

Theodore Totten to be postmaster at Findlay, Ohio, in place of Theodore Totten. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

OKLAHOMA.

Benjamin G. Baker to be postmaster at Chattanooga, Okla., in place of Benjamin G. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Henry G. Moyer to be postmaster at Perkaspie, Pa., in place of Henry G. Moyer. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

John W. Zerbe to be postmaster at Shamokin, Pa., in place of John W. Zerbe. Incumbent's commission expires March 1, 1913.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Allen T. Collins to be postmaster at Conway, S. C., in place of Allen T. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

John L. Dew to be postmaster at Latta, S. C., in place of John L. Dew. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1912.

J. E. Folger to be postmaster at Easley, S. C., in place of Alonzo T. Folger, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Gregory Smithberger to be postmaster at Bowdle, S. Dak., in place of Hiram A. Mason, resigned.

TEXAS.

Harry H. Cooper to be postmaster at Nacogdoches, Tex., in place of Harry H. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

Charles F. Darnall to be postmaster at Llano, Tex., in place of Charles F. Darnall. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Frank G. Goodridge to be postmaster at Robstown, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Eve Wright Kennedy to be postmaster at Kirbyville, Tex., in place of Jasper C. Williamson, resigned.

Le Roy P. Loomis to be postmaster at Slaton, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

Frederick Loudon to be postmaster at Fredericksburg, Tex., in place of Frederick Loudon. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Charles Real to be postmaster at Kerrville, Tex., in place of Charles Real. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1913.

William Reese to be postmaster at Floresville, Tex., in place of William Reese. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

Rudolph L. Reuser to be postmaster at Runge, Tex., in place of Rudolph L. Reuser. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

VIRGINIA.

James Carter to be postmaster at Chatham, Va., in place of James Carter. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1911.

Howard P. Dodge to be postmaster at Manassas, Va., in place of Howard P. Dodge. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

John W. Gregg to be postmaster at Purcellville, Va., in place of John W. Gregg. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Harry A. Sager to be postmaster at Herndon, Va., in place of Harry A. Sager. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Bezer Snell to be postmaster at Brookneal, Va., in place of Bezer Snell. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1912.

WASHINGTON.

James R. O'Farrell to be postmaster at Orting, Wash., in place of James R. O'Farrell. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

WISCONSIN.

Carrie E. MacLaughlin to be postmaster at Benton, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 26, 1913.

CONSULS GENERAL.

James A. Smith, of Vermont, to be consul general of the United States of America at Marseille, France.

Alphonse Gaulin, of Rhode Island, to be consul general of the United States of America at Calcutta, India.

POSTMASTERS.

MINNESOTA.

William Wichman to be postmaster at Morton, in the State of Minnesota.

MISSOURI.

Arthur W. Schmidt to be postmaster at Clayton, in the State of Missouri.

NEW YORK.

Gerow Van Wyck to be postmaster at Walkkill, in the State of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Walter C. Brinson to be postmaster at Belhaven, in the State of North Carolina.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Harry B. Jacobs to be postmaster at White Haven, in the State of Pennsylvania.

TEXAS.

Henry Krabbenschmidt to be postmaster at Grand Prairie, in the State of Texas.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 26, 1913.

Irwin B. Laughlin to be secretary of the embassy at London, England.

INJUNCTION OF SECRECY REMOVED.

The injunction of secrecy was removed from the following:

An agreement signed on February 13, 1913, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States and the French Republic extending for a period of five years from February 27, 1913, the convention of arbitration of February 10, 1908, between the United States and the French Republic.

A convention between the United States and other powers, signed at Paris on January 17, 1913, modifying the International Sanitary Convention of December 3, 1903.

A treaty between the United States and Italy, signed on February 25, 1913, amending article 3 of the treaty of commerce and navigation of February 26, 1871, between the two countries.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 26, 1913.

The House met at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite spirit, Father almighty, maker of the heavens and the earth, we would pour out our hearts in love and gratitude for the faith which binds us to Thee. An inspiration in the struggle for existence, a potent factor in the civilization of the world, a shield against the temptations which assail, it purifies and ennobles, comforts and sustains us in sorrow, lights the dark valley.

Faith is the rainbow's form
Hung on the brow of heaven,
The glory of the passing storm,
The pledge of mercy given.

Increase and strengthen it in all our hearts that we may be true to Thee, to ourselves, and to our fellow men. In the spirit of Him who personified it in life and death. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 28730) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions for the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the pension appropriation bill, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules, take from the Speaker's table the pension appropriation bill, with Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia moves to suspend the rules, take from the Speaker's table the pension appropriation bill, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second; and I also make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia demands a second and makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Aiken, S. C.	Doremus	Jackson	Patten, N. Y.
Ames	Draper	Johnson, S. C.	Pickett
Ansberry	Ferris	Konig	Porter
Barchfeld	Focht	Kopp	Post
Bartholdt	Fornes	Korbly	Prince
Berger	Fowler	Lafean	Proudy
Bradley	Gardner, N. J.	La Follette	Pujo
Broussard	George	Langham	Reyburn
Brown	Gill	Lewis	Rothermel
Burleson	Glass	Lindsay	Rucker, Colo.
Carlin	Godwin, N. C.	Littleton	Sabath
Carter	Green, Iowa	Lobeck	Saunders
Conry	Greene, Mass.	McDermott	Smith, J. M. C.
Copley	Gudger	McGuire, Okla.	Stack
Covington	Guernsey	McKinney	Stanley
Cox	Hamilton, W. Va.	McMorran	Sterling
Cravens	Harris	Mays	Sweet
Crumpacker	Harrison, N. Y.	Merritt	Tuttle
Cullop	Heald	Moore, Tex.	Vare
Curry	Henry, Conn.	Morgan, Okla.	Vreeland
Danforth	Higgins	Mott	Warburton
Davenport	Hill	Needham	Watkins
Davidson	Howland	O'Shaunessy	Wilder
De Forest	Hughes, Ga.	Palmer	Wilson, Ill.
Dickson, Miss.	Humphrey, Wash.	Parran	Wilson, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 279 gentlemen have responded to their names, a quorum.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] demanded a second.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on suspending the rules—

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I rise to be recognized to use the 20 minutes which is accorded under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the motion is to suspend the rules and disagree to the Senate amendment to the pension appropriation bill and ask for a conference. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I ask the Chair to kindly advise me when five minutes of my time has been used. Mr. Speaker, the proposition here involved is to suspend the ordinary rules under which this bill would be referred to the Committee on Pensions, there considered, again reported to the House, and there considered according to the rule. If this motion to suspend the rules be adopted that carries this bill to conference at once upon instructions of nonconcurrence. Six days and less remain before the Sixty-second Congress passes into history and the Sixty-third Congress will have begun. The Sixty-second Congress is a Congress with a Democratic House, a Republican President, and a Republican Senate. The Sixty-third Congress will have a Democratic House, a Democratic Senate, and a Democratic President. We have already, from a Democratic House, sent to a Republican Senate divers and sundry bills fastening charges of millions of dollars upon the American people. The Indian appropriation bill comes back from a repudiated Republican Senate with \$5,000,000 more added to it, and it is proposed to suspend the rules and pass the bill. The pension bill now comes back, the public buildings bill will come back, I apprehend, in a day or two with \$20,000,000 added by a repudiated Republican Senate for this House to pass under suspension of the rules. The river and harbor bill now pends in the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, returned from a repudiated Republican Senate with \$7,000,000 added for the people of this country to pay. To pass these bills now means coercion of a Democratic House by a Senate which the people have repudiated; we put it in their power to rob the people on their deathbed. I respect party leadership; I am devoted to the success of my party; but I say to you that when party leadership or that when party instrumentality departs from its honorable pledge to the country I will follow that leadership no longer, and I take my place by striving in a small minority to direct the feet of my party for the good of the country rather than follow the party leadership or party organization to a betrayal of a trusting people and a violation of my party's sacred promises to them. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Five minutes of the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that I shall proceed for five minutes more just here and ask to be notified. I read from the New York Herald of this morning:

AND \$180,000,000 FOR PENSIONS.

"She stirs, she moves, she seems to feel
The thrill of life along her keel."

Another Democratic battleship of the "pork" fleet was launched yesterday when the pension bill rushed from the ways in the Senate.

This fine new ship is \$180,000,000 in length, \$180,000,000 in breadth, and of \$180,000,000 draft. She is the finest craft that has yet been set afloat on the seas of Democratic economy. She will not be torpedoed by any enemy in the White House and will serve her country well.

The proportions of this great ship puts all vessels of her class in the background.

In 1900 the total for pensions was \$140,877,316; in 1905, the high-water mark of Republican extravagance, it reached \$161,710,367; and this year it is but \$153,590,456.

But \$180,000,000! Whew!

Gentlemen, I say to you that there is no party leader in the face of whose power, if it involves betrayal of my party or my country, to whom I will truckle here or anywhere. [Applause.] There is no party leader in the face of whose edict I will fawn or falter in living up to the pledges of my party or the obligations that an honorable man should hold sacred in public as well as private station. [Applause.] Free men have no fears. I know the penalty of the rebuke that will be inflicted. I will stand the fearful personal destruction that may be visited upon me by the dreadnought of masterful party leadership, supported by a masterful party majority. I am now ready to receive it. I thank God I never saw the day when power rested in one or power rested in many could cause me to falter or fear to perform my duty to my party or to my country as I saw it. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] has used eight minutes. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I have no war to make with my colleague and no criticism here upon the position which he takes that satisfies his own conscience or convictions of duty.

This is a simple matter, Mr. Speaker. The pension appropriation bill passed this House on the 14th day of this month. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations and chairman of the subcommittee, I was directed to report that bill to the House. It carries for the next fiscal year, after the estimates which have been submitted by the Pension Bureau had been reduced, \$180,000,000. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY], my colleague, is not more opposed to a wrong pension system than I am or always have been. I may not have been as loud and vociferous in my denunciation of what I consider to be wrong upon that subject as he has been. He is entitled to all the credit and reputation that he has made upon that subject. I do not propose to detract anything from him on that account. This is a simple proposition—whether the House by the objection of one man can be locked down the balance of this session and the first Democratic Congress that has assembled for the last 16 years shall pass into history with the distinction of not being able to pass the necessary supply bills to carry on the Government. That is the question which is presented to this Congress. As far as I am concerned, now and at all times I have taken responsibility in any shape that it has presented itself. I declare that that is my duty as a Member of this House. My duty as a member of the great party to which my colleague and I both now and have always belonged is to pursue every legitimate method, so that when in the ides of March we shall declare this Congress adjourned sine die we shall not find upon its records and journals these great supply bills undisposed of. Therefore I have made this motion as a duty to the House, as a duty to the country, and I have no apology to make for it.

The amendment is one which I do not think ought to be agreed to, and the usual course, when some objection is made, not for the purpose of preventing this amendment from being passed on by the House or adopted, is to ask for a conference; and I hope the House will aid me and the representatives of the Appropriations Committee in this particular instance to send this bill to conference that we may do that which is to be done in an orderly, decent way, and pass this great supply bill which the necessities of the Government under existing law has made necessary to be passed.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

The SPEAKER. How much time?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who voted with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] against the passage of the Sherwood pension bill, and I come from a district which is full of old Union soldiers, which

is not the case with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERY]. And, although I come from a district which is filled with old soldiers, I should not vote for the Sherwood bill if it were before the House to-day. But this is not a question of an extension of our pension laws. The question before us is whether a majority of this House is going to show itself incapable of passing an appropriation providing for the payment of soldiers' pensions, whether the appropriation relates to the pensions ordained by the Sherwood bill or the pensions ordained by former pension bills. Even if the pending bill only affected the appropriation to pay the pensions ordained by the bill against which I voted, nevertheless I should now vote to send this bill to conference. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it may not have been wise to pass the Sherwood bill. Nevertheless the veterans became entitled to those increased pensions the moment that Congress passed the law granting them. The issue had been settled and it at once passed beyond the field of discussion. Since that day many an old soldier has ceased work in his old age. Others have readjusted their living expenses, perhaps they have even readjusted their whole lives, expecting that this Nation is going to pay them what it has voted to pay.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The amendment the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERY] is, supposedly by his motion, not in favor of, is an amendment to pay out money to somebody else, and not to a soldier.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. That is true. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have merely said these words in order to aid if I can in carrying the motion to send this bill to conference. I felt that I could properly advocate this step in view of the fact that I voted against the passage of the Sherwood pension bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Mr. Speaker, I accord to my friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] and to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] absolute candor, and I have no criticism for them. And to the membership of this House it is my pleasure to concede in the highest sense the belief that they are acting in obedience to their conception of public duty. But a day or so ago, when I undertook to state my views in respect to adopting special rules, there was an impatience of speech on the part of the floor leader of this House, as if to sweep me aside with one stroke, when I had no opportunity to reply. Accordingly, I arose a moment ago to put him on notice, face to face, that I fear not to antagonize him, nor will I hesitate to maintain here, as everywhere, not only my self-respect but my rights on the floor of this House. [Applause.]

I shall stand here unawed and undeterred by any living man, with the flag of my party in one hand and my party platform in the other, and battle for both, that the Democratic Party may serve the country and not betray either the people or our solemn compact with them.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, for several days I have been amused at the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the minority leader, who has chuckled to himself and congratulated the Republican Party that this side of the House is becoming extravagant, although "a small minority" of us, as he dubbed us, were economists. The gentleman need take no consolation from that state of affairs. If this country is looking two years from now for a party that is extravagant, it will have no occasion to turn us out of office, and if it is looking for economists, Mr. Speaker, it will always have more sense than to return the Republican Party to power. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This pension measure, as I understand it, carries about \$185,000,000, to which should be added the \$15,000,000 carried in the deficiency appropriation bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] on yesterday informed us that tax payments were not paid by the country at large, but were principally paid by the citizens of Philadelphia. [Laughter.] Aside from being amused at the novelty of it, I was carried back to the dusty times of Rip Van Winkle, and I could see old Rip rising up, with his rusty musket falling to pieces under the decaying hand of time; and when the gentleman got through with his speech about Philadelphia, its wonderful population, its tremendous extent, and the fact that it was paying practically all the expenses of the Government, and told us with what deviltry the balance of the country was behaving itself, I felt like asking him, in all meekness, whether Philadelphia would permit the balance of the Union to depart in peace. [Laughter.]

This thought I want to give to my colleagues in all seriousness, and I do not lay to myself any especial wisdom. I do

not in sincerity believe that my wisdom averages with the wisdom of the Members of this House, but let me say this to you, my Democratic friends, and to those on the other side of the House: The whole country has run mad with extravagance. Republicans are as extravagant as Democrats, and the fact of it is that it is at home accounted bad statesmanship to cheesepare, as they say, and that gives you license to practice extravagance here.

The \$200,000,000 for pensions, the \$50,000,000 for public buildings, the \$1,200,000,000 that will be appropriated by this Congress, comes, mind you, from the blankets that wrap the shivering limbs of the people; it comes from the food they eat and the clothes they wear, not in proportion to the wealth they own but in proportion to consumption.

The States have given Congress the right to levy and collect an income tax. I want you to gather this: Since the day that Grover Cleveland said we had a balance on our hands to dispose of, the wealthy men of this Nation, the Republican Party of this country, have been devising ways to spend more money in order to bolster up the protective system. Look out for this income tax. It will not be 10 years until the very men who are standing here laughing at economy will be praying for the mountains to fall on them.

I will tell you why. If you ever saw anything expand and grow in this country and wax, like a giant, fat in a few years, it is going to be the uses to which the people of this country will put the income tax. The protective system, with which you wring these millions from the people of this country, is to-day trembling in the balance, and instead of despising honest efforts on the part of honest Democrats to carry out their platform pledges and economize in the expenditure of the public money, you had better get busy and help us in defense of your protective system. For if the people of this country despair of Congress collecting this tax and spending this money fairly and economically, they will tax the incomes of the rich men of this country and make them pay for all this folly. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DIES. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would the gentleman advocate in the forthcoming tariff bill the destruction of the protective system and the complete substitution of an income tax as a means of raising revenue for the Government?

