many conflicting statements as to whether the ship broke in two, but the preponderance of evidence is to the effect that she assumed an almost end-on position and sank intact.

## NO SUCTION.

The committee deems it of sufficient importance to call attention to the fact that as the ship disappeared under the water there was no apparent suction or unusual disturbance of the surface of the water. Testimony is abundant that while she was going down there was not sufficient suction to be manifest to any of the witnesses who were in the water or on the overturned collapsible boat or on the floating debris, or to the occupants of the lifeboats in the vicinity of the vessel, or to prevent those in the water, whether equipped with life belts or not, from easily swimming away from the ship's side while she was sinking.

## CAPTAIN ROSTRON.

The committee invites your attention to the course followed by Captain Rostron, commanding the *Carthage*. Immediately upon the receipt of the wireless call of distress Captain Rostron gave the order to turn the ship around and set a definite course toward the *Titanic* and instructed the chief engineer to call another watch of stokers and make all possible speed to that ship.

Realizing the possible presence of ice, because of the collision, Captain Rostron doubled his lookouts and exerted extra vigilance, putting an extra lookout on duty forward and having another officer on the bridge. The captain immediately instructed the first officer to "prepare all our lifeboats and have them all ready for turning outboard." He further sent for the heads of the different departments and issued the following order, which the committee deem of sufficient importance to quote in full:

English doctor, with assistants, to remain in first-class dining room.  
Italian doctor, with assistants, to remain in second-class dining room.  
Hungarian doctor, with assistants, to remain in third-class dining room.

Each doctor to have supplies of restoratives, stimulants, and everything to hand for immediate needs of probable wounded or sick.

Purser, with assistant purser and chief steward, to receive the passengers, etc., at different gangways, controlling our own stewards in assisting *Titanic* passengers to the dining rooms, etc.; also to get Christian and surnames of all survivors as soon as possible to send by wireless.

Inspector, steerage stewards, and master at arms to control our own steerage passengers and keep them out of the third-class dining hall, and also to keep them out of the way and off the deck to prevent confusion.

Chief steward: That all hands would be called and to have coffee, etc., ready to serve out to all our crew.

Have coffee, tea, soup, etc., in each saloon, blankets in saloons, at the gangways, and some for the boats.

To see all rescued cared for and immediate wants to be attended to. My cabin and all officials' cabins to be given up. Smoke rooms, library, etc., dining rooms, would be utilized to accommodate the survivors.

All spare berths in steerage to be utilized for *Titanic's* passengers, and get all our own steerage passengers grouped together.

Stewards to be placed in each alleyway to reassure our own passengers, should they inquire about noise in getting our boats out, etc., or the working of engines.

To all I strictly enjoined the necessity for order, discipline, and quietness, and to avoid all confusion.

Chief and first officers: All the hands to be called, get coffee, etc. Prepare and swing out all boats.

All gangway doors to be opened.

Electric sprays in each gangway and over side.

A block with line rove hooked in each gangway.

A chair sling at each gangway for getting up sick or wounded.

Boatswain's chairs, pilot ladders, and canvas ash bags to be at each gangway, the canvas ash bags for children.

Cargo falls with both ends clear, bowlines in the ends and bights secured along ship's sides for boat ropes or to help the people up.

Heaving lines distributed along the ship's side and gaskets handy near gangways for lashing people in chairs, etc.

Forward derricks topped and rigged and steam on winches; also told off officers for different stations and for certain eventualities.

Ordered company's rockets to be fired at 2.45 a. m. and every quarter of an hour after to reassure *Titanic*.

The committee deems the course followed by Capt. Rostron of the *Carthage* as deserving of the highest praise and worthy of especial recognition. Capt. Rostron fully realized all the risk involved. He doubled his lookouts, doubled his fireroom force, and notwithstanding such risk pushed his ship at her very highest limit of speed through the many dangers of the night to the relief of the stricken vessel. His detailed instructions issued in anticipation of the rescue of the *Titanic* are a marvel of systematic preparation and completeness, evincing such solicitude as calls for the highest commendation. The precautions he adopted enabled him to steer his course between and around icebergs until he stopped his engines at 4 o'clock in the morning in the vicinity of the accident, where he proceeded to pick up the *Titanic's* lifeboats with the survivors.

## ON THE SCENE OF THE WRECK.

The first boat was picked up at 4.10 a. m. Monday, and the last of the survivors was on board by 8.30 a. m., after which Capt. Rostron made arrangements "to hold service, a short prayer of thankfulness for those rescued, and a short burial service for those who were lost."

Upon the arrival of the *Californian* upon the scene, about 8 o'clock in the morning, the captain of the *Carthage* communicated with her commander, stating that all of the passengers had been rescued from the boats but that he thought one was still unaccounted for; and arrangements were made whereby the *Californian* made an exhaustive search in the vicinity for this missing boat.

Capt. Rostron stated that the *Carthage* picked up 15 lifeboats and 2 collapsible boats. Evidence was given before the committee by at least one occupant of every lifeboat, satisfying the committee that the 16 lifeboats with which the *Titanic* was equipped were all accounted for. Thirteen of these lifeboats were hoisted on board and carried to New York by the *Carthage*.

After arranging for a thorough search of the vicinity by the *Californian*, Capt. Rostron headed his vessel for New York, reporting immediately by wireless to the officials of his company in New York, as follows:

NEW YORK, latitude 41.45; longitude 50.20 west.—Am proceeding New York, unless otherwise ordered, with about 800, after having consulted with Mr. Ismay and considering the circumstances. With so much ice about consider New York best. Large number icebergs and 20 miles field ice with bergs amongst.

#### BODIES NOT VISIBLE.

The committee directs attention to the fact that Captain Rostron, of the *Carpathia*, although four hours in the vicinity of the accident, saw only one body, and that Captain Lord, of the *Californian*, who remained three hours in the vicinity of the wreckage, saw none. The failure of the captain of the *Carpathia*, of the captain of the *Californian*, and of the captain of the *Mount Temple* to find bodies floating in that vicinity in the early morning of the day following can only be accounted for on the theory that those who went down with the ship either did not rise to the surface or were carried away or hidden by the extensive ice floe which during the night came down over the spot where the ship disappeared, while those bodies which have been found remote from the place where the ship went down were probably carried away from the scene by the currents or by the movement of the ice.

#### WIRELESS SERVICE.

Numerous wireless messages of an official character were given to the operator on the *Carpathia* on Monday morning, April 15, with explicit instructions from the captain to send them immediately, and, if necessary, relay through other vessels.

Captain Rostron's testimony on this point before the committee on April 19, 1912, the day following his arrival in New York, is unqualified upon this point, and is as follows:

"From the very commencement I took charge of the whole thing and issued orders that every message sent would be sent under my authority, and no message was to be sent unless authorized by me. My orders were: First of all, the two official messages. The two official messages were to the Cunard Co. and the White Star Co., as regards the accident, telling them that I had gotten approximate number of passengers aboard and was returning to New York. That was to the White Star Co., and the other one was to our company, of course, telling them that I was proceeding to New York unless otherwise ordered, and considered New York the best for many considerations."

"After those two messages were sent, I sent a press message to the Associated Press, practically in the same words as I had sent to the companies, over my signature."

"Those were the three first messages that were sent. After those messages were sent, we began sending in the names of the first-class passengers. This was by the *Olympic* on Monday evening. We got the first, and, I think, all the second, off by the *Olympic*. Then we lost touch."

"I controlled the whole thing through my orders. I said I placed official messages first. After they had gone and the first press message, then the names of the passengers. After the names of the passengers and crew had been sent my orders were to send all private messages from the *Titanic's* passengers first in the order in which they were given in to the purser; no preference to any message."

The question having arisen as to the authority exercised over the operator of the *Carpathia*, the chairman of the subcommittee sent the following cablegram to Captain Rostron.

NEW YORK, May 4, 1912.

To Captain ROSTRON,  
Cunard Steamship "Carpathia," Gibraltar:

Original wireless message sent by Bruce Ismay addressed Islefrank, New York City, immediately after he boarded *Carpathia* Monday morning, April 15, containing these words: "Deeply regret advise you *Titanic* sank this morning after collision iceberg, resulting serious loss life. Further particulars later," signed Bruce Ismay, is now in my possession. Ismay under oath waived secrecy, and I desire cable from you containing contents of that message and any memoranda thereon showing hour and date when sent by *Carpathia* operator and through what ship or shore station. Also whether relayed through other ship station. Also whether operator was forbidden by you to communicate such message or any other message via steamships *Californian* and *Olympic*. Also whether operator was prevented by you from sending this message or any other concerning accident. Cable answer collect to me, Washington.

WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,  
Chairman Senate Subcommittee.

And received the following reply:

GIBRALTAR, May 18, 1912.

Senator WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,  
Chairman Senate Subcommittee, Washington:

Ismay's telegram begins "Islefrank, New York; deeply regret advise you *Titanic* sunk this morning, 15th, after collision with iceberg, resulting serious loss of life; further particulars later. Bruce Ismay, Exe." (ends). Purser asked my permission to send it, which I granted. As it was official message, Ismay mentally very ill at time, our purser asked him to add last three words; now find sent through Sable Island 17th April. Message given to purser afternoon of 15th; purser took message to Operator Cottam personally and gave my permission to send early as possible. I did not forbid relaying message to any ship. On contrary, particularly mentioned doing all possible to get official messages, names of survivors, then survivors' messages away by most convenient means. By *Olympic* were sent my messages signed by self to Cunard, Liverpool, and New York, White Star, and press messages, Ismay's, almost identical with mine; worked *Olympic* as long as possible. Only messages I prevented sending were further press messages. I desire full investigation my actions.

ROSTRON.

10.40 p. m.

Notwithstanding the specific instructions of the captain to the wireless operator on the morning of April 15 regarding the transmission of Mr. Ismay's message to Mr. Franklin in New York, the evidence shows that the message in question was not received by Mr. Franklin until about 9 o'clock Wednesday morning, April 17. The original message, in the possession of the committee, shows that the message was transmitted from the *Carpathia*, April 17, via Halifax. Our investigation

discloses the fact that the message was delivered to Mr. Franklin in New York promptly after its receipt by the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. The message in question is as follows:

STEAMSHIP CARPATHIA, April 17, 1912 (via Halifax).

ISLEFRANK, N. Y. C.:

Deeply regret advise you *Titanic* sank this morning, after collision iceberg, resulting serious loss life. Further particulars later.

BRUCE ISMAY.

This message was received by Mr. Franklin in New York about 9 a. m. April 17.

#### PUBLIC INFORMATION.

The record further discloses the first official information concerning the disaster communicated to the public by the officials of the White Star Line was received from Capt. Haddock, of the *Olympic*, at 6.13 p. m. Monday, April 15, as follows:

*Carpathia* reached *Titanic's* position at daybreak. Found boats and wreckage only. *Titanic* had foundered about 2.20 a. m. in 41.16 north, 50.14 west. All her boats accounted for. About 675 souls saved, crew and passengers, latter nearly all women and children. Leyland Line steamship *Californian* remaining and searching position of disaster. *Carpathia* returning to New York with survivors; please inform Cunard.

HADDOCK.

Notwithstanding this information in possession of the officials of that company, a telegram was sent to Representative J. A. HUGHES, Huntington, W. Va., dated New York, April 15, 1912, reading as follows:

*Titanic* proceeding to Halifax. Passengers will probably land there Wednesday all safe.

8.27 p. m.

WHITE STAR LINE.

The committee have been unable to fix the identity of the author of this telegram. We find, however, that this message was delivered to the Western Union branch office, in the same building as the offices of the White Star Line, 31 Broadway, at 7.51 p. m. on that day, but are left wholly in doubt as to the person who sent it or the purpose of the author in sending such a message. Whoever sent this message, under the circumstances, is guilty of the most reprehensible conduct.

#### INFORMATION WITHHELD.

The committee does not believe that the wireless operator on the *Carpathia* showed proper vigilance in handling the important work confided to his care after the accident. Information concerning an accident at sea had been used by a wireless operator prior to this accident for his own advantage. That such procedure had been permitted by the Marconi Co. may have had its effect on this occasion. The disposition of officials of the Marconi Co. to permit this practice and the fact of that company's representatives making the arrangements for the sale of the experiences of the operators of the *Titanic* and *Carpathia* subjects the participants to criticism, and the practice should be prohibited. The committee are pleased to note that Mr. Marconi approves of such prohibition.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS.

The committee finds that this accident clearly indicates the necessity of additional legislation to secure safety of life at sea.

By statute the United States accepts reciprocally the inspection certificates of foreign countries having inspection laws approximating those of the United States. Unless there is early revision of inspection laws of foreign countries along the lines laid down hereinafter, the committee deems it proper that such reciprocal arrangements be terminated, and that no vessel shall be licensed to carry passengers from ports of the United States until all regulations and requirements of the laws of the United States have been fully complied with.

The committee recommends that sections 4481 and 4488, Revised Statutes, be so amended as to definitely require sufficient lifeboats to accommodate every passenger and every member of the crew. That the importance of this feature is recognized by the steamship lines is indicated by the fact that on many lines steps are being taken to provide lifeboat capacity for every person on board, including crew; and the fact of such equipment is being widely advertised. The president of the International Mercantile Marine Co., Mr. Ismay, definitely stated to the committee (p. 985):

"We have issued instructions that none of the ships of our lines shall leave any port carrying more passengers and crew than they have capacity for in the lifeboats."

Not less than four members of the crew, skilled in handling boats, should be assigned to every boat. All members of the crew assigned to lifeboats should be drilled in lowering and rowing the boats not less than twice each month, and the practice of such drill or practice should be noted in the log.

The committee recommends the assignment of passengers and crew to lifeboats before sailing; that occupants of certain groups of state-rooms and the stewards of such groups of rooms be assigned to certain boats most conveniently located with reference to the rooms in question; the assignment of boats and the shortest route from stateroom to boat to be posted in every stateroom.

The committee recommends that every ocean steamship carrying 100 or more passengers be required to carry 2 electric searchlights.

The committee finds that this catastrophe makes glaringly apparent the necessity for regulation of radiotelegraphy. There must be an operator on duty at all times, day and night, to insure the immediate receipt of all distress, warning, or other important calls. Direct communication either by clear-speaking telephone, voice tube, or messenger must be provided between the wireless room and the bridge, so that the operator does not have to leave his station. There must be definite legislation to prevent interference by amateurs and to secure secrecy of radiograms or wireless messages. There must be some source of auxiliary power, either storage battery or oil engine, to insure the operation of the wireless installation until the wireless room is submerged.

The committee recommends the early passage of S. 6412, already passed by the Senate and favorably reported by the House. The committee recommends that the firing of rockets or candles on the high seas for any other purpose than as a signal of distress be made a misdemeanor.

The committee recommends that the following additional structural requirements be required as regards ocean-going passenger steamers the construction of which is begun after this date:

All steel ocean and coastwise seagoing ships carrying 100 or more passengers should have a water-tight skin inboard of the outside plat-

ing, extending not less than 10 per cent of the load draft above the full-load water line, either in the form of an inner bottom or of longitudinal water-tight bulkheads, and this construction should extend from the forward collision bulkhead over not less than two-thirds of the length of the ship.

All steel ocean and coastwise seagoing ships carrying 100 or more passengers should have bulkheads so spaced that any two adjacent compartments of the ship may be flooded without destroying the stability or stability of the ship. Water-tight transverse bulkheads should extend from side to side of the ship, attaching to the outside shell. The transverse bulkheads forward and abaft the machinery spaces should be continued water-tight vertically to the uppermost continuous structural deck. The uppermost continuous structural deck should be fitted water-tight. Bulkheads within the limits of the machinery spaces should extend not less than 25 per cent of the draft of the ship above the load water line and should end at a water-tight deck. All water-tight bulkheads and decks should be proportioned to withstand, without material permanent deflection, a water pressure equal to 5 feet more than the full height of the bulkhead. Bulkheads of novel dimensions or scantlings should be tested by being subjected to actual water pressure.

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic."

[In many cases the addresses given only represent the places in Southampton, etc., at which the members of the crew usually stayed, their permanent home addresses not being known.]

A.

DECK DEPARTMENT.

Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Archer, E.	59 Porchester Road, Woolston, Southampton.	A. B.	Saved.
2. Anderson, J.	1 Cozens Court, Southampton.	do.	Do.

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Allsop, A. S.	134 Malmesbury Road, Southampton.	Junior electrician.	
2. Adams, R.	168 Romsey Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
3. Allen, H.	3 French Street, Southampton.	do.	Saved.
4. Allen, E.	9 Short Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	Do.
5. Avery, J.	122 Hills Road, Southampton.	do.	
6. Abraham, C.	3 Charles Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Ayling, E.	22 Wilton Street, Southampton.	Assistant vegetable cook.	
2. Allen, E.	32 Grove Street, Southampton.	Scullion.	Saved.
3. Andrews, C.	145 Millbrook Road, Southampton.	Assistant steward.	
4. Akermann, A.	25 Rochester Street, Northam, Southampton.	Steward.	
5. Ashcroft, A.	28 Canterbury Road, Seacombe, Cheshire.	Clerk.	
6. Allsop, F.	73 Obelisk Road, Woolston, Hants.	Saloon steward.	
7. Ashe, H.	15 Wyrestale Road, Liverpool.	G. H. steward.	
8. Ahler, P.	136 Northumberland Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
9. Abbott, E.	98 Northumberland Road, Southampton.	Pantryman.	
10. Allan, F.	Short Street, Southampton.	Lift attendant.	
11. Allan, R.	Staying at Devonfield, Charlton Road, Shirley, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	
12. Allaria, B.	9 Orchard Place, Southampton.	(R) Assistant waiter.	
13. Aspeliagi, G.	76 St. Pauls Road, London, N.V.	(R) Assistant plate-man.	
14. Anderson, W.	12 Queens Terrace, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	
15. Akerman, J.	25 Rochester Street, Northam, Southampton.	Assistant pantryman.	

B.

DECK DEPARTMENT.

Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Brice, W.	11 Lower Canal Walk, Southampton.	A. B.	Saved.
2. Boxhall, J. G.	"Manora," Westbourne Avenue, Hull.	Fourth officer.	Do.
3. Bailey, W.	377 Portswood Road, Southampton.	Master at arms.	Do.
4. Bright, A.	105 Firgrove Road, Southampton.	Quartermaster.	Do.
5. Bradley, F.	25 Threefield Lane, Southampton.	A. B.	
6. Buley, E.	10 Cliff Road, Woolston, Southampton.	do.	Do.

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Bell, J.	34 Canute Road, Southampton.	Chief engineer.	
2. Barlow, C.	10 St. Marys Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
3. Beauchamp, G.	Redbridge Road, Southampton.	do.	Saved.
4. Biggs, E.	65 College Street, Southampton.	do.	
5. Baines, Rich.	9 Union Place, Southampton.	Greaser.	

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.

B.—Continued.

ENGINE DEPARTMENT—continued.

Name.	Address.	Rating.	
6. Barnes, Chas.	45 York Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
7. Brown, J.	2 Russell Street, Southampton.	do.	
8. Bendell, T.	26 Woodley Road, Southampton.	do.	
9. Bessant, W.	30 Henry Road, Southampton.	do.	
10. Bennett, G.	3 Deal Street, Southampton.	do.	
11. Bannon, J.	9 St. George Street, Southampton.	Greaser.	
12. Barrett, F.	24 King Street, Southampton.	Leading fireman.	Saved.
13. Blake, T.	35 Peel Street, Northam, Southampton.	Fireman.	
14. Balley, G. W.	16 Brook Road, Woolston, Southampton.	do.	
15. Barrett, F. W.	26 Bevois Street, Southampton.	do.	
16. Ball, W.	51 Brintons Road, Southampton.	do.	
17. Brooks, J.	128 Lyon Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
18. Bevis, J.	171 Empress Road, Southampton.	do.	
19. Brewer, H.	27 Palmerston Road, Southampton.	do.	
20. Bott, W.	6 Nichols Road, Southampton.	Greaser.	
21. Burroughs, A.	73 Adelaide Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
22. Bonville, E.	4 Orchard Lane, Southampton.	do.	
23. Blackman, H.	58 College Street, Southampton.	do.	
24. Blake, P.	18 Endle Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	Do.
25. Black, D.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Fireman.	
26. Brown, J.	237 Desborough Road, Eastleigh.	do.	
27. Blaney, J.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	do.	
28. Barnes, J.	Woodley Road, Woolston, Southampton.	do.	
29. Bradley, P.	4 Greens Court, Southampton.	do.	
30. Billows, J.	28 Bell Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
31. Blake, S.	Holyrood House, Southampton.	Mess steward.	
32. Burton, E.	24 Chapel Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	
33. Binstead, W.	49 Endle Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	Do.
34. Brigg, W.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Fireman.	
35. Butt, W.	6 Cawte Road, Southampton.	do.	
36. Blann, E.	99 Pound Street, Southampton.	do.	
37. Black, A.	8 Briton Street, Southampton.	do.	
38. Biddlecombe, C.	42 Kentish Road, Southampton.	do.	
39. Beattie, F.	3 Isthmus Street, Belfast.	Greaser.	

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Bennett, Mrs.	22 Cranbury Avenue, Southampton.	Stewardess.	Saved.
2. Bliss, Miss.	56 Upper Park Road, New Southgate.	do.	Do.
3. Burke, W.	57 Bridge Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	Do.
4. Brown, E.	43 Suffolk Road, Southampton.	do.	Do.
5. Best, E.	87 Malmesbury Road, Southampton.	do.	
6. Boyes, H.	106 Clovelly Road, Southampton.	do.	
7. Bristowe, H.	Shortlands, Kent.	do.	
8. Boughton, E.	10 Richmond Road, Southampton.	do.	
9. Barker, E.	4 Grand Parade, Haringay, London.	do.	
10. Barrows, W.	34 Hanover Street, Islington, London, N.	do.	
11. Burr, E.	34 Victoria Road, Woolston, Hants.	do.	
12. Barringer, A.	52 Padwell Road, Southampton.	do.	
13. Brown, W.	"Nestleton," Hillside Avenue, Bitterne, Southampton.	do.	Do.
14. Baggott, A.	106 Park Road, Southampton.	do.	
15. Benham, T.	61 Peach Street, Wokingham.	do.	
16. Hully, H.	31 Carlton Crescent, Southampton.	Boots.	
17. Barlow, G.	"Carminster," Foundry Lane, Southampton.	B. R. steward.	
18. Boothby, W.	31 Winchester Road, Shirley, Southampton.	do.	
19. Byrns, J.	218 Balfour Road, Ilford, Essex.	do.	
20. Beedman, G.	81 Shrewsbury Road, Southampton.	do.	
21. Bogie, L.	100 The Crescent, Eastleigh.	do.	
22. Brookman, J.	34 Richmond Street, Southampton.	Steward.	
23. Bristow, R.	49 Westridge Road, Southampton.	do.	
24. Barton, S.	85 College Street, Southampton.	do.	
25. Burrage, A.	9 Emsworth Road, Southampton.	Plates.	Do.
26. Baxter, H. R.	110 Shirley Road, Southampton.	Steward.	
27. Barker, R.	"May Bush," Old Shirley, Southampton.	Second purser.	
28. Balley, G.	Brooklands, Shepperton.	Saloon steward.	
29. Bochetet, J.	28 Oak Bank Road, Southampton.	Assistant chef.	

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
B—Continued.

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT—continued.

Name	Address	Rating	
30. Bedford, W.	163 Manor Road, Itchen, Hants.	Assistant cook	Saved.
31. Bull, W.	27 Shandall Street, Southampton.	Scullion	
32. Beere, W.	2 Avenus Cottage, Shirley Warren, Southampton.	Kitchen porter	Do.
33. Buckley, H.	7 Brunswick Square, Southampton.	Assistant vegetable cook	
34. Burgess, C.	65 Bridge Road, Southampton.	Extra third baker	Do.
35. Barnes, W.	25 Parsonage Road, Southampton.	Assistant baker	
36. Barker, A.	Kingsworthy, Winchester.	do	Do.
37. Barker, T.	29 Upper Bugle Street, Southampton.	Assistant butcher	
38. Bride, H. S.	Care of Marconi Co., London.	Second Marconi	Do.
39. Barrow, H.	17 Derby Road, Southampton.	Assistant butcher	
40. Buit, H.	6 Cawte Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward	Do.
41. Bagley, E.	183 Priory Road, St. Denys, Southampton.	do	
42. Boyd, J.	52 Cranbury Road, Southampton.	do	Do.
43. Butterworth, J.	270 Priory Road, Southampton.	do	
44. Boston, W.	1 Hanley Road, Southampton.	Assistant deck steward	Do.
45. Burke, R.	26 Southampton Road, Chandlersford, Hants.	Lounge attendant	
46. Back, C.	38 Weymouth Terrace, Southampton.	Assistant attendant	Do.
47. Broome, A. thol.	White Lodge, Bitterne Park, Southampton.	Assistant veranda café	
48. Bessant, E.	39 Shirley Park Road, Southampton.	Baggage master	Do.
49. Barrett, A.	164 Northumberland Road, Southampton.	Bell boy	
50. Broom, H.	2 High Street, East Cowes.	Bath steward	Do.
51. Baxter, F.	81 Atherly Road, Southampton.	Linen keeper	
52. Bishop, W.	17 High Street, Itchen, Hants.	Bedroom steward	Do.
53. Bond, W.	20 Hanley Road, Southampton.	do	
54. Brewster, G. H.	5 Carlton Place, Southampton.	do	Do.
55. Bunnell, F.	Father, 212 Bedford Road, Rockferry, Liverpool.	Plate washer	
56. Bradshaw, T.	2 Portland Street, Southampton.	do	Do.
57. Ball, Percy	7 Windsor Terrace, Southampton.	do	
58. Bowker, Miss	The Cottage, Little Sutton, Cheshire.	(R) Cashier	Do.
59. Bochet, G.	4 Tonbridge House, Mercer Street, Long Acre, London.	(R) Second waiter	
60. Basilico, G.	27 Old Compton Street, London.	(R) Waiter	Do.
61. Banfi	33 Aubert Park, Highbury Hill, London.	do	
62. Boux, D.	5 Beauchamp Place, Brompton Road, London.	(R) Assistant waiter	Do.
63. Bernardi, B.	113 High Street, Notting Hill Gate, London.	do	
64. Bolhens, H.	37 Orchard Place, Southampton.	(R) Larder cook	Do.
65. Dietrix, G.	22 Albert Mansions, Lambeth, London.	(R) Sauce cook	
66. Blumet, J.	26 Richmond Street, Southampton.	(R) Plateman	Do.
67. Berthold, Florentini.	52 St. James Road, Little Poultony Street, London.	(R) Assistant scullery man	
68. Bazzi, L.	21 Great Chapel Street, Oxford Street, London.	(R) Waiter	Do.
	(10 saved, 58 lost.)		

C.

DECK DEPARTMENT.

1. Couch, F.	Port Isaac, Cornwall.	A. B.	Saved.
2. Clench, G.	10 The Flats, Chantry Road, Southampton.	do	
3. Clinch, F.	do	do	
	(1 saved, 2 lost.)		

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

1. Coy, F. E. G.	134 Portwood Road, Southampton.	Junior third assistant engineer	Saved.
2. Cunningham, B.	6 Briton Street, Southampton.	Fireman	
3. Crimmins, J.	7 King Street, Southampton.	do	Do.
4. Corcoran, D.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	do	
5. Castleman, E.	37 North Road, St. Denys, Southampton.	Greasor	Do.
6. Cooper, H.	9 George Street, Southampton.	Fireman	
7. Cherrett, W.	13 Nelson Road, Southampton.	do	Do.
8. Chorley, J.	2 Regent Street, Southampton.	do	
9. Carter, F.	11 Cross Court, Southampton.	Trimmer	Do.
10. Cavell, G.	Lower East Road Sholing, Southampton.	do	
11. Coe, H.	10 Cross Court, Southampton.	do	Do.
12. Couch, J.	42 Canton Street, Southampton.	Greasor	
13. Cross, W.	97 Ludlow Road, Southampton.	Fireman	Do.
14. Clark, W.	30 Paget Street, Southampton.	do	
15. Curtis, A.	55 Kingsley Road, Southampton.	do	Do.
16. Collins, S.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	do	
17. Canner, J.	17 Shamrock Road, Woolston, Southampton.	do	

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
C—Continued.

ENGINE DEPARTMENT—continued.

Name	Address	Rating	
18. Crabb, H.	101 Firgrove Road, Southampton.	Trimmer	Do.
19. Cooper, J.	27 Pound Street, Southampton.	do	
20. Carr, R.	Wellham Cottage, Winchester Road, Southampton.	do	Do.
21. Calderwood, H.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	do	
22. Coleman, J.	7 Mortimer Road, Woolston, Southampton.	Mess steward	Do.
23. Cotton, A.	Shore Cottage, Hythe, Southampton.	Fireman	
24. Casey, T.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Trimmer	Do.
25. Croese, H.	2 Enfield Grove, Woolston, Southampton.	Deck Engineer	
26. Chisnall, G.	53 High Street, Itchen, Southampton.	Boilermaker	Do.
27. Coombes, G.	45 Coleman Street, Southampton.	Fireman	
28. Couper, R.	101 Dukes Road, Southampton.	do	Do.
29. Copperthwaite, B.	39 Mount Street, Southampton.	do	
	(6 saved, 23 lost.)		

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Charman, J.	Mother, 19 Burford Road, Horsham; Malden Hill House, Lewisham.	Saloon steward	Saved.
2. Christmas, H.	4 Brintons Road, Southampton.	Assistant steward	
3. Chapman, J.	31 Belleview Road, Southampton.	Boots	Do.
4. Chitty, G.	Sister, Mrs. Carpenter, "Clovelly" Newtown Road, Bitterne Park, Southampton.	Steward	
5. Cox, W.	110 Shirley Road, Southampton.	do	Do.
6. Cecil, C.	194 Millbrook Road, Southampton.	do	
7. Crispin, W.	"Sanfoin Villa," Eastleigh.	G. H. steward	Do.
8. Campbell, D. S.	White Star Line, Southampton.	Clerk	
9. Crow, G. F.	89 Milton Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward	Do.
10. Carney, W.	11 Cairo, W. Derby Road, Liverpool.	Lift attendant	
11. Corben, E.	58 Floating Bridge Road, Southampton.	Assistant printer	Do.
12. Clark, T.	Seflon Mount, Hillside Avenue, Southampton.	Bedroom steward	
13. Cunningham, A.	60 Charlton Road, Southampton.	do	Do.
14. Crawford, A.	23 Cranbury Avenue, Southampton.	do	
15. Cullen, C.	21 Warberton Road, Seaford, Liverpool.	do	Do.
16. Crumplin, C.	"Anchor and Hope," Threefield Lane, Southampton.	do	
17. Caton, Miss	50 Highbury Hill, London, N.	T. B. attendant	Do.
18. Crosbie, J. B.	47 St. Dunstons Road, Kensington, London.	do	
19. Cave, H.	17 Shirley Park Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward	Do.
20. Crafter, F.	143 Albert Road, Southampton.	do	
21. Cartwright, J.	77 Gossett Street, Bethnal Green, London.	do	Do.
22. Cook, George	13 Franklin Road, Westham, Weymouth.	do	
23. Coleman, A.	2 Myrtle Bank, Oak Tree Road, Bitterne Park, Southampton.	do	Do.
24. Cheverton, W.	Mill Street, Newport, I. O. W.	do	
25. Crisp, H.	36 Macnaughten Road, Southampton.	do	Do.
26. Caswell, C.	81 Melbourne Street, Southampton.	do	
27. Conway, P.	Parents, 131 Bentham Road, South Hackney, London; 25 South Front, Southampton.	do	Do.
28. Caunt, W.	55 Sideny Street, Southampton.	Grill cook	
29. Coombs, C.	78 Dukes Road, Southampton.	Assistant cook	Do.
30. Colgan, J.	27 West Street, Southampton.	Scullion	
31. Collins, John	65 Ballycarry Street, Belfast.	do	Do.
32. Chitty, G.	Mrs. Carpenter, "Clovelly" Newton Road, Bitterne Park, Southampton; 69 Bevois Street.	Assistant baker	
33. Crovelia, L.	5 Orchard Place, Southampton.	(R) Assistant waiter	Do.
34. Coutin, A.	37 Orchard Place, Southampton.	(R) Entrée cook	
35. Charbeison, A.	10 Kennington Park Gardens, London, S. E.	(R) Roast cook	Do.
36. Cornaire, M.	15 Tringalgar Square, Chelsea, London.	(R) Assistant roast.	

D.

DECK DEPARTMENT.

1. Davis, S. J.	42 Duncan Street, Landport, Portsmouth.	A. B.	Do.
	(1 lost.)		

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
D—Continued.

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Dyer, H. R.	53 Middle Street, Southampton	Senior fourth assistant engineer.	
2. Dodd, E. C.	26 Queens Parade, Southampton.	Junior third engineer.	
3. Dodd, R.	12 Queens Park Terrace, Southampton.	Junior fourth assistant engineer.	
4. Duffy, William.	11 Garton Road, Itchen, Southampton.	Writer.	
5. Davies, T.	2 Church Lane, Southampton.	Leading fireman.	Saved.
6. Dilley, J.	44 Threefield Lane, Southampton.	Fireman.	
7. Dillon, T. P.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Trimmer.	Do.
8. Dore, A.	9 Mount Street, Southampton.	do.	Do.
9. Doel, F.	20 Richmond Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	Do.
10. Doyle, F.	10 Orchard Place, Southampton.	do.	
11. Dymond, F.	2 Farmers Court, Southampton	do.	Do.
12. Dawson, J.	70 Brintons Road, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
13. Diaper, J.	102 Derby Road, Southampton	Fireman.	Do.
14. Dickson, W. (6 saved, 8 lost.)	10 Oriental Terrace, Southampton.	Trimmer.	

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Deeble, A.	81 Atherley Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
2. Dyer, W.	46 Stafford Road, Southampton.	do.	
3. Derrett, A.	Father, care of Fry, High Street Chambers, Wotton under Edge, Gloucester. Tinden, Hillside Avenue, Southampton.	do.	
4. Dodd, Geo.	57 Morris Road, Southampton.	Second steward.	
5. Deslands, P.	405 Portswood Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
6. Davies, R. J.	12 the Polygon Road, Southampton.	do.	
7. Davies, J.	19 Eastfield Road, St. Denys, Southampton.	Extra second baker.	
8. Dinenage, J.	4 Cawte Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
9. Dolby, J.	12 Devonshire Road, Polygon, Southampton.	Reception-room attendant.	
10. Davies, Gordon.	"Trefasis," Hillside Avenue, Bitterne, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	
11. Donoghue, F.	60 Ludlow Road, Southampton.	do.	
12. Dashwood, W.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
13. Doughty, W.	39 Queens Square, London.	do.	
14. Dean, G.	"De Kalb," King Edward Avenue, Southampton.	Assistant steward.	
15. Daniels, S.	119 Albert Road, Southsea.	Steward.	Saved.
16. Dunford, W.	16 Bridge Street, Southampton.	Hospital steward.	
17. Dennarsico.	20 Church Street, Soho, London.	(R) Assistant waiter.	
18. De Breucq, M.	12 Mead Street, Kennington, London.	do.	
19. Donati, Itallo.	3 Whitfield Street, Tottenham Court Road, London.	do.	
20. Dornier, S.	3 Orchard Place, Southampton	(R) Assistant fish.	
21. Desvernini, L. (1 saved, 20 lost.)	4 Queens Park Terrace, Southampton.	(R) Assistant pastry.	

E.			
DECK DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Evans, F.	20 Deal Street, Southampton.	L. O.	Saved.
2. Evans, F. O. (2 saved.)	14 Bond Street, Southampton.	A. B.	

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Ervine, A.	Meronfield, Belfast.	Assistant electrician.	
2. Evans, W.	11 Ryde Terrace, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
3. Elliott, E.	1 Wilmington Street, Wilmington Square, London.	do.	
4. Eagle, A. J.	13 Lyon Street, Southampton.	do.	
5. Eastman, C. (5 lost.)	17 Cecil Avenue, Southampton.	Greaser.	

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Ennis, W.	141 Bedford Road, Southport.	T. B. attendant.	
2. Evans, Geo.	46 Richmond Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	Saved.
3. Eitches, H. S.	23a Gordon Avenue, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	
4. Edwards, C.	7 Brunswick Square, Southampton.	Assistant pantryman.	
5. Edge, F.	28 Clovelly Road, Woolston, Hants.	Deck steward.	
6. Egg, W. H.	1a Trent Road, Brixton, London.	Steward.	
7. Evans, Geo.	2 Nightingale Gardens.	do.	

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
E—Continued.

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT—continued.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
8. Edbrooke, F.	98 Lake Road, Landport.	Steward.	Saved.
9. Ede, G. B.	Manor Farm Road, Bitterne Park, Southampton.	do.	
10. Ellis, J. (2 saved, 8 lost.)	40 Dukess Road, Southampton.	Assistant vegetable cook.	Do.

F.			
DECK DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Fleet, F.	9 Norman Road, Southampton.	L. O.	Saved.
2. Forward, J.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	A. B.	
3. Foley, J. (3 saved.)	2 Queen's Road, Southampton.	Storekeeper.	Do.

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Farquharson, W.	90 Wilton Avenue, Southampton.	Senior second engineer.	
2. Fraser, J.	54 Tennyson Road, Southampton.	Junior third assistant engineer.	
3. Fitzpatrick, H.	109 Nelson Street, Belfast.	Junior boilermaker.	Saved.
4. Fitzpatrick, C. W.	93 Millbrook Road, Southampton.	Mess steward.	
5. Fredericks, W.	6 Elm Road, Chapel, Southampton.	Trimmer.	Do.
6. Ford, H.	Royal Oak, Southampton.	do.	
7. Foster, A.	38 North Front, Southampton.	Storekeeper.	
8. Ford, T.	36 Russell Street, Southampton.	Ldg. fireman.	
9. Flarty, E.	21 Stamford Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	Do.
10. Ferris, W.	5 Hanover Buildings, Southampton.	Ldg. fireman.	
11. Fraser, J.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Fireman.	Do.
12. Fryer, A.	1 Charlotte Place, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
13. Ferrary, Auto.	38 St. Mary's Place, Southampton.	do.	
14. Fay, F. (4 saved, 10 lost.)	31 Stamford Street, Southampton.	Greaser.	

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Fairall, H.	31 Surrey Street, Ryde, I. O. W.	Saloon steward.	
2. Freeman, E.	5 Hanley Road, Southampton.	Deck steward.	
3. Fletcher, P.	13 Strathville Road, Southfields, London.	Bugler.	
4. Faulkner, R.	16 Malmesbury Road, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	Saved.
5. Fellows, A.	51 Bridge Road, Southampton.	Assistant boots.	
6. Fenton, F.	19 Middle Road, Sholing, Hants.	Saloon steward.	Do.
7. Fropper, R.	8 Washington Terrace, Southampton.	do.	
8. Ford, F.	Rector Dunsfold; 63 Oxford Street, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	
9. Ford, E.	100 Brintons Road, Southampton.	Steward.	
10. Foley, W. C.	15 Monsons Road, Southampton.	do.	Do.
11. Finch, H.	32 French Street, Southampton.	do.	
12. Fox, W. T.	Totton, Hants; Pölhawn, Springfield Road, Ealing.	do.	
13. Farrendon, E.	23 South Street, Emsworth.	Confectioner.	
14. Franklin, A.	Egremont, Newton Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
15. Feltham, G.	64 St. Denys Road, Southampton.	Vienna.	
16. Panette, M.	Cairo Café, 3 Soho Street, Oxford Street, London.	(R) Assistant waiter.	
17. Fei, Carlo. (3 saved, 14 lost.)	26 Annes Court, Dean Street, Soho, London.	(R) Sculleryman.	

G.			
ENGINE DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Golder, M. W.	15 Lansdown Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
2. Gregory, D.	30 Floating Bridge Road, Southampton.	Greaser.	
3. Goree, F.	5 Belvedere Terrace, Southampton.	do.	
4. Gosling, B.	11 Lower York Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
5. Godley, G.	17 Mount Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	Saved.
6. Gosling, S.	17 French Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
7. Green, G.	57 Howards Grove, Southampton.	do.	
8. Gear, A.	2 Stamford Street, Chapel, Southampton.	Fireman.	
9. Gordon, J.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
10. Gurney, G.	24 Canute Road, Southampton.	Mess steward.	
11. Gardner, F.	Totton, Southampton.	Greaser.	Do.
12. Graham, T.	28 Downpatrick Street, Belfast.	Fireman.	
13. Groddidge, E.	44 Ratcliffe Road, Southampton.	do.	
14. Graves, S. (2 saved, 12 lost.)	8 North Front, Southampton.	do.	



EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
G—Continued.

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Gibbons, J. W.	Harbour View.	Saloon steward.	Saved.
2. Gunn, J.	23 Bridge Road, Southampton.	Assistant steward.	
3. Gold, Mrs.	Glentborne, Bassett, Southampton.	Stewardess.	Do.
4. Gregson, Miss	28 Lorne Road, Portswood, Southampton.	do.	Do.
5. Goshawk, A.	6 Coventry Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
6. Gollop, C.	Sister, E. Gollop, 25 Orcheston Road, Bournemouth; 27 Briton Street.	Assistant cook.	
7. Gill, P.	24 Waverley Road, Southampton.	Ship's cook.	
8. Giles, J.	28 Compton Street, Everton, Liverpool; 104 Lyon Street, Southampton.	Second baker.	
9. Geddes, R.	80 Grove Road, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	
10. Gill, S.	17 Suffolk Avenue, Southampton.	do.	
11. Guy, J.	5 College Terrace, Milton Abbas, Hants.	Assistant boots.	Do.
12. Gatti, L.	Montalto, Harborough Road, Southampton.	(R) Manager.	
13. Guillo, Casali.	50 Greek Street, Soho, London.	(R) Waiter.	
14. Gilardino, V.	15 Belle Vue Road, Southampton.	do.	
15. Gros, Claude G.	S Lumber Court, London, W. C.	(R) Assistant coffee man.	
(4 saved, 11 lost.)			

H.  
DECK DEPARTMENT.

1. Hutchinson, J. H.	40 Onslow Road, Southampton.	Joiner.	
2. Haines, A.	52 Grove Street, Southampton.	Boatswain's mate.	Saved.
3. Hommings, S.	31 Kingsley Road, Southampton.	Lamp trimmer.	Do.
4. Humphreys, S.	113 Duke's Road, Southampton.	Q. M.	Do.
5. Hichens, R.	43 James Street, Southampton.	do.	Do.
6. Hogg, G. A.	44 High Street, Southampton.	L. O.	Do.
7. Horswill, A. E.	44 Derby Road, Southampton.	A. B.	Do.
8. Holman, H.	Cascard, Britannia Road, Northam, Southampton.	do.	
9. Hopkins, R.	4 Woodstock Road, Belfast.	do.	Do.
10. Harder, W.	46 Winton Street, Southampton.	Window cleaner.	Do.
(8 saved, 2 lost.)			

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

1. Heskeith, J. H.	80 Garrett Avenue, Liverpool.	Second engineer.	
2. Harrison, N.	30 Coventry Road, Southampton.	Junior second engineer.	
3. Harvey, H. G.	40 Obelisk Road Woolston, Southampton.	Junior second assistant engineer.	
4. Hosking, G. F.	28 Avenue Road, Itchen, Southampton.	Senior third engineer.	
5. Hodge, C.	16 Ivy Road, Woolston, Southampton.	Senior third assistant engineer.	
6. Hodgkinson, L.	67 Arthur Road, Southampton.	Senior fourth engineer.	
7. Hands, B.	St. Michael's House, Southampton.	Fireman.	
8. Hurst, C. J.	Laundry Road, Southampton.	do.	
9. Hall, J.	2 Westgate Street, Southampton.	do.	
10. Hallett, G.	101 Church Street, Southampton.	do.	
11. Hurst, W.	15 Chapel Road, Southampton.	do.	Saved.
12. Hill, J.	10 Kingsland Square, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
13. Hart, T.	51 College Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	
14. Hunt, T.	2 Queens Street, Southampton.	do.	
15. Harris, F.	57 Melville Road, Gosport.	do.	Do.
16. Hodges, W.	6 Britannia Road, Southampton.	do.	
17. Hinton, W.	20 Cumberland Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
18. Haslin, J.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	do.	
19. Hasgood, R.	19 Woodley Road, Woolston, Southampton.	Fireman.	
20. Hunt, S.	1 French Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	Do.
21. Harris, F.	12 Wilton Street, Southampton.	do.	Do.
22. Hebb, A.	5 Bells Court, Southampton.	do.	Do.
23. Head, A.	19 Russell Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	
24. Hendrickson, C.	255 Northumberland Road, Southampton.	Ldg. fireman.	Do.
25. Haggan, J.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Fireman.	Do.
26. Hannam, G.	1 Oxford Terrace, Southampton.	do.	
27. Harris, E.	83 Belgrade Road, Southampton.	do.	
28. Hopgood, R.	81 Romsey Road, Southampton.	do.	
(6 saved, 22 lost.)			

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Hughes, H.	Ivy Bank, Dyer Road, Southampton.	Assistant second steward.	
2. Howell, A.	12 Clift Road, Itchen, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
3. House, W.	44 Derby Road, Southampton.	do.	

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
H—Continued.

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT—continued.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
4. Hoare, Leo.	108 Lyon Street, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
5. Hendy, E.	21 Paynes Road, Southampton.	do.	
6. Harris, C. W.	14 Short Street, Southampton.	do.	
7. Heinen, J.	Norden Hill House, Lewisham.	do.	
8. Hawkesworth, John.	18 Wilton Road, Southampton.	do.	
9. Humphreys, H.	Brother, Humphreys, 9 Plaswell Lane, Dolgelly.	Assistant steward.	
10. Himekley, G.	2 Oxford Street, Southampton.	Baths.	
11. Hamblyn, E.	2 Norman Villas, Dyer Road, Southampton.	B. R. steward.	
12. Harding, A.	Station Cottage, Swaything, Hants.	Assistant B. R. steward.	
13. Humby, F.	2 Golden Grove, Southampton.	Plates.	
14. Hart, J.	Aberdeen, Foundry Lane, Southampton.	Steward.	Saved.
15. Hylands, L.	55 Orchard Place, Southampton.	do.	Do.
16. Hill, H.	Florence Hill, 68 Upper Richmond Street, East Sheen, London; 66 Oxford Street.	do.	
17. Halford, R.	2 Latimer Street, Southampton.	do.	Do.
18. Hartnell, F.	Miss Trestrail, Star Hotel, Southampton; 25 Argyle Road.	Saloon steward.	Do.
19. Harrison, A.	131 Oakley Road.	do.	Do.
20. Holland, T.	38 Walton Vale, Liverpool.	Assistant reception room attendant.	
21. Hawkesworth, W.	Bellmoor, Lemon Road, Southampton.	Assistant deck steward.	
22. Hamilton, E.	5 Shirley Road, Southampton.	Assistant S. R. steward.	
23. Halloway, S.	60 Hertington Road, Southampton.	Assistant clothes presser.	
24. Harris, C. H.	14 Short Street, Southampton.	Bell boy.	
25. Hayter, A.	10 Mayflower Road, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	
26. Hill, J.	64 Padwell Road, Southampton.	do.	
27. Hewett, T.	96 Devonshire Road, Southampton.	do.	
28. Hogg, C.	24 Bulwer Street, Brock Road, Liverpool.	do.	
29. Hardy, John.	Oakleigh, Holyrood Avenue, Highfield, Southampton.	Chief second-class steward.	Do.
30. Hall, F.	28 Derby Avenue, North Finchley, London; 70 Sidney Road, Shirley.	Scullion.	
31. Hutchinson, J.	91 Woodcroft Road, off Earls Road, Wavertree, Liverpool.	Vegetable cook.	
32. Hardwick, R.	4 Heysham Road, Southampton.	Kitchen porter.	Do.
33. Hatch, H.	446 Portsmouth Road, Woolston, Hants.	Scullion.	
34. Hines, G.	Bridge Street, Bruckley, Northants.	Third baker.	
35. Hensford, J.	132 Malmesbury Road, Southampton.	Assistant butcher.	
36. Harris, E.	13 Greenhill Avenue, Winchester.	Assistant pantryman.	
37. Hiscock, S.	19 Palmerston Road, Southampton.	Plate washer.	
38. Hogue, E.	Alison Gardens, Dulwich, London.	do.	
39. Hopkins, F.	14 Fanshawe Street, Southampton.	do.	
40. Henry, W.	27 Romsey Road, Southampton.	Assistant boots.	
(7 saved, 33 lost.)			

I.  
ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

1. Instance, T.	12 Guillaume Terrace, Southampton.	Fireman.	
2. Ingram, C.	18 Lower Canal Walk, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
(2 lost.)			

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Ings, W.	Care Northover, 45 Stratton Road, Southampton.	Scullion.	
2. Ingrouville, H.	15 Floating Bridge Road, Southampton.	Steward.	
3. Ide, H.	Mother, Harris Mill Road, Hertford; 114 Lyon Street, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	
(3 lost.)			

J.

DECK DEPARTMENT.

1. Jewell, A.	32 College Street, Southampton.	L. O.	Saved.
2. Jones, T.	68 Nesfield Street, Liverpool.	A. B.	Do.
3. Johnson, A. J.			
4. Johnson, W. J.			
(2 saved, 2 lost.)			

<sup>1</sup> Not Titanic crew, both American Line men, traveling as passengers.

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
J—Continued.

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Jupo, H.	74 Bullar Road, Bitterne Park, Southampton.	Assistant electrician.	Saved.
2. Joas, N.	55 Bond Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	
3. James, Thos.	27 College Street, Southampton.	do.	
4. Judd, C.	68 Derby Road, Southampton.	do.	
5. Jago, J.	47 Millbank Street, Northam, Southampton.	Greaser.	
6. Jukes, J.	Moor Green, West End, Southampton.	do.	
7. Jacobson, John.	97 Duke's Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
8. Jarvis, W. (1 saved, 7 lost.)	29 Canal Walk, Southampton.	do.	

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Jessop, Miss.	71 Shirley Road, Bedford Park, London.	Stewardess.	Saved.
2. Johnston, J.	Salors' Home, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	Do.
3. Jones, R. V.	7 Portland Terrace, Southampton.	do.	Do.
4. Jenner, H.	3 Belle View Road, Southampton.	do.	
5. Jones, H.	Broad Street, Alresford.	Roast cook.	
6. Johnston, H.	183 Albert Road, Southampton.	Assistantship's cook.	
7. Joughin, J.	Eimhurst, Leighton Road, Southampton.	Chief baker.	
8. Jaraway, W.	Alpha House, Richmond Road, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	
9. Jackson, H.	22 Graham Road, Southampton.	Assistant boots.	
10. Jones, A.	Woodfield, Charlton Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
11. Jenson, C. V.	17 Morris Road, Southampton.	do.	
12. Jones, A.	22 Ludlow Road, Woolston, Hants.	Plates.	
13. Jeffery, W.	2 Church Lane, Highfield, Southampton.	(R) Controller.	
14. Janin, C.	56 Seddlescombe Road, West Brompton, London, S. W.	(R) Soup cook.	
15. Jallet, H.	Jamison Street, Notting Hill Gate, London, W.	(R) Pastry cook.	
16. Johannmault, G. (3 saved, 13 lost.)	3 Orchard Place, Southampton.	(R) Assistant sauce.	

K. DECK DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. King, T. (1 lost.)	23 Middle Market Road, Great Yarmouth.	Master-at-arms.	

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Kemp, Thos.	11 Cedar Road, Southampton.	Executive fourth assistant engineer.	Saved.
2. Kelly, William.	1 Claude Road, Dublin.	Assistant electrician.	
3. Kenchenten, Frank.	9 Latimer Street, Southampton.	Greaser.	
4. Kearn, C.	17 Chantry Road, Southampton.	do.	
5. Kirkham, J.	4 Chapel Street, Southampton.	do.	
6. Keegan, Jas.	2 Cross House Road, Southampton.	Leading fireman.	
7. Kasper, F.	6 Brunswick Square, Southampton.	Fireman.	
8. Kerr, T.	7 Hanley Street, Southampton.	do.	
9. Kearn, G.	37 Bay Road, Sholing, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
10. Kelly, Jas.	12 Woodley Road, Southampton.	Greaser.	
11. Kemish, G.	238 Shirley Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
12. Kinsella, L.	7 Canal Walk, Southampton.	do.	
13. Kenzler, A.	21 Bloehynden Terrace, Southampton.	Storekeeper.	
14. Knowles, T. (3 saved, 11 lost.)	Fanner's Lane, Lynton.	Firemen's messman.	

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Kingscote, W. F.	24 Elgin Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	Saved.
2. King, A.	Mother, Mrs. Tait, 132 Mile Street, Gateshead-on-Tyne.	Lift attendant.	
3. Kieran, M.	7 Avenue Road, Southampton.	Assistant storekeeper.	
4. Ketchley, H.	40 Northcote Road, Portsmouth, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
5. Knight, Geo.	45 Ludlow Road, Woolston, Hants.	do.	
6. Kitching, A.	170 Derby Road, Southampton.	do.	
7. Keene, P.	14 Rigby Road, Southampton.	do.	
8. Kelland, T.	Commercial Street, Bitterne, Southampton.	Library.	
9. Klein, H.	56 Oakley Road, Southampton.	Barber.	
10. Kieran, J.	Ingleswood, Bellmoor Road, Southampton.	Chief third-class steward.	
11. Knight, L.	37 Spring Lane, Bishopstoke.	Steward.	
12. King, E. W.	Curra Rectory, Clones.	Clerk.	

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
K—Continued.

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT—continued.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
13. Kerley, W. T.	Woodminton Cottages, Bow-erthalk, Salisbury.	Assistant steward.	Saved.
14. King, G.	46 Threefield Lane, Southampton.	Scullion.	
15. Kennell, C. (2 saved, 13 lost.)	6 Park View, Southampton.	Heb. cook.	

L. DECK DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Lightoller, C. H.	Nikko Lodge, Netley Abbey, near Southampton.	Second officer.	Saved.
2. Lowe, H. G.	Penralet, Barmouth.	Fifth officer.	Do.
3. Lee, R. R.	62 Threefield Lane, Southampton.	L. O.	Do.
4. Lucas, W.	2 Corporation Flats, Southampton.	A. B.	Do.
5. Lyons, W. H. (4 saved, 1 lost.)	27 Orchard Place, Southampton.	do.	
6. Leonard, L., not Titanic crew, American Line man.			

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Lindsay, W.	3 Coleman Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	Saved.
2. Light, W.	25 Grove Street, Southampton.	do.	Saved.
3. Long, F.	19 Sidford Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
4. Leahy, T.	19 Spulling Road, E. Dulwich.	Fireman.	
5. Lee, H.	94 Bevois Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
6. Light, C.	24 Lower Back of Walls, Southampton.	Fireman.	
7. Long, W.	3 Marine Terrace, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
8. Lloyd, W. (1 saved, 7 lost.)	18 Orchard Place, Southampton.	Fireman.	

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Lane, A. E.	207 Victoria Road, Woolston, Hants.	Saloon steward.	Saved.
2. Lydlatt, C.	12 Brunswick Square, Southampton.	do.	
3. Lefever, G.	25 Orchard Place, Southampton.	do.	
4. Lovett, G.	5 Shirley Cottages, New Southgate.	Assistant pantry-man.	
5. Light, C.	Thorny Hill, Christchurch, Hants.	Plate washer.	
6. Lovell, J.	21 Highlands Road, Southampton.	Grill cook.	
7. Lock, A.	70 Newland Road, Worthing. 309 Portswood Road, Southampton.	Assistant cook.	
8. Leader, A.	Kelston, Fenton Road, West Southbourne.	Assistant confectioner.	
9. Lavington, Miss.	Manor Farm, Headbourne Worthy, Winchester.	Stewardess.	
10. Leather, Mrs.	28 Park Road, Port Sunlight.	do.	
11. Latimer, A.	4 Glenwyllen Road, Waterloo, Liverpool.	Chief steward.	
12. Lloyd, H.	Criterion restaurant, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
13. Littlejohn, A.	11 Western Terrace, Chapel Road, Southampton.	do.	
14. Lake, W.	Florence Hotel, Southampton.	do.	
15. Lucas, W.	3 Cardigan Terrace, Southampton.	do.	
16. Lawrence, A.	66 Oxford Street, Southampton.	do.	
17. Lacey, Bert. W.	26 Southampton Road, Salisbury.	Assistant steward.	
18. Longmuir, J.	130 The Crescent, Eastleigh.	Assistant B. R. steward.	
19. Leonard, M.	45 Charlesworth Street, Southampton.	Steward.	
20. Lewis, A. (5 saved, 15 lost.)	99 Radcliffe Road, Southampton.	do.	

M. DECK DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Murdoch, W. M.	94 Belmont Road, Portswood, Southampton.	First officer.	Saved.
2. Moody, J. P.	St. James House, Grimsby.	Sixth officer.	
3. Maxwell, J.	27 Leighton Road, Shirley, Southampton.	Carpenter.	
4. Moore, G.	51 Graham Road, Southampton.	A. B.	
5. McCarthy, W.	9 Gratton Hill Road, Cork, Ireland.	do.	
6. Matherson, D.	20 Richmond Street, Southampton.	do.	
7. McGough, J.	St. George's Street, Southampton.	do.	
8. Mathias, M. (3 saved, 5 lost.)	2 Western Esplanade, Southampton.	Mess-room steward.	

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
M—Continued.  
ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

Name	Address	Rating	
1. Mackie, W. D.	2b Margery Park Road, Forest Gate, London, S. E.	Junior fifth assistant engineer.	
2. Millar, R.	19 North Street, Alloa, N. B.	Extra fifth assistant engineer.	
3. Magee, W.	11 Douglas Terrace, Stirling	Senior sixth assistant engineer.	
4. McReynolds, W.	1 Lagan View, Belfast	Junior sixth assistant engineer.	
5. Millar, T.	13 Meadow Street, Belfast	Assistant deck engineer.	
6. Middleton, A.	Ballisodare, Sligo.	Assistant electrician.	
7. McAndrew, Thos.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Fireman.	
8. Marrett, G.	32 Elm Street, Southampton.	do.	
9. McKae, Wm.	43 Threefield Lane, Southampton.	do.	
10. Mintram, W.	15 Chapel Road, Southampton.	do.	Saved.
11. Major, W.	4 Oriental Terrace, Southampton.	do.	
12. Moores, R.	174 Northumberland Road, Southampton.	Greaser.	
13. Mason, J.	3 Wycomb Cottages, French Street, Southampton.	Leading fireman.	
14. McGregor, J.	7 Briton Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	
15. May, A.	75 York Street, Southampton.	do.	
16. Maskell, L.	26 Albert Road, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
17. Morrell, R.	51 Malmesbury Road, Southampton.	do.	
18. Morgan, A.	18 Threefield Lane, Southampton.	do.	
19. McInerney, T.	38 Elston Street, Liverpool.	Greaser.	Do.
20. McIntyre, W.	20 Floating Bridge Road, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
21. McGann, J.	18 George's Place, Southampton.	do.	Do.
22. Morris, W.	5 Marine Parade, Southampton.	do.	
23. Moore, R.	Manor Cottage, Headbourns, W. F.	do.	
24. Mitchell, B.	45 Bevois Valley, Southampton.	do.	
25. May, A. W.	75 York Street, Northam, Southampton.	Firemen's messman.	
26. Murdoch, W.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Fireman.	Do.
27. Morgan, T.	do.	do.	Do.
28. Moore, J.	64 Arthur Road, Southampton.	do.	Do.
29. Mason, F.	30a Waverley Road, Southampton.	do.	Do.
30. Morris, A.	18 Short Street, Southampton.	Greaser.	
31. Mayo, W.	24 Cable Street, Southampton.	Leading fireman.	
32. McGaw, E.	6 Broadlands Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	Do.
33. Mayzes, T.	8 Commercial Street, Southampton.	do.	
34. Marsh, F.	4 Back of Walls, Southampton.	do.	
35. Milford, Geo.	3 Graham Street, Southampton.	do.	
36. McGarvey, E.	54 College Street, Southampton.	do.	
37. McCastlen, W.	53 French Street, Southampton.	do.	
38. McQuillan, W.	Sea View Street, Belfast.	do.	
39. McAndrews, W.	17 New Capley Road.	do.	(7 saved, 32 lost.)

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Middleton, M. V.	84 Felsham Road, Putney, London.	Saloon steward.	
2. Muller, L.	67 Oxford Street, Southampton.	Interpreter.	
3. Mabey, J.	190 Albany Road, Southampton.	Steward.	
4. Mantle, R.	60 Brintons Road, Southampton.	do.	
5. Mullen, T.	12 Onslow Road, Southampton.	do.	
6. McElroy, H. W.	Polygon Hotel, Southampton.	Purser.	
7. MacGrady, J.	Platform Tavern, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
8. Mellor, A.	6 Cariton Place, Southampton.	do.	
9. McCawley, T. W.	22 Camden Place, Southampton.	Gymnasium.	
10. Mishellany, A.	123 Ledbury Road, Bayswater, London, W.	Printer.	
11. McMurray, W.	60 Empress Road, Liverpool.	Bedroom steward.	
12. Marks, J.	93 Livingstone Road, Southampton.	Assistant pantryman.	
13. Marriott, J. W.	5 Shingley Cottages, New Southgate; 7 Chillworth Road.	do.	Saved.
14. Morris, F.	46 Deloune Street, Fulham, London.	Bath steward.	
15. Major, E.	9 Old Park Villas, Palmers Green, London.	do.	
16. Moore, A.	142 St. Marys Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
17. Martin, A.	13 High Street, Fareham.	Scullion.	Do.
18. Mills, C.	94 Albert Road, Southampton.	Assistant butcher.	Do.
19. Maynard, J.	21 Highlands Road, Southampton.	Entrée cook.	Do.
20. Maytum, A.	12 Stafford Road, Southampton.	Chief butcher.	
21. Morgan, W.	46 Besboro Road, Birkenhead.	Assistant storekeeper.	

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
M—Continued.  
VICTUALING DEPARTMENT—continued.

Name	Address	Rating	
22. Marsden, Miss.	7 Westmoreland Terrace, Southampton.	Stewardess.	Saved.
23. McLaren, Mrs.	9 Shirley Road, Southampton.	do.	Do.
24. Martin, Mrs.	Fosbrooke Road, Portsmouth.	do.	Do.
25. Moss, H.	37 Charlton Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
26. MacKay, C.	18 Milton Road, Southampton.	do.	Do.
27. McMicken, A.	43 Suffolk Avenue, Southampton.	do.	Do.
28. McMullen, J.	120 St. Marys Road, Southampton.	do.	
29. Martin, Miss.	1 Apsley Villas, Horn Lane, Acton, London.	(R) Second cashier.	Do.
30. Monoros, J.	27 Tension Street, Waterloo, London.	(R) Assistant waiter.	
31. Monteverdi, J.	4 Queens Park Terrace, Southampton.	(R) Assistant entrée.	
32. Mattman, A.	3 Orchard Place, Southampton.	(R) Ice man.	Do.
33. Manga, Paul.	53 Neal Street, London.	(R) Kitchen clerk.	
34. McCarty, F.	Devonfield, Charlton Road, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	
35. MacKie, G.	31 Winchester Road, Shirley Southampton.	do.	

N.

DECK DEPARTMENT.

1. Nichol, A.	St. Cloud, Oak Tree Road, Shirley, Southampton.	Boatswain.	
---------------	---	------------	--

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

1. Noon, John.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Fireman.	Saved.
2. Noss, H.	12 Black Lane, Southampton.	do.	
3. Nutbean, W.	Sportsman's Arms, High Street, Southampton.	do.	Do.
4. Newman, C.	9 Latimer Street, Southampton.	Storekeeper.	
5. Norris, J.	5 Spa Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
6. Nettleton, G.	23 Empress Road, Southampton.	do.	
7. Noss, B.	8 St. Peters Road, Southampton.	do.	(2 saved, 5 lost.)