Mr. DIES. Oh, no. The Democratic Party is going to reduce the tariff gradually. [Laughter on the Republican side.] We understand that this puissant city from which the gentleman comes, with all of its boasted strength and grandeur, could not stand on its own legs without the protective tariff prop, and we are not going to let the infant die for want of pap.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman will leave just a little protection in the forthcoming tariff bills, will he not?

Mr. DIES. I do not suppose your great city of Philadelphia needs it, but I dare say when we get enough money to run this Government there will incidentally follow enough protection for every legitimate industry of this country. But gentlemen who represent infant industries, instead of encouraging all manner of extravagance in this country, had better help us practice economy, else the income tax will come and the graduated inheritance tax will come, and you will not have this twelve hundred million dollars to bolster up the protective system.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] thinks there is cause for congratulation in the fact that all Democrats are not in unity upon these appropriation bills. The Republican Party has been so accustomed to having every member jump over the bars like sheep and all of them answer to their names in monotonous, dull, menageric animal fashion, that when they see three or four Democrats of independent minds who beg to differ with their fellows they think the Democratic Party is going to the bow-wows. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, just a word. I did not conceive that a motion of this sort would cause a debate and a discussion upon a subject so foreign to the question before the House. I have nothing to say now with reference to the matter of extravagance or economy so far as the question now before the House is concerned. The record that I have made in 18 years, in the votes that I have cast, and the suggestions I have made in debate is an ample answer to any insinuation from any side that I have been engaged or am now engaged in any effort to be extravagant or to vote for extravagant appropriations. [Applause.] The gentlemen who oppose this motion now may be found in the record to have voted for measures like the public roads bill and big public building bills, carrying millions of dollars, when such measures were popular at home; then they had no conception of economy when those measures were under

consideration. [Applause.] On past occasions, when some of my constituency and many in other parts of my State have urged me to vote for measures that would place upon the people of this Government immense burdens, I have taken my political life in my hands and have resisted their importunities and voted against those measures, because I could not approve them; and if gentlemen think that their insinuations of extravagance will injure me they are mistaken, for the record I have made here in this House is an ample armament against such attacks, and their arrows will fall harmless and be in vain.

Mr. Speaker, I did not vote for the pension bill passed at last session, which increased the amount of the annual expenditures for pensions \$30,000,000 and caused a deficiency of \$15,000,000 for this year. I have said heretofore what I desired to say upon that subject. My people understand my position, the House understands it, and the country understands it. It is not necessary for me to reiterate every day and upon every bill that comes before the House what my position is upon this subject.

It has been the same since I entered this House that it is to-day. I do not agree with the policy of the pension system that this bill has to provide for, but I must submit to the will of the majority of Congress—the will of the majority of my own Democratic colleagues—and I will not engage in the useless performance of gnawing a file simply in order to have headlines in the first column of the first page of the daily newspapers stating what my position is upon this subject. I have served in this House 18 years, and I have never sought to add to or make my reputation by what was published in the headlines in the first column of the first page.

Mr. Speaker, I call for a vote and ask that this motion prevail. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules, take from the Speaker's table the pension appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds voting in the affirmative) the rules were suspended, the bill taken from the Speaker's table, the Senate amendments disagreed to, and a conference asked with the Senate; and the Speaker announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BORLAND, and Mr. GOOD.

THE LATE SENATOR MONEY.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend remarks in the RECORD by publishing a sermon delivered by Dr. Leavell, in Carrollton, Miss., at the funeral of the late Senator Money.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 28812, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

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 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 greatest desirable radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$7,425,000 each.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a request that we agree upon a time for debate on the increase of the Navy. I desire to ask if it would be agreeable to have two hours of debate.

Mr. FOSS. How would the gentleman suggest that the time be controlled?

Mr. PADGETT. That it be divided equally between those in favor of the increase and those opposed to the increase. As the gentleman from Illinois represents the two-ship proposition and personally I stand for one, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG], I think, stands for none, I suggest that it be divided into three parts, each one to control 40 minutes.

Mr. MANN. What does the gentleman propose to cover by his proposition—to cut off all debate on the 10 items?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it is in the nature of general debate.

Mr. FOSS. This debate, as I understand it, will be on the first paragraph.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I understand that two hours will be for general debate, and then if amendments are offered there would be the five-minute debate.

Mr. MANN. I do not see that it is possible to have two hours debate before you read the 10 items in the bill. It seems to me that those two hours would be wasted to begin with.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the whole proposition of the increase of the Navy is included in these 10 paragraphs. It is open to discussion on the same general principle, and of course any amendments during this time will be pending. It may be more agreeable to the gentleman in charge of the bill to arrange the time so that there may be more latitude than under the five-minute debate, but it is clear that we have had ample general debate on the bill before we started in. The five-minute debate can not be limited in this way. It seems to me that it ought to proceed along the regular order, and if agreement can be made whereby gentlemen will have more latitude to make speeches than they would otherwise, I would like to see the gentleman's suggestion agreed to, and the gentleman from Tennessee on the one side and the gentleman from Illinois on the other side control the time.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Is the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama to limit the discussion on these 10 items to two hours and have no five-minute debate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would suggest that we read through the 10 paragraphs, allow amendments to be offered without debate, and when you have read the paragraphs covering the increase of the Navy, then allow the two hours general debate to go on and let the gentleman from Tennessee distribute the time to those opposed to the increase, and the gentleman from Illinois distribute the time to those in favor of the increase.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Alabama will yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. There is a proposition in reference to the battleships, there is a proposition in relation to torpedo boats and torpedo destroyers, all of which I judge are contested. To have two hours' general debate on the battleship proposition would, it seems to me, be useless.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I suppose on the increase or decrease of the Navy there is not a man on this floor that has not made up his mind how he is going to vote.

Mr. MANN. I have not made up my mind how I will vote on the torpedo boats and the destroyers.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The regular order would be to take this up under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas demands the regular order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall object to anyone doling out time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 54, line 21, by striking out the word "two" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "four."

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I have come to the conclusion that a committee of the House and each Member of the House, on this question at least, and not infrequently in general, ought to lay before the House its and his conclusion as to what is wise for the Government. Heretofore the Committee on Naval Affairs has been recommending substantially what it thought we could get through, not what was the consensus of conviction of the committee that we ought to have. I am convinced that that practice has had a bad effect in having Congress believe that a two-battleship program is a large program. Two battleships a year will not make up for depreciation, which at 10 per cent per year would be more than the tonnage of two *Dreadnoughts*. I want to ask the gentlemen who differ with me as to the number of battleships, or the number of craft, to be kind enough, for the edification of myself, as well as the edification of the other Members, to give us a statement of the grounds upon which they make their recommendations. I venture this broad proposition, that those who are opposing the proper development and increase of the Navy have, as their basis of recommendation, substantially an adjustment of expenditures with rivers and harbors, public buildings, pensions, and similar matters with the idea of simply coming to a compromise.

I want to submit the proposition that the great question of national defense is commensurate with the whole question of the Nation's internal affairs; indeed, that it should take precedence over all internal matters; that you can not carry forward in a systematic, orderly way your internal affairs for any length of time unless you have made wise and adequate provision for protection from without. The proposition I am going to lay down is based upon that general plan.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. In just a moment. I assume that those who are opposed to my amendment do not maintain that their country's defense can be provided by recourse to any international organization—that is, to any international parliament, or any international judicial system, or to any international

executive who may have power to enforce our rights or protect us in our liberties and our vital interests when they are endangered from without. I assume that no Member will maintain that we can let our national defense rest upon arbitration, since arbitration treaties specifically exclude from the domain of arbitration questions of vital interest and national honor, the questions over which nations fight; nor do I believe that any Member of this House will seriously maintain that America ought to allow its national defense to rest simply upon the balance of power of other nations, a plan that Turkey and China and other nations have followed to their great undoing. Therefore I believe we can all start with this proposition: America must provide herself for her own defense. The agencies available are the Army and the Navy. There is no other means. If you have water surrounding your shores, you can utilize naval power more and military power less. The advantage fundamentally in naval power is that it employs ships, or property, and does not involve military activities of the people. It is estimated that one battleship with 1,000 men is equivalent to an army corps of 50,000 men. Military activity amongst the masses of the people of any nation is undesirable. It takes men away from productive pursuits, interfering with the best economic development. The military conditions undermine the democratic relations that ought to prevail between the country's citizens for the best development of free institutions. America is so fortunately located that we can by utilizing property and not men provide an absolute security, a perfect security, on the sea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a brief time.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I must object to all extensions at this time. I move that all debate upon this amendment do now close. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that all debate upon the amendment now close.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the word "four," at the end thereof, and substituting therefor the word "one."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I take it that this is open to debate. Having closed debate on the Hobson amendment, is debate closed on the amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman who proposed the amendment is entitled to the floor, if he wants it.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to consume the time of the House in the discussion of the one-battleship amendment which I offer. We have had discussion now for several days on this appropriation bill, and my position is well known to the membership. The expense of this bill, as everyone knows, at the present time is \$127,000,000, without considering battleships. Last year we appropriated for one battleship. This bill carries the second-year appropriation for the construction of that battleship. About one-half of the amount necessary to construct a battleship is carried in the bill the year of the authorization, and the succeeding appropriation carries the balance necessary to complete the ship. Mr. Chairman, if it increases this appropriation from \$123,000,000, with one battleship in 1912, to \$150,000,000 the present year, carrying only one-half the necessary amount to build two battleships, and providing for the first year's appropriation, and the next year to provide for the other half to complete these two, where will the appropriation stop next year. Suppose you vote two this year and next year two, then you have the one-half carried over for next year's appropriation and the first year's appropriation on the next bill. Mr. Chairman, we should consider next year's appropriation when we authorize battleships. If we show no better economy in building two battleships and keeping up the expenses of the Navy than we have in building one, the present year, I hesitate to forecast what amount the bill for the year 1914 will carry. I have stubbornly contended for economy in the operating expense of the Navy. In view of the truth that this bill carries \$127,000,000 expense and will not be reduced, I appeal to the Members of this House to support this one-battleship amendment; for, sir, if we can not build battleships any cheaper than we are now constructing them, one is all we can afford to authorize in this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask now if we can not reach an agreement for debate. I would like to see if we can not reach an agreement for closing debate upon this amendment?

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me? Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, in my judgment, if we were to talk here until the hot place that we have heard of so often is frozen over we would not change a single vote on this battleship proposition. Every man in the House knows right now whether or not he is going to vote for four, three, two, one, or no battleship, and therefore I want to serve notice on the House now that it can not afford to consume a single extra moment of its valuable time in the closing hours of this session in the further discussion of this threadbare question. I object to the consideration of extra time for debate.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOBSON. Is a substitute for an amendment to the amendment in order? I desire to offer now a substitute for the amendment as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the amendment to the amendment the following: "On page 54, line 21, strike out the word 'two' and insert the word 'three.'"

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, as I was stating when my remarks were cut short, we are in a unique position—

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I desire to know if the gentleman who has offered an amendment can now offer a substitute?

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be interrupted. I was saying that if we desire we can safeguard our country against any enemies by simply utilizing ships that will stand between our shores and the great standing armies of the world. Now, if we have undisputed control of the sea, we need not have a great standing army, and yet no military nation on the earth could utilize her standing army in a war with us. Therefore, we would have our best guaranty of peace. Furthermore, if we have control of the sea and for any reason war does come, then we have an opportunity to end the war quickly, by a test of naval power, and we would never be compelled to call out a great standing army and have a long expensive war of endurance that would tend to bring militarism upon us. Therefore, resolved to its conclusion, it is a wise policy for this Nation to at least in the very minimum have an equilibrium on the Atlantic with any nation in Europe that maintains permanently a great standing army, and to have on the Pacific a fleet at least equal to that of any nation of Asia that keeps permanently a great standing army. And I want to say with regard to the reference of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE]—I will stake my professional reputation on this proposition—that if we properly reorganize the Navy from top to bottom we can maintain a navy equal to the navy of Germany; we can maintain a navy that would embrace three battleships and four battleships a year, and, in proportion, auxiliaries; we can maintain a navy half as strong again as the present Navy that would be fully half again as efficient as the present Navy on the present cost. I would undertake, if given a free hand, to have such a navy to never exceed in cost \$150,000,000 a year and include a naval program as large as called for in my amendment.

But it is not such a question. We must have the ships if we are to have security. It is far from me to undertake to point out that any nation would likely enter into war with us, but it is a fact that the completion of the Panama Canal and the development of this hemisphere is going to be a practical question for all the nations of the world.

We have laid down a proposition that the colonial system adopted by the old world shall not be applied in this hemisphere. That proposition will be accepted by the world, and the world's peace will be secure if we have an approximation toward control of the sea in the Atlantic; and if we do not have the control of the sea, if we fall below equilibrium of naval strength with continental nations of Europe, then the colonial systems of Europe will be applied to this hemisphere, and that would entail a long, costly, and bloody war that would tend to make us military. And I lay down the further proposition that, occupying Pearl Harbor, the most strategic point in the world, occupying Panama, the next most strategic point in the world, both over seas from us, occupying the Philippines, that we must protect whether we set them free or not, having Alaska, a great treasure house, that in the Pacific Ocean, where two great races are meeting, where a centralized expanding monarchy is coming in contact with a decentralized Republic, we can only hope to solve the problems there and maintain our national defense with an equilibrium of power on that ocean. Such an equilibrium would tend to make the open-door policy effective and give us peace at home and contribute greatly to the peace of the world. This means a fleet in the

Pacific parallel with that of Japan. The two oceans being so far away we must have equilibrium in both at the same time.

Now, then, I wish to call the attention of the Members to the report of the Bureau of Naval Intelligence, which I have printed in my speech of last Saturday, which appeared in yesterday's Record, showing what will be the standing of the naval powers in the years to come, provided that America has only two battleships. We go to the fourth place by 1916. My amendment would not be more than necessary to keep us in third position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] has expired.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, in the five minutes allotted me I desire to announce my advocacy of the one-battleship program. I believe it is absolutely true that no man can give a better reason for two, three, or four battleships than he can for no battleships. The trouble with the whole proposition is that there has not been given a good reason for a large extension or a small extension or no extension at all of our battleship program. Now, that is the condition of mind of the Members of this House to-day, I believe, succinctly stated.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. BATHRICK. In just a second.

There is only one reason that should appeal to the sensible mind, that stands between the large-battleship program and the no-battleship program, and that is the one thing that appeals to the mind of every man in his private business and should affect him in the consideration of public business, namely, caution. We employ caution in our private business. We buy locks for the doors of our houses. We pay sums far in excess of the cost of battleships with which to supply policemen and constables and sheriffs and justices of the peace and judges in our country and in our city governments. Why do we do that? We do it for protection, for caution. And if we are to throw aside all caution in the matter of protection for our national interests and protection of our shores with battleships we might just as reasonably assume that we do not need the services of policemen for patrolling our streets. It is true that when we retire at night and lock the door we do it merely from a sense of caution—because there have been burglars. No man can say that there will be burglars, which failure of human prophecy would be as good a reason not to lock the door as it is not to maintain a navy. No man can say there will be war; but we know there have been wars, and we know there may be in the future, and therefore we should, in the exercise of our duty as representatives of the people, use ordinary caution in consideration of this matter.

A great deal has been said about the enormous cost to the people. We have considered this bill item by item, and we have stricken out, in my opinion, some things that were needed for the ordinary efficiency of the Navy, to keep just what we have and not expend another cent to get more. I do not want to be too cheap, and yet, at the same time, I would like to have the people of my district believe and the people of the country believe that I belong to the ranks of the real, true, genuine economists. But I do not believe it is economy to close the doors, pull down the shutters, and go out of business. It is not economy for us to do less than ought to be done. It is economy for us to do what ought to be done, and no more, and do it for less than any other party that has been in power if we can. In the construction of the one-battleship program, who pays? Why, the people of this country are buying of tobacco, beer, cigars, whisky, and other things that are strictly luxuries or ardent follies, over \$30 per capita per year. They are paying internal revenue of about \$3.50 per capita per year. What are you going to say when you go back home and tell your constituents that you refused to supply a battleship that cost each of them 7 cents this year? What are you going to say to the man who spends \$20 for whisky, beer, and tobacco when he asks you why you refused to spend the few cents that might prevent his sons being drafted to go forth and risk their lives to repel invaders?

When 1,000 men on a good battleship represent the force of 50,000 on land and might keep an enemy from our shores, what will you say to the mother whose son may be called upon to give his life because of an irrational and cheap economy?

Government costs money. While you know I have fought to keep down this bill and am against a large extension program, I will not object to expenditures that seem demanded by ordinary business judgment.

Why, you can not go home and tell your people that they should not expend a reasonable sum per year for the exercise of caution and the protection of their country and to keep the old flag flying where hundreds of thousands of lives were freely given to plant it. You can not make them think that.

But what about our people who do not use these luxuries? They are not really ground down to the earth by reason of over-taxation for internal revenue, because they do not use the things that pay internal revenue. When you come to find out who pays

these taxes you find that the man who is poor very often pays much of it because of his extravagant habits. We will arrange it in the next Congress by the income tax and reduction of the tariff so that his other taxes will be lighter and he will pay much less on his necessities.

Mr. Speaker, I am for caution, for one battleship. I would rather 1,000 men risk their lives at sea, if necessary, than 50,000 on shore.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, throughout the pendency of this bill I have tried to be consistent. I have endeavored not to raise a point of order excepting in such cases where I was absolutely certain that it was in the interest of the people and that the point was well taken. I believe that we, as Members of this great body, should act carefully, deliberately as well as patriotically, exercising every bit of wisdom that we can bring to bear upon all propositions, and I want to say here and now—and I would like to have the attention of the House while I say it—that I do not believe, under the present situation of things, as things now exist, that there is a set of business men anywhere that would stand for two battleships much less for three or four, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] suggests. Then why should we not deal as carefully, as judiciously with the money of the people as we would with our own private funds?

I stand for an adequate Navy. I would not be worthy the confidence of anybody if I did not stand for a Navy that is sufficient to meet all the needs of this great Government of ours. But I insist here and now that we do not at this time need two additional battleships in order to make the Navy adequate and sufficient.

But the gentleman from Alabama declares that we ought to be able to show why we do not need them. I have heard this fallacious argument made several times in connection with this debate. My God, my friends, has it come to that, that we are thrown on the defensive, have to assert and make proof as to why we do not need the many things enumerated in this bill, aggregating millions of money, instead of the other fellows, the proponents, showing why we do need them? I insist that when you ask for an appropriation, when you ask us to go into the Treasury and take the people's money, you should be required to assign some just and valid reason for so doing, instead of trying to throw the burden on those who insist it ought not to be done. [Applause.]

Now, then, I know that I ought not to presume to discuss this question with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], because I am in the category with my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON]. Perhaps, in the judgment of the gentleman from Alabama, I have not sprouted my pin feathers.

But I want to say here and now that if constancy and devotion to every public duty is calculated to sprout pin feathers, I am constrained to believe that even though my friend from Mississippi is serving his first term he has had greater opportunity to develop his pin feathers than has the gentleman from Alabama, although the gentleman from Alabama has been on the pay roll for six years, because I see him on the floor of this House only when the things in which he is particularly interested are up for consideration. [Applause.]

Now, he says that we need these battleships which are increasing the amount of our appropriations by leaps and bounds and yet he tells us that as soon as we adopt his plan of council of national defense all will be well. Now, I want to call your attention to something else. There is a magazine which circulates throughout this country called, I believe, the Navy, or the Navy League. It is a monthly periodical. I want to call your attention to whom the officers of this magazine were in 1912—the officers of the Navy League of the United States. We find that the president of the league is Gen. Horace Porter; the treasurer of this league is J. P. Morgan, jr., 26 Wall Street, New York City; the counsel is Herbert L. Satterlee, who I am informed is a son-in-law of J. Pierpont Morgan, sr. This morning you no doubt all received a circular letter from this league, indorsing the plan of the gentleman from Alabama for a council of national defense.

That is the proposition. [Applause.] They not only set out the platform adopted by the Democratic national convention at Baltimore and what it says on that subject, but they cite the planks contained in all the party platforms and urge that Democrats as well as Republicans live up to these platform pledges. I desire to remind these gentlemen that these statements contained in the party platforms do not mean any particular plan of national defense. It does not require any great amount of wisdom to understand and appreciate just why the Morgans and their crowd favor a big navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSLEY. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOBSON. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman if he intends to insert in the RECORD any further matter of a personal nature? I have no objection to what he said on the floor.

Mr. HENSLEY. I will not pursue the course that was pursued by the gentleman in the last session, of inserting in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, words that I did not use on the floor. No; I shall not.

Mr. HOBSON. Then I do not object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. What last two words can be stricken out? There is an amendment pending which consists of only one word. Now, can you not reach an agreement as to how long debate shall run on the paragraph?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I think that is exceedingly desirable. The question of one or more battleships is now before the committee. So far as I am concerned, I am entirely disposed to agree upon a moderate time for debate, and have the precise hour set at which we shall vote. This has been my attitude all the time.

Mr. PADGETT. I renew my request.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I desire to state that this subject of battleships that Members are now discussing has been discussed in the committee room, upon the floor of this House, in the cloakroom, in restaurants, in the hotels and cafés of this city, upon the streets, and, in my judgment, everywhere else except on the housetops and in the gutters; and the only reason the question has not been discussed on the housetops and in the gutters is because none of our membership have risen as high as the housetops or fallen as low as the gutters. For that reason, and knowing how valuable time is in this House in the closing hours of the session, I say most emphatically that all the powers within the House can not get me to yield my position or my rights under the five-minute rule that the committee is operating under at this time.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. EDWARDS. I demand the regular order.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I should like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas if he has not changed his position in reference to battleships?

Mr. MACON. No, sir.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have before me a speech which the gentleman made two years ago.

Mr. MACON. I have not changed my position upon the question during this Congress.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman confines his answer to the life of the present Congress.

Mr. MACON. Yes. That is the Congress that is legislating upon the subject, is it not?

Mr. SAUNDERS. If the gentleman from Arkansas can change his mind with respect to this matter, other gentlemen upon a proper presentation of the case on its merits may be induced to do the same. Formerly the gentleman favored one ship, now he favors two. Possibly at the conclusion of reasonable debate Members now favoring two ships may be satisfied that after all we do not need more than one battleship a year at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that all debate on this amendment has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this amendment has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I make the point of order that all debate on this amendment has closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for one minute. I wish to submit a request for unanimous consent, and I hope that my friend and colleague on the committee will consent to it, that we limit the debate on this paragraph and all amendments to one hour.

Mr. MACON. With the greatest possible deference to the gentleman from Tennessee, I want to submit this question to him: Does he believe that an hour's debate will change any vote in the House on this question?

Mr. PADGETT. There is more in a debate than changing votes in the House. We have a right to let the discussion go to the country.

Mr. MACON. I realize that there is more in debate than the simple proposition of changing votes. Some Members want to talk to the galleries and some of them want to talk to their constituents at home through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think we ought to take a vote here on the question before the House without regard to the galleries and without regard to the messages that we want to send home to our

constituents. I therefore object to the extension of time for debate.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURRAY. Failing the unanimous-consent agreement that the gentleman from Tennessee suggests, is it not in order to move to close debate on the paragraph and all amendments in one hour?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, in the confusion I did not catch the reply of the Chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Chair to state the question before the vote takes place.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to hear what is going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no doubt that all members of the committee are anxious to get along with the consideration of this bill. The Chair asks their cooperation, and gentlemen can not give it in any better way than by refraining from conversation and keeping their seats. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, have I the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the floor.

Mr. EDWARDS. The amendment has not been read, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SAUNDERS. My amendment was to strike out the last two words of the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. There is but one word in the substitute.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I came in just a moment ago, and do not know the exact parliamentary status. I desire to amend the substitute, and would like to have it reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

As a substitute for the amendment to the amendment insert the word "three" in lieu of the word "four."

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to amend the substitute. I am compelled to take this course, Mr. Chairman, by reason of the tactics that have been pursued in order to hinder me from addressing the House at this time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. How many substitutes and amendments to substitutes can be pending at the same time?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment, an amendment to the amendment, and a substitute for the amendment to the amendment. The amendment moved by the gentleman from Virginia is the text of the bill now.

Mr. MADDEN. I make a point of order that it is not in order.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Mr. Chairman, would it not be in order for the gentleman from Virginia to move to amend by making it "no battleships"?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I move an amendment to the substitute, as follows: I move to strike out the word "three" and insert the word "no." Mr. Chairman, this bill, and more particularly the battleship feature thereof, has been discussed from the practical standpoint, from the patriotic standpoint, from the business standpoint, and in largest measure from the sensational standpoint.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The amendment has not been reported from the desk.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is true, but I have stated what it is.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. But I do not know what it is, and I have a right to know.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course if the gentleman insists, he can have the amendment reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the substitute by inserting in place of the word "three" the word "no."

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, it is chiefly from the sensation mongers that the cry comes for additional battleships. I was astonished when I came into the House to-day to find the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] vehemently insisting upon an immediate vote. He was unwilling to wait a minute. He asserts that the mind of no one Member will be, or can be changed by debate. I know of no better illustration of change than the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MACON. I do not think the gentleman wants to misrepresent me. I said the minds of Members could not be changed by argument on the floor now.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Why does the gentleman confine his statement to this particular time? A few years ago there was no more vehement opponent of two battleships than the gentleman from Arkansas. He has afforded no reason for this change of front. In his speech against two battleships during the session

of 1908 he averred that the demand for two battleships proceeded from jingoism pure and simple, and that he was not to be driven from voting for one ship by the suggested danger of impending war.

Mr. MACON. Has the gentleman heard me say that I was in favor of two battleships?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, but I understand that is the gentleman's attitude.

Mr. MACON. Then why discuss me or my position on the subject?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Because I understand that is the gentleman's attitude. As I say, when our friend from Arkansas is so clamorously anxious to prevent any fair discussion of the battleship feature of this bill, my mind reverts at once to his attitude of a session or two ago. He was an economist, and little-navy man at that time, and I was in full accord with him. I thought he was right then, and I know that I am right now. In view of that attitude, and of his change of mind, it is hard to understand his present stand, or to see why he insists upon shutting off the light of full and free discussion. If the two-battleship proposition stands on the solid ground of reason, if it is buttressed by weighty argument, why fear attack, why avoid the challenge to high debate?

The gentlemen who place their votes for two battleships on the grounds of patriotic necessity, and vital self-defense, apparently lack the courage of their convictions. We are told that the Members of this House who are mere Congressmen, and not authorities on naval construction, should hearken to the voice of the experts, and from that illuminating source, ascertain our patriotic duty, and secure the definition of a proper and adequate Navy. Having hearkened, presumably we ought to heed. The one expert on this floor, the one man who speaks with the voice of authority, is the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]. When he is asked for a definition of an adequate Navy, for an exposition of a proper building program for the United States, he tells us that it should be not less than six battleships a year. He tells us further that each battleship should be accompanied with four destroyers, so that a program of six battleships a year carries with it a necessary sequel of 24 destroyers—that is, the entire program means the annual construction of 30 ships. If this be true, if the dangers that he parades before our excited imaginations, are real, and not the airy fabric of a dream, then two battleships a year as reported in the naval bill, is not an adequate Navy. It is a pitiful, wretched, inadequate Navy, far short of the necessities of the situation, and inviting, rather than capable of repelling attack. Surely these gentlemen who have worked themselves into so fine a frenzy over impending dangers that in their view threaten the very life of our Republic, are woefully lacking in patriotism, if they are content to vote for two ships a year, when the voice of the expert, and proper regard for the protection of our homes and firesides, alike tell them that they should insist upon six! Six battleships then, and not two should be the patriotic program. Go forward gentlemen, valiant aggregation that you are of jingoes and Don Quixotes, and attack the windmills of your fevered imaginations, we at least are content with a Navy that is sufficient for the purposes of defense, and not large enough to tempt this country to commit lawless aggression.

Mr. Chairman, I can not afford an adequate discussion of so large a subject in a few minutes, but I desire to call the attention of the House to one or two fallacies that have been injected into this debate by the advocates of the jingo policy. One is the assertion that this country speaks with more authority in the world of to-day, than heretofore. I deny this. Another fallacy is that the Monroe doctrine requires a great Navy for its maintenance. I deny this too. When did the United States speak with greater authority than in the establishment of that doctrine? And yet at that time we lacked both a Navy and an Army sufficient to make our position effective in the Western Hemisphere, if our assertion had been challenged by the Holy Alliance which then dominated Europe. Where were your battleships, where was your naval or military strength adequate to maintain the principle which we so firmly announced in the natal days of our Republic? Where was the brute and compelling force sufficient to meet and crush the forces of united opposition if our challenge had been accepted? The gentleman from Alabama has been born out of season. The lesson which he now urges us to accept should have been pressed upon Monroe and his Cabinet. But somehow, and in some fashion, without an armed establishment the Government of that day carried its point, and both announced, and maintained a doctrine, that was almost insulting in its challenge to the powers of the world.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of a great navy, but of a greater navy. This country has a great Navy, a far greater

Navy than the man in the street is aware of, when he listens to the ranters who would have him believe that sane and moderate men are unwise and unpatriotic, merely because they are unwilling to waste the substance of the country in a wild riot of naval construction. In this connection it is not amiss to say that the enlisted men and officers in our Navy number 85,614. Our fighting ships of all sorts, number 277. Comprised in this mighty aggregate, which a few months ago was pronounced magnificent by President Taft, are 11 armored cruisers, 28 torpedo boats, 38 battleships, 33 of which are ready for action, 63 submarines, 47 of which are complete and in service, and other auxiliaries. The guns large, and small on these vessels, may almost be said to be numberless. Compared with the guns of every other nation in the world, save England, and the jingoes always exclude England from their calculations, the guns on our ships in weight, and carrying power are distinctly superior to all others. Comparing the gun power of our Navy with that of Japan, I mean particularly in respect of the 12, 13, and 14 inch guns, the preponderance is largely in our favor. Comparing our gun power with the naval gun power of France, or Germany, the difference is strikingly in our favor, though not so great as in the case of Japan. And yet in the fevered imaginations of some well-meaning, if hysterical people, we are in imminent danger all the while from nations on the other side of the world, nations that would be compelled to cross the heaving oceans that separate us, and without naval bases, or coaling stations, challenge us to protracted war in our domestic waters. Does it never occur to these people that if Germany has to build ships for home defense she can not afford to risk them in a war with this country, and incur the dangers of torpedoes, mines, and submarines, not to speak of our fighting ships, in an effort to blockade our coasts? War to-day to a greater extent than ever before in the history of the world, is a matter of matching purses. What nation, or combination of nations can match purses with this country? The bank assets of the United States are \$17,000,000,000. The bank assets of the rest of the world, roughly speaking amount to no more than this sum. A combination of nations might for the time being drive us from the high seas, and cause us to withdraw within our coast lines. Such a combination might for the time being capture our outlying possessions, but these are not vital to our stability, greatness, or capacity to make war, or to sustain ourselves. Nor would the capture of these possessions add anything in a material way to the power of the captors. Destroy, or materially interrupt the trading power of this country, and such an interruption would be the most dreadful blow that could be struck to Germany, Great Britain, or Japan. Persistence in hostile relations with this country, coupled as it would be with the inability to strike us at any vital point, would bring these countries to the verge of bankruptcy within a comparatively short period. So great would be the disorder in the world's affairs ensuing upon such a conflict, that the nations engaged in its conduct would be unable to finance their operations for a limited period, much less to the extent necessary to bring this country to terms.