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Nichols, A.	43 Suffolk Avenue, Southampton.	Steward.	
2. Nichols, W. K.	16 Kent Road, Southampton.	Assistant steward.	Saved.
3. Neale, H.	10 Cliff Road, Freemantle, Southampton.	Assistant baker.	
4. Nicholls, T.	3 Brunswick Square, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
5. Nannin, F.	33 Albert Park, Highbury Hill.	(R) Head waiter.	(2 saved, 3 lost.)

O.

DECK DEPARTMENT.

1. O'Loughlin, W. F. H.	Polygon Hotel, Southampton.	Surgeon.	
2. Olliver, A.	38 Anderson Road, Southampton.	Quartermaster.	Saved.
3. Osman, F.	43 High Street, Itchen, Southampton.	A. B.	Do.

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

1. Olive, C.	43 College Street, Southampton.	Greaser.	Saved.
2. Othen, C.	6 Northumberland Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
3. Oliver, H.	15 Nichols Road, Southampton.	do.	Do.
4. O'Conner, J.	9 Tower Place, Bargate Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	Do.

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Orr, J.	45 Coleman Street, Southampton.	Assistant vegetable cook.	
2. Osborne, W.	7 Hewetts Roads, Freemantle, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
3. Orpet, W.	1 Vaudry Street, Southampton.	do.	
4. Owens, L.	29 Earls Road, Southampton.	Assistant steward.	
5. Olive, E. R.	37 Hanley Road, Southampton.	Clothes presser.	
6. O'Conner, T.	12 Linacre Lane, Liverpool.	Bedroom steward.	(6 lost.)

P.

DECK DEPARTMENT.

1. Pitman, H. J.	Care W. H. Taylor, Castle Cary, Somerset.	Third officer.	Saved.
2. Perkis, W.	Victoria Road, Bitterne, Southampton.	Quartermaster.	Do.
3. Pascoe, C. H.	68 High Street, Itchen, Southampton.	A. B.	Do.

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
P—Continued.

DECK DEPARTMENT—continued.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
4. Peters, W. C. ....	114 Ludlow Road, Woolston, Southampton.	A. B. ....	Saved.
5. Pigott, P. ....	2 Windsor Terrace, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.
6. Ponjdestae, J. .... (6 saved.)	4 Elm Road, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.

## ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

1. Parsons, F. A. ....	38 Bugle Street, Southampton.	Senior fifth assistant engineer.	Saved.
2. Priest, J. ....	27 Lower Canal Walk, Southampton.	Fireman.	
3. Pand, G. ....	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.
4. Preston, T. ....	42 Millbank Street, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
5. Pelham, G. ....	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.
6. Pearce, J. ....	14 Drummond Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
7. Perry, E. ....	3 Hyde Terrace, Southampton.	Trimmer.	Do.
8. Podesta, J. ....	81 Chantry Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
9. Pregnall, G. ....	3 Brew House Court, Southampton.	Greaser.	Do.
10. Pallas, T. ....	25 Upper Palmer Street, Liverpool.	do. ....	
11. Painter, C. ....	172 Mortimer Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	Do.
12. Paice, R. ....	30 Hornwell Gardens, Southampton.	do. ....	
13. Pusey, R. ....	School Lane, Hythe, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.
14. Phillips, G. ....	5 Grove Street, Southampton.	Greaser.	
15. Pitfield, W. ....	13 Albert Road, Woolston, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.
16. Painter, F. ....	10 Bridge Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
17. Pugh, P. ....	22 Peel Street, Northam, Southampton.	Leading fireman.	Do.
18. Proudfoot, R. ....	2 Pear Tree Green, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
19. Perry, H. .... (7 saved, 12 lost.)	3 Ryde Terrace, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.

## VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Phillimore, H. ....	72 Priory Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	Saved.
2. Parsons, R. ....	Ashbrittle, near Wellington, Somerset.	do. ....	
3. Proctor, C. ....	29 South View Road, Southampton.	Chef.	Do.
4. Platt, W. ....	107 Belgrave Road, Southampton.	Scullion.	
5. Phillips, J. T. ....	Care of Marconi Co., London.	First Marconi.	Do.
6. Penny, W. ....	29 Lodge Road, Southampton.	Assistant steward.	
7. Pacey, R. ....	Cambridge Villa, Millbrook Road, Southampton.	Lift attendant.	Do.
8. Perrin, W. ....	24 Bellmoor Road, Southampton.	Boots.	
9. Petty, E. ....	26 Orchard Place, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	Do.
10. Pearcey, A. ....	23 Kent Road, Southampton.	Pantry.	
11. Pook, R. ....	102 Alexandra Road, Plymouth.	Assistant bedroom steward.	Do.
12. Pridcaux, J. A. ....	23 Cotlands Road, Bournemouth.	Steward.	
13. Port, F. ....	Rockbourne.	do. ....	Do.
14. Pearce, A. ....	Father, 70a Holderness Road, Bournemouth.	do. ....	
15. Prior, H. J. ....	48 Padwell Road, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.
16. Pugh, A. ....	72 Orchard Lane, Southampton.	do. ....	
17. Parsons, E. ....	26 Roberts Road, Southampton.	Chief storekeeper.	Do.
18. Prentice, F. ....	71 Denzil Avenue, Southampton.	Assistant storekeeper.	
19. Pritchard, Mrs. ....	9 Roslyn Road, East Ham, London.	Stewardess.	Do.
20. Puzey, Jno. ....	61 Manor Road, Itchen, Hants.	Saloon steward.	
21. Pryce, W. ....	Heathdene, Newlands Avenue, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.
22. Perriton, H. ....	11 St. Andrews Road, Southampton.	do. ....	
23. Perkins, L. ....	New Inn, Soberton, Hants.	Telephone operator.	Do.
24. Paintin, A. ....	48 Stratford Street, Ilfley Road, Oxford.	Captain's steward.	
25. Pennell, F. ....	16 West Street, Shirley, Southampton.	Bath steward.	Do.
26. Penrose, J. ....	39 Southview Road, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	
27. Price, E. ....	93 Grove Road, Holloway, London.	(R) Barman.	Do.
28. Piazza, P. ....	94 Newport Building, Shaftesbury Avenue, London.	(R) Waiter.	
29. Phillips, J. ....	8 Jessie Terrace, Southampton.	(R) Storeman.	Do.
30. Piatti, L. ....	15 Princes Street, Cavendish Square, London.	(R) Assistant waiter.	
31. Perotti, A. ....	2 Denmark Place, Charing Cross Road, London.	do. ....	Do.
32. Poggi, E. ....	Bowling Green House, Southampton.	(R) Waiter.	
33. Petrachio, A. ....	4 Richmond Building, Dean Street, London.	(R) Assistant waiter.	Do.

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
P—Continued.

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT—continued.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
34. Petrachio, S. ....	4 Richmond Building, Dean Street, London.	(R) Assistant waiter.	Do.
35. Pedrini, Alex. ....	Bowling Green House, Southampton.	do. ....	
36. Pachera, J. .... (7 saved, 29 lost.)	3 Orchard Place, Southampton.	(R) Assistant larder.	Do.

## R.

## DECK DEPARTMENT.

1. Rowe, G. .... (1 saved.)	63 Henry Street, Gosport.	Quartermaster.	Saved.
--------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------	--------

## ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

1. Reed, R. ....	3 Wickhams Court, Southampton.	Trimmer.	Do.
2. Read, J. ....	3 Nelson Place, Southampton.	do. ....	
3. Richards, H. ....	25 Summers Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	Do.
4. Rudd, H. ....	20 Peel Street, Northam, Southampton.	Storekeeper.	
5. Rous, A. ....	18 Ratcliffe Road, Southampton.	Plumber.	Do.
6. Reeves, F. ....	22 Cable Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	
7. Rickman, G. ....	40 Derby Road, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.
8. Roberts, G. ....	5 Withers Court, Southampton.	do. ....	
9. Rice, C. ....	12 Oriental Terrace, Southampton.	do. ....	Saved.
10. Ranger, T. .... (2 saved, 8 lost.)	81 Middle Road, Southampton.	Greaser.	

## VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Ricks, C. ....	1 Hanley Road, Southampton.	Assistant storekeeper.	Do.
2. Rogers, E. J. ....	120 Oxford Avenue, Southampton.	do. ....	
3. Roberts, Mrs. ....	9 Chestnut Grove, Notts.	Stewardess.	Do.
4. Robinson, Mrs. ....	128 Shirley Road, Southampton.	do. ....	
5. Revell, W. ....	102 Malmesbury Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	Do.
6. Ray, F. ....	Palmer Park Avenue, Reading.	do. ....	
7. Rowe, M. ....	86 Bridge Road, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.
8. Ranson, Jas. ....	72 Harrowdene Road, Knowle, Bristol.	do. ....	
9. Rummer, G. ....	50 Cranbury Avenue, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.
10. Robinson, J. ....	Vine Cottage, Carlisle Road, Southampton.	do. ....	
11. Rule, S. ....	81 Atherley Road, Southampton.	Bath steward.	Do.
12. Roberts, H. ....	39 Merry Road, Liverpool.	Bedroom steward.	
13. Rogers, M. ....	13 Greenhill Avenue, Winchester.	Saloon steward.	Do.
14. Russell, R. ....	Anchor Hotel, Redbridge, Hants.	do. ....	
15. Riddout, W. ....	6 Queen Ann Buildings, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.
16. Randall, F. ....	182 Empress Road, Southampton.	do. ....	
17. Ross, R. ....	70 Inkerman Road, Woolton, Hants.	Scullion.	Do.
18. Roberts, F. ....	Solicitors, Brook, Knight, and Sullivan, Farnborough; 7 Dawson's Cottages, Reading.	Thrd butcher.	
19. Ryerson, W. E. ....	18 Salop Road, Walthamstow, London.	Saloon steward.	Do.
20. Robertson, G. ....	36 Mount Street, Southampton.	Assistant steward.	
21. Reed, C. ....	140 Derby Road, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	Do.
22. Rice, P. ....	40 Thackeray Road, Southampton.	Steward.	
23. Ryan, T. ....	87 Albert Road, Southampton.	do. ....	Do.
24. Rice, J. R. ....	37 Kimberly Drive, Crosby.	Clerk.	
25. Rotta, A. ....	10 West Street, St. Martins Lane, London.	(R) Waiter.	Do.
26. Rath, E. ....	5 Lumber Court, St. Martins Lane.	do. ....	
27. Ricardona, R. ....	50 Greek Street, Soho, London.	(R) Assistant waiter.	Do.
28. Rousseau, P. ....	7 Kennerton Place, London, SW.	(R) Chef.	
29. Rigozzi, A. .... (6 saved, 23 lost.)	6 Titchfield Street, London.	(R) Waiter.	Do.

## S.

## DECK DEPARTMENT.

1. Simpson, J. E. ....	Packenhall Road or Street, Belfast, Ireland.	Assistant surgeon.	Saved.
2. Symons, S. ....	55 Frauchise Street, Weymouth.	L. O. ....	
3. Smith, W. ....	42 Bridge Street, Southampton.	A. B. ....	Do.
4. Scarrott, J. ....	36 Albert Road, Southampton.	do. ....	
5. Sawyer, R. F. ....	55 Bevois Street, Southampton.	Window cleaner.	Do.
6. Smith, E. J. Capt. (2 saved, 4 lost.)	Woodhead, Winn Road, Southampton.	Commander.	

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
S—Continued.

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Smith, J. M.	Cawdor, Millars Road, Itchen, Southampton.	Junior fourth engineer.	
2. Shepherd, J.	16 Bellevue Terrace, Southampton.	Junior second assistant engineer.	
3. Sloan, P.	77a Clovelly Road, Southampton.	Chief electrician.	
4. Stafford, M.	4 Southbrook Square, Southampton.	Greaser.	
5. Sparkman, H.	Spring Road, Sholing, Southampton.	Fireman.	Saved.
6. Smither, H.	1 Ash Tree Road, Southampton.	do.	
7. Shiers, A.	5 Peel Street, Southampton.	do.	Do.
8. Senior, H.	17 South Road, Clapham, London.	do.	Do.
9. Saunders, W.	136 Edward Street, Southampton.	do.	
10. Self, A.	75 Romsey Road, Southampton.	Greaser.	
11. Stubbs, H.	11 Spa Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	
12. Snow, E.	21 Lower Canal Walk, Southampton.	Trimmer.	Do.
13. Stanbrook, A.	36 York Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	
14. Self, E.	3 Kingsley Road, Southampton.	do.	Do.
15. Snooks, W.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Trimmer.	
16. Shillaber, C.	21 Nelson Road, Southampton.	do.	
17. Stocker, H.	Middle Road, Sholing, Southampton.	do.	
18. Skeats, W.	29 King Street, Southampton.	do.	
19. Sheath, F.	12 Bell Street, Southampton.	do.	Do.
20. Steel, R.	do.	do.	
21. Smith, E.	1 St. Marys Buildings, Southampton.	do.	
22. Shea, Thos.	18 Briton Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	
23. Saunders, T.	17 Sussex Terrace, Southampton.	do.	
24. Sullivan, S.	27 Marsh Lane, Southampton.	do.	
25. Scott, Archd.	3 Lower Ditches, Southampton.	do.	
26. Small, W.	14 Russell Street, Southampton.	Leading fireman.	
27. Sangster, C.	83 Bevois Street, Southampton.	Fireman.	
28. Snellgrove, G.	9 Cecil Avenue, Southampton.	do.	
29. Scott, F.	107 Clifford Street, Southampton.	Greaser.	Do.
30. Street, A.	10 Crown Street, Shirley, Southampton.	Fireman.	Do.
31. Saunders, W. (8 saved, 23 lost.)	1 Southbrook Square, Southampton.	Trimmer.	

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Stap, Miss.	41 Bidston Avenue, Birkenhead.	Stewardess.	Saved.
2. Sloan, Miss.	1 Kersland Road, Strandtown, Belfast.	do.	Do.
3. Smith, Miss.	Balmoral, Cobbett Road, Southampton.	do.	Do.
4. Snape, Mrs.	Hill Lane, Sandown.	do.	
5. Slocombe, Mrs.	8 Leopold Terrace, London, N.	T. B. attendant.	Do.
6. Strugnell, Jno.	Scullard's Hotel, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
7. Smillie, J.	16 Malmesbury Road, Southampton.	do.	
8. Skinner, E.	Criterion Restaurant, Southampton.	do.	
9. Stroud, E. A.	Mother, 167 Shirley Road, Berkshire; 129 Malmesbury Road, Southampton.	do.	
10. Samuels, W.	125 Osborne Road, Southampton.	do.	
11. Smith, C.	Holydene, Portsmouth Road, Woolston, Hants.	B. R. steward.	
12. Stone, E.	91 Shirley Road, Southampton.	do.	Do.
13. Seward, H.	54 Stamford Street, London, E. C.; 5 Shirley Road, Southampton.	Pantryman.	
14. Sedunary, S.	34 Emsworth Road, Southampton.	Steward.	
15. Slight, H. J.	48 Bellevue Street, Southampton.	do.	
16. Sevier, W.	Westbourne Street Mews, Paddington.	do.	
17. Savage, C.	8 Harold Road, Southampton.	do.	Do.
18. Saunders, W. E.	29 Albert Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
19. Simmons, F. C.	263 Millbrook Road, Southampton.	do.	
20. Stewart, J.	77 Earls Road, Southampton.	Veranda café.	Do.
21. Swan, W.	62 Hale Road, Walton, Liverpool.	Bedroom steward.	
22. Siebert, J.	8 Harold Road, Shirley, Southampton.	do.	
23. Stone, E.	105 St. Andrews Road, Southampton.	do.	
24. Stebbing, S.	25 Richville Road, Shirley, Southampton.	Chief boots.	
25. Scott.	6 Upper Canal Walk, Southampton.	Assistant boots.	
26. Smith, F.	33 Ordnance Road, Southampton.	Assistant pantryman.	
27. Shea, J.	77 Portsmouth Road, Woolston, Hants.	Saloon steward.	
28. Smith, R. G.	46 Stafford Road, Southampton.	do.	

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.  
S—Continued.

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT—continued.			
Name.	Address.	Rating.	
29. Symonds, J.	61 Church Street, Shirley, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
30. Stagg, J. H.	66 Commercial Road, Southampton.	do.	
31. Stroud, H.	167 Shirley Road, Southampton.	do.	
32. Stubbings, H.	North Cottage, Woodside, Lymington.	Cook and mess.	
33. Slight, W.	Hillside, Broadland Road, Southampton.	Larder cook.	
34. Simmons, W.	2 Thackeray Road, Southampton.	Pass cook.	
35. Simmonds, A.	80 Bevois Valley Road, Southampton.	Scullion.	Saved.
36. Smith, C.	35 Itchen Ferry, Hants.	do.	
37. Shaw, H.	47 Towcester Street, Liverpool.	do.	
38. Smith, J.	5 Sir George's Road, Freemantle, Southampton.	Assistant baker.	
39. Scovell, R.	141 Foundry Lane, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
40. Sesea, Gino.	3 Little Poulteney Chambers, Poulteney Street, London.	(R) Waiter.	
41. Scavino, C.	19 Strowbridge House, 231 Hampstead Road, London.	(R) Carver.	
42. Saecaggi, G.	22 Ponsonby Place, Westminster, London.	(R) Assistant waiter.	
43. Salussolia, G. (8 saved, 35 lost.)	7 Coldbath Square, Farringdon Road, London.	(R) Glass man.	

T.

DECK DEPARTMENT.

1. Taylor, C.	85 High Street, Southampton.	A. B.	
2. Terrell, D.	2 Trinity Cottages, Southampton.	do.	
3. Tamlyn, F.	20 Southampton Street, Southampton.	Mess-room steward.	
4. Turnquist, W. (not Titanic crew, American Line man. (1 saved, 3 lost.)			Saved.

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

1. Turley, R.	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Fireman.	
2. Triggs, R.	3 Canal Walk, Southampton.	do.	Saved.
3. Toung, F.	28 Russell Street, Southampton.	do.	
4. Tizard, A.	23 Lr. York Street, Southampton.	do.	
5. Thomas, J.	20 Newman Street, Southampton.	do.	
6. Tozer, J.	6 Chattis Street, Orchard Lane, Southampton.	Greaser.	
7. Threlfall, T.	128 St. Martin's Court, Southampton.	Ldg. fireman.	Do.
8. Thresher, G.	36 Mount Pleasant Road, Southampton.	Fireman.	Do.
9. Taylor, J.	35 Russell Street, Southampton.	do.	Do.
10. Taylor, W. H.	2 Broad Street, Southampton.	do.	Do.
11. Thompson, J.	11 Court, 2 House, Primrose Hill, Liverpool.	do.	Do.
12. Taylor, J.	23 Queen's Street, Southampton.	do.	
13. Taylor, T. (6 saved, 7 lost.)	94 Manor Road, Southampton.	do.	

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Taylor, W.	42 Morris Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
2. Thomas, A. C.	11 Brunswick Road, Southampton.	do.	Saved.
3. Thessinger, A.	102 French Street, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.	Do.
4. Tucker, B.	43 Suffolk Avenue, Southampton.	Second pantryman.	
5. Terrill, F.	5 Grove Street, Southampton.	Assistant steward.	Do.
6. Talbot, G. F. C.	4 Lemon Road, Southampton.	Steward.	
7. Thayer, M.	19 Station Road, West Croydon.	do.	
8. Taylor, C.	5 Oxford Street, Southampton.	do.	
9. Turner, G. F.	Awberry, Bond Road, Bitterne Park, Southampton.	Stenographer.	
10. Topp, T.	89 Millbrook Road, Farnborough.	Second butcher.	
11. Thorley, W.	18 John Street, Southampton.	Assistant cook.	
12. Thompson, H.	Eastwood, Lumsden Avenue, Southampton.	Second storekeeper.	
13. Taylor, L.	6 Shirbourne Road, Blackpool.	T. B. attendant.	Do.
14. Toms, F.	Allerdale, Bitterne Park, Southampton.	Saloon steward.	
15. Thomas, B.	122 Avenue Road, Southampton.	do.	Do.
16. Turner, L.	19 Terminus Terrace, Southampton.	do.	
17. Turvey, C.	90 Cornwall Road, Bayswater, London, W.	(R) Page boy.	
18. Tietz, C.	Richmond Tavern, Bridgwood.	(R) Kitchen porter.	
19. Testoni, E. (5 saved, 14 lost.)	32a St. James Building, Little Poulteney Street.	(R) Assistant glassman.	

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.

U.  
VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

Name.	Address.	Rating.	
1. Urbini, R. (1 lost.)	16 Manette Street, Charing Cross Road, London.	(R) Waiter.....	

V.  
ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

1. Veal, A.....	15 Imperial Avenue, Southampton.	Greaser.....	
2. Veal, W.....	2 Spa Gardens, Southampton.	Fireman.....	
3. Veal, H. (3 lost.)	do.....	do.....	

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Veal, T.....	20 Forster Mount, Southampton.	Saloon steward.....	
2. Vini, H.....	55 Leith Mansions, Maida Vale, London.	(R) Assistant controller.....	
3. Valvassori, E.....	7 Great Russell Street, London.	(R) Waiter.....	
4. Vioni, R.....	8 Lynton Mansions, Kennington Road, London.	do.....	
5. Vicat, J.....	13 Howley Street, London, S.E.	(R) Fish cook.....	
6. Vilvarlarge, P.....	Rue National, Ambroise, France.	(R) Assistant soup.....	
7. Voogelin, H. (7 lost.)	8 Lumber Court, London, W. C.	(R) Coffeeman.....	

W.  
DECK DEPARTMENT.

1. Wilde, H. T.....	25 Grey Road, Walton, Liverpool.	Chief officer.....	
2. Winn, W.....	8 Church Street, Southampton.	Quartermaster.....	Saved.
3. Weller, R. (2 saved, 1 lost.)	Holyrood House, Southampton	A. B.....	Do.

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

1. Wilson, B.....	40 Richmond Road, Shirley, Southampton.	Senior second assistant engineer.	
2. Ward, A.....	Manor House, Romsey.....	Junior fourth assistant engineer.	
3. Wardner, F.....	45 Endle Street, Southampton.	Fireman.....	
4. Woods, H.....	St. Michael's House, Southampton.	Trimmer.....	
5. Ward, J.....	22 James Street, Southampton.	Leading fireman.....	
6. Williams, E.....	2 Canal Walk, Southampton.	Fireman.....	
7. White, F.....	14 Northbrook Road, Southampton.	Trimmer.....	
8. Wilton, Wm.....	5 Queens Street, Southampton.	do.....	
9. Webber, F.....	49 Avenue Road, Southampton.	Leading fireman.....	
10. Witcher, A.....	9 Wilson Street, Southampton.	Fireman.....	
11. White, W.....	9 Cobdens Street, Woking.....	Trimmer.....	Saved.
12. Witt, H.....	28 Lower College Street, Southampton.	Fireman.....	
13. Webb, S.....	Sailors' Home, Southampton.	Trimmer.....	
14. Witt, F.....	St. Michael's House, Southampton.	do.....	
15. White, A.....	3 Southampton Place, Southampton.	Greaser.....	Do.
16. Woodford, H.....	14 Clovelly Road, Southampton.	do.....	
17. Wateridge, E.....	Millbrook, Southampton.	Fireman.....	
18. Wyeth, J.....	14 Millbank Street, Southampton.	do.....	
19. Watson, W. (2 saved, 17 lost.)	13 York Street, Southampton.	do.....	

1. Warwick, F.....	Totton, Hants.....	Saloon steward.....	
2. Webb, B.....	33 Hanley Road, Southampton.	Smoke-room steward.	
3. Wright, F.....	22 Steur Street, Shepherds Bush, London.	Racquet-court attendant.	
4. Watson, W.....	23 Oakley Road, Southampton.	Bell boy.....	
5. Warham, R.....	46 Park Road, Southampton.	Bedroom steward.....	
6. Whitman, H.....	12 Richville Road, Shirley, Southampton.	do.....	
7. Ward, P.....	35 Richmond Road, Southampton.	do.....	
8. Ward, E.....	6 Blechynden Terrace, Southampton.	do.....	
9. Walpole, J.....	12 Stafford Road, Southampton.	Chief pantryman.....	
10. Wraspon, H.....	33 Southampton Street, Southampton.	Assistant pantryman.	
11. Williams, W.....	53 Northumberland Road, Southampton.	Assistant steward.....	Saved.
12. Wood, J. T.....	7 Norfolk Road, Upper Clapton, London.	do.....	
13. Witter, J.....	55 Porchester Road, Woolston, Hants.	Smoke-room steward.	Do.
14. Widgery, J.....	25 Rokey Avenue, Rodland, Bristol.	Baths.....	Do.
15. Willis, W.....	59 Derby Road, Southampton.	Steward.....	
16. White, J.....	41 Thackeray Road, Portswood, Southampton.	G. H. steward.....	

EXHIBIT "A."—Particulars of crew of steamship "Titanic"—Continued.

W—Continued.  
VICTUALING DEPARTMENT—continued.

Name.	Address.	Rating.	
17. Wright, W.....	9 Emsworth Road, Shirley, Southampton.	G. H. steward.....	
18. Windebank, J.....	Elmhurst, Shirley, Southampton.	Sauce cook.....	Saved.
19. Welch, W. H.....	North Haven, Bond Road, Bitterne Park, Southampton.	Assistant cook.....	
20. Whitford, A.....	33 Richmond Street, Southampton.	Saloon steward.....	
21. Wiltshire, W.....	8 Britannia Road, Southampton.	Assistant butcher.....	
22. Wake, S.....	2 Gloster Passage, Southampton.	Assistant baker.....	
23. Williams, A.....	52 Peter Road, Walton, Liverpool.	Assistant store-keeper.	
24. Whiteman, A. H.....	9 Dyer Road, Southampton.	Barber.....	Do.
25. White, A.....	36 Purbrooke Road, Portsmouth.	Assistant barber.....	
26. Walsh, Miss.....	57 Church Road, Southampton.	Stewardess.....	
27. Wallis, Mrs.....	23 St. Marys Street, Southampton.	Matron.....	
28. Wheat, J.....	14 Cobden Gardens, Bitterne, Southampton.	Assistant second steward.	Do.
29. Wheelton, E.....	Norwood House, Shirley, Southampton.	Saloon steward.....	Do.
30. Weatherstone, T.....	5 Kenilworth Road, Polygon, Southampton.	do.....	
31. White, L.....	248 Romsey Road, Southampton.	do.....	
32. Ward, W.....	107 Millbrook Road, Southampton.	do.....	Do.
33. Whiteley, T.....	29 St. Johns Park Mansions, London.	do.....	Do.
34. Wormald, T. (9 saved, 25 lost.)	5 Testwood Road, Southampton.	do.....	

Y.  
ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

1. Young, F..... (1 lost.)	28 Russell Street, Southampton.	Fireman.....	
-------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------	--

VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Yoshaek J.....	103 Malmesbury Road, Southampton.	Saloon steward.....	
2. Yearsley, H..... (1 saved, 1 lost.)	6 Gloster Passage, Southampton.	do.....	Saved.

Z.  
VICTUALING DEPARTMENT.

1. Zarracchi, L..... (1 lost.)	9 Orchard Place, Southampton.	(R) Wine butler....	
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------	--

Summary of crew list.

	Total.	Saved.	Lost.
Deck department.....	70	46	24
Engine department.....	327	72	255
Victualing department.....	494	96	398
Band.....	8		8
Total.....	899	214	685

In the above totals are included 23 women in the victualing department, of whom 20 were saved and 3 lost.

EXHIBIT "B."—Particulars of the first-class passengers who sailed on the steamer "Titanic," April 10, 1912.

Total number sailed: Women and children, 156; men, 173; total, 329. Total number saved: Women and children, 145; men, 54; saved, 199. Total number lost: Women and children, 11; men, 119; total lost, 130.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF FIRST-CLASS SURVIVORS.

Allen, Miss Elizabeth Walton.	Brayton, Mr. George.
Allison, Mrs. H. J., and maid.	Brown, Mrs. J. J.
Allison, Master, and nurse.	Brown, Mrs. J. M.
Anderson, Mr. Harry.	Bucknell, Mrs. W., and maid.
Andrew, Miss Cornelia I.	Catderhead, Mr. E. P.
Appleton, Mrs. E. D.	Cardell, Mrs. Churchill.
Astor, Mrs. J. J., and maid.	Cardeyn, Mr. T. D. M., and manservant.
Aubert, Mrs. N., and maid.	Cardeya, Mrs. J. W. M., and maid.
Barkworth, Mrs. A. H.	Carter, Mr. W. E.
Baxter, Mrs. James.	Carter, Mrs. W. E., and maid.
Beckwith, Mr. R. L.	Carter, Miss Lucie.
Beckwith, Mrs. H. L.	Carter, Master William T.
Bishop, Mr. D. H.	Cassebeer, Mrs. H. A.
Bishop, Mrs. D. H.	Cavendish, Mrs. T. W., and maid.
Blank, Mr. Henry.	Chaffee, Mrs. Herbert F.
Bonnell, Miss Caroline.	Chambers, Mr. N. C.
Bonnel, Miss Lily.	Chambers, Mrs. N. C.
Bowen, Miss.	Cherry, Miss Gladys.
Bowerman, Miss Elsie.	

Chevré, Mr. Paul.  
 Chibnall, Mrs. E. M. Bowerman.  
 Clark, Mrs. Walter M.  
 Compton, Mrs. A. T.  
 Compton, Miss S. R.  
 Cornell, Mrs. R. C.  
 Crosby, Mrs. Edward G.  
 Crosby, Miss Harriet.  
 Cummings, Mrs. John Bradley.  
 Daly, Mr. P. D.  
 Davidson, Mrs. Thornton.  
 de Villiers, Mrs. B.  
 Dick, Mr. A. A.  
 Dick, Mrs. A. A.  
 Dodge, Mr. Washington.  
 Dodge, Mrs. Washington.  
 Dodge, Master Washington.  
 Douglas, Mrs. F. C.  
 Douglas, Mrs. W. D., and maid.  
 Earnshaw, Mrs. Boulton.  
 Endres, Miss Caroline.  
 Eustis, Miss E. M.  
 Flegenheim, Mrs. A.  
 Flynn, Mr. J. J.  
 Fortune, Mrs. Mark.  
 Fortune, Miss Ethel.  
 Fortune, Miss Alice.  
 Fortune, Miss Mabel.  
 Frauenthal, Mr. T. G.  
 Frauenthal, Dr. Henry W.  
 Frauenthal, Mrs. Henry W.  
 Frollicher, Miss Marguerite.  
 Frotelle, Mrs. J.  
 Gibson, Mrs. L.  
 Gibson, Miss I.  
 Goldenberg, Mr. E. L.  
 Goldenberg, Mrs. E. L.  
 Gordon, Lord Duff.  
 Gordon, Lady Duff, and maid.  
 Gracie, Col. Archibald.  
 Graham, Mrs. William G.  
 Graham, Miss Margaret.  
 Greenfield, Mrs. L. D.  
 Harder, Mr. George A.  
 Harder, Mrs. George A.  
 Harper, Mr. Henry Sleeper, and manservant.  
 Harper, Mrs. Henry Sleeper.  
 Harris, Mrs. Henry B.  
 Haven, Mr. H.  
 Hawksford, Mr. W. J.  
 Hays, Mrs. Charles M., and maid.  
 Hays, Miss Margaret.  
 Hippach, Mrs. Ida S.  
 Hippach, Miss Jean.  
 Hogeboom, Mrs. John C.  
 Holverson, Mrs. A. O.  
 Hoyt, Mr. Frederick M.  
 Hoyt, Mrs. Frederick M.  
 Ismay, Mr., and manservant.  
 Kenyon, Mrs. F. R.  
 Kimball, Mr. E. N.  
 Kimball, Mrs. E. N.  
 Leader, Mrs. F. A.  
 Lindstrom, Mrs. J.  
 Lines, Mrs. Ernest H.  
 Lines, Miss Mary C.  
 Longley, Miss Gretchen F.  
 Madill, Miss Georgette Alexandra.  
 Marechal, Mr. Pierre.

The following names have been cabled as amongst the first-class passengers saved; it is thought they are maids and valets:  
 Chandowson, Miss Victorine.  
 Lesneur, Gustave, Mr. Cardeya's valet.  
 Olivia, Mlle. Mrs. Penasco's maid.  
 Pericault, Miss A.  
 Renago, Miss Maman T.

List of first-class passengers.  
 [Corrected Apr. 25.]

Passenger's name.	European address.	American address.
Allen, Miss Elizabeth Walton (saved).	4 South Terrace, Littlehampton.	4140 Pendell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
Allison, Mr. H. J.	152 Abbey Road, West Hampstead, NW.	Montreal, Quebec.
Allison, Mrs. H. J., and maid (saved).		
Allison, Miss (saved).		
Allison, Master (saved), and nurse (saved).	Waldorf Hotel, London.	
Anderson, Mr. Harry (saved).	Care of Harland & Wolff, Belfast.	Care of E. Metz Green, Consul Uruguay, New York.
Andrews, Miss Cornelia I. (saved).		
Andrews, Mr. Thomas.		
Appleton, Mrs. E. D. (saved).		840 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
Artagaveytia, Mr. Ramon.		
Astor, Col. J. J., and manservant.		
Astor, Mrs. J. J. (saved), and maid (saved).		
Aubert, Mrs. N. (saved), and maid (saved).	17 Le Scour Street, Paris.	
Barkworth, Mr. A. H. (saved).	Tranby House, Hesse, East York, England.	
Baumann, Mr. J.		
Baxter, Mrs. James (saved).		Montreal, Quebec.
Baxter, Mr. Quigg.		

Marvin, Mrs. D. W.  
 McGough, Mr. J. R.  
 Meyer, Mrs. Edgar J.  
 Minahan, Mrs. W. E.  
 Minahan, Miss Daisy.  
 Mock, Mr. Phillip E.  
 Newell, Miss Alice.  
 Newell, Miss Madeline.  
 Newsome, Miss Helen.  
 Omont, Mr. F.  
 Ostly, Miss Helen E.  
 Pears, Mrs. Thomas.  
 Penasco, Mrs. Victor, and maid.  
 Penchen, Maj. Arthur.  
 Potter, Mrs. Thomas, jr.  
 Rheims, Mr. George.  
 Robert, Mrs. Edward S., and maid.  
 Rolmans, Mr. C.  
 Rosenbaum, Miss.  
 Rothes, the Countess of, and maid.  
 Rothschild, Mrs. M.  
 Ryerson, Mrs. Arthur, and maid.  
 Ryerson, Miss.  
 Ryerson, Miss.  
 Ryerson, Master.  
 Sealfeld, Mr. Adolphe.  
 Solomon, Mr. A. L.  
 Schabert, Mrs. Paul.  
 Seward, Mr. Frederic K.  
 Shutes, Miss E. W.  
 Silvertone, Mr.  
 Silvey, Mrs. William B.  
 Simonius, Mr. Oberst Alfons.  
 Sloper, Mr. William T.  
 Smith, Mrs. L. P.  
 Snyder, Mr. John.  
 Snyder, Mrs. John.  
 Spedden, Mr. Frederick O.  
 Spedden, Mrs. Frederick O., and maid.  
 Spedden, Master R. Douglas, and nurse.  
 Spencer, Mrs. W. A., and maid.  
 Stahelin, Dr. Max.  
 Stehl, Mr. Max Frollicher.  
 Stehl, Mrs. Max Frollicher.  
 Stengel, Mr. C. E. H.  
 Stengel, Mrs. C. E. H.  
 Stephenson, Mrs. W. B.  
 Stone, Mrs. George M., and maid.  
 Swift, Mrs. Frederick Joel.  
 Taussig, Mrs. Emil.  
 Taussig, Miss Ruth.  
 Taylor, Mr. E. J.  
 Taylor, Mrs. E. J.  
 Thayer, Mrs. J. B., and maid.  
 Thayer, Mr. J. B., jr.  
 Thorne, Mrs. G.  
 Tneker, Mr. G. M., jr.  
 Warren, Mrs. F. M.  
 White, Mrs. J. Stuart, maid, and manservant.  
 Wick, Mrs. George D.  
 Wick, Miss Mary.  
 Widener, Mrs. George D., and maid.  
 Willard, Miss Constance.  
 Williams, Mr. R. M. J.  
 Woolner, Mr. Hugh.  
 Young, Miss Marie.

Renalt, Miss Appie.  
 Segesser, Miss Emma, Mme. Aubert's maid.  
 Serepeca, Miss Augusta.  
 Steffanson, H. B.

List of first-class passengers—Continued.

Passenger's name.	European address.	American address.
Beattie, Mr. T.		Care of Mr. Morgan, 69 Leonard Street, New York.
Beckwith, Mr. R. L. (saved).		Care of McKean, Brewster & Morgan, 40 Wall Street, New York.
Beckwith, Mrs. R. L. (saved).		
Behr, Mr. K. H.		40 Wall Street, New York.
Bishop, Mr. D. H. (saved).		
Bishop, Mrs. D. H. (saved).		
Bjornstrom, Mr. H. (Stoffenson; see end list.)		
Blackwell, Mr. Stephen Weart.	Brown, Shipley & Co., Son.	167 West State Street, Trenton, N. J.
Blank, Mr. Henry (saved).		Care of Whiteside & Blank, Newark, N. J.
Bonnell, Miss Caroline (saved).		Youngstown, Ohio.
Bonnell, Miss Lily (saved).	Carlton Hotel, London.	
Borebank, Mr. J. J.		Lodges of the World, Winnipeg.
Bowen, Miss (saved).		Care of A. D. Britton, 189 Montague Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Bowerman, Miss Elsie (saved).	Thorncliff, St. Leonards on Sea, England.	
Brady, Mr. John B.		Care of Miss E. M. Brady, Hotel Wellington, New York City.
Brandels, Mr. E.		Omaha, Nebr.
Brayton, Mr. George (saved).	Hotel Metropole, London, W. C.	Union Trust Building, Los Angeles, Cal.
Brewer, Dr. Arthur Jackson.		
Brown, Mrs. J. J. (saved).		Denver, Colo.
Brown, Mrs. J. M. (saved).		
Bucknell, Mrs. W. (saved) and maid (saved).		
Butt, Maj. Archibald W.		Care of Lewis F. Butt, Augusta, Ga.
Calderhead, Mr. E. P. (saved).		Gimbel Bros., New York City.
Cardell, Mrs. Churchill (saved).		
Cardeza, Mrs. J. W. M. (saved) and maid.		
Cardeza, Mr. T. D. M. (saved) and manservant.		
Carison, Mr. Frank.		Care of A. Metz Green, consul for Uruguay, New York City.
Carran, Mr. F. M.		
Carran, Mr. J. P.		
Carter, Mr. William E. (saved).		
Carter, Mrs. William E. (saved) and maid.	Rotherley Manor, Rotherley, Leicester.	Philadelphia, Pa., Attorneys Windrop & Stimson, 32 Liberty Street, New York City.
Carter, Miss Lucile (saved).		
Carter, Master William T. (saved).		
Case, Mr. Howard B.	Vacuum Oil Co., London.	Care of Standard Oil Co., Rochester, N. Y.
Cassebeer, Mrs. H. A. (saved).	59 Rue Vaneau, Paris.	
Cavendish, Mr. T. W.		Care of Simpson Crawford Co., New York City.
Cavendish, Mrs. T. W. (saved) and maid (saved).	23 Chesham Place, London.	
Chaffee, Mr. Herbert F.		Amenia, N. Dak.
Chaffee, Mrs. Herbert F. (saved).		
Chambers, Mr. N. C. (saved).	Royal Mail S. P. Co., London.	Care of W. Bruce Cobb, 49 Wall Street, New York City.
Chambers, Mrs. N. C. (saved).		Care of E. H. Fallows, 30 Church Street, New York City.
Cherry, Miss Gladys (saved).		
Chevré, Mr. Paul (saved).	96 Avenue des Terres, Paris.	
Chibnall, Mrs. E. M. Bowerman (saved).		
Chisholm, Mr. Robert.		Care of Hon. W. A. Clark, 29 Exchange Place, New York.
Clark, Mr. Walter M.		
Clark, Mrs. Walter M. (saved).		
Clifford, Mr. George Quincy.		Care of Mrs. K. R. Burr, 451 Lexington Avenue, New York City.
Colley, Mr. E. P.	Farmagh, Rathgar, Dublin.	
Compton, Mrs. A. T. (saved).		Lakewood House, Lakewood, N. J.
Compton, Miss S. R. (saved).		
Compton, Mr. A. T., jr.		
Cornell, Mrs. R. C. (saved).		
Crafton, Mr. John B.	Victoria Hotel, London.	Care of H. R. Crafton, Roachdale, Ind.
Crosby, Mr. Edward G.		Transportation Co., Milwaukee, Wis.
Crosby, Mrs. Edward G. (saved).	Grand Trunk Ry., London SW.	Care of Hervey, Barber & McKee, 30 Nassau Street, New York.
Crosby, Miss Harriett (saved).		Care of Curtis, Mallet, Prevost & Colt, 30 Broad Street, New York City.
Cummings, Mr. John Bradley.		328 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Cummings, Mrs. John Bradley (saved).		Care of Mr. Sparling, Grand Trunk Ry., 290 Broadway, New York City.
Daly, Mr. P. D. (saved).		
Daniel, Mr. Robert W.		
Davidson, Mr. Thornton.		
Davidson, Mrs. Thornton (saved).		
de Villiers, Mrs. B. (saved).	111 Rue Fardier, Brussels.	
Dick, Mr. A. A. (saved).		Care of Dean & Dawson, Calgary, Alberta.
Dick, Mrs. A. A. (saved).	Hotel Cecil, London.	

## List of first-class passengers—Continued.

Passenger's name.	European address.	American address.
Dodge, Mr. Washington (saved)		(San Francisco, Cal.; at-
Dodge, Mrs. Washington (saved)		torney, Nathan Ur-
Dodge, Master Washington (saved)		daver, 116 Nassau Street, New York City.
Douglas, Mrs. F. C. (saved)		
Douglas, Mr. W. D.		Minneapolis, Minn.
Douglas, Mrs. W. D. (saved) and maid.		
Duiles, Mr. William C.		Care of R. B. Evans, 1335 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
Earnshaw, Mrs. Boulton (saved)		Care of D. H. McIntyre, Punxsutawney, Pa.
Endres, Miss Caroline (saved)		Hotel Belmont, New York City.
Eustis, Miss E. M. (saved)		Care of E. G. Alsdorf, 40 Wall Street, New York City.
Evans, Miss E.		Gimbel Bros. New York City.
Flegenhein, Mrs. A. (saved)		306 West Ninety-ninth Street, New York City.
Flynn, Mr. J. I. (saved)		
Foreman, Mr. B. L.		
Fortune, Mr. Mark		
Fortune, Mrs. Mark (saved)		
Fortune, Miss Ethel (saved)	Hotel Metropole, London.	(291) Portage Avenue, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
Fortune, Miss Alice (saved)		
Fortune, Miss Mabel (saved)		
Fortune, Mr. Charles		
Franklin, Mr. T. P.	17 Cheapside, E. C.	
Frauenthal, Mr. T. G. (saved)		
Frauenthal, Dr. Henry W. (saved)		
Frauenthal, Mrs. Henry W. (saved)		
Frollicher, Miss Marguerite (saved)	Care of Mr. Obersteg, Basel.	Care of E. J. Stehli, 13 West Seventy-sixth Street, New York City.
Futrelle, Mr. J.	44 Gloucester Terrace, Hyde Park, W.	Hotel Belmont, New York City.
Futrelle, Mrs. J. (saved)		Care of Edwin Gee, Lawrence, Mass.
Gee, Mr. Arthur		Care of Curtis, Mallet, Prevost & Colt, 30 Broad Street, New York City.
Gibson, Mrs. L. (saved)		
Gibson, Miss D. (saved)		
Giglio, Mr. Victor	57 Avenue Montaigne, Paris.	Do.
Goldenberg, Mr. E. L. (saved)		
Goldenberg, Mrs. E. L. (saved)		
Goldschmidt, Mrs. George B.		
Gordon, Lord Duff (saved)		Care of Lucile (Ltd.), 17 West Thirty-sixth Street, New York (sailed Lusitania May 8, 1912).
Gordon, Lady Duff (saved) and maid (saved)		Hotel St. Loine, Washington Square, New York City.
Gracie, Col. Archibald (saved)	Savoy Hotel, London, W.	Care of I. Eaton & Co., 45 East Seventeenth Street, New York City.
Graham, Mr.		
Graham, Mrs. William G. (saved)		
Graham, Miss Margaret (saved)		
Greenfield, Mrs. L. D. (saved)		
Greenfield, Mr. W. B. (saved)		
Guggenheim, Mr. Benjamin		Care of J. K. McGowan, 165 Broadway, New York.
Harder, Mr. George A. (saved)		(117) Eighth Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Harder, Mrs. George A. (saved)		
Harper, Mr. Henry Sleeper (saved) and manservant (saved)		
Harper, Mrs. Henry Sleeper (saved)		
Harris, Mr. Henry B.		(50) Central Park West, New York City.
Harris, Mrs. Henry B. (saved)		
Harrison, Mr. W. H.	30 James Street, Liverpool.	
Haven, Mr. H. (saved)		
Hawksford, Mr. W. J. (saved)		
Hays, Mr. Charles M.	Grand Trunk Ry., London, SW.	Grand Trunk Ry., Montreal.
Hays, Mrs. Charles M. (saved) and maid.		
Hays, Miss Margaret (saved)		304 West Eighty-third Street, New York City.
Head, Mr. Christopher		Care of G. W. Head, Grain Exchange, Winnipeg, Boston, Mass.
Hilliard, Mr. Herbert Henry		Avery Scale Co., North Milwaukee, Wis.
Hipkins, Mr. W. E.		Hotel Imperial, New York City.
Hippach, Mrs. Ida S. (saved)		
Hippach, Miss Jean (saved)		
Hogeboom, Mrs. John C. (saved)		
Holverson, Mr. A. O.	Piccadilly Hotel, London, W.	Cluett, Peabody & Co., New York City.
Holverson, Mrs. A. O. (saved)		
Hoyt, Mr. Frederick M. (saved)		
Hoyt, Mrs. Frederick M. (saved)	Care of Brown, Shipley & Co., London.	
Hoyt, Mr. W. F.		36 West Thirty-fifth Street, New York City.
Isham, Miss A. E.		Care of Edward Isham, 26 West Thirty-seventh Street, New York.

## List of first-class passengers—Continued.

Passenger's name.	European address.	American address.
Ismay, Mr. (saved) and manservant.	30 James Street, Liverpool.	
Jakob, Mr. Birnbaum	11 Rue Membling, Antwerp.	
Jones, Mr. C. C.		Fillimore Farms, Bennington, Vt.
Julian, Mr. H. F.		Care of G. W. Shepherd, 30 Church Street, New York.
Kent, Mr. Edward A.		512 Delavan Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y.
Kenyon, Mr. F. R.		(Care of J. Kenyon, South- ington, Conn.
Kenyon, Mrs. F. R. (saved)		Care of McKean, Brew- 30 ster & Morgan, 40 Wall Street, New York City.
Kimball, Mr. E. N. (saved)		Care of D. S. Netter, 441 Market Street, Phila- 41 delphia, Pa.
Kimball, Mrs. E. N. (saved)		
Klaber, Mr. Herman		
Lambert-Williams, Mr. Fletcher Fellows.	6 W. Bickerhall Mansions, Gloucester Place, London, W.	
Leader, Mrs. F. A. (saved)		
Lewy, Mr. E. G.		Lewy Bros. Co., State and Adams Streets, Chicago, Ill.
Lindstrom, Mrs. J. (saved)		
Lines, Mrs. Ernest H. (saved)		Care of Krauth T. Har- 43 mon & Mathewson, 55 Wall Street, New York City.
Lines, Miss Mary C. (saved)		Springfield, Mass.
Lingrey, Mr. Edward		
Long, Mr. Milton C.		
Longley, Miss Gretchen F. (saved)		
Loring, Mr. J. H.	28 Park Lane, London, W.	Care of Thos. Plunkett, 49 Broadway, New York City.
Madill, Miss Georgette Alexandra (saved)	4 South Terrace, Littlehampton.	4140 Pendell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
Maguire, Mr. J. E.		
Marechal, Mr. Pierre (saved)		
Marvin, Mr. D. W.	58 Acre Lane, Brixton, SW.	
Marvin, Mrs. D. W. (saved)		
McCaffry, Mr. T.		Vancouver, British Columbia.
McCarthy, Mr. Timothy J.		
McGough, Mr. J. R. (saved)		Gimbel Bros., New York City.
Meyer, Mr. Edgar J.		(Care of Saks & Co., New York City.
Meyer, Mrs. Edgar J. (saved)		
Millet, Mr. Frank D.		
Minahan, Dr. W. E.		
Minahan, Mrs. W. E. (saved)	Savoy Hotel, London, W.	Fond du Lac, Wis.
Minahan, Miss Daisy (saved)		Care of Curtis, Mallet, Prevost & Colt, 30 Broad Street, New York City.
Mock, Mr. Philip E. (saved)		Montreal, Quebec.
Molsom, Mr. H. Markland	Junior Athenaeum Club, Piccadilly, W.	1716 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C.
Moore, Mr. Clarence, and manservant.	Almond's Hotel, Clifford Street, W.	
Natsch, Mr. Charles		(Care of Bureau of Uni- 44 versity Navel, Boston, Mass.
Newell, Mr. A. W.		Care of McKean, Brew- 45 ster & Morgan, 40 Wall Street, New York City.
Newell, Miss Alice (saved)		Care of Mrs. E. M. Cory, 1 Greenwood Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Newell, Miss Madeline (saved)		
Newsom, Miss Helen (saved)		
Nicholson, Mr. A. S.		Providence, R. I.
Omont, Mr. F. (saved)		
Ostby, Mr. E. C.		Care of H. B. Claffin Co., New York City, Mr. J. M. Menendez.
Ostby, Miss Helen R. (saved)		
Ovies, Mr. S.		Care of Barrow, Wade & Guthrie, 25 Broad Street, New York City.
Parr, Mr. M. H. W.		Grand Trunk Ry., Mon- 46 treal.
Partner, Mr. Austin	Care of Meyers & Robertson, 11 Copthall Court, London, E. C.	(Care of Walter Janvier, 417 Canal Street, New York City.
Payne, Mr. V.	Grand Trunk Ry., London, SW.	Care of Mrs. F. Garcia, 6 East 58th Street, New York City. Sailed La 47 Provence May 9.
Pears, Mr. Thomas	"Inevagissey" I I s e - 48 worth, NW.	Toronto, Ontario.
Pears, Mrs. Thomas (saved)		
Penasco, Mr. Victor		
Penasco, Mrs. Victor (saved) and maid.		
Peuchen, Maj. Arthur (saved)	Savoy Hotel, London, W.	
Porter, Mr. Walter Chamberlain.		
Potter, Mrs. Thomas, jr. (saved)		Care of R. B. Evans, 1335 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
Renchlin, Mr. Jonkheer J. G.		Care of Holland-America Line, 39 Broadway, New York City.
Rheims, Mr. George (saved)	42 Rue de Paradis, Paris.	
Robert, Mrs. Edward S. (saved) and maid (saved)	4 South Terrace, Littlehampton.	4140 Pendell Boulevard, St. Louis.
Roebing, Mr. Washington A., 2d.		Trenton, N. J.
Rolmano, Mr. C. (saved)		235 West 107th Street, New York City.



List of first-class passengers—Continued.

Passenger's name.	European address.	American address.
Rood, Mr. Hugh R.	Ritz Hotel, London, W.	
Rosenbaum, Miss (saved)		
Ross, Mr. J. Hugo.	Savoy Hotel, London.	
Roths, the Countess of (saved), and maid (saved).		Ritz-Carlton Hotel, New York City.
Rothschild, Mr. M.		753 West End Avenue, New York City.
Rothschild, Mrs. M. (saved)		Care of Knox & Co., 17 Battery Place, New York City.
Rowe, Mr. Alfred.	6 Petersham Place, Gloucester Road, W.	
Ryerson, Mr. Arthur.		Care of G. S. O'Loughlin, 31 Nassau Street, New York City.
Ryerson, Mrs. Arthur (saved), and maid.		
Ryerson, Miss (saved)		
Ryerson, Miss (saved)		
Ryerson, Master (saved)		
Saalfeld, Mr. Adolphe (saved)	Victoria Park, Manchester.	Hotel Astor, New York City (sals Cedric May 16).
Salouan, Mr. A. L. (saved)		
Schabert, Mrs. Paul (saved)		Curtis, Walle, Prevost & Colt, 30 Broad Street, New York City.
Seward, Mr. Frederic K. (saved)	Savoy Hotel, London, W.C.	
Shutes, Miss E. W. (saved)		168 West One hundred and twentieth Street, New York City.
Silverthorne, Mr. (saved)		St. Louis, Mo.
Silvey, Mr. William B.		Care of Mrs. S. Deshler, 1811 Wyoming Avenue, Washington, D. C.
Silvey, Mrs. William B. (saved)		Ritz-Carlton Hotel, New York City.
Simonius, Mr. Oberst Alfons (saved)		
Sloper, Mr. William T. (saved)	Waldorf Hotel, London, W.	
Smart, Mr. John M.		Care of C. S. Butler, 32 Nassau Street, New York City.
Smith, Mr. J. Clinch.		Care of Ford & Lyon, Fitchburg, Mass.
Smith, Mr. R. W.		Huntington, W. Va.
Smith, Mr. L. P.		Minneapolis, Minn.
Smith, Mrs. L. P. (saved)		
Snyder, Mr. John (saved)		
Snyder, Mrs. John (saved)		
Spedden, Mr. Frederick O. (saved)		Morristown, N. J.
Spedden, Mrs. Frederick O. (saved), and maid (saved)		
Spedden, Master R. Douglas (saved), and nurse (saved)		
Spencer, Mr. W. A.		Care of J. C. Tiedeman, St. George's Church, New York.
Spencer, Mrs. W. A. (saved), and maid (saved)		Ritz Hotel, New York City.
Stahelin, Dr. Max (saved)		13 Astor Place, New York City.
Stead, Mr. W. T.	5 Smith Square, Westminster, London, SW.	Care of E. J. Stehll, 13 West Seventy-sixth Street, New York City.
Stehll, Mr. Max Frollicher (saved)		(South Broad Street, Newark, N. J.)
Stehll, Mrs. Max Frollicher (saved)		Cincinnati, Ohio.
Stengel, Mr. C. E. H. (saved)		
Stengel, Mrs. C. E. H. (saved)		Care of R. H. Macy & Co., New York City.
Stephenson, Mrs. W. B. (saved)		Care of Mrs. E. C. Sutton, Haddonfield, N. J.
Stewart, Mr. A. A.		
Stone, Mrs. George M. (saved), and maid (saved)		
Straus, Mr. Isidor, and manservant.		
Straus, Mrs. Isidor, and maid (saved)		
Sutton, Mr. Frederick.		
Swift, Mrs. Frederick Joel (saved)		
Taussig, Mr. Emil		
Taussig, Mrs. Emil (saved)		
Taussig, Miss Ruth (saved)		
Taylor, Mr. E. Z. (saved)	Whitehall Hotel, Bloomsburg Square, W. C.	Care of S. E. Wright, Wilson, N. C.
Taylor, Mrs. E. Z. (saved)		
Thayer, Mr. J. B.		(Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Philadelphia, Pa.)
Thayer, Mrs. J. B., and maid (saved)		
Thayer, Mr. J. B., jr. (saved)		
Thorne, Mr. G.		
Thorne, Mrs. G. (saved)		
Tucker, Mr. G. M., jr. (saved)		
Uruchurtu, Mr. M. R.		Care of R. R. Uruchurtu, Mexico City, Mexico.
Van der Hoef, Mr. Wyckoff		109 Joralemon Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Walker, Mr. W. Anderson		East Orange, N. J.
Warren, Mr. F. M.		
Warren, Mrs. F. M. (saved)		
Weir, Mr. J.	Care of Mrs. Carter, 6 Howe Street, Edinburgh.	
White, Mr. Percival W.		Winchendon Springs, Mass.
White, Mr. Richard F.		Waldorf-Astoria, New York City.
White, Mrs. J. Stuart (saved) and maid (saved) and manservant.		

List of first-class passengers—Continued.

Passenger's name.	European address.	American address.
Wick, Mr. George D.		Youngstown, Ohio.
Wick, Mrs. George D. (saved)		
Wick, Miss Mary (saved)		
Widener, Mr. George D. and manservant.		(Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.)
Widener, Mrs. George D. (saved), and maid (saved).		
Widener, Mr. Harry		Care of J. W. Moffit, Duluth, Minn.
Willard, Miss Constance (saved).		(Care of Alex. Williams, Philadelphia Club, Philadelphia, Pa.)
Williams, Mr. Duane		
Williams, Mr. R. M., jr. (saved)		
Woolner, Mr. Hugh (saved)		Care of I. Jackerman Polhemus Printing Co. 121 Fulton Street, New York.
Wright, Mr. George		234 West 44th Street, New York City.
Young, Miss Marie (saved)		

The following names have also been cabled as amongst the first-class passengers saved, whom we are at present unable to identify, but it is thought they are maids and valets:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Chandowson, Miss Victorine.              | Steffanson, H. B., on list as H. Bjornstrom. |
| Renago, Miss Maman T.                    | Sorepeca, Miss Augusta.                      |
| Olvin, Mlle., Mrs. Penasco's maid.       | Lesneur, Gustave, Mr. Cardeza's valet.       |
| Renalt, Miss Apple (or Effie).           | Pericault, Miss A.                           |
| Segesser, Miss Emma, Mme. Aubert's maid. |  |

List of second-class passengers of steamship "Titanic," rescued by steamship "Carpathia."

- |  |                                      |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Angle, Mrs.                                   | 56. Kantor, Mrs. M.                  |
| 2. Abelson, Mrs. Hanna.                          | 57. Letch, Jessie.                   |
| 3. Balls, Mrs. Ada E.                            | 58. Laroche, Mrs.                    |
| 4. Buss, Miss Kate.                              | 59. Laroche, Miss Simmomo.           |
| 5. Becker, Mrs. A. O., and 3 children.           | 60. Laroche, Miss Louise.            |
| 6. Beane, Mr. Edward.                            | 61. Lehman, Bertha.                  |
| 7. Beane, Mrs.                                   | 62. Lauch, Mrs. A.                   |
| 8. Brown, Mildred.                               | 63. Lamore, Amelia.                  |
| 9. Brown, Miss Elizabeth.                        | 64. Mellinger, Eliz.                 |
| 10. Bonham, Lillian W.                           | 65. Mellinger, Child.                |
| 11. Bystrom, Karolina.                           | 66. Marshall, Mrs. Kate.             |
| 12. Bryhl, Dagmar.                               | 67. Mallett, Mrs.                    |
| 13. Beesley, Mr. L.                              | 68. Mallett, Master R. E.            |
| 14. Clark, Mrs. Ada.                             | 69. Mellers, W. J.                   |
| 15. Cameron, Miss Clara.                         | 70. Naaser, Mrs.                     |
| 16. Caldwell, Albert E.                          | 71. Nye, Elizabeth.                  |
| 17. Caldwell, Mrs. Sylvan.                       | 72. Oxenham, Thos.                   |
| 18. Caldwell, Infant Aiden.                      | 73. Phillips, Alice.                 |
| 19. Collyer, Mrs. Charlotte.                     | 74. Pallas, Mr. Emilio (?).          |
| 20. Collyer, Miss Marjorie.                      | 75. Padro, Mr. Julian.               |
| 21. Christy, Alice.                              | 76. Pinsky, Rosa.                    |
| 22. Christy, Julia.                              | 77. Portaluipi, Emilio.              |
| 23. Collet, Stuart (Mr.).                        | 78. Parish, Mrs. Davis.              |
| 24. Doling, Mrs. Ada.                            | 79. Quick, Mrs. Jane.                |
| 25. Doling, Miss Elsie.                          | 80. Quick, Miss Vera W.              |
| 26. Drew, Mrs. Lulu, and child.                  | 81. Quick, Miss Phyllis.             |
| 27. Davies, Mrs. Agnes.                          | 82. Reynolds, Mrs. E.                |
| 28. Davis, Miss Mary.                            | 83. Ridsdale, Lucy.                  |
| 29. Davis, John M.                               | 84. Renouf, Miss Lily.               |
| 30. Del Carlo, Mrs. S.                           | 85. Rugg, Miss Emily.                |
| 31. Drachstedt, Ivan von (saved as first class). | 86. Richards, Emily, and 2 children. |
| 32. Durano, Florentino.                          | 87. Rogers, Miss Selma.              |
| 33. Durano, Miss A.                              | 88. Sincok, Miss Maude.              |
| 34. Eantherpo, Mrs. Lizzie.                      | 89. Slayter, Miss H. M.              |
| 35. Garside, Ethel.                              | 90. Shelley, Mrs. J.                 |
| 36. George, Master Wm. Rons S.                   | 91. Sinkkonen, Miss Anna.            |
| 37. Hart, Mrs. (Esther).                         | 92. Smith, Miss Marion.              |
| 38. Hart, Child (Eva).                           | 93. Silver, Lylie.                   |
| 39. Harris, George.                              | 94. Toomey, Miss.                    |
| 40. Hewlett, Mrs. Mary.                          | 95. Trent, Mrs. Jessie.              |
| 41. Harper, Nina.                                | 96. Trout, Miss E.                   |
| 42. Hold, Mrs. A.                                | 97. Williams, C. Chas.               |
| 43. Hosno, Mr. Masabumi.                         | 98. Weltz, Mrs. (Mathilda).          |
| 44. Hocking, Mrs., and daughter.                 | 99. Welber, Miss Susie.              |
| 45. Herman, Mrs. Jane.                           | 100. Wright, Miss Marion.            |
| 46. Herman, Miss Kate.                           | 101. Watt, Mrs. Bessie.              |
| 47. Herman, Miss Alice.                          | 102. Watt, Miss Bertha.              |
| 48. Hamila, Mrs. H., and child.                  | 103. West, Mrs. E. A.                |
| 49. Hoffman, Lolo.                               | 104. West, Miss Constance.           |
| 50. Hoffman, Lues.                               | 105. West, Miss Barbara.             |
| 51. Ilett, Bertha.                               | 106. Wells, Addie.                   |
| 52. Jacobsohn, Mrs. Amy.                         | 107. Wells, Master.                  |
| 53. Jervan, Mrs. M.                              | 108. Wells, Miss.                    |
| 54. Kenne, Miss Nora A.                          | 109. Ware, Mrs. Florence.            |
| 55. Kelly, Mrs. F.                               | 110. Whillems, Chas.                 |
|  | 111. Watercroft, Nellie.             |

Total saved 119

Women and children saved 104

Men saved 15

Total 119

MAY 15, 1912.

List of second-class passengers, arranged alphabetically.