The foreign countries know these things as well as we know them ourselves, and we must credit them with a little common sense. They may not be afraid to fight, but the matter in issue must be worth the struggle. Conceivably in the view of the men who play the war games, landing parties from other countries might descend upon our coasts, but there is always the question of return to be considered. War must be waged under modern conditions. Cities are no longer sacked, and countries invaded for booty and slaves. The age of the viking, of the pirate, of the robber nations, has passed. In the destruction of the material resources, and of the purchasing power of another nation, the country that accomplishes such a result, aims a blow at herself. Hence even in the contingencies of war, our coast cities would not be destroyed, nor private property given over to fire and sword. To hold any portion of continental United States is beyond the power of any combination of nations on the globe. Great Britain retired baffled from the War of 1775. At that time she was the giant, and we the pigmy. Now we are the giant, and any nation, or aggregation of nations invading this country would be the pigmy. This is not the language of boasting, but mindful of our population, of our resources, of our present wealth, of the virility of our people, and the intensity of our patriotism, it is the language of sober common sense.

But if our Navy is mighty and awe compelling from the standpoint of ships and gun power, it is even more impressive from the viewpoint of expenditure. Few people who prate lightly of the need of a greater navy, are aware of the vast sums that we are spending, and have spent within the last decade upon our naval establishment, sums out of all proportion to the necessities of the situation, and imperatively needed in other directions of useful expenditure. The inspiration of

much of the clamor for a greater Navy comes from interested quarters, from the concerns that find profits in the work of construction, and in the contracts for material. It is not patriotism, but the dollar, that maintains a large proportion of the naval propaganda. Like the daughters of the horse leech these people are never satisfied. But it is well for the men who pay the piper, to count the cost of our participation in this vicious circle of never-ending, always-increasing expenditure which inevitably attaches to a policy which makes the program of other nations collectively, and individually, the measure of our own.

Within the past 10 years we have spent on our naval program \$452,666,114 more than France has spent. We have spent \$410,455,321 more than Germany has spent. We have spent a billion dollars more than Japan has spent. The greatest expenditure that Germany has made in any one year is \$110,000,000, which is \$29,000,000 less than we spent in 1911. The greatest expenditure ever made by France in any one year was \$89,000,000, which was \$50,000,000 less than we spent in the same year. The greatest amount that Japan ever spent in any one year was \$46,000,000, which is \$90,000,000 less than our highest annual expenditure.

These figures are startling, bewildering, and passing the ordinary understanding. Yet we are told that the expenditure of these gigantic sums has been practically useless, that our coasts are defenseless, and our Navy inadequate, insufficient and lagging far in the rear.

A large navy is sometimes likened to an insurance policy, but when the premiums become too high, the assured prefers to carry his own risk. So with an army, or navy. It is perfectly apparent so far at least as we are concerned that it is a race of folly that we are running when we build ships, merely because other nations in their ambition, or madness choose to impoverish their people in the pursuit of this insensate policy. The people of the older world groaning as they are under the burdens of military expenditure, find at least a haven in this country. They flock in millions to this land of free institutions, and greater opportunity. But when in time, and that time is not distant unless our policies are changed, this country will groan under the burden of an overweening naval establishment, no avenue of escape is open, no fair land of promise beckons, for our toilers and taxpayers. It is the history of the world that military establishments never go backward. But at least if we can not retrace our steps, we need not go forward. At least we can halt, and if satisfied that our Navy is adequate and sufficient for the purposes of defense, address ourselves to the task of maintaining that Navy in the highest state of efficiency. One battleship a year does not mean that naval construction will be limited to one ship a year. Many incidental ships form the tail, so to say, of the battleship kite. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] says in substance that it is folly to build a battleship, unless at the same time provision is made for four accompanying destroyers.

This is why our efforts for moderation and economy should be directed toward reduction in battleships, rather than in other vessels. Strike out a collier, or destroyer, or submarine, and you save the cost of that vessel. Strike out a battleship, and a whole sequel of other construction falls with it. Mr. WITHERSPOON of the Naval Committee emphasizes this distinction in his very able speech:

Whenever you add one more battleship to the Navy, that necessitates more men. It necessitates more coal; it necessitates more powder; it necessitates more guns; it necessitates more clothing and more food. The fact is that it increases every expense of the department. The cost of a battleship is not the \$16,000,000, we have to pay to construct it. No man knows what it does cost, because it increases the expense in every bureau and department of the Navy. A battleship causes all the expenses of the Navy to rise, just as the revolutions of the moon causes the tides to rise, but unlike the moon, it never causes them to ebb. [Applause.]

It is begging the question for the advocates of two battleships a year to insist that a vote for two ships, is a vote for national defense, and national honor. If national defense and national honor require six ships a year, as insisted by the gentleman from Alabama, then a vote for two ships is not a vote for adequate national defense. Such a vote is far short of our duty. If six ships are required, we should be ashamed to vote for two. But if the construction of one battleship a year is sufficient to render our Navy adequate to defend this country against the attack of any nation on earth, then a vote for two battleships a year is a vote for vicious folly, and criminal extravagance. Mr. Chairman some of us at least have become alarmed at the vaulting proportions of our naval expenditures. Unless we succeed in some measure in amending this bill, it will carry over \$146,000,000. This will be \$23,666,825.78, more than the amount carried in our last bill. And yet there is not a cloud on our horizon to justify this increase. At this rate,

the naval bill will carry over \$250,000,000, within the next few years. These figures are appalling, menacing, portentous.

Convinced that some organized effort must be made to stay this un-American tendency toward militarism, the moderate-navy men in this House have affiliated themselves in a movement to make a concentrated attack upon the vicious features of this bill. Looking to that end they have held various conferences. I have had the honor to preside over these conferences, and to be associated with the conduct of the fight on this floor. Our meetings have afforded merriment in some quarters. We have been styled economists, and little-navy men. These appellations have not been intended to be complimentary. Quite the reverse. Presumably as little-navy men, we are unable to comprehend the calls of honor, patriotism, and national defense which are claimed to be the impelling forces in the movement for a greater navy. To be an economist, in the view of some, is to be a little fellow who can not rise to the height of this argument, and who is so far behind the vanguard of the navy procession that he insists upon some decent regard for the pledges of the Democratic platform relating to economy and efficiency in the departments of our Government.

Extravagance is extravagance, without regard to the branch of government in which it occurs. Our forefathers fondly conceived that this was an isolated country, in which we could develop without regard to the jealousies, and policies of continental Europe. The greater-navy advocates have ascertained that this is a mistake, that so far from being an isolated country, this is the most exposed country in the world, calling for a great Army, and a greater Navy to defend its vast stretches of coast line. So far from being able to develop apart from the entanglements of Europe, it is insisted that we are drawn into the swirl of its policies, willingly, or unwillingly, and must order our own naval program according to the individual and collective programs of the Governments of the old world. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson], who is for peace and battleships, is literally for peace at any price. His theory of construction is a very simple one. Ship for ship, and gun for gun, he would set the pace for the other countries of the world, until from very inability to build further, they would cry, "Hold, enough." A cessation of dreadnought building would then ensue throughout the world, and universal peace would reign, but it would be the peace of exhaustion.

Once enter upon this insane competition, once divert the energies of the world in this direction, with every available resource strained to afford the means to maintain such a program, and the march of development in a hundred directions of utility would be stayed for generations to come. Its blighting effect upon civilization would be greater than that of the Thirty Years' War on Germany. A nation that builds an aggressive navy begins to dream of wars, and rumors of wars, to plan conquests, and adopt the attitude of the man with the chip on his shoulder. Conceivably the great nations of the world, or some combination of them may unite in war against us. In that view our Navy is not adequate to carry the war into their waters, that is it would not be adequate in such a contingency for offensive war, but even in that event it would be fully adequate for defensive war. It is amply "sufficient to provide for any contingencies within the limit of probabilities."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HOBSON. I object. My own request for an extension was ruthlessly objected to.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman from Alabama had 1 hour and 40 minutes in general debate.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have not consumed 15 minutes of the time of this House during the entire debate on this bill.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to trespass upon the time of this body, and however feebly or inadequately I may be debating the pending proposition, I can at least say that I am discussing the matter in hand, and not cumbering the RECORD with foreign, or irrelevant subjects.

Reverting to the assertion that we will not be heard to speak with authority in the civilized world, unless we are prepared to make our contentions effective with bristling bayonets, or terrifying battleships, I wish to ask what force did the United States possess as compared with that of Great Britain, when President Cleveland required that country to submit the Venezuelan controversy to arbitration? At that time the fleet of the United States was immeasurably inferior to that of England.

The disparity was even greater than that which existed at the time of the War of 1812. Yet once again, even as in the case of the institution of the Monroe doctrine, the moral strength of our position, as well as the latent might of this Republic, ready if necessary to be called into play, were more effective than the menace of the mailed fist. Great Britain could not afford to take issue with us, and gracefully yielded.

There is still another historical incident to which I will refer.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the gentleman what the Navy of 1823 was, when the Monroe doctrine was proclaimed.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will be very glad to have the figures.

Mr. SHERWOOD. At that time we had only 10,000 soldiers in the Regular Army, including Infantry, Artillery, and riflemen, and our population was less than 10,000,000. So far as the Navy is concerned, we had 7 wooden battleships, 9 small frigates, 2 corvettes—low sloops with one tier of guns—5 sloops, 2 brigs, and 5 small schooners; 30 war craft all told. The appropriation for the Navy for that year was \$929,513. We defied the whole world at that time under the Monroe doctrine. I have the list of midshipmen here also. We had all told in the Navy at that time 512.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for this timely contribution of weighty facts. It is a complete refutation of the claim that the Monroe doctrine must be abandoned unless we build two battleships a year. One more illustration. Just after the Civil War passions ran high. Public sentiment in this country was inflamed toward Great Britain in consequence of the losses to our commerce due to the ravages of the *Alabama*, and the United States firmly believed that she had been greatly wronged by the attitude of the authorities of that country. We were ready for war, and not afraid to fight, but we had no Navy adequate to meet the navy of Great Britain on the high seas. Yet without the exercise of compulsive force, we compelled Great Britain to submit the *Alabama* claims to arbitration, and secured an ample award.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, I can not yield for lack of time.

Mr. HOBSON. At that time we had control of the sea.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I deny that proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to some further facts in connection with this frenzy for more battleships. A few years ago the people who demanded two battleships a year were characterized by my friend from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] as jingoes. He said then that he had no apprehension of danger from the wars that were so freely predicted by the advocates of naval expansion. He declined to approve the policy of a mighty Navy, presented by the enthusiasts of that day with so much heat and vehemence, and with such direful pictures of woes to come, unless it was adopted. Firmly assured of his position he was not moved by the hysterical appeals of the frenzied jingoes. I wish that I could quote him at length on this line, but space and time forbid.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. MACON. I may have said what the gentleman says I did. I reckon I did—I am sure I did—but I was not as well advised upon the necessity for an adequate Navy as I am now; and, furthermore, my party had not declared by its platform for an adequate Navy. I was left to judge from the information that I had before me at that time. Information was what I acted upon then and it is what I am acting upon now. With the information that I have now, I see the necessity for an adequate Navy, and I propose to act in accordance therewith.

I have not said upon the floor that I was in favor of any kind of a Navy, but I can now say that I am in favor of an adequate Navy, if it will please the gentleman to know it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, after the gentleman came into possession of these illuminating facts which have caused so complete a reversal of his attitude, he ought to have taken part in this debate, and furnished us with a portion at least of this information which has caused so complete and startling a reversal of attitude in his case. I agreed with the gentleman at the time, and would like to be with him now. Apparently nothing seemed more unlikely than that the gentleman would ever become a jingo, and an advocate of two battleships a year.

Mr. MACON. I will answer the gentleman in one sentence, if he will allow me.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I can not yield now; at least 5 minutes of my 10 minutes have been taken up by questions.

Mr. MACON. I did not object to the gentleman's 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MACON. I want to say at the time that I made the declaration that the gentleman accuses me of having made I was not a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs; but for the past four years I have been, and I have tried my level best to learn the needs of the country in regard to the Navy, based upon such information as I have been able to obtain, and I am now convinced that we ought to keep our Navy up to its present standard. I believe we will have to authorize two battleships this year in order to do it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Then my friend does not do his duty when he fails to give us those facts, and furnish us that information which have caused so complete a reversal of attitude on his part. I am as open to conviction as the gentleman from Arkansas, and I wish to say that once it becomes a question of patriotism, of vital defense, of preservation of national honor, I would vote, not for 2 battleships, but for 20 battleships a year. We are eagerly, hungrily, anxiously desirous of coming into acquaintance with those pregnant facts which have so wrought upon the mind of my friend who was for one battleship, or less, during six or eight years of service in this body, that in the result they have effected his conversion, and lined him up with the once despised jingoes. Is it asking too much to ask for these facts?

Mr. MACON. Does the gentleman want me to answer that question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I would be delighted to have the answer.

Mr. MACON. Let me answer by saying that the reason I have not done so is because I did not think that what I might say upon the subject would change any more votes than the gentleman's remarks will change. The minds of Members are fully made up on the battleship subject, and all of the talk that the gentleman from Virginia and myself could put in from now until adjournment would not change the vote of a single Member. It is therefore a waste of time to continue the discussion further.

Mr. SAUNDERS. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's change of attitude is so conspicuous that I think that a word from him would have been most seasonable, and the reasons that have effected that remarkable revolution of attitude in his case, might have been potent to bring over every one-battleship man in this House to the side of two battleships. [Applause.] Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to weary the House in connection with this matter, but in conclusion I will call the attention of my colleagues to some common-sense reflections upon the matter in hand. If it is believed that England, France, Germany, Russia, and the other European countries, are impelled to build great navies by reason of the fact that their relations of contiguity with each other, are supposed to constitute a menacing situation; if it is believed that the naval program of one of these nations, must set the pace for the program of the others, such considerations do not apply to our case.

If there is present danger to the nations of Europe growing out of their contiguity, if each must be prepared to resist probable aggressions on the part of the others, is it not evident to all, to my friend from Arkansas, and to the rest of us, that not one of those nations can afford the hazard of war with the United States? Granting that they would emerge victor from such a war, they would return to the shores of Europe so crippled and battered that they would be unable to maintain themselves against the real and menacing dangers at home. If Germany must maintain a great navy to protect herself against England, or France, or Russia, or some alliance of those countries, she can not risk that fleet in a futile war with this country. She might be willing to wound, but she would be afraid to strike. Why should we not realize upon the assets of our situation? Why not capitalize the fact of our happy isolation, and once agreed that we need not prepare for wars that in all reasonable likelihood will never come, endeavor to reduce our expenditures at home? May I suggest one further thought to my colleagues in this body. It is true, as pointed out by the gentleman from Texas, and as first suggested by George Washington that, owing to our fortunate isolation it is impossible for any foreign nation to wage a successful war with us. Where is the vital point at which any nation in conflict with this country can launch a mortal blow? Other nations may harass us, they may annoy us, they may blockade our coasts for a time, but what would be the inevitable outcome? Any nation undertaking such a course would soon retire from a futile contest which, if persisted in, would bring them to bankruptcy, while we would emerge more united, more puissant, and in a more commanding position than ever.

Who will undertake to say that a nation like Japan, tottering under the financial burdens imposed by her war with Russia, with the shadow of that great Empire ever athwart the territory that the armies of the Mikado tore away from her reluctant grasp, will try conclusions with this country, the greatest, the richest, and the most powerful on the globe? The Rus-

sian Bear may be slow, but he is sure. The policies of that Empire are as fixed and irrevocable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. Japan's real danger is in Manchuria, and Korea. We know that such is the case, and full well she knows it, and so long as she must be prepared for possible war in that quarter, Japan has neither the ships, nor the men, nor the money to embark upon a war with the United States, a war that would be as foolish as it would be futile, and leave her in the result prostrate before her ancient enemy, who is even now dreaming of revenge.

The words of the Father of his Country are as weighty today, as when first uttered. In his immortal farewell address, he announced principles that may well be restated in this connection, since they have an important bearing upon the meaning to be attached to the word "adequate," in its relation to the Navy. He concludes that address as follows:

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

This is a complete answer to the oft-repeated suggestion that in our relation to the world game of politics, we must equip ourselves with a formidable military establishment in order that our rôle may be sustained in honor and safety. We little-navy men, and economists derisively so called, are better patriots than the flamboyant jingoes who come forward with banners flying, and drums beating whenever a naval bill is under consideration, and by their groundless insinuations against the good faith, and purposes of other nations, would hazard the peace of the world to secure an imposing naval program. We applaud the attitude of George Washington, when he counseled his countrymen to maintain themselves in a respectable defensive posture.

These are wise words. Equally wise are the words of our floor leader [Mr. UNDERWOOD], responding to the gentleman from Illinois in this debate:

I say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] that the great bulwark of defense that protects the American people from foreign invasion, that compels respect for the American citizen on foreign soil, are not the guns of the Army, and Navy, but the genius, spirit, courage, and manhood of American citizenship. No great world power, Mr. Chairman, is going to invade our shores, so long as we are just and right in our treatment of other nations. Our own integrity, our own honesty, and our own moral courage protect us against attacks, and if we want to go out into the world, and attack other people unjustly, we are only pirates and national highwaymen. [Applause.] I hope that the proposition to build one battleship will be the proposition adopted by the House. [Applause.]

In this connection a recent declaration of Vice President Marshall may be appropriately cited:

This high sense of honor constitutes the panoply of the American people. Armies and battleships furnish no substitute for it. These are available, but the people never intended that authority should use them as accessories to a burglar's kit.

Already the nations of the world vexed and burdened by the policies which President Taft wished to incorporate and make a part of our own, the policies of the mailed fist, and the big stick, are looking forward with hopeful anticipation to the work of the new administration whose ideals have been so nobly expounded by President Wilson. That great English newspaper, the Nation, presents this thought:

From the new President of the United States, comes a saner and nobler vision of policy than Europe knows. With Bryan in charge of its foreign policy, it is reasonable to expect that America will enthusiastically cooperate with Great Britain in an effort to save Europe from itself.

For this war the little-navy men, and economists are ready to enlist. It is a war for the reduction of armaments, a war against war, and the multiplication of the equipments of war. Amid the tumult, and the shoutings of the captains is heard the still, small voice of peace proclaiming its message to the uttermost parts of the earth, that the nations which live by the sword will perish by the sword.

This Nation may well take to itself the words, be just, and fear not. Secure in our solitary grandeur in the western world,

like a mighty eagle in its eyrie, too just to make wanton war, and too great to be lightly assailed, we may well aspire to be the arbiter of nations, and by the inspiration of our example bring to pass the reign of perfect peace. The task is not beyond our strength, and is in harmony with that destiny which has been so felicitously portrayed in this concluding extract:

I can conceive of a national destiny surpassing the glories of the present and the past—a destiny which meets the responsibilities of to-day and measures up to the possibilities of the future. Behold a Republic, resting securely upon the foundation stones quarried by revolutionary patriots from the mountain of eternal truth—a Republic applying in practice and proclaiming to the world, the self-evident propositions that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights; that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights; and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Behold a Republic in which civil and religious liberty stimulate all to earnest endeavor, and in which the law restrains every hand uplifted for a neighbor's inquiry—a Republic in which every citizen is a sovereign, but in which no one cares or dares to wear a crown.

Behold a Republic whose flag is loved while other flags are only feared. Behold a Republic increasing in population, in wealth, in strength, and influence, solving the problems of civilization and hastening the coming of an universal brotherhood—a Republic which shakes thrones and dissolves aristocracies by its silent example and gives light and inspiration to those who sit in darkness. Behold a Republic gradually but surely becoming the supreme moral factor in the world's progress and the accepted arbiter of the world's disputes—a Republic whose history, like the path of the just, "is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

The vote having been taken, the position of the little Navy advocates was sustained, and the provision for two battleships was stricken from the bill. The Senate first rejected this amendment, but the House insisting, they receded and acquiesced in the reduced program.

The Congress having now provided in two successive sessions for one battleship only, this authorization may be taken as our settled policy for the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PADGETT. I desire again to submit a request for unanimous consent that debate may continue for 45 minutes on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 45 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to say that I was thrown off my guard awhile ago by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], when he jumped up and objected so boldly to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] proceeding for 10 minutes, and I lost my opportunity. It was my purpose to prevent anything except five-minute debates on this question under the rules. I meant to do that then. I mean to do it now. I shall object to the extension of time for any and every Member of the House from now on. I do not intend to play favorites.

Mr. BURNETT. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] desires to offer an amendment at the end of this paragraph, which does not relate to the question of battleships.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman modify his request so that that can be done?

Mr. MACON. I want to either pass the bill or see it defeated. We have had it under consideration for nearly a week, and we ought to dispose of it one way or the other without further delay.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Was there any agreement which I could not hear that would prevent a Member from offering an amendment to this paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. Not that the Chair knows of.

Mr. MADDEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. Are not all the amendments to this paragraph pending that are permissible under these rules?

The CHAIRMAN. There are four pending, namely, the original amendment, the amendment to the amendment, the substitute, and an amendment to the substitute, and no others are in order.

Mr. MANN. At this time.

The CHAIRMAN. At this time.

Mr. MANN. And only at this time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does that mean an amendment can not be offered that does not contain the subject matter in these amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. It means that no other amendment is permissible until these are voted up or down.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But after they are voted upon it will be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the substitute. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, most everyone who has spoken on this subject has favored an adequate Navy. The only question of difference is what we think is an adequate Navy. One gentleman may think an adequate Navy is a Navy large enough to control the nations of the world. Another may determine that in his judgment an adequate Navy is one that may protect our shores from foreign invasion. But I think, Mr. Chairman, in voting on this paragraph we should vote with our eyes open and understand where the vote that we cast leads to. The stature of the human frame is built on the bone skeleton; a man's size is built about that bone frame. So it is with this Navy. The number of battleships you build measures the ultimate size of the Navy that you intend to support. You must have colliers, dispatch boats, torpedo boats, men, and armament to correspond with the number of battleships that you build. It is not merely the cost of how much per capita would be added as a charge against the American people to construct one battleship or two battleships, but if you want to have a rounded Navy, a Navy that is prepared for war, you have got to build all along the line to meet your battleship program. The battleship program as constituted to-day, if you take the estimates that come from the Navy Department, means that you must make a charge against the American people of \$140,000,000 or \$150,000,000 a year. If you go on building battleships to increase your Navy and increase it proportionately, so must the increase of that supply bill eventually come. Now, build your four battleships a year, and what does it lead to and what does it mean? Within 10 years, instead of \$150,000,000 of charge to maintain this Navy, it means that you approach the \$250,000,000 mark.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I beg my colleague's pardon, but I can not; I have only five minutes.

I do not say that accurately, of course, because I am not a naval expert, as is my friend from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], but it is in that neighborhood. I think we can maintain the present Navy with a battleship a year that will take the place of the discarded fleet. I am willing to do that. I want a fair Navy, a reasonable Navy, but I am not willing to increase the charge that is being piled up against the American people any further than it is to-day without there is some change in the political conditions of the world of which I am not advised to-day. Why, my friends, we do not need a Navy to protect our country against invasion. When Admiral Dewey sailed into the harbor of Manila, commanding practically a gunboat fleet, he held the situation, with the cables cut and no coal, by reason of the moral courage of an American citizen. [Applause.]

No great world power, Mr. Chairman, is going to invade our shores.

Mr. WEEKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not yield. No great world power is going to invade our shores as long as we are just and right in our treatment of other nations. [Applause.] Our own integrity, our own honesty, and our own moral courage protect us against attacks, and if we want to go into the battlefields of the world and attack other people unjustly, we are only pirates and national highwaymen. [Applause.] I hope that the proposition for the building of one battleship will be the proposition adopted by this House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 28858) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1913 and for prior years, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and, with the accompanying report (No. 1576), ordered to be printed.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] reserves all points of order on the bill. The committee will resume its sitting.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all debate on this amendment is exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] makes the point of order that all debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, there has been no debate on this side of the House. All the time that has been taken up heretofore has been taken up by the other side of the House. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BATES], a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, be given five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. MACON. I object. I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas objects.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that no debate has been had on this proposition as yet. The House is entitled to hear both sides of the discussion.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am very much surprised to hear from the gentleman from Illinois that I did not take any position on the amendment. I was speaking in favor of one battleship, and was against the proposition for no battleship.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman did not take any position on the amendment. He was taking a position of patriotism, and, so far as I could ascertain, his speech had no reference to the number of battleships. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOBSON. Is not the order to be the amendment to the substitute first?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not. The order is this: The amendment must be perfected first. The question before the House will be on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]. In other words, the proposition before the committee is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE], striking out "four battleships" and inserting "one battleship." The question is on agreeing to that amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (ordered by the Chair) there were—ayes 130, noes 115.

Mr. HOBSON. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. HOBSON and Mr. TRIBBLE.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 131, noes 123.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the amendment to the substitute to strike out "three battleships" and substitute "no battleship." The amendment to the substitute provides for no battleship.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 46, noes 115.

So the amendment to the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] substituting "three battleships" for "two battleships."

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 25, noes 140.

So the substitute was lost.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 54, at the end of the page, add a new paragraph: "Two armored cruisers, each carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessel of its class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, and to cost not to exceed \$20,000,000 each."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not in order as an amendment.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that an amendment to the amendment is still before the House to substitute one battleship for two.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I will withhold my amendment for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, does not know the character of an amendment when it is offered and sent up to the desk.

Mr. MANN. I know; I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question before the House is on the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] to substitute one battleship for two, as written in the bill.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. A division, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. I ask for tellers.

Mr. HOBSON. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] ask for tellers. Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. PADGETT and Mr. HOBSON.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HAMLIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] will state it.

Mr. HAMLIN. What is the proposition we are now to vote upon?

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] to strike out two battleships and insert one battleship. The Members will pass between the tellers.

Mr. PADGETT and Mr. HOBSON took their places as tellers.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 144, noes 133.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen must take their seats and not rush up to the desk to ask for recognition.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. How many times can the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] be recognized to offer an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has not been recognized yet.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] is recognized. The Chair wishes to say that gentlemen can not expect to rush up to the desk and ask for recognition. They must rise in their seats and be recognized.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, may I—

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

The Clerk read as follows:

At the bottom of page 54 insert the following:

"Provided, The money for the battleships herein authorized shall not be available unless said battleship is built in one of the navy yards."

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I suggest a modification of the amendment so that it will read "Government navy yards."

Mr. CALDER. There are no private navy yards, Mr. Chairman, but I have no objection to inserting the word "Government."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. CALDER. I say, Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting after the word "Navy" the word "Government," so that it will read:

"Provided, That the money for a battleship herein authorized shall not be available unless said battleship is built in one of the Government navy yards."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment to the amendment. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by adding:

"Provided, That more than one navy yard shall be fully equipped to build the vessel herein authorized."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is already an amendment pending.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, my amendment was an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair's understanding was that the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] was accepted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that you can not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. If objection is made, it is not admissible. If no objection were made, it could be so ordered.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. MANN. No objection was made to it. Objection was made to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] taking the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] off his feet to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] objected to it.

Mr. MANN. My colleague did not object to the request.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, is my amendment ruled out on the ground that it is not germane?

The CHAIRMAN. It was not. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] has the floor.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, there has been a good deal of discussion at this session of Congress as to the advisability of the Government having its own powder plants, its torpedo plants, and its plants for the manufacture of ordnance. It has been stated that at these Government plants we were able to manufacture the Government's powder at less than the price at which we could buy it by contract, and manufacture our own torpedoes and our own ordnance at less than it could be purchased. So, Mr. Chairman, we present to-day a proposition to this House that we can build warships more cheaply at a Government navy yard than they can be built by contract.

Now, Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said about building ships in the past, and at times we have had some difficulty because of the methods of account keeping by the Navy Department. But I am glad to announce to the House that we can actually build warships more cheaply at navy yards than we can build them by private contract.

Only last week bids were asked for by the Navy Department for the building of the battleship *Pennsylvania*, with the result that the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. bid for the building of the *Pennsylvania* \$7,275,000, and the New York Navy Yard bid on exactly the same plans, for exactly the same ship, \$7,303,000, or \$28,000 more than the bid of the Newport News Shipbuilding Co.

Now, gentlemen, this bid by the New York Navy Yard was based on the experience of building three battleships during the past eight years. They made their bid on the *Pennsylvania*, and they are only \$28,000 higher than the bid of the Newport News Shipbuilding Co., the lowest bidder. That is but one-third of 1 per cent. And, gentlemen, added to the New York Navy Yard's bid is an item of \$860,000 for overhead charges.

I have here a statement from the Navy Department illustrating what these overhead charges are. They include maintenance of power plant, boilers, stacks, piping and machinery, elevators, telephone and telegraph charges, pay of watchmen, pay of clerks, pay of officers, and so forth. Over 50 per cent of these overhead charges, Mr. Chairman, would be permanent charges on the yard if a ship was not built there, and when ships are built there these charges are apportioned so that a part is debited against the ship in course of construction and other parts against other things going on in the yard.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Then it is evident that it is cheaper to the Government to build in a Government navy yard?

Mr. CALDER. It is certainly cheaper.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to ask the gentleman if there is more than one Government navy yard equipped so that ships of this character could be built there?

Mr. CALDER. There is only one navy yard at present equipped so that it could build ships of this character, but yesterday we appropriated \$300,000 to build a crane at the Norfolk Navy Yard, and when that crane is built that yard can build battleships of this character.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CALDER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The only place, as I understand, where they can build this ship now is the navy yard at Brooklyn, in part represented by the gentleman who now has the floor [Mr. CALDER] and in part by my friend at the left [Mr. FITZGERALD], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CALDER. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that as soon as the crane that has been authorized is completed they can build these vessels at the Norfolk Navy Yard, and that crane will undoubtedly be built by the time this ship is to be constructed.

Mr. MANN. Not if the gentleman can prevent it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CALDER. I voted yesterday to build the crane.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the work of the Brooklyn Navy Yard is admitted to be superior to contract work?

Mr. CALDER. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question, Mr. Chairman. It undoubtedly is superior. I have had the opportunity of discussing with naval officers the question of the construction of contract-built ships and navy-yard-built ships, and no less an authority than Admiral Bob Evans, who took the *Connecticut* for his flagship in his fleet of battleships that sailed around the world, told me himself that, in his judgment, the *Connecticut*, a navy-yard-built ship, was a better battleship by 25 per cent than any other battleship he ever was on. [Applause.]

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the gentleman got the bid made by the Norfolk Navy Yard for this work?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the gentleman read it, please?

Mr. CALDER. Seven million two hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars. No; I beg the gentleman's pardon, that is not for the Norfolk Navy Yard. I understood that the gentleman meant Newport News.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the gentleman got the bid from the Mare Island Navy Yard?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman read it?

Mr. CALDER. Seven million two hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has the bid from the Norfolk Navy Yard?