- |                      |                           |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Abelson, Mrs. Hanna. | Andrew, Mr. Frank.        |
| Abelson, Mr. Samson. | Ashby, Mr. John.          |
| Angle, Mr. W.        | Balby, Mr. Percy.         |
| Angle, Mrs.          | Balls, Mrs. Ada E.        |
| Andrew, Mr. Edgar.   | Bambridge, Mr. Charles P. |

Banfield, Mr.  
 Bateman, Mr. Robert J.  
 Beane, Mr. Edward.  
 Beane, Mrs. Ethel.  
 Beauchamp, Mr. H. J.  
 Becker, Mrs. A. O.  
 Becker, Miss Ruth Elizabeth.  
 Becker, Miss Marion Louise.  
 Becker, Master Richard.  
 Beesley, Mr. L.  
 Bentham, Miss Lillian W.  
 Berreman, Mr. W. S.  
 Botsford, Mr. W. H.  
 Bowenur, Mr. Solomon.  
 Bracker, Mr. James H.  
 Brown, Mrs. E. C.  
 Brown, Miss E.  
 Brown, Mr. S.  
 Brown, Miss Mildred.  
 Bryhl, Mr. Curt.  
 Bryht, Miss Dagmar.  
 Buss, Miss Kate.  
 Butler, Mr. Reginald.  
 Byles, Rev. T. R. D.  
 Bystrom, Mrs. Carolina.  
 Cameron, Miss Clear.  
 Carbules, Mr. W.  
 Campbell, Mr. William.  
 Caldwell, Mr. Albert Francis.  
 Caldwell, Mrs. Sylvia M.  
 Caldwell, Master Alden G.  
 Carver, Rev. E. C.  
 Carver, Mrs. E. C.  
 Chapman, Mr. C.  
 Chapman, Mr. D. H.  
 Chapman, Mrs. D. H.  
 Christy, Mrs. Alice.  
 Christy, Miss Jule.  
 Clarke, Mr. Charles U.  
 Clarke, Mrs. Ada Maria.  
 Corey, Mrs. P. C.  
 Collett, Mr. Stewart.  
 Coleridge, Mr. R. C.  
 Collyer, Mr. Harvey.  
 Collyer, Mrs. Charlotte.  
 Collyer, Miss Marjorie.  
 Corbett, Mrs. Irene C.  
 Collander, Mr. Erik.  
 Cotterill, Mr. Harry.  
 Cunningham, Mr. Alf.  
 de Carlo, Mr. Sabastiani.  
 de Carlo, Mrs. Sabastiani.  
 de Brito, Mr. Jose.  
 Davies, Mr. Charles.  
 Dawson, Mr. William James.  
 Davis, Miss M.  
 Davis, Master John M.  
 Davis, Mrs. Agnes.  
 Deacon, Mr. Percy.  
 Debaen, Mr. William.  
 Decht, Miss Bertha.  
 Denbury, Mr. Herbert.  
 Doling, Mrs. Ada J.  
 Doling, Miss Elsie.  
 Drashledt, Baron von.  
 Drew, Mr. James U.  
 Drew, Mrs. James U.  
 Drew, Master Marshall.  
 Durand, Miss Florentina.  
 Durand, Miss Asuncion.  
 Ettemiller, Mr. G. E.  
 Elander, Mr. Ingvar.  
 Fallstrom, Mr. Arne D.  
 Fallbrook, Mr. Charles.  
 Faunthorpe, Mr. Harry.  
 Faunthorpe, Mrs. Lizzie.  
 Fox, Mr. Stanley H.  
 Frost, Mr. A.  
 Funk, Miss Annie.  
 Fyuncy, Mr. Joseph.  
 Gale, Mr. Henry.  
 Gale, Mr. Shadrach.  
 Garside, Miss.  
 Gaskell, Mr. Alfred.  
 Gavey, Mr. Galovence.  
 George, Master William Rand S.  
 Giles, Mr. Ralph.  
 Gill, Mr. John.  
 Giles, Mr. Fred.  
 Giles, Mr. Edgar.  
 Gilbert, Mr. William.  
 Gillespie, Mr. William.  
 Givard, Mr. Hans L.  
 Grals, Miss H.  
 Greenberg, Mr. Samuel.  
 Hansons, Mr. M.  
 Hamalainen, Mrs. Anna, and infant.  
 Harris, Mr.  
 Hart, Benjamin.  
 Hart, Mrs. Esther.  
 Hart, Miss Eva M.  
 Hale, Mr. Reginald.  
 Harper, Miss Mina.  
 Harper, Mr. John.  
 Harris, Mr. George.  
 Harbeck, Mr. William.  
 Herman, Mr. Samuel.  
 Herman, Mrs. Jane.  
 Herman, Miss Kate.  
 Herman, Miss Alice.  
 Hickman, Mr. Leonard.  
 Hickman, Mr. Lewis.  
 Hickman, Mr. Stanley.

Hodges, Mr. Henry P.  
 Hocking, Mrs. Eliza.  
 Hocking, Miss Nellie.  
 Hocking, Mr. George.  
 Hocking, Mr. Samuel J.  
 Hoffman, Mr.  
 Hoffman, Masters.  
 Hood, Mr. Ambrose.  
 Howard, Mr. Benjamin.  
 Howard, Mrs. Ellen T.  
 Hold, Mr. Stephen.  
 Hold, Miss Annie.  
 Hunt, Mr. George.  
 Hewlett, Mrs. M. D.  
 Jacobsohn, Mr. S. S.  
 Jacobsohn, Mrs. S. S.  
 Jarvis, Mr. J. D.  
 Jewan, Mrs. A. B.  
 Jefferys, Mr. Clifford.  
 Jefferys, Mr. Ernest.  
 Jonkin, Mr. Stephen.  
 Kantor, Mr. S.  
 Kantor, Mrs.  
 Karnes, Mrs. J. F.  
 Keane, Mr. Daniel.  
 Kenne, Miss Nora A.  
 Kelly, Mrs. F.  
 Kirkland, Rev. Charles Leonard.  
 Knight, Mr. R.  
 Lahnen, Mr. William.  
 Lahnen, Mrs. William.  
 Lamore, Mrs. A.  
 Lamb, Mr. J. J.  
 Laroche, Mr. Joseph.  
 Laroche, Mrs. Joseph.  
 Laroche, Miss Lemoine.  
 Laroche, Miss Louise.  
 Lehman, Miss Bertha.  
 Leinot, Mr. Rene.  
 Leisch, Miss Dessie.  
 Levy, Mr. R. J.  
 Leyson, Mr. R. W.  
 Lingan, Mr. John.  
 Louch, Mr. Charles.  
 Louch, Mrs. Alice A.  
 McCrie, Mr. J. M.  
 McCrae, Mr. Arthur G.  
 McKane, Mr. Peter D.  
 Mack, Mrs. Mary.  
 Mallet, Mr. A.  
 Mallet, Mrs. A.  
 Mallet, Master Andre.  
 Malachard, Mr. Noel.  
 Manevlla, Mr. Joseph.  
 Mangeavache, Mr. Emilio.  
 Maraweck, Dr. E.  
 Marshall, Mr. Henry.  
 Marshall, Mrs. Kate.  
 Matthews, Mr. W. J.  
 Maybery, Mr. Frank H.  
 Mellenger, Mrs. Elizabeth, and child.  
 Mellers, Mr. William.  
 Meyer, Mr. August.  
 Milling, Mr. Jacob E.  
 Mitchell, Mr. Henry.  
 Mudd, Mr. Thomas C.  
 Myles, Mr. T. F.  
 Nasser, Mr. Nicolas.  
 Nasser, Mrs. Nicolas.  
 Nesson, Mr. I.  
 Nicholls, Mr. Joseph C.  
 Norman, Mr. Robert D.  
 Nye, Mrs. Elizabeth.  
 Oldworth, Mr.  
 Otter, Mr. Richard.  
 Oxenham, Mr. T.  
 Paard, Mr. Julian.  
 Pain, D. A.  
 Parker, Mr. Clifford R.  
 Parks, Mr. Frank.  
 Parrish, Mrs. L. D.  
 Fallas, Mr. Emilio.  
 Parnachity, Rev. P. Joseph M.  
 Phillips, Miss Alice.  
 Phillips, Mr. Robert.  
 Pinsky, Miss Rosa.  
 Ponesell, Mr. Martin.  
 Portaluppi, Mr. Emilio.  
 Pulbaum, Mr. Frank.  
 Quick, Mrs. Jane.  
 Quick, Miss W. V.  
 Quick, Miss Phyllis.  
 Reeves, Mr. David.  
 Renouf, Mr. Peter H. Y.  
 Renouf, Miss Lillie.  
 Reynolds, Miss E.  
 Ridsdale, Miss Lucy.  
 Richards, Mrs. Emily.  
 Richard, Mr. Emile.  
 Rogers, Mr. Harry.  
 Rogers, Miss Selina.  
 Rugg, Miss Emily.  
 Sedgwick, Mr. C. F. W.  
 Senkkonen, Miss Anna.  
 Sharp, Mr. Percival.  
 Shelley, Mrs. J.  
 Silver, Miss Lyvill.  
 Sincock, Miss Maude.  
 Sjostedt, Mr. E. A.  
 Slemen, Mr. Richard J.  
 Slayter, Miss H. M.  
 Smith, Mr. A.

Smith, Miss Marion.  
 Soby, Mr. Hayden.  
 Stanton, Mr. S. Ward.  
 Stokes, Mr. Philip J.  
 Svillner, Mr. Johan Henrik.  
 Swane, Mr. George.  
 Sweet, Mr. George.  
 Toomey, Miss Ellen.  
 Trent, Mrs. Jessie.  
 Trout, Miss E. E.  
 Troupeansky, Mr. Moses Aaron.  
 Turpin, Mr. William J.  
 Turpin, Mrs. D. A.  
 Veale, Mr. James.  
 Wells, Mrs. A. D.  
 Wells, Miss Joan.  
 Wells, Master Ralph.  
 West, Mr. E. A.

West, Mrs. E. A.  
 West, Miss E. M.  
 West, Miss P. J.  
 Watcroft, Miss Nellie.  
 Ware, Mr. William J.  
 Wheaton, Mr. Edward W.  
 Webber, Miss Susie.  
 Wheeler, Mr. Edwin.  
 Williams, Mr. C.  
 Wright, Miss Marion.  
 Watt, Mrs. Bessie.  
 Watt, Miss Bertha.  
 Ware, Mr. John J.  
 Ware, Mrs. F. L.  
 Wilhelms, Mr.  
 Weitz, Mr. L.  
 Weitz, Mrs. L.  
 Watson, Mr. E.

Particulars of the second-class passengers who sailed on the steamship "Titanic" April 10, 1912.

Total number sailed: Women and children, 128; men, 157; sailed, 285.  
 Total number saved: Women and children, 104; men, 15; saved, 119.  
 Total number lost: Women and children, 24; men, 142; lost, 166.

Second-class berthing list.

Passenger's name.	Address.
Mrs. Hanna Abelson (saved).....	Hebrew Shelter and Emigrant Aid Society, 229 East Broadway, New York City
Mr. Samson Abelson.....	Brother is S. Alfredo Andrew, New York Ship Building Co., Camden, N. J.
Mr. Edgar Andrew.....	With sister, 212 East Forty-sixth Street, New York City.
Mrs. Angie (saved).....	1 Mill Street, Warwick, England.
Mr. W. Angle.....	Wife is 317 Synnes Street, West Hoboken, N. J.
Frank Andrew.....	26 Gwavas Street, Penzance, Cornwall, England, or care of Harry Lutey, 1024 Hofferson Avenue, Akron, Ohio.
Mr. John Ashby.....	227 West One hundred and twenty-fifth Street, thence to Jacksonville, Fla.
Mr. Percy Bailey.....	20 Grenville Road, Plymouth, England. Brother is in Houghton, Mich.
Mrs. Ada E. Balls (saved).....	
Mr. Chas. P. Bambridge.....	
Mr. Banfield.....	
Mr. Robert J. Bateman.....	
Mr. Edward Beane (saved).....	
Mrs. Ethel Beane (saved).....	
Mr. H. J. Beauchamp.....	Care of Thos. Cook & Son, Bombay, or Benton Harbor, Mich., or, until May 18, Lancaster, Ohio.
Mrs. A. O. Becker (saved).....	
Miss Marion Louise Becker (saved).....	
Master Richard Becker (saved).....	
Miss Ruth Elizabeth Becker (saved).....	
Mr. L. Beesley (saved).....	4 Tetchfield Terrace, London, N. W.; or care Cornell Club, New York City.
Miss Lillian W. Bentham (saved).....	11 Kay Terrace, Rochester, N. Y.
Mr. W. S. Berreman.....	
Mr. W. H. Botsford.....	Care of Thos. Cook & Son, London, or, father is William B. Botsford, 402 West Fifth Street, Elmira, N. Y. General post office, London.
Mr. Solomon Bowenur.....	
Mr. Jas. H. Bracker.....	
Mr. Jose de Brito.....	
Miss E. Brown (saved).....	
Mrs. E. C. Brown (saved).....	152 Abbey Road, London, N. W.
Miss Mildred Brown (saved).....	
Mr. S. Brown.....	
Mr. Curt Bryhl.....	Brother of Dagmar Bryhl, who survives and returns to G'burg, Sweden, on Baltic, May 9.
Miss Dagmar Bryhl (saved).....	Care Oscar Lustig, 611 Pearl Street, Rockford, Ill.; returned to Gothenburg, steamship Baltic, May 9.
Rev. T. R. D. Byles.....	1901 Lexington Avenue, New York City.
Mrs. Carolina Bystrom (saved).....	Care of Rev. Dalziel, Bellmore, Long Island, thence to San Diego, Cal.
Miss Kate Buss (saved).....	
Mr. Reginald Butler.....	
Mr. Albert Francis Caldwell (saved).....	2 Upper Montague Street, London, England.
Master Alden G. Caldwell (saved).....	
Mrs. Sylvia M. Caldwell (saved).....	
Miss Clear Cameron (saved).....	Mamaroneck, Conn. (?)
Mr. William Campbell.....	Care of Harland & Wolf, Belfast, Ireland.
Mr. W. Carlines.....	
Mr. Sabastiani de Carlo.....	Care Branchini, Lucca, Italy.
Mrs. Sabastiani de Carlo (saved).....	Returned to Italy on Cretic May 18.
Mrs. E. C. Carver.....	
Rev. E. C. Carver.....	
Mr. C. Chapman.....	MoWheelers, West Droyton, England.
Mr. D. H. Chapman.....	Care of George & George, Leskeard, England.
Mrs. D. H. Chapman.....	
Mrs. Alice Christy (saved).....	Returned to England, Megantic, May 11.
Miss Jule Christy (saved).....	
Mrs. Ada Maria Clarke (saved).....	Returned to England, Celtic, Apr. 25.
Mr. Charles V. Clarke.....	Colaba - Grange Lane, Netley Abbey, England.
Mr. R. C. Coleridge.....	232 Strand, London, W. C.
Mr. Erik Collander.....	Finska, A. A.
Mr. Stewart Collett (saved).....	Care of M. E. Collett, Port Byron, N. Y.
Mrs. Charlotte Collyer (saved).....	Mount Hill, Dosingstoke, Hants, England, or Payette, Idaho.
Mr. Harvey Collyer.....	Do.
Miss Majorie Collyer (saved).....	Do.
Mrs. Irene C. Corbett.....	General Lying-In Hospital, York Road, London.
Mrs. P. C. Corey.....	
Mr. Harry Cotterill.....	26 Adelaide Street, Penzance, England, or care of Mrs. Richards, 457 Rhodes Avenue, Akron, Ohio.
Mr. Alf Cunningham.....	Care of Harland & Wolf, Belfast, Ireland.

Second-class berthing list—Continued.

Passenger's name.	Address.
Mrs. Agnes Davis (saved)	Mohawk, Mich.
Master John M. Davis (saved)	Do.
Miss M. Davis (saved)	29 Fleet Lane, New Gate, London.
Mr. Charles Davies	
Mr. William James Dawson	
Mr. Percy Deacon	
Mr. William Debaeu	
Miss Bertha Decit (saved)	
Mr. Herbert Denbury	
Mrs. Ada J. Dolling (saved)	Canute Road, Southampton, England; returned to England, Philadelphia, May 11.
Miss Elsie Dolling (saved)	
Baron von Drashslet (saved as first class)	
Mr. James V. Drew	
Mrs. James V. Drew (saved)	Constantine, Penryn, Cornwall, England.
Master Marshall (saved)	
Miss Asuncion Durand (saved)	Care of Monter, Barcelona, or Calle Zulinta, Habana, Cuba.
Miss Florentina Durand (saved)	
Mr. G. F. Eitemiller	Bonnington Hotel, Southampton Row, London, or 29 Web Avenue, Detroit.
Mr. Ingvar Enander	
Mr. Arne D. Fahlstrom	
Mr. Charles Fallbrook	16 Charles Street, Truro, Cornwall, England, or care of George Filbrook, P. O. Box 115, Houghton, Mich.
Mr. Harry Faunthorpe	
Mrs. Lizzie Faunthorpe (saved)	Care of John Devine, 669 Brooklyn Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mr. Stanley H. Fox	Sister is D. B. Fox, 1250 Astor Street, Chicago, Ill.
Mr. A. Frost	Care of Harland & Wolf, Belfast, Ireland.
Miss Annie Funk	Care of Thos. Cook & Son, London.
Mr. Jos. Fyuncy	
Mr. Henry Gale	
Mr. Shadrach Gale	
Miss Garside (saved)	
Mr. Alfred Gaskell	Care Mrs. Ellison, 522 Seventy-fifth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Mr. Galloence Gavey	
Master Wm. Rand S. George (saved)	
Mr. William Gilbert	
Mr. Edgar Giles	
Mr. Fred Giles	
Mr. Ralph Giles	
Mr. John Gill	
Mr. William Gillespie	
Mr. Hans L. Givard	
Miss H. Grak	
Mr. Samuel Greenberg	
Mr. Reginald Hale	Alliance Hotel, Southampton, Care of Alexander Wolf, 154 Nassau Street, New York City.
Mrs. Anna Hamalainen and infant (saved)	Care of Mrs. S. Hall, Rodney Hoke, near Cheddar, England.
Mr. Wm. Harbeck	
Mr. John Harper	
Miss Mina Harper (saved)	389 Clay Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
Mr. Harris	
Mr. George Harris (saved)	3 Claude Villa, Denmark Hill SE., England.
Mr. Benjamin Hart	3 Claude Villa, Denmark Hill SE.; returned Celtic Apr. 25.
Mrs. Esther Hart (saved)	47 Granvill Road, Hoe Street, Walthamston, England.
Miss Eva M. Hart (saved)	41 Claredon Street, Pimlico SW.
Mr. M. Hasono (saved)	Care of Bloomfield-Slemfold House, Whalebone Road.
Miss Alice Herman (saved)	Chadwell Heath, Essex, England; returned on Celtic Apr. 25.
Mrs. Jane Herman (saved)	Imperial Japanese Ry. Co., Tokyo, Japan.
Miss Kate Herman (saved)	Bernardsville, N. J.
Mr. Samuel Herman	Do.
Mrs. M. D. Hewlett (saved)	Do.
Mr. Leonard Hickman	Care of Mrs. Groves, 6 The Avenue, Brondesbury, England, or Rapid City S. Dak.
Mr. Lewis Hickman	
Mr. Stanley Hickman	
Miss Marsh Hiesunen	
Mrs. Eliza Hocking (saved)	26 St. Marys Street, Penzance, England, or care of Mrs. Emily Richards, 457 Rhodes Avenue, Akron, Ohio.
Miss Nellie Hocking (saved)	
Mr. George Hocking	26 St. Marys Street, Penzance, England, or 457 Rhodes Avenue, Akron, Ohio.
Mr. Faml. J. Hocking	3 Fore Street, Devonport, England.
Mr. Henry P. Hodges	
Masters Hoffman (saved)	Children, care of Miss Hays, 304 West Eighty-third Street.
Mr. Hoffman	Care of Thos. Cook & Son, Monte Carlo.
Mrs. Annie Hold (saved)	630 M Street, Sacramento, Cal.
Mr. Stephen Hold	
Mr. Ambrose Hood	
Mr. Benjamin Howard	
Mrs. Ellen T. Howard	
Mr. George Hunt	
Mr. S. S. Jacobsohn	85 Cheltenham Street, Swindon, England.
Mrs. S. S. Jacobsohn (saved)	The Gardens, Ashstead, Epsom.
Mr. J. D. Jarvis	7 Fembridge Square, London, and care F. Jones, 73 Apach Road, Josephine Avenue, Buxton.
Mr. Clifford Jefferys	
Mr. Ernest Jefferys	
Mrs. A. B. Jervan (saved)	Returned to England, Megantic, May 11.
Mr. Stephen Jonkin	The Crest, Stonegate, Leicester, England.

Second-class berthing list—Continued.

Passenger's name.	Address.
Mrs. Kantor (saved)	Care of Lieberman, 1314 Brook Avenue, Bronx, N. Y.
Mr. S. Kantor	
Mrs. J. F. Karnes	Care of Mrs. Lavelly, North Water Street, Kittanning, Pa.
Mr. Daniel Kenne	Father (?) of Nora Keane, who survived and went to Harrisburg, Pa.
Miss Nora A. Keane (saved)	Harrisburg, Pa.
Mrs. F. Kelly (saved)	31 Bedford Place, Russell Square, London, England, or 68 West Seventy-first Street New York City
Rev. Charles Leonard Kirkland	
Mr. R. Knight	Care of Harland & Wolf, Belfast, Ireland.
Mr. Wm. Lahlmen	
Mrs. Wm. Lahlmen	Brother is C. Albert Sylvan, Hancock, Mich.
Mr. J. J. Lamb	
Mrs. A. Lamore (saved)	Care of Linnix, 2235 Austin Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Mr. Joseph Laroche	131 Grand Rue, Villegnif.
Mrs. Joseph Laroche (saved)	Do.
Miss Louise Laroche (saved)	Do.
Miss Lemoine Laroche (saved)	Do.
Miss Bertha Lehman (saved)	Care of Jos. Lehman, 171 West 95th Street, 12 Rue Le Sneur, Paris.
Mr. Rene Leinot	3 Claude Villa, Denmark Hill SE.; returned Celtic, Apr. 25.
Miss Dessie Leisch (saved)	Grand Hotel, Paris.
Mr. R. J. Levy	171 Cromwell Road, South Kensington, London.
Mr. R. W. Leyson	
Mr. John Lingan	
Mrs. Alice A. Louch (saved)	Returned to England, Celtic, Apr. 25.
Mr. Charles Louch	Regent Street, Weston Super-Mare, England.
Mr. Arthur G. McCrae	Care Bank of Australasia, 4 Threadneedle Street, SE.
Mr. J. M. McCrie	Wife is 503 North Sixteenth Street, Sarnia, Ontario.
Mr. Peter D. McKane	
Mrs. Mary Mack	
Mr. A. Mallet	6 Rue Corumalle, Paris.
Mrs. A. Mallet (saved)	Returns to France.
Master Andre Mallet (saved)	
Mr. Noel Malachard	
Mr. Joseph Manevila	
Mr. Emilio Mangeavacche	21 The Oval, Hackney Road, N. E., England.
Dr. E. Maraweck	Thos. Cook & Son, London, or care of Miss Jennie Zuckerman, 1814 Clinton Avenue, Bronx, New York City.
Mr. Henry Marshall	Brother is A. H. Maraweck, care of Pacific Phone & Telegraph Co., San Francisco, Cal.
Mrs. Kate Marshall (saved)	
Mr. W. J. Matthews	7 New Street, Birmingham, England. Returned, Celtic, Apr. 25.
Mr. Frank H. Maybery	Fenwithick, St. Anstell, Cornwall, England.
Mr. Wm. Mellers (saved)	1 Whitcross Road, Weston Super-Mare, England.
Mrs. Elizabeth Mellenger and child (saved)	Richmond County Club, Dongan Hills, Long Island, N. Y.
Mr. August Meyer	Care of Mrs. C. C. Jones, Bennington, Vt.
Mr. Jacob E. Milling	26 St. Kindas Road, Harron Road, England.
Mr. Henry Mitchell	
Mr. Thos. C. Mudd	
Mr. T. F. Myles	
Mr. Nicolas Nasser	Care of Thos. Cook & Sons, London; 652 Bolivia Road, Cleveland, Ohio.
Mrs. Nicolas Nasser (saved)	
Mr. I. Nesson	
Mr. Joseph C. Nicholls	
Mr. Robt. D. Norman	
Mrs. Elizabeth Nye (saved)	A. E. G. Electric Co., 50 Wellington Street, Glasgow.
Mr. Oldworth	Salvation Army, London.
Mr. Richard Otter	Chanfleur to Mr. Carter, first-class passenger.
Mr. T. Oxenham (saved)	Care of Herbert Green, Southwell, Portland, Dorset.
Mr. Julian Paard (saved)	86 South Street, Ponders End, N., England.
D. A. Palm	Care of Montes, Barcelona, or Calle Zuleieta, Habana, Cuba.
Mr. Emilio Pallas (saved)	Do.
Mr. Clifford R. Parker	
Mr. Frank Parks	Care of Harland & Wolf, Belfast, Ireland.
Mrs. L. D. Parrish (saved)	85 Abingdon Road, Kensington, — W. or Deer Lodge, Mont.
Rev. P. Joseph M. Permachitz	Care of P. Jaricot, St. Augustine's College, Rainsgate, England.
Miss Alice Phillips (saved)	700 Thirteenth Street, New Brighton, Beaver County, Pa.
Mr. Robert Phillips	Father of Alice Phillips, who survived and went to 700 Thirteenth Street, New Brighton, Beaver County, Pa.
Miss Rosa Pinsky (saved)	
Mr. Martin Ponesil	
Mr. Emilio Portaluppi (saved)	
Mr. Frank Pulbaum	Millford, N. H.
Mrs. Jane Quick (saved)	Luna Park, Paris.
Miss Phyllis Quick (saved)	
Miss W. V. Quick (saved)	
Mr. David Reeves	
Miss Lillie Renouf (saved)	
Mr. Peter H. Y. Renouf	
Miss E. Reynolds (saved)	
Mr. Emile Richard	St. Dean d'Angeleys, Charente, France.

Second-class berthing list—Continued.

Passenger's name.	Address.
Mrs. Emily Richards (saved).....	26 St. Marys Street, Penzance, England, or care of Mrs. E. Richards, 457 Rhodes Avenue, Akron, Ohio.
Miss Lucy Ridsdale (saved).....	8 Quebec Street, Montague Square, London; or 1117— Street, Marietta, Ohio.
Mr. Harry Rogers.....	Uncle is Fred Adams, 49 Oxford Street, Lee Park, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
Miss Selma Rogers (saved).....	Care of Mrs. Bower, 4 East Eighty-ninth Street, New York City.
Miss Emily Rugg (saved).....	119 South Van Buren Street, Wilmington, Del.
Mr. C. F. W. Sedgwick.....	68 Amphill Road, Aiglecurith, Liverpool, England.
Miss Anna Senkkonen (saved).....	Brighton, Mass.
Mr. Percival Sharp.....	
Mrs. J. Shelley (saved).....	85 Abingdon Road, Kensington, — W. or Deer Lodge, Mont.
Miss Lyyli Silven (saved).....	Care of Calvert Sylvan, Hancock, Mich.
Miss Maude Simecock (saved).....	Hancock, Mich.
Mr. E. A. Sjostedt.....	Hjo, Sweden.
Miss H. M. Slayter (saved).....	Moon Island, near Vancouver, British Columbia.
Mr. Richard J. Slomen.....	Landrake-St. Germans, Cornwall, England.
Mr. A. Smith.....	11 Berwick Street, London.
Miss Marion Smith (saved).....	Care of Mrs. Kelly, 68 West Seventy-first Street, New York City.
Mr. Haydon Sobey.....	Port Hallow, near Helston, Cornwall, England. Intended going to Houghton, Mich.
Mr. S. Ward Stanton.....	Thos. Cook & Son, London and Paris.
Mr. Phillip J. Stokes.....	Uncle is Phillip O'Grady, Kewanee, Ill.
Mr. Johan Henrik Svillner.....	
Mr. George Swane.....	164 Abbey Road, London, N. W.
Mr. George Sweet.....	
Miss Ellen Toomey (saved).....	Care of Mrs. Bridget Hannery, 119 Bates Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
Mrs. Jessie Trent (saved).....	Care J. G. Grosman, 13 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio.
Mr. Moses Aaron Troupeansky.....	African Hotel, Southampton.
Miss E. C. Trout (saved).....	Auburndale, Mass.
Mrs. D. A. Turpin.....	Plymouth, England.
Mr. William J. Turpin.....	50 Chaddlewood Avenue.
Mr. James Veale.....	Care of B. Veale, Port Navis, Falmouth, England.
Mrs. F. L. Ware (saved).....	186 South Main Street, New Britain, Conn.
Mr. John J. Ware.....	Care of H. J. Long, 13 Salthrope Road, Moreley Square, Bishopston, Bristol, England.
Mr. William J. Ware.....	Do.
Miss Nellie Wateroff (saved).....	Mamaroneck, Conn. (?)
Mr. E. Watson.....	Care of Harland & Wolf, Belfast, Ireland.
Miss Bertha Watt (saved).....	Care of Mrs. Ballantyno, 2 Gorst Road, Wandsworth, England, thence to Portland, Oreg., care of W. Watt.
Mrs. Bessie Watt (saved).....	
Miss Susie Webber (saved).....	61 Heath Street, Hartford, Conn.
Mr. L. Weitz.....	Care of Bronsgrove Guild, Bronsgrove, Worcestershire, England, or care of Bronsgrove Guild, Bank of Toronto Building, Montreal.
Mrs. L. Weitz (saved).....	
Mrs. A. D. Wells (saved).....	270 Arch Street, Akron, Ohio.
Miss Joan Wells (saved).....	Do.
Master Ralph Wells (saved).....	Do.
Mr. E. A. West.....	Newborn-Truro, Cornwall, England.
Mrs. E. A. West (saved).....	
Miss E. M. West (saved).....	Returned to England per Celtic, Apr. 25.
Miss P. J. West (saved).....	
Mr. Edward W. Wheaton.....	
Mr. Edwin Wheeler.....	Mr. Vanderbilt's servant.
Mr. Wilhelms (saved).....	
Mr. C. Williams (saved).....	
Miss Marion Wright (saved).....	Cottage Grove, Oreg.

Particulars of the third-class passengers (steerage) who sailed on the steamship "Titanic," Apr. 10, 1912.

THIRD-CLASS PASSENGERS, ACCORDING TO SEX, WHO EMBARKED ON THE "TITANIC."

	Male.	Female.
Southampton.....	366	129
Cherbourg.....	67	38
Queenstown.....	53	57
Total.....	486	224
Total (male and female).....	710	
Saved.....	174	
Total lost.....	536	
Number women and children saved.....	105	
Number men saved.....	69	
Total.....	174	

List of third-class passengers, survivors from steamship "Titanic," reported by purser of steamship "Carpathia" April 18, 1912.

- |                        |                       |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Abbott, Rosa.       | 8. Abelseth, Koran.   |
| 2. Anderson, Etna.     | 9. Asplund, Selma.    |
| 3. Aks, Leah.          | 10. Asplund, Lillian. |
| 4. Aks, Filly.         | 11. Asplund, Felix.   |
| 5. Abrahamson, August. | 12. Assaf, Marlon.    |
| 6. Asplund, John.      | 13. Anderson, Carla.  |
| 7. Abelseth, Olaus.    | 14. Buckley, Daniel.  |

- |                                 |                                  |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 15. Bradley, Bridget.           | 95. Manion, Margaret.            |
| 16. Badman, Emily.              | 96. Murphy, Mary.                |
| 17. Blackstrom, Mary.           | 97. Murphy, Kate.                |
| 18. Bolos, Nourelain.           | 98. *Moor, Mier.                 |
| 19. Bakline, Latifa.            | 99. *Moor, Belle.                |
| 20. Rakline, Marie.             | 100. Muilvihill, Bertha.         |
| 21. Bakuline, Eugene.           | 101. McCoy, Bernard.             |
| 22. Bakline, Helene.            | 102. Mullen, Kate.               |
| 23. Banoura, Ayout.             | 103. Murphy, Norah.              |
| 24. Coutts, Winnie.             | 104. Midtsjo, Carl.              |
| 25. Coutts, William.            | 105. Moss, Albert.               |
| 26. Coutts, Leslie.             | 106. *Messenacker, Guillermo De. |
| 27. Carr, Ellen.                | 107. *Messenacker, Emma De.      |
| 28. Cohen, Gurshon.             | 108. Monbarck, Omine.            |
| 29. Cribb, Alice.               | 109. Monbarck, Genfos.           |
| 30. Conolly, Kate.              | 110. Monbarck, Hallim.           |
| 31. Dorkings, Edward.           | 111. McCormack, Thos.            |
| 32. Driscoll, Bridget.          | 112. McCoy, Agnes.               |
| 33. Daly, Eugene.               | 113. McCarthy, Kate.             |
| 34. Devany, Margaret.           | 114. McCoy, Alice.               |
| 35. Draplin, Jennie.            | 115. McGowan, Mary.              |
| 36. Dean, Ettie.                | 116. McGowan, Annie.             |
| 37. Dean, Bertram.              | 117. *Nelson, Bertha.            |
| 38. Dean, Gladys.               | 118. Nyster, Anna.               |
| 39. Davidson, Mary.             | 119. Nilson, Hemina.             |
| 40. Dahl, Chas.                 | 120. Nicola, Jamila.             |
| 41. Daly, Marcella.             | 121. Nicola, Elias.              |
| 42. Dowdell, Elizabeth.         | 122. Naked, Said.                |
| 43. Dyker, Elizabeth.           | 123. Naked, Maria.               |
| 44. Dugemin, Joseph.            | 124. Naked, Maria.               |
| 45. Emanuel, Ethel.             | 125. Niskanen, John.             |
| 46. Fat-ma, Mustmani.           | 126. O'Brien, Hanna.             |
| 47. Glynn, Mary.                | 127. O'Dwyer, Nellie.            |
| 48. Goldsmith, Emily.           | 128. O'Keefe, Pat.               |
| 49. Goldsmith, Frank.           | 129. O'Leary, Norah.             |
| 50. Gilnagh, Kate.              | 130. Olson, Arthur.              |
| 51. Hyman, Abraham.             | 131. Olman, Vilna.               |
| 52. Howard, Mary.               | 132. Osman, Mara.                |
| 53. Hakkarainen, Ellen.         | 133. Person, Ernest.             |
| 54. Herronen, Hilda.            | 134. Ryan, Edward.               |
| 55. Hanson, Jenny.              | 135. Riordan, Hannah.            |
| 56. Hadman, Oscar.              | 136. Roth, Sarah.                |
| 57. Hanna, Meme.                | 137. Schurlineh, Jean.           |
| 58. Hillstrom, Hilda.           | 138. Sop, Jules.                 |
| 59. Heikinen, Laina.            | 139. Shine, Ellen.               |
| 60. Hankonen, Elina.            | 140. Smyth, Julian.              |
| 61. Jermyn, Annie.              | 141. Stanley, Amy.               |
| 62. Johanson, Oscar.            | 142. Swenson, Cervin.            |
| 63. Joseph, Katherine (Peters). | 143. Sandman, John.              |
| 64. Joseph, Mary.               | 144. Sjoblom, Anny.              |
| 65. Jensen, Carl.               | 145. Sandstrom, Agnes.           |
| 66. Johanson, Berendt.          | 146. Sandstrom, Margaret.        |
| 67. Johanson, Oscar L.          | 147. Sandstrom, Beatrice.        |
| 68. Johnson, Alice.             | 148. Saljilsvik, Anna.           |
| 69. Johnson, Eleonora.          | 149. Stranden, Jules.            |
| 70. Johnson, Harold.            | 150. Thomas, Tamin.              |
| 71. Janson, Carl.               | 151. Thomas, Assad.              |
| 72. Jussila, Eric.              | 152. Tonglin, Gunner.            |
| 73. Kassen, Nassef.             | 153. Thornycroft, Florence.      |
| 74. Kelly, Annie.               | 154. *Trombisky, Buk.            |
| 75. Kelly, Mary.                | 155. *Turnquist, Wm. H.          |
| 76. Krikorian, Nichan.          | 156. Turgo, Ann.                 |
| 77. Kennedy, John.              | 157. Turkula, Hedvig.            |
| 78. Kink, Anton.                | 158. *Vagil, Adelle Jane.        |
| 79. Kink, Louisa.               | 159. Wannerstrom, August.        |
| 80. Kink, Louisa.               | 160. Wilkes, Ellen.              |
| 81. Karum, Franz.               | 161. Yasbeck, Sallal.            |
| 82. Karum, Anna.                | 162. Youssef, Brahmin.           |
| 83. Karlson, Elmar.             | 163. Youssef, Hanne.             |
| 84. Lundin, Olga.               | 164. Youssef, Marian.            |
| 85. Lundstrom, John.            | 165. Youssef, Georges.           |
| 86. Landergren, Laura.          | 166. Vartanian, David.           |
| 87. *Lindquist, Elnor.          | 167. Zuni, Fabin.                |
| 88. Lulle, Nicola.              | 168. *Luigi, Finoli.             |
| 89. Madsen, Fridjof.            | 169. Ab Lam.                     |
| 90. *Mulder, Theodore, De.      | 170. Bing Lee.                   |
| 91. Moran, Bertha.              | 171. Fang Lang.                  |
| 92. Madigan, Maggie.            | 172. Hee Lang.                   |
| 93. Mocklare, Ellen.            | 173. Chip Chang.                 |
| 94. McDermott, Delia.           | 174. Foo Chiang.                 |

Total saved, 174; women and children, 105; men, 69.

List of third-class passengers (other than foreign) embarked at Southampton, steamship "Titanic," sailed April 10.

[Those marked with an asterisk (\*) were saved.]

- Abbott, Eugene; \*Abbott, Rosa; Abbott, Rossmore; going to Providence, R. I.  
 Abbing, Anthony.  
 Adams, J.  
 \*Aks, Filly; Aks, Leah; care of Carrie Greene, 131 College Place, Norfolk, Va.  
 Alexander, William (to Albion, N. Y.).  
 Allen, William.  
 Allum, Owen G.; to New York City (father).  
 \*Badman, Emily; going to Skaneateles, N. Y.  
 Barton, David.  
 Beavan, W. T.  
 Billiard, A. van.  
 Billiard, James (child).  
 Billiard, Walter (child).  
 \*Bing, Lee.  
 Bowen, David.  
 Braund, Lewis; going to Saskatoon, Canada.  
 Braund, Owen; going to Saskatoon, Canada.  
 Brocklebank, William.  
 Cann, Ernest.  
 Carver, A.  
 Celotti, Francesco.  
 \*Chip, Chang; joining steamship Anetta, Donald Steamship Co.  
 Christmann, Emil.  
 \*Cohen, Gurshon; going to an uncle in Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Cook, Jacob.  
 Corn, Harry.

\* Coutts, Winnie; \* Coutts, William (child); \* Coutts, Leslie (child); going to husband and father in New York.  
 Coxon, Daniel.  
 Crease, Ernest J.; going to Cleveland, Ohio.  
 Cribb, John.  
 \* Cribb, Alice.  
 \* Dahl, Charles; going to Fingal, N. Dak.  
 Davies, Evan.  
 Davies, Alfred.  
 Davies, John.  
 Davis, Joseph.  
 Davison, Thomas.  
 \* Davison, Mary; going to H. J. Finck, Bedford, Ohio.  
 \* Dean, Bertram; \* Dean, Hetty; Dean, Bertram (child); \* Dean, Vera (infant); going to Hume, Mo., but returned steamship *Adriatic*, May 2.  
 Dennis, Samuel.  
 Dennis, William.  
 \* Dorkings, Edward; going to Oglesby, Ill.  
 \* Dowdell, Elizabeth; going to Union Hill, N. J.  
 \* Drapkin, Jenie.  
 \* Dugemin, Joseph; going to Albion, N. Y.  
 Elsbury, James.  
 Emanuel, Ethel (child); going to grandparents in New York City.  
 Everett, Thomas.  
 \* Foo, Cheong.  
 Ford, Arthur.  
 Ford, Margaret.  
 Ford, Miss D. M.  
 Ford, Mr. E.  
 Ford, M. W. Y. N.  
 Ford, Maggie (child).  
 Franklin, Charles.  
 Garrth, John.  
 Gillinski, Leslie.  
 \* Goldsmith, Frank J.; \* Goldsmith, Emily A.; Goldsmith, Frank J. W.; going to Mrs. Goldsmith's father, Henry Brown, 115 Butternut Street, Detroit, Mich.  
 Goodwin, Frederick.  
 Goodwin, Augusta.  
 Goodwin, Lillian.  
 Goodwin, Charles.  
 Goodwin, William (child).  
 Goodwin, Jessie (child).  
 Goodwin, Harold (child).  
 Goodwin, Sidney (child).  
 Green, George.  
 Guest, Robert.  
 Harknett, Alice.  
 Harmer, Abraham.  
 Hee, Ling.  
 \* Howard, May; going to Jane Hewitt, 1032 Florence Avenue, Albion, N. Y.  
 \* Hyman, Abraham; going to Springfield, Mass.  
 Johnston, C. (child).  
 Johnston, E.  
 Johnston, Mrs.  
 Johnston, William (child).  
 Johnstone, A.  
 Johnstone, W.  
 Keefe, Arthur.  
 Kelly, James.  
 \* Lam, Ah; joining steamship *Anetta*, of Donald Steamship Co.  
 Lam, Len; joining steamship *Anetta*, of Donald Steamship Co.  
 \* Lang, Fang; joining steamship *Anetta*, of Donald Steamship Co.  
 Leonard, L.  
 Lester, James.  
 \* Ling, Lee; joining steamship *Anetta*, of Donald Steamship Co.  
 Lithman, Simon.  
 Lobb, Cordella.  
 Lobb, William.  
 Lockyer, Edward; going to Ontario, N. Y.  
 Lovell, John.  
 MacKay, George.  
 Malsner, Simon.  
 McNamee, Ellen.  
 McNamee, Neal.  
 Meanwell, Marian.  
 Meek, Annie.  
 Meo, Alfonso.  
 Miles, Frank.  
 \* Moor, Belle.  
 \* Moor, Meier.  
 Moore, Leonard.  
 Morley, William.  
 Moutal, Rahamin.  
 Murdin, Joseph.  
 Nancarrow, William.  
 Niklasen, Sander.  
 Nosworthy, Richard.  
 Peacock, Alfred (infant).  
 Peacock, Treasteall.  
 Peacock, Treasteall (child).  
 Pearce, Ernest.  
 Peauzzi, Joseph.  
 Perkin, John.  
 Peterson, Marins.  
 Potchett, George.  
 \* Rath, Sarah; going to New York City.  
 Reed, James.  
 Reynolds, Harold.  
 Risien, Emma.  
 Risien, Samuel.  
 Robins, Alexander.  
 Robins, Charity.  
 Rogers, William.  
 Rouse, Richard H.  
 Rush, Alfred.  
 Sadowitz, Harry; going to Providence, R. I.  
 Sage, John.  
 Sage, Annie.  
 Sage, Stella.  
 Sage, George.  
 Sage, Douglas.  
 Sage, Frederick.

Sage, Dorothy.  
 Sage, William (child).  
 Sage, Ada (child).  
 Sage, Constance (child).  
 Sage, Thomas (child).  
 Sather, Simon.  
 Saunderson, W. H.  
 Sawyer, Frederick.  
 Serata, Maurice.  
 Shellard, Frederick.  
 Shorney, Charles.  
 Simmons, John.  
 Slocovski, Selman.  
 Somerton, F. W.  
 Spector, Woolf.  
 Spinner, Henry.  
 \* Stanley, Amy; going to Grace French, 310 Prospect Street, New Haven, Conn.  
 Stanley, E. R.  
 Storey, T.  
 Sutehall, Henry.  
 Theobald, Thomas.  
 Thomson, Alex.  
 \* Thorneycroft, Florence; going to Clinton, N. Y.  
 Thorneycroft, Percival; going to Clinton, N. Y.  
 Tomlin, Ernest.  
 Torber, Ernest.  
 \* Trembisky, Berk.  
 \* Tunquist, W.  
 Ware, Frederick.  
 Warren, Charles.  
 Webber, James.  
 \* Wilkes, Ellen; going to son in Akron, Ohio.  
 Willey, Edward.  
 Williams, Harry.  
 Williams, Leslie.  
 Windelov, Einar.  
 Wiseman, Philip.

List of third-class Scandinavian and continental passengers embarked at Southampton, steamship "Titanic," sailed April 10.

\* Abelseth, Karen; going to Los Angeles, Cal.  
 \* Abelseth, Olaf; going to Minneapolis, Minn.  
 \* Abrahamson, August.  
 Adolf, Humblin.  
 Ahlin, Johanna; going to Chicago, Ill.  
 Ahmed, Ali.  
 Alhomaki, Iimari.  
 All, William.  
 Anderson, Alfreda.  
 \* Anderson, Erna.  
 Anderson, Albert.  
 Anderson, Anders.  
 Anderson, Samuel.  
 Anderson, Sigrid (child).  
 Anderson, Thor.  
 \* Anderson, Carla; returned on steamship *Adriatic*, second class.  
 Anderson, Ingeborg (child).  
 Anderson, Ebba (child).  
 Anderson, Sigvard (child).  
 Anderson, Ellis.  
 Andersson, Ida.  
 Andreason, Paul.  
 Angheloff, Minko.  
 Apslund, Carl (child); Apslund, Charles; \*Apslund, Feix (child); Apslund, Gustaf (child); \*Apslund, Lillian (child); Apslund, Oscar (child); and \*Apslund, Selma; going to Worcester, Mass.  
 Arnold, Josef.  
 Arnold, Josephine.  
 Aronson, Ernest.  
 Asim, Adola.  
 \*Apslund, Johan; going to friend, Mrs. A. Engstrom, 212 Fifty-third Street, Brooklyn.  
 Assam, All.  
 Augustsan, Albert.  
 Backstrom, Karl.  
 \*Backstrom, Marie; going back to Finland.  
 Balkic, Cerin.  
 Benson, John.  
 Berglund, Ivar.  
 Berklund, Hans.  
 Bjorkland, Ernst.  
 Bostandyeff, Guentcho.  
 Braff, Elin.  
 Brobek, Carl.  
 Cacic, Gego.  
 Cacic, Luka.  
 Cacic, Maria.  
 Calic, Manda.  
 Calic, Peter.  
 Carlson, Carl.  
 Carlson, Julius.  
 Carlsson, August.  
 Coelho, Domingo.  
 Coleff, Peyo.  
 Coleff, Sotio.  
 Cor, Bartol.  
 Cor, Ivan.  
 Cor, Ludvik.  
 Dahl, Mauritz.  
 Dahlberg, Gerda; going to Chicago, Ill.  
 Dakic, Branko.  
 Danbom, Ernest.  
 Danbom, Gilbert (infant).  
 Danbom, Sigrid.  
 Danoff, Yoto.  
 Dantchoff, Christo.  
 Delalic, Regzo.  
 \*De Messemacker, Emma; going to Tampico, Mont.  
 \*De Messemacker, Guillaume; going to Tampico, Mont.  
 \*De Mulder, Theo.; going to E. De Clerck, 33 Lessine Street, Detroit.  
 Denkoff, Mitto.  
 Dimic, Jovan.

Dintcheff, Valtcho.  
 Dyker, Adolf; 468 Washington, West Haven, Conn.  
 \*Dyker, Elizabeth; going to mother and father, West Haven, Conn.  
 Eclmovic, Joso.  
 Edwardson, Gustaf.  
 Eklung, Hans; going to Bern, Eklund, Jerome Junction, Ariz., care of J. Bergren.  
 Ekstrom, Johan.  
 \*Finoli, Luigi; going to 707 Catherine Street, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Fischer, Eberhard.  
 Goldsmith, Nathan.  
 Goncalves, Manoel.  
 Gronnestad, Daniel; going to Regina, Saskatchewan.  
 Gustafsen, Gideon.  
 Gustafson, Alfred; to Nielsen & Lundbeck, New York.  
 Gustafson, Anders.  
 Gustafson, Johan.  
 Haas, Alaisia.  
 \*Hadman, Oscar; going to 414 West First Street, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.  
 Hagland, Ingvald; going to New York, N. Y.  
 Hagland, Konrad; going to New York, N. Y.  
 Hakkurainen, Pekka.  
 \*Hakkurainen, Elin; going to Monessen, Pa.  
 \*Hankonen, Eluna; going to Indianapolis, Ind.  
 Hansen, Claus.  
 \*Hansen, Jenny; going to sister in Racine, Wis.  
 Hansen, Henry.  
 Heininen, Wendla.  
 Hendekovic, Ignaz.  
 Henriksson, Jenny; going to Iron Mountain, Mich. (Olaus Ras).  
 Hervonen, Helga; going to Monessen, Pa.  
 \*Hervonen, Hildwe (child); going to Monessen, Pa.  
 \*Hiekkinen, Laina; going to Monessen, Pa.  
 \*Hillstrom, Hilda; going to Evanston, Ill.  
 Holm, John.  
 Holten, Johan.  
 Hieff, Ylio.  
 Imakangas, Ida.  
 Imakangas, Pista.  
 Ivanoff, Kanio.  
 \*Jansen, Carl.  
 \*Janson, Carl; going to Sioux Falls, S. Dak. (414 West First Street).  
 Jardin, Jose.  
 Jensen, Hans, Svenst, and Niels.  
 \*Johannessen, Bernst; going to brother in Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Johannessen, Elias.  
 Johansen, Nils.  
 \*Johanson, Oscar; going to 65 Poplar Street, New Haven, Conn.  
 \*Johanson, Oscar; going to Detroit, Mich.  
 Johansson, Erik.  
 Johansson, Gustav; going to Eddy, N. Dak.  
 Johnson, Jakob.  
 \*Johnson, Ellis; \*Johnson, Harold; \*Johnson, Eleanora (infant); going to husband in St. Charles, Ill.  
 Johnson, Carl; going to Swedeburg, Nebr.  
 Johnson, Malkoim; going to 814 Seventh Street, Minneapolis, Minn.  
 Jonkoff, Lazar.  
 Jonsson, Nils.  
 Jussila, Katrina.  
 Jussila, Marl.  
 \*Jussila, Erik; going to Monessen, Pa.  
 Jutel, Henry.  
 Kallio, Nikolai.  
 Kalvig, Johannes; going to Roland, Iowa.  
 Karajic, Milan.  
 \*Karlson, Einar; going to 447 Bergen Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Karlson, Nils.  
 Kekic, Tido.  
 \*Kink, Anton; \*Kink, Louise; \*Kink, Louise (child); going to uncle in Milwaukee, Wis.  
 Kink, Maria.  
 Kink, Vincenz.  
 Klasson, Klas.  
 Klasson, Hilda (child).  
 Klasson, Gertrud (child).  
 Laitinen, Sofia; going to New York City.  
 Laleff, Kristo.  
 \*Landgren, Aurora; going to New York City.  
 Larson, Viktor; going to New York City.  
 Larsson, Bengt; going to 70 Smith Street, Hartford, Conn.  
 Lason, Edward; going to 70 Smith Street, Hartford, Conn.  
 Lefebre, Frances; Lefebre, Henry (child); Lefebre, Ida (child); Lefebre, Jeanne (child); Lefebre, Mathilde (child); going to Mystic, Iowa.  
 Leionnen, Antti.  
 Lindabloom, August; to Nichols Avenue, route No. 13, Starford, Conn.  
 Lindell, Edvard.  
 Lindell, Elin.  
 Lindhal, Agda; to mother, 20 Woodruff Street, Saranac Lake, N. Y.  
 \*Lindqvist, Vino; going to Monessen, Pa.  
 \*Lulle, Nicola; going to Chicago, Ill.  
 Lundall, John.  
 \*Lundin, Olga; going to sister in New York.  
 Lundstrom, Edwin; going to brother in Chicago, Ill.  
 Lyntakoff, Stanko.  
 \*Madsen, Fridjof; going to Brooklyn to join a ship.  
 Maenpaa, Matti.  
 Makinen, Kalle.  
 Mampe, Leon.  
 Marinko, Dimitri.  
 Markoff, Marin.  
 Melkebnk, Philemon.  
 \*Midsjo, Carl; going to Chicago, Ill.  
 Mikanen, John.  
 Milsson, Berta.  
 Mineff, Ivan.  
 Minkoff, Lazar.  
 Mirko, Dika.  
 Mitkoff, Mitto.  
 Moen, Sigurd.  
 \*Moss, Albert; going to Philadelphia to join steamer.  
 Myhrman, Oliver.  
 \*Nyster, Anna; going to cousin in New York City.  
 Naldenoff, Penko.  
 Nandewalle, Nestor.

Nankoff, Minko.  
 Nedello, Petroff.  
 Nenkov, Christo.  
 Nieminen, Martt.  
 Nilsen, August.  
 \*Nilson, Helmina; going to Joliet, Ill., care of Edward Sander.  
 Nirva, Isak.  
 \*Nyskanen, John; going to Graniteville, Vt.  
 Nyoven, Johan.  
 \*Nelson, Bertha; going to Missoula, Mont., 533 East Trent Street.  
 Odahl, Martin; going to Peoria, Ill.  
 \*Olman, Velin; going to Chicago, Ill.  
 \*Olsen, Arthur; going to stepmother in Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Olsen, Carl.  
 Olsen, Henry.  
 Olsen, Ole; going to Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan.  
 Olson, Elen; going to Mitchell, S. Dak.  
 Olson, John.  
 Olson, Elida.  
 Oreskovic, Luka.  
 Oreskovic, Maria.  
 Oreskovic, Teko.  
 \*Osman, Mara; going to Steelton, Pa.  
 Pacruc, Mate.  
 Pacruc, Tama.  
 Panula, Elna.  
 Panula, Erneste.  
 Panula, Juha.  
 Panula, Maria.  
 Panula, Sanni.  
 Panula, Urhu (child).  
 Panula, William (infant).  
 Pasic, Jakob.  
 Pastcho, Petroff.  
 Paulsson, Alma; Paulsson, Gosta (child); Paulsson, Paul (child); Paulsson, Stina (child); Paulsson, Torberg (child); going to husband, Nils Paulsson, 159 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.  
 Pavlovic, Stefo.  
 Pekonemi, E.  
 Pelasmaker, Alfons de.  
 Peltomaki, Miholai.  
 \*Person, Ernest; going to 3546 La Salle Avenue, Chicago, Ill.  
 Peterson, Ellen; going to Claus Ras, 805 East Second Street, Iron Mountain, Mich.  
 Peterson, John.  
 Petersen, Olaf.  
 Petranec, Matilda.  
 Planke, Augusta Vander.  
 Planke, Emilie Vander.  
 Planke, Jules Vander.  
 Planke, Leon Vander.  
 Plotcharsky, Vasil.  
 Randeff, Alexandre.  
 Rintamaki, Matti.  
 Rosblon, Helen.  
 Rosblon, Sally (child).  
 Rosblon, Viktor.  
 Runnestvet, Kristian.  
 \*Salander, Carl; going to Red Wing, Minn.  
 Saljilsvik, Anna; going to Proctor, Minn.  
 Salonen, Werner.  
 \*Sandstrom, Agnes; \*Sandstrom, Beatrice (child); \*Sandstrom, Margretha (child); going to husband and father in San Francisco.  
 Sydcoff, Todor.  
 \*Sheerlinck, Jean; going to E. De Clerck, 33 Lessine Street, Detroit.  
 Sihvola, Antti.  
 Sivic, Hensen.  
 \*Sjblon, Anna; to father, care of Gab. Gustafson, Olympia, Wash.  
 Skoog, Anna; Skoog, Carl (child); Skoog, Harold (child); Skoog, Mabel (child); Skoog, Margret (child); Skoog, William; going to uncle, Olaus Ras, 802 East Second Street, Iron Mountain, Mich.  
 Slabenoff, Petco.  
 Smiljanic, Mlle.  
 Soholp, Peter.  
 Solvang, Lena; going to Centerville, S. Dak.  
 \*Sop, Jules; going to E. De Clerck, 33 Lessine Street, Detroit, Mich.  
 Stanef, Ivan.  
 Stoytcho, Mikoff.  
 Stoytchoff, Ila.  
 Strandberg, Ida; going to New York, N. Y. (Finnish Steamship Co. agency).  
 \*Stranden, Jako; going to Graniteville, Vt.  
 Strille, Ivan.  
 Strom, Elma; Strom, Selma (child); 3905 Grapevine Street, Indiana Harbor, Ind.  
 Sundman, John; going to Cheyenne, Wyo.  
 Svensson, John.  
 \*Swensson, Servin; going to Alcester (Beresford), S. Dak.  
 Tikkanen, Juho.  
 Todoroff, Lallo.  
 \*Tonglin, Gunner; going to Erick Morberg, 502 South Marshall, Burlington, Iowa.  
 Turcin, Stefan.  
 \*Turgo, Anna; going to Ashtabula, Ohio.  
 \*Turkula, Hedwig; going to Hibbing, Minn.  
 Uzelas, Joso.  
 \*Vaclens, Adulle.  
 Van Impe, Catharine (child).  
 Van Impe, Jacob.  
 Van Impe, Rosalie.  
 Vande Velde, Joseph.  
 Vereruyse, Victor.  
 Vook, Janko.  
 Wendal, Olof.  
 \*Wennerstrom, August; going to 7041 Center Avenue, Chicago, Ill.  
 Wenzel, Zinbart.  
 Westrom, Holda.  
 Widegrin, Charles.  
 Wiklund, Carl.  
 Wiklund, Jacob.  
 Wirz, Albert.  
 Wittenrougee, Camille.  
 Zievens, René.  
 Zimmermann, Leo.

*List of third-class passengers embarked at Cherbourg, steamship "Titanic," sailed April 10.*

Abl, Weller; going to wife, 1330 South Halstead Street, Chicago, Ill.  
 \*Assof, Marlan; going to Ottawa, Ontario.  
 Attala, Malaka.  
 Babara, Catherine.  
 Babara, Salide.  
 \*Bachini, Latifa; \*Bachini, Marie; \*Bachini, Eugene; \*Bachini, Helene; going to father in New York City.  
 Badt, Mohamed.  
 \*Banoura, Ayont; going to Youngstown, Ohio.  
 Bexros, Tannons.  
 Bontos, Hanna.  
 Boulos, Sultani.  
 \*Boulos, Menthora; going to Troy, N. Y.  
 Boulos, Akar.  
 Canons, Elias.  
 Caram, Joseph.  
 Caram, Maria.  
 Cassim, Nassef; going to Fredericksburg, Va.  
 Chanini, Georges.  
 Chemat, Emir, Farres.  
 Chronopoulos, Apostolis.  
 Chronopoulos, Demetris.  
 Dibo, Elias.  
 Drazenovic, Josef.  
 Elias, Joseph.  
 Elias, Joseph.  
 Forfa, Assad.  
 Gerios, Assaf.  
 Gerios, Joussef.  
 Gerios, Youssef.  
 Gheorghieff, Stanio.  
 Hanna, Mansour.  
 \*Hanna, Meme.  
 Jean Nassr, Saade.  
 Johann, Markin.  
 \*Joseph, Mary.  
 Jusef, Shanine; going to Youngstown, Ohio.  
 \*Karun, Franz.  
 Karun, Anna (child).  
 \*Kassen, Housseing.  
 Kassein, Fared.  
 Khalil, Betros.  
 Khalil, Lahie.  
 Kraeff, Theodor.  
 \*Krikorean, Nichean; going to Yarmouth, Nova Scotia.  
 Lemberopoulos, Peter.  
 Mallinoff, Nicola.  
 Monbarek, Assi; going to Port Huron, Mich.  
 \*Moncarek, Hanna; \*Moncarek, Genios (child); \*Moncarek, Halim (child); going to Wilkes-Barre, Pa.  
 Mousa, Mantoura.  
 Mouselman, Fatima; going to Michigan City, Ind.  
 \*Naked, Said; \*Naked, Walka; \*Naked, Maria; going to Waterbury, Conn.  
 Nnsr, Mustafa.  
 \*Nicola, Jamila; \*Nicola, Elias (child); going to friends in New York.  
 Norel, Mansouer.  
 Odeic, Najib, Jenc.  
 Orsen, Sirayaman.  
 Ortin, Lakarian.  
 \*Peter, Catherine Joseph.  
 Peter, Mikl.  
 Peter, Anna.  
 Raibed, Razi.  
 Roufoul, Baccos.  
 Saad, Amin.  
 Saad, Khalil.  
 Samaan, Hanna.  
 Samaan, Elias.  
 Samaan, Joussef.  
 Sarkis, Margfresian.  
 Sarkis, Lahond.  
 Seman, Betros.  
 Shedid, Daher.  
 Stelman, Attalla.  
 Stankovic, Jovan.  
 Tannans, Daper.  
 Tannons, Thomas.  
 Thomas, Charles.  
 \*Thomas, Tamin; \*Thomas, Assad (infant); going to Yarmouth, Nova Scotia.  
 Thomas, John.  
 Tonik, Nakle.  
 Usher, Baulmer.  
 \*Vartanian, David; going to Brantford, Ontario.  
 Vassillos, Catavelas.  
 Yousif Weaper (Shanine).  
 Yalsevac, Ivan.  
 Yazbeck, Antoni.  
 \*Yazbeck, Salini; going to Wilkes-Barre, Pa.  
 \*Youssef, Brahim.  
 \*Youssef, Hanne.  
 \*Youssef, Marian (child).  
 \*Youssef, Georges (child).  
 Zabour, Tamini.  
 Zabour, Hillen.  
 Zakarian, Mapri der.  
 \*Zenni, Filip; going to Cincinnati, Ohio.

*List of third-class passengers embarked at Queenstown, steamship "Titanic," sailed April 11.*

Barry, Julia.  
 \*Bradley, Bridget.  
 \*Buckley, Daniel; going to friends in New York City.  
 Bourke, John; Bourke, Cath.; going to Ellen Hugh, 66 Ruby Street, Chicago, Ill.  
 Buckley, Kath.; going to Marg. Buckley, 71 Mount View Street, Roxbury, Mass.  
 Burke, Jeremiah; going to Mrs. Burns, 41 Washington Street, Charlestown, Mass.