Mr. CALDER. I have not. I asked the department for the bids of the navy yards, and they sent me a letter giving the bid of the Brooklyn and the Mare Island yards. The facts are that under the bids made by the navy-yard authorities at Brooklyn we can save an amount of nearly \$500,000. We have had great difficulty in the past in getting them to tell us the form of the account keeping, and now that we have it over their own signature we know we can compete with the private yards and bid successfully. Until the building of the *Connecticut* six years ago the Government never had a battleship completed within the time limit, but after the *Connecticut* was built by the Government it compelled the private yards thereafter to build in the contract time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman tell whether the Brooklyn yard has been invited to bid on the fuel colliers about to be constructed?

Mr. CALDER. I do not know.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Brooklyn yard is equipped to build colliers or battleships?

Mr. CALDER. They can build any ship.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want to say that the Mare Island Navy Yard is thoroughly equipped for building a battleship, and I notice that the bid of that yard is \$21,000 less than that of the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Twenty-one thousand dollars less.

Mr. CALDER. We have built three battleships at the Brooklyn yard, and from our experience and the statement of the Government of indirect charges we can prove that we can build the ships at a great saving to the Government.

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman from New York in favor of giving the ship to the lowest bidder on a contract?

Mr. CALDER. I am, depending on their capacity to carry out the undertaking. I want to say frankly to the gentleman that if it can be demonstrated that the Mare Island Navy Yard is equipped to build a battleship and can build it for less than the Brooklyn Navy Yard, I should say that the ship should be given to the Mare Island yard.

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania. If the Mare Island yard takes the contract, does not the gentleman think they will be able to do the work?

Mr. CALDER. The navy yards do not build by contract. It is the statement of the navy-yard officials. I say frankly that if the Mare Island yard can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the department that they can build cheaper than Brooklyn they ought to get the work.

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania. There is no question about that. Mr. CALDER. Not a particle.

Mr. REDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I think there is no doubt that it can be demonstrated that the Government can build a better vessel for the same money than it gets from a private yard. Before I entered Congress I had the privilege of furnishing under contract certain important parts for four battleships, the *Delaware*, the *North Dakota*, the *Florida*, and the *Utah*.

Now, it is perfectly possible under specifications for battleships to furnish either one of several kinds of apparatus. If I may take the case of the two ships, the *Utah* and the *Florida*, for each of which I furnished, or my company did, the forced-draft apparatus, I point out that such apparatus affects directly the speed of the ship and the steaming economy of the ship in service. In the case of one of these vessels, built at a private yard, the question that the contractor cared for was price, and in the case of the sister ship, built at the Government yard, the Government officer cared chiefly for efficiency. So, as a matter of fact, there are two ships to-day for which my own concern furnished this part of the equipment, one of which ships has an equipment less efficient than the other, because in the Government-built ship the naval constructor in charge insisted on having the more efficient and more economical apparatus and in the other case the private yard insisted on a less expensive and less efficient apparatus, although both would fully meet the specifications.

I want to be quite particular about this. These were blowers for forced-draft apparatus. The Government vessel took the larger equipment, which cost a little more and which gave the ship more power for speed and more steaming economy in operation. The private yard took the apparatus which gives less and involves a little better profit to the contractor; the Government yard took the larger outfit, which worked a little more efficiently and gave the vessel rather more speed.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REDFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. I think the gentleman in his reference to these cases has stated the whole argument, and that is in constructing a battleship as between the Government and a private concern the profit is the great consideration with the private concern, whereas in the Government-constructed ship there is no element of profit entering into it, but simply a desire to make the best vessel for the men to go to sea and fight the battles of the country.

Mr. REDFIELD. The practical point in what I have said is that in the Government-built ship in case of an emergency there is a reserve of speed, a reserve of steaming power, that does not so fully exist in the private vessel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAHER. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important reasons for this amendment is to continue the present competition between the private shipbuilders and the Government yards, for I believe if it were not for this competition the bids made for the building of battleships would be far in excess of what they are to-day. Another is to supply steady employment to the mechanics employed in the Government yards. There is no employer of labor who would expect the best results from his skilled mechanics, if he were compelled to lay them off three or four months every year.

The battleship *New York* was launched at the New York Navy Yard on October 30, 1912, or about four months ago, and during that short period of time 481 men have been discharged. This reduction in the force is inevitable as the work advances on a battleship under construction, and within the next few weeks it is expected that from 75 to 100 additional men who are now working on the *New York* will be discharged, and these gradual reductions in the force will continue until the vessel is finally completed and ready for commissioning. And what is true of work on the *New York* also applies to the general work of overhauling vessels under repair—that is, under the present system reductions must take place in all trades as the work nears completion. Experience has demonstrated that better results can be obtained in any line of work by retaining a permanent force of skilled mechanics. In the first place when a man knows that his job is secure he is able to work to better advantage. Of course there may be exceptions to this rule, but it is true of the average workman. Contentment is a necessary factor to efficiency, and when a man knows that he has a permanent job he is naturally more contented than when he realizes that he may lose his place any day.

Another advantage of retaining a permanent force at the yards is that you have a complete organization of skilled mechanics in all the various trades that enter into the complicated work of building a modern battleship; thus obviating the necessity of calling in new men and breaking them in on the

work. This necessity of calling in new men in the building of a ship means a great loss to the Government, and it can be safely estimated that this method is equal to at least 10 per cent of the total cost of labor in building the ship. On the other hand, if a permanent force of men were always available, with sufficient work authorized to keep them busy, there would be no necessity for calling in new men, and in addition such a permanent force would naturally become more efficient, as they would gain experience in shipbuilding. When the forces at the yards are disorganized, or discharged, on account of lack of work, they naturally look for employment wherever they may be able to procure same; and these men, when they are discharged after six months or a year's work, go to various points away from the yard, as the shipbuilding industries are scattered throughout the entire country. Some of them, of course, are able to obtain employment in New York or vicinity. When another ship is authorized and work is started at the yard a majority of them have probably secured steady work and they are therefore not overanxious to give their services to the Government again, knowing that they will be laid off in batches as the battleship under construction nears completion. This method of laying off is inevitable under our present system of employing mechanics. Should we be able to keep intact a steady force of men at the yard the men would naturally settle close to their work; in other words, they would make their homes in that locality, and you can readily understand how such a condition would tend to improve their efficiency, as they would then be able to enjoy all the comforts of home life with their families, which, as you are aware, are so essential to the well-being and moral stability of workmen. In this connection I might state that there were times during the building of the *New York* when it was necessary to advertise in the daily papers for drillers, calkers, and chippers; and the reason for this was simply due to the uncertainty of employment in the yard. In view of these facts, I believe that every Congressman should use his best efforts toward securing the establishment of a permanent force of mechanics at the navy yards and the authorizing of sufficient work on the construction of battleships to keep them employed. With a skilled force of this kind always available the Government would undoubtedly save considerable money and at the same time we would be able to turn out better ships in every way.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask now for the reading of the amendment to the amendment, which I had sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, at the end of the amendment, the following: "Provided, That more than one navy yard shall be fully equipped to build any of the vessels herein authorized."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what point of order would lie against this?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those who seeks to depopulate the navy yards of the country, nor do I seek to drive out of business the men whose capital is invested in private shipyards. Nor do I want to see thrown out of employment the thousands of skilled mechanics and laborers who are working in the private shipyards. There are two private institutions along the river Delaware, shipyards that give employment each to 5,000 men, which means sustenance to at least 50,000 people. The taking away from private shipyards of the construction of large vessels and the placing of them exclusively in the navy yards of the country would mean that these 50,000 people would have to look elsewhere for their support.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania should prevail, and the Secretary of the Navy should be of opinion that there are not two navy yards that could turn out a battleship such as is contemplated by the bill, then the purpose of my colleague from New York [Mr. CALDER], namely, that the battleship be built at the Government yards, would be defeated.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not objecting to that at all. I am not opposing the gentleman's amendment, except that I want to go a little further than he does and say that while I do not want to destroy the private shipyards of the country, because of the employment they give to labor, yet I do not want to see every battleship and every collier that is constructed by the Government built at one navy yard only, to the prejudice of all other navy yards of the United States. Hence, I offer an amendment which proposes that more than one navy

yard shall be fully equipped to build a battleship or any vessel that may be contracted for by the Government.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Does not the gentleman then concede that if there be not two navy yards fully equipped to build a battleship the amendment of my colleague from New York [Mr. CALDER] that the battleship be built at the navy yard would be futile?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not in his amendment state specifically that the only navy yard fully equipped to build a battleship is the navy yard at Brooklyn; but the effect is just the same, because the fact is that that is the only Government yard fully equipped to build a battleship. My point is this, and the purpose of my amendment is not wholly hostile to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York: I propose that whereas we inveigh against monopoly in private life and insist that no one big concern shall have all of the business, that no one corporation shall absorb the trade of the country; I insist that no one navy yard shall absorb all of the construction work and build all of the battleships of the country, provided we embark on the business of having the Government build battleships.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state any reason why there should not be monopoly on the part of the Government when doing its own work—why there should be competition between Government plants?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think, in answer to the gentleman's question, it would be fair to those skilled mechanics and laborers whose livelihood is obtained on the Pacific coast, as well as in the matter of the exigency of war, that the Government should be equipped to build a battleship on the Pacific coast. By the same token, I think that if naval warfare should break out in the West Indies or as a result of our fortification of the Panama Canal, it would be wise policy on the part of the Government to have down there at Pensacola a navy yard fully equipped to build a battleship of any size.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I can understand this argument being made in favor of having several yards, though I do not think the argument has ever been a good one, but I can not understand the original argument of the gentleman that the reason of having these yards is for the purpose of competition. Competition with whom? Does the Government compete with itself? The purpose of competition outside is to protect the Government. The purpose of competition inside can only be to favor locality.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very well. The gentleman has stated a question which I can answer fully in an instant. In the instance of a fuel collier about to be constructed the Navy Department had sent out proposals to four or five navy yards along the Atlantic coast—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have my time extended in order that I may answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, as there are so many gentlemen who desire to speak, I must object.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman to withhold his objection for a moment. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the gentleman from New York had his time extended, and that I have just entered upon this discussion and have yielded to gentlemen to ask questions, and had only half answered the most important question of all.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more, and I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will not object.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection, but I shall not consent to any further extensions.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, answering further the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] with regard to competition in the navy yards and whether it would be advantageous to the Government, I say that at the present time the Navy Department is inviting bids from Portsmouth, Charleston, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, and Norfolk for the construction of a fuel collier.

That answers the question completely.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, it does not answer it at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is to find out at which one of these navy yards vessels can be constructed and—

Mr. SHERLEY. The determination of that fact will not determine the wisdom of having four or five yards.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman see, what it is difficult sometimes to make those see who charge

favoritism or prejudice on the part of a Member who is in favor of his own district, that 50,000 people in the vicinity of Philadelphia are dependent upon the business of shipbuilding?

Mr. SHERLEY. All of which is a reason for the gentleman's speech, but not for the Government's action.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Five thousand people depend upon the continuance of the business of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, and does not the gentleman think that if all this construction work is concentrated in one navy yard, either at Brooklyn or Norfolk—and the Norfolk yard is coming to be equipped to build battleships—that this labor to which I refer must give up its employment and go elsewhere?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, the whole argument was made with even greater force by the spinners of Flanders in regard to the use of modern machinery in spinning.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky in his superior knowledge of the textile industry, but I still insist that the Government would be better off in the matter of construction of battleships if it had two places to go for the construction of battleships under its own direction.

Mr. DYER. Does not the gentleman know Mare Island is now equipped for the construction of battleships and that Norfolk will be in a short time?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have listened to gentlemen contending that Mare Island was fully equipped, and, in fact, my friend from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] contends it is equipped and that two colliers were built at the Mare Island Navy Yard. But I do not want to debate the question of the advisability of constructing battleships at Mare Island in its present condition. I want to see Mare Island put in shape, or any other station that the Government may agree upon, to do repair and construction work on the Pacific if the Government wants to enter into the business of building battleships and putting private contractors for battleships out of business. And while I do not blame the gentlemen from New York for doing the best they can for holding all they can at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, I still insist it would be better for the Government as a business proposition, apart from the bread-and-butter side of it, if it would equip more than one navy yard in which to do this kind of work; hence I have offered this amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from New York, and I trust it will pass.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, whatever may be the purpose or intention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], whether to bring the construction of the battleship to a private yard in the vicinity of Philadelphia, or elsewhere, or not, the real effect of the adoption of the amendment he has offered would probably go to defeat the proposition to build the ship at the Government yard.

The battleship authorized by this bill ought, in my opinion, to be constructed at a Government yard. We have had ample demonstration of the fact that the Government in its own yard and with its own men can turn out work in a manner, with a skill and efficiency and expedition unexcelled—in fact, unequaled—by private shipbuilding concerns. The *Connecticut* and the *Florida*, the latter ship constructed at the Brooklyn Yard under an amendment I introduced to the naval appropriation bill some years ago, serve as splendid and effective illustrations of that fact. The excellent workmanship, the rapidity within which the work was finished, the efficiency of everything that went to construct these two ships speak in favor of our desire to have the contemplated ship constructed at the navy yard. The large and adequately equipped and costly plant at the Government yard ought not, by sending the work to a private shipyard, be allowed to remain, in a great measure, inactive and go to consequent decay. The immense force of men, who have done such commendable work in every department of the yard's activities, ought not to be cast out of employment and sent many into idleness. Trained to their work and to a fine discipline, they are a valuable working force, to scatter which and replace with new men in hours of necessity would really be a detriment.

We should encourage and promote that competition between our Government and the private shipbuilders as will make for cheapening the cost of building our ships at private yards. This end will be accomplished by providing that the ship now to be authorized be built at the navy yard. It will also, to an extent, prevent combination of shipbuilders to enhance their price and increase their bids beyond reasonable figures.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] urges that unless there be more than one Government yard in which the battleship can be built, the building should be turned over to the private yards. Mr. Chairman, we may safely intrust the Secretary of the Navy with the duty of determining at what yard—Brooklyn or elsewhere—the ship should be built. If there be a yard properly provided and sufficiently equipped to handle and do the work other than in

Brooklyn, the Secretary of the Navy will have power, if he chooses, to send it there. But it will be useless, and I may add destructive, of the amendment offered by my colleague from New York [Mr. CALDER] to adopt the amendment the gentleman from Pennsylvania proposes. To my mind its true intent is to defeat the purpose I so strongly advocate that we do the building at the Government yard.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How many Government yards are capable of building battleships?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I can not with accuracy answer that question. There is one yard, I know, has demonstrated its absolute ability to do the work well and expeditiously and efficiently. The Secretary of the Navy can determine hereafter whether there be another Government yard where the work may be done.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is not the particular yard to which the gentleman referred located in the gentleman's own State?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes; the yard that turned out the excellently built *Connecticut* and *Florida* is located in my State; it is at Brooklyn.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Would it not require a great deal of money to put the other yards in a condition to build battleships?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Probably; yes. I do not know just how well equipped some of the other yards may be. Let's leave that to the Secretary of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I ask leave to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. All debate on this amendment and the amendment to the amendment is exhausted.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] have five minutes.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. That is an amendment in the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true, and the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I be given five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I hope neither of these amendments will prevail. There seems to be a disposition on the part of the House to place in Government manufacturing establishments the building of battleships, the manufacture of powder, and the manufacture of many articles and commodities used by the Government, thus seeking to exclude private concerns from Government contracts.