Burke, Mary; going to Ellen Hugh, 66 Ruby Street, Chicago, Ill.  
 Burns, Mary.  
 Canavan, Mary.  
 Canavan, Pat; to sister, K. Canavan, 1512 Diamond Street, Philadelphia.  
 \*Car, Ellen; going to Honer Carr, 38 East Seventy-fifth Street, New York.  
 Car, Jeannie; to P. Mullarkey, 7 Hamilton Street, Hartford, Conn.  
 Chartens, David; going to David Vance, 310 West One hundred and eighth Street, New York.  
 Colbert, Patrick; going to Rev. Brother Christopher, Sherbrooke, Quebec.  
 Conolly, Kate; going to J. Bunbury, Dobbs Ferry.  
 Conlin, Thomas H.; going to Rosa Conlin, 2238 Fairhill Street, Philadelphia.  
 Connaghton, Michel; going to Mrs. Horan, 905 De Kalb Avenue, Brooklyn.  
 \*Conolly, Kate.  
 Connors, Pat.  
 \*Daly, Marcella; going to friends at 356 East One hundred and fifty-seventh Street, New York City.  
 \*Daly, Eugene; going to E. G. Schuktze, 477 Avenue E, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 \*Devaney, Margareth; going to brother in New York.  
 Dewan, Frank.  
 Dooley, Patrick; going to B. Dooley, 142 East Thirty-first Street, New York.  
 Doyle, Elin; to Bridget Fox, 123 West Eightieth Street, New York.  
 \*Driscoll, Bridget; going to cousins in New York.  
 Emmeth, Thomas.  
 Farrell, James.  
 Foley, Joseph.  
 Foley, William; going to brother, Jer. Foley, 252 West One hundred and fifteenth Street, New York.  
 Flynn, James; going to his brother, Ant. Flynn, 236 East Fifty-third Street, New York.  
 Flynn, John; going to 3434 Frazier Street, Oakland, Pittsburgh, Pa.  
 Fox, Patrick; going to brother Fox, 123 West Eightieth Street, New York.  
 Gallager, Martin; going to 296 East One hundred and forty-third Street, New York.  
 \*Ginnagh, Katie.  
 \*Glynn, Mary; going to Washington, D. C.  
 Hagardon, Kate; to sister, M. Hagardon, 133 West One hundred and twenty-sixth Street, New York.  
 Hagarty, Nora; to Mrs. Burns, 41 Washington Street, Charlestown, Mass.  
 Hart, Henry; going to John Hart, box 307, Marion, Mass.  
 Healy, Nora; going to friends in New York.  
 Horgan, John.  
 Hemming, Norah.  
 Henery, Della.  
 \*Jermyn, Annie; going to sister in Boston, Mass.  
 Kelly, James.  
 \*Kelly, Annie K.; going to Chicago, Ill.  
 \*Kelly, Mary; going to friends in New York.  
 Keane, Andy; going to John Keane, 102 Melrose Street, Auburndale, Mass.  
 \*Kennedy, John; going to 20 Perry Street, New York, N. Y.  
 Kilgannon, Thomas; going to 449 West Fifty-ninth Street, New York.  
 Kiernan, John.  
 Kiernan, Philip.  
 Lane, Patrick; going to O'Mahony, Hotel Webster, West Forty-fifth Street, New York.  
 Lemon, Denls.  
 Lemou, Mary.  
 Linehan, Michel.  
 \*Madigan, Maggie; going to friends in New York.  
 \*Mannion, Margareth; going to sister in New York.  
 Mangan, Mary; to brother, Ed. Mangan, 1848 Lincoln Avenue, Chicago.  
 \*McCarthy, Katie; going to Mrs. P. J. Murray, 231 East Fiftieth Street, New York.  
 \*McCoy, Agnes; \*McCoy, Alice; \*McCoy, Bernard; going to 207 St. Marks Avenue, Brooklyn.  
 \*McCormack, Thomas; going to friends in New York.  
 \*McDermott, Della; going to St. Louis, Mo.  
 McElroy, Michel.  
 \*McGovern, Mary; going to friends in New York.  
 McGowan, Kath.; to 3241 North Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Ill.  
 \*McGowan, Annie; going to aunt in Chicago, Ill.  
 McMahon, D.  
 McMahon, Martin; going to 415 West Fifty-third Street, New York.  
 Meehan, John; to Nora Meehan, 4745 Indiana Avenue, Chicago, Ill.  
 Mernagh, Robert; going to M. Mernagh, West Street, Chicago, Ill.  
 \*Mocklare, Ellie; going to friends in New York City.  
 Moran, James.  
 \*Moran, Bertha; going to 1226 Shakespeare Avenue, New York, N. Y.  
 Morgan, Daniel J.; going to 22 Dow Street, Troy, N. Y.  
 Morrow, Thomas; to brother, Waddell Morrow, Gleichen, Alberta, Canada.  
 \*Mullen, Katie; going to Mrs. P. J. Murray, 231 East Fiftieth Street, New York.  
 \*Mulvihill, Bertha; going to sister in Providence, R. I.  
 \*Murphy, Norah; going to Mrs. P. J. Murray, 231 East Fiftieth Street, New York.  
 \*Murphy, Mary; going to 2238 Fairhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 \*Murphy, Kate; going to 2238 Fairhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Naughton, Hannah; going to P. Naughton, 433 West Thirty-third Street, New York.  
 O'Brien, Denls.  
 O'Brien, Thomas; going to Mrs. W. Hunt, 638 Sherman Place, Chicago, Ill.  
 \*O'Brien, Hannah; going to friend in Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 O'Connor, Maurice; to Michael O'Connor, 539 East Seventy-second Street, New York, N. Y.  
 O'Connell, Pat D.  
 O'Connor, Pat.  
 O'Donoghue, Bert.  
 O'Dwyer, Nellie; going to cousin in New York City.  
 \*O'Keefe, Pat; going to J. Phelan, 416 West Thirty-eighth Street.  
 \*O'Leary, Norah.

O'Neill, Bridget.  
 O'Sullivan, Bridget.  
 Peters, Katie; supposed to go to Mrs. Egan, 243 East Forty-fifth Street, New York.  
 Rice, Margaret; Rice, Albert (child); Rice, George (child); Rice, Eric (child); Rice, Arthur (child); Rice, Eugene (child); going to Spokane, Wash., care of Mrs. T. Coleman, East 1922 Columbia Avenue.  
 \*Riordan, Hannah; going to friends in New York.  
 Ryan, Patrick; going to 1503 Hoe Avenue, Bronx, N. Y.  
 \*Ryan, Edward; going to sister in Troy, N. Y.  
 Sadtler, Matt; going to Thomas Sadtler, R. F. D. 3, Lakewood, N. J.  
 Scanlan, James; going to Kate Scanlon, The Plaza, New York.  
 Shaughnessy, Pat; going to sister, 1509 Lexington Avenue, New York.  
 \*Shine, Ellen; going to brother in New York.  
 \*Smyth, Julia; going to friends in New York.  
 Tobin, Roger; to Mrs. Egan, 243 East Forty-fifth Street, New York.

Mr. NELSON. I make the request that the testimony taken by the committee be printed as a Senate document. (S. Doc. No. 726.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, an order therefor will be entered.

The order as agreed to was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That the testimony of witnesses taken in the hearings of the Titanic disaster inquiry be printed as a Senate document.

#### THE METAL SCHEDULE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18642) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenues, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909.

Mr. BORAH. Is the unfinished business now before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is now before the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Richardson
Bailey	Culbertson	Lea	Root
Bankhead	Cullom	Lodge	Sanders
Borah	Cummins	McLean	Simmons
Bourne	Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	du Pont	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Bristow	Fall	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Bryan	Fletcher	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.
Burton	Foster	Oliver	Smoot
Catron	Gallinger	Overman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Gardner	Page	Thornton
Chilton	Gronna	Perkins	Townsend
Clapp	Heyburn	Pomerene	Watson
Clark, Wyo.	Johnston, Ala.	Rayner	Williams

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is necessarily absent from the Chamber.

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is necessarily detained from the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I send to the Secretary's desk an amendment intended to be proposed to the metal schedule bill. I will offer it when the time comes to offer amendments, and I understand that it will be accepted by the minority of the Finance Committee who have charge of the bill. I ask that the amendment may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amend by changing the number of paragraph 73 to 74, by changing the number of paragraph 72 to 73, by changing the number of paragraph 71 to 72, and by increasing the free list by inserting the following as paragraph 71:

"Trace chains, plows, axes, spades, shovels, hoes, cane knives, briar hooks, rakes, scythes, sickles, pruning knives, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills, and planters, mowers, horse-rakes, cultivators, thrashing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, before continuing my observations upon the amendment I have offered I desire to supply a word in paragraph 20, which was omitted either in writing the amendment or in printing it. I desire to insert the word "saw" after the word "steel," in line 5, on page 10.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will note the modification.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, line 5, in the proposed substitute, after the word "steel," insert the word "saw."

Mr. CUMMINS. The clause will then read:

And on steel circular-saw plates there shall be paid \$3 per ton in addition to the rates provided herein for steel saw plates.

Reference to the comparative table prepared by the Finance Committee, I think, will show a very inadequate duty upon circular and steel saw plates, and the result in that comparison has been reached on account of the omission of the word I have just had inserted in the amendment.

I intend, Mr. President, to do what I think I have never done before in the discussion of any matter before the Senate; it is to ask that I be permitted to finish my remarks without interruption, for I have the greatest desire to speedily bring the debate to an end, and the subject is so vast that interruptions inevitably carry not only myself but those who engage in the colloquies into every part of the field we are examining.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So far as the Chair can, he will see that the Senator from Iowa is not interrupted.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no doubt the Chair is in sympathy with the suggestion I have just made.

Last night, before adjournment, I was endeavoring to state concretely and briefly the basis of the amendment I have proposed. First, it is founded upon the assumption, which I believe to be sustained, and amply sustained, by the proof, that the average cost of making pig iron in this country is less, certainly not greater, than the cost of making pig iron in other countries of the world. Second, that with respect to all the heavier forms of iron and steel, ordinarily known as tonnage iron and steel, I have reached the duties which will be found in my amendment by assuming that the labor entering into the commodities, in whatever process is undertaken, from pig iron to the ultimate form, costs twice as much in this country as it costs in other countries.

Third, I have added to the duties in each instance an allowance that will fairly compensate for the additional capital involved in the production in America as compared with the production abroad. If I have faithfully complied with the rules that are involved in these three propositions it seems to me that the duties which will be found in my amendment must necessarily be protective, must preserve our market for our own producers, if our own producers are willing to occupy it with fair and reasonable profit.

It is said, especially by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], that the report of Mr. Pepper respecting the production of pig iron in Luxemburg, Germany, shows that it costs there less than it costs here. I believe it to be true that pig iron fit to be manufactured into steel can, in some parts of the Luxemburg district, be produced at less cost than such pig iron can be produced in some parts or in some mills of the United States. But we are endeavoring here to find an average cost, and I think therein lies the error into which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] was led, because he found one place in Germany in which pig iron could be manufactured a little more cheaply than the high cost in the United States. Taking Mr. Pepper's report as authentic and as reliable—and I am quite willing to do so—the Senator from North Dakota reached the conclusion that we ought to adjust our tariff duties with reference to that low cost. I do not think so; for if, as it seems to me, we take the lowest cost that can be found abroad and compare it with the highest cost that can be found in our own country, we will reach an end entirely unjustified by the doctrine itself or the interpretation which even my Republican friends put upon it.

We have found that the average cost in our country is less than the average cost in England. We have found with respect to part of the production in Germany that it is no less there than here. If we wanted to be entirely fair, we would compare the lowest cost in Germany with the lowest cost in the United States, and when we do we will discover that the United States Steel Corporation produced pig iron in 1910—that being the last year of which we have reliable information—more cheaply than it is asserted by Mr. Schwab, by the Senator from North Dakota, or by Mr. Pepper, the same quality of pig iron can be produced for in the Luxemburg district; and to establish that I desire to refer again to the report of the Commissioner of Corporations.

On page 108 he submits a table known as Table No. 32. It is headed "Comparison of Steel Corporation's integration furnace cost per gross ton for Bessemer, northern basic, and southern pig iron, as shown by the records of the corporation, for 1910." The table itself discloses that there have been excluded the return upon the investment in any stage of the production from the mine to the furnace. The result is, as shown by the table, that in the examination of 6,269,534 tons of Bessemer steel the total was \$9.71 per ton, and the southern pig iron, concerning which the investigation was carried over on a production of 585,273 tons, the cost was \$8.57 per ton.

I instance this simply to show that if we are selecting in our country that place and that company in which and by which pig iron can be produced at its lowest cost, we will discover



that we are doing quite as well as any blast furnace in the Luxemburg district.

In the same connection I desire at this time to indicate what the Steel Corporation was doing in the way of producing steel rails in 1910, and I refer to Table 38 of the report of the Commissioner of Corporations. This table is headed "Steel Corporation's mill cost per gross ton of heavy standard Bessemer rails, as shown by producing companies' cost sheets, approximate intercompany profits included therein, and integration mill cost, as shown by the records of the corporation, for 1910." The first item of the table shows a cost of \$20.23. This includes all the intercompany profits. The last column of the table is headed thus: "Integration cost, exclusive of any return to investment on any anterior stage of production or transportation." And treating the production from that standpoint, the cost of producing steel rails to the United States Steel Corporation in 1910 was, per ton, \$15.37, and I hazard this statement, that there is no other rail mill in the world, no matter where it is situated, that pretends to manufacture steel railway rails at a cost of \$15.37 at the present time. I have mentioned these things in order to fortify my conclusion that upon the average we produce our pig iron as cheaply as it can possibly be produced abroad.

Now I come to the second paragraph of my general proposition. If what I have stated be true, what duty ought to be attached under the Republican doctrine upon steel rails? I have in my amendment named a duty of \$2.50 per ton. The Democratic bill names a duty of 10 per cent. I refer to this table again in order to apply the rules that I have just suggested.

The labor cost in producing steel rails is \$1.25 a ton. Steel rails from the ingots, the raw material, or all the material that enters into the production of a ton of steel rails, cost the average company in the United States \$18.29. If I have shown anything in this somewhat extended discussion, I have shown that the raw material costs the company that manufactures it into steel rails a little less, I think very considerably less, than it costs any rail mill in Europe; and therefore we need no duty to compensate our manufacturers with respect to the cost of raw material, and in the raw material there is included the American labor standard or scale from the mine to the rail mill. If we credit the rail mill with raw material costing \$18.29, we have already taken care of all the labor actually employed in the production of raw material, and by raw material I mean the form in which it is used in the rail mill. We have already seen that it costs in labor, upon the very same hypothesis, 61 cents to reduce the ore, the coke, and all other materials that enter into a ton of pig iron, and therefore we have the labor cost, and it is not asserted that there is any other cost greater in this country than abroad, save the capital cost, of which I spoke a few moments ago. We have a total labor cost for manufacturing a ton of steel rails from pig iron into the finished product of \$1.86. There is no escape from that proposition. It can not, as it seems to me, be controverted by anyone who is willing to accept the investigation carried on by our own Government here and abroad.

I therefore apply the rule I have suggested: If our labor costs twice as much as the labor abroad for performing the same operation—and mark you I am only adding that for the purpose of meeting what I look upon as an unreasonable demand upon the part of my brother Republicans, for I do not believe the labor cost here is greater than the labor cost abroad, but I am assuming that it is—therefore it costs the foreign manufacturer one-half of \$1.86, or 93 cents, in labor; and in order to equalize our own manufacturers it is necessary to attach a duty of 93 cents.

I mean to equalize the labor cost. I have attached a duty of \$2.50 instead of 93 cents. I have done that because, first, I really wanted to satisfy my friends upon this side of the Chamber; second, because I do not want to approach the danger point; and third, because the capital employed in producing a ton of steel rails in the United States is somewhat larger than the capital invested in producing a ton of steel rails abroad. That is because it costs us more to build plants, our machinery costs us a little more, and I have, out of good measure, allowed the difference between the 93 cents a ton and \$2.50 a ton to cover that contingency.

There is not a man in the Senate who, looking at it with a dispassionate mind, can establish the necessity for as high a duty as I have proposed. I am speaking of it now, of course, wholly from the standpoint of the duty required for protection and not for revenue. I do not believe there will be any considerable revenue at \$2.50 a ton. If you wanted to get any revenue out of steel rails you would be compelled to reduce the duty to fifty cents a ton or a dollar a ton, and even then no very

great quantity of this commodity would come into the United States.

I take now the next large item in the production of steel in this country—structural iron and steel—and referring to the same table it will be found that the raw material in a ton of structural steel costs \$20.21. It costs no more here than abroad, and that again accounts for all the labor expended at the American wage scale in bringing the raw material into existence. The labor cost of structural steel is \$2.15. That is all that labor does in turning a ton of ingots into structural steel. Now, adding to \$2.15 the 61 cents for turning the pig iron into ingots, and we have a labor cost of \$2.76. That is all. In every other respect we are upon equal terms with our rivals in other countries. But if it costs us more for labor than it does them, and if it costs us twice as much, then we ought to put a duty on structural steel of one-half of \$2.76, or \$1.38, a ton, and there is nobody anywhere who can vindicate or can justify a duty of more than \$1.38 a ton except that we may compensate the additional capital.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRYAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Nebraska probably was not in the Chamber when I made the announcement that I hoped to pass through my speech without further interruption. My experience leads me to believe that if I do not know a rule of that sort I will never get through.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa indicates that he does not wish to yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. However, I will yield at this time because the Senator from Nebraska was not in the Chamber at the time I made the announcement.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to have the Senator from Iowa reconcile in some way the difference between the labor cost, as he makes it out, in these finished products and the labor cost as made out by the Senator from Utah. I believe, of course, that the Senator from Iowa is much more accurate, but I can hardly reconcile the difference between the aggregate labor cost as made up by the two Senators.

Mr. CUMMINS. I did that last night. I do not know anything about the table used by the Senator from Utah. I have no reason, however, to doubt its accuracy. The reason that he does not reach the same result that I do is largely because he gives to labor in the antecedent forms or processes no credit for the cheapened material, for the cheapened transportation, as compared with our competitors in the other countries. For instance, when I say that the metallic mixture required to produce a ton of pig iron costs in this country \$7.30, I have included in that all the labor expended in mining the ore and in transporting it, as well as the other material that is necessary to enter into the furnace with the iron ore.

Now, our iron ore costs us less than it costs abroad. Our coke costs us less than it costs abroad. Our coal is much cheaper, and the transportation is much less in most instances. I have not analyzed the table of the Senator from Utah, but I do not dispute it. I only know that the table that I have produced is the proof furnished by the Commissioner of Corporations upon this subject, and I intend to accept it.

Now, the duty on structural iron and steel ought to be but \$1.38 a ton. I have put a duty of \$3 a ton on it for less advanced forms, and \$4 a ton upon the more advanced forms. I have doubled, as I said before, the amount necessary to furnish reasonably fair protection to this industry, and when anyone votes to maintain a duty upon structural steel of from \$3 to \$20 a ton, as the duties are under the present law, he votes to make the American people pay a price for this material which yields to the producer, where competition at home has been extinguished, an extortionate and indefensible profit.

In passing I may say that the duty placed upon this commodity by the Democratic bill is 15 per cent ad valorem. If the structural material is worth \$30 abroad, the Democratic duty would be \$4.50. If it is worth \$40 abroad, the duty would be \$6 a ton. So I think it can be said to be true that the specific duty which I have put upon structural iron and steel is somewhat lower than the duty named by the House of Representatives.

I now pass to the next great item of iron and steel, namely, merchant bars. The raw material in merchant bars costs us in this country \$21.40 a ton. The labor of conversion is involved in three processes—first, from the pig iron into the ingot; second, from the ingot into what is known as sheet bars; and, third, into the bar itself. The first process involves labor of the value of 61 cents per ton, the second process of the value of 55 cents per ton, and the last of the value of \$3.06 a ton, making

a total labor cost for converting pig iron into merchant bars of \$4.22.

This is again upon the hypothesis that our producers manufacture pig iron as cheaply as it can be manufactured anywhere in the world. If our labor cost was twice as much as it costs abroad for the same operations, we ought to put a duty upon merchant bars in order to just equalize that difference of \$2.11. I have put a duty in my amendment upon bars of \$3.50 for the larger bars, and \$4.50 for the smaller bars. The Democratic bill attaches a duty on bars of 10 per cent. I think there is no material difference between the Democratic bill and my own in that respect, for merchant bars vary from \$25 a ton to \$50 a ton, and sometimes in very rare instances more; but I have added this additional duty solely to avoid approaching the danger point where we would be compelled to yield our markets to the other countries of the earth, and to compensate for the additional capital which we invest as compared with other countries.

I now pass to rods—wire rods—another very great article of commerce in this industry, the rods as shown by this table, and this is the table furnished by the Commissioner of Corporations. The material that makes a ton of rods costs our people \$21.42. Again, there are three processes here—one in converting the pig iron into ingots; labor cost, 61 cents; then the ingot into bars, 55 cents; and again, the bars into rods, \$1.53; making a total of \$2.69 for all the labor—I mean the labor that we are trying to protect—involved in these three operations.

The duty therefore upon rods, to be mathematically accurate, should be \$1.34½ a ton, and when we charge the importer \$1.34½ a ton we have equalized the difference between the amount that we have paid for labor and the amount that he has paid for labor upon the hypothesis that ours has cost twice as much. I am proceeding upon that hypothesis, although I know it is not true in all instances. I think it is true that we pay double the wages that they pay abroad. I believe that is true, but with our greater production, with our more skillful operation, we are able to utilize, through machinery, labor in a way that they do not utilize it abroad, and we make it more efficient than they make it abroad in very many of the fields of industry.

But let us see what I have done. Although we need a duty of but \$1.34 a ton, I have attached a duty of \$4.25 a ton. I have done this, first, because there is a wide range in the cost of drawing rods or rolling rods. It depends somewhat upon the size of the rod. I have tried to name a duty that would protect the most expensive rod so far as cost is concerned, and in doing it I have put a duty upon the less expensive rods greater than the conditions of the trade require. Again, I have sought to keep our manufacturers free from unfair rivalry on account of the higher capital cost in our own country.

The Democratic duty upon rods is 10 per cent. I think it is somewhat lower than my duty, although I can not conceive that there would be any revenue derived under it.

The next article is wire. Wire, of course, comes from the rod, and therefore I will not go further back than the rod, as I have just been considering that article. I have found that the labor cost in a rod is \$2.69 per ton. The cost of turning the rod into wire or drawing it, to use the technical expression, is \$1.62 per ton according to the report we have before us. This, of course, does not include some of the finer wires that are used for pianos and other purposes, sometimes ornamental and sometimes useful. But the labor cost is \$1.62 for the last operation, making a total labor cost for converting pig iron into coarse wire of \$4.31 per ton. If England or Germany or France paid out half that much the labor cost there would be \$2.16 a ton, and that is all the duty that under our platform could be attached to this article, except for the compensation of capital. I have put a duty upon this wire of from \$5 to \$8 a ton—more than double the amount required under the computation I have just made; and I have done it for the very same reason that I have given with respect to other commodities. I do not want the foreign manufacturer to be able to enter our markets. I want them all to be abundantly high to protect every interest at home, but I do not want them to be so high that our own manufacturer, freed from competition at home, can raise his price to any point his avarice may lead him.

I may say the Democratic bill puts a duty of 20 per cent upon wire.

The next item is what is known as sheet iron or iron and steel sheets. This is one of the principal commodities of the tonnage steel business. These sheets are, of course, taken first from the pig into the ingot, and then from the ingot or billet rolled into sheets, and there are three operations. The pig iron into the ingot costs 61 cents in labor. The ingot into the billet or the sheet bar costs 57 cents in labor. The bar into the sheet costs \$10.39 in labor, making a total of \$11.57 for turning pig

iron into iron or steel. Upon the same hypothesis, our duty should be \$5.75 per ton, and when we attach that duty we have equalized this difference of which our platform in 1908 speaks.

Now, mark what I have done. In my amendment I have attached a duty of \$10 a ton upon the thicker sheets and \$12 a ton upon the thinner sheets—almost double the amount necessary to measure the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire if the Senator would prefer to go on without interruption.

Mr. CUMMINS. I would rather go on and finish without interruption.

Mr. HEYBURN. I make the inquiry, because if we are going to vote on this amendment immediately upon the close of the Senator's remarks, some of the things will go out unanswered and the reading world may think there was no answer to them.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I will say that if after I have finished my remarks upon the subject any Senator desires to make any inquiry of me, I shall be very glad to answer it. I know that is not a very satisfactory way of debating, but as I remarked when the Senator from Idaho was out of the Chamber, I felt that unless I could go on without interruption I was likely, as a very distinguished lawyer in New York once said, to make my speech immortal by making it eternal.

Mr. HEYBURN. And unanswered.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not crave immortality of that sort.

Mr. HEYBURN. Would not the Senator also like to make it unanswerable rather than unanswered?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have no concern about that. I know that I am making it unanswerable. I am not so sure, however, that I can enjoy immunity from an answer.

I come now to another form of iron and steel that is well known by all true Americans, because it is intimately connected with what is known as the tin-plate industry. I mean black plate, a plate of steel prepared, gotten ready, made for the subsequent coating of tin or zinc or whatever may be put upon it. Black plate has the same process precisely that I have already instanced with regard to sheets, except the preparation of which I have spoken. The cost is first 61 cents from the pig into the ingot, 57 cents from the ingot into the sheet bar, and \$14.19—now we are reaching labor, and a great deal of labor—\$14.19 for converting it into the black plate. The total of these labor items is \$15.37 per ton.

On the same assumption that we pay twice as much for doing this work as is paid abroad our duty upon black plate should be \$7.64 per ton. Then we would be ready to start upon even terms, without regard to the transportation from the foreign country to our own, with the foreign producer.

But I have put a duty upon black plate of \$12.25 a ton, before the acid or pickling process, in order to prepare it for the tin, and of \$14.25 after being so prepared. I have again doubled, or substantially doubled, the difference in the cost of labor here and abroad, and it is impossible for me to conceive why anyone desires to maintain the duty which the Payne-Aldrich tariff law attaches to this commodity.

I have one other item and I shall have finished this review—universal plates. The universal plates are of course the cheaper form of plate iron and steel. The universal plates go through the same process practically—pig into ingots, ingots into billets, and then the billets into the plates. The total labor cost of performing those operations, as given by the Commissioner of Corporations, is \$3.04, and a duty that will equalize us with the foreign countries, if we pay twice as much for labor as they pay abroad, would be \$1.52 a ton. But I have put upon this commodity a duty on the cheaper forms of \$4 a ton, and upon the higher-priced forms of 15 per cent.

Is there anyone here who will gainsay my proposition that this duty which I have named in the amendment covers the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, if I have established my proposition that the material itself costs no more here upon the average than it costs abroad?

Before passing, I will say that the Democratic bill puts a duty upon these plates of 15 per cent.

Now, Mr. President, I have finished my specific review of the heavier forms of iron and steel. I could pass through all the items of the schedule contained in the paragraphs which I have rewritten and could show, just as I have shown concerning the items I have already mentioned, that I have pursued a logical and, as I believe, a scientific method in reaching these duties. The duties have risen as the articles themselves have passed through various processes of manufacture, and the duty varies, as it should vary, with the labor that has been expended in production.

The remainder of this amendment is precisely like the dozen great items that I have already mentioned. There is no differ-

ence in principle. If what I have already passed over in detail is accepted as sound, then all these items which relate to the heavier forms of iron and steel are also sound, but I can not and must not take up each of these items for the purpose of performing, in the presence of the Senate, the mathematical operations through which the duties were reached.

I now come for a few minutes to consider those paragraphs in the amendment which cover an entirely different kind of commodities. Twenty-eight paragraphs in this schedule—I think I have named the right number—I have not rewritten at all; and the reason I could not vote for the bill passed by the House of Representatives is that, in my opinion, the duties upon these twenty-eight or more paragraphs are reduced in the House bill below the protective point. They cover high forms of production. They cover articles into which a very great deal of labor has entered. They cover forms in which the cost of the raw material is but a slight factor in the cost of the ultimate product.

I can understand perfectly how my Democratic friends, desiring to place duties at the point at which the maximum revenue will be derived upon their importation, have reduced the duties as they have, but they differ so entirely from the commodities I have just been considering, that from the protective standpoint the Democratic duties upon many of these things can not be said to be adequate and will not be efficient. Therefore it would be impossible for me, believing that we ought to award that full measure of protection of which I have been speaking, to consent to the reduction of duties shown in the House bill.

I have, however, in one or two instances reduced the duty even below the House bill. I mentioned one of them the other day. I have reduced the duty on automobiles from 45 per cent in the Payne-Aldrich law and from 35 per cent in the House bill to 25 per cent. I do not think there is any justification from the protective standpoint of assessing a duty upon automobiles of 45 per cent. What I said a moment ago applies to automobiles and the labor cost in them. I have no doubt we pay men and women, if there are any women employed in our automobile factories, more than they pay them abroad; but because our production is so great we are able to use men in the management or the conduct of machinery, so that the efficiency of a single man is much greater in this country than it is abroad.

I desire only to mention one or two facts with regard to this industry, of which Americans ought to be very proud. France makes about 30,000 automobiles. The value at the factory in France of the 30,000 cars is substantially \$50,000,000. Germany makes about 10,000 cars, with a value at the factory of about \$20,000,000. Great Britain builds about 15,000 cars, with a value of about \$2,000 per car. Italy, Belgium, and Switzerland have scarcely entered the race.

The United States will make this year about 175,000 cars. We make more than two-thirds of all the cars that are used in the world. We export cars of the value of more than \$20,000,000 per year. Our export of automobiles is of greater value than the total value of all the cars made by either England, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, or Italy. There is but one country that makes as many cars as the United States exports. We export these cars not so much as we do many other things to neutral ports, but we export these cars to England, to France, and to Germany. We export them because we can build a cheap car better and for a lower price than any other country in the world can build it.

It is not wise, as it seems to me, for us to maintain a practically prohibitive duty upon automobiles, because, first, we shall engender the spirit of retaliation abroad and we may shortly be excluded from a market that we very greatly desire; and, second, because while we import about \$2,000,000 in value of automobiles, we export about \$21,000,000 in value of cars, and our imports are largely, if not altogether, of the very highest priced cars. The importations do not seriously interfere with our production at home, and, under the proof that has been submitted, it can not be said that with respect to our manufacture the other countries of the world have any advantage over us. It can not be alleged that it costs more to produce a car here than it costs to produce it in either England, Germany, or France, although I readily admit that you can select a particular kind of car that would cost us more to build than it would cost in Germany or France. For the reason I have given I have reduced the duty from 45 per cent to 25 per cent. So much for automobiles.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to ask him, as he has investigated the question, what does he find to be the relative cost of the cheaper cars in the European factories and the American factories?

Mr. CUMMINS. I hardly dare venture upon much of the history or explanation of this business, but I have heard this about it: The cars we export cost about from \$1,000 to \$1,200 each, while the cars we import come here in an unfinished condition mainly; that is, we import the chassis, and we ourselves build on the body principally, because they do not abroad manufacture these cars in sufficient quantities to warrant them in equipping to construct metal bodies, and our cars are mainly constructed with metal bodies. They have a great many advantages over the wooden bodies, and, therefore, we have adopted that kind of construction to a very great degree. So the cars come in from Germany, France, and England, in so far as they come in at all, in the unfinished condition of which I have just spoken. I think the average-priced value of the car or that part of the car coming would be more than \$3,000.

Mr. BACON. The particular point of the inquiry that I made of the Senator was this: I desired to know, if he had the information, what was the relative cost of manufacturing in Europe and in this country of the cheaper grades of cars such as are commonly used?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think, Mr. President, that no one questions the fact that we can make the cheaper cars at a lower cost than can any other country anywhere.

Mr. BACON. Does the Senator think that reducing the duty to 25 per cent—and I am very frank to say I am in favor of that personally—would increase the importation of that grade of cars?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I do not. I do not think that there would be any of the cheaper cars imported under any duty, however low it might be, but there might be some of the higher grade of cars imported under the duty of 25 per cent.

Mr. BACON. That are not now imported?

Mr. CUMMINS. That are not now imported. I think it would be a very excellent corrective. I think 25 per cent will measure the difference between the cost of producing the higher-priced cars here and abroad, and that when we put a duty on of 45 per cent, we have put a wall so high that only extreme taste or fashion will ever mount it.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon one other question, the Senator spoke of the fact that the number of cars manufactured in Italy was almost negligible. Do they, or do they not, manufacture a very high-grade car in Italy?

Mr. CUMMINS. They manufacture one car anyway of a very high grade in Italy.

Mr. BACON. I knew nothing about the number they manufactured.

Mr. CUMMINS. The number manufactured is very small.

Mr. BACON. I had my attention called to the fact that they manufactured there a very high-grade car; but I did not know the fact that they manufacture very few of such cars.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is true. France manufactures the greatest number of cars in Europe. France has the largest export trade in Europe.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I assume that the reason we can make cars such as the Senator has been speaking of at as low a cost probably as any other country, comes from the fact that we make so many that we standardize them—

Mr. CUMMINS. Unquestionably.

Mr. GALLINGER. As we are competing with the world successfully in the making of bridges, because we have standardized our bridges, in contradistinction to our handicap in building ships, for we hardly build any, especially for the foreign trade, while England perhaps will have a dozen ships under construction at the same time; and the fact that she standardizes that particular kind of a ship enables her to build it much cheaper than she could otherwise possibly build one or we could build one. That is my view of it.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from New Hampshire has stated the whole case, and it might be emphasized by reference to instances. A factory in Germany that turns out 2,000 cars, or even 1,200 cars, is regarded as a large enterprise. One man works upon all parts of each machine, and it requires a long time to build a machine, just as the old shoemaker worked on all parts of the shoe that he finally turned out. We have one enterprise in the United States, I am told, that will in the coming year build 70,000 cars. That enables the company to standardize every part of the car. The parts are all convertible, and each mechanic has his own particular thing to make, and he can employ machinery in making it. That multiplies

its efficiency; and that is the reason we can build these cars cheaper than they can be built anywhere else.

I now come to another paragraph, concerning which I think I ought to call attention. My amendment differs very materially from the Democratic bill with respect to zinc and lead. The House bill attaches a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on the lead contained in lead ore. It attaches no duty whatever, as I remember it, upon the zinc in zinc ore; that is made free. I do not think it is wise either from a revenue standpoint or from a protective standpoint. I have not changed the duty upon lead ore or upon zinc ore. I do not believe the duty on either ought to be changed.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is, from the present duties?

Mr. CUMMINS. From the present duties. And I will explain why, inasmuch as this constitutes one of the prominent phases of that part of the bill which I have not rewritten and which is, therefore, allowed to stand. Lead ore is precisely like wool in one respect. The Tariff Board has reported that the cost of wool in this country varies all the way from less than nothing, paradoxical as that may seem, to 19 cents per pound.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is from a loss to a profit.

Mr. CUMMINS. And just so with lead. The cost of producing lead or lead ore differs quite as largely and as radically as does the cost of producing wool. The cost of producing lead in the Idaho district is one sum; the cost of producing lead in the Colorado district is another sum; the cost of producing lead in the Missouri district or the southeastern Kansas district is another sum. I pause for a moment to say that the present duty on lead no more than compensates the difference between the cost of producing lead in some of these mines, for instance, in the Idaho district. I do not believe that a cent and a half a pound, which is now the duty on lead in lead ore, is any more than the difference between the cost of producing the lead in Idaho and the cost of producing it in Mexico. The duty of a cent and a half a pound is a little more, in my opinion, than the difference between the cost of producing lead in Colorado and the cost of producing it in Mexico. So, if we reduce the duty on lead ore, the result necessarily is, that we close some of the mines that are now producing lead, for they can not continue to operate if the price is materially reduced. We do not produce more lead than we ought to produce and, therefore, viewing it from a protective standpoint, it seems to me that, inasmuch as we are not producing a surplus of lead, it would be contrary to the protective doctrine to reduce the duty on lead ore.

My remark with regard to lead ore is applicable as well to zinc ore. We can not produce zinc ore or zinc in this country as cheaply as it can be produced abroad; and the result of reducing the duty would, in my opinion, be the closing of many of our mines, which now are running to produce this commodity. So, therefore, I have not reduced these duties at all. I have not changed them.

But we pass now to the next stage. I have reduced the duty in my amendment upon lead bullion and pig lead and the like from 2½ cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound. I have reduced it because I do not believe that the differential can be defended.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. I am aware that the Senator said at the beginning of his remarks that he did not wish to be interrupted, and if he still objects, I will not interrupt him.

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, I would rather the Senator from Utah would wait until I finish, and then I will be very glad to answer any question that he may propound to me. I want to make this part of my argument as concise as possible, because I have undertaken the very difficult task of convincing the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] that I have done right in reducing the duty on lead bullion and pig lead from 2½ cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound.

Again I introduce the parallel of the wool schedule. We put a certain duty on wool, and then, when we come to ascertain what duty ought to be placed upon the manufactures of wool, we endeavor to compensate the manufacturers for the increase, hypothetical or real, as the case may be, in his raw material occasioned by the duty upon it. So we ought to do with the lead manufacturer. I have put a duty of a cent and a half a pound on the lead in the ore, precisely as it is now in the law. Then, I give to the manufacturer or the smelter, first, the cent and a half a pound, which I have already put upon the raw material, namely, the lead in the ore, and, then, I have to ascertain the difference between the cost of reducing lead ore in this country and reducing lead ores in other countries. Our Republican platform requires us to give to that smelter just the difference between the cost of doing his work here and what

it costs abroad. We have given him under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law the difference between a cent and a half a pound and 2½ cents a pound, or five-eighths of a cent per pound, for the purpose of compensating him for his increased labor charge. What does that mean? It means that the smelter for his protective duty—not compensatory duty, for I have already given him that in the cent and a half—but for his protective duty he is given an advantage of \$12.50 a ton. That is more than it costs in the United States to reduce lead ore to lead bullion or pig lead. It is more than the smelter pays all told—I mean in labor—for doing that work.

Therefore I have reduced that differential, as I called it a few moments ago, or protective duty, as I had better call it, from five-eighths of a cent per pound to three-eighths of a cent per pound. Three-eighths of a cent per pound means \$7.50 per ton, and I do not believe that it will ever be contended here or anywhere else that it costs the lead smelters in this country \$7.50 per ton more than it costs the lead smelters in other countries to take ore and convert it into lead bullion or pig lead.

What I have said with regard to the lead smelter applies also to the zinc smelter, for I have pursued precisely the same policy, and I have adjusted the rates in the case of zinc in the same way that I have the rates for the lead smelter.

Mr. President, I fear that some errors which have crept into the comparative statement, to which I have referred more than once, may have made an impression on some Members of the Senate, especially upon this side. I called the attention of the Senator from Utah several days ago to the utter inaccuracy of attempting to reduce specific duties to ad valorem duties where the specific duties cover the same article with a wide range of prices or values. You will find in this comparative statement, I think, two or three articles on which it appears I have reduced the duties to an abnormally low point—covering only two or three articles, however—to a point of 4 or 5 per cent ad valorem. I have not the time, and I will not take the time, to analyze those items. I only ask that if any one of you has happened to take them up for the purpose of judging of the merits of my amendment, you will not forget to trace the article to its place, not only in the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, but in the amendment I have proposed, and you will find that in these two or three articles—they cover not very important items, it is true—the whole error lies in attempting to group commodities that vary from 1 cent a pound to 10 cents a pound in a single bracket and in reducing specific duties to ad valorem duties covering that tremendous range of values.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question with reference to his lead schedule?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wondered if the Senator had ascertained that the vast quantity of lead ores produced in this country are of low grade, while a very large proportion of the lead ores in Mexico are of high grade, and if so, whether he has taken that fact into consideration in fixing the differential of three-eighths of a cent per pound?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In other words, if I may illustrate my question, it will cost more to extract a pound of lead from a ton of low-grade ore than it will to extract a pound of lead from a ton of high-grade ore.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Utah has stated a fact with which, I am sure, we will all agree. Ordinarily it does cost more to extract a ton of lead from low-grade ore than a ton of lead from high-grade ore, and I have taken that into full consideration, because I have attached a differential of \$7.50 a ton, and I do not believe there is a smelter in the United States in which the cost is \$7.50 a ton for converting our own grade of lead ore into lead. I have attempted to draw as far away as possible from the danger point upon that item as I have upon all others.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I understand, in the Missouri lead-ore districts the lead ores contains no silver, or comparatively little silver, while the Mexican ores are silver-lead ores, sometimes containing a very large amount of silver. I desire to ask whether or not the Senator has taken that into consideration in making his schedule?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I have not taken that into consideration, because that would pertain to the duty on lead ore, and I have not changed the duty on lead ore; it remains at 1½ cents per pound as it is under the present law.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The point to which I wanted to direct the Senator's attention was that the lead in Mexican ores, which contain a high percentage of silver, might be regarded as a by-product and the cost of extracting the lead would be little or nothing, because the silver in the ores themselves would justify the smelting, while in the Missouri districts, there being no silver, the lead is not a by-product, but is the very thing which the miner is after and which the smelter is after in reducing the ore.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Utah has stated, of course, a very difficult question. He has instanced a case in which it is utterly impossible mathematically or accurately to apply the Republican doctrine of protection, namely, to ascertain and enforce the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. The Tariff Board, in dealing with wool, has assumed that everything but wool is a by-product, and if it applied the same principle to a silver mine in Mexico it would treat the lead as a by-product, and would probably come to the conclusion that it would probably cost nothing at all either to produce lead ore in Mexico or to produce lead bullion; but it is impossible to make any law covering all those disparities.

Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to one other item which I have changed radically among the 28 paragraphs not rewritten. Under the present law we levy a duty upon monazite sand and upon thorium and upon thorite, with its oxides and its salts, levying the same duty upon the latter as we levy upon the gas mantles, to make which the thorium is mined and manufactured. We have no hope, in my opinion, in this country of manufacturing or producing thorium. There is some monazite sand, it is said, in North Carolina that contains some thorium, but not in sufficient quantities to warrant its development. The United Gas Improvement Co., I think, tried hard to establish an industry there to produce its own thorium from American sand. I think its experiment was a failure, for it long since abandoned the effort, and it, the largest manufacturer of gas mantles in this country, imports its monazite sand from Brazil.

Now, I have rewritten this section on the assumption that it was our business to manufacture gas mantles, if we could, against the whole world, and inasmuch as we must import the raw material out of which they are made, it ought to be allowed to come into the country with as little burden as possible. I have, therefore, rewritten the section, taking the duty from monazite sand and from thorium and from gas-mantle scrap and retaining the duty of 30 per cent upon gas mantles. They are the real products in the manufacture of which American capital and American industry are now engaged. I hope earnestly that this change will meet the approval of the Senate, because I regard it as essential to the best interests of this industry. It is one of the infant industries. It is one of the enterprises which really needs the encouragement and support of our tariff law.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is a case of second childhood. It was a great industry, and it languished, and now it is starting anew in life.

Mr. CUMMINS. The production of thorium in our country has never been a great industry and apparently never will be. If the Senator means that the production of gas mantles is a great industry, he is quite right, but he is not right in assuming it is in its second childhood. It is now in its superb manhood.

The difficulty it encounters—and we might as well speak frankly about it—is that a great corporation imports the monazite sands from Brazil and makes thorium for itself. It makes no thorium for sale. It would, I assume, if it could, exclude every other manufacturer of gas mantles in the country, but the independent manufacturers of gas mantles can not import monazite sands, because they do not do their business upon a sufficient scale to warrant it. But they are compelled to import thorium or the oxide of thorium and use that in the manufacture of gas mantles, and they ought to be given a chance fairly to compete with the large manufacturer by getting their raw material free, especially as there is no reasonable hope that we will be able to furnish that raw material for many years to come, if ever.

One other section I have added to these 28 paragraphs of which I have spoken. I have made a new paragraph for metal molds—for the pattern maker in metal. He is not sufficiently protected now. The metal pattern is allowed to go with the other forms—the merchantable forms of iron and steel. The metal pattern is not for sale. It is not in common use. It is made in order that there may be a casting made from it. It has to be most carefully, most skillfully fashioned in order to accomplish its purpose, which is to receive the molten iron or steel and then turn it out without injury or damage. I have

added a new paragraph in order that the industry may be sufficiently protected. I hope that that also will commend itself to the protective patriotism of the Republican Senators.

Senators, I have completed a review of my amendment. I, of course, have not gone over every item. I can not do that, but I will be very glad to do it, in so far as I may be able, if anyone is interested in any particular paragraph.

With some exceptions, a part of which I have noted, I have reduced these 28 paragraphs 20 per cent as compared with the Payne-Aldrich law, and I believe that is all they ought to be reduced in order to furnish fair and reasonable protection to the manufactures of this country.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. NEWLANDS. May I ask the Senator from Iowa what is the relative percentage of reduction made by these two bills that are presented to us?

Mr. CUMMINS. There is no such thing as a relative percentage.

Mr. NEWLANDS. What is the percentage, then?

Mr. CUMMINS. These averages with which the Senate has been deluded so often have no meaning whatsoever. My bill in a general way is as low as the House bill upon the heavier forms of iron and steel. I think, upon the whole, it is as low. It is not so low, it is very much higher than the House bill, upon these more intricate forms and more highly developed forms of manufacture into which a great deal of labor has entered and in which the raw material is but a small proportion of the ultimate value. But it is utterly impossible to compare them by percentages. The House bill is an ad valorem bill throughout. My bill is a specific bill, so far as that principle can be applied without injustice.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say to the Senator that I have heard it alleged that the Payne-Aldrich bill fixes an average duty of about 35 per cent, the Cummins bill an average duty of about 22½ per cent, and the Democratic bill, or the House bill, an average of about 19 per cent. Would the Senator regard that as fairly accurate?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not. I do not believe that it means anything at all as applied to the business of the country. Of course it is accurate mathematically as applied to these figures—

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to ask the Senator another question, and that is, in view of his experience in the Senate during the last four years in endeavoring to accomplish tariff reductions, whether he thinks the method we have been pursuing thus far has been a satisfactory method of reducing the tariff.

Mr. CUMMINS. I say with the utmost frankness it has not been satisfactory to me, if the Senator means the result.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state what I mean. Undoubtedly the majority of this body favor tariff reduction, but they favor it on differing principles, the Republican Party having regard to the difference in the cost of production here and abroad, with a fair profit to the manufacturer added, and the Democratic Party having regard to a gradual reduction of the duty toward a revenue basis. Now, the country expects a reduction, and the sentiment of both Houses—the majority—is favorable to a reduction. Can not the Senator suggest some method by which we could practically accomplish that reduction at this session?

Mr. CUMMINS. I can. If the Senator from Nevada and his associates will vote for this amendment, I think it will become the law of the land. Will the Senator from Nevada do it?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Is that the only suggestion?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is the only suggestion at this moment. I believe this amendment which I have offered proposes a fair and reasonable reduction of the duties on iron and steel; that it is logical, with some claim to scientific adjustment.

I understand what the Senator from Nevada is thinking about just as well as he does. If my friends the Democrats succeed in passing their bill, it will not become a law. Therefore we will have no reduction. That is, we are told it will not become a law. If, however, the Democrats will vote for the amendment that I have now proposed by way of a substitute, and we pass that, while I will not assure the Senator from Nevada that it will become a law, it has a better chance of becoming a statute of the United States than has the House bill.

Therefore, will the Senator from Nevada come to the aid of a somewhat perplexed progressive at this moment and secure the passage of this amendment?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say, Mr. President, that if the Democratic measure fails to receive the signature of the President I shall be glad to vote for the measure presented by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. Ah! Then the Senator never will know whether it will receive the approval of the President or not unless he votes for it and thus enables it to become an act of Congress.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Undoubtedly we can remain here until the Senator's bill becomes a law, in the contingency of the refusal of the President to sign the Democratic measure.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I for one would be glad to have the Senator explain more fully the reasons why the Democratic bill would not be signed and why his bill would be signed. It might aid us in coming to a conclusion as to what is our duty in the matter.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will be very glad to do that. The Democratic bill is declared to be a purely revenue measure, and that there has been eliminated from it all of the protection that could be eliminated from it having regard to the revenue that is desired. The President of the United States is a Republican, and it would be easier for him to be persuaded that there is no protection or not sufficient protection in the House bill than it would be to persuade him that there is not sufficient protection in the amendment I have offered. I will be perfectly frank with the Senator. That is the reason I think if the House bill is passed there may be rocks upon which it may founder before it becomes a law.

Inasmuch as it is seen how recalcitrant a body of men I have to deal with on the other side of the Chamber, I want to address a word or two to my Republican friends. You are about to vote upon this amendment. I know that some of you do not believe that it is sufficiently protective, but I want to know whether there is a single one of you who will assert that it is not more protective than the bill which passed the House. I want to know if there is a single Republican who will dare challenge the bill in comparison with the bill that passed the House?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEYBURN. I assume the Senator wants a reply.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. Neither is protective. They do not sufficiently reach the word "protective."

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well. I know the standards of the Senator from Idaho. I assume it does not fulfill his expectations as to protection, but the amendment I have proposed is more protective, even from his point of view, than the bill which passed the House and which is now before the Senate subject to amendment. The duties are higher in the bill I have proposed upon all the great forms of steel and iron—I mean the real manufactures of steel and iron—than in the House bill.

Mr. HEYBURN rose.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HEYBURN. You can not span a 20-foot chasm with an 18-foot bridge any better than you can with a 15-foot bridge. Neither of them will span the chasm. The Senator's amendment does not treat lead more fairly than the House bill. He dropped into one mistake. He made sufficient provision—that is, a satisfactory one—for the protection of certain classes—lead in the ores, for instance—and then permitted the lead to be mined and smelted outside of our country, at outside wages, and brought in in competition with our labor.

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course I know that an 18-foot bridge will not enable one to successfully cover a 20-foot chasm, but is it not true that it is easier to step from the end of an 18-foot bridge to the solid ground than it is to step from the end of a 15-foot bridge to the ground?

Mr. HEYBURN. If a man could not cover the 2 feet at all, he is just as far from his destination as if there were no bridge.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am sure the Senator from Idaho will have no difficulty in covering this negligible difference, even measured by his own standard. But I appeal from him, then, to the other Republican Senators, whose views may not be so rigid. The Senator from Utah and the Senator from Pennsylvania have both reviewed my bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania came near suggesting that I had busied myself with this bill largely for the purpose of doing something, and that really I had not decreased the duties seriously enough to occasion alarm.

Mr. OLIVER. I should like to say to the Senator that I have no recollection of ever having intimated anything of the kind.

Mr. CUMMINS. I listened to the Senator from Pennsylvania, and that is the way I understood him, although I am frank to say that when his speech was published in the Record the intimation did not appear.

Mr. OLIVER. I said nothing that was not published in the Record.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well. I suppose as I grow older my ears mislead me and deceive me more and more.

Mr. OLIVER. Very likely.

Mr. CUMMINS. But I very distinctly caught that general notion of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I speak of it in a gratified sense. I am using it as a compliment to the Senator from Pennsylvania, because if I may infer his real belief with regard to this subject from the speech that he made—and a very able and very interesting speech it was—he himself believes that there are many articles upon which the duties of the Payne-Aldrich law could be reduced without injury to the producers of iron and steel and to the great benefit of the general public.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMITH], whose knowledge upon the details of the metal schedule—and I may broaden that to include every schedule of the tariff—is surpassed by that of no Senator either now or at any time in the past, who has been over the whole subject with a comprehensiveness of learning and a keenness of analysis which has never been excelled, was of the opinion that while some of the duties in the amendment I have proposed were too low, yet they are at least in the direction of protection; whereas the House bill was headed straight for the port of free trade.

I only instance these things, not to express a hope that either the Senator from Idaho or the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Pennsylvania would as a separate proposition vote for this amendment if it were in the form of an independent bill. I mention it for the purpose of appealing to them and to all the Republican Senators to vote for it as against the bill for which it is offered as a substitute.

What defense has any Republican here for voting against the amendment I have proposed when the question upon that vote is whether it is better legislation than the House bill? You are not expressing your opinion with regard to the wisdom of this measure; you are not saying to the country you believe the duties here imposed are sufficiently and adequately protective; you are simply saying that, as between a bill which is formed along the lines of protection—and which I believe is completely and fully protective—and a bill organized upon the doctrine of a tariff for revenue alone, you think this is the better bill. If you will vote your real consciences and your real judgments, I shall be entirely satisfied, no matter what the vote on the amendment may ultimately be; but what you intend to do, as I have been informed, is to vote against the protective amendment and in favor of the free-trade bill. What you intend to do is to refuse to substitute the bill I have offered for the revenue bill, because you think there would be less danger of the Chief Executive of the United States signing the revenue bill than of signing the protective bill.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HEYBURN. An objection which I entertain to the Senator's amendment or the substitute, whichever it may be termed, is that it is drawn or framed upon the hypothesis that no other business than that now established needs consideration or is entitled to it; upon the hypothesis that no new concerns, be they manufacturers of iron or steel or any of the articles enumerated in his bill; that no others are to follow; that the machinery and the buildings will last forever; and the men who are engaged in them will live forever.

Now, that is not the true spirit of protection. The spirit of protection is not only to maintain that which we have, but to make it possible for other similar enterprises to be born, to have their growth and others after them, and so on, forever. That is protection. But the Senator's schedule does not include the consideration of that proposition.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not claim that it does; and therein lies, possibly, the fundamental difference between the Senator from Idaho and myself. He desires—and I grant his absolute sincerity in the position—duties levied upon iron and steel upon the hypothesis that there has never been a mine opened; that there has never been a blast furnace erected or a rail mill established; that this whole country is a virgin continent yet to be explored and still to be developed; and he desires duties

that would, under those circumstances, enlist capital in the work of exploration and production.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I do, as the Senator suggests, regard the opportunities of life in the business world in this country as absolutely virgin soil to the generations not yet launched in the business. To those who have not established business it is as virgin as ever, and that element constitutes the opportunity upon which the future greatness and wealth of the country must rest. If it rested only on the present generation, with present established business, with the existing capital, it would be only a question of a lifetime when it would pass out, or the men would pass out. But the true policy of protection goes as far as I have expressed it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the issue is clearly made between the Senator from Idaho and myself. If anyone believes that the duties upon iron and steel should be fixed upon the hypothesis that there had been no iron discovered, no furnaces erected, no railroads built, no rolling mills constructed, and that we were about to invite capital into this unexplored region, a country fertile and rich in its resources—if that were the situation, then the duties which I have proposed in my amendment are not sufficient. But if we are to take the country as it is, with mines of greater extent and greater richness than the mines of any other country in the world, with a railroad system that measures in its extent about one-half of all the railway mileage in the world, with rolling mills and furnaces and factories in full and complete operation, with a capacity to produce more iron and steel than any other country in the world now produces or has ever produced, then the duties which I have proposed will be found to be ample for the protection of a condition of that sort, and that is the condition which actually exists.

Now choose between the senior Senator from Idaho and myself. He is honestly of his opinion; I am honestly of mine. Speaking to the Republican Senators of this body, I want it published to the world whether you believe in the doctrine which he has so emphatically stated, or whether you believe in the doctrine which I have attempted to assert. If you vote with me and for my amendment the country will accept that vote as indicating an opinion on your part that the duties should be adjusted with reference to existing conditions. If you vote against my amendment, while I do not say it will necessarily be true, there will be much reason for the country to believe that you insist on retaining duties measured by the standard just asserted by the senior Senator from Idaho. One more word and I shall conclude.

We Republicans were taunted yesterday or the day before by a distinguished Senator on the other side of the Chamber with the statement that you, or enough of you to be effective, upon the final vote upon this measure, intend to absent yourselves and allow, by your absence and your silence, the House bill to receive a majority of the votes in this Chamber, although it is known by every Republican here and elsewhere that it does not embody the Republican doctrine. I was never so humiliated as a Republican in all my public life as to hear a taunt of that sort with no indignant response from the men to whom it was directed.

Tell me what you intend to do with regard to this amendment so far as that charge is concerned. Do you intend to allow a bill which does not pretend to meet your economic opinions and which is contrary to your fundamental beliefs to pass the Senate by refusing to vote simply in order to give the President of the United States a better opportunity, from his standpoint, to veto the measure? I do not believe that Senators will dare to repeat what was done a year ago upon the same subject covered by the measure now before you.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HEYBURN. A taunt is not to be taken very seriously when it comes from the opposition. The fair presumption is that the Republicans will vote for the principle of a protective tariff, and in my judgment—and I set myself up as the censor of no other man's principles—to refrain from voting your principles is as bad as to vote against them.

Speaking for myself, and I assume to speak for no other, there will be no absenteeism if I am in good health and able to be here when the vote comes; and I shall not vote for the

House bill. I shall do what I can within legitimate means to prevent it from coming to a vote. I am not going to filibuster, and if it comes to a vote I shall vote against it. I shall expect the senior Senator from Iowa to do the same thing, because he does not believe—he has stated to-day and yesterday that he does not believe—in the justice of the tariff schedules sent here by another body and supported by the other side. I know the Senator well enough to believe that he, not believing, will not support.

Now, where are the votes to come from on this side of the Chamber to pass the Democratic measure, for—I dislike to use different words in describing Republicans—I will say the Republicans of this side must, in justice to the principles they profess, support the Republican measure and vote against the Democratic measure at any and all times. How can the minority's tariff measure pass this body, that being the case?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, of course it could not pass the body if all the Republicans were moved by the same sense of duty which actuates the senior Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HEYBURN. We are bound to assume that they are.

Mr. CUMMINS. I never dreamed that he would attempt to pass the House bill by refraining from voting. He did not a year ago.

But I reply now to the senior Senator from Idaho in respect to my attitude toward the House bill. If the House bill were confined to a reduction of the duties, as they are reduced in it, to the heavier forms of iron and steel, I would vote for it in a moment, because I believe it to be fully protective from our standpoint. But inasmuch as it reduces the duties upon the more highly organized manufactured forms of iron and steel to a point which I believe is not protective, I can not vote for the House bill, and I do not intend to vote for it. So there need be no uncertainty with regard to that particular matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa one single question. Does the Senator from Iowa think that the House bill is better or worse than the existing Payne-Aldrich law?

Mr. CUMMINS. I believe that the House bill, as applied to the iron and steel industry, is not so good as the Payne-Aldrich tariff law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I asked the Senator from Iowa that question, because there has been a great deal of discussion in the magazines and a great deal upon the floor of the Senate coming from the school of politics to which he belongs in denunciation of the Payne-Aldrich metal schedule, and I had hoped that even though the bill came from the Democratic Party he could find it within his heart to recognize that some good might come out of Nazareth; and as he has been contending for a reduction of duties, I had hoped that even though our scheme of reduction was not precisely his scheme—not exactly the scheme but very close to it—he might find it in his heart to vote in behalf of the great consuming public of America, in behalf of whom he has delivered very many very eloquent speeches.

I had rather hoped that we were both prepared to serve the people rather than our parties. I am. If the Democratic bill should fail, I would vote for the bill offered by the Senator from Iowa, because while I do not think it goes sufficiently far in reducing taxes upon the American people it is infinitely better than the Payne-Aldrich law, and I would be reduced to a choice between the Payne-Aldrich law and his bill. I had hoped that when he was reduced to a choice between the Democratic bill and the Payne-Aldrich law he would follow in the lines of his utterances.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if I believed the Senator from Mississippi held the opinion that might be fairly inferred from the utterance he has just made, it would greatly concern me. But I have too high a regard for his capacity and understanding to make the inference which one might be inclined to draw.

I can not vote for the House bill, because I believe that upon a great many things it reduces the duty below the protective point. As I have said a great many times, being a protectionist, if I am forced to decide whether a duty shall be above or below the protective point, I must choose the higher point.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Be calm. I would do so for the reason that if the duty does not come to the protective point it ceases to answer in any degree the protective principle. I believe the House bill applied to these heavier forms of iron and steel is not a revenue bill at all. I believe you are deluding yourselves upon that subject. I do not believe it is a revenue bill, because

I do not think that the duties are low enough to invite any considerable importations of those commodities. I would therefore vote for that part of the House bill if I were driven to a choice between it and similar paragraphs in the Payne-Aldrich tariff law. It matters not to me whether the law or bill originates with the Democratic Party or with the Republican Party. I am not held so close to the hearts of our friends upon this side of the Chamber that I can refuse the kindly offices of sympathy from my friends upon the other side. I will vote for any measure, no matter from whence it comes, that will reduce the duties upon the Payne-Aldrich law, provided they do not reduce them below the point which will furnish fair and reasonable protection for our own people.

The difficulty with the House bill, as I have said, from my standpoint—it is perfect from your standpoint—is that with regard to the 28 or 30 paragraphs which embrace the advanced forms of manufacture of the Payne-Aldrich law, in my opinion you fall below, and in many instances far below, the level of protection.

If I were to vote to put those paragraphs of the House bill into the law and so expose the producers who are protected by them to the unfair competition or rivalry from abroad, I would be compelled to abandon a principle that I have held so long as I have known anything of political economy or of national politics, whereas the Senator from Mississippi, on the other hand, is not so situated. He believes in a tariff for revenue. Really I think he believes in free trade, and that is not disparaging, because if it were not for protection, as I said the other day, I would not raise the revenue of this country at the customhouses. But he believes in a tariff for revenue. Our tariff is higher than a revenue tariff, and any reduction on any duty is an approach toward the principle which he so ably and so eloquently espouses and advocates. Therefore he can, without any inconsistency whatever, vote for any reduction in the tariff duties and he will be entirely in harmony with the views that he has held his whole life long. But it is not so with one who views the economic question from the standpoint I have occupied.

Therefore I am sure the Senator from Mississippi will see that my earnestness for tariff reduction or the sincerity of my efforts for tariff reduction is not challenged by the fact that I can not, must not, will not go below that point which I believe furnishes the people of this country a protection which they can justly demand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa further yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield again to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Iowa has made a mistake when he says that I would vote for any reduction. I would not. I recognize that there confronts the American people a condition to which I would not apply my theory ruthlessly, or overnight, as the Germans say. I am not criticizing the Senator from Iowa. I have the highest regard for his sincerity. I believe him to be intellectually honest, and that is a very high compliment to pay to a man. I believe that he has intellectual integrity. I have not attempted to attack his sincerity or his integrity at all. I would be false to myself if I had attempted it. But it does seem to me that in his remarks to-day he has put himself outside the pale of those who differ with other men upon a question of principle, and has put himself in the pale of those who differ with them only upon a question of percentages.

The Senator from Iowa speaks of the "protective point." What is the protective point? If there be any real protective point it is the point of prohibition of foreign imports. Wherever a protective duty fails to keep out of competition with American producers the entire foreign production, whatever it may be, falls to any extent whatsoever, it falls just to that extent in being a protective duty.

Now, I have hitherto understood that the Senator from Iowa wanted a sufficient importation of foreign production to compete with American production to the extent, at any rate, of making the American producer treat the American consumer fairly. If I am mistaken about that I have mistaken the Senator from Iowa clear through. I have understood the difference between a protective prohibitionist, a reasonable protectionist, and a man who believes in a tariff for revenue. I do not understand what the Senator from Iowa means by the protective point.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Mississippi want me to explain now?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would be glad to understand it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have explained it a great many times, but possibly not in the hearing of the Senator from Mississippi.

The protective point is that point at which the domestic producer can supply the entire domestic market.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah!

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment. Theoretically I have stated the protective point. If the domestic price is raised above a fair one from the American standpoint, then the importation comes in. If the domestic price is kept at or below the American level, the importation does not come in, again theoretically. When, however, we are ascertaining or fixing the protective point, it being impossible to do it with absolute and mathematical accuracy, if it be fixed along the lines I have already stated, there will be in the very nature of things a certain importation. In order to exclude all importations the wall must be raised so high that it would be far above the protective point. If it is fixed as nearly as we can fix it at a protective point, trade and commerce, with their ebb and flow, will pass over the barrier and there will be a reasonable importation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. President, if I understand the Senator from Iowa, and I think probably I do, the protective point is the point of the tariff duties at which the American producer can supply the entire American market at a satisfactory profit.

I think that is a summary of what the Senator from Iowa has said. Where are we left when that definition is given? We have thousands of schedules, and the protective point is the point of tariff levy at which—and I am using now, in the first three words, the Senator's own words—the entire American market will be the field for the American producer at a satisfactory profit. The words "at a satisfactory profit" are mine, not his. Who is going to determine what the "satisfactory profit" is? How is it to be determined? Upon what basis? By whom? Are we to be left forever to determine this very important point by hearing the so-called testimony of so-called witnesses who appear in behalf of their own pocketbooks in order to make the best showing that they possibly can for themselves and against the public to the American national legislators? What will constitute a satisfactory or, as the Republican platform calls it, a reasonable profit? Who is to determine when it exists? Who is to determine when it is exceeded? Who is to determine what percentage constitutes it?

I come back to what I said. I think the Senator has extirpated all points of difference in principle between him and the Senator from Idaho. If the Senator from Idaho were called upon to testify as to what he thought was the protective point, he would say it was the point at which the duty was so high that the foreigner could not compete. If the Senator from Utah chief apostle in the church of protectionism, were called upon to define what he considered a satisfactory protective duty, he would define it in exactly the same way—that it was the rate of duty which gave to the American producer the American market, regardless of the American consumer.

The Senator from Idaho has said we are all consumers and we are all producers. With regard to any particular schedule we are not. Not 1 per cent of the American people are engaged either with their capital or their labor in making metal, and the other 99 per cent are engaged every now and then to some slight extent, more or less, in buying these numerous products. The trouble with the Senator's statement is that he has forgotten what he has sometimes previously dwelt upon so eloquently, to wit, the fact that the American consumer, the American buyer, has some rights. The negro upon my plantation who looks at the rear elevation of a mule day after day while he plows cotton and corn has some rights in this country when it comes to economical arrangements, though he does not make steel, though he does not manufacture wool nor cotton, and has nothing to do with the manufacture of those things.

Mr. President, this brings me back to the Republican platform, and then I am through.

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope the Senator from Mississippi will not inject a long speech into mine; but I have no objection to—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Upon second thought, Mr. President—I forgot myself—I have injected too much already, and I will leave off even the other sentence that I intended to put in now, but I could not well keep my seat in face of the last explanation of the Senator from Iowa. Before I take my seat, however, I want to say that I have just about as much confidence in the political integrity and the intellectual integrity of the Senator from Iowa as I have in my own, which last confidence is absolute, but I think he is making a great strategic mistake.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I never listen to the Senator from Mississippi without feeling a little better than before he began to speak. He has the faculty of lifting one up somewhat even while he criticizes him. I think I would rather have the



compliment that he has just bestowed upon me than any honor that is likely to befall me. I do not agree with the Senator from Mississippi. I do not see that I have stated my belief in any other terms or in any other form than I have often heretofore stated it. I can not plead guilty to the accusation that in my estimate of the tariff the consumer is forgotten. On the contrary, as I said the other day, the difference between the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] and myself is that I always begin the consideration of a tariff schedule by thinking of the consumer and then of the producer, while others reverse the process of reflection.

I now feel, however, before I say the final word, which I must say in a moment, that I should yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who claimed my attention some time ago.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, referring to the legislative situation, I want to say merely a few words. I find myself in the position that I can not vote for the pending Democratic bill, and I do not want to vote for the substitute offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. There are many rates in the substitute I could approve, but, taken as a whole, it would be impossible for me to vote for it. What am I to do? Am I to vote for his amendment believing that if I did so it would become a law?

Mr. BAILEY. You mean the President would approve it?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know what the President would do. I can not say as to that.

Mr. BAILEY. It could not become a law unless he did approve it.

Mr. SMOOT. Or am I to vote against it and allow the Democratic bill to pass?

Let us look at the history of tariff legislation at our last session. The Republicans in this Chamber voted against an amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to the Democratic wool bill; they voted against the Democratic wool bill; and as soon as both of these bills were defeated, a Democrat immediately arose, asked for the reconsideration of the bill, and then the Democrats voted with a few Republican Senators, and the bill was passed. I may, on second thought, be mistaken as to the Senator who asked for a reconsideration. It may have been a Republican who asked for that reconsideration, but, be that as it may, every Democrat voted for the bill that they had a few minutes before voted against. We are told now that that shall again be the program; that if we vote against the Democratic bill and if we vote against the substitute offered by the Senator from Iowa, as soon as that is done some Senator will ask for a reconsideration, and the Cummins amendment will be passed.

What am I to do, Mr. President, as a Senator believing in the principles of protection? Am I to allow this thing to happen, knowing that that is the program? I do not believe that it would be proper or right; I do not believe that the American people, when they understand the situation, will say that a Senator who believes in protection should sit here and allow a program of that kind to be carried out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. I want to ask him to do an exceedingly difficult thing for the Senator from Utah; I want to ask him to put himself in my place for the nonce with regard to the answer that he will make to the question I am about to ask him—that is awfully difficult, I know—but suppose he were a Democrat and in favor of reducing tariff taxes, and suppose that he had failed in getting through a bill which reduced them, say, 50 per cent, just for an illustration, and suppose he then had an opportunity to vote for a bill that reduced them 20 per cent, does he not understand that it would be absolutely impossible for him in our place to be true to himself and pursue any other course than that of supporting the next best bill?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I say, just as the Senator from Iowa has stated, that the Senator from Mississippi perhaps is consistent in his position and statement, but that is not all there is in this proposition. We know what the program is; and, as was stated by the Senator from Iowa, we were taunted with it by a Democratic Senator only yesterday. So far as that is concerned, it did not trouble me in the least, because I know the Senator who taunted the Republicans knew that that would be the program, and he will help to carry it out. Therefore, Mr. President, the Republican Members who believe in protection and in all that the word "protection" implies, unless a bill can be provided that all the Republicans can agree upon, I believe are justified in doing the very best

they can to defeat a bill that they do not believe would be amply protective to the industries of this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the Senator from Utah sits down—

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the Senator from Utah sits down I should like to ask him one question. I do not know whether I understood him or misunderstood him; but I gathered from his speech the other day that he admitted that some of the duties in the metal schedule were too high.

Mr. SMOOT. I called attention to the fact that the rate on tin plate could be reduced, based upon the testimony of the men who make it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. President, having secured that confirmation of my recollection, or, rather, of my hearing, I want to ask the Senator a question: He is, of course, a great Republican constructive statesman, as all Republican statesmen are, and why is it that the Senator from Utah has not introduced a bill reducing those duties where they are too high even from his standpoint?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Utah will not make his answer to that question long. I really think it is not quite fair to inject two such prominent figures as the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Utah in the foreground of my speech.

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, the Senator from Utah—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa submit to interruption by another important character? [Laughter.]

Mr. CUMMINS. I do; I think, now that these two eminent gentlemen are grouped together, I might as well admit another.

Mr. BAILEY. Well, I wanted to make plain what the Senator from Utah intends for the initiated to understand, and that is, he is serving notice on you that Republicans like him intend to refrain from voting and let us pass the Democratic bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely. I understand that. He is not, however, serving notice upon me, but is really answering the charge that I made a few moments ago against him and those who are with him, that they were about to do that thing.

Mr. BAILEY. It is not often they can do so good a thing.

Mr. CUMMINS. I was trying to convince them that they ought not to do it.

Mr. SMOOT. That has been the burden of the Senator's speech here for the last half hour.

Mr. CUMMINS. Surely; and I think I have made a step in advance when they feel compelled to explain and defend.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They were forced into an experience meeting at any rate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes. Mr. President, as the Senator from Utah was describing that rather tortuous way which led him finally to the conclusion that he ought to pass a measure in which he did not believe at all in order to defeat a measure in which he believed partly, I could not help thinking of those lines which run something like this:

Oh what a tangled web we weave  
When first we practice to deceive.

You are deceiving yourselves. Why do you not take on some of the candor and the courage displayed by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HENRY]? He will not flee this Chamber when the House bill is to be voted upon; he will sit here and record his judgment with respect to that bill; and I simply want all Republican Senators to accept him as a model in this respect—as an example—upon the vote about to be had. I do not ask the Senator from Utah to vote for a measure in which he does not believe; but I do ask—and I believe the country will ask presently—that Republican Senators shall sit here and record their honest beliefs respecting the subject, and not refrain from voting so as to send a bill to the President in order that he may veto it because it is a Democratic bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Iowa if he intends to insist upon the use of the word "first" in his quotation?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, that was a mere act of memory, and I may not have correctly quoted the passage. It has been many years since I have had any occasion to apply it to anybody, and I therefore may have misquoted it.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator quoted it correctly.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—  
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think there is any disposition on the part of any Republican to try to deceive anybody. I do not believe that there is any disposition on the part of the Democrats to deceive the Republicans or themselves. I think the program is known by every Democrat in the Chamber, and I think they have agreed to it time and time again.

Mr. ASHURST and Mr. OLIVER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I must insist on finishing my observations, and then the whole subject will be open for discussion. Indeed, I had finished—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I intended from the beginning that my last word should be a word of adjuration, of appeal to my Republican associates to stand up and be counted upon this subject.

You know that my bill is a better bill from the protective standpoint than the Democratic bill. Therefore I am entitled to your affirmative votes in order to substitute it for the House bill, and when it is substituted for the House bill, if you are not convinced that it is a better bill than the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, then record your votes against it. In that way the record of the Senate will be written with sincerity, with courage, and with some comprehension of our responsibility in the performance of our public duties; but do not, for conscience sake, permit any amendment or any bill to pass or to be defeated in order that an ulterior purpose or object may be accomplished.

Mr. President, I have finished.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator just one question. It is this: In all the tariff legislation from the beginning of tariff legislation in this country, does the Senator remember a time, with the exception of the last Congress, where bills were introduced and all of them voted down, and then the Democratic Party voted for the bill that they voted against and it was passed by the solid vote of the Democratic Party and a few votes on the Republican side of the Chamber?

Mr. CUMMINS. My experience in the Senate has been brief. The Senator from Utah knows much more about the history of the Senate and what has occurred here than I do. Therefore I will not attempt to answer his question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not true that hardly ever a measure is passed where some one does not vote against some amendment but does vote for the bill?

Mr. CUMMINS. That is not the question.

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is the same principle.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, the appeal of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to his Republican associates to vote in favor of his amendment as against the Democratic bill is a very fair sample of that plausible but very fallacious kind of argument in which the Senator from Iowa is an adept. When a tariff bill similar in nature to this was before the Senate last year, the Democratic Senators and a section of the Republican Senators laid a trap for the other Republican Senators, and it succeeded. When another bill of the same nature came before the Senate, Republican Senators refused to be led into this trap.

Now, as between the bill as it came from the House and the substitute offered by the Senator from Iowa, I will say that both are objectionable to the protectionists of the Senate. The House bill is a revenue measure. The substitute offered by the Senator from Iowa is insufficiently protective. I am against both measures, and I propose, as a Senator performing my duty as one of the representatives of my State, to do everything I can, either by voting or refraining from voting, to prevent the adoption of either of these measures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. CUMMINS. Upon that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I am informed that that Senator is absent from the city on important public business. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. CRAWFORD's name was called). I have been requested to announce that the Senator from South

Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. FOSTER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], but I am released on this vote, and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GORE (when Mr. OWEN's name was called). My colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma, is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE].

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN]. I transfer the pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARCGS], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REDD], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BURNHAM. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I am informed that if he were present and voting he would vote against the pending amendment. As I am of the same mind, I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BAILEY. I have a pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. DIXON] and therefore withhold my vote. I desire this announcement to stand not only for to-day, but until the conclusion of the work in which he is now engaged.

I also desire the announcement to stand as an explanation of why I have not voted on some other roll calls.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is detained from the Chamber on public business.

Mr. LODGE. My colleague [Mr. CRANE] has a standing pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. GARDNER].

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—12.			
Borah	Clapp	Jones	Poindexter
Bourne	Cummins	Nelson	Townsend
Bristow	Gronna	Page	Works
NAYS—60.			
Ashurst	Dillingham	McCumber	Sanders
Bacon	du Pont	McLean	Shively
Bankhead	Fall	Martin, Va.	Simmons
Bradley	Fletcher	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Foster	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	Gallinger	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.
Burnham	Gore	Oliver	Smoot
Burton	Guggenheim	Overman	Stephenson
Catron	Heyburn	Paynter	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Percy	Swanson
Chilton	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	Thornton
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Pomerene	Tillman
Culberson	Lea	Rayner	Watson
Cullom	Lippitt	Richardson	Wetmore
Curtis	Lodge	Root	Williams
NOT VOTING—23.			
Bailey	Davis	La Follette	Reed
Briggs	Dixon	Lorimer	Smith, Md.
Brown	Gamble	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Mich.
Clark, Wyo.	Gardner	Nixon	Stone
Crane	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Warren
Crawford	Kenyon	Penrose	

So the substitute of Mr. CUMMINS was rejected.

Mr. HEYBURN. I suggest that it is rather late in the day, and the Senate is not ready to vote upon the pending bill. I therefore move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, the Senate is evidently in an industrious mood and desires to further consider the measure before the Senate. The zeal of Senators is rather unusual, but very gratifying. No greater mistake could be indulged in than to think that this measure has received that consideration which it will receive or must receive before being sent out to the country as an enactment, so far as the Senate is concerned.

I was engaged at a very interesting point to the Republicans when this matter was last before the Senate. I know that the Democrats take very little interest in a Republican platform. I know that Republicans are presumably very greatly interested in the principles of their party. I am going to test it, because my remarks will be addressed to the Republicans for a few moments. Then if the Democrats are still in evidence I will address some remarks to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Meanwhile will the Senate be in order? Will Senators please refrain from conversing in audible tones—those other than the one entitled to the floor?

Mr. HEYBURN. In support of the suggestion of the Chair I will say that I will undertake to do all the talking that is indulged in while I have the floor. I do not mean by that that I am not ready to be interrupted, but there will be some talk going on.

Yesterday I was calling the attention of the Republican Members to the promises they had made and declarations of princi-

ples that are as binding upon them to-day as they were when they were announced. The principles of a Government do not change. The declarations of principles are to be respected.

Mr. President, I would inquire if the rules permit me to stroll back where I can be close to those who are present. These Senators did not wish to adjourn. I assume that they had some reason for not desiring to adjourn. I am going to talk rather plainly about it. They will either pass on the motion to adjourn with reasonable frequency or they will make it unnecessary. They certainly do not imagine that I am going to refrain from discussing this question in the Senate Chamber because they do not care to hear it. They never were more mistaken if they do.

I am going to call the attention of Senators to what the Republican Party told the people it stood for in 1884, and that is not very far back. Most Senators were then actively engaged or interested, at least, in the affairs of the Government. This is the declaration, and it is as much a part of the Republican policy and principles to-day as it was when it was published by the convention in 1884:

It is the first duty of a good government to protect the rights and promote the interests of its own people.

The largest diversity of industry is most productive of general prosperity and of the comfort and independence of the people.

We therefore demand that the imposition of duties on foreign imports shall be made not "for revenue only," but that in raising the requisite revenues for the Government such duties shall be so levied as to afford security—

Bear that word in mind; I will revert to it directly—

security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborer, to the end that active and intelligent labor, as well as capital, may have its just reward and the laboring man his full share in the national prosperity.

Against the so-called economic system of the Democratic Party, which would degrade our labor to the foreign standard, we enter our earnest protest.

The Republican Party pledges itself to correct the inequalities of the tariff and to reduce the surplus.

Now, the first part of that platform, the protective part of it, was good Republican doctrine, and it would have won the election for the Republican Party in that year. But the Democrats were making the campaign upon the cry of surplus. They made nearly as much noise about it as they now make on the tariff question, and some—enough—of the members of the committee that framed this platform were deceived by that noise, because they were charged with the iniquitous crime of so conducting the affairs of the Government as to produce a surplus that they immediately took to the woods and promised they would not do it again. The result was the American people said, "Well, if you are not for protection and the fruits of protection, we will give you a chance to think it over," and they elected a Democrat President of the United States.

So what they did—and this is a warning against giving heed to the cry of those who have it in mind to scare you away from the principles which they fear—the committee went on and said:

The Republican Party pledges itself to correct the inequalities of the tariff and to reduce the surplus.

The Republican Party, running before the charge made against them by Democrats ambitious for power and office, retreated and lost out to the Democrats. You ought to be very careful that that lesson is not repeated.

I read that platform and emphasized it particularly because we repeated that mistake in 1892. We apologized for being Republicans. We asserted the doctrine of Republicanism, asserted the benefits that had been derived from it, and then, because the Democrats were making so much noise that some of the people thought there must be something in their cry, we retreated from it and apologized and said we would not do it again. So the Democrats came in, and they got rid of the surplus. That is their strong point. No one ever charges the Democratic Party with so administering the affairs of the Government as to create a surplus. That is one thing they are not guilty of.

In that platform, however, shifting as it was, we declared specifically for the duty on wool. The Republican Party said:

We recognize the importance of sheep husbandry in the United States, the serious depression which it is now experiencing, and the danger threatening its future prosperity; and we therefore respect the demands of the representatives of this important agricultural interest for a readjustment of duties upon foreign wool.

They had that in mind, but they promised a change. Well, the people had put them in power because of what they were, what they stood for, and the people expected them to remain hitched, but because somebody gave a long yapping at their heels they broke loose and ran away. We have seen that kind of thing happen not only in conventions but elsewhere.

Now I come to a platform that commended the Republican Party to the people, the next one, in 1888. We learned some sense from the chastisement that we got in 1884, and we quit apologizing for being Republicans.

I have heard some discussion here in connection with these tariff schedules where I think, without realizing just exactly the effect of the words, there has been some apology for Republican legislation and a tacit promise to undo it. I am not in sympathy with that kind of talk or action.

Now I beg your attention to the platform that speaks Republicanism, that of 1888, when we nominated Benjamin Harrison for President of the United States on a real Republican platform. This is it:

We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection; we protest against its destruction as proposed by the President—

Cleveland—

and his party. They serve the interests of Europe; we will support the interests of America. We accept the issue and confidently appeal to the people for their judgment. The protective system must be maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by general disaster to all interests except those of the usurer and the sheriff.

They had gotten a little Republican vigor into them by that time, and they realized the effect of their declarations of apology. The usurer and the sheriff came pretty soon afterwards, when we did have a Republican administration.

We condemn the proposition of the Democratic Party to place wool on the free list—

And yet we hear men in this body, in this Congress and in the last Congress, on the Republican side of this Chamber, who are willing to compromise for free wool or its equivalent. They stand here and engage in cheeseparing and quibbling and refining of figures to try to prove that we could possibly live if we did not have what we are entitled to. Bear that declaration in mind when we come to consider the woolen schedule—

and we insist that the duties thereon shall be adjusted and maintained so as to furnish full and adequate protection to that industry throughout the United States.

The Republican Party would effect all needed reduction of the national revenue by repealing the taxes upon tobacco, which are an annoyance and burden to agriculture, and the tax upon spirits used in the arts and for mechanical purposes.

We have already legislated that last declaration into law.

Upon that platform we elected our President, and we entered upon an era of prosperity. During that administration we enacted the McKinley tariff bill. In 1888 both parties boasted of their prosperity.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. Does not the Senator think that at this time of the day we ought to have a quorum?

Mr. HEYBURN. I think there is a quorum here, probably. There are many here who had better be at home in their household, but they like to be here. I think they like to hear me talk.

Mr. JONES. I make the point of no quorum, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cullom	Lodge	Sanders
Bailey	Cummins	McCumber	Shively
Borah	Curtis	McLean	Simmons
Bourne	du Pont	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Bradley	Fall	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Brandeggee	Fletcher	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Bristow	Gallinger	O'Gorman	Smoot
Bryan	Gore	Oliver	Swanson
Burnham	Gronna	Page	Tillman
Burton	Heyburn	Paynter	Townsend
Catron	Hitchcock	Percy	Watson
Chilton	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	Williams
Clapp	Jones	Poindexter	Works
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Pomeroy	
Clarke, Ark.	Lea	Richardson	
Cullbertson	Lippitt	Root	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-one Senators have answered the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator from Idaho if he will yield to me for a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, no Senator is more anxious to complete the work of the present session than I am, but there are certain things that we can not do, as is well

known to every Senator who has had much experience here. Yesterday, as a matter of courtesy to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], the Senate adjourned perhaps a few minutes later than to-day, but we had been in session only from 12 o'clock on yesterday. We have been in session to-day continuously from 11 o'clock.

The Senator from Idaho is not in robust health and he wishes to discuss this question. I think he ought to be given a fair opportunity to do it when the Senators are in their seats and when they are not tired with the arduous duties of a long legislative day. Desiring to extend the same courtesy to the Senator from Idaho that was extended to other Senators, I now move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator withhold his motion?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly, I withhold it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will ask the Senator if he will not withhold his motion for a few minutes that some amendments may be offered?

Mr. GALLINGER. With pleasure.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then there will be no opposition to an adjournment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho has the floor, however, if the Senate continues in session.

Mr. HEYBURN. I yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield for the purpose of having amendments considered?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I sent to the Secretary's desk an amendment which I desire to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend by changing the number of paragraph 73 to 74, by changing the number of paragraph 72 to 73, by changing the number of paragraph 71 to 72, and by increasing the free list by inserting the following as paragraph 71:

Trace chains, plows, axes, spades, shovels, hoes, cane knives, briar hooks, rakes, scythes, sickles, pruning knives, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills, and planters, mowers, horse-rakes, cultivators, thrashing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Mr. GALLINGER. I inquire if there are other amendments to be offered?

Mr. SIMMONS. On behalf of the minority members of the committee in charge of the House bill, I accept the amendment just offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator desired it to lie over, did he not? The Senator did not wish action upon his amendment this evening, as I understand?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I offered the amendment this morning. Our purpose was to perfect such amendments to the minority report this evening as the committee agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it is manifest that we can not consider and vote upon that amendment this evening. It will be discussed, I think, somewhat.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not suppose, Mr. President, that a vote would be asked upon the amendment this evening; I supposed it would simply be offered, and that I would state for the minority that we would accept the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely.

Mr. SIMMONS. When we next consider the bill we can vote upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be considered as the pending amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I now renew my motion to adjourn.

Mr. SIMMONS. There are one or two other amendments yet to be offered, I understand.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well. I withhold the motion.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it an amendment to the amendment or a new amendment?

Mr. POMERENE. It is a new amendment; it is to a different paragraph of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is one amendment now pending.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that the amendment might be read for information, and be printed and lie over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. On page 20, line 21, after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert: Machine tools, 20 per cent ad valorem.

And on page 22, line 9, to strike out the words "machine tools."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to state that, on behalf of the minority members of the Finance Committee, we will accept that amendment. I understand there is one other amendment to be presented.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read, for the information of the Senate only, as it is not in order at this time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Do I understand that the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is accepted by the minority members of the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina simply expressed a willingness to that effect. The amendment can not be accepted; it will have to be voted on in its regular order.

The Chair desires to inform the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] that his proposed amendment has already been read; that it is now on the table, and as it is not in order nothing further can be done with it at this time.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood that the Senator from Nevada wished to make some statement as to his purpose with respect to that amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will not yield for a speech from any Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. He does not intend to make a speech.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state that I can make the explanation in a few words to-morrow morning.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certain Senators have expressed a wish to have an executive session. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 29, 1912, at 12 o'clock m.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 28, 1912.*

##### SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Joshua L. Chamberlain to be surveyor of customs in the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine.

##### PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Cadet Gustavus Urban Stewart to be third lieutenant.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Henry L. Fassett to be United States marshal for the western district of New York.

Guy Murchie to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

##### POSTMASTERS.

###### ALABAMA.

Henry J. Godfrey, Columbia.  
James W. McNeil, Luverne.  
Robert L. Wilson, Stevenson.

###### MISSISSIPPI.

Malcolm S. Graham, Forest.  
Sidney M. Jordan, Louisville.  
Lewis M. Joyner, Agricultural College.  
Andrew M. Patterson, jr., Como.  
Wade H. Phyfer, New Albany.  
James M. Tyler, Bogue Chitto.

###### OHIO.

Charles H. Huffman, Richwood.

###### PENNSYLVANIA.

John F. Fenstermacher, Mount Joy.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 28, 1912.

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, make us conscious of Thy presence by quickening our minds and conscience, that we may walk in the light of Thy countenance, and, without taking ourselves too seriously, do the work Thou hast given us to do in humility, yet with courage and fortitude, in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. PADGETT. 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 naval appropriation bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] rise?

Mr. HEFLIN. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Tennessee will be pending while the gentleman from Alabama rises to a question of personal privilege. The gentleman from Alabama will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Focht] in referring to me said:

Now, my friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has undertaken, I think, to do something that does not become him, and, in view of the record of his own State, is indefensible.

In another place he says:

Mr. Chairman, in substantiation of what I have read, in response to what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has said in his assaults on the North and labor conditions there, and to the shame of the State of Alabama, I want to show you the evidence of the inhumanity, brutality, and cruelty of his State.

This is a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and reflects upon me and my service here, and charges something that is not true, namely, that I had assaulted the North, and I desire to address the House upon the question of personal privilege.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman has not stated any question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair could not hear distinctly what the matter was. The gentleman from Alabama will read the passage on which he claims he has the right to rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am reading from the RECORD of yesterday, Mr. Speaker, page 7265. The gentleman from Pennsylvania said:

I want, Mr. Chairman, to read a few lines from a letter written by a friend of mine who resides near his [my] home, and I think, possibly, in his district.

And in that letter, Mr. Speaker, there is a reflection not only upon my district, but the entire State.

The SPEAKER. But read what is in the letter.

Mr. HEFLIN. Of course, the letter itself, Mr. Speaker, does not refer to me, but what the gentleman himself said does. He said in another place:

Mr. Chairman, in substantiation of what I have read, in response to what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has said in his assaults on the North and labor conditions there, and to the shame of the State of Alabama, I want to show you the evidence of the inhumanity, brutality, and cruelty of his State—greater than the camps of Siberia and Russia.

Now, the other question of privilege. When I arose and asked unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] objected.

The SPEAKER. Where is that?

Mr. HEFLIN. It is on page 7266, near the center of the second column. I said:

Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to deny me the opportunity to reply to the assault made upon my State by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. Good. The gentleman from Alabama has already invited all the attacks that he has received.

I had made no statement in my speech that invited any such attack; but the gentleman from Pennsylvania proceeded undisturbed; no one objected upon this side of the House; and when I rose, after this slanderous assault had been made upon my people—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama will suspend. What is the point that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] made?

Mr. DALZELL. That the gentleman has not stated any question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think that that point is well taken. Of course, men might stand up here and abuse Alabama or Missouri or any other State until they were black in the face without laying the foundation for a question of personal privilege. The rule is that the question of privilege rests upon something that affects a man injuriously or scandalously in his representative capacity.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is exactly what I am trying to get at. My grounds, as stated, constitute a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. Now, what part of this is it that the gentleman claims appertains to him in his legislative capacity?

Mr. HEFLIN. The rule says, "The rights, reputation, and conduct of Members, individually, in their representative capacity," and so forth, constitute a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. That is exactly it, and it is a very narrow question, too.

Mr. HEFLIN. Now, it reflects upon me, Mr. Speaker. He says that this man who writes the letter about the conditions in Alabama lives near my home, lives, he thinks, in the district that I represent, and that I can not stand here and make a speech upon these other questions because these conditions that he talks about exist down there; that my position is indefensible; that I have attacked the North, which is not true, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. That part of it, if it is considered scandalous or affecting the gentleman in his representative capacity, would lay the foundation. The Chair can understand very well how the gentleman from Alabama would feel outraged in his feelings if somebody assaults the State of Alabama, but that does not make a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says:

Mr. HEFLIN has undertaken, I think, to do something that does not become him—

The SPEAKER. That was the gentleman's opinion about it.

Mr. HEFLIN (continuing)—

And, in view of the record of his own State, is indefensible.

The SPEAKER. Well, that was just simply in that gentleman's opinion.

Mr. HEFLIN. It forms a basis, Mr. Speaker, to my mind, for a question of personal privilege. I am convinced of that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague will yield to me for a moment, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] shall proceed for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that his colleague be allowed to proceed for 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, in my speech yesterday with reference to the unemployed of this country and the dreadful conditions obtaining under the high protective tariff system of the Republican Party, I reflected upon no particular State, upon no particular Member. I simply arraigned the Republican Party, and stated that for 16 years the Republican Party had been in power and that we had been trying to obtain remedial legislation for the laboring people of the United States and had failed. After I had discussed some of the things that have oppressed the laboring men of America, Mr. Focht, of Pennsylvania, arose and reflected upon me and delivered a slanderous assault against my State. The gentleman read a letter—and where it comes from, God only knows; no post mark, no date, no particular convict camp was referred to, and yet it contains a charge against an officer of the State of Alabama with reference to his treatment of a convict. It names no place; it names no man, and yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania calls the writer of this mysterious, slanderous letter a friend of his.

Where is that convict camp where the gentleman says they whipped a black man in the presence of a northern man? There is no truth in that statement. The State that I have the honor in part to represent has a reformatory for young criminals, both white and black, and Alabama stands well with reference to her humane treatment of convicts within her borders. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, Alabama has a law which forbids and punishes cruel treatment of convicts. We have State inspectors, whose duties are to report on the health, sanitary condition, and general treatment of convicts. I do not claim that conditions are perfect in the convict system of Alabama, but I do resent the false and slanderous charge contained in the letter read in this House yesterday regarding that system.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Focht] by his attack on me and on my State yesterday is responsible for my speech this morning. As evidence of that fact I quote from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], a Republican. On yesterday, when I tried to obtain unanimous consent to reply to the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr.

FOCHT], Mr. Good, a Republican, objected, and here is what Mr. AUSTIN said:

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of appealing to my colleague from Iowa to withdraw his objection. This attack upon the State of Alabama came from the Republican side, and I ask in all justice and fair play as a Republican that the gentleman from Alabama have the opportunity to be heard in answer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the point was not made against the gentleman from Pennsylvania, when he read his letter, from this side, and it is unfair for this side to object to the gentleman from Alabama having an opportunity to reply to it.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I shall say now I feel justified in saying on account of what was said here yesterday by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones." For the benefit of the gentleman from Pennsylvania I desire to read from the hearings before the Rules Committee regarding the treatment of free labor in Pennsylvania:

Mr. FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I understand you have but little time to listen to the numerous arguments that we intended to present, and I will be as brief as possible.

I want to state that we are desirous of this investigation, and expect to prove, as Mr. WILSON stated—

Mr. WILSON is one of the honored Democratic Representatives from Pennsylvania and a true and tried friend of the laboring man.

That there is peonage—

What!

That there is peonage—

Where? In Pennsylvania. [Applause]—

that the coal companies have erected stockades, and that they have resorted to other methods to compel the mine workers and others who are not mine workers, whom they have imported into their mine localities, to work in the mines, keeping them there against their will. I know from experience hundreds of cases where men have escaped, got over what they call the "dead line," where deputies employed by the coal companies are stationed to patrol the outer edges of the company's property. They have some privileges, liberties, inside of the company's property, but if they attempt to get out at any time they are restrained from doing so, and frequently threatened, and often beaten and driven back in.

Where is this? It is in Pennsylvania. No such condition exists in Alabama—not anywhere in the State of Alabama. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If they get over what the imported men call the "dead line" and are captured again, they are taken back forcibly, and in many instances men who have escaped from these stockades in the mining localities have come into the miners' headquarters to obtain information as to how they could get away from the place and to get financial assistance.

Listen. Taken back by force for what? For trying to escape from the clutches of the cruel industrial slavery of the State of Pennsylvania under Republican rule. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They have been sometimes badly wounded; many of them had their heads cut; some of them even shot and otherwise disfigured—

What a fearful condition!

That is the condition that prevails, and the citizens of Westmoreland County know that condition and have known of it in a general way since the strike was inaugurated. We expect that a Federal investigation will put a stop to this. We expect to prove on investigation that men, in order to go to church on Sunday morning, were required to get a pass out from the officials of the coal company or the deputies.

Think of that. These men are not convicts, and yet they are not permitted to go out and worship God on Sunday unless the industrial boss gives them a written pass, and this in the gentleman's State of Pennsylvania.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the black slave in Alabama in the old slave days was treated a thousand times better than were these poor white industrial slaves in Pennsylvania under the reign of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Men guarded in a camp, not permitted to get out, hounded by guards and deputies, lashed and shot and driven back; human beings held in the remorseless grasp of the most despotic industrial slavery in the world! [Applause.] And yet the gentleman [Mr. FOCHT] gets up and talks about a letter that some mysterious fellow, one Ben Phillips, has written. He did not give his name yesterday. If he did, I did not hear it. It was an anonymous letter then so far as this House knew. The letter speaks of punishing a convict in Alabama. Why, I suppose in all the convict camps in the United States they have some discipline; they have some means of punishment for wrongdoing and violated rules; but, as I said before, we have a statute against cruel treatment of convicts in my State.

Mr. Speaker, the condition recited here by this leader of organized labor in Pennsylvania, Mr. Fechan, could not exist in Alabama for one hour. [Applause on Democratic side.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] says that in my speech yesterday I assaulted the North. Why did the gentleman make that statement? What was his purpose in making it? I have made no assault upon the North. Not one word can be found in that speech that can in any way be construed into

an assault on the North. Some of my best friends in this House are northern men. I claim among my friends here some clever Republicans from the North. I have made no assault upon the North, and why did the gentleman from Pennsylvania do me the injustice to say that I had assaulted the North? I want to say to him, and those like him, the time for that kind of political buncombe is past. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. If the gentleman will permit me, I have no doubt that everything the gentleman says about industrial conditions in Pennsylvania is absolutely true; but, in justice to the fair name of our State, I want to call his attention to the fact that very recently Pennsylvania has seen the light, and both of the great political parties have driven out of power the leaders of the organizations in those parties that have been responsible for legislative conditions which have made these horrible things possible in the industrial centers of the State. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And as the promises of these new organizations in Pennsylvania will doubtless be carried out, we hope the future will be able to show conditions which will not justify any such criticism. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend knows that I would have made no reference to these conditions had it not been for the attack on me and on my State by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT]. I am glad the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] made the statement that he did.

Now, then, let me read a sentence from the letter which was read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] yesterday. Listen:

If what I have written you is not what you want, kindly let me know just what you want and I can give you more details.

[Laughter.]

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if this picture of the weeping convict is not strong enough for political purposes drop me a note, and I will fix the next one to suit your purpose. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, when wages have been reduced below a living wage and the laboring man can not get justice from his employer, what else can he do but use his power as an organization and strike? It is often his only remedy, and he has a right to exercise it. Many a time he has been wrong and many a time he has been right, and right is right as God is God. [Applause.] When they struck in Pennsylvania some time ago, what happened to them? They were cruelly treated. Some were beaten with clubs, some were shot, and some were murdered, and we are told that innocent women and children were murdered. Black policemen, it is said, with their clubs struck down women of the white race, American mothers, struck them down and murdered them in Pennsylvania during that strike. Did the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] have this horrible condition in mind when he assaulted my State without foundation of fact [applause on the Democratic side] when he read the mysterious letter from one Ben Phillips, who promised to write any kind of letter if they would just let him know what kind of letter they wanted?

Mr. Speaker, I do not care to detain the House longer now. I regret the necessity that called forth these remarks from me. I made them in obedience to a sense of duty to my State, myself, and the truth of the matters involved.

Mr. Speaker, the issues of this campaign are going to be fought out before the American people, and they are not going to allow anyone to inject in immaterial issues or cause them to lose sight of the greatest of all evils, the high protective tariff system of the Republican Party. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have the House understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] has not been present during the speech just delivered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. I do not know what the wishes of the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be in the matter, but I think that the House ought to know that the speech was made in his absence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend some remarks in the Record on the Military Academy bill, as I shall be necessarily absent when that bill is considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend some remarks in the Record on the Military Academy bill (H. R. 24450). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1912, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6479. An act to authorize the St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co. to repair, alter, or rebuild certain bridges in the State of Arkansas.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 6479. An act to authorize the St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co. to repair, alter, or rebuild certain bridges in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## CONTINGENT EXPENSES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, pending the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, that the Speaker lay before the House House joint resolution 319.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that, pending the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, the House consider the resolution of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 319, making appropriations to supply deficiencies for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1912, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The title to the joint resolution was amended.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate amendment was concurred in was laid on the table.

## NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 24565), with Mr. HULL in the chair.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 6 of the bill, line 7, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to return to page 6 of the bill for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, let us see what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be reported for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding, after the word "rank," in line 7, page 6, as follows: "Provided further, That the service of a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy or of a cadet at the United States Military Academy, who shall hereafter be appointed, shall not be counted in computing for any purpose the length of service of any officer of the Navy: Provided further, That so much of the act approved March 3, 1890, entitled 'An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States,' as contained in section 13 of said act relating to five years' constructive service for officers and warrant officers entering the Navy from civil life, which reads as follows: 'That all officers, including warrant officers, who have been or may be appointed to the Navy from civil life shall, on the date of appointment, be credited for computing their pay with five years' service,' shall not apply to officers and warrant officers appointed to the Navy after the date of the passage of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. I object. I know nothing at all about it, and therefore I object.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to reserve his objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the objection, but I am going to object to going back to this paragraph. Here is a provision of law that I have never seen and know nothing about.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for an opportunity to explain to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I think he will withdraw his objection. The present law provides that the time these young men are attending the Naval Academy at the expense of the Government of the United States shall be counted as service actually rendered, when the fact is that the period of time spent at the naval school is spent for the purpose of training the young men to render service afterwards when they do actually enter the Navy. As is well known, it costs the United States Government nearly \$20,000 to give a young man four years' schooling at this academy. I submit to the gentleman that this four-year period is not service and should not be counted as such.

When the Army bill was before the committee the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HAY, chairman of that committee, introduced, as an amendment coming from the committee, a similar amendment to the one I offer, and it passed the House. I see no reason why this four years' time should be counted as service, when it is not. Further, under the present law, as I understand it, when one enters the staff service from civil life he is, instantaneously, credited with five years' actual service, or five years' service, so to speak. This amendment eliminates that feature. I am told that this will effect a saving of something over \$400,000 annually. It does not apply to those in the school to-day, but it applies to those who enter on and after the passage of this bill. That is the proposition.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSLEY. Yes.

Mr. KOPP. Has this matter been submitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. HENSLEY. Not to the committee, but it has been submitted to the members of the committee.

Mr. KOPP. Does the gentleman think that it is quite fair to the committee to ask that we pass on such an important matter as this is without the opportunity of any consideration by that committee?

Mr. HENSLEY. I will confess to the gentleman that the matter was not called to my attention in time to have it brought before the Committee on Naval Affairs, or I should have done so.

Mr. KOPP. I might add that it appeals to me as being a sensible amendment, yet it changes a law of long standing and is very far-reaching in its results. It does seem to me we ought to give it careful consideration and not adopt it on a few minutes' discussion in the House.

Mr. LEWIS. May I interrupt the gentleman—

Mr. HENSLEY. Let me answer just one thing. I would have gladly submitted this amendment, which I prepared only yesterday morning—though it was offered in another form on Saturday—to the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I had no opportunity to do so; but I did submit it to the chairman of the committee and, as I understand, he thinks it is right and is ready to support it now.

Mr. BOWMAN. Does not the gentleman think that amounts to a reduction in wages; that this change which he proposes amounts to a reduction in the wages of these cadets?

Mr. HENSLEY. No.

Mr. BOWMAN. If they are reduced in rank, it certainly will amount to a reduction in salary.

Mr. HENSLEY. But they are not reduced in rank.

Mr. BOWMAN. But they are placed at a disadvantage with those who preceded them.

Mr. HENSLEY. It only applies to the future.

Mr. BOWMAN. I think it places them at a disadvantage in relation to those who have gone before. In view of the fact that the cost of living has increased, does the gentleman think it right to reduce these wages when we are asking everybody else to advance them?

Mr. HENSLEY. This House did it in relation to the military bill, and it is identical with the amendment which was then agreed to in that bill. What I am asking is that the House have a chance to pass on it. I am only asking now to return to that section of the bill that makes this proper, and then let the House pass upon this proposition. If a majority of the Members of this House see fit to vote against this amendment, that is their privilege.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have the second navy on earth. It is a necessary arm of defense. There is difficulty in securing sufficient officers, difficulty and more difficulty in securing sufficient seamen to man these great engines of war for our national defense. The law is now that a young man who goes to the Naval Academy commences his service. There is no

more strenuous discipline and service anywhere in the Navy than at the Naval Academy.

Mr. BURLESON. It is the hardest period in his whole career.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the request that the gentleman may have two minutes more in order to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks that the gentleman from Illinois may have two minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENSLEY. Does the gentleman from Illinois believe that if these institutions, the academies at West Point and Annapolis, were thrown open to the young men of the country who measure up to the standard physically, mentally, and morally, they would not be willing to pay their own expenses in receiving the necessary training to qualify them in entering the Government service?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman asks a question. I reply that it is my experience that it is almost impossible to get competent boys to enter the Naval and Military Academies. There are better rewards outside. For two years from my district it has gone without representation at West Point because there was no one desiring to go. At last I think I have a young man who passes up in G who will go.

Now, I want to say these boys are subject to this discipline. These boys are liable to be called out of the academy into active service. They have been heretofore and may again. I am for protecting these boys. Oh, there is not a great many of them, and they do not vote, and the gentleman feels free to attack them, because there is nobody to defend them—

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CANNON. I am not speaking of the gentleman personally.

Mr. HENSLEY. I never have attacked these boys. Let me ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman can get a little time of his own. I am here to say that I stand by the Army and stand by the Navy, and I am ready to vote a marked increase in the pay of seamen and of the minor officers. I am ready to refuse my consent or vote to make two classes of men in the Navy. I wondered the gentleman said it was not called to his attention. We all know of the strife for promotion—length of service—that exists in the Army and Navy. I imagine that it exists because the human animal that is of any account in civilization, resting upon the unit, wants to climb and better his condition. I do not know what the far-reaching effect of this provision might be, but on the merits I am against it; and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not object, I will. If the law is to be amended, let it be done after consideration by the Naval Committee, reported to the House, and passed by the House after consideration. I do not approve of tying this legislation on this great appropriation bill as a rider.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman will object if he ever gets the chance.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. I object for two reasons—first, that I do not want to return; secondly, I know nothing whatever of the subject and was never talked to about it. I exercise the right I have, and I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

That for the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President is hereby authorized to have constructed the following vessels:

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, after line 10, insert, as a separate paragraph:

"Two first-class battleships, each carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessel of its class; to have the highest practicable speed and the greatest practicable radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$6,000,000 each."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I presume the members of the committee will desire more or less discussion on this battleship provision. I would like to see if some arrangement for time can not be made with the chairman of the committee. I will state for the benefit of the chairman that, while he was absent from his seat, I think a cog has been slipped from the understanding of last evening, and the battleship provision is now before the committee. The suggestion I make is that some arrangement be made for discussion of the battleship provision.

Mr. PADGETT. I was called out for just a moment to meet a party who was talking to me about another bill. I supposed

that the debate would proceed for a minute or two until I got back.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I understood from the chairman last evening the matters that had been passed over during the discussion of the bill would be taken up before we got on to the increase in the Navy, but the Clerk began reading the bill under "Increase of the Navy," and came to a point where the battleship amendment should be offered and I had no other course but to offer it. Now, if the chairman desires to go back and take up the matters that were passed over before we take up the increase, I ask unanimous consent that we return to that portion of the bill and that my amendment be held as pending.

Mr. PADGETT. I would be glad to do that and dispose of matters back of that with the exception of the question of the eight-hour amendment. I stated to the committee the other day when the amendments were offered that I did not think it was good legislation to inject all through the bill provisions with reference to the eight-hour law and that I was going to ask unanimous consent at the appropriate place under the provision for the increase in the Navy to incorporate the bill that was passed by this House by a large majority of both sides of the House at the present session and is now pending in the Senate reported by the committee without amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that the motion just offered by me be considered as pending and that the chairman of the committee be permitted to go back to such portions of the bill as he wishes to have disposed of before we take up the increase in the Navy.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will yield—

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCALL. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW] is proposing to offer an amendment to the amendment of my colleague, and I simply wish to have his right saved.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. There will be a long debate over the coal provision first—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the amendment just offered by him be considered as pending and that the committee return to unconsidered portions of the bill and take them up for consideration. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say this in reference to the matter of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY]. I said the other day when he offered the amendment that there should be some amendments to his amendment in order to put it in proper shape and that it should be withdrawn and that he should put it in shape, and I further said to him so far as I was concerned that I was perfectly willing that they should return and each have an opportunity to offer his amendment, which he did this morning. Of course I had no right to bind anybody except myself.

Now, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] desires that I should ask unanimous consent to return to the provision.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me? Has the gentleman prepared the amendment of which he speaks?

Mr. PADGETT. I am speaking of the one offered by the gentleman awhile ago.

Mr. CANNON. Has the gentleman prepared the amendment he thought ought to be made?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; he has prepared the one he indicated to me that he wanted to prepare along those lines.

Mr. CANNON. It meets the gentleman's approval, does it?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; personally I have no objection to it.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. This is legislation?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman have any fear that his committee would not report that bill for consideration?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know what the feelings of the committee are. I have not talked with the members of the committee. I do not know the feeling of any member of the committee except the gentleman who offered the matter.

Mr. BUTLER. We had no hearing on it?

Mr. PADGETT. None whatever.

Mr. CANNON. My objection to it is twofold: First, on the merits; and, second, it ought to be considered and passed upon its merits as a separate act of legislation and not fastened on this great money bill.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this matter might well be considered by the committee in connection with the personnel bill, on which we are now having hearings and to which it very properly relates.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Missouri?



Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HENSLEY. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Tennessee and all the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs that, as I understood the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, there would be no question about returning to this portion of this bill, so that I should be permitted to offer this amendment at this time. I had no idea but that the House would be given an opportunity to pass upon the merits of the amendment. Now, whether I misunderstood the gentleman from Tennessee or not I am unable to say, but I submit that to me it appears unfair to have the situation that is presented here at this time.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, there can be no misunderstanding whatever as to the position of myself in the House. It is of record, and it speaks for itself and is known of all who were here. The gentleman asked unanimous consent on the floor to return to this point and offer an amendment. Pending the question of unanimous consent, and before unanimous consent was granted, while the discussion was going on pro and con, I suggested to him that his amendment was not in proper form and should be amended to be in proper shape, and then the matter was withdrawn. I said to him that, so far as I was concerned, he should have an opportunity to ask to return to this place and offer his amendment. I have granted that opportunity this morning. He has returned. He has submitted his request, and it has been declined. I am not responsible for that in any way, and I did not mislead him, for I simply stated to him that he could have opportunity to return.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further discussion the Clerk will report the first item passed over unfinished.

Mr. PADGETT. Let us return to the question of coal transportation, on page 26.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 7, after the word "dollars," insert:  
"Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in time of peace for transporting coal from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans for the use of naval vessels or navy yards on the Pacific Ocean, except this limitation shall not apply to vessels crossing the Pacific Ocean or stationed in the Hawaiian Islands or in the Philippine Islands, or to navy yards situated in these islands."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Washington, the author of the amendment, if we can not agree upon time for closing debate on this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think so. What time would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. PADGETT. I suggest that 30 minutes will be ample.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Thirty minutes on a side?

Mr. PADGETT. No; all told.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. We never have disposed of it heretofore in 30 minutes. On a question of this importance I do not think that is long enough.

Mr. PADGETT. It has been debated over and over again.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman is willing to confess that my amendment ought to pass, I would be willing to limit the time.

Mr. PADGETT. I never would confess that if I had the reasoning faculties that I have now.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Which did not agree with the authorities before.

Mr. PADGETT. Then I will agree to 20 minutes to a side.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think the gentleman ought to allow 30 minutes on a side, because this is one of the most important features in the bill. I would rather proceed under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman may control one-half the time or the Chair can control it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Why not make it 30 minutes on a side?

Mr. PADGETT. That is too long a time.

Mr. SIMS. Members will get up and leave the Hall.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Why not proceed under the five-minute rule?

Mr. PADGETT. I wish to serve notice now that at the end of 40 minutes I shall move to close debate under the five-minute rule on this paragraph and all amendments to it.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Do it now.

Mr. PADGETT. I move to close debate on this paragraph and the pending amendment, and all amendments, at the end of 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that a motion to close debate is not in order at this time.

Mr. PADGETT. That is true, as there has been no debate upon it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Why does not the gentleman ask unanimous consent?

Mr. PADGETT. I ask unanimous consent that at the end of 40 minutes debate be closed upon this paragraph and all amendments, and that one half the time be controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the other half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes, and that one half the time be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Is there objection?

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHARP. Does the gentleman mean to include in this 40 minutes any amendment that may be offered to the subsequent portion of the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. This is the only paragraph to which it applies. We have read all of the bill except this, down to the increase of the Navy.

Mr. SHARP. But this does not apply to the increase of the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. It does not apply to it in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection to the request, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the members of the committee I think it might be well to give a brief history of this proposed amendment. Two years ago it was offered by me at the suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and a vote was taken upon it after a limited discussion, and it was defeated in the committee by one vote.

A year ago I offered a similar amendment, and after debate it was agreed to in the Committee of the Whole by a 3 to 1 vote. It went over to the Senate, and at about 2 o'clock on the morning of the 4th of March the conferees came to me and said that if it was insisted upon it might defeat the entire naval appropriation bill. So, under those circumstances, as the one who had offered the amendment, I did not urge that it be retained.

One would think from these expressions of the sentiment of this House, gentlemen on that side of the aisle having voted almost unanimously in favor of it, some attention would have been given to it by the Navy Department, but such has not been the fact.

I have attempted, without any success whatever, to induce the Navy Department to make use of the coal upon the Pacific coast for some purposes.

Now, it costs to-day to take a ton of Pocahontas coal from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean between \$6 and \$6.50 a ton. The Pacific coast coal laid down at the Bremerton Navy Yard costs \$4 a ton. In other words, the freight upon the Pocahontas coal costs from \$2 to \$2.50 more than the entire cost of the coal from the Pacific coast laid down at the navy yard.

The objection has been raised that the Pacific coast coal is not equal to the Pocahontas coal, and that is true to a limited extent, but it only varies from 6 per cent to 10 per cent, according to how it is used. But I call the attention of the committee to this fact, that it costs the Government from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 a year additional to send this coal around to the Pacific coast, and that when war comes, if it ever does come, we will be compelled to use the Pacific coast coal, because we have no means of transporting Pocahontas coal rapidly, and when it is taken over there and stored it soon becomes of less value than the Pacific coast coal. So I ask this question of this House: If we are compelled, as we would be, to use Pacific coast coal in time of war, why should we continue, at an expense of one to two million dollars a year, to use this high-priced coal in time of peace?

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Has the gentleman presented this argument before the committee, and is there anything in the hearings on this proposition?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I did not, because the committee was familiar with it; it has been argued on the floor of this House, and it passed the House by a vote of 3 to 1 a year ago, and the committee was familiar with all the facts.

Mr. GOOD. Did any of the officers of the Navy appear before the committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. They did not appear before the committee, so far as I know. We had a hearing in the Navy Department on January 24, 1912, in which this matter was thoroughly discussed—gone into fully.

Mr. GOOD. Then there is nothing in the hearings?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; there is not in regard to this matter, so far as I know.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the Navy Department would spend the same amount of money that it costs extra for Pocahontas coal for two or three years they could develop the coal fields of Alaska and get a better coal than the Pocahontas. I am not going to make the charge that there is any collusion between the Navy Department and the Pocahontas Coal Co., but such statements have been made by high authority, and insinuations have been made on the floor of the House that such is the case. I want to read a few words from a speech made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] on this question when it was up a year ago. He said:

Mr. Chairman, I agree thoroughly with the proposition advanced by the gentleman from Washington. The closest corporation in this country is the combination between the Pocahontas coal people and the Navy Department, and it has been so for 20 years. I know that during the Spanish-American War, when Alabama coals that were perfectly good for steaming purposes were offered to the Navy Department for \$3.25 a ton over the ship's rail at Mobile, only a night's sail from Tampa, the Navy Department bought Pocahontas coal and shipped it by rail to Tampa at an expense of \$9.60, and that proposition has been kept up ever since.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, continuing, said:

There is no reason in time of peace why these Pacific coals could not be used for our Navy. They are absolutely as good steaming coals as the Pocahontas coal. They are the same class of coals as the Alabama grades of coal, and 20 years ago, when Mr. Herbert was Secretary of the Navy, he sent out the battleships *Montgomery* and *Mobile* to test the Alabama coals, and the only difference between them and the Pocahontas coal was not that they did not produce as much steam power or that they did not have as great a steaming radius per ton per mile as the Pocahontas coal, but that they produced a little more smoke and clogged the flues a little sooner, a few hours sooner in a 40-hour trial. Now, what have these men got to do but clean the flues?

Then he added these words of warning, that I want to call to the attention of gentlemen on that side of the aisle, on February 21, 1911:

This business of making the Navy Department a close corporation, bound in here between the Allegheny Mountains and the Potomac River, has got to stop, or you will raise a prejudice against the Navy in this country that will bring more injury to it than anything else you can do. You want to build all your battleships on the eastern coast line. You want to buy all your supplies on the eastern coast line. You want all the navy yards there. You do not want the people of the United States to have any share in this Navy except in a few States. You might as well make up your minds, if you want a big navy and a navy that will be popular with the people of the United States, you have got to stop this, and you had better stop it right now by voting for the amendment of the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman comment on this statement, found on page 314 of the hearings before the Naval Committee, in which Admiral Cowie says:

This question of coal supply on the Pacific has been one so vexing on account of its vital importance to our fleet for its maintenance in the Pacific that, with the opportunity confronting us whereby high-grade fuel could be obtained, the bureau believes that every possible effort should be made by the department to cause Congress to take advantage of this opportunity to solve this problem and provide for the safety of the country by making the necessary appropriation for mining and operating these fields, whose product alone will insure the safety of our fleets in the Pacific.

Will the gentleman state whether or not there is any foundation in fact for that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will answer it by saying that they have never made a fair test of the Pacific coast coal. They have been promising to make tests ever since I have been a Member of this House. I asked them to make the test and report here so that it could be used two years ago, but they failed to do it, and I also repeated that a year ago and they also failed. They are still making tests on the Pacific coast coal or promising to do it.

In the hearing that we had before the Navy Department last January they ended the hearing by promising to make a fair and full test of the coal of the Pacific coast, but they have never done so.

Now, I want to read one more statement from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], who has more knowledge upon this subject than any man in this House. He says:

I wish to register here a complaint that the Navy Department is not encouraging the development of appliances so that it can use the other coals. When it found, for instance, that the coal in Alabama approximated to the needs of the Navy it would have been in the line of economy and the best interests of the Government to have undertaken to develop smoke-consuming devices and other devices, so that the department could then use Alabama coal.

The same applies to the Pacific coast coal, not only that mined on the mainland but that in Alaska, and the Navy Department has not shown great interest in developing additional sources of supply that would prove of great, if not vital, importance in time of war, and we are put to millions of dollars of expense, perhaps, unnecessarily.

So the whole question is, Are we going to pay one or two million dollars a year unnecessarily for Pocahontas coal and permit the Navy Department to make no effort whatever to learn the use of other coals that they will have to use in the time of war?

No gentleman on the floor of this House and no man representing the Navy Department can say that in case of war they will not be compelled to use these Pacific coast coals. Had they not better get accustomed to them in time of peace? Would it not be better for this Government, instead of spending this one or two million dollars extra each year, to compel the Navy Department to experiment with Pacific coast coals, become accustomed to their use, and have some mines developed out there that would be ready to furnish fuel to them in time of emergency?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the essence of this whole matter is to prohibit the Government from getting the benefit of the open market and the best terms that can be had in the purchase of its coal, and the best coal, and to limit the Government to a restricted area. It is nothing more or less than a proposition to create a coal trust for the benefit of some coal miners in the State of Washington. We may just as well understand fully and frankly what it is. That is all that it is.

With reference to the question of tests, the Navy Department has repeatedly made tests. The Bureau of Mines of the Government, a different department, has made several tests, and every single one of these tests, without exception, has shown that the coal was not suited and was not fit for use in the vessels of the Navy. I have here memoranda of various tests that have been made by the departments of the Government. The department, through the Bureau of Steam Engineering, made tests of Washington State coals and various other coals—British Columbia coal, and coal from Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico—giving the names of the mines, et cetera.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Is there any evidence of any test having been made of Alaska coal?

Mr. PADGETT. Alaska coal is not available. The Matanuska coal fields are 120 miles from a railroad, and the Naval Committee has had up at this session, not in a formal way, but we have been gathering evidence and having communications, and have submitted the matter to the Navy Department, the matter of Alaskan coal, and there is a reference on page 313 of the hearings to the Alaska coals, with a view of getting them. There are in Alaska, at Matanuska, fields of coal that are of sufficient grade and test, but that coal is not available. Two gentlemen who were interested in the development of those fields were to see me, and I said to them that we would gladly cooperate with them to secure the coal whenever they put a railroad to it. They intimated to me that they wanted the Government to guarantee their bonds. I said to them that I was not willing to advocate that proposition, but for the reservation of the lands and for making contracts and all of that I was willing to cooperate.

Mr. KAHN. I understand that there was a test made of Alaska coal, and that it showed that it had 1,000 British thermal units more than any other coal that is mined in this country.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it does not show that much. It is referred to in the hearings. I think it shows a total of something like fifteen thousand and odd.

Mr. KAHN. More thermal units?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; here it is:

From the reports of analyses made from samples recently obtained by the Director Bureau of Mines, while in Alaska, from the Matanuska and Bering fields, it is shown that these coals are exceptionally low in ash and sulphur, and exceedingly high in heating value, the British thermal units in some cases running as high as 15,400 as received, while the best eastern coals average a little under 14,800 British thermal units.

Mr. KAHN. That is what I had reference to. Does not the gentleman think, in view of the fact that these coal fields in Alaska have not been developed, it would be a good thing on the part of the Government to open them up for the use of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I have indicated that I was perfectly willing to do it and would be glad to cooperate, but I am not willing to forbid the Government getting the benefit of the best coal as long as these fields are 120 miles from a railroad.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman from Tennessee believe that it is well to pursue the policy that we have pursued, namely, that the Government should not guarantee the bonds or encourage the building of the roads, and should continue to make it impossible for private capital to develop those coal fields and get the transportation? Upon the whole, is it not better that we should do without the Alaska coal for this and perhaps many other generations, and keep it there stored, as it always has been, for the benefit of a remote posterity?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I am not willing to go that length. I am not willing to adopt that policy. Now, Mr. Chairman, in my time I am going to ask that the Clerk shall read this memorandum furnished by the Paymaster of the Navy, that is a complete answer to this proposition, and I ask the attention of the committee to the reading of that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,  
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1912.  
MEMORANDUM RE COAL, PACIFIC COAST.

NAVY YARD, MARE ISLAND, CAL.—COAL FOR YARD USE.

1. After a full investigation of western-coast coals available for use at the navy yard, Mare Island, it is found that only one company at San Francisco was able to furnish western-coast coal—Black Diamond coal from State of Washington, cost \$6.75 per ton on barges alongside sea wall, Mare Island, and \$6 per ton on Navy barges at company's bunker. Cost of eastern coal at yard, \$8.19 per ton.

2. Efficiency reports of Pocahontas and western-coast coals prove that for the same work as would be obtained from one ton of Pocahontas coal the cost of Black Diamond coal (State of Washington coal) would be between \$10 and \$11, showing an increased cost of western-coast coals where used, or between \$2 and \$3 over the cost of Pocahontas coal.

3. The Navy Department issued orders during the latter part of 1911 for commandants at Mare Island and Puget Sound to use western-coast coals for yard and yard craft, provided same could be done at not greater cost than the use of eastern coals. From the reports from the navy yard, Puget Sound, on the use of western-coast coals for yard craft, it has been noted that coal used aboard tugs does not furnish sufficient steam, and does not give satisfaction. It requires constant use of jet, and when tugs are handling large ships it is almost impossible to hear signals from the bridge of the ship when jet is going. The coal does not give sufficient steam for tugs to handle large ships in safety. Coal gives 80 per cent ashes and fires have to be cleaned every hour. The coal used is one of the best State of Washington coals, and coal was washed to be cleared of impurities before being received. The boiler house of the U. S. S. *Philadelphia*, station ship, at Puget Sound, used about 10 tons a day of western coal, when an average of only 2.94 tons of eastern coal had been used heretofore. The present cost of eastern coal at Puget Sound is about \$7.59, and the cost of western coal is between \$3.66 and \$4, which price is a low figure for western coal.

4. Naval officers who are responsible under the department for the efficiency of our ships have uniformly taken the ground that our ships of war should use only the highest grade of coal. In foreign ports only the best grade of Welch coal from the admiralty list are purchased, except in such of these ports where the best American coals can be had at satisfactory prices. In our own ports, Pocahontas, New River, and Georges Creek coals are procured. It has been found from experience that the best coal is cheaper as it contains a greater heating efficiency, and a still more important fact, that it is not as subject to spontaneous combustion, and therefore will stand storage in coal piles, and in bunkers of ships of war for a much longer period than inferior coals.

5. The main source of supply of coals for the Navy is at present obtained from the largest producers of the best grades of Pocahontas, New River, and Georges Creek coals. The purchase of coal for the Navy has been made a matter of deep and careful study, and the department now feels assured at all times of a sufficient supply of coal to meet any needs from the mines producing the highest grades of steaming coals in this country and at the lowest market rates.

6. The coal supply for the Navy in the Pacific has become a matter of great national importance. The department in its endeavor to provide for a satisfactory quality of coal for the Pacific has caused careful investigation to be made under the direction of the Bureau of Mines of all the principal coals in the western coast States, as well as in British Columbia. Nine of the best of these coals have been tested under the boilers of some of our largest vessels in the Pacific, and the results of these tests have shown that these coals do not possess the required characteristics for naval fuel, the following objections being most noticeable:

- Excessive smoke.
- Increased consumption of coal, making a corresponding reduction in the steaming radius of the fleet.
- An increase in the number of colliers to supply coal.
- Deteriorating effects on the boilers.
- Increase of labor in handling coal and ashes in the fireroom.

BRITISH COLUMBIA COAL—PRICE AT SAN DIEGO, CAL.

7. During the summer of 1911, while the Pacific Fleet was at San Diego, Cal., there was somewhat of a shortage of fuel for the fleet. An inquiry as to the available fuel suppliers at that port was made, and it was found that 2,000 tons of Nainaimo coal (British Columbia) could be purchased at \$8.75 per ton. Roughly speaking, it takes 2 tons of Nainaimo coal to do the same work as 1 ton of Pocahontas—Pocahontas coal at that time costing on the Pacific coast, at Mare Island, about \$8.50 per ton, including transportation. In other words, the department was called upon to pay \$17.50 for \$8.50 worth of work, not to mention ill effects of western coal on boilers, etc., and reduction of steaming radius.

8. The best British Columbia coal (Crows Nest Pass or Fernie) costs at Seattle, including duty (about 50 cents per ton), about \$7.55 per long ton. This coal is less efficient than eastern coal and costs but a fraction less.

9. Shipments to Pacific coast, 1906-1911, inclusive, for past six years:

Number of tons of eastern coal shipped.....	676,000
Cost for transportation.....	\$3,476,000
Cost for both the coal and transportation.....	\$5,359,000

Issues of coal at Mare Island and Puget Sound (tons).

1907.....	38,410.00
1908.....	142,943.47
1909.....	95,228.39
1910.....	73,273.44
1911.....	89,484.48

Total tons issued during the past 5 years..... 439,348.78

Shipments to Pacific coast, fiscal year 1911.

Shipments.	Tons.	Cost of coal.	Transportation.	Average per ton.		
				Coal.	Transportation.	Coal and transportation.
Foreign.....	124,087	\$327,347.10	\$660,409.02	\$2.64	\$5.29	\$7.96
American.....	34,756	93,841.20	223,514.59	2.70	6.43	9.13
Total.....	158,843	421,188.30	883,923.61	2.65	5.56	8.85

10. The department has made 7 tests of Washington State coals, 3 tests of British Columbia coal, and on June 4 a test of 900 tons of Primero coal, from the State of Colorado, will be started on the armored cruiser *Maryland*, this coal costing \$9.50 per ton on lighters in San Francisco Harbor. The prices of Washington State coal in Seattle for test have ranged from \$4.10 to \$5.40 a ton; the cost of British Columbia coal at Vancouver has ranged from \$5.80 to \$5.85 per ton. None of the coals so far tested has been found economical or satisfactory for naval use. With the battleship fleet operating in the Pacific it is estimated that 500,000 tons of eastern coal will be required on that coast, and by the use of western coast coals so far tested the consumption would be 45 per cent more than Pocahontas coal, so it will be seen that the requirements of Washington State coal would be about 725,000 tons a year. The department is doing everything in its power to procure satisfactory west-coast coal, and will continue tests with that end in view.