I do not believe that the Government should manufacture all of the necessary powder, nor do I believe that the Navy Department should build all our ships. "Uncle Sam" should live and let live. A vast amount of capital is invested in shipbuilding plants in this country; there is one plant in my city which employs between five and six thousand men at all times.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] spoke of the magnificent construction of the battleship *Florida*, which was built at the Brooklyn Navy Yard. I wish to state that her sister ship, the *Utah*, was built by the New York Shipbuilding Co., at Camden, N. J., and she is just as good a vessel as the *Florida*. And I desire also to state that the *Florida* cost \$6,212,000, and her sister ship, the *Utah*, cost \$4,030,000. Now, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the vast amount of capital and the great number of people employed in these private concerns, performing such economical and good work, should receive some consideration at the hands of the Government.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. What will it cost to equip a yard to manufacture a boat like the *Florida* or the *Utah*?

Mr. BROWNING. I can not tell you. There are millions of dollars invested in shipbuilding.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It cost somewhere from \$200,000 to \$250,000 for slips and traveling cranes. It is not a very expensive thing.

Mr. BROWNING. I thought you meant the amount of money invested in private plants.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not the \$400,000 allowed yesterday to the Norfolk Navy Yard be sufficient to equip a navy yard for building a battleship?

Mr. BROWNING. I think it would.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And would not the same amount for the Philadelphia Navy Yard be sufficient to equip it there?

Mr. BROWNING. I think it would.

Admiral Watt says that ships built in private yards are just as good as ships built in Government yards, and I hope these amendments will not prevail.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand an article from the Philadelphia Public Ledger of February 15. I ask unanimous consent that I may have the same printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Certainly.

Mr. HOWARD. As to the construction of the *Connecticut* and the *Louisiana*, the *Connecticut* being constructed by the Government, and the *Louisiana* by a private shipbuilding concern, has the gentleman any information as to the cost of the repairs on the *Connecticut*, as compared with the cost on the *Louisiana*?

Mr. BROWNING. I have not.

Mr. HOWARD. Does not the gentleman know that the cost of repairs on the *Connecticut* has been 30 per cent less than those on the *Louisiana* since the construction of these two ships, which were launched at about the same time?

Mr. BROWNING. I do not know that. We have never had any such information as that before the Naval Committee.

Mr. HOWARD. As a matter of fact, if you will refer to the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs, you will find Admiral Evans testified to that fact.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has not the gentleman his figures reversed?

Mr. HOWARD. I have not. I have my own figures, and I know they are correct.

Mr. BROWNING. Some ships may have more repairs than others, but that has nothing to do with the work done at the yards.

Mr. HOWARD. I will go a step further and say that the percentage of repairs on the *Connecticut* was occasioned by the *Connecticut* running aground very shortly after she was constructed.

Mr. BROWNING. That might be. What has that to do with the construction of the two ships?

Mr. HOWARD. The repairs of the ship, as the gentleman from New Jersey well knows—

Mr. BROWNING. If a ship runs aground, would it not need repairs?

Mr. HOWARD. Certainly. But I would allow that in the total repairs of that particular ship.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print this article from the Philadelphia Public Ledger as a part of my remarks. It is a very short article.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] has expired. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the article referred to:

UNITED STATES SHIPS COME HIGH—GOVERNMENT SPENDS EXTRA MILLIONS BY OWN CONSTRUCTION.

[Special telegram to the Public Ledger.]

WASHINGTON, February 15.

Last year's naval appropriation bill provided, among others, for the building of two fuel ships, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$1,140,000, and each ship to be constructed at a navy yard, one on the Pacific coast.

One of the ships has been started at the Mare Island Navy Yard, but the other ship, which would normally be built at the New York Navy Yard, as that is the only navy yard on the eastern coast that is fitted out to build ships, has not yet been ordered.

This delay undoubtedly is for the purpose of permitting the New York Navy Yard to build one of the two battleships authorized by this year's naval program. And it is therefore to be presumed that the second final ship will be built on the Pacific coast.

The extra cost of building in navy yards is well set forth by Admiral R. M. Watt, chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, in his hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs a year ago, February 2 and 5, 1912. Admiral Watt stated that the *Nevada* and *Oklahoma*, building, respectively, at Fore River and the New York Shipbuilding Co.'s works, cost for hull and machinery \$5,895,000 and \$5,926,000, respectively. These ships are of 27,500 tons displacement, or 500 tons larger than the *New York* and *Texas*, and they are built under the eight-hour law, so that the men employed in their construction only work the same number of hours per day as Government employees in a navy yard. These ships were contracted for in 1911 and are identically the same.

The battleships *New York* and *Texas*, which are also both the same, are 500 tons smaller than the *Nevada* and *Oklahoma*. The *Texas* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. at a contract price of \$5,830,000. The *New York*, which is being built at the New York Navy Yard, is estimated to cost \$7,293,000 and will probably exceed this amount. The *Texas* was built under the eight-hour law of 1892.

The battleship *Florida* was built at the New York Navy Yard, being completed in the summer of 1911, at the following cost:

Labor	\$2, 815, 000
Indirect charges	955, 000
Material	2, 442, 000
Total	6, 212, 000

The sister ship to the *Florida*, the *Utah*, was built at the New York Shipbuilding Co.'s plant at a cost of \$4,030,000, so that the Government-built *Florida* cost \$2,182,000 more than the contract-built *Utah*.

There is not very much difference in the time required to build a ship by private contract or in a Government yard, but such difference as

there is has been uniformly in favor of the private yards, which have built battleships in from three to eight months' less time than required in the Government yards.

It is interesting to note that the labor cost per ton on the *Florida* at the New York Navy Yard is double what it would be at a private yard, even under the eight-hour-law conditions.

In making up the cost of a ship at a navy yard the pay of the mechanics, who receive 28½ days' leave a year, is not included as part of the cost of building a ship, nor is the disability pay which they receive for absence in excess of 15 days as a result of accidents while at work. The salaries of clerks and of draftsmen who work on the plans of the vessel are not charged up to part of her cost. There is no allowance made for insurance; there is no charge for a bond to insure the performance of the contract. The trial trip is run after the ship is in commission and is considered as part of the regular expense and not as a separate item, and many other charges that form a part of the cost in a private yard are entirely overlooked when a ship is built at a Government yard. The reasons for the greater cost at a navy yard are:

1. The very much higher wages for the same class of mechanics.
2. The greater number of high-grade mechanics.
3. The greater number of foremen.
4. The less efficient organization, due to the intermittent character of the shipbuilding work and the lack of incentive of competition.
5. It is also a fact that building at a navy yard results in inferior work, because there is no adequate inspection, while a private contractor's work is supervised by 50 inspectors, who require absolute compliance with the specifications.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes upon this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] asks unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes on the pending amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSS. Before gentlemen vote on the proposition for building ships in the navy yards, I think it would be well to pause a moment and look at our experience in the comparative cost between building ships in private yards and building ships in navy yards. I have here a statement of all the ships that have been built in navy yards, with the cost of similar ships built in private yards, and it has been prepared in the Navy Department by the Chief Constructor of the Navy, and it shows that we have spent nearly \$8,000,000 more in building ships in Government yards than we would have spent if they had been built by contract in private yards.

Take, for instance, the *Connecticut* and the *Louisiana*. The *Connecticut* was built in the New York Navy Yard and cost \$374,000 more than her sister ship, the *Louisiana*, which was built in a private yard. But in the construction of that ship little more than labor and material was charged up against the *Connecticut*. A large percentage of the indirect charges were never added to the *Connecticut*, and I asked the Chief Constructor of the Navy to give me a statement as to what that ship would have cost if the same things had been charged against her that were charged against her sister ship, the *Louisiana*. And here is his letter:

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR, NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1913.

(Data concerning indirect charges in commercial establishments and navy yards.)

HON. GEORGE EDMUND FOSS, M. C.,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I forward herewith such data as is available in reply to your various inquiries:

"(1) What items included by commercial concerns are not included in the indirect charges entering into the cost of construction at navy yards of new vessels for the Navy?"

On page 397 of the printed hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives on appropriation bill subjects of 1911 appears a statement of the Paymaster General to the effect that since July 1, 1910, the following items have not entered into the indirect cost under the navy yard system of accounting:

Officers' salaries.
Clerical force, draftsmen, civilian assistants, subinspectors, expert aids, chemists, watchmen, messengers, etc.
Leave, holiday, and disability.
Expenses of receiving, testing, and handling stores.
Depreciation, fire insurance.
Interest on money invested; taxes.
Repairs made to buildings, railways, plant machinery, when such repairs exceed \$100.

[NOTE: Under the accounting instructions issued July 1, 1912, repairs made to buildings, machinery, etc., are not included when repairs exceed \$25.]

Such items entering into commercial indirect charges which are excluded from Navy indirect charges, are unquestionably not less than 25 per cent of the productive labor on which both commercial and Navy indirect charges are figured.

"(2) What is the latest reported cost of the *Florida*, the proportion of indirect, and what would have been the cost of the *Florida* had all items of indirect charge been made in accordance with commercial practice?"

The cost of the *Florida*, under the appropriation, "Increase of the Navy, Construction and Machinery," to November 1, 1912, is as follows:

Labor	\$2, 830, 804. 28
Material	2, 400, 255. 45
Indirect	965, 308. 44
Miscellaneous	53, 657. 03
Total	6, 250, 025. 20

From the above it will be noted that the indirect charges figure almost exactly 34 per cent of the direct labor charges.

While it is not practicable to state exactly how much these charges would have been increased had they included all expenditures which would be included in the indirect charge for a commercial establishment, because the method of figuring indirect was modified several times during the construction of this vessel, the chief constructor, on page 371 of the hearings on the appropriation bill subjects, 1912, estimated that such increased indirect charges would be about \$500,000. The cost of the *Utah*, under the contract, including changes therein, was \$4,018,815.46.

"(3) What was the percentage of indirect charges on the *Connecticut*, and how much would the cost of the *Connecticut* have been increased under the system of indirect charges holding in commercial establishments?"

As regards the indirect cost of the *Connecticut*, it is impossible to give any exact statement. Under the accounting system in vogue during her construction, certain items now included in indirect cost would have been charged direct. In the construction of the *Connecticut*, however, a separate account was kept of general superintendence, clerical and drafting work, and it appears from page 401 of the 1911 hearing that this amounted to a little over 10 per cent of the direct cost of labor. Unquestionably, with the system of indirect charges holding in commercial establishments, the cost of the *Connecticut* would have been increased by not less than 25 per cent of the direct labor, or at least \$625,000.

"(4) What have been the total expenditures for repairs on the *Connecticut* and *Louisiana* to date?"

The total expenditures for repairs on the *Connecticut* and *Louisiana* to November 1, 1912, are as given in the following table:

Fiscal year.	Connecticut.	Louisiana.
1906.....	\$236.97	\$5,748.39
1907.....	54,960.29	105,404.49
1908.....	140,482.70	66,691.43
1909.....	198,298.56	126,556.53
1910.....	197,843.82	205,839.54
1911.....	70,531.15	53,849.20
1912.....	57,258.78	80,476.70
1913 (to Nov. 1, 1912).....	19,607.02	40,806.14
	739,219.32	685,372.42

The actual cost of the *Connecticut*, as reported to Congress by the Navy Department on April 18, 1908, was \$4,562,094. The actual cost of the *Louisiana*, as reported to Congress by the Navy Department on April 18, 1908, including all bureau and navy-yard inspections, changes, and other charges not included in the contract price, in the same manner as said charges were made for the sister vessel, the *Connecticut*, in order to be directly comparable therewith, was \$4,188,468.

Faithfully, yours,

P. M. WATT,

Chief Constructor, United States Navy, Chief of Bureau.

Now, if the same method of cost accounting obtained in the navy yard at Brooklyn in the building of the *Connecticut* that obtained in the building of the *Louisiana* in a private shipyard, it would have cost a million dollars, nearly, more than her sister ship, the *Louisiana*.

Now, let us take up another ship which we have been building in the New York Navy Yard, the *Florida*. According to the testimony of the Chief Constructor of the Navy, the *Florida*, which has just been completed in the New York Navy Yard, cost \$2,269,000 more than her sister ship of equal tonnage, similar in every respect, built at a private shipyard; and if the same cost-accounting system obtained in the New York Navy Yard which obtains in the private shipbuilding yard at Newport News, where the *Utah* was built, we would have to add to the cost of the *Florida* between four hundred and five hundred thousand dollars more.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOSS. No; I can not. I have only five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to make a correction. The *Utah* was built in the New York Shipbuilding Co.'s yard, on the Delaware.

Mr. FOSS. Now, this is what the Chief Constructor says in regard to the *Florida* and the *Utah*, and I propose to put it in the RECORD:

MEMORANDUM.

In the development of the new Navy, 15 vessels have been constructed in navy yards, namely:

- Second-class battleships *Maine* and *Texas*; 1888-1895, 1889-1895.
- Protected cruisers *Cincinnati* and *Raleigh*; 1890-1894, 1889-1894.
- First-class battleship *Connecticut*; 1903-1906.
- Training ships *Cumberland* and *Intrepid*; 1904-1907, 1904-1907.
- Wooden brig *Bower*; 1904-5.
- Tugs *Patapsco* and *Patuxent*; 1907-1909, 1907-1909.
- Fleet collars *Vestal* and *Prometheus*; 1906-1909, 1906-1910.
- First-class battleship *Florida*; 1909-1911.
- Fleet collier *Jupiter*; 1911-.
- First-class battleship *New York*; 1911-.

The last two vessels are now under construction, the collier *Jupiter* at the navy yard, Mare Island, and the battleship *New York* at the navy yard, New York.

In no instance have these vessels been constructed within the limit of cost first set by Congress.

In several instances, sister vessels to those built at navy yards have been built by contract, and a direct comparison between the cost of building by contract and of building in a Government yard is thus obtained.

In the cases of the *Cincinnati* and *Raleigh*, bids were invited from shipbuilders, but as the bids were in excess of the limit of cost construction in a Government yard was undertaken, and a direct comparison of cost of building in Government yards and of building by contract is thus obtained.

In the cases of the *Maine*, *Texas*, *Cumberland*, *Intrepid*, *Bower*, *Vestal* and *Prometheus*, no proposals were obtained from outside shipbuilders and no absolute comparison of cost is available; but a very fair comparison is possible by comparing the cost per ton of the above vessels with the cost per ton of vessels of the same type constructed about the same time by contract.

Further, the cost of preparing the navy yards at New York and Mare Island for shipbuilding purposes has amounted to many hundreds of thousands of dollars. In the hearings of the Secretary of the Navy before the Committee on Naval Affairs on Thursday, January 12, 1911, page 377, is found an official statement that "the total expenditure for preparing the navy yard, New York, for the construction of the *Connecticut* and *Florida*, exceeded \$900,000."

While there is no question as to the desirability of having certain of the navy yards equipped with plant and prepared with organization and skilled mechanics necessary to undertake shipbuilding, the cost of vessels built and building in navy yards is not less than \$7,000,000 in excess of the cost of building the same vessels by contract, an amount sufficient to provide the hull and machinery for one of the latest type all-big-gun battleships.

Navy-yard built.	Cost about.	More than.
Connecticut.....	\$374,000	Louisiana, a sister vessel built by contract.
Florida.....	2,209,000	Utah, a sister vessel built by contract.
Jupiter.....	590,000	Cyclops, a sister vessel built by contract.
New York.....	1,463,000	Texas, a sister vessel building by contract.
Cincinnati.....	770,000	Formal proposals received for their construction.
Raleigh.....	714,000	Limit of cost inside which it is estimated that vessels could have been contracted for.
Maine.....	780,000	The average of informal estimates received from three shipbuilding companies. (See p. 359, Secretary of the Navy's hearing, Jan. 12, 1911.)
Texas.....	449,000	
Vestal.....	250,000	
Prometheus.....	140,000	
Total.....	7,799,000	

COMPARISON OF COST OF BUILDING SHIPS IN NAVY YARDS AND BY CONTRACT.