T. J. COWIE.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute remaining. Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield that to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LITTLEPAGE].

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I have not more time. I simply want to say to this House that there is the official statement you have heard read from one of the important bureaus of our Government, a Government which every patriotic man ought and does love. This statement shows that if we let the conditions alone as they are now everything is all right and all will be well. If this amendment is adopted, as the statement shows, it means that it will cost the Government 45 per cent more for the coal which this amendment seeks to force upon this Government than the present cost. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington on the 21st day of February, 1911, when it seemed there were five Republican Congressmen here from West Virginia, not one of whom, according to the Record, opened his mouth in opposition to the same, and on this account it did pass this House by the great majority the gentleman mentioned, is found on page 3228 of the Record, and reads as follows:

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to transport coal from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean.

Had I then been a Member of this House, the amendment should not have passed without the same exposition then I have been endeavoring to make during the past two days of the amendment under consideration, which reads as follows:

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the time of peace for transporting coal from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans for the use of the naval vessels or the navy yards on the Pacific Ocean, except this limitation shall not apply to the vessels crossing the Pacific or stationed in the Hawaiian Islands or in the Philippine Islands or to navy yards situated on those islands.

The same amendment as of a year ago on a much larger scale and much greater importance to us all and to this Republic.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the candid consideration of this House the following reliable information, as it comes to me from a thoroughly reliable source, and I impart it to my brother Congressmen in absolute good faith, and trust you will give it credence with the belief upon your part that I am faithfully endeavoring to treat this important matter with candor and with perfect fairness and frankness when I say this amendment is in the interest of the Pacific slope or the western coal combine:

MEMORANDUM RE COAL, PACIFIC COAST.

NAVY YARD, MARE ISLAND, CAL.—COAL FOR YARD USE.

1. After a full investigation of western coast coals available for use at the navy yard, Mare Island, it is found that only one company at San Francisco was able to furnish western coast coal—Black Diamond coal from State of Washington cost \$6.75 per ton on barges alongside sea wall, Mare Island, and \$6 per ton on Navy barges at company's bunker. Cost of eastern coal at yard, \$8.19 per ton.

2. Efficiency reports of Pocahontas and western coast coals prove that for the same work as would be obtained from one ton of Poca-

hontas coal, the cost of Black Diamond coal (State of Washington coal) would be between \$10 and \$11, showing an increased cost if western coast coals were used, or between \$2 and \$3 over the cost of Pocahontas coal.

3. The Navy Department issued orders during the latter part of 1911 for commandants at Mare Island and Puget Sound to use western coast coals for yard and yard craft, provided same could be done at not greater cost than the use of eastern coals. From the reports from the navy yard, Puget Sound, on the use of western coast coals for yard craft it has been noted that coal used aboard tugs does not furnish sufficient steam and does not give satisfaction. It requires constant use of jet, and when tugs are handling large ships it is almost impossible to hear signals from the bridge of the ship when jet is going. The coal does not give sufficient steam for tugs to handle large ships in safety. Coal gives 80 per cent ashes, and fires have to be cleaned every hour. The coal used is one of the best State of Washington coals; and coal was washed to be cleared of impurities before being received. The boiler house of the U. S. S. *Philadelphia*, station ship at Puget Sound, used about 10 tons a day of western coal when an average of only 2.94 tons of eastern coal had been used heretofore. The present cost of eastern coal at Puget Sound is about \$7.59, and the cost of western coal is between \$3.05 and \$4, which price is a low figure for western coal.

4. Naval officers who are responsible under the department for the efficiency of our ships have uniformly taken the ground that our ships of war should use only the highest grade of coal. In foreign ports only the best grade of Welch coal from the admiralty list are purchased, except in such of these ports where the best American coals can be had at satisfactory prices. In our own ports, Pocahontas, New River, and Georges Creek coals are procured. It has been found from experience that the best coal is cheaper, as it contains a greater heating efficiency, and a still more important fact that it is not as subject to spontaneous combustion, and therefore will stand storage in coal piles and in bunkers of ships of war for a much longer period than inferior coals.

5. The main source of supply of coals for the Navy is at present obtained from the largest producers of the best grades of Pocahontas, New River, and Georges Creek coals. The purchase of coal for the Navy has been made a matter of deep and careful study, and the department now feels assured at all times of a sufficient supply of coal to meet any needs from the mines producing the highest grades of steaming coals in this country and at the lowest market rates.

6. The coal supply for the Navy in the Pacific has become a matter of great national importance. The department, in its endeavor to provide for a satisfactory quality of coal for the Pacific, has caused careful investigation to be made, under the direction of the Bureau of Mines, of all the principal coals in the western coast States, as well as in British Columbia. Nine of the best of these coals has been tested under the boilers of some of our largest vessels in the Pacific, and the results of these tests have shown that these coals do not possess the required characteristics for naval fuel, the following objections being most noticeable:

- Excessive smoke.
- Increased consumption of coal (making a corresponding reduction in the steaming radius of the fleet).
- An increase in the number of colliers to supply coal.
- Deteriorating effects on the boilers.
- Increase of labor in handling coal and ashes in the fireroom.

#### BRITISH COLUMBIA COAL—PRICE AT SAN DIEGO, CAL.

7. During the summer of 1911, while the Pacific Fleet was at San Diego, Cal., there was somewhat of a shortage of coal for the fleet. An inquiry as to the available fuel suppliers at that port was made, and it was found that 2,000 tons of Nainaimo coal (British Columbia) could be purchased at \$8.75 per ton. Roughly speaking, it takes two tons of Nainaimo coal to do the same work as one ton of Pocahontas—Pocahontas coal at that time costing on the Pacific coast at Mare Island, about \$8.50 a ton, including transportation. In other words, the department was called upon to pay \$17.50 for \$8.50 worth of work, not to mention ill effects of western coal on boilers, etc., and the reduction of steaming radius.

8. The best British Columbia coal (Crow's Nest Pass or Fernie) costs at Seattle, including duty—about 50 cents per ton—about \$7.55 per long ton. This coal is less efficient than eastern coal and costs but a fraction less.

9. Shipments to Pacific coast, 1906-1911 inclusive, for past six years:

Number of tons of eastern coal shipped	676,000
Cost for transportation	\$3,478,000
Cost for both the coal and transportation	\$5,355,000

#### Issues of coal at Mare Island and Puget Sound (tons).

1907	38,419.00
1908	142,943.47
1909	95,228.30
1910	73,273.44
1911	80,484.48

Total issued during the past five years..... 430,348.78

#### Shipments to Pacific coast, fiscal year 1911.

Shipments.	Tons.	Cost of coal.	Transportation.	Average per ton.		
				Coal.	Transportation.	Coal and transportation.
Foreign.....	124,087	\$327,347.10	\$390,409.02	\$3.64	\$5.29	\$7.96
American.....	34,736	93,841.20	223,514.59	2.70	6.43	9.13
Total.....	158,823	421,188.30	613,923.61	2.65	5.50	8.85

10. The department has made seven tests of Washington State coals, three tests of British Columbia coal, and on June 4 a test of 900 tons of Primero coal from the State of Colorado will be started on the armored cruiser *Maryland*—this coal costing \$9.50 per ton on lighters, in San Francisco harbor. The prices of Washington State coal in Seattle for test have ranged from \$4.10 to \$5.40 a ton; the cost of British Columbia coal at Vancouver has ranged from \$5.80 to \$5.85

per ton. None of the coals so far tested have been found economical or satisfactory for naval use. With the battleship fleet operating in the Pacific, it is estimated that 500,000 tons of eastern coal will be required on that coast, and by the use of western coast coal so far tested the consumption would be 45 per cent more than Pocahontas coal, so it will be seen that the requirements of Washington State coal would be about 725,000 tons a year.

Now, let me say to you in addition to the foregoing that a saving of 45 per cent in the cost of coaling the ships, and especially with the best steam coal on earth, is a matter of vital importance to the Treasury Department of the Government, much less of vital importance to the Government in having the best coal to be procured on the continent; and I have no hesitancy in saying to the American people, through this Congress, that in West Virginia is to be found the finest coking and steam coal there is to be found anywhere on this earth. We are very proud of our natural wealth in West Virginia; we are very proud of our coal miners who mine the coal; we are very proud of our operators who have invested their life's savings in the development of our coal mines; who have come with their families away from the cities and builded their homes, in many instances, in the woodland, near their mines, where they can be with their property day and night, in order to facilitate in every way possible the supply of their products to the markets of the country.

I want to give you here an analysis of the New River smokeless coal, some of which the Navy Department of the Government is using. My distinguished friend Mr. HUMPHREY, from the great State of Washington, has made a great fight upon the floor of this House to protect and promote the material interests of those engaged in the mining of coal beyond the Rockies and along the Pacific slope. He has quoted from a speech made by Mr. UNDERWOOD, a very distinguished Member of this House and one of the most lovable characters in American politics, which speech was made some time ago—before I came here—and in which, he says, Mr. UNDERWOOD intimated that there was a combination and conspiracy between the Navy Department and the Pocahontas coal operators. Mr. UNDERWOOD will not say this now.

While my district in West Virginia does not include the Pocahontas region, which is a very wealthy part of my sister State, Virginia, I know the majority of the men engaged in the coal industry there, and there is no better class of men on this continent than the men engaged in the coal business in the Pocahontas region. They went into that rugged wilderness country, bought the land, built railroads, constructed houses, built tipples, opened up coal mines, and spent vast fortunes of money in getting in position to realize something upon their heavy investments. They are solvent, reliable, patriotic, and they are just as honest as the day is long, and God Almighty has never created better people than those dwelling within the Commonwealth of West Virginia; and I here resent any improper imputations sought now or heretofore by any man in or out of this Congress to impugn bad motives upon the part of these splendid men.

Very many of them do not agree with me in politics, but they are among the people of my State, and I am proud to be in position here to proclaim in this magnificent presence that they are of our best people.

This is my Government and my people's Government, and for any man to intimate there has been improper dealings between the Navy Department of this Government at any time and the men engaged in the coal industry in the Pocahontas region, or anywhere within the confines of West Virginia, I say again, I am here to resent it and proclaim to the world that there is no foundation in fact that will justify any such insinuation coming from any man. My people have the coal; they bought the land and own it; they have it for sale; their production is in the market. I am proud of them and proud of the coal we have in my State—apparently an inexhaustible amount of coal, oil, and gas—and if you people want to get rich and receive better treatment than you have ever received anywhere on this earth, come with your money into the hills of West Virginia, make your investments, take care of them as our people have, grow up with our State, and take pride in our State's institutions, and you will all lay by a competency for old age. We have churches, Sunday schools, schoolhouses, courthouses, and, above all, our people are the most generous and hospitable anywhere to be found on the American Continent. Climatic conditions are of the very best, and it is a fruitful field for investors to visit. We have no use for stragglers. When people come among us we want them to know that so long as they are law-abiding, liberty loving, and respect the rights of others, look after and take care of their own rights, we invite them to dwell with us.

Now, in this connection I submit for your consideration an analysis of the New River smokeless coal, to be found in my district, in a region of country traversed by the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, one of the very best railroad companies doing

business in the United States, and which analysis was finally completed on June 3, 1910:

Moisture	1.18
Fixed carbon	71.80
Volatile	22.54
Ash	4.48
<hr/>	
Sulphur	100.00
	.89
<hr/>	
B. T. U.	15.040
B. T. U. (dry basis)	15.220

Is it any wonder that the Government of the United States, and especially the Navy Department, is exceedingly anxious to have such coal? It does not leave clinkers in the furnaces, nor does it leave cinders; and while I do not desire to embarrass my friend from the State of Washington, nor would I say anything derogatory of the coal mined on the Pacific slope, but from what I understand from the analysis of that coal in history and the history thereof, and from what information I can get, I understand that it will produce heat and leaves the furnaces practically full of cinders and clinkers, requiring most of the time of the firemen to pull them out, and such a coal will burn out furnaces quicker than any other coal produced. There is much difference between cinders and clinkers and a soft white ash. The coal the Government is using from West Virginia, as it burns out leaves no clinkers, no cinders, and nothing but white ashes or dust.

This amendment ought to be defeated, and it will be defeated, because there are so many men in this Congress, every one of whom is an intelligent man, and I believe every one of whom is honestly inclined, a great majority of whom are men of affairs, business experience, and therefore broad minded; and they know that if it requires practically 2 tons of the western or Pacific slope coal to produce as much steam as 1 ton of the West Virginia coal will produce, and if there is from one to three dollars difference in the price of the coal per ton, every one of you men know that it is a money-saving proposition to this Government to continue the use of the West Virginia coal. The Secretary of the Navy wants it done, and insists that it shall be done. He does not want to cripple the Navy; he wants to get along as cheaply as he can and make the best record he can—that is, a record of economy—and when the information comes from that office that to continue the use of the West Virginia coal means a saving of, in round numbers, 45 per cent in the cost of the coal to the Government, I say to you that the patriotism of the men of this House, the moral desire to do right is such that this amendment can never pass this House.

I do from the bottom of my heart thank my Democratic friends all over the East of this country and from the Southland and those of you who reside in the Middle West for the very great interest you have taken in this matter. Let the vote come; let men show their colors; and when the final count is had this desperate amendment will be defeated.

I have no word of complaint against my brother Congressman from the State of Washington for waging the fight he has, as he is necessarily anxious to do what he can for the people of his western clime. And while it is true, as stated by him, this amendment has heretofore passed this Congress, I am here to-day to tell you that it has never been resisted until this contest began, nor have the facts relative to this important matter been placed before the American Congress until within the last few days.

If I have been instrumental in doing the Government a service in this matter, if I have been instrumental in saving the Government a vast amount of money, if I have been instrumental in properly presenting the cause of the business men of my State, defending the rights of the operators, and protecting the interests of the miners of my State, I am content and proud of the opportunity to do so. Let justice be done, it matters not where the chips fall. Let us look at this matter from a thoroughly business standpoint, from the standpoint of dollars and cents, and if you do I am sure the Government will not be harassed by the incorporation of this unmeritorious, if not deceptive, amendment to this important naval bill.

I have been carefully watching this amendment from the moment it was first introduced, nor have I lost a minute's time from this House while in session, as I was anxious in the discussion of this amendment to do this House a service and let the country know that the West Virginia coal operators are giving value received for every single penny they are receiving from the Government of the United States for their coal.

My friend from Washington has intimated that the Government is paying to my people \$6.50 a ton for the coal delivered along the coast of the Pacific slope. Nearly all of this money is absorbed by railroad companies and steamship companies which have to haul and float the coal to the market. They give employment to hundreds of railroad men and seamen. The fact is,

our operators are making very little profit on their coal. I wish they could make \$6.50 a ton profit and that it was economical upon the part of the Government to pay that price.

My friend has also intimated that 2,000,000 tons of the eastern coal per annum was being shipped to the Pacific slope. So far as I am individually concerned, I hope it all comes from West Virginia, as that would mean a trade to my people of at least \$12,000,000. I hope he is right in his assumption, and I wish it was \$112,000,000 that the coal operators in West Virginia were getting annually for their coal, and that the consumers of the coal could make use of it, as that would give employment to hundreds and thousands of idle men and give them fair prices for their labor and good conditions under which to labor.

I love to see and deal with broadgauged men. Let us demonstrate to the American people that we are broadgauged, capable of ignoring little things in life in order to accomplish the more important matters.

Mr. Chairman, let the vote come; we are ready. This Congress is ready, and as Representatives of the American people, they are for one time, at least, in dealing with this important subject, conscientiously prepared to act. Their verdict will be the verdict of the people; their judgment will be the judgment of the American people, and when it has been explained and they have acted, all will be well with my people.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be adopted. There is, in my opinion, no question but what it is in the interest of economy. There is no question but what in time of peace, and the provision applies only to times of peace, our Navy will be supplied with a fuel in every way as satisfactory as it is supplied by shipping the Pocahontas and other Chesapeake coals around the Horn. I have another reason for favoring this amendment. In my opinion, if the Navy had been using Pacific coast coals for the last three or four years we would have found much less difficulty in settling the question of opening the Alaskan coal fields. In my mind there is no question at all but what certain influences emanating from localities where the Chesapeake coals are mined and controlled have made it more difficult to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the Alaskan coal situation. So long as the Navy uses Chesapeake coals, so long as those industries and the carrying industries which carry the coal are interested in preventing the development of the Alaskan coal fields, so long it will be more difficult than it would be otherwise to open those fields to development; and if the Navy is compelled to use Pacific coast coals, we will have an added influence in favor of a reasonable development on the Pacific coast. There are coals on the Pacific coast that are just as satisfactory in every way for naval use as the Chesapeake coals, except that perhaps they do not contain quite as many steam units in the same space, but that is a matter of entire indifference except under the stress of war.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. Under the stress of war it is absolutely essential that we shall have the greatest number of steam units in a given cargo space, but that is a matter of entire indifference in times of peace. The land service and the tender service do not need the most intensely condensed fuel in the world for efficient use—

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. PADGETT. The statement I have here shows from official tests made that the western coals cost \$17 and for the same heat in eastern coals it costs \$8.50, and there is a difference of not less than 45 per cent.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has figures which, in the opinion of certain people, prove that.

Mr. PADGETT. No; that is the official test made by the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. MONDELL. I have investigated this question of steaming coals, I know something about it myself, and I do know—

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). That there have been many tests which show that there are Pacific-coast coals that have very nearly the same steaming efficiency as the Pocahontas coals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. And I am of the opinion that the amendment is in the interest of economy.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I think that if there is any place connected with the Government service

where they ought to put the soft pedal on monopoly it is in the case of the Pocahontas coal proposition and the Navy. They practically limit their purchase to that one company.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I will not yield. Of all the millions of tons of coal that they have sent to the Pacific Ocean, it all comes from the Pocahontas mine, so far as I know.

Mr. PADGETT. No; there are three of them.

Mr. BUTLER. Four companies.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Four companies.

Mr. BUTLER. There are four companies—the Pennsylvania, the Georges Creek, the New River, and Pocahontas.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. They never get any coal except right up here in our little part of the country. So far as monopolies are concerned, there are more than six different mines in the State of Washington that I know; there are several mines in British Columbia and one mine down in Oregon. Nobody wants to limit this coal to any particular State or mine. Now, to show you how unfair the gentleman's statement is, that the Pocahontas coal is 45 per cent better—and I have here a copy of the hearings before the Navy Department—that was only when they were running under forced draft; the Bureau of Mines says there is only 6 to 8 per cent difference in efficiency in the Washington coal and the Pocahontas.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman let me ask him a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will not, because the gentleman insisted on limiting the time. It makes a difference, because the Navy does not know how to use western coal and does not want to learn. And in that particular test to which the gentleman [Mr. PADGETT] refers, let me show you the unfairness of the proposition. They refused to take freshly mined coal, although those interested offered to furnish it to them without cost. I have here a copy of the hearings in which the man who represented the coal company, Mr. Huston, made the charge, in talking to the Secretary of the Navy, that the tests had not been fair, and he admitted it and said they would give him a further test.

Now, to show you the unfairness of that long recital that was just read, they ended up by saying it would take 725,000 tons of western coal per year. For what? For the entire fleet, not for the vessels that are on the Pacific Ocean. I want to say to this committee now that there is but one vessel out on the Pacific coast, except in the reserve fleet, and that is a third-class cruiser, and the reserve fleet has only a lot of old, secondhand, dilapidated, antiquated vessels, and the Navy Department wants you to think that they ought to have high-priced coal to run them at a high rate of speed up and down that coast in time of peace.

The truth about it is it is only a question of convenience, that is all, whether or not you are going to have a little more smoke and a little more coal. I want to ask again: Are you going to pay one or two million dollars a year in order that these men who are out on the Pacific coast, in time of peace, may have a coal that makes a little too much smoke? That is the whole question.

Now, this coal is good enough for the great merchant vessels that run on the Pacific. It is used by the Pacific Mail, which has among the finest vessels in the world, and it is used by the great Hill vessel, and it is used by the Revenue Cutter Service. It is used by the merchant vessels which run from that country to Europe—foreign vessels—it is good enough for everyone, in fact, except the Navy. But the Navy wants you to buy this high-priced coal, and pay from one to two million dollars a year extra for it, to be used on vessels that stay on Puget Sound or run up and down the coast to San Francisco. What is the use of running vessels in time of peace at a high rate of speed? The Navy experts even say the difference is not over 10 per cent in ordinary speed. As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] says, when you compel them to use this coal, they will learn how to get rid of the smoke. And let me again call your attention to this fact: That when we had that hearing at the department, Mr. Huston, representing one of the coal companies, said to the Secretary of the Navy, "In time of war you would be compelled to use Pacific coal. Do you not think you had better get accustomed to it in time of peace?" The Secretary of the Navy admitted that this was the most serious question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Division, Mr. Chairman. The committee divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 26, line 7, by adding at the end of the line the following proviso:

"Provided, That the coal purchased by the Government shall be mined by labor that is employed not exceeding eight hours a day."

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is not in order at this time.

Mr. PADGETT. I would like to have the amendment read again.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 6 for the purpose of offering a proviso by way of amendment; a proviso to the amendment which was adopted last Saturday, I believe.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. What page?

Mr. PADGETT. Page 6.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to the purport of the amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. I will state that the amendment that was adopted the other day repealed the provision passed in 1910, relative to bureau officers, and I have this amendment:

Provided, That no officer who has received his commission under the provision of said act shall be deprived of said commission or the rank, title, or emoluments thereof by virtue of this repeal.

That is the usual clause that is inserted to save the repealing clause.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment for information, without objection.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, at the end of the amendment, the following proviso:

"Provided, That no officer who has received his commission under the provisions of said act shall be deprived of said commission or the rank, title, or emoluments thereof by virtue of this repeal."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, while we are on that page, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman's motion would require unanimous consent.

Mr. HENSLEY. We are on that page now.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent was given only to return to this page for the purpose of offering the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to return to that page in order that the gentleman may offer the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Is that the same amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next unfinished amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, this disposes of all the matters that were passed over for consideration except the amendments relative to the eight-hour provisions. I am going to ask that they remain in abeyance until we take up the question of the eight-hour provisions under the "Increase of the Navy."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I want to suggest to the Chairman that perhaps he is in error in saying that we have disposed of all the amendments. If I am not mistaken, my colleague, Mr. MURRAY, from Boston, has an amendment which was passed over.

Mr. PADGETT. That is included.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is not an eight-hour provision.

Mr. PADGETT. That is connected with the labor question.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I do not want to imperil my colleague's rights.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no. Then suppose we return to page 59, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment pending.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PADGETT. Let me ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, was not the gentleman's amendment offered on page 59?

The CHAIRMAN. On page 45, as the Chair is informed.

Mr. MURRAY. I think it was on page 45, at the end of that portion of the bill in regard to the Bureau of Construction and Repair, at line 5, page 45.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 45, line 5, by striking out the period and inserting the following:

"Provided, That no part of any money appropriated in this act shall be used for construction or repair of vessels at navy yards or naval stations in the United States by enlisted men of the Navy."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the pending amendment an amendment which is to the same effect but which is phrased in language that is more satisfactory to the men who are affected in the navy yards by the provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] asks unanimous consent to substitute for his amendment the following.

Mr. PADGETT. Let the Clerk report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 45, line 5, after the word "dollars," insert the following: "Provided, That no part of the appropriations authorized by this act shall be expended for the pay of enlisted men or seamen, not including officers, while doing repair work belonging to any recognized trade on battleships or other vessels of the Navy when such battleships or vessels are docked or laid up at any navy yard for repairs. This provision shall not apply to such ordinary duties as are engaged in by the crew while at sea, except the dismantling and assembling of armament for the purpose of repairs."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the objection and also the point of order. It is clearly subject to a point of order, because it is not limited to this paragraph, but it says "this act."

Mr. MURRAY. I will withdraw it and offer it at a later place. As it relates to the same subject matter, however, I thought we might save time by offering it here.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the matter ought to come before the committee for settlement, I suggest that my colleague Mr. MURRAY be allowed to offer his amendment as a new paragraph, on page 63, line 6, just before the increase of the Navy.

Mr. MURRAY. I had in mind to offer it at page 65, line 6.

Mr. PADGETT. Then the gentleman will not have to ask unanimous consent for that.

Mr. MURRAY. I wanted to offer it now, so that we might clean up the whole matter.

Mr. PADGETT. We will take it up when we reach it.

Mr. MURRAY. Very well, then I withdraw the amendment at this time.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, we reach the question of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] relative to the battleships.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I should like to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MURRAY. Do I understand that the gentleman from Missouri has an amendment to my amendment or to the amendment of my colleague Mr. ROBERTS?

The CHAIRMAN. He offers his amendment to the amendment of the gentleman's colleague Mr. ROBERTS. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "two first-class battleships," and the word "each" wherever it occurs, and insert in lieu thereof the words "one first-class battleship."

Mr. PADGETT. Before we get to that, let me ask the gentleman [Mr. MURRAY] what became of the amendment he offered, for which he asked to substitute this other one, and then stated that he would bring it up on page 65. Do I understand that the gentleman withdraws the amendment on page 45 for the purpose of introducing the other one at page 65?

Mr. MURRAY. No, Mr. Chairman, I desire to have my rights on the original amendment that I offered on page 45.

Mr. PADGETT. Then we had better dispose of that.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. May I ask my colleague if he intends to offer both amendments?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; I want this one to this paragraph as to the Bureau of Construction and Repair. I would rather have this other one that I have in my hand, but I do not want to lose my opportunity to insist on both of them.

Mr. PADGETT. We have to come back anyway, so suppose we wait until we get to page 65.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. As I understand, if the later amendment of my colleague is adopted, his first amendment will not be necessary, and will not be pressed.

Mr. MURRAY. That is it. That is why I wanted first consideration of this subsequent one; but that was objected to.

Mr. PADGETT. We will consider it when we reach page 65.

Mr. MURRAY. I suppose we might reach an agreement—  
Mr. PADGETT. It can be offered then. I do not want to make any agreement now, because it may be subject to a point of order.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not believe it is.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] if we can arrive at an agreement, as to the debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I think so, Mr. Chairman. I do not know how many Members who favor battleships desire to speak at this time. I assume there will be several of them. Personally I do not propose to take much time, perhaps not over five minutes. What does the gentleman from Tennessee suggest as a reasonable time for this debate?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I suggest an equal division of time between those who desire one and two battleships, and no battleship.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know about that.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, it is not very clear what amendment is being referred to here. Is it the battleship proposition?

Mr. PADGETT. The battleship proposition.

Mr. BARTLETT. We have had a game of battledore and shuttlecock, and I wanted to find out what was pending.

Mr. PADGETT. It occurs to me that under the existing conditions an hour's debate on this question will be ample, 30 minutes on a side. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] some of my time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I would suggest 40 minutes on a side, in view of the magnitude of the proposition.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Can not the gentleman make it 30 minutes for each proposition?

Mr. PADGETT. Then those against all battleships would claim half of the time, because the one battleship is a battleship proposition. The one-ship men can get recognition with the two-ship men. I think one hour's debate will satisfy everyone.

Mr. CANNON. Of course, the bill will be read. This is general debate, I take it, that the gentleman is fixing the time for?

Mr. PADGETT. No; this is under the five-minute rule, and at the end of the hour debate will be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the power to move to close debate under the five-minute rule at any time, and, after all, that is the most valuable debate. If the gentlemen desire more than five minutes, I have no objection to the hour being divided as the gentleman suggests, but this is a large committee and it is a short paragraph. The gentleman from Tennessee, on the reading of the paragraph, can close debate at any time under the five-minute rule, if the majority desire.

Mr. PADGETT. I will state that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] and myself discussed the matter, and after looking over the field it occurred to us that with the information we had before us an hour would be sufficient time.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know that I shall want any time, and still I might want five minutes, and I apprehend that that is the case with many gentlemen on this side.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will state that we will proceed under the five-minute rule for the present, but gentlemen may expect that after about an hour there will be a motion to close debate if it is not arranged otherwise.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time since the second session of the Fifty-ninth Congress when the Naval Committee has reported a bill that did not carry battleships. During all that time the Naval Committee has consistently reported two battleships for each session of Congress, and each session of Congress has enacted into law a provision for two battleships. Now, however, we have before us a naval program that omits battleships entirely.

The program heretofore has not been one of increase of battleships of the American Navy; it has been a program to keep an effective fighting force of the size we then had. The additions of each year have not been for the purpose of building up an enormous Navy, but they have been made for the purpose of placing in commission effective fighting vessels to take the place of those becoming obsolete by reason of age or by reason of the rapid strides in naval architecture and the development of fighting vessels.

The effect of the program which has been carried on thus far has been to place the United States to-day second among the list of naval powers of the world, second in the amount of tonnage already constructed.

And while the United States has been carrying on this moderate and sensible program, some of the other nations of the earth have been carrying on a larger program, a more elaborate construction of ships, so that, when the ships already author-

ized by the United States are constructed and the ships that are authorized by other nations are constructed, the United States will drop to third place among the naval powers of the world.

But if at this session the Congress stops the program of building battleships, it immediately drops the United States not merely from second to third, but down into the fifth position among the naval powers of the world. Is that something the people of this country want to see done? The letters, petitions, and memorials that are being received by scores by Members of this body, and by the Committee on Naval Affairs, lead me to believe that the American people do not look upon such a policy with any degree of approval. If there is any one institution in this country of which the American people are proud it is their Navy; and they want to see it maintained on its present plane of efficiency. [Applause.]

And I say to our Democratic friends on the other side that if they imagine they are making a popular move by stopping this increase of our Navy and preventing the building of battleships to take the place of those that are becoming obsolete, they are making the greatest of mistakes, as they will learn later. The Navy of the United States appeals to the patriotism of the people.

There is no institution in this country more popular among the people than the Navy; and they want to see that Navy maintained as an efficient fighting unit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. ROBERTS. In spite of the action of the Democratic caucus on a recent occasion, I rise at this time as much a Democrat as any man in this Chamber to support that amendment. I said in that caucus that I believe the Democratic Party would make a grave and serious mistake if they adjourned this Congress without carrying out the pledge of the Denver platform—to enact such laws as would give the United States an adequate Navy.

I tried to point out to my colleagues in that caucus that with a Nation which has to-day the annual wealth of more than \$125,000,000,000, a restricted naval program that provided for no battleships at a time when the naval appropriation was \$125,000,000 was a short-sighted policy of national defense.

I have tried to show that, in spite of the arguments as to the expenditures against the Navy, the naval appropriation is about one-tenth of 1 per cent of the annual wealth of the American people. [Applause.]

It is a fundamental of the business management of to-day that insurance against risk and loss must be paid for and accounted as a fixed charge on the business. Men may try to get insurance on their lives and property at low rates, but in the last analysis they are pretty sure to get that insurance at any rate.

I believe that it is wise from the point of view of protecting the national wealth against possible loss from causes that seem now most unlikely to arise, but causes that may come upon us at a most unlikely time, to appropriate a comparatively small amount which well may be charged up to insurance. The total expenditure of \$125,000,000 a year for the Navy is a tax of 1 and a small fraction of 1 per cent of the total of capitalized industries in the country. Such an appropriation represents an actual per capita tax of about \$1.30, which is small indeed when it is compared with the per capita income of \$590. It is shown that the Spanish War cost the United States \$500,000,000. We had a Navy in that war that was splendidly efficient [applause]; but if we had had a Navy that included then four more *Oregons* than the one we did have, it is certain there would have been no war. [Applause.] The cost of these additional ships would have been, to be sure, approximately \$30,000,000. An investment, therefore, of 6 per cent of the money the war cost would have saved half a billion of dollars and hundreds of lives. [Applause.]

I said a few moments ago to one of my very good friends, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Judge ADAMSON, of Georgia, that I was in favor of two battleships. He asked me if I was in favor of a navy to comprise 100 battleships. Of course, I am not and so I told him. The judge wondered what I believed an adequate navy to be, and I am glad that he asked me the question.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is wise to quote from the remarks of the gentleman whose duty it is in this connection to advise this legislative body. I refer to the head of the great Navy Department, and I find at page 36 of the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy an expression of what may be accepted as an adequate American Navy. That statement gives not only the opinion of the Secretary himself, but also the consensus of opinion of the best men in the Navy and out of

it who have given consideration to this subject. You may readily see by an examination of the accompanying tables the sea strength of the navies of the world as of December 1, 1911.

## SEA STRENGTH.

Tables showing the relative strength of the Navy and its importance in comparison with foreign navies December 1, 1911. Vessels undergoing trials are considered as completed. The following vessels are not included in the tables: Those over 20 years old, unless they have been reconstructed and rearmed since 1905; transports, colliers, repair ships, converted merchant vessels, or any other auxiliaries; vessels of less than 1,000 tons, except torpedo craft; torpedo craft of less than 50 tons.

## Vessels built.

	Battleships, Dreadnought type. <sup>1</sup>	Battleships. <sup>2</sup>	Armored cruisers, invincible type. <sup>3</sup>	Armored cruisers. <sup>4</sup>	Cruisers. <sup>5</sup>	Destroyers.	Torpedo boats.	Submarines.	Coast-defense vessels. <sup>6</sup>
England.....	12	42	5	34	79	192	59	65	.....
Germany.....	7	21	2	9	39	109	22	14	5
United States.....	6	25	.....	12	30	36	28	20	4
France.....	.....	20	.....	22	10	72	200	66	2
Japan.....	.....	13	2	11	15	58	59	10	2
Russia.....	.....	9	.....	6	11	95	29	31	2
Italy.....	.....	8	.....	10	6	22	46	9	.....
Austria.....	.....	6	.....	3	6	14	43	6	6

<sup>1</sup> Battleships having a main battery of all big guns (11 inches or more in caliber).

<sup>2</sup> Battleships, first class, are those of (about) 10,000 tons or more displacement.

<sup>3</sup> Armored cruisers having guns of largest caliber in main battery and capable of taking their place in line of battle with the battleships. They have an increase of speed at the expense of carrying fewer guns in main battery and a decrease in armor protection; also called battleship cruisers.

<sup>4</sup> Includes all unarmored cruising vessels above 1,000 tons displacement.

<sup>5</sup> Includes smaller battleships and monitors. No more vessels of this class are being proposed or built by the great powers.

<sup>6</sup> Includes vessels of colonies.

## Vessels building or authorized.

[Includes vessels authorized, but not yet laid down, as well as those actually under construction.]

	Battleships, Dreadnought type.	Battleships.	Armored cruisers, invincible type.	Armored cruisers.	Cruisers.	Destroyers.	Torpedo boats.	Submarines.
England <sup>1</sup> .....	10	.....	5	.....	10	31	.....	17
Germany <sup>2</sup> .....	9	.....	3	.....	6	12	.....	10
United States.....	6	.....	.....	.....	1	14	.....	18
France.....	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	13	.....	15
Japan.....	.....	.....	4	.....	.....	2	.....	3
Russia.....	7	.....	.....	.....	.....	13	.....	8
Italy.....	4	.....	.....	.....	.....	10	46	11
Austria.....	4	.....	.....	.....	.....	6	12	6

<sup>1</sup> England has no continuing shipbuilding policy, but usually lays down each year 5 armored ships with a proportional number of smaller vessels.

<sup>2</sup> Includes vessels of colonies.

<sup>3</sup> Germany has a continuing shipbuilding program, governed by a fleet law authorized by the Reichstag. For 1912 there are authorized 1 battleship, 1 armored cruiser 2 cruisers, 12 destroyers; eventual strength to consist of 38 battleships, 20 armored cruisers, 38 cruisers, 144 destroyers.

<sup>4</sup> \$3,570,000 authorized for experiments and further construction.

<sup>5</sup> \$78,837,591 authorized to be expended from 1911 to 1917 for the construction of war vessels.

## Personnel.

Rank.	England.	France.	Germany.	Japan.	United States.
Admirals of the fleet.....	4	.....	2	1	( <sup>1</sup> )
Admirals.....	12	.....	5	7	.....
Vice admirals.....	22	15	12	20	.....
Rear admirals.....	55	30	22	38	30
Captains and commanders.....	636	340	302	296	212
Other line officers.....	2,274	1,509	1,596	1,710	1,114
Midshipmen at sea.....	606	61	398	154	287
Engineer officers.....	940	505	433	695	.....
Medical officers.....	593	413	286	358	348
Pay officers.....	697	216	236	324	202
Chaplains.....	138	.....	.....	.....	24
Warrant officers.....	2,494	2,850	2,512	1,520	645
Enlisted men.....	105,434	53,316	50,380	42,043	47,500
Marine officers.....	425	.....	109	.....	354
Enlisted men (marines).....	619,635	.....	74,672	.....	9,521
Total.....	133,965	58,755	60,974	47,167	60,217

<sup>1</sup> The Admiral of the Navy.

<sup>2</sup> The United States now has, temporarily, as extra numbers, due to promotion for war service, and to officers restricted by law to engineering duty only on shore only, 12 flag officers, 26 captains, 4 commanders, 11 lieutenant commanders, and 1 lieutenant.

<sup>3</sup> Includes pharmacists and apothecaries.

<sup>4</sup> Includes pharmaceutical officers.

<sup>5</sup> Includes adjutants, premier matres, and matres of all branches.

<sup>6</sup> Includes 3,100 men of the Coast Guard.

<sup>7</sup> Marine Infantry and Seaman Artillery.



This table shows that the United States is now second among the navies of the world, but that it will drop to third when vessels now building, or authorized by various countries, shall have been completed.

I invite your attention also to this table which shows the warship tonnage of the principal naval powers as of December 1, 1911:

WARSHIP TONNAGE OF THE PRINCIPAL NAVAL POWERS.

Number and displacement of warships, built and building, of 1,000 or more tons, and of torpedo craft of more than 50 tons, Dec. 1, 1911.

[Vessels undergoing trials are considered as completed. The following vessels are not included in the tables: Those over 20 years old, unless they have been reconstructed and rearmament since 1905; those not actually begun or ordered, although authorized; transports, colliers, repair ships, torpedo depot ships, converted merchant vessels, or yachts; vessels of less than 1,000 tons, except torpedo craft; torpedo craft of less than 50 tons.]

Type of vessel.	Great Britain.				Germany.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
Battleships <sup>1</sup> (Dreadnought type)	12	236,350	10	247,000	7	141,720	9	217,400
Battleships, first class <sup>2</sup>	42	617,500			21	252,712		
Coast-defense vessels <sup>3</sup>					5	20,273		
Armored cruisers <sup>4</sup> (Invincible type)	5	96,850	4	90,800	2	41,637	3	72,650
Armored cruisers	34	406,800			9	94,245		
Cruisers above 6,000 tons <sup>5</sup>	14	140,500						
Cruisers, 6,000 to 3,000 tons <sup>6</sup>	42	200,460	10	50,040	24	98,180	6	32,650
Cruisers, 3,000 to 1,000 tons <sup>6</sup>	23	49,540			15	34,528		
Torpedo-boat destroyers	192	108,703	31	26,980	109	58,474	12	9,000
Torpedo boats	59	12,710			22	3,700		
Submarines	65	20,736	17	13,610	14	4,140	10	6,000
Total tons built and total tons building	1,896,140		428,430		749,609		337,700	
Total tons built and building	2,324,579				1,087,399			

  

Type of vessel.	United States.				France.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
Battleships <sup>1</sup> (Dreadnought type)	6	115,650	4	105,600			4	92,308
Battleships, first class <sup>2</sup>	25	334,140			20	280,005		
Coast-defense vessels <sup>3</sup>	4	12,900			2	15,400		
Armored cruisers <sup>4</sup> (Invincible type)								
Armored cruisers	12	157,445			22	211,070		
Cruisers above 6,000 tons <sup>5</sup>	5	43,800			3	24,022		
Cruisers, 6,000 to 3,000 tons <sup>6</sup>	14	49,541			5	21,280		
Cruisers, 3,000 to 1,000 tons <sup>6</sup>	11	13,631			2	4,706		
Torpedo-boat destroyers	36	21,306	14	12,550	72	26,782	13	9,170
Torpedo boats	28	4,802			200	19,106		
Submarines	20	4,490	18	8,805	66	22,304	15	9,182
Total tons built and total tons building	757,711		127,355		630,705		110,720	
Total tons built and building	885,066				741,425			

<sup>1</sup> Battleships having a main battery of all big guns (11 inches or more in caliber).  
<sup>2</sup> Battleships, first class, are those of (about) 10,000 or more tons displacement.  
<sup>3</sup> Includes smaller battleships and monitors.  
<sup>4</sup> Armored cruisers having guns of largest caliber in main battery and capable of taking their place in line of battle with the battleships. They have an increase of speed at the expense of carrying fewer guns in main battery and a decrease in armor protection. Are also called battleship cruisers.  
<sup>5</sup> Colonial vessels included.  
<sup>6</sup> All unarmored warships of more than 1,000 tons are, in this table, classed according to displacement as cruisers. Scouts are considered as cruisers in which battery and protection have been sacrificed to secure extreme speed. The word "protected" has been omitted because all cruisers except the smallest and oldest now have protective decks.

Number and displacement of warships, built and building, etc.—Contd.

Type of vessel.	Japan.				Russia.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
Battleships <sup>1</sup> (Dreadnought type)			2	41,600			7	153,000
Battleships, first class <sup>2</sup>	13	191,698			9	122,250		
Coast-defense vessels <sup>3</sup>	2	9,086			2	10,380		
Armored cruisers <sup>4</sup> (Invincible type)	2	29,200	4	110,000				
Armored cruisers	11	108,900			6	63,599		
Cruisers above 6,000 tons <sup>5</sup>	2	13,130			7	46,430		
Cruisers, 6,000 to 3,000 tons <sup>6</sup>	8	30,303	3	15,000	2	6,385		
Cruisers, 3,000 to 1,000 tons <sup>6</sup>	5	9,158			2	2,680		
Torpedo-boat destroyers	58	22,608	2	1,200	95	35,794	13	13,230
Torpedo boats	49	5,500			29	3,722		
Submarines	10	1,726	3	950	31	6,648	8	4,800
Total tons built and total tons building	421,309		168,750		297,819		176,000	
Total tons built and building	590,119				473,879			

Type of vessel.	Italy.				Austria.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
Battleships <sup>1</sup> (Dreadnought type)			4	85,020			4	80,000
Battleships, first class <sup>2</sup>	8	95,700			6	74,613		
Coast-defense vessels <sup>3</sup>					6	41,700		
Armored cruisers <sup>4</sup> (Invincible type)								
Armored cruisers	10	78,520			3	18,800		
Cruisers above 6,000 tons <sup>5</sup>								
Cruisers, 6,000 to 3,000 tons <sup>6</sup>			3	9,070	3	11,453	3	10,449
Cruisers, 3,000 to 1,000 tons <sup>6</sup>	6	12,470			3	7,650		
Torpedo-boat destroyers	22	7,587	10	6,130	14	5,702	6	4,800
Torpedo boats	46	7,713	28	3,390	43	6,899	12	2,400
Submarines	9	1,822	11	3,500	6	1,686	6	1,800
Total tons built and total tons building	203,812		108,310		167,993		99,440	
Total tons built and building	312,122				267,442			

<sup>1</sup> Battleships having a main battery of all big guns (11 inches or more in caliber).  
<sup>2</sup> Battleships, first class, are those of (about) 10,000 or more tons displacement.  
<sup>3</sup> Includes smaller battleships and monitors.  
<sup>4</sup> Armored cruisers having guns of largest caliber in main battery and capable of taking their place in line of battle with the battleships. They have an increase of speed at the expense of carrying fewer guns in main battery and a decrease in armor protection. Are also called battleship cruisers.  
<sup>5</sup> Colonial vessels included.  
<sup>6</sup> All unarmored warships of more than 1,000 tons are, in this table, classed according to displacement as cruisers. Scouts are considered as cruisers in which battery and protection have been sacrificed to secure extreme speed. The word "protected" has been omitted because all cruisers except the smallest and oldest now have protective decks.

*Relative order of warship tonnage.*

Present order (tonnage completed).		As would be the case were vessels building now completed.	
Nation.	Tonnage.	Nation.	Tonnage.
Great Britain	1,896,140	Great Britain	2,324,579
United States	757,711	Germany	1,087,399
Germany	749,609	United States	885,066
France	630,705	France	741,425
Japan	421,309	Japan	590,119
Russia	297,819	Russia	473,879
Italy	203,812	Italy	312,122
Austria	167,993	Austria	267,442

Now, we do not propose to rival England and Germany and Japan in the matter of a building program for the Navy. But we do believe that the annual appropriation should be such that it will provide for the future of our Nation a fleet of at least 20 ships in the first line and 20 ships in the second line of the Navy. The present strength of the Navy is 37 battleships, of which 28 may be considered as worthy of a place in the first line and the remaining 9 as second-line ships. Sixteen of those 28 are pre-Drednaughts and their qualifications of the first line is indeed doubtful; certainly three years from now they can not be so qualified, and the first fleet has been reduced to 12 ships—new ships are added to it. Four of the nine ships classed now in the second line will reach the limit of the recognized life of a battleship in 1915-16. They must be removed, therefore, from the second fleet and relegated to the line of harbor defenses.

The ships that we may provide for at this time can not be ready for at least three years, and we must legislate at this time with the thought in mind as to what the condition of our Navy may be in the year 1915-16.

There is a splendid page of our American history that tells the story of how Perry and his men on Lake Erie in the War of 1812 hastily built a navy and with it swept England from the seas. It is only matched by that page of American history which shows that with undaunted courage the "embattled farmer" stood in Massachusetts and in other places and made a great fight for constitutional Government for equality and liberty. [Applause.]

That courage can be exemplified at any time by American soldiers and sailors; but present-day conditions are such that a navy can not be hastily put together. If we permit this Congress and future Congresses to go by without making the appropriations necessary to maintain an adequate navy, the time may come, and I for one am afraid that it will come, when we shall wish that we had made this appropriation.

I listened with great interest the other day to my colleague from Massachusetts, Judge HARRIS, as he told of the great work that his illustrious father did as his share in contributing to the building of the original American Navy. I felt a reasonable and just pride as I listened to his recital of that story, and I shall never forget his recital of what that father said to him when he brought to him the news of Dewey's victory at Manila. "Well, boy," said the father, "it seems now after many years that eight years of hard work and strife has finally been of some service to the country." I wonder whether or not it will ever again be necessary to repeat the victory of Manila Bay. If such a necessity does arise, the economy of to-day will be looked upon as a foolhardy policy, in view of any such contingency, and it is because I feel this way that I am pledged to step out of the ranks of my Democratic colleagues and to urge this House to support the amendment of my colleague, Mr. ROBERTS, even though it comes from a Republican member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I protest that this bill is not a political measure. I protest that when it comes to the matter of the American Navy we should not be Republicans, Democrats, nor partisans of any class, but we should give to the consideration of the matter the best opinion and political judgment that we can, in order that there may be a true and right solution of the great problem that confronts us. [Applause.]

It has been only 14 years since the Spanish War, and we all remember the great work the battleship *Oregon* did when she made her great triumphant world tour from Manila to Santiago. We all know what splendid work that ship did at that time, and it is hard for some to realize that the time has come when the *Oregon* must be retired from the first line of fighting ships in the Navy; but the fact is, as is contained in the Secretary's report and as given to us by the Navy experts of the country, that not only the *Oregon*, but the *Indiana*, the *Iowa*, the *Massachusetts* must soon be retired from the first line. We are not asking to do anything more than to maintain the Navy at its present standard of efficiency when we ask to have the resolution for two battleships appropriated.

Now, I have no fears of the danger of war. I have no thoughts of impending disaster; but I want to help in every way that I may to maintain an adequate Navy, particularly at this time when the Panama Canal, at an expenditure of \$400,000,000 of American money, is about to be completed. I want our Navy to be of such strength that it may be able to maintain its high place among the navies of the world. And in urging this thought upon this House I am trying to reflect the sentiment of that great water-front district in the city of Boston that has honored me by sending me as its Representative to this House.

If you believe that this is a sectional question, however, let me call your attention to the editorial comments of the newspapers of the country, regardless of their political affiliations,

on the days just after the caucus that we Democrats had on this matter of a building program for the Navy. If you believe that this is a sectional question, let me assure you that men who have campaigned throughout our country bear testimony to the fact that mere mention of the glorious work of the American Navy always touches a responsive chord in the breasts of the American citizens. I hope, therefore, that, regardless of party and regardless of the section of the country from which they may come, a sufficient number of the Members of this House may support this amendment for two battleships to insure an appropriation by this House. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, during the general debate I took occasion to say that the battleship question does not cause the usual excitement this year. The reason probably is that everyone knows what the final disposition of the question will be. The Democratic majority of the House will vote for no battleships. The Senate will insist on at least one, and the House will finally yield to a program so wisely limited in order to keep the Navy at its present state of efficiency. [Applause.] I have consistently voted for the last 8 or 10 years for one battleship. Way down deep in my heart I am frank to say that I am for no battleships. [Applause.] I do not think we would incur any risk whatsoever if none were provided this year. But so it may not be said that those of us who are favoring arbitration are willing to go to the extent of denying to the country such means of defense as seem, unfortunately, still necessary, under present conditions I am willing to vote for one, which means a vote not for an increase of the Navy, but for the maintenance of the Navy at its present strength. No matter what position a man may take on the question of battleships, there may be and are great differences among us, but there is no difference as to one paramount proposition, and that is we are all in favor of the absolute security of our country. [Applause.] Now, that security might be achieved in two different ways. It might be achieved according to the old system, which unfortunately is still in vogue, of building battleship after battleship and thereby taxing the resources of all the nations to their utmost.

Or it might be done in the same way that civilized nations are now guarding their domestic peace, namely, by law, or, speaking in an international sense, by the perfection of the necessary legal machinery to adjust and settle international difficulties in a peaceful way. And along this line I wish to call the attention of the Members to the fact that this legal machinery is no longer a mere dream of theorists, inasmuch as The Hague conferences, the first as well as the second, have unanimously agreed upon the creation of a high court of nations, which is to decide all questions of an international character that might be brought before it. That high court of nations was established in 1899 at the first Hague conference. At the second conference the court was perfected. In order to secure a real judicial tribunal The Hague conference agreed on a court of arbitral justice, and the motion to establish such was carried unanimously by all the nations represented at that conference—44 in number. Only the mooted question of how the judges should be distributed among the different nations and how many judges should be appointed is the cause of its not having been put in execution so far. But all signs point to the probability that at the next Hague conference in 1915 that court will be established.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And in connection with that court, the nations will agree on general arbitration treaties such as have been proposed by President Taft recently. We are going to have them in spite of the Senate of the United States, because the time is very close at hand when that great body will have to do the bidding of the will of the American people regarding this great question. And after we have arbitration treaties with all great powers these powers among themselves will negotiate similar ones, so that the civilized world will be one great net of arbitration treaties. And the next question will be a code of international law to be sanctioned by all the parliaments and to be applied in all cases that may be brought before that court.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a substitute for your battleships, more humane and much more economical and much more in accordance with modern civilization than your method of force. And that substitute, I hope, will be supported even by those who are now supporting the policy of battleships. I think we

ought to all join hands if we can for a substitute such as that which will relieve the people of this country and other countries of a well-nigh unbearable burden of taxation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KONIG, Mr. SAUNDERS, and Mr. TURNBULL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TURNBULL] is recognized.

Mr. TURNBULL. Mr. Chairman, if I had been given the power to fix the battleship program in the bill under consideration, I think I should have included therein one battleship or one fast armored cruiser, as that has been the policy heretofore advocated by the Democrats. But when a majority of my colleagues on this side of the House, after due consideration, determined otherwise, I abided by the decision, as I always expect to do.

I am a highland man, if I may use that expression, and prior to becoming a member of the Naval Committee had given very little attention to the character of the ships to be built or of the needs of our Navy along that line. I am in favor of having a Navy sufficient to protect our rapidly increasing foreign commerce, to protect our seacoasts in time of war, and to give assurance of protection to our citizens in whatever country they may desire to do business. I attended the naval review in New York in October, 1911, and was justly proud of our 7-mile line of battleships exhibited on that occasion, and I am doubly proud of the officers in command and of the men behind the guns, for I believe the same spirit now exists among those men that animated and permeated the hearts of the brave men who manned our ships and helped so materially in giving life to our Nation and liberty to our people in the beginning. I am satisfied that as a fighting force they have no equal in any of the nations of the earth. [Applause.]

Since I have become a member of the Naval Committee I have studied the subject of the needs of our Navy in every way I possibly could, and have listened carefully to the testimony taken before the committee on the subject, and the more I try to study and consider the question from a common-sense business standpoint the more I doubt the expediency or wisdom of the construction of any more battleships of the *Dreadnought* type, such as those we are now building or have already in commission.

Let us look at the history of and effect of this battleship building. When the *Merrimac* and the *Monitor* had the engagement in Hampton Roads, our ships were wooden vessels and our guns were smooth bore and of short range. When we began to armor plate the ships, we began to improve the type of the guns, and they were changed from smooth bores to rifles. As the thickness of the armor plate was increased, the size and length of the guns were increased. As the size of the guns was increased of course the size, character, and destructiveness of the projectiles were increased.

We invented the torpedo, which is a projectile loaded with high explosives that are fired out of tubes, and when started they propel themselves, and it is admitted that when one of these strikes one of our *Dreadnoughts* it ends the life of the ship, it matters not what is the thickness of the armor plate. Then the submarine boats were invented so that they can travel under water and fire these torpedoes with the same accuracy, almost, as if they were upon the surface of the water. This necessitated the building of torpedo-boat destroyers to try and prevent the deadly effect of the torpedo boats, and now it is claimed that each one of these *Dreadnoughts* should have to protect it five torpedo boats and two destroyers. In addition to what I have stated, a torpedo shell has been invented that can be fired out of the same guns as the steel projectiles with nearly the same range, and it is admitted that if one of these shells strikes the ship or strikes and explodes in the water within from 40 to 100 feet of the ship that it will destroy it.

Now, then, what do we deduce from this state of facts? We build a battleship of the *Dreadnought* type that costs not less than \$12,000,000, armored with the heaviest armor plate and equipped with the best guns known, and this ship can be destroyed, first, by a steel projectile fired out of a 14-inch rifle, which it is claimed will pierce the armor and destroy the ship certainly at a distance of 10,000 yards; second, by a torpedo fired out of a torpedo tube; third, by a torpedo shell fired out of a 14-inch gun; fourth, by a mine that may be put in any harbor.

When I consider these facts, I ask myself the question, What good is the armor if the projectile will pierce it? What superior advantage does a large ship have over a smaller one if it can be sunk by a torpedo, torpedo shell, or mine as readily as a smaller ship? We all know, whether we have any common sense or not, that a large ship can be hit more readily than a smaller one. If what I have said is true, the fighting capacity

of our ships has not advanced one inch beyond the ships in which Decatur and Perry won their victories. These large ships are of slow speed and can travel only in very deep water. The ships do not do the fighting, but it is done by the men with the guns, and I can not help but feel that three ships built at the same cost that one of these big ships costs now, and with a greater rate of speed and manned by the same men and with the same character of guns will be more effective than the one big ship. This is certainly true if there is anything in the tactics of the great generals that the way to win a battle is to get there first with the most men.

In my judgment we are putting too many eggs in one basket. We are expending our revenues faster than we gather them in. Think of the great expense and ask yourself the question, Where are we drifting? We are simply aping foreign nations, with no fixed policy of our own. Have we made any progress? Yes; but principally in the facility with which we spend the people's money, wrung from them, it is claimed, by unjust taxation; for the cost of the Navy has increased in the last 20 years from about thirty millions to one hundred and thirty millions of dollars. It is easy to expand, but it is hard to contract, and it looks as if we are using greater efforts to find new subjects of taxation than we are to reduce the burdens now resting upon us.

Mr. Chairman, there is great unrest among the people all over the country. It looks as if the wealth of the country continues to accumulate in the hands of a few, and the burdens of the people who do the work and receive the wages are becoming greater as the days go by. If we would win battles in the future we must so act as to keep the men behind the guns contented and happy. Let the people at home become discontented and poverty stricken, and then patriotism and love of country will vanish and the big ships and the big guns will become useless. [Applause.]

Mr. KONIG. Mr. Chairman, it will take me but a few minutes to express my views on the subject now under discussion. I am a Democrat, and a party man at that, and, thank God, since I have been a Member of this House I have never had to vote against my party organization. The question of the size of the American Navy is not now and never has been a party question; and, moreover, whatever the caucus may have done in respect to this bill, I am not bound by it, for I remained away from the caucus.

Just exactly how many battleships or how many cruisers or how many torpedo boats we have, I confess I do not know as well, perhaps, as I ought to, and I also confess I do not know just exactly how our Navy compares in strength with that of France or of England or of Germany. But I do know, Mr. Chairman, that there are other navies far larger and far better equipped than ours. And I also know, Mr. Chairman, that the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy have urged Congress to make an appropriation for two additional battleships. These officials are in the possession of the information that makes them experts; and in any event I would rather follow their judgment and be guilty of an extravagance than to refuse to follow it and suffer the disastrous consequences that must attend upon a false economy in so important a matter as the strength of our Navy.

The American Nation, whether wisely or unwisely, has become a world power; our interests are no longer confined to the North American Continent. We have become an empire, with possessions in all corners of the world; we have those gold bricks within the shadow of the shores of Japan—the Philippine Islands; we have Hawaii to watch over, and also Porto Rico, and we must not forget our foster child, Cuba. The Panama Canal represents an investment of hundreds of millions of dollars and the best engineering genius of all time. If the American flag is ever to come down in any of these possessions or dependencies, it must come down of our own freely given consent. We can not let ourselves be put in the position where we may be forced to lower the flag.

These considerations and the consideration that a fellow who can take care of himself seldom has to fight compel me as a lover of peace to vote for the building of additional battleships. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL and Mr. MARTIN of Colorado rose.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I do not care about shutting off that side altogether. I am willing to follow the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado. I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] for one battleship. [Applause.] And I shall support it with some reservation, because, as a matter of fact, I had fully made up my mind not to vote for any battleships this year. It is not often that that side of the House does a really good thing, but I think they

did a very excellent thing when the caucus decided against battleships, not that I think the caucus decision will stand as a final decision of the Congress, because I think that ultimately we shall provide for one battleship. But I think it was a most excellent thing to challenge the attention of the country to the mad race of the world in competition in the building of enormous and costly ships of war, ships of a character that never have been tried out in actual warfare, and ships that, at the very best we can hope for them, will within a decade be useless and valueless. England, Germany, and France, and to a lesser extent Japan and Russia, each feels it can not afford to be too far distanced in this race for military preparedness.

We are the only nation in the world that can safely halt our naval program, for there is not a man under the flag who knows his country and understands the condition of the world that has the slightest notion that there would be any danger whatever to our country, its honor, or its people if we did not build a battleship in the next 20 years. [Applause.] Not that I believe we should wholly neglect this arm of defense. On the contrary, I have always believed that we should adopt and steadily maintain a decent and reasonable naval program, that we should have such a Navy as will form a reasonable first line of defense in the very improbable event of a great war.

We are in a position now to do the world a mighty service in calling to the attention of the civilized world the fact that we are not being carried away by this naval madness that seems now to control all the courts of Europe and the Orient—a naval madness that is well-nigh rushing into bankruptcy the greatest nations of the world. Let us stop and think how rapidly these naval expenditures have been increasing, the world over, in the past few years, and how certainly they must lead to the bankruptcy of the nations if they are to be continued in the same ratio for a few years longer. There must be a halt in this tremendous increase of naval armaments, and we are in such a position that we can show all the world that we are not carried away by this desire to have more and larger ships than any other nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I am not one of those who look for the speedy coming of the millennium. I am not one of those who believe that wars will ever wholly cease. But I am one of those who look forward with hopeful anticipation toward the day when most of the differences between the nations shall be settled by courts of arbitration. I think we have seen more than the dawning of that day. I think we are well within it, and I sincerely hope that generations will pass before there shall be another great war among the great civilized nations of the world. And if we are not to have wars constantly recurring, then it is the duty of every citizen of every civilized country to use the influence he has, be it great or small, in the checking of the wasteful expenditures for war-like purposes. [Applause.]

How much the world might do, what benefits might be brought to the human race, what splendid monuments of peace could be erected, if we expended the money we are now expending for these huge leviathans of the deep for works that would benefit mankind, instead of joining in a mad race to prepare the biggest ships and the most ships with which to blow men off the earth and out of the water. If we could use the same sums of money in the great undertakings of peace, and if we could retain in the paths of useful productiveness the men whose lives are now wasted in warlike pursuits, how much better it would be for all the world.

We can not, of course, disarm. We must maintain a fair Army and a fair Navy. We must maintain a Navy in keeping with our great wealth and power and position in the world. But we should not endeavor to make a display of our power by building battleships as some people make display of wealth by wearing costly jewels. The one is as undesirable as the other. Our place in the world and our influence and strength in war and peace depend infinitely more upon our 90,000,000 of intelligent citizenship than upon all of the bayonets in the country and all the guns we will ever mount on battleships. [Applause.]

If we would turn our attention to and spend the money now wasted in these great armaments, upon works that would be helpful to all mankind, all the world would rise up and call us blessed. Let us not allow our Navy to be reduced to a point where we shall not have a Navy in keeping with our power and wealth and our influence in the world. One ship a year is

quite sufficient to maintain an adequate Navy in this country, and if we adopt a one-battleship program we shall have given notice to all the world that we do not propose to join or participate in this unwise, wasteful, and wicked race for enormous armaments, taxing the people for their construction and their upbuilding. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW] may be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, that this is not a political question, at least that it is not properly a party question, is strikingly illustrated by the fact that the Republican Member from Wyoming approves and the Democratic Member from Colorado disapproves of the battleship program, or rather the no-battleship program, which has been adopted on this side of the House.

Right at the outset of his remarks the gentleman [Mr. MONDELL] stated a fact which strongly inclines me in favor of continuing, for the present at least, our present battleship program, and that is what he referred to as the mad race of the other powers of the world to build up great navies. I want to ask the gentleman from Wyoming if he thinks this great Nation, with its tremendous responsibilities as a world power, can afford to sit idly by and see the peace of the world—yea, even the map of the world—threatened by the building up of these great navies, and yet this Nation not place itself in a position to protect the peace of the world.

Mr. MONDELL. Is that a question?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. That is not a question. At least it ought not to be a question. If it is a question, it is one that ought to answer itself. It is a question that ought to point to the undoubted duty of this Nation to place itself in a position where, if necessary, it would be able to assert itself in favor of the peace of the world. One day during this session our Socialist brother, the gentleman from Milwaukee [Mr. BERGER] made what I thought was a very pat and apt suggestion, and that was that neutrality is a good thing if only you are able to enforce it.

Mr. Chairman, I subscribe most heartily to that proposition. I was one of the thirty-odd Members on this side of the House who voted for two battleships in each of the two naval appropriation bills in the Sixty-first Congress, and I regret very much that the pending naval appropriation bill does not make similar provision. [Applause.]

While I represent the State which above all others in the Union is secure from foreign attack or invasion, I take some pride in the fact that I am as much in favor of an adequate Navy as any Member of this body who represents a seacoast district. I take some pride in the fact that I am a big-Navy Democrat; not a big Navy as a threat and menace against the peace of the world, but a big Navy as a guaranty of the peace of the world; and that I understand and believe to be, in this time of striving for naval supremacy, the true need and the highest mission of an adequate American Navy.

As I have listened to the objections of gentlemen to continuing for a time longer, at least, our present naval program, it has seemed to me that they looked at this question, both in its larger and in its smaller aspects, with an entirely too limited vision. It seems to me, as I have listened to some gentlemen, that the chief question at issue is whether the Navy is built up around battleships or coal barges. Which is the unit of a navy? I have never heard that a naval engagement ever turned upon the auxiliaries. I have never heard that a naval engagement hinged upon transports and colliers, or even submarines and destroyers. In the great decisive naval battle between China and Japan, in the decisive battle between Japan and Russia, and in the two great naval battles between the United States and Spain, I did not hear anything about auxiliaries. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. There is no use asking for five minutes more. A man could not undertake to discuss this subject in five minutes. I will ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear about auxiliaries in the China Sea, or the Japan Sea, or Manila Bay, or Santiago, or even in the present war between Italy and Turkey. I did not read about any auxiliary fleet convoying and supporting the *Oregon* in its great historic cruise around the Horn. I do not understand such a fleet could make such a cruise. But I do not say that all these auxiliaries are not necessary to the naval power which would keep abreast of

the naval equipment of other countries. I simply say that these factors, in which the American Navy is said to be deficient, are minor. As for transports and colliers, we have 300 vessels in the coastwise trade which could be seized and impressed into the defense of the country should occasion require.

But it is objected that the Navy is badly balanced because of the disparity between fighting ships and auxiliaries. A more practical and analytical way of stating the proposition would be to ask whether we have too many battleships or too few auxiliaries. If we had sufficient auxiliaries for the present number of battleships, would the Navy be too large? If no, then we should continue the present rate of increase in battleships, thus maintaining our front while bringing up our rear. If yes, then we ought to reasonably curtail the battleship program, not stop it altogether. It is all right to balance the Navy, but it is a matter of vital importance whether it is balanced up or down.

But it is further argued that our ships become quickly obsolete. My reply to this is twofold. First, they do not become obsolete any more quickly than the vessels of other nations; and second, the same objection would apply with even more force to such novel factors in naval warfare as submarines and torpedo-boat destroyers. If, as has been argued by gentlemen on this side of the House, we are to await the development of the best type of battleship, then let us await the development of the best type of submarine and destroyer. What is the use of building a lot of submarines and destroyers that may be obsolete to-morrow? And how will we know the best type when it comes? The truth is, to state these objections is to answer them. They are so feeble they fall of their own weight.

The same may be said of the proposition that we want a defensive, not an aggressive, Navy. I confess, perhaps because it is that I am so dense, that I can no more distinguish between a defensive and an aggressive navy than I can between good trusts and bad trusts. According to my way of reasoning, a navy is either adequate or inadequate, measured by the power and the responsibility of the nation.

I can conceive of no other practicable test. This is one case where, in my judgment, a half loaf is not better than no bread. A weak Navy would provoke, not prevent, trouble. Either we should have and maintain a first-class Navy or none. It takes two years to build a modern fighting ship and so long to build a modern Navy that you must keep building. When you want a Navy you want it badly and at once. One naval battle decided the war between China and Japan, one naval battle decided the war between Russia and Japan, two naval battles decided the war between the United States and Spain. In these four engagements, three navies were destroyed and their countries humbled and driven from power for decades; and unless the human race has suddenly lost the instinct of the ages, other powers will meet the same fate. Members of this House participated in the greatest civil war of all history. Since then the world has witnessed the terrible Franco-Prussian War, the war between Turkey and Greece, the war between England and the Transvaal, the war between China and Japan, the war between Japan and Russia, the war between the United States and Spain; so that, within the memories of yet vigorous and active men, every great nation of the world—England, the United States, Germany, France, Spain, Russia, Italy, Turkey, China, Japan, all of them—have been involved in war. Shall we see no more terrible wars? To ask this question in the light of history and of the racial instinct is to answer it.

And it is agreed that these future wars, and particularly so far as this country is concerned, will be determined upon the seas.

This fact ought to determine us, so far as our own welfare is concerned, upon the character of our naval policy. But, above this, standing here as the dominant and responsible power of one-half of the world, our duties and liabilities in the Western Hemisphere are vast and growing, and we must be in a position to meet them.

But, above this, we owe a duty to the whole world. We can not sit idly by and see other nations go on in a mad race to build up great navies with which to threaten the peace without being in a position to assert ourselves in behalf of the peace of the world. Our Navy is to-day steaming toward Cuba, not to intervene, but by the possibility and ability to intervene to restore peace. Does this smaller lesson convey to gentlemen no suggestion of the possibilities of its reproduction upon a far larger scale? This is what I mean, and the latter ideas I have been expressing are what I had in mind when I stated at the outset that I feared gentlemen viewed this question with a too limited vision.

Mr. Chairman, I am for an adequate Navy, as promised by the Democratic national platform, and I want to say in con-

clusion that no political party can afford to incur the distrust of the country with reference to the national defense. The national sense of honor is a tinder box, needing only the spark of danger to explode it, and the Nation will cry with one voice, "Are we ready?" and if we are not ready, then God help the party or the policy responsible for lack of readiness. The people will not.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Chairman, this Nation ought to have a great and high ambition, and to my mind the field of that ambition is to exert its influence toward the establishment of the world's universal peace. [Applause.]

No longer I hope will the leading minds of this great Republic be moved by an ambition, to show to the world a great Navy strutting and posing, with its cruel guns, bellowing a message of brutality and death to mankind in this civilized age.

We are told that we must stand for a Navy if we would be popular. The trouble with our House of Representatives, and the trouble with our politics, and our parties, to-day is the effort to be popular. [Applause.] The lessons of history tell us that no great hero of the past, or great man of the past, was in his day very popular. The advocates of new truth, the pioneers of justice and right, ever since the dawn of history, have not had the crowd with them. The world has waited and built their monuments centuries after they were dust. They were outcasts while they lived. They were unpopular. If our motto is always to be to vote for and support only that which is popular, the days of the Republic are numbered.

I am ready and willing to talk about something else besides popularity in these days. It is not safe for us to enshrine our heroes until they are dead and a long time dead. If there is one lesson the American people ought to learn it is not to worship individuals, but to reverence principles, to enshrine our ideals rather than men, and march forward toward the realization of those ideals of right and justice and peace. [Applause.]

We are always told that the way to have peace is to prepare for war. No long-standing proverb or saying has less sense or less logic. I assert that the way to prepare for peace is to be peaceful. [Applause.] How are we going to have peace? If we have passed the youth day of bombast and swagger as a nation, then let us stand on the rock of faith and trust to that which is best in men and in other nations as well as ourselves, and we shall have no war. The way to have peace, Mr. Chairman, is to have faith in peace [applause] and to quit the popular hurrah for navies that has so long moved men and nations to the sensational and spectacular. Human reason is always swept from its throne by the spectacular, but we face a new day and, I trust, a new era.

I want to say this in passing, that I have not any faith in "peace," if it is not to cost us something.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Minnesota be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Chairman, the individual who avoids brutal contest and physical battle, sometimes at the cost of a little suffering, learns that it pays a bigger dividend than anything else. The greatest teacher whoever stepped upon this grain of sand has taught us that it is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong. I am not so afraid of our national pride, and all that sort of thing, that I would not be willing as an American citizen, honoring my flag, I trust, as well as any man in the Nation, that I would not be willing that we pay our share of the cost of an enduring peace among the nations of the world. [Applause.]

That which is worth the most to mankind ought to cost something and as a Nation we should be willing to pay it. I will admit I am tired of the talk of peace that seems to mean nothing. We talk peace and prepare for war. We boast that we are a peace-loving people and proceed to build large navies. This Nation made the greatest mistake in all the centuries when it voted to fortify the Panama Canal. [Applause.] It stood at the pivotal moment when it could have shown that its trust and confidence was in the good will of men and not in the disposition to fight. Yes, we talk peace and then we get ready for war. The time is coming when the manhood and character of this Nation will spurn this spirit of resentment, of war, just as civilized people to-day can only have a good standing in the world by going into court rather than by putting a chip on their shoulders and going out to slug somebody.

On what principle is it that civilized men settle their differences in courts of justice? On that same principle civilized

nations may settle their disputes without resort to force. Slowly it may be, but surely we are outgrowing the degrading brutalities of the past and asserting a higher freedom and nobler national dignity. Our true defense is moral. Our armor is the virtue and patriotism of a great people, and our real scepter is our love of peace.

I do not know but that I will vote for one battleship. I have voted for one heretofore. I have done it reluctantly, and I am frank to say that I believe you are nearer right over there than we are. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Navy is not symmetrical. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG] said in his address the other day, it is top-heavy. Yes, it is top-heavy and it is show heavy. Has not the time come, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, for us to show the world that we mean in good faith to maintain that peace which, though it may cost us, as well as other nations, something, will be a blessing to all men?

What we need in this day and age of ours is faith, faith not only in the possibility of peace, but in the practicability of peace. [Applause.] Right may be radical, but it is always practical. Only small minds shrink from it and say: "At a more convenient season I will call for thee."

I think the position of the present Executive on this subject reflects high honor upon the Nation and makes his administration worthy of a place in the centuries, because it is a step toward the world's final peace. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

[Mr. SAUNDERS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. WILDER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to three men almost in succession talking against the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri. It seems to me, however, there ought to be some golden mean that we might strike on this subject between the somewhat ambitious program suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and the do-nothing policy of his party caucus. It seems as if in these days the pendulum was inclined to swing extremely to one side or extremely to the other, as if we have arrived at a time when a sane proposition would scarcely receive the attention of anyone. One has said that in order to be peaceful we should act in a peaceful manner. About everything I have heard said on this subject indicates to me that there is a lack of practical relation and application between our naval affairs and our Army affairs. An army can be built up in a very short order, but not so with a navy. Suppose when Japan started in her recent war that ended with the sinking of Rojstvensky's ships in the Japan Sea she had not been able to go in a harbor in Korea and sink a couple of Chinese ships to start with. Suppose Dewey had not been able to take his swing in Manila Bay and sink every one of Montejó's ships without a single loss of life. Suppose Sampson or Schley, whichever one it was who did the fighting at Santiago, had had no ships with which to meet and sink Cervera's ships. I might go on indicating suggestions of this sort to quite some extent. As I have said before, armies may be raised in short order, but not so with ships. We come down to the Spanish-American War, and we put \$50,000,000 at the free use of the President of these United States—enough money to build five battleships such as contemplated at the present time. The result of that war went into the hundreds of millions before we were done with it. Of what moment is the cost of few or many ships compared with the need at such times? A warship means about 10 cents apiece of the entire inhabitants of this great Nation. Two mean 20 cents apiece, and it will not be paid by the very poor, but more of it will be paid by the others; but that is the average.

Another has said that we should have a Navy and Army somewhat commensurate with the great importance and wealth and power of this country, and in the same argument he rather reluctantly indicated that he might stand for one more ship and wished there might not be any. I wish there might be two. It is an incidental proposition when the insurance of this country is contemplated, when the well-being of this country with all its immense wealth is contemplated. I will doff my hat to no one in my desire for peace, but what good does it do to propose peace when the navies of some other nations are threatening our peace? That is exactly the condition in which the other nations of the earth want us. "Who are we standing for? Are we standing for ourselves or other nations of the earth? It seems to me that the most common kind of prudence requires that we provide our national armament in advance for those things which we can not prepare in a moment, and that fact is essentially true in reference to the Navy; but this is not necessarily so or in such a manner the fact in reference to our Army. It is notorious that our Volunteer Army—that is, the men who

come from the State militias, or even the farms or factories and otherwise—do substantially as good service as the service of the Regular Army. But what are we to do for ships? Are they to be brought from the farms? Are they to be grown on the farms? No; they must be prepared beforehand. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to speeches that have been made on each side of the House for peace, the prophecies of the millennium, and all that kind of thing. After all, I do not believe in the millennium. If we want complete rest, I trust we will get it after we cross over, because we are to be changed in the twinkling of an eye. But if there was an absolute millennium on earth, and the human family had complete rest, we would go back to barbarism. So I am not in favor of the millennium as long as we remain as we are. The human animal is a virile one. What is true of individuals is true of nations. Gentlemen, the oldest civilization is in China, with her 400,000,000 of people. The German, the English, and the French zones divide up their influence in China; and it is only because of the leadership of William McKinley and those who succeeded him that we at last have the open door in China, that otherwise would have been closed if it were not for the United States—Japan coming in as a factor with Great Britain. Mr. Chairman, if the nations of the world would let the Chinese alone, they would conquer the world by their patience and industry. We do not do it. We shut them out because we can not compete with them. They have no navy. They are a peaceful people. And yet they come and go and submit to the will of little Japan and all the other nations.

Now, the United States—and I confess it—is the greatest nation on earth—almost the greatest in population and every other respect. What are our burdens? What are our duties? They are to preserve the Government of the people first, to care for the greatest coast line of any nation on earth, to protect production at home and commerce among ourselves and with foreign nations, and to support the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. Chairman, would gentlemen reject the Monroe doctrine? It is a matter of serious consideration and, perhaps, discussion as to whether there ought to have been a Monroe doctrine; but we have it, and if you propose to abandon it the multiplied millions, amounting to the whole population, would rise up and say "no."

I want to be practical. We have these burdens. We are building the Panama Canal. We have, with a very small per cent of our production, the greatest foreign trade of any nation on earth. They do not want our trade? Oh, no. They would not take our trade if they could get it. Mr. Chairman, I met a missionary on my way home a few days ago who is located in far-away Tibet—a very intelligent man, attached to the missionary corps. He told me about the Chinese. He was in that part of Tibet that now belongs to China. I said, "How about the opium trade?" He replied, "China never wanted opium. It was forced on her." I said, "At last we have agreed it shall not be forced on her longer." He said, "The opium-producing colonies of Great Britain were so languishing in their production on account of the loss of the Chinese market that the British merchant was demanding that the exclusion of the opium policy should be abandoned." I said, "Do you think there is any danger of it?" He said, "I do." I replied, "Why, she is a great Christian nation and the mother nation of this country." "Yes," said he, "it is a great nation and it is the mother country, but for all that and with her trade and with her power she wants markets."

Mr. Chairman, suppose we sit down and inaugurate in the United States the millennium, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NYE]. It would no sooner be inaugurated than this most promising market in the world would be divided up into zones of influence, as China is now divided by the virile nations of the world. Ah, you say, but they can not conquer us. We are bigger, without arms and without training and without a navy, than all the balance of the world. Great thunders of the Fourth of July, they dare not tread upon us! [Laughter and applause.]

Well, now, I believe in a reasonable Navy, not the equal of Great Britain, but—

Mr. CLINE. Would the gentleman make as the basis of our Navy our coast line?

Mr. CANNON. Coast lines are a valuable adjunct. Why, that coast line has enough tonnage and enough commerce to make it the principal factor in building up and sustaining the great shipyards in this country. Without that patronage they would go into decay.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McKELLAR). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman require 10 minutes?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; only five minutes. I should be modest about asking for time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] be allowed to continue his remarks for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me just a moment, I desire to say that at the conclusion of the gentleman's five minutes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] desires five minutes, and I shall then move to close debate.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not insist upon that. I should like to have five minutes on this question.

Mr. PADGETT. Then I will include five minutes to the gentleman from California. I now move, Mr. Chairman, that debate close at 2 o'clock. It is now 25 minutes after 1. I have allowed a great deal of leeway already.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope I am conservative. I hope I do not desire to see our country engaged in war. I hope we may have continuing peace. But as to that prophecy about pruning hooks and swords—I believe it originated with Isaiah—bless my soul, I believe it is farther off now than when it was uttered over there in little Palestine.

Do you say, "Are we going to abandon progress?" No; by no manner of means. But I say there is no great nation, in my judgment, save alone the United States, that is not increasing its armament. We have got so much room to expand in, growing from ninety millions to four hundred millions, so much room upon this continent that we are not crowded now, and will not be perhaps for the next hundred years, for a breathing space. But all the other great nations of the earth are increasing their armament. What for? For trade, for commerce. Why? Because without the trade and without the commerce they believe that their people could not be employed. That is the reason why. Ah, England was willing to quit building if Germany would quit building. But Germany would not.

Now, all I want to do, inasmuch as it takes three years plus to build a battleship, is to have at least two battleships all the while in process of construction to take the place of the two or more ships that will be antiquated. [Applause.] That is all I want. Why, the Oregon, whose trip around the Horn caused the construction of the Panama Canal, is now practically old junk, and there are many others like it. Naval architecture progresses.

People prophesy that the aeroplane is to be the great war force or war weapon of the future. Perhaps so. But we can not afford to sit down and see the world develop the aeroplane. We can not afford to see them monopolize the high explosives and the higher explosives. We have got to keep step. It is insurance. It is the best insurance. By keeping step with the weapons with which to preserve peace we insure peace, I trust, without war.

It has been said that we have ever presented a vigorous manhood. But I do not care how vigorous is the manhood of one man or ten thousand, if you will send them up against one man or ten thousand armed with a repeating rifle that loads in the cartridge and will bring down 15 or 20 victims and then load again in less than 30 seconds, the one would almost put the unarmed ten thousand to flight under such conditions. I shall vote for two battleships, and do it heartily. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the ex-Speaker of this House, who has just taken his seat, has voiced the sentiment of a certain school of political economists in this country whose teachings are based upon the doctrine that our future greatness depends upon the size and strength of our standing armies and threatening navies. I am truly glad to know that there is another and better school of political economy abroad in our land, based upon that immortal doctrine enunciated by our Saylor more than two thousand years ago: "On earth peace, good will toward men." I stand for this doctrine to-day and invite you to accept it as our national policy instead of that offered by our distinguished ex-Speaker. While his tenure of office in this House has been long and his political sagacity is great, yet his doctrine had its origin in barbarism and blood and found its greatest supporters in paganism and polygamy. It stands to-day for force and murder and is a living menace to our intellectual and moral growth and to the prosperity and happiness of mankind. Its best beast is slavery, torture, and death, and

the brightest page of its history is the blood of 15,000,000,000 men, women, and children. What a fitting tribute Gen. Sherman paid to it when he said, "War is hell." [Applause.]

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the doctrine of peace had its origin in love and liberty. It stands for the rights of men, wherever they be, rich or poor, high or low, and against the shedding of human blood. Its greatest weapon is, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." It is supported by the best religion the world ever knew, with an instinct of a happier life in a better world. The brightest page of its history is the saving of the souls of men from the sins of the world. Then, in the language of our greatest modern soldier, "Let us have peace."

Mr. Chairman, the policy of this Nation has always been for peace. Our forefathers left kindred and homes of plenty across the sea to satisfy their longings for peace of conscience and peace of state and pitched their tents in an unknown land where the flash of sabers had never been seen and the roar of cannons had never been heard. A mere handful of men and women with the Bible in their hands and the love of God and liberty in their hearts, in the midst of wild beast and savage men, established a new civilization and surrounded it by school-houses and church houses as its wall of defense. Acting under the inspiration of this national policy, the seed of these God-fearing men and women has developed and multiplied until to-day we stand first in power and influence among the nations of the world, while other countries, with a national policy of force and murder, have dwindled in national importance and lost much of their former prestige. The sturdy manhood of our citizenship has always been equal to the emergency, and whenever our peace has been threatened by insurrection at home or invasion by enemies from abroad it has furnished us with the volunteer soldier—the best soldier the world ever knew—and being armed with right, we have always been thrice armed for victory. On all occasions, whenever forced to fight, America, without a strong navy and a large standing army, has always maintained herself both on land and on sea, and in every contest in which she has been called to measure her metal she has acquitted herself most nobly. [Applause.] What she has done in the past she is able to do in the future.

At the court of The Hague its representatives talk of world-wide peace and spread this news to the four corners of the earth, and yet the great nations of the world are running mad in trying to outstrip each other in the size and strength of their navies. At the same time they are annually appropriating large sums of money to experiment in the construction of successful flying machines, with the hope of arming them with skyrocketts to be dropped down like flaming meteors from heaven to destroy these mighty fleets. [Applause.]

And yet, Mr. Chairman, in the face of all this madness, I am sorry to say, we have men here on the floor of this House contending that we should appropriate from \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000 annually for the purpose of constructing great seagoing hounds, surpassing in viciousness, if possible, Dante's hell hounds, to keep up an eternal yelping the world around. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the time has come when some great power should propose to the nations of the world the dismantling of battleships and their elimination from the high seas as a means of settling international disputes. It is to the great discredit of the world that such disputes have hitherto been settled by the arbitrament of battle. The wonderful progress of mankind demands a more peaceable method of adjustment, and to continue a policy of blood and bluster is to oppose the advancement of the times. The statesmanship of to-day ought to be clothed in the garments of the progress of the times and no fourteenth-century statesmanship policy should be contemplated for America. In the light of our present advancement and our peculiar fitness for leadership among nations I feel that we should be first to propose this great reformation, and to show our good faith in the wisdom of such a national policy let us stop building for terror and trouble and let all of our works be for peace and progress. Let us propose to the representatives at The Hague that they prepare an international arbitration treaty at their next meeting for the adjustment of all international controversies, to be submitted to the civilized powers of the world for their ratification, the same to become effective between the countries so ratifying on and after such ratification. Our Constitution was drafted and adopted on this plan. Such a treaty would be worth more to the peace and advancement of mankind than all the battleships which could be constructed at the present rate of building in the entire world for the next century to come. There is no reason for a strong standing navy unless it be for the purpose of carrying on war. [Applause.]

The preachers in the pulpit plead for universal peace, the newspapers and magazines of the world daily fill their columns with reasons and plans for it, the statesmen in their council chambers throughout the civilized countries talk in favor of it, but annually construct against it.

The rulers of nations exchange diplomatic papers concerning it and lead the people to believe that they are about ready to adopt it, but at the same time they go ahead with the construction of new monsters of the deep, with greater speed and greater destructive powers. It will never be accomplished until some great power formulates a plan for it and has the moral courage to carry it out. A nation is not necessarily prepared for war because she has a large standing army and a big navy. We whipped Great Britain in two wars, one on land and the other on the sea, and yet we had no standing army for the one (Revolutionary War) and but a small navy for the other (War of 1812). The cause of right was with us in both of them and undoubtedly gave us an overshadowing advantage which resulted in our victories.

Mr. Chairman, the world is practically at peace to-day, but there never has been such a scramble among nations for big fleets and improved engines of death as is going on now. I am forcibly reminded of a story I once heard of a camel on coming in the presence of a wild boar that was busily engaged in whetting his tusks on the root of a tree, had his curiosity so aroused that he inquired of him, "What are you doing, sir?" Whereupon the boar replied, "I am preparing for war in time of peace." The wild-boar policy is what our ex-Speaker and his school of statesmen are advocating for America. Philosophers often peer into the misty future and foretell coming events, thereby giving the people an opportunity to escape disaster. Noah built the ark long before the flood, yet it was the means of perpetuating both human and animal life and the species thereof. Joseph was sold into Egyptian bondage by his envious brothers, but his preparation for the seven years of famine was the means of saving the lives of his cruel brothers. It is a most noble mission to prepare in advance for future happiness and prosperity, but no one can justify preparation for human slaughter and human destruction. The wild-boar policy originated in the dens of the devil. The Bible teaches us that on a certain occasion Jesus found a certain man possessed of many devils, and after casting them out they entered a herd of swine, and the entire herd ran into the sea and were drowned. Whether the wild boar escaped and is at large as a missionary of the devil I am not prepared to say, but it is quite evident that his doctrine is not in harmony with doctrine of peace and the golden rule and ought not to be accepted by any civilized power. Our greatest war is our war against war, and we ought to wage this war so unrelentingly in every clime until we prevent wars.

Mr. Chairman, we have not yet taken into consideration the question of our new possessions—Hawaii, Philippine Islands, Guam, Porto Rico, the Panama Canal, and the Canal Zone. Many of our citizens and some Members of this House believe that a strong navy is necessary in order to properly protect these possessions and discharge our duty to other nations whose citizens are interested therein. Members of Congress plan for the government of the Philippine Islands as though they were permanent property of ours. Capital is flocking there for investment and trying to gobble up the valuable parts of these rich islands in order, as I take it, that our permanent possession may be made possible. I am not in sympathy with this policy. America should retain the permanent possession of territory which may become States of this Union ultimately, and all property within our possession which is not so intended should be handled by us as a protectorate until a republican form of government can be established, with the view of ultimate independence for such territory. This ought to be our policy with the Philippine Islands, for it is evident that they can never become States of our Union. They are too far away and too far south. Their people are not Caucasian, and hence not desirable as part and parcel of this country. While they are intelligent and able in business and government, yet their environments and their social status is so at variance with our customs and institutions that they can never be amalgamated with us. Our other possessions are so close to us that we do not need a big navy for their protection. There can be no excuse, Mr. Chairman, for a strong navy in America unless it is to perpetuate a colonial policy. [Applause.]

It may be that America will embark upon this dangerous program, but if she does she has the history of the world against her. I have no doubt but that we have men in this Chamber who would gladly see her adopt such a policy, but even the thought of its possibility makes me tremble for the safety of my country. It is a trait of human character that we do not like to keep costly things just to look at. We are anxious to

put them into use, if for no other reason, just to see how they work.

The same thing is true of nations. Large standing armies and big navies are highly expensive, and if a nation has been at great expense to maintain these luxuries, in the course of time she becomes anxious to try them to see how they work, and might pick quarrels on trivial matters as an excuse to declare war for conquest. It is the history of the world that all republics which have taken on a colonial policy have ruled their colonies ruthlessly and, in many instances, cruelly, thereby engendering hatred among the subjects against the mother country, which has invariably resulted in rebellion and the loss of liberty. Ancient Venice, Genoa, Athens, Pisa, Carthage, Syracuse, Rome, Holland, and republican France all tell the same sad story. They not only lost their colonies, but they lost their own liberties. Mr. Lincoln said that no man is good enough or wise enough to rule another without his consent. The same is true of nations. No country is good enough or wise enough to rule another country without the consent of the people of that country. With the fate of both the ancient and modern republics which have adopted a colonial policy staring us in the face, who will declare for a colonial policy for America? As the lurking magazine lieth in watery ambush to blow unsuspecting fleets into fragments, so lieth the colony of a republic to blow her ship of state into kindling wood. Beware of a colony for our Republic, my countrymen, oh, beware! [Applause.] A few days ago the House adopted an amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill for the purpose of stimulating and encouraging the construction of a system of good roads in this country by giving national aid thereto. Were we to expend as much money for this purpose annually as we have been using for the construction of battleships it would not be long until America would have an ideal system of hard roads, and it would add real and substantial happiness and prosperity to our own people. Internal improvements ought to command our best thoughts and our wisest action, for therein lies the greatest hope for the happiness of our people and the perpetuity of this Republic. Let the battleship give place to good roads and internal improvements generally.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, since my refulgent light spread itself upon this House, relieving the former Erebus and atmospheric oppression, I regret that I still find there is a dearth in finding out what is done and said upon this floor in matters of so much importance as this. Why, three years ago I made a speech here—a great speech [laughter]—the greatest speech; in fact, the only speech that was made upon the battleship proposition. [Laughter.] If there had been a censor upon the speeches that went into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a historian beside, who would keep account of those things, the subject matter of this debate never would have again occurred, because they may have read my speech. [Laughter.] In fact, I believe some Member having the good of the country at heart should introduce a bill making ineligible for reelection anyone who did not read my speech.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I first offered an amendment to strike out the two battleships in my adolescent period of service. I got 17 votes upon that amendment. The next time it came up, having more influence, I got about 18 votes against the two battleships.

And then you all know that I am a caucus man. [Laughter.] I have been extremely fortunate in the Democratic caucuses, because whenever I have bolted a Democratic caucus they no sooner get back into the House after my vote had been recorded and the fact was known in the Senate and its intelligence was communicated back to the House than it immediately comes over to my side. [Laughter.]

Now, in this matter, contrary to the usual method, I stood by the Democratic caucus decree, and again the Democratic caucus is standing by me. Therefore I take pleasure in casting my vote against the two battleships. [Applause.]

I want to say to you, furthermore, gentlemen, that, notwithstanding you did not read by speech of three years ago, if you had read my speech I delivered yesterday, each and all of you would vote against the battleships for the very reason that battleships have gone out of commission. Aeroplanes and waterplanes have taken their place. I asked the chairman of this committee who these experts were that they called before the committee to determine what was the proper appropriation to make for the development of aeroplanes, and it developed that these men came before this committee before the greatest exploit of the greatest development of the age had been made at Weymouth, England, on the 10th of this month, where it was shown that the aeroplane or, rather, the waterplane, can rise from the deck of a ship without running space; that it can rise from the water; that it can descend upon the water; that it can descend upon the land; and that it can go to a distance of



500 miles without making a landing either upon the land or upon the sea. In such a case, with our immense seacoast and borders, what is the necessity of longer fortifying our coast? Why, gentlemen, it is absolutely senseless, and the fortification of the Panama Canal is so much money thrown away. Gentlemen, do not be so self-centered; for the sake of the country and for your self-respect, please read my speech. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] a few moments ago spoke of the "mad rush for war." I want to ask him whether the people of the United States were not just as ready and just as mad to rush to war after the battleship *Maine* was sunk in Habana Harbor as the most excitable nations on earth? I want to ask him whether it did not require all the skill and ability and energy of the then President of the United States, the lamented McKinley, to hold Congress back from precipitately declaring war against Spain, in order that this country might be at least partially prepared for the then impending conflict?

Mr. Chairman, war comes suddenly. It comes unexpectedly; and it is the experience of the modern world that the more a nation is prepared for war the less the likelihood of that nation becoming involved in war. The highwayman lurking in the shadow of a tree for a likely victim seldom undertakes to attack a strong, powerful individual who might worst him in the fight. He rather looks for a physically weaker brother, one who shows evidence of being more apt to fall at the very beginning of his onslaught. It is even thus with nations. This country stands behind the Monroe doctrine. There is not a man in this House that dare cast his vote against the maintenance of that doctrine. I believe the overwhelming sentiment of this country would be for war if war were necessary to maintain it. If we intend to maintain it, we must have an adequate fleet. Our fleet is the only thing that will stand behind that doctrine. It has nothing behind it in international law. To-day its strength lies largely in the will of the people of the United States.

And what is happening on the American continent to-day? In South America large numbers of settlers from foreign countries are taking up great areas of the rich agricultural and grazing land. I understand that in Brazil alone German colonizing concerns have taken up 8,000 square miles of land. The States of Santa Catharina and Rio Grande de Sul are largely controlled by German companies. The nations are reaching out for the trade of South America. They are sending their immigrants and their settlers there, and these create a market for the products of the mother country. No one can tell what complications may arise as the result of this colonization. We have nothing but the tacit consent of European countries to our maintenance of the Monroe doctrine. I do not believe that a single power in all Europe has ever acknowledged acquiescence in the doctrine in writing. Indeed the soundness of our position has been attacked occasionally in recent years in various European periodicals. A sharp attack on the Monroe doctrine appeared in a recent number of a leading German review—the *Grenzboten*—and the *National Zeitung*, commenting on that attack, urges the Fatherland to examine closely whether things resting on such shallow legal and historical foundations as the Monroe doctrine need be tolerated, or whether, at the bottom, they are not merely American arrogance which requires sharp and decisive opposition.

Admiral Mahan, in an article published in the *New York Times* on the 24th of this month, says that twice recently, once from Canada and once from an English source in China, has come a suggestion that the present feeling of Germany against Great Britain might be placated by Great Britain repudiating the Monroe doctrine. Personally I have no reason to believe there is anything in the suggestion to cause alarm. But the game of world politics is an absorbing one. Combinations and alliances are oftentimes made between world powers that are startling in their effect upon world policies. We are an isolated nation. Many of our statesmen have strenuously contended that therein lies our strength. But in my opinion that very isolation demands of us the construction and maintenance of a most powerful Navy, especially if we expect to continue our championship of the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] well stated the case of the oldest nation in the world, China. The Celestial Empire has been bullied by every little nation that wanted a slice of her territory. She has had to suffer indignities, she has had to concede "spheres of influence" to the land-grabbing countries of the world. Why? Because she has neither an adequate army or navy to defend herself.

Does anyone believe that China, with her teeming millions, would be a prey to the rapacity of European nations for territorial aggrandizement if she were adequately prepared to defend her rights? Why, of course not.

Man is a fighting animal. There is no use trying to deceive ourselves. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that the millenium has not yet come. The fighting instinct seems to be inborn. Deprecate the fact as we may, we see that instinct manifested in the fights among schoolboys. As we reach maturer years the instinct is outgrown by most of us. And yet in many cases it is only latent, and it frequently asserts itself upon slight provocation even among adults. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] speaks of settling cases in court. True, the great majority of men take their differences into the courts and cheerfully abide by the judges' decisions. But some men still resort to murder in settling their disputes. Men are still shot down by such of our countrymen who refuse to submit their causes to peaceful arbitration. And while I am as strong an advocate of peace as any Member on this floor, I am nevertheless of the opinion that many questions between nations will continue to be settled by the arbitrament of war. It will be many generations before we can settle everything in the courts.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. KAHN. I have only five minutes. I yield, however, to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I merely wish to say that the Monroe doctrine is recognized by nearly all the nations of the earth, and certainly has not been invented for the purpose of keeping up militarism in the United States.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, there is no question about the fact as to why the Monroe doctrine was enunciated.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And another thing—

Mr. KAHN. I can not yield any further. As a matter of fact, the Monroe doctrine was announced at the time when the Spanish-American colonies were throwing off the yoke of the mother country and were assuming their stations as American Republics. It was enunciated because President Monroe at that time believed that no foreign power ought to be allowed to take land forcibly on the American continent. He undoubtedly voiced the sentiment of his period. We had but a few years before concluded our second war with Great Britain. Our Navy played a glorious part in the settlement of that war. There was no question as to its ability to cope with the navies of the other world powers of that epoch. And in announcing his famous doctrine, President Monroe undoubtedly believed that the prestige won by the American Navy in the War of 1812, and the heroism manifested by our naval commanders and sailors in the war against Algeria, Tunis, and Tripoli in 1815 were but an earnest of a strong and powerful Navy for all time to come.

Mr. Chairman, it has been well said that "battleships are cheaper than battles." I firmly believe in that declaration, and so believing, I heartily advocate the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] for the construction of two battleships at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. McCALL. Will not the gentleman agree to prolong the agony for just two minutes? [Cries of "Vote."]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS]. Without objection the amendment to the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBERTS) there were—ayes 60, noes 87.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts and Mr. PADGETT were appointed tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 80, noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FITZGERALD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3367) to amend section 2291 and section 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to homesteads.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 23634. An act to authorize the village of Oslo, in the county of Marshall, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North.

## NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Two fuel ships to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$1,140,000 each.

Mr. CONRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, it is not worth while to report the amendment until the point of order is disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true. The amendment is not in order pending the disposition of the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, last year we made an appropriation for two fleet colliers at this point in the bill. As I understand it, these are unauthorized unless they are colliers.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, these are colliers. We are calling them fuel ships, because the last battleships are being constructed to run with oil instead of coal, and the department desires some of the colliers equipped to carry oil as well as coal, so that to designate them that they may not be confused with the exclusive coal-carrying colliers we designate them as fuel ships.

Mr. GOOD. Then they are to take the place of ones we appropriated for last year, except that they have an equipment for oil?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "each," on page 63, line 13, insert the following proviso:

"Provided, That no part of the appropriation shall be expended for the construction of any such ships by any person, firm, or corporation which has not, at the time of the commencement and construction of such vessels, established an 8-hour work day for all employees, laborers, and mechanics engaged on or to be engaged in the construction of the vessels named herein."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment, in substance, that was offered heretofore that has been passed over. I ask unanimous consent that it remain in abeyance until we reach line 20, on the next page, page 64, when we will take up the matter of general legislation, and if we do not agree on anything we will return and dispose of this.

Mr. CONRY. Well, on the condition that it remains pending.

Mr. PADGETT. That it remains pending, just as the others.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as pending and be passed over for the present. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, line 13, after the word "each" strike out the period and insert a comma and insert the words "which shall be built in a navy yard."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, as the other amendment provides that it should come in after the word "each" it will not come at that place if the other is adopted and the character of the amendment at this time not being either a substitute or an amendment to this amendment it would not come in unless the gentleman from New York consents that this one come in ahead of his.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer that as a substitute for the other amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the other amendment has been passed over informally.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that by unanimous consent the gentleman from New York be given the privilege of withdrawing his amendment to be offered at the conclusion of the bill if he desires.

Mr. PADGETT. At this point?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. That is all right; I have no objection to that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to withdraw his amendment and have the right to return to this portion of the bill and reoffer it after that section of the bill if he so desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his colleague be permitted to withdraw his amendment for the present with the privilege after the consideration of the bill has been concluded of recurring to this paragraph for the purpose of reoffering this amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the amendment I have offered.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, has the amendment been reported?

The CHAIRMAN. It has.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the experience of the Government in building its own war vessels, auxiliaries, and so forth, has been of great advantage not only to the Government but to the men who are employed in that class of work. It has reduced the contract price paid to the private-contract shipyards. It is admitted by all of those who know about the conditions that the men are securing better conditions, and also that we are getting a better class of work done when these vessels are constructed in the Government shipyards, and therefore I hope that the amendment which I have offered will be agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that these ships are to be built in a navy yard and not elsewhere. It is a plain and simple question. We have had a number of illustrations with reference to it. The *Florida* and the *Utah* were duplicate ships, sister ships. One was built in a navy yard at a cost of \$6,200,000, not counting \$500,000 of overhead charges, which, if you add the overhead charges, would amount to \$6,700,000. The other ship, the *Utah*, was built by contract at \$4,020,000. There was another instance where we built the *Prometheus* and the *Vestal*, two colliers, that cost us in a navy yard \$1,150,000 in round numbers and in private yards, by contract, we could produce the ships for \$890,000.

Mr. CANNON. How much was the first?

Mr. PADGETT. The colliers, a million and a half in round numbers.

Mr. CANNON. And in private yards?

Mr. PADGETT. Eight hundred and ninety thousand dollars in private yards. Now, with this simple statement, I do not care to argue this question. If the House sees fit to place this limitation upon it—

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. In a moment. And requires them to be built in a navy yard, you must realize that we must increase the appropriations to pay for them.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman from Tennessee give any reason why this great difference? Why should there be such a difference as this?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; there are several reasons. One of the reasons is that the navy yard pays higher wages. Another reason is that the navy yard employees get about 28½ days of holiday with pay during the year; and then, I think, with the lack of business organization and utilizing to the best advantage, the labor employed in the navy yard is not adequate to that in private yards under private management.

All of these things contribute to the cost. Now, it is a plain, simple question, and I am not going to take up the time with it. A few weeks ago I had a conversation with a labor leader that to me was very illustrative. He came into my room and said he wanted to urge that we should build one of the battleships in the navy yard compulsorily. I said to him that I could not take that position, that it was a question of labor and that labor was employed wherever it is built—whether in the private yard or in the navy yard the labor is employed and paid. He said, "Yes, that is so; but in the navy yards we get much better pay and we get holidays with pay and leaves, and so forth." I said to him, "If that is true, why is it that the employees in the navy yards are always complaining of their wages and demanding of us that we shall increase them?" Then it was he made the reply, "If we do not

make complaints and keep up a fuss about our wages they may be reduced." I said to him, "Do you think as a patriotic citizen that is the way to deal with your Government?"

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. In the incident that the gentleman cited to the committee, where the battleship and collier were made in private yards, were they made under the eight-hour system?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. The outside contracts were made, as I understand it, on a nine-hour basis.

Mr. MAHER. What is the difference in the construction of the *Louisiana* and the *Connecticut*?

Mr. PADGETT. There has always been a dispute over that, but not a very great difference, I think.

Mr. MAHER. Do you know what the difference is?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember the exact figures. I have not looked into it of late years.

Mr. MAHER. I think the facts will show that there is no difference whatever.

Mr. PADGETT. There is some difference. The navy yard is greater—about 4 per cent.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. PADGETT. The *Louisiana* cost \$7,426,000 and the *Connecticut* cost \$7,911,000; something like \$500,000 difference in the cost. Repairs up to an even date on the two ships are—on the *Louisiana* \$547,351 and on the *Connecticut* \$634,234.71.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. As I understand the gentleman, it is proposed to amend this bill so that in cases of contract for the building of ships it shall be done by 8-hour labor.

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. It is provided it shall not be built by contract at all, but shall be built in a Government navy yard.

Mr. CANNON. But I am speaking of the general legislation.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. In the bill which this House passed and the Senate has favorably reported, and which you propose to put upon this bill, that provision is made?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; for the 8-hour law. And we have placed the appropriation on the 8-hour basis for all the work.

Mr. CANNON. And the gentleman states that the wage in the navy yard is much larger than in the private yards?

Mr. PADGETT. I said materially.

Mr. CANNON. Materially larger; with leaves of absence, and so forth?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Those are favored places in comparison with the great bulk of mechanics who are in union labor and who will be under the eight-hour law?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Then, I will ask the gentleman if, in the last analysis, labor does not pay it all?

Mr. PADGETT. This is a discrimination against outside union labor in favor of the labor in the navy yards, to which we are already giving advantages and favors that outside labor does not possess.

Mr. CANNON. And outside union labor increases 10 times in number, in comparison with that in the yards?

Mr. PADGETT. That is true.

Mr. CALDER. There are 10 other ships in this program, are there not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CALDER. They will be built by contract in other yards?

Mr. PADGETT. There are some small ships to be built in other yards. The position I take is this: It is a wrong policy and we are running wild on this question. Let us allow the Government, which is spending the tax money of the people, free to contract this work where the Government will get the worth of its money, and for the benefit of the labor that is outside as well as inside of the navy yards.

Mr. SIMS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield to his colleague [Mr. SIMS]?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. SIMS. In making these calculations as to the cost of building a ship by contract and by the Government, does the gentleman allow nothing for interest on capital invested by the private contractor?

Mr. PADGETT. Nothing whatever.

Mr. SIMS. And does the gentleman say that the Government, on account of the increased amount of wages paid, loses all the difference claimed and allows nothing for repairs or insurance or replacement or interest on the capital?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Then you must have a very incompetent set of men in charge of the navy yards if they can not do better than that.

Mr. PADGETT. I am only telling what the cold facts are. I said that a lack of proper organization and ability to utilize the organization is contributing to the excess cost.

Mr. SIMS. If they are not any more competent to do a business transaction that that, that makes a difference as great as you make it and allows nothing absolutely for interest and replacement and maintenance and insurance, they are not competent to be in charge of a hen roost. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I yield to the member of the committee [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is it not a fact that those who made the statement before the committee to the effect that they were paying, I believe, 25 per cent more than private shipyards finally stated that they did not know what private shipbuilding companies were paying? Did they not?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I think not. They stated that the expenses are fixed by boards, and that upon the general average they made about 25 per cent more than the outside shipyards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of continuing the policy of building some of the vessels authorized for the Navy in Government yards. In 1900 I initiated a movement in this House which resulted in the adoption of a policy by which the Government yards, which are maintained at a very great expense, were utilized to a very small degree in the construction of new vessels for the Navy. Ever since that policy was initiated the department has been doing its utmost to discredit the yards and to bring into disrepute the new work done there for the Navy.

We have established powder factories, and in those factories we manufacture powder more cheaply than we can purchase it by contract. We maintain arsenals at Rock Island, Ill., Frankford, Pa., and Springfield and Watertown, Mass., and in those arsenals we manufacture small arms and ammunition more cheaply than it can be manufactured by private contractors. We seem to be able to enter into any line of manufacture of munitions of war and to compete successfully with private manufacturers excepting in the construction of ships. In determining costs in this line, by a skillful jugglery of the figures, it is made to appear that it costs inordinately more to build ships in a navy yard than by contract in private yards.

The *Connecticut* and the *Louisiana* were built as the first ships in competition, one in a navy yard and one in a private shipyard. The navy yard was without full equipment, without experience, without practice, and yet, despite the utmost efforts of the Navy Department to show a very great discrepancy, and although they charged against the yard building the ship even the cost of educating at the Naval Academy the officers employed in the yard, the best that could be done was to make a difference of about 5 per cent in the cost.

The navy yard worked 8 hours as against 10 hours in the Newport News Shipbuilding Co.'s yard. I have been reliably informed that the private yard was compelled to work overtime in order to keep pace with the progress made on the *Connecticut*. For the first time in the history of the Government, as a result of that competition, a ship authorized by the Government was turned out within the time fixed by the contract—three years—instead of running from 36 to 42 months over the time.

Since then we have been getting our ships in less than three years' time instead of in seven years' time. The ships now authorized to be built by contract are no longer utilized by the private contractors as a means of keeping their plants going while the interests of the Government are sacrificed, but the interest of the Government is now compelled to be put first.

When this movement to utilize the navy yards started a differential of 4 per cent was given to shipbuilding plants on the Pacific coast, and, taking the bids submitted year after year, the low bid on the Pacific coast was to a penny exactly 4 per cent in excess of the low bids on the Atlantic coast.

They talk about the difference in the cost of building these ships. I demonstrated to this House last year by a carefully drawn diagram prepared by an expert in the Navy Department, who resented the practices indulged in there of misleading the country and the House, that they had shifted from the ordinary yard-maintenance charges over \$600,000, if I recall correctly, to the cost of the ship there under construction, and to refute the conclusions of the department I demonstrated that at a period when there was no ship under construction the overhead charges had increased at the same ratio as when a ship was under construction and the maximum force employed thereon.

What has resulted from this practice? The gentleman speaks of the cost of the *Utah*, \$4,200,000, and yet the testimony before his committee is to the effect that the contractor who built that ship built it at a loss of in the neighborhood of \$500,000. Is it a wise policy to have our ships built by contractors at a loss of half a million dollars? Does that explain many of the mysterious accidents that are happening upon our contract-built ships in this country? The battleship *Florida*, just completed at a navy yard, is heralded as the fastest battleship afloat, exceeding the speed requirements of the specifications and making almost a knot better than her sister ship built in a private yard, and for the first time in many years since the paying of a bonus for excess speed has any ship built for the Navy exceeded in so marked a degree the speed requirements set forth in the specifications.

Mr. KOPP. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPP. Is it the gentleman's position that this increased cost in the navy-yard-built ship is due to the indirect charges solely?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My position is, in the first place, that the difference in cost which is pretended by the department does not exist. In the second place, whatever difference does exist is due in some part at least to the inefficient manner in which the department is at present conducted, and I am not certain but that it is done deliberately for the purpose of stopping yard construction, although I should be reluctant to believe such to be deliberately done.

Mr. KOPP. Will the gentleman yield for another question? I call his attention to the fact that according to the testimony before the Naval Committee the difference between the two ships—the *Florida* and the *Utah*, one built by private contract and the other in the navy yard—was \$2,182,000, while the total indirect charges were only \$954,000, leaving over \$1,000,000 after you have taken out all indirect charges. How can the gentleman explain that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Add \$500,000 dead loss to the contractor and it comes down to half a million dollars, and still the contractor apparently is engaged in the eleemosynary work of building ships for the Government for nothing.

Mr. KOPP. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. And if there be no other objection, I would object to permitting any contractor to work for the Government for nothing, particularly in the vital matter of building battleships or other ships essential to the defense of the country.

Mr. KOPP. Granting that what the gentleman says is true and that the contractor lost \$500,000 on that ship, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is still a difference of \$700,000 after taking out that loss, if there be a loss, and after deducting all the indirect charges.

Mr. PADGETT. I call attention to the fact that the two million one hundred thousand and some odd dollars does not include the \$500,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not agree with those figures.

Mr. KOPP. That is the testimony.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman asked me a question. I do not agree to those figures.

Mr. KOPP. So far as that loss was concerned, it was merely an estimate on the part of Admiral Watts, that he believed the contractor must have lost \$500,000. Personally I do not believe they are doing business for nothing or at a loss.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is talk here about the cost of building ships at the yards, and last year or the year before

much ado was made over the fact that it was necessary to increase the limit of cost of a yard-built ship, because it could not be completed within the limit of cost. Is there complaint when they can not build ships authorized by contract within the limit of cost? Not at all. The latest vessels authorized to be built by contract, I am informed, were treated in an interesting manner. When the bids were received, the bids were all in excess of the limit of cost. Did the department come to Congress and complain that it was impossible to build those ships, as they did with the ones placed in the navy yards?

Mr. PADGETT. They were less than the limit by about \$100,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They could not be built within the limit of cost.

Mr. PADGETT. They were built within the contract. The contract limit of cost was \$6,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman will pardon me while I make my statement, I think I am correct. When it was ascertained that it would not be possible to get the ship that had been laid down as planned they substituted inferior material in many respects. They substituted nickel steel for special hardened steel that was intended to be placed in the ship. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee if that is not true?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not heard that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have, and it is a matter of some notoriety, but it has not been done so far as I have been able to learn as to any ship that was set to be built in a Government yard.

Mr. Chairman, there was without question some years ago an understanding among the shipbuilding plants of the country to divide the business of the Government among them, and never until we initiated the policy, not of building all the ships—we have built, I think, ships costing some \$25,000,000, out of a total of \$396,000,000, in Government yards—never, until this policy was established, was the hold of the Shipbuilding Trust on the Government broken. A new standard of efficiency and speed in construction was also established, which elicited the admiration even of the great British naval constructor who visited this country about two years ago and expressed surprise that it was possible to put a ship off the ways as speedily as we did the *Florida*.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have his time extended two minutes. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to ask the gentleman from New York if he can reconcile this: Here is a statement in the hearings by Rear Admiral Watts, Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, who says that the labor cost on the *Florida* was \$2,815,388.15—that that was the whole labor cost according to the statement of the constructor. Now they tell us that, due to the increased cost of labor in Government yards, one vessel costs more than two millions more, due to labor cost, than in a private shipyard.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can not reconcile the figures nor can anyone else. They do not fit. The labor cost is not very much different from the cost of material. Double the labor cost, make liberal allowances for all other items, and there still remains almost a million dollars of the stated cost to be allotted. In that connection let me call attention to the fact that under the direction of Congress the Department of Commerce and Labor made an investigation to determine how it was that working 10 hours a day the Newport News Ship Yard had hardly been able to keep up with the Government yard with an 8-hour day. The report of that department made to the House shows that twenty-four and a fraction more per cent of work was turned out in the Government yard in an 8-hour day than in the private yards with a 10-hour day. So remarkable and astounding was the record that the naval attaché of the German embassy asked me to furnish a copy of that report for transmission to Germany, in order to show the capacity and efficiency of the Government yards in this country.

To illustrate the difficulty of obtaining accurate information about costs from the Navy Department let me remind the House that when it was proposed to compel contract ships to be built in yards having an eight-hour day it was asserted that the cost would be increased 20 to 25 per cent. The following statement shows bids for collars to be constructed under the eight-hour provision and without it.

Proposals received for the construction of fleet colliers Nos. 9, 10, 11, and 12.  
[Proposals opened June 20, 1911.]

Name.	Time, months.	Number of vessels.	Class 2, bidders' price—plans.	Remarks. <sup>1</sup>
Newport News Steamship & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va.	Both in 22.....	Nos. 9 and 10.....	\$995,000	Proposal accompanied by certified check for \$60,000. Vessels to be constructed at Newport News.
	Both in 22.....	Nos. 11 and 12.....	\$975,000	
	4 in 24.....	(Nos. 9 and 10.....	\$980,000	
		(Nos. 11 and 12.....	\$980,000	
Maryland Steel Co., Baltimore.....	Both in 22.....	Nos. 11 and 12.....	\$997,000	Babcock & Wilcox boilers. Bond for \$35,000. Transverse system. Isherwood system.
	1 in 18.....	1 of 11 and 12.....	\$984,000	
	Both in 24.....	Both 11 and 12.....	\$973,000	
	1 in 18.....	1 of 11 and 12.....	\$962,000	
	Both in 24.....	Both 11 and 12.....	\$951,000	

<sup>1</sup>All proposals based on second form of payment in Construction and Repair letter June 10, 1911.

No proposals received under Class 1, department's plans.

Publicly opened at the Navy Department by direction of the Secretary of the Navy.

<sup>2</sup>Each.

\_\_\_\_\_, Solicitor.

Mr. Chairman, Nos. 9 and 10 are to be built under the 8-hour law; Nos. 10 and 11 are not so restricted. The Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co.'s bids show a difference of \$20,000, or 2.05 per cent, only. If they get four they would build each of them for \$980,000; that is, there is apparently no difference in price between those under the 8-hour law and those not under it, or if there is any difference, as may be noted, it is \$5,000, or only one-half per cent.

Comparing Maryland Steel Co.'s bids, the lowest, \$951,000, as against Newport News Co.'s high bid, \$995,000, there is only a difference of 4.6 per cent. It is to be noted that the Maryland Steel Co.'s bid is for the Isherwood system of construction, which is undoubtedly somewhat cheaper construction than that for which the Newport News Co. bid.

As far as the general provisions are concerned with regard to these bids, they speak for themselves.

They demonstrate the futility of accepting the figures of the department upon the question of cost. I favor the pending amendment; I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments close in 10 minutes.

Mr. REDFIELD. I will say to the gentleman that I would like five minutes.

Mr. CALDER. I want a few minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. All you gentlemen are on one side, and you ought to be content with four speeches against one.

Mr. JONES. I would like five minutes on the gentleman's side.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will modify that and move that all debate close in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be given to the gentleman from California, Mr. KNOWLAND, 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. REDFIELD, both on one side, and 5 minutes to Mr. JONES, on the other side.

Mr. CALDER. I hope the gentleman will extend it three minutes more.

Mr. PADGETT. I will make it 18 minutes, to give 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. CALDER.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 18 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, the statements of the chairman of the committee would, I am free to admit, present a very strong case against the construction of ships in navy yards were they to go unchallenged. But I want to present to the House some facts that I believe will convince this body that instead of resulting in a loss to the Government that the construction of these colliers in navy yards has resulted in a direct saving to the United States.

Let me call your attention to the fact that in 1908 the naval appropriation bill provided for the building of two colliers. It was understood that these two colliers were to be constructed in private shipyards, and the limit of cost placed upon them was \$1,800,000 each. No protest was made in the committee as to the cost, and no one voiced a protest on the floor of this House. An amendment was inserted on the floor providing that one of the colliers should be built in a navy yard of the United States. That amendment remained in the bill.

Immediately private shipbuilding firms reduced their prices. Bear in mind that \$1,800,000 each was to be the cost of these colliers, but as soon as we provided that one should be built in a navy yard of the United States the various private firms submitted exceptionally low bids ranging from \$822,500 to \$900,000. There were three or four separate bids, and these bids were all so much alike that it at least gave suspicion of collusion. The result was that the Secretary of the Navy refused to build the collier in a navy yard notwithstanding the mandate of Con-

gress, because of these bids—no doubt at below cost. The next year the bids were raised to \$900,000, then to \$1,000,000, and again to \$1,100,000.

This year the limit of cost is placed at \$1,140,000. After the eight-hour law was placed upon construction of the colliers there was only one of these private concerns that submitted a bid, and that bid was for \$1,500,000, a larger amount than it cost to build the collier in a navy yard of the United States. A contract has since been let to a private firm at a lower figure, made possible because this firm was given a contract for two colliers. A navy yard could build two much cheaper than one no doubt. I believe it is sound business policy for this great Government, in order to maintain the navy yards at a high standard of efficiency and to retain an efficient, skilled, and permanent force of mechanics, to occasionally build a ship in these yards, and I also contend that it has a tendency to keep the private shipbuilding firms from combining and submitting excessive bids. We know in one instance that it has resulted in lowering the cost of colliers from \$1,800,000 to less than \$1,000,000. I would not advocate the building of all ships in navy yards, but we find that nearly every foreign country—France, Germany, England, and Japan—are building some of their ships in the navy yards, because they appreciate that to keep these yards up to a high standard of efficiency, and to retain skilled mechanics, has an excellent effect upon the private shipbuilding concerns. While it may cost a few dollars more, in the long run we are saving money to the Government by providing that occasionally small ships at least be constructed in the navy yards of the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. REDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, had he gone a little more in detail into the cost of the *Florida*, would have discovered a state of facts which I am inclined to think would have surprised him, for it is a fact that the engines of the *Florida*, which were built at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, actually cost less—some tens of thousands of dollars less—than the engines of the *Utah*, which were built at a private yard in Camden, N. J. The fact was stated to me by one of the engineer officers of the Navy. I went to the Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering and asked him if it was true that the engines of the *Florida* actually cost less than the engines of the *Utah*. He said it was true. I asked him if he would put it in writing, and he did. He gave me the figures, and I have them. I have them not here with me, but I showed them at the time to my colleague, Mr. FITZGERALD, and so far as the construction of that portion of the ship is concerned—and it is a very large portion, nearly or quite one-third of it—it actually costs less to-day to build the great engines of battleships in the Brooklyn Navy Yard than it does at private plants; and the detail facts I shall be very glad to state as soon as I can look again at the letter. The difference is some tens of thousands of dollars in that one ship.

Secondly, no one has ever ventured to question that the Government gets a better ship when it builds its own vessels; and it gets a better ship for two very excellent reasons. In the first place, the element of profit is entirely left out. The private contractor, if he will survive, must make, if he can make, a profit out of his vessels. In an effort to meet the competition of the navy yards they have sometimes failed to make a profit; but the effort for profit is always there in the private ship and can never be eliminated in any calm judgment of the wisdom of building a ship in a private or a public yard. Apart from the element of profit, which is in every one of the ships built in the private yards, there is the high professional pride of the naval constructors in building a better ship with their own hands for their fellows to use; and in a thousand little details

that make up the life of a battleship and count for its security, and especially bear upon its cost of maintenance and repair, the public-built ship is a better-built ship and a cheaper ship to maintain, a better vessel in very many ways than you get out of a private yard for the same or a less price.

I am not myself wholly unfamiliar with the facts from personal knowledge. Before I ever expected to enter these halls I was in a way connected directly with the building and equipment of four of our great vessels, one of them built in a public yard and three in private yards; and it is true that you get a better ship all through if she is built in the navy yard than you get if she is built with the necessary element of profit which is necessarily present in a private yard. And for the evidence of it you have only to look at two vessels recently constructed under the same specifications, with each of which I had myself a little something to do—the *Florida* and the *Utah*. The *Utah* far outdid any other previous ship. I said to the admiral commanding the Bureau of Steam Engineering, "Wait until the *Florida* comes." He said, "She will hardly do better." And I said, "She will." And she did better. So that the fastest ship and the strongest ship we have got, beating not only all other ships, but beating a fine ship built in a private yard, under the same specifications and at the same time, is the *Florida*, built in the Brooklyn Navy Yard. You have got to explain these hard, solid facts away before you can say it is always cheaper to build in a private yard, for in what does cheapness consist—first cost or ultimate cost? Never in first cost, unless the ultimate cost can be considered, and not alone in ultimate cash cost, but in usefulness, endurance, stability, and power, and in this respect unquestioned and so far unchallenged by anybody, the ships built in the public yards have been supreme. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES. I did not expect, Mr. Chairman, to take part in this debate, but I have been so much astonished at the statements that have been made by gentlemen favoring this amendment as to the comparative cost of building ships in Government yards and building them in private yards, and as to the comparative strength and speed of ships built in Government yards and those built in private yards, that I can not permit these misleading and absolutely unfounded statements to go unchallenged. The facts show just the reverse of what is claimed by these gentlemen. I wish first to notice the statements made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. The gentleman has stated that the *Florida*, which was built at a Government yard, was one of the few of our battleships whose speed has exceeded that required in the specifications. He would create the impression that the battleships built in private yards had fallen short of the speed requirements. Let me tell the House, Mr. Chairman, that the great battleship *Delaware*, which was built at Newport News, Va., by the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., one of the world's most powerful *Dreadnoughts*, exceeded its contract speed by 1 knot. Many of the greatest battleships of our Navy were built by this great private shipbuilding concern, and there has never been one of them whose speed did not exceed that required under the specifications. The *Texas*, which is designed to be the most powerful battleship afloat, and which was successfully launched only a few days ago at Newport News, is to cost the Government less than \$6,000,000. It was estimated by the Brooklyn Navy Yard authorities that it would cost \$7,500,000 to build this ship at that yard. The Government has thus saved more than \$1,500,000 by building this ship at this great private yard. Something has been said in regard to the *Louisiana* and the *Connecticut*, built some years ago. The *Louisiana* was built at Newport News, a private yard, and was completed five months ahead of the *Connecticut*, built at a Government yard. It is true that the *Louisiana* was built under the 10-hour system, but it is not true, as has been stated, that any nightwork was done upon that ship. These facts show what little reliance can be placed upon the alleged facts of the advocates of this amendment.

I wish to say further, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentlemen who represent Government navy yards that it is known to everybody who possesses any knowledge upon the subject that ships can be and are built cheaper in private than in Government yards. I had not supposed until I listened to these gentlemen that this was a question about which there was any room for argument or dispute. I deny, too, most emphatically that the ships which are built in private yards are in any respect inferior to those built in the navy yards. The facts absolutely disprove such absurd charges as these.

The Government has its representatives and expert supervisors and inspectors stationed at every private yard where a Government ship is being built, and there is not a bolt that goes into the construction of that ship that is not carefully in-

spected. These inspectors are thoroughly trained men, whose competency is beyond question, and they reject every piece of wood or steel which does not come up to the most rigid requirements of the specifications. The naval constructors, under whose supervision the ships are built in private yards, are experts in shipbuilding and it is not possible for any private shipbuilding concern to slight Government work. Those who are competent to speak upon this subject know that this is true. It is a serious reflection upon the Navy Department to intimate that private yards turn out inferior work and for that reason are enabled to build Government vessels at a less price than they can be built in Government yards. It is easy enough for gentlemen to make these charges, but I challenge any man upon this floor to name a single ship ever built for the Government by the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. that was not built strictly according to specifications or into which inferior material or bad workmanship entered. It is easy to make unsupported and reckless charges such as these, but it will be quite another thing to prove them, and I demand the proof. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, in the naval bill of two years ago one battleship was authorized to be built in a Government yard and 1 battleship and 15 auxiliary vessels were authorized to be built by contract. In the naval bill of last year 2 battleships and 12 auxiliary craft were authorized, all to be built by private contract. So that in the two years past out of 23 vessels provided for only 1 has been authorized to be built in a navy yard of the country. In the program of this year there are 13 vessels authorized. We come here to-day and ask that 2 of those 13 be built in Government yards. We do not ask that all of these vessels be built at navy yards, but simply a small proportion of them. It has been our argument, Mr. Chairman, for years that it ought to be the policy of this Government to continue in the highest state of efficiency some of its navy yards, so that at a moment's notice they will be able to handle any naval proposition that may be put upon them. Now, to those of you who are not familiar with navy-yard matters, let me suggest the fact that three or four times each year the fleets come in for repair, and between the time the fleets are in and away at sea many men are discharged from the navy yard and the efficiency of the force is broken up, and I am advised by no less authority than the Secretary of the Navy himself that while a ship is under construction at the yard, when the fleet comes in for repair or alteration, it is the custom to take the men from the new vessel and put them on the repair work. This is done without the slightest inconvenience, and enables the Government to fit the fleet for sea without delay at much less cost than if it were compelled to call in several thousand men, many unfamiliar with naval work, employ them for several weeks, and then lay them off again.

Such has been said of the difference in the cost of construction of vessels built in the yards and those built by contract. We are informed that before the session ends to-day an amendment is to be put into this bill providing for the construction of all these vessels by 8-hour labor. When that is done it will materially increase the cost of the contract-built ships, with the effect that unquestionably we will be able to compete with the private yards of the country almost on equal terms. And taking into consideration the necessity of having at least two or three of our great yards constantly in shape to handle this work at a moment's notice, it seems to me the argument falls to the ground.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois will prevail; it will mean that the navy yard at New York will keep its very efficient force together for another year, at least, in the construction of one of these colliers. During the debate this afternoon the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] made the statement that the attitude of the Democratic Party in caucus in opposing the construction of any battleships this year had met with almost universal favor throughout the country, and he particularly cited the attitude of the newspapers of the country. Such has not been my experience, as an evidence of the public sentiment of the great State of New York on this important subject, and, as I understand it, the feeling throughout the entire country can be no better emphasized than in the editorials of some of the great New York dailies, which I propose to print as a part of my remarks. The *Brooklyn Eagle*, *New York Times*, *New York Sun*, *New York Herald*, all four the most independent politically of any newspapers in the country:

[From the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, Mar. 27, 1912.]