The comparisons below are not of the whole cost, including cost of armor and armament, which are always purchased or supplied by the Government, but the cost for construction of hull and machinery and placing on board the armor and armament. This is the work covered by the contracts for contract-built vessels.

The first case is that of the *Cincinnati* and *Raleigh*. These are protected cruisers authorized as long ago as 1888. The authorizing act fixed a limit of cost of \$1,100,000. The department was unable to obtain a bid for private construction within the limit, the lowest bid being \$1,225,000, so they were ordered built in navy yards—the *Cincinnati* at New York, the *Raleigh* at Norfolk. The navy yard costs in the end were: For the *Cincinnati*, \$1,978,225.52, and for the *Raleigh*, \$1,816,187.57, an average cost of \$1,897,206.54, or just about 40 per cent above the cost if the vessels had been built by contract. The costs of the vessels were taken from Senate Document No. 175, second session Fifty-sixth Congress, extended to December 31, 1901.

The second case is that of the *Connecticut* and *Louisiana*, battleships of 16,000 tons displacement authorized in 1902 and completed in 1906. The *Connecticut* was built at the New York yard, the *Louisiana* by contract. House Document No. 868, of the Sixtieth Congress, gives the cost of the *Louisiana*, built by contract, as \$4,188,468.36, and of the *Connecticut*, built at the New York yard, as \$4,562,093.57. The difference is \$373,625.21, or the cost of the navy yard ship is but 9 per cent greater than that of the contract-built ship. This is a very great reduction from the 40 per cent of the *Cincinnati* and *Raleigh*.

The *Connecticut* and *Louisiana* were built in competition, both as to time and cost, and stringent orders were issued by the Navy Department that full cost should be ascertained for the *Connecticut*, even to charging to her a proportion of the salaries of all officers at the yard concerned in any way in her construction, a thing never done for later navy yard-built ships.

The third case is that of the *Utah* and *Florida*, battleships of 21,825 tons, authorized in 1903 and completed so recently as 1911.

The *Utah* was built by contract, the *Florida* at the New York yard. Admiral Watt testified before the Naval Committee last year that the cost of the *Utah* was \$4,030,000, and of the *Florida* \$6,213,000. Admiral Cone, testifying a few weeks ago, gave even a higher figure for the *Florida*, namely, \$6,286,143. Taking Admiral Watt's lower figures, the excess cost of the *Florida* is \$2,183,000, or 54 per cent in excess of the contract-built ship.

Admiral Watt testified also, very unwillingly, that the cost of the *Florida*, as given by him, did not include certain indirect charges that are properly chargeable to cost of work and must be so charged by contractors. So a really full comparison would show up the navy-yard costs in even a worse light.

As the figures stand, however, they indicate a most woeful falling off in efficiency at the New York Navy Yard from 1906, the date of the *Connecticut*, to 1911, the date of the *Florida*. These are all the cases of completed ships. Consider now the cases of ships still under construction.

We have the *Texas* and *New York*, 27,000-ton battleships, authorized in 1910 and now building, the *Texas* by contract, the *New York* at the navy yard of that name. The contract price of the *Texas* is \$5,850,000. The limit of cost for the *New York*, exclusive of indirect charges, is \$6,400,000. There never has been yet a navy-yard-built ship which did not exceed her original limit of cost, and none would ever have been completed in a navy yard had not Congress in each case increased the limit it had set, but without attempting to prophesy evil suppose we assume that the direct cost will be only \$6,400,000. From Admiral Cone's figures the indirect costs for the *Florida*, even the reduced indirect costs charged to her, were 18 per cent of the direct, which would make the cost of the *New York* \$7,552,000. This is \$1,722,000, or 30 per cent, more than the cost of the contract-built ship. Moreover, the *Texas* is being built under the eight-hour law. It happens that the same contractors who built the *Louisiana* in competition with the *Connecticut* are not building the *Texas* in competition with the *New York*. When they were building the *Louisiana* they had no limit to their working hours and worked their men between 9 and 10 hours. They are now allowed to work their men on the *Texas* only 8 hours, the same as the navy yard, and yet the excess of navy-yard costs has increased from 9 per cent to 30 per cent on a very fair estimate. It will probably be even more. Truly there has been exceedingly rapid progress backward in navy-yard efficiency.

One more comparison.

The *Jupiter*, a 19,360-ton collier, is now being built at the navy yard, Mare Island, a yard which built the collier *Prometheus* somewhat more cheaply than the New York Navy Yard built the sister collier *Vestal*.

The limit of cost of the *Jupiter* is \$1,200,000 for direct costs only, and the actual total cost, including indirect costs, will undoubtedly be very close to \$1,500,000, if it does not exceed that figure.

We have completed, or are now building by contract, a number of these large colliers, sister vessels, or very nearly sister vessels, of the *Jupiter*. The table below gives their names, their displacements, and their contract prices:

Name.	Displacement.	Contract price.
	<i>Tons.</i>	
Cyclops.....	19,360	\$822,500
Jason.....	19,132	951,000
Neptune.....	19,531	889,600
Nereus.....	19,000	990,000
Orion.....	19,132	951,000
Proteus.....	19,000	990,000

Some of these colliers are building under the eight-hour law. It is evident that the navy-yard cost of \$1,500,000 will be from 50 to 70 per cent greater than the contract cost.

Contract prices of battleships—hull and machinery.

Ships.	Authorized.	Normal displacement.	Contract price.	Cost per ton of normal displacement.
		<i>Tons.</i>		
Indiana.....	1890	10,288	\$3,063,000	\$297.72
Massachusetts.....	1890	10,288	3,063,000	297.72
Oregon.....	1890	10,288	3,222,810	313.26
Iowa.....	1892	11,346	3,010,000	265.29
Kearsarge.....	1895	11,520	2,250,000	195.31
Kentucky.....	1895	11,520	2,250,000	195.31
Alabama.....	1896	11,552	2,650,000	229.40
Illinois.....	1896	11,552	2,595,000	224.64
Wisconsin.....	1896	11,552	2,674,950	231.56
Maine.....	1898	12,500	2,885,000	230.80
Missouri.....	1898	12,500	2,885,000	230.80
Ohio.....	1898	12,500	2,899,000	231.92
Virginia.....	1899	14,948	3,590,000	240.16

Contract prices of battleships—hull and machinery—Continued.

Ships.	Authorized.	Normal displacement.	Contract price.	Cost per ton of normal displacement.
		<i>Tons.</i>		
Nebraska.....	1899	14,948	\$3,733,600	\$249.77
Georgia.....	1899	14,948	3,590,000	240.16
Rhode Island.....	1900	14,948	3,405,000	227.79
New Jersey.....	1900	14,948	3,405,000	227.79
Connecticut.....	1902	16,000	14,526,694	285.13
Louisiana.....	1902	16,000	14,188,468	261.78
Vermont.....	1903	16,000	4,179,000	261.19
Minnesota.....	1903	16,000	4,110,000	256.88
Kansas.....	1903	16,000	4,165,000	260.31
Idaho.....	1903	13,000	2,999,500	230.73
Mississippi.....	1903	13,000	2,999,500	230.73
New Hampshire.....	1904	16,000	3,748,000	234.25
South Carolina.....	1905	16,000	3,540,000	221.25
Michigan.....	1905	16,000	3,585,000	224.06
Delaware.....	1906	20,000	3,987,000	199.35
North Dakota.....	1907	20,000	4,377,000	218.85
Florida.....	1908	21,825	16,212,793	284.66
Utah.....	1908	21,825	13,946,000	180.80
Wyoming.....	1909	26,000	4,450,000	171.15
Arkansas.....	1909	26,000	4,675,000	179.81
Texas.....	1910	27,000	5,830,000	215.93
New York.....	1910	27,000	5,293,000	207.11
Nevada.....	1911	27,500	5,895,000	214.36
Oklahoma.....	1911	27,500	5,926,000	215.49

¹ Built at navy yard, New York, N. Y.; actual cost, as reported to Congress by the Navy Department on Apr. 18, 1908.
² Actual cost, including all bureau, navy-yard inspection, changes, and other charges not included in contract price in same manner as said charges were made for sister vessel, the Connecticut, and in order to be directly comparable therewith. This cost is as reported to Congress by the Navy Department on Apr. 18, 1908.
³ Built at navy yard, New York, N. Y.; actual cost.
⁴ Loading at normal displacement greater than for previous ships.
⁵ Building under eight-hour labor law.
⁶ Building at navy yard, New York, N. Y.; estimated cost.

Comparison of costs of navy-yard and contract built ships.

[Vessels braced are sister vessels.]

Name of vessel.	Type.	Displacement.	Builder.	Limit of cost.	Cost: (A), actual; (C), contract; (E), estimated. ¹	Cost per ton.	Date of act authorizing building.	Date of contract.	Date of completion.
Maine.....	Second-class battleship.....	<i>Tons.</i> 6,682	New York Navy Yard.....	\$2,500,000	(A) \$3,280,792	\$491	Aug. 3, 1886	Oct. 17, 1888 ²	Sept. 17, 1895 ³
Texas.....	do.....	6,315	Navy yard, Norfolk.....	2,500,000	(A) 2,949,549	467	do.....	June 1, 1889 ²	Aug. 15, 1895 ³
Average.....						479			
Indiana.....	First-class battleship.....	10,288	Wm. Cramp & Sons, Philadelphia.....	4,000,000	(A) 3,261,657	318	June 30, 1890	Nov. 19, 1890	Nov. 19, 1895
Massachusetts.....	do.....	10,288	do.....	4,000,000	(A) 3,333,570	324	do.....	Nov. 18, 1890	May 29, 1893
Oregon.....	do.....	10,288	Union Iron Works.....	4,000,000	(A) 3,736,180	364	do.....	Nov. 19, 1890	June 26, 1896
Average.....						335			
Cincinnati.....	Protected cruiser.....	3,213	Navy yard, New York ⁴	1,100,000	(A) 1,995,773	628	Sept. 7, 1888	Jan. —, 1890 ²	June 16, 1894 ³
Raleigh.....	do.....	3,213	Navy yard, Norfolk ⁴	1,100,000	(A) 1,839,965	577	do.....	Dec. —, 1889 ²	Apr. 17, 1894 ³
Average.....						602			
Charleston.....	Protected cruiser.....	3,730	Union Iron Works.....	1,100,000	(A) 1,097,190	294	Mar. 3, 1885	Dec. 28, 1886	Dec. 26, 1889
Baltimore.....	do.....	4,413	Wm. Cramp & Sons, Philadelphia.....	1,500,000	(A) 1,480,918	336	Aug. 3, 1886	Dec. 17, 1886	Jan. 7, 1890 ³
Detroit.....	Unprotected cruiser.....	2,089	Columbian Iron Works.....	700,000	(A) 905,674	434	Sept. 7, 1888	Nov. 2, 1889	July 20, 1893 ³
Minneapolis.....	Protected cruiser.....	7,350	Wm. Cramp & Sons, Philadelphia.....	2,750,000	(A) 3,263,581	444	Mar. 2, 1891	Aug. 31, 1891	Dec. 13, 1894 ³
Average.....						377			
Connecticut.....	First-class battleship.....	16,000	Navy yard, New York.....	\$4,212,000	(A) 4,562,094	285	July 1, 1902	Mar. 10, 1903 ²	Sept. 29, 1906 ³
Louisiana.....	do.....	16,000	Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.....	4,212,000	(A) 4,188,468	262	do.....	Oct. 15, 1902	May 21, 1906
Florida.....	do.....	21,825	Navy yard, New York.....	\$6,000,000	(A) 6,299,295	288	May 13, 1908	Mar. 9, 1909 ²	Sept. 15, 1911 ³
Utah.....	do.....	21,825	New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden.....	6,000,000	(A) 4,030,844	185	do.....	Nov. 24, 1908	Aug. 30, 1911
New York.....	do.....	27,000	Navy yard, New York.....	7,600,000	(E) 7,293,000	270	June 24, 1910	Sept. 11, 1911 ²	May 19, 1914 ³
Texas.....	do.....	27,000	Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.....	6,000,000	(C) 5,830,000	216	do.....	Dec. 17, 1910	Oct. 17, 1913 ³
Jupiter.....	Fleet collier.....	19,375	Navy yard, Mare Island.....	\$1,800,000	(E) 1,467,514	76	May 13, 1908	Oct. 18, 1911 ²	May 12, 1913 ³
Cyclops.....	do.....	19,375	Wm. Cramp & Sons, Philadelphia.....	1,800,000	(A) ¹⁸ 872,605	45	do.....	Mar. 24, 1909	Nov. 7, 1910 ³
Neptune.....	do.....	19,375	Maryland Steel Co.....	900,000	(C) ¹⁹ 889,600	46	Mar. 3, 1909	Sept. 23, 1909	Sept. 20, 1911 ³
Vestal.....	do.....	12,585	Navy yard, New York.....	¹¹ 1,250,000	(A) 1,625,400	130	Apr. 27, 1904	Mar. 25, 1907 ²	Oct. 4, 1909 ³
Prometheus.....	do.....	12,585	Navy yard, Mare Island.....	¹¹ 1,250,000	(A) 1,516,462	122	do.....	Oct. 18, 1907 ²	Jan. 15, 1910 ³
Cumberland.....	Training ship.....	1,800	Navy yard, Boston.....	1,370,000	(A) 422,933	220	Mar. 3, 1903	Jan. 21, 1904 ²	July 20, 1907 ³
Intrepid.....	do.....	1,800	Navy yard, Mare Island.....	¹² 370,000	(A) 398,191	208	do.....	Jan. 2, 1904 ²	Aug. 16, 1907 ³
Boxer.....	Wooden brigantine.....	346	Navy yard, Portsmouth.....	50,000	(A) 94,703	274	do.....	Jan. 15, 1904 ²	May 11, 1905 ³
Severn.....	Training ship.....	1,175	Bath Iron Works.....	250,000	(C) 112,600	96	Mar. 3, 1897	Mar. 16, 1898	July 22, 1899
Patasco.....	Tug, seagoing.....	755	Navy yard, Portsmouth.....	¹² 175,000	(A) 219,402	290	Apr. 27, 1904	May 12, 1907 ²	Aug. 2, 1909
Patuxent.....	do.....	755	Navy yard, Norfolk.....	¹³ 175,000	(A) 212,167	280	do.....	July 25, 1907	Apr. 5, 1909
Sonoma.....	do.....	1,120	New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden.....	215,000	(C) 194,000	178	Mar. 4, 1911	Aug. 24, 1911	Aug. 15, 1912 ³
Ontario.....	do.....	1,120	do.....	215,000	194,000	178	do.....	do.....	Aug. 15, 1912

¹ Exclusive of armor, armament, and equipment.
² Date of laying keel.
³ Date of first commission.
⁴ Proposal received for construction by contract \$1,225,000, or \$385 per ton. As this was in excess of limit of cost, construction in a navy yard was decided upon by the department.
⁵ Limit of cost increased to \$4,600,000 in naval appropriation bill of June 29, 1906.
⁶ Limit of cost increased to \$6,400,000 in naval appropriation bill of Mar. 4, 1911.
⁷ Limit of cost increased to \$6,400,000 and indirect charges excluded in naval appropriation bill of Mar. 4, 1911.
⁸ Probable date of completion.

⁹ Limit of cost decreased to \$900,000 in naval appropriation bill of Mar. 3, 1909; subsequently increased to \$1,000,000 in naval appropriation bill of June 24, 1910; subsequently increased to \$1,200,000 and indirect charges excluded in naval appropriation bill of Mar. 4, 1911.
¹⁰ It is estimated that these vessels could not be obtained by contract at this time for less than \$1,100,000.
¹¹ Limit of cost increased to \$1,550,000 in naval appropriation bill of June 29, 1906.
¹² Limit of cost increased to \$410,000 in naval appropriation bill of June 29, 1906.
¹³ Extension of limit of cost to amount