A DEMOCRATIC CRISIS SELF-PRECIPIATED.

The Democratic House caucus has resolved that there shall be no increase of the strength of the Navy this year and no measure to au-

thorize any new Federal buildings. The national need had to be sacrificed to beat back the local greed. The Navy is a national need. The demand for Federal buildings on a numerous scale is a local greed. The local greed has fought the national need to a standstill, and the national need has been sacrificed to beat back the local greed.

This makes the House a slaughterhouse instead of a House of Representatives. It makes the caucus a trading body instead of a body of legislators for the public good. It is a disgraceful spectacle, but not an unintelligible or a surprising one. No political party has ever successfully been an enemy of the National Navy. The Whigs tried that before the Civil War. The Federals tried that before the Whigs. The Democrats tried it at times after the Civil War, and are now trying it again. They have made a mistake which ought to be fatal or which certainly ought to be at once retraced.

As usual, there are explanations. They are, however, explanations that will not explain. The people of the United States will not excuse Representatives who say: "We had to scant the Navy in order to beat the excessive demands for large Federal buildings in small towns." The subordination of a national need in order to curb a local greed will not be justifiable to the American electorate. The preservation of Democratic supremacy in the next House can not be made to depend on the beating of petty local sentiment for Federal buildings at national expense in hole-and-corner districts. There is a better alternative. It is to change the control of the next House of Representatives from Democracy to Republicanism. That has been done before because of the hostility of the Democracy to the Navy and of the surrender of the Democracy to banded rapacity for local buildings at national expense.

The action of the Democratic House caucus has done not a little to restore the Republican Party to House control. It can not be too soon and too absolutely renounced by the Democracy of this House, if that party would carry the next. The Navy can not be stricken down by the Federal-buildings ring of Representatives of both parties without the Democracy, which controls and is responsible for this House, losing the next. The loss of the next House should carry with it the loss of the next Presidency; and this in spite of Republican divisions or dissensions.

The Republican Party would welcome the opportunity to sink its divisions in order to rally the people for the preservation of the Navy against a party that would immediately cripple the Navy by a policy which would progressively destroy the Navy. "The Navy," triumphantly exclaimed Commodore and United States Senator Richard Field Stockton, "is the darling of the Nation." His words have not lost force or meaning or national hold on national sentiment. The House yesterday greatly weakened its hold on American sentiment, and the weakening of the hold is deserved.

We care not to deal seriously with the excuses. There was reason for patriotic Democrats to bolt the caucus. There was no reason for them to strangle the Navy in order to strangle the Federal-buildings ring. They could have left the fate of that ring to a not wholly demoralized Senate and to the action of a patriotic President and to the action of a patriotic people.

And the banded river and harbor cabal of rapacious Congressmen must yet be confronted, and it may drive the Democratic House to as pusillanimous a course as the Federal-buildings ring has done. There is no statesmanship in cowardice. There is no politics which commands respect in surrendering what should be preserved in order to flank what should not be tolerated. A party that truckled to free silver should have learned enough from surrendering its convictions not to offend the sentiment for the Navy by such a course as was taken in the caucus on Wednesday. The buildings ring could have been left to the Senate and the veto power. The Navy should not have been abandoned in order to head off a motley combination of jobbers and cranks.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1912.]

#### BUILD THE TWO DREADNOUGHTS.

The interruption of the building up of our Navy for economical reasons would be bad policy, and we do not believe that the policy will prevail, in spite of the recent action of a Democratic caucus in Congress. Secretary Meyer's protest, printed Wednesday, states the case clearly. His arguments seem unanswerable, unless we are willing to have our Navy deteriorate. England is building five new *Dreadnoughts*, and Germany three, while Japan has ordered five. The Secretary of the Navy points out that one *Dreadnought* is the equal of five battleships of the older type.

The boast that the United States now occupies second place among the naval powers of the world is ill founded, according to the Naval League. We have not been keeping pace with the other powers in the building of warships of the latest type, and it would be blind folly now to lose the advantage of such progress as we have made. Provision should be made to meet the President's request for the addition of two *Dreadnoughts* to our fleet this year. The Democrats should take pride in the fact that much of the credit for the modernization of our Navy belongs to them. It began in the first Cleveland administration. The plan of building two new battleships yearly was the result of a compromise originally, as four were asked for in 1909, and the understanding reached then was that two should be authorized each year thereafter. No party question is involved in this matter. The caucus was controlled by a false idea of economy.

[From the New York Times, May 24, 1912.]

#### THE NEED OF INCREASING OUR NAVY.

Admiral Mahan presents in The Times this morning a clear and logical argument against the plan of the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives so to cripple the United States Navy as to affect our standing in the community of nations. Only by keeping our naval establishment on a footing with the great navies of the world can we secure peace to the whole American Continent and hold securely our foreign possessions. The policy of increasing the Navy by at least two ships of the first class every year should not be abandoned. Admiral Mahan points out that Mr. Stead, the peace advocate, favored as a peace measure the building of two British warships for every one built by Germany.

We talk a great deal of the Monroe doctrine. As Admiral Mahan says, the only leg it has to stand upon is a strong Navy. He finds a curious inconsistency in the fact that in the very session in which the House Democratic caucus voted against the appropriation for two battleships a Democratic Senator saw fit to introduce a resolution reaffirming the Monroe doctrine. The action of the House of Representatives in the matter of warships is purely political. It puts the majority in the light of rebuking Republican expenditures. The United States Navy, however, is neither Republican nor Democratic. The Senate should not hesitate to restore the appropriation for the new warships.

[From the New York Sun, Mar. 29, 1912.]

#### CRIPPLING THE NAVY.

The Democrats at Washington, by an almost unanimous vote in caucus, have decided not to vote any money for the construction of new battleships at a time when England has 18 *Dreadnoughts* completed and 14 building, when Germany has 9 completed and 15 building, and when Japan is preparing to add 8 *Dreadnoughts* and 8 powerful battle cruisers to her fleet.

Regarding the *Michigan* and *South Carolina* as *Dreadnoughts*, only because they have a main battery of eight 12-inch guns (they would be no match for the swifter and more heavily armed *Florida* or *Utah*), the United States Navy has 6 *Dreadnoughts* in her fleet, 4 more building, and 2 authorized. That is the end of the chapter so far as the Democratic Party is concerned.

The action of the Democratic majority is notice to the world that when the Panama Canal opens the United States will have only 10 *Dreadnoughts* in commission (the 2 ships authorized by the Sixty-first Congress will not have been completed), with no more than 12 ships of the first battle line in sight. If the canal should be finished in the summer of 1914, England will have 32 *Dreadnoughts* flying the flag and Germany 21. The *Dreadnought* strength of Japan at that time can not be surely determined, but her first battle line will be almost as strong as that of the United States, and Japan will be steadily pursuing a policy of naval expansion, such as the United States has abandoned.

A more alarming aspect of the case is that Germany, which may some day challenge the Monroe doctrine, not satisfied with 24 *Dreadnoughts* completed and building, is planning a battle fleet of 1 flagship and 5 squadrons of 8 battleships each, with 10 large cruisers and 30 small cruisers as reconnaissance ships.

In the general expansion of armaments among the great naval powers, the United States is compelled to relinquish the minimum of safety in new construction and go to the rear, because the Democrats in the House are bent on posing as the party of frugal economy on the eve of a presidential election. The American people have never been treated to such an exhibition of vicious humbug. No retrenchment could be more uncalled for, unpatriotic, and perilous, and it is flagrantly indefensible, because the Democrats in the Sixty-first Congress voted for at least one new *Dreadnought*.

[From the New York Herald, Feb. 2, 1912.]

#### BATTLESHIPS AS A MATTER OF BUSINESS.

Representative CLAUDE KITCHIN, of North Carolina, has favored the country with his reasons for opposing any authorization of battleships this session. In an explanation that must make the judicious grieve he delivers himself of the great truth that small ships can be built more cheaply than large ones. Quite so. Therefore, he concludes we must, for the present, delay providing battleships and authorize auxiliaries alone.

Has Mr. KITCHIN even given serious thought to what such delays in the past have meant to us? Between 1888 and 1900, for example, one hundred and ten millions were spent on warship construction and repairs. In seven months of 1898 the Spanish War cost us something more than five hundred millions. Had one-fifth of this last expenditure—let us say one hundred millions—been devoted to fleet construction, our sea force would have been doubled and four hundred millions of dollars would have been saved, for no Spanish War would have been fought.

With such odds in sea power against her Spain could, with honor, have declined hostilities, Cuba would have been freed, and reparation have been made for the *Maine*. And, happiest of all, the suffering and pathetic waste of life would have been spared. But no. The same delay Mr. KITCHIN is preaching now was preached then, and for the same reasons, and here, offered as a cold fact of business management, was the pitiable outcome of this policy of delay.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by striking out the letter "a" before the word "navy," and inserting the letter "s" after the word "yard."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modify the amendment by striking out the letter "a" in front of the word "navy," and adding the letter "s" to the word "yard," so that it will read, "which shall be built at navy yards."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. PADGETT. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 81, noes 19.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Six torpedo-boat destroyers, to have the highest practicable speed, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$940,000 each.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment and ask that it be considered as pending until after the amendment of the chairman of the committee is acted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire the amendment to be reported?

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Yes, sir; and then be considered as pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "each," in line 16, page 63, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the construction of any of said torpedo-boat destroyers by any person, firm, or corporation which has not at the time of the commencement and construction of said vessels established an eight-hour workday for all employees, laborers, and mechanics engaged or to be engaged in the construction of the vessels named herein."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as pending and passed for the present. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not object, but I ask unanimous consent that every Member may offer an amendment at every paragraph in this bill that appropriates money to the same effect, and let them be pending.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, that was said facetiously.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

One tender to destroyers to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$1,315,000.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that after it is reported it be considered as pending and take the same course as the other one which I have just offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "dollars," in line 19, page 63, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the construction of said tender to destroyers by any person, firm, or corporation which has not at the commencement and construction of said vessels established an eight-hour workday for all employees, laborers, and mechanics engaged or to be engaged in the construction of the vessels named herein."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Four submarine torpedo boats in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$2,240,000; and the sum of \$800,000 is hereby appropriated for said purpose.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. First, let me ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG] if he proposes to offer that same amendment?

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. I wanted to offer a new paragraph at that point. Let the gentleman proceed with his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. CANNON. Unanimous consent is given to every Member to offer an amendment to every paragraph that appropriates any money. Two positives make a negative, and two negatives make a positive; and if it comes to two consents that comes to no consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "purpose," line 23, page 63, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the construction of any submarine torpedo boats by any person, firm, or corporation which has not at the time of commencement and construction of said vessels established an eight-hour workday for all employees, laborers, and mechanics engaged or to be engaged in the construction of the vessels herein named."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, after line 23, as a separate paragraph, insert the following: "The appropriation made by the act of May 4, 1898, for one gunboat to be built on the Great Lakes, to take the place of the U. S. S. Michigan (now Wolverine), is hereby made available for the construction of a river gunboat, which may, as advantage may offer, be built elsewhere than on the Great Lakes or their connecting waters."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, this is not an additional appropriation, but heretofore an appropriation was made to construct a gunboat for use on the Great Lakes; but on account of our treaty relations with Great Britain it can not be carried out. They need a gunboat of that description in Chinese waters, and this is simply to authorize the appropriation heretofore made for a gunboat on the Lakes to be for a gunboat to be used in Chinese waters.

Mr. PAYNE. To convert this appropriation in this way means, I suppose, an economy in the appropriations of this Congress.

Mr. PADGETT. This was an appropriation of a previous Congress, and it is proposed to use it for something that is now needed instead of for something that can not be used.

Mr. PAYNE. But doing it in this way will enable the gentleman to show a smaller appropriation for naval construction in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. This Congress is not responsible for it, because this appropriation was made heretofore, and the Secretary says he can not use it.

Mr. PAYNE. On account of our relations with Great Britain?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. And so we propose to sneak that appropriation into this bill for something that we do need, that should be charged to this bill but will not be.

Mr. PADGETT. I am perfectly willing to charge it here if you want to. We are going to use that appropriation to build a gunboat to be used in Chinese waters.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the square way would be to appropriate just this amount of money and have it counted in this bill as an appropriation.

Mr. PADGETT. I am putting it exactly in the language in which the Secretary of the Navy asked for it. I do not suppose the gentleman desires to discredit his own Secretary.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman does me too much honor when he credits me with the possession of so important a Secretary.

Mr. GOOD. What was the amount of the former appropriation?

Mr. PADGETT. It reads—

To cost, exclusive of armament, not more than \$200,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ESTOPINAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana offers an amendment, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a new paragraph the following:

"One submarine tender, to cost not to exceed \$1,000,000; and the sum of \$400,000 is hereby appropriated toward said purpose."

Mr. ESTOPINAL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide a tender for the submarines that have been appropriated for in this bill. We have now a number of submarines in commission, but there is not in the Navy a proper tender for those submarines. What tenders we have are make-shifts.

There are at present 16 submarines in active service provided with tenders which, although sufficient in number, are in all cases improvised for the purpose and are by no means efficient or satisfactory. The *Severn*, for example, has no motive power, and must be towed by another vessel, while the *Fortune*, on the Pacific coast, is but a tug, and the *Mohican*, of the Asiatic station, besides having no motive power, is very old and can be used practically only as a stationary barrack ship.

There are 4 submarines in reserve at Charleston with no tender whatever assigned, and these vessels can not operate at any distance from that place for this reason. The 4 submarines on the west coast which will soon be commissioned will have the services of the *Alert* as tender, but that vessel is nearly 30 years old and is not suited for such duty, although being the best available.

There are, in addition, 15 submarines under construction which will be assigned to the active flotillas in the next year or two, which, with the 4 boats in reserve at Charleston without a tender, make a total of 19 for which tenders will have to be assigned and for which but one such vessel, authorized last year, is the only provision thus far made. It should be noted that I make no reference to any submarines that may be authorized in the naval appropriation bill now under discussion.

As 1 tender can care for 5 submarines, it is apparent that 3 additional tenders should be ready for service in the comparatively near future. I am informed that there are no vessels of the Navy suitable for conversion to submarine tenders that can be spared from their present assignments, and that, furthermore, a thoroughly satisfactory tender can not be developed from a ship designed for other purposes without extensive expenditures.

The existing type of submarines and those now under construction are very dependent upon their tenders, which act as mobile bases, furnish quarters for the personnel, carry stores and supplies of all kinds necessary for the operation and maintenance of the submarines, and are equipped with suitable dynamos for charging their batteries, and with machine shops capable of making all ordinary repairs. Without a tender these submarines are very much restricted in their sphere of activities and can not venture far from a fixed locality.

With the long coast line of the United States and the present number of submarines in the Navy it is apparent that circumstances might arise rendering necessary a change of base of any of the submarine groups, involving possibly long distances to be traversed. Without sufficient tenders this would not be



possible and the consideration of both offensive and defensive strategy would be accordingly handicapped.

It, therefore, seems most important that this type of vessel be authorized at the present time, and accordingly I move that there be inserted in the bill under discussion the necessary authorization for the construction of 1 submarine tender not to exceed \$1,000,000 in cost.

As we are providing for submarines, we ought to provide for the necessary adjuncts to the submarines. I hope that this amendment will be adopted; it is almost useless to have submarines unless they have tenders.

I can assure the Representatives from the great interior ports of the country which are dependent, many for safety and all for their prosperity, in a large measure, on the stability of the improvement at the mouth of the Mississippi River, that the adoption of this amendment will have direct and important bearing on that protection, for it will enable the Department of the Navy to effectively patrol the waters of the Gulf of Mexico at its mouth with submarines fully equipped for such defense.

Mr. Chairman, I append a description of the modern submarine which has been furnished me, and which shows how much confidence we may place in them as instruments of defense, and the people of the Mississippi Valley may place great faith in them if a sufficiently large number, fully equipped for service, with the necessary tenders, be stationed at the mouth of the river:

The modern submarine is a vessel ranging in length from 150 to 230 feet, having a speed of from 14 to 17 knots on the surface and 10 to 12 knots submerged. Propulsion on the surface is by means of internal-combustion oil engines, usually of about 1,000 horsepower per boat, although one boat is being built with engines of 5,000 horsepower. These vessels are very seaworthy—can remain at sea without injury in the severest storms—and in this respect are superior to destroyers. They can cruise on the surface at a distance of 5,000 miles without replenishing their fuel supply. They can pass from the surface to the submerged condition in a time of only three minutes and can run completely submerged at any depth down to 200 feet, and can also, by means of their periscopes, obtain a view of the surface without danger of being themselves discovered, except when only a few hundred yards distant from the enemy. Even if discovered at this close range they are immune from attack for the reason that they can almost instantly dive to any depth desired.

Their armament consists of modern torpedoes, which, due to the fact that the submarine can approach with impunity to very close quarters, may be considered very accurate and exact. The chances of misses when fired from a submarine are very small as compared to the chances when fired from a long range from surface vessels. The uses of submarines in time of war would be both defensive and offensive. Primarily they would be used to protect seaports, landing places, and other strategic points. When provided in a sufficient number an attack from sea or the landing of an enemy's force is rendered practically impossible. For certain purposes of defense, such as the Panama Canal, the submarine would be as effective as a large fleet of battleships stationed on either side of the canal. Guns on shore alone could never fully protect this most important strategic point. A ship could lie off at such great distance as to be practically safe from the attacks of the fort and at the same time land shells into the canal, doing immense damage. As a weapon of defense the modern submarine as at present developed could be used in connection with the battleship fleet.

Its surface speed is now such that it could cruise with the fleet and would be left behind only in extreme cases—where the maximum speed of the fleet would be called for. Instead of accompanying the fleet modern submarines could be used to cruise in flotillas alone, searching out and destroying the enemy wherever he might be found.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted. It is contemplated that some of the submarines authorized in the bill will be sent to New Orleans for the protection of the mouth of the Mississippi. They will be built in the East; they can not be sent to New Orleans nor used after they get there without a tender, and I trust that the committee will agree to this amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman from Louisiana, Gen. ESTOPINAL, has presented these matters and urged them before the committee, and it is true that a submarine tender is needed. The committee did not include it in the appropriation bill, because, considering all matters and the amount of the bill, we felt that it was as much as the bill should carry in the report to the House. But this tender is needed, and if the committee sees fit to include it I shall not enter any protest against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, to follow right after the one just adopted, and I ask that it take the same course as the other amendments that have been passed in the same line.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by adding after the last word, as follows: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the construction of said submarine tender by any person, firm, or corporation which has not at the time of the commencement and the con-

tinuation of said vessel established an 8-hour workday for all employees, laborers, and mechanics engaged or to be engaged in the construction of said submarine tender."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that the amendment should be passed?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 63, after line 23, by adding the following paragraph: "The Secretary of the Navy may build any or all of the vessels authorized in this act in such navy yards as he may designate, and shall build any of the vessels herein authorized in such navy yards as he may designate, should it reasonably appear that the persons, firms, corporations, or agents thereof bidding for the construction of any of said vessels have entered into any combination, agreement, or understanding, the effect or the purpose of which is to deprive the Government of fair, open, and unrestricted competition in letting contracts for the construction of any of said vessels."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order to that provision.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is the same provision that has been in the naval bill heretofore.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It has appeared in the bill ahead of the provision for submarines. Submarines are of such a character and so controlled by patents that it is not possible for the Government to build them in the navy yards. If the gentleman will modify his amendment I will withdraw the point of order. I am in sympathy with it, but do not want to tie up the construction of submarines.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then I have no objection to excepting the submarines, and I will modify my amendment in that particular.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Chairman, can we have the amendment as modified read by the Clerk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy may build any or all of the vessels in this act in such navy yards as he may designate, and shall build any of the vessels herein authorized, except submarines, in such navy yards as he may designate should it reasonably appear that persons, firms, corporations, or agents thereof bidding for the construction of any of said vessels have entered into any combination, agreement, or understanding, the effect, object, or purpose of which is to deprive the Government of fair, open, or unrestricted competition in letting contracts for the construction of any of said vessels.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I have no objection to that.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the word "submarines" ought to be inserted in the first part of the amendment. It only appears once in the amendment, and it should appear twice. Let the Clerk report the amendment as it now stands.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy may build any or all of the vessels authorized in this act, except submarines, in such navy yards—

Mr. PADGETT. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California as modified.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and steam machinery of vessels heretofore and herein authorized, \$8,946,205.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "dollars," in line 2, page 64, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation for the construction and machinery of vessels shall be expended for construction of any vessels by any person, firm, or corporation which have not at the time of commencement and during the construction of said vessels established an eight-hour working day for all employees, laborers, and mechanics engaged or to be engaged in the construction of vessels named herein."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that be considered as pending.

Mr. PADGETT. Consent has already been given for that.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee, in connection with this amendment and others, if this appropriation does not apply to the completion and construction of vessels where contracts have already been made?

Mr. PADGETT. The amendment has been offered, but it is simply passed for the present, and it should not apply to those heretofore contracted for.

Mr. PAYNE. I wanted to call attention to that.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. When we take them up for consideration we will also take up that question.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course you can not go into a wholesale violation of contracts by enacting legislation of this kind without its being subject to a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. They are just offered now and are passed subject to points of order and for consideration.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand that part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of the Navy; colliers: On account of two fleet colliers heretofore authorized, \$581,321.48.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk. It is an amendment of the same character as that which I just offered, and I ask unanimous consent that this be considered as pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the same disposition will be made of the amendment which the gentleman from Illinois has just submitted.

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire now to ask unanimous consent to offer at this place the bill H. R. 9061, the 8-hour law, as passed by this House at the present session of Congress on the 14th day of December, 1911, which is the one that I have heretofore mentioned several times. This act was passed by an overwhelming vote, a large majority on both sides of the aisle. It has been reported favorably, without amendment, by the Senate committee. Instead of having all of these various matters interjected through the bill here and there and elsewhere, so that we will have to deal with all of those separately, and which, perhaps, may be in conflict with the general law that may be passed, I am asking unanimous consent that this amendment may be incorporated. When the bill goes to conference, should the Congress change it in any way and the law become different, in the conference we would have this changed, made to conform to the law as it shall pass. If there is no change made in the bill, it would remain as it is; and should the Senate not take action before receding from the action of the House I should submit the matter to the House for its future instruction.

I desire to make that statement that it may be clearly understood what my purpose is. I ask that this may be incorporated as an amendment at this time, to come after line 20, page 64.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. What has become of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] to follow the word "cents," in line 9, page 64?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to inquire whether the gentleman from Tennessee offered his amendment as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PADGETT. I offer my amendment to come after line 20, page 64. I thought that had been reached.

The CHAIRMAN. That has not been reached.

Mr. PADGETT. Then I withdraw it until that time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN.] I want to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois, if he will give me his attention, that, as I understand the wording of his amendment, it would apply to all vessels that were authorized in the last Congress and which, as I understand it, are now under construction. Contracts have been let for the construction of those vessels, and to attach such an amendment as this to them would be a violation of the contracts which the Government has already entered into, and I do not think the gentleman desires to place the Government in any such position as that of impairing the obligation of its contracts.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Would anything that we now adopt be retroactive?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It would make it so here.

Mr. CANNON. Suppose it does; could we not pay the damage on suits brought in the Court of Claims?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Oh, yes; we could pay the damages, but we do not want to subject people who have entered in good faith into contracts with this Government to a suit at law.

I am in favor of these eight-hour provisions going on to all new authorizations in the bill, but I am not in favor of an eight-hour provision going on this bill which is going to impair a contract already entered into by this Government, and I do not think the gentleman from Illinois is.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I understand that those amendments are pending and are subject to points of order.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. This is one that has just been offered.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Yes; but the gentleman from Illinois has asked that it be considered as pending. It is in the same position as the others.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is what I have been endeavoring to find out.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Until the amendment which is proposed to be offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, to follow after line 20, page 64, has been disposed of.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will pardon me, I do not think he understood the parliamentary situation. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] offers this amendment to which I have reserved the point of order, but before any action could be taken upon it, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], rose to his feet and asked unanimous consent to offer as an amendment at this time the general eight-hour law. That left the motion of the gentleman from Illinois wholly undetermined. I thereupon reserved a point of order, and pointed out to the gentleman wherein I think his amendment is out of order and not a fair motion to make on this provision of the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I simply wanted to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has in it a provision that exempts its application from contracts already made.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I am not finding any fault with the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee. It is the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, that preceded it, that I am questioning.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total increase of the Navy heretofore and herein authorized, \$16,839,373.48.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to present as an amendment the bill which I have just explained, which is the eight-hour law as it passed the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 20, page 64, insert the following:

"That every contract hereafter made to which the United States, any Territory, or the District of Columbia is a party, and every such contract made for or on behalf of the United States, or any Territory, or said District, which may require or involve the employment of laborers or mechanics shall contain a provision that no 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; and every such contract shall stipulate a penalty for each violation of such provision in such contract of \$5 for each laborer or mechanic for every calendar day in which he shall be required or permitted to labor more than eight hours upon said work; and any officer or person designated as inspector of the work to be performed under any such contract, or to aid in enforcing the fulfillment thereof, shall, upon observation or investigation, forthwith report to the proper officer of the United States, or of any Territory, or of the District of Columbia, all violations of the provisions of this act directed to be made in every such contract, together with the name of each laborer or mechanic who has been required or permitted to labor in violation of such stipulation, and the day of such violation, and the amount of the penalties imposed according to the stipulation in any such contract shall be directed to be withheld for the use and benefit of the United States, the District of Columbia, or the Territory contracting, by the officer or person whose duty it shall be to approve the payment of the moneys due under such contract, whether the violation of the provisions of such contract is by the contractor or any subcontractor. Any contractor or subcontractor aggrieved by the withholding of any penalty as hereinbefore provided shall have the right within six months thereafter to appeal to the head of the department making the contract on behalf of the United States or the Territory, and in the case of a contract made by the District of Columbia to the commissioners thereof, who shall have power to review the action imposing the penalty, and in all such appeals from such final order whereby a contractor or subcontractor may be aggrieved by the imposition of the penalty hereinbefore provided such contractor or subcontractor may within six months after decision by such head of a department, or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, file a claim in the Court of Claims, which shall have jurisdiction to hear and decide the matter in like manner as in other cases before said court.

"That nothing in this section shall apply to contracts for transportation by land or water, or for the transmission of intelligence, or for such materials or articles as may usually be bought in open market, except armor and armor plate, whether made to conform to particular specifications or not, or for the purchase of supplies by the Government, whether manufactured to conform to particular specifications or not; Provided, That all classes of work which have been, are now, or may hereafter be performed by the Government shall, when done by contract by individuals, firms, or corporations for or on behalf of the United States or any of the Territories or the District of Columbia, be performed in accordance with the terms and provisions of this act. The President, by Executive order, may waive the provisions and stipulations in this act as to any specific contract or contracts during time of war or a time when war is imminent. No penalties shall be imposed for any violation of such provision in such contract due to any emergency caused by fire, famine, or flood, by danger to life or to

property, or by other extraordinary event or condition on account of which the President shall subsequently declare the violation to have been justifiable. Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or modify the act entitled "An act relating to the limitation of the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon the public works of the United States and of the District of Columbia," being chapter 352 of the laws of the Fifty-second Congress, approved August 1, 1892, or to apply to work done under contracts made prior to the passage of this act."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, just a pro forma amendment. As this was an act and we are incorporating it as one section in the bill here, in line 12, page 3, the word "act" should read "section," and, on page 4, line 8, the word "act" should read "section," as it is incorporated in this general act.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as indicated by the gentleman.

There was no objection.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Now I ask—

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Let me dispose of this. I ask unanimous consent, to expedite matters, that all of the amendments heretofore offered and reserved which have relation to the eight-hour law be now disagreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Do I understand the gentleman that that will include my amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly not; that is not embraced in the eight-hour law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all the amendments indicated that were offered as pending and passed by informally be considered as withdrawn. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment to be added as a paragraph at the end of the amendment just adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of the amendment just adopted the following as a new paragraph:

"That no part of the appropriation authorized by this act shall be expended for the pay of enlisted men or seamen, not including commission and warrant officers, while doing repair work belonging to any recognized trade on battleships of the Navy when such battleships are docked or laid up at any navy yard for repairs: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not apply to such ordinary duties as are engaged in by the crew while at sea excepting dismantling and assembling armament for the purpose of repairs."

[Mr. MURRAY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I quite understand the amendment. It is to prohibit repairs of any kind by enlisted men?

Mr. PADGETT. In the ships at navy yards aside from battleships. It takes the greater ships, but excludes the other vessels.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The amendment goes a little bit further than that. It prevents the enlisted personnel of the Navy who are on battleships that are in navy yards from doing any work on that ship that is ordinarily done by the recognized crafts or trades in the navy yard while the battleship is in the yard except such ordinary duties as the sailors do at sea.

Mr. CANNON. I want to ask, and I ask in good faith for information, is it important when a battleship goes to sea that there should be some enlisted men aboard the ship who will be competent to make repairs necessary in distress—

Mr. PADGETT. Very important.

Mr. CANNON. Either from battle or storm?

Mr. PADGETT. Under any circumstances I think it is very important, and it does not occur to me that as amended this will prevent that, and therefore I did not object.

Mr. CANNON. But the men must know how.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Now then, if when they are in the navy-yard docks and being repaired, not being skilled, they are shut out from being skilled, it seems to me if this amendment is adopted the gentleman ought to increase the membership of the crew of the battleship by a sufficient number of trained mechanics to meet emergencies that might arise from war or from storm.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the gentleman from Illinois by saying that these ships have in their service machinists, boiler makers, and all those trades who may be needed to repair vessels at sea. For the last 20 years we have had enlisted men as boiler makers and such mechanics competent to keep things in repair.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that the reason for this amendment is because some of

the battleships during the present fiscal year have been put into a navy yard for repairs and because of a lack of funds in the Navy Department the crews, while the ships were in dock there or at the wharf in the navy yard, have been put to work doing things that are ordinarily done by the yard mechanics, and to make the situation more aggravated the yard mechanics that would ordinarily do that work were being discharged right and left because there was not money enough to keep them at work. Now, that is the situation, and this amendment seeks to prevent that recurring in the future.

Mr. CANNON. Now, let me understand. For the want of an appropriation, if the battleships were repaired at all, there was no money to pay the ordinary mechanic, who was discharged, and a seaman who was a mechanic, if he was fitted to repair it, was put at work on it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Now, the claim is made that these seamen are not skilled mechanics and are not doing good work in addition to taking work away from the men employed heretofore.

Mr. CANNON. I take it they must be skilled mechanics, because the other sailor and navigator, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER], says that they have these mechanics, boiler makers, etc., in the regular crews, so that the gentleman must be mistaken.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I am telling the gentleman what the men in the navy yard say.

Mr. CANNON. What is the fact?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I am not competent to judge.

Mr. CANNON. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill and the gentleman from Massachusetts, who offered the amendment, if the gentlemen have taken in consideration the absolute necessity of much larger appropriations, so that these battleships when they come into dock could be repaired by the ordinary employee or mechanic in the navy yard, and therefore be something to pay? Otherwise we, by law, would shut out the mechanic, who I am sure is of equal skill and belongs to the regular crew which is enlisted, and prevent him, by this provision, from making in whole or in part—

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I want to say to the gentleman further—

Mr. CANNON. You know I am a landlubber. I want to know.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I want to say to the gentleman that I have heard of complaints coming from the enlisted men that they have been compelled to do work while the ships were in the navy yard that formerly had not been done by enlisted men when the ship was in the navy yard. There is a double complaint over this practice that has come to me.

Mr. CANNON. Was the seaman, who was competent to repair the ship, under pay?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. He was under pay, certainly; but the practice heretofore has been for the seaman not to be put to this kind of work when the ship was in the navy yard.

Mr. CANNON. What was he doing in the meantime?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I could not tell you. He did not want to do the work that shore mechanics should be doing.

Mr. PADGETT. I will be frank with the gentleman that I think the effect of this will be to increase the expense; but this House has manifested such a marked disposition to recognize the demand with reference to labor, that when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] modified it and placed it in the present form I said to him I would withdraw my opposition to it.

Mr. CANNON. How much does my friend think it would increase the expense?

Mr. PADGETT. I am not prepared to say.

Mr. CANNON. I want to make this remark in justice to all parties. I know the gentlemen on both sides of the House who represent the navy-yard districts. They are most splendid Representatives, and, if it costs two or three millions more, they are worth it.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I heartily urge the adoption of the amendment which my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] has just offered. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is not conversant with the conditions in our navy

yards, or he would not voice the objections which he has just made.

The purpose of this amendment is to prevent the employment in navy yards of sailors in work which is being done at those yards by regular mechanics of recognized trades. It is obviously unfair to these mechanics to have their work taken from them and given to enlisted sailors from the vessels. Whenever this takes place it causes friction on both sides. The enlisted men from the vessels resent their employment in other work not connected with their work as seamen, and the men in the yards, who have families to support and belong to recognized trades, naturally resent the competition of enlisted men in their work.

It is urged that this seldom takes place. Then, Mr. Chairman, there can be little interference occasioned by the provisions of this amendment. This amendment is not intended to interfere with good discipline or with efficiency; it is intended to assist in the conduct of the yards and to prevent occasions arising which might cause feeling between the mechanics in the yards and the enlisted men on the vessels. Many of the employees in the Charlestown Navy Yard live in my district, and I have received letters of complaint from them on this subject. I am glad to see the chairman of the committee accept this, and trust that his decision will be followed finally by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer the following amendment, to follow the last two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add as a separate paragraph following the amendment:

"Provided, That no part of any sum herein appropriated shall be expended for the purchase of structural steel, ship plates, armor, armament, or machinery from any persons, firms, or corporations who have combined or conspired to monopolize the interstate or foreign commerce or trade of the United States, or the commerce or trade between the States and any Territory or the District of Columbia, in any of the articles aforesaid, and no purchase of structural steel, ship plates, or machinery shall be made at a price in excess of a reasonable profit above the actual cost of manufacture. But this limitation shall in no case apply to any existing contract."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, that is the same provision that was agreed to last year.

Mr. CANNON. Have there been any contracts let since that was adopted?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. How was it ascertained as a fact that a maker of structural steel was or was not in the trust?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not been charged with the duty of finding out or ascertaining.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand the Secretary of the Navy made one of the officers make an affidavit.

Mr. CANNON. Now, an affidavit would be a lie without a penalty for perjury. There is a penalty for forming a trust. I am just anxious to know whether this be merely high-sounding "leather and prunella" to show to the galleries and on the stump what we have been doing to break up the trusts, or whether it really be a matter of force.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I recollect that a few years ago an amendment was placed on the bill prohibiting the purchase of any powder from a trust. It was ascertained that the only place the powder could be purchased was from a trust, and the powder was purchased.

Mr. CANNON. In spite of the law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In spite of the law.

Mr. CANNON. Has not the Judiciary Committee been called upon to impeach the official who purchased it for violating the law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. It was expected that a Republican official would violate it. Nobody paid any attention to it.

Mr. CANNON. Then it ought to be expected that a Democratic House would impeach.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It happened when the House was Republican, and nobody expected it.

Mr. CANNON. It is not barred by the statute of limitation now. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add as a separate paragraph the following:

"After January 1, 1914, no captain or commander of the line of the Navy, who is not restricted by law to shore duty only, shall be pro-

moted to the next higher grade who has not performed at least two full years of sea service in cruising ships of the Navy in his grade: *Provided*, That hereafter, except in time of war, no officer shall be appointed a chief of bureau, or to any other position in which his temporary rank shall be more than one grade higher than his rank in the regular service, and in no case shall an officer be appointed a chief of bureau who has not performed two years' sea service in command in the grade of commander and two years' sea service in the grade of captain."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order and permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I will reserve the point of order, although I assure the gentleman that it is a waste of time, because I shall insist upon it.

Mr. BURLESON. I should like to ask the gentleman if he thinks a commander of the Navy ought to be promoted to be a captain of a ship when he has never served a day at sea as a commander?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. As a general proposition, no; but there are exceptional cases, where it would be an injustice not to promote him.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman state one of those exceptional cases?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Yes; I can state half a dozen.

Mr. BURLESON. State just one, and I will be content.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Here is a commander who is an expert in ordnance, and his services are so valuable to the Government that he is kept on ordnance work, and when his time for promotion comes he has not been able to go to sea as a commander. Ought that man to be retired and his services lost to the Government, when he has been doing the Government most valuable service in designing our guns and perfecting our means of offensive warfare?

Mr. BURLESON. This amendment does not contemplate that such an officer shall be put on the retired list.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Why should the man be kept out of his deserved promotion because he has not seen two years' sea service as commander through no fault of his own? I can cite half a dozen other instances where it would be a hardship not to allow a man to go from one grade to another.

Mr. BURLESON. One further question: Is the gentleman in favor of the petty favoritism that has some time been practiced in the Navy Department by denying some officers shore duty in order that others may be saved from sea service?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman gets his provision into the law there will be a one-man plucking board, because one man, by refusing to detail an officer to sea duty, can force him on to the retired list.

Mr. BURLESON. Have you not under existing law got it in the power of one man now?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. No; because the sea-service requirement is not now a prerequisite to promotion.

Mr. BURLESON. Under the law as it is, is it not within the power of one man now to take an officer of the Navy and make him chief of a bureau, and by keeping him there a few months enable him to retire as an admiral when he has completed 30 years' service?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. No man's promotion to-day depends on his sea service, and it is not in the power of any one man to prevent an officer being promoted. I make the point of order.

Mr. BURLESON. I confidently expected the gentleman from Massachusetts would make the point of order.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Then the gentleman is not disappointed.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the amendment just adopted add the following as a separate paragraph:

"That hereafter the per diem clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger force at navy yards and naval stations under the Navy Department shall be granted leave of absence with pay not to exceed 15 days in any one year, which leave may in exceptional and meritorious cases where an employee is ill be extended, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, not to exceed 15 days additional in any one year."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that. It is legislation.

Mr. CALDER. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I can not. It is too late in the day.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.  
The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is requested to consider the advisability of a permanent policy of stationing torpedo boats and submarines at or near the mouth of the Mississippi River and the United States seaports of the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific coast as the proper naval defense thereof.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.  
Mr. PADGETT. It is subject to a point of order if the gentleman desires to make it. It is only expressing to the Secretary of the Navy the suggestion of the committee that he shall consider these matters.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will notice, this provision simply authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to investigate this matter in one particular locality.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it says on the Gulf coast and the Pacific coast.

Mr. GOOD. It seems to me if a provision of this kind is proper it ought to give the Secretary of the Navy broader power, so that he can investigate the subject with regard to the advisability of establishing the permanent policy of stationing torpedo boats in the Atlantic and Pacific and at other places.

Mr. PADGETT. He already has some on the Pacific, but not enough, if you will allow me to express my own judgment; but there are on the Atlantic a great many in proportion to what we have. This is simply asking him to consider whether or not it is advisable to have them on the Gulf coast and additional ones on the Pacific coast.

Mr. CANNON. Has he the power to inquire touching that matter now?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee, if I may, what is the use of this amendment? I always bow to the will of the majority, because I must; and we have voted by a great majority to-day that there is no danger of war. Why go to this useless expense? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to introduce one amendment, with one word, and have one minute to explain it. I move at the end of the last line of the bill to insert the word "notwithstanding."

In the minute, if I may be recognized, I desire to say that when I was a small boy there was a queer old creature by the name of Campbell, who could not read or write, and still he was a great correspondent. We used in that time foolscap paper, and he dictated to me until every side of that foolscap of four pages was filled, and then he would dictate until I wrote across, and then finally when I would read the letter to him that contained almost everything known and unknown, seen and unseen, from the birth of Christ to the death of the devil, he said, "Sonny, 'notwithstanding' is a mighty good word to conclude a letter with." [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment by the gentleman from Illinois is withdrawn.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill, with the various amendments, to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HULL, 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. 24565) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back, with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Naval Affairs, to report the same back forthwith, containing the paragraph in the hands of the Clerk, and on that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts opposed to the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Recommit the bill to the Committee on Naval Affairs with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following paragraph: "That for the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President is hereby authorized to have constructed one first-class battleship, carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessel of its class, to have the highest practicable speed and the greatest practicable radius of action, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$6,000,000."

The SPEAKER. On that the gentleman moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this vote be taken by yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 106, nays 140, answered "present" 14, not voting 132, as follows:

YEAS—106.

Akin, N. Y.	Green, Iowa	Longworth	Roberts, Nev.
Anderson, Minn.	Greene, Mass.	McCall	Rosenberg
Austin	Groost	McCrary	Sells
Ayres	Hamilton, Mich.	McKinley	Simmons
Barchfeld	Harris	McKinney	Sloan
Bartholdt	Haugen	McLaughlin	Smith, Saml. W.
Bates	Hawley	McMorran	Steenerson
Butler	Hayes	Maher	Stephens, Cal.
Caldor	Heald	Martin, S. Dak.	Sterling
Campbell	Helgesen	Matthews	Stevens, Minn.
Cannon	Henry, Conn.	Miller	Sulloway
Cary	Higgins	Moon, Pa.	Talcott, N. Y.
Catlin	Hill	Morgan	Taylor, Ohio
Crago	Howell	Morse, Wis.	Thistlewood
Curry	Howland	Murray	Tison
Danforth	Humphrey, Wash.	Needham	Towner
Davis, Minn.	Kahn	Nelson	Utter
Dodds	Kennedy	Norris	Volstead
Donohoe	Kent	Nye	Warburton
Draper	Knowland	Palmer	Wedemeyer
Driscoll, M. E.	Konig	Patton, Pa.	Weeks
Esch	Kopp	Payne	Wildor
Farr	La Follette	Powers	Willis
Fordney	Lawrence	Pray	Wilson, Ill.
French	Lee, Pa.	Prince	Wilson, N. Y.
Gardner, Mass.	Lenroot	Rees	
Good	Lindbergh	Roberts, Mass.	

NAYS—140.

Adair	Driscoll, D. A.	Humphreys, Miss.	Rothermel
Adamson	Dupré	Jacoway	Rubey
Alexander	Edwards	Jones	Rucker, Colo.
Allen	Elberbe	Kitchin	Russell
Anderson, Ohio	Estopinal	Konop	Sabbath
Barnhart	Evanus	Korby	Saunders
Bartlett	Faison	Lafcan	Shackelford
Boall, Tex.	Fergusson	Lamb	Sharp
Blackmon	Ferris	Lever	Sherwood
Bocher	Finley	Lewis	Sims
Borland	Fitzgerald	Lloyd	Slisson
Brantley	Flood, Va.	Lobeck	Slayden
Broussard	Floyd, Ark.	McDermott	Smith, N. Y.
Buchanan	Foster	McGillcuddy	Smith, Tex.
Bulkley	Fowler	McKellar	Stephens, Miss.
Burgess	Francis	McKenzie	Stephens, Nebr.
Burke, Wis.	Gallagher	Macon	Stephens, Tex.
Burleson	Garner	Maguire, Nebr.	Stone
Byrns, Tenn.	Garrett	Moon, Tenn.	Sweet
Callaway	George	Moss, Ind.	Taggart
Candler	Glass	Necley	Taylor, Ala.
Claypool	Godwin, N. C.	Oldfield	Taylor, Colo.
Clayton	Goodwin, Ark.	Padgett	Thayer
Cline	Gregg, Tex.	Patten, N. Y.	Trible
Collier	Gudger	Peters	Turabull
Conry	Hamlin	Post	Underhill
Cullop	Hardwick	Pou	Watkins
Dent	Harrison, Miss.	Rainey	Webb
Dickinson	Hay	Raker	Whitacre
Dickson, Miss.	Heftin	Ranch	White
Dies	Hensley	Redfield	Wickliffe
Difenderfer	Houston	Reilly	Wilson, Pa.
Dixon, Ind.	Howard	Richardson	Witherspoon
Doremus	Hughes, Ga.	Robinson	Young, Kans.
Doughton	Hull	Roddenbery	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—14.

Davenport	Fornes	Littlepage	Speer
Davidson	Hardy	Martin, Colo.	Underwood
Dwight	Henry, Tex.	Parran	
Dyer	Johnson, S. C.	Riordan	

NOT VOTING—132.

Alken, S. C.	Anthony	Boehne	Burke, Pa.
Alney	Ashbrook	Howman	Burke, S. Dak.
Ames	Bathrick	Bradley	Burnett
Andrus	Bell, Ga.	Brown	Byrnes, S. C.
Ansberry	Berger	Browning	Cantrill

Carlin	Gray	Levy	Reyburn
Carter	Gregg, Pa.	Lindsay	Rouse
Clark, Fla.	Guernsey	Linthicum	Rucker, Mo.
Concoll	Hamill	Littleton	Scully
Cooper	Hamilton, W. Va.	Loud	Sheppard
Copley	Hammond	McCoy	Sherley
Covington	Hanna	McGuire, Okla.	Slemp
Cox, Ind.	Harrison, N. Y.	McHenry	Small
Cox, Ohio	Hartman	Madden	Smith, J. M. C.
Cravens	Hayden	Malby	Smith, Cal.
Crumpacker	Helm	Mann	Sparkman
Curley	Hinds	Mays	Stack
Currier	Hobson	Mondell	Stanley
Dalzell	Holland	Moore, Pa.	Stedman
Daugherty	Hubbard	Moore, Tex.	Sulzer
Davis, W. Va.	Hughes, N. J.	Morrison	Switzer
De Forest	Hughes, W. Va.	Mott	Talbott, Md.
Denver	Jackson	Murdock	Thomas
Fairchild	James	Olmsted	Townsend
Fields	Johnson, Ky.	O'Shaunessy	Tuttle
Focht	Kendall	Page	Vare
Foss	Kindred	Pepper	Vreeland
Fuller	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Pickett	Wood, N. J.
Gardner, N. J.	Kinkead, N. J.	Plumley	Woods, Iowa
Gillett	Lafferty	Porter	Young, Mich.
Goeke	Langham	Prouty	
Goldfogle	Langley	Pujo	
Gould	Lee, Ga.	Randell, Tex.	
Graham	Legare	Ransdell, La.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Mr. FURNES with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD with Mr. MANN.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Until further notice:

Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. HANNA.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.

Mr. PAGE with Mr. WOOD of New Jersey.

Mr. MCCOY with Mr. VREELAND.

Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. VARE.

Mr. LEVY with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. LEGARE with Mr. REYBURN.

Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. KINDRED with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky with Mr. PICKETT.

Mr. HOLLAND with Mr. MURDOCK.

Mr. HELM with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. HAYDEN with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. GOULD with Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. KENDALL.

Mr. GOEKE with Mr. JACKSON.

Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia with Mr. HINDS.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. HARRISON of New York with Mr. CRUMPACKER.

Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOEHNE with Mr. BOWMAN.

Mr. ANSBERRY with Mr. AMES.

Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. FOCHT.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina with Mr. GILLETT.

Mr. CARTER with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. TUTTLE with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. STANLEY with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. MALBY.

Mr. HARDY with Mr. OLMSTED.

Mr. JAMES with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. BROWN with Mr. CURRIER.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. SHEPPARD with Mr. BATES.

Mr. MAYS with Mr. THISTLEWOOD.

Mr. LITTLETON with Mr. DWIGHT.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri with Mr. DYER.

Mr. COX of Indiana with Mr. SMITH of California.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. PARRAN.

On the vote:

Mr. FOSS (to recommit) with Mr. SMALL (against).

Mr. DALZELL (to recommit) with Mr. HENRY of Texas (against).

Mr. VREELAND (to recommit) with Mr. BATHRICK (against).

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania (to recommit) with Mr. BURNETT (against).

Mr. SULZER (to recommit) with Mr. CONNELL (against).

Mr. SPEER (to recommit) with Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania (against).

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY (to recommit) with Mr. ROUSE (against).

Mr. CURLEY with Mr. FULLER.

Mr. PUJO with Mr. DE FOREST.

Until May 28:

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey with Mr. YOUNG of Michigan.

Ending May 31:

Mr. MORRISON with Mr. MADDEN.

Ending June 1:

Mr. THOMAS with Mr. HUBBARD.

Ending June 5:

Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. HARTMAN.

From May 15 and ending two weeks hence:

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. LOUD.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. OLMSTED. I voted "no." I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. HARDY was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I voted "no." I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present." I am paired with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GILLETT.

The name of Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. PADGETT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 16661. An act to relinquish, release, remise, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to all the lands held under claim or color of title by individuals or private ownership or municipal ownership situated in the State of Alabama which were reserved, retained, or set apart to or for the Creek Tribe or Nation of Indians under or by virtue of the treaty entered into between the United States of America and the Creek Tribe or Nation of Indians on March 24, 1832, and under and by virtue of the treaty between the United States of America and the Creek Tribe or Nation of Indians of 9th day of August, 1814; and

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the Senate and House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1912, and for other purposes.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SMALL, for one week, on account of death in family.

To Mr. THAYER, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. BORLAND, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. PADGETT, for 10 days, on account of important business.

#### ADJOURNMENT-OVER.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, next Thursday is Memorial Day. A great many gentlemen on both sides of the House desire to be absent upon that day. I therefore ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow, Wednesday, it adjourn to meet on Friday, May 31, 1912, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow, Wednesday, it adjourn to meet on Friday, at 11 o'clock. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m., the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 29, 1912, at 12 o'clock m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting estimate for appropriation for reinforcing floor in room 400, Patent Office Building, and to equip same as a file room (H. Doc. No. 779); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting special-agent report on shoe and leather trade in the United Kingdom (S. Doc. No. 719); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to section 2, act of July 7, 1884, schedule of claims allowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 778); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 321) relative to observance of Memorial Day, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 788), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (S. 5207) to provide an American register for the steamer *Occana*, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 793), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 302) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to accept the title to 4,000 acres of land at or near Anniston, Ala., for the purpose of establishing maneuver camps, rifle and artillery ranges, etc., reported in lieu thereof joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) authorizing the Secretary of War to accept the title to 4,000 acres of land in the vicinity of Anniston, in the State of Alabama, which certain citizens have offered to donate to the United States for the purpose of establishing a maneuver camp and for the maneuvering of troops, establishing and maintaining camps of instruction, for rifle and artillery ranges, and for mobilization and assembling of troops from the group of States composed of Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina, accompanied by a report (No. 789), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HEALD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17709) for the relief of John M. Oak, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 764), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2070) for the relief of the estate of Antonia Sousa, deceased, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 765), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18213) to refund to the Sparrow Gravely Tobacco Co. the sum of \$173.52, with penalty and interest, the same having been erroneously paid by them to the Government of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 766), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HEALD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7650) for the relief of I. S. Rogers and J. L. Worthley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 767), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17850) to pay Cowden & Cowden, of Armory, Monroe County, Miss., for the loss of a horse while being used by the Department of Agriculture, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 768), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FRANCIS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20873) for the relief of J. M. H. Mellon (administrator), James A. Mellon, Thomas D. Mellon, Mrs. E. L. Sevir, J. M. H. Mellon, Bessie Blue, Mrs. Simpson, Annie Turley, C. B. Eyer, Luella C. Pearce, John McCracken, A. J. Mellon, J. J. Marlin, Eugene Richmond, Springdale Methodist Episcopal Church, Heidekamp Mirror Co., James P. Confer, jr.,

W. P. Bigley, W. J. Bole, and S. A. Moyer, all of Allegheny County, Pa., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 769), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18294) for the relief of John C. Sullivan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 770), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12476) for the relief of Henry W. Carpenter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 771), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15181) for the relief of Harry S. Wade, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 772), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICKINSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13938) for the relief of Theodore Salus, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 773), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 644) for the relief of Mary E. Quinn, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 774), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14333) for the relief of John Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 775), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16621) for the indemnification of Frank Wenzel, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 776), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 22863) for the relief of H. C. Owens, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 777), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MOTT, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19819) to authorize the payment of \$2,000 to the widow of the late Tranquillino Luna, in full for his contest expenses in the contested-election case of Manzanera against Luna, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 778), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CATLIN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3668) for the relief of William F. Norris, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 779), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12131) for the reimbursement of Ralph E. Hess for two horses lost while hired by the United States Geological Survey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 780), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7672) for the relief of Mary J. Manning, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 781), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICKINSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21760) for relief of the estate of William B. Taylor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 782), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FARR, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20511) for the relief of Samuel Butler & Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 783), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17355) for the relief of Robert F. Scott, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 784), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15594) for the relief of the heirs of those killed by the explosion at Fort Lafayette February 19,

1903, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 785), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FRANCIS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 295) to adjust the claims of certain settlers in Sherman County, Oreg., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 786), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FARR, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 462) for the relief of Slavo Ramadanovitch, heir of Cettigne, a Montenegrin subject, heir and administrator of Marcus Ramadanovitch, alias Radich, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 787), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AINEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14748) to refund certain taxes paid by the heirs of William Hannum, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 790), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21403) for the relief of Bolognesi, Hartfield & Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 791), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CATLIN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4007) for the relief of the J. Kennard & Sons Carpet Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 792), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 23439) granting an increase of pension to Walter K. Kling; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 23832) granting an increase of pension to Clyde C. Elkins; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 24180) granting an increase of pension to Rachel I. Halloway; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 24570) granting an increase of Pension to John Richardson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22462) granting an increase of pension to R. W. Tuffs; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 24423) granting an increase of pension to Martin Kimble; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 23503) granting a pension to John F. Klossy; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16782) granting an increase of pension to Charles Almendinger; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 24422) granting a pension to Charles A. Ward; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 24611) granting a pension to John Y. Thornton; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22397) granting a pension to Thomas Corian; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 23335) granting a pension to Eugene Jobe; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21791) granting a pension to Anna A. Engel; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22000) granting a pension to Ellen Cardenas; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 19373) granting a pension to Sarah Scott; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 20693) granting a pension to Bertie L. Wade; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13525) granting a pension to James E. Welch; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16879) granting a pension to Martha Fitzpatrick; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 24928) providing for site and public building at Sylvania, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24924) providing for purchase of site and for public building at Millen, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 24925) to amend the copyright law passed March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 24926) to amend paragraph 709 of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1900; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 24927) to regulate the interstate transportation of immature calves; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 24928) regulating trials by jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 554) to print 2,500 copies of the hearings on the investigation of the strike at Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DENT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) authorizing the Secretary of War to accept the title to 4,000 acres of land in the vicinity of Anniston, in the State of Alabama, which certain citizens have offered to donate to the United States for the purpose of establishing a maneuver camp and for the maneuvering of troops, establishing and maintaining camps of instruction, for rifle and artillery ranges, and for mobilization and assembling of troops from the group of States composed of Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, favoring the passage of the three-year homestead bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, asking that said State be permitted to select additional lands within forest reserves; to the Committee of the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requesting an investigation of a certain contract made by the United States Reclamation Service with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 24929) granting a pension to Charlotte C. Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 24930) granting a pension to William G. Park; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24931) granting a pension to Fred A. Hecker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 24932) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Titman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 24933) for the relief of Eli A. Helmick, major, United States Army; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24934) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Duran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 24935) for the relief of the heirs of Alexander K. Phillips, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 24936) granting a pension to George F. Dickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 24937) to correct the naval record of Rev. Oscar Samuel, alias August Meier; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 24938) granting a pension to John W. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 24939) granting a pension to Amanda Dimsdale; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 24940) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Courtenay A. Stovall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 24941) for the relief of William Corley; to the Committee on the Public Lands.



By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 24942) for the relief of the administrator and heirs of John G. Campbell, to permit the prosecution of Indian depredation claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 24943) granting a pension to Thomas B. Kneeder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 24944) granting a pension to Alphonso Penley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 24945) granting an increase of pension to Theoda C. Newlon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24946) to grant an easement to the city of Kingfisher, Okla., for public street purposes, over a strip off the east, west, and south sides of the Government acre, in the city of Kingfisher, Okla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 24947) to establish a fish hatchery and fish-culture station in the first congressional district in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 24948) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to the John Mangan Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Selby, S. Dak., condemned bronze or brass cannon, with their carriages and outfit of cannon balls, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 24949) granting an increase of pension to Samuel K. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 24950) granting an increase of pension to George De Garmo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24951) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo English; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 24952) granting a pension to Mary A. Swaggerty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 24953) to authorize the appointment of John W. Hyatt to the grade of second lieutenant in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 24954) granting a pension to Rutherford B. H. Kinback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 24955) granting a pension to Flora A. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 24956) for the relief of Ira Haworth; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TALCOTE of New York: A bill (H. R. 24957) granting a pension to Mary A. Snider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARRBURTON: A bill (H. R. 24958) granting a pension to Kate Spencer Carpenter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24959) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 24960) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Kindsman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AKIN of New York: Petitions of citizens of New York; the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Harrisburg, Pa.; and the Immigration Restriction League, favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Southern Sociological Congress, Nashville, Tenn., favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Missouri, in favor of securing a pensionable status for members of the Enrolled Missouri Militia; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: Papers to accompany invalid claim for increase of pension for Charlotte E. Morrison, of Milford, Steele County, State of Minnesota, widow of the late Samuel Morrison, of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to Charlotte C. Morrison, widow of Samuel Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany claim for increase of pension for Charlotte E. Morrison, of Steele County, Minn., widow of late Samuel Morrison, Company D, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, in opposition to any change in present patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, relative to control of floods in the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BOWMAN: Resolution of the Erie Chamber of Commerce, of Erie, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 357, relative to investigation of the business of foreign and domestic fire insurance corporations of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the New York Milk Committee, of New York City, N. Y., favoring continuance of Commission on Efficiency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Samuel Felt Drug Co., of Watertown, N. Y., favoring passage of the Richardson bill (H. R. 14000) relative to pure drugs, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Alice Cleaveland, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of bill for the betterment of conditions in Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the National Jewelers' Board of Trade, of New York City, against passage of amendment changing present patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, resolution of the American Purity Federation, favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Italo-American Alliance of the United States of America, of Philadelphia, Pa., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, favoring placing on a civil-service basis the Diplomatic and Consular Service of the subordinate classes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Sample & Co., of New York City, against passage of the Works bill, relative to license for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the New York State Vegetable Growers' Association, of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring passage of a parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CATLIN: Resolutions of the Merchants' Exchange, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of the Newland river-regulation bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Missouri State Dental Association, favoring passage of Senate bill 5177, amending the patent laws, etc., and resolution opposing bill by Senator CULLOM to restore the so-called Low patent covering crown or bridge work; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, resolutions of Pride of the West Lodge, No. 56, Order B'rith Abraham, of St. Louis, Mo., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of citizens of Troy, N. Y., favoring passage of the Hughes-Borah bill, to create a commission on industrial relations; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of Senate bill 3, known as the Page bill, for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Alexander Lodge, No. 34, Order B'rith Abraham, of Troy, N. Y., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL: Petition of the Woman's Auxiliary of the Board of Missions, Diocese of Central New York, relative to conditions of natives of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the United States Civil Service Retirement Association, of Washington, D. C., against the five-year tenure of office clause contained in House bill 24023; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of citizens of Chicago, protesting against passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of the Advertising Men's League of New York, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 18327, relative to printing a national directory of commercial organizations of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the United States Civil Service Retirement Association, Washington, D. C., protesting against any legislation that will reestablish the spoils system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the American Association of Foreign Language Newspapers, against passage of the Oldfield-Brown bills, relating to proposed amendment to patent law, etc.; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of merchants of Leland and Morris, in the twelfth congressional district of Illinois, against passage of a parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of laboring and professional men of Rockford, Ill., favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, favoring certain amendments to the Sherman Antitrust Act, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John Nash, R. F. D. No. 1, Hunlock Creek, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 1339, to grant increase of pension in certain cases; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Resolution of citizens of Chicago, against passage of the Dillingham bill, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of members of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., against passage of the Root amendment, relative to the deportation of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of citizens of the State of Iowa, favoring passage of bill providing for building one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of retail merchants of Hartford, Mich., against passage of the Oldfield-Brown bills, for proposed change in patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 24549, to pension Martha E. A. Ackerman, of Miami, Mo., widow of Thomas Stoker Ackerman, deceased, a teamster in the service of the United States during the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 12 other citizens of Tyner, N. Dak., favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. E. Jacobson and 120 other citizens of Glen Ullin, N. Dak., protesting against the removal of tax from colored oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of a church at Leal, N. Dak., and the Presbyterian churches of Tyner, Backoo, and Cavaller, N. Dak., favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of the Hartford Central Labor Union, Hartford, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 16844, requiring the manufacturer's brand on all goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers of Harrisburg, Pa., favoring passage of the workmen's compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Women's Auxiliary of Windham, Conn., relative to condition of the natives of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the United States Civil Service Retirement Association, protesting against compulsory retirement in civil service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Hebrews of New Britain, Conn., against passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Young People's Eastern Connecticut organizations, favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of 7 merchants of Danbury, Conn., against amendment changing present patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of J. A. Lawson, of Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring passage of House bill 22339, to regulate the method of directing the work of Government employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Matthew Cullom and other citizens of Utah, against passage of House bill 17593, to divest intoxicating liquors of their interstate-commerce character in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, protesting against change in the present patent laws without the opinion of a committee of experts; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York, favoring passage of the workmen's compensation act (H. R. 20487); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Branch No. 157, East River, Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund, protesting against passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Lithuanian Socialist Federation of America, of Mahanoy City, Pa., protest-

ing against the passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolution of Jacob S. Strahl Lodge, No. 139, Independent Order Ahawas Israel, Brooklyn, N. Y., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of E. Locker & Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of Senate bill 3607, relative to so-called disintegration of the Tobacco Trust; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of citizens of New York, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Jacob S. Strahl Lodge, No. 158, Independent Order Ahawas Israel, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of a mass meeting of Americans, Chicago, Ill., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petition of business men of Alledo, Ill., against passage of a parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Rhode Island Lodge, No. 213, of Providence, R. I., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Rhode Island favoring passage of House bill 22339 and Senate bill 6172, against use of the stop watch in timing Government workmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Eureka, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 22580, for acquisition by the United States of suitable homes for its diplomatic representatives abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of the Daughters of Liberty, East Orange, N. J., and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Harrisburg, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Papers to accompany bill granting pension to Mrs. Flora A. White, of Litchfield, Mich., widow of Charles P. White, deceased, a member of Company H, Fourth Michigan Infantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: Petitions of Local No. 64, Osawatomie, Kans., International Association of Machinists, and Local No. 90, United Brotherhood of Leather Workers on Horse Goods, Fort Scott, Kans., protesting against the use of the stop-watch system on Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, of the State of Kansas, against passage of the workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of merchants of Fort Scott, Kans., protesting against any legislation that would affect price maintenance; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Petition of Guiding Star Council, Daughters of Liberty, favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TILSON: Resolution of the Connecticut Merchants' Association, against passage of any parcel-post system that is not self-sustaining; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petition of U. S. Grant Post, No. 117, Grand Army of the Republic, in the fifth congressional district of the State of New Jersey, favoring passage of House bill 4070, for relief of veterans whose hearing is defective; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UTTER: Petition of citizens of Rhode Island, favoring passage of House bill 22339, for prohibiting the use of the stop-watch system on Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of South Providence Lodge, No. 328, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, Providence, R. I., protesting against passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Immigration Restriction League, favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEEKS: Resolution of the Immigration Restriction League, favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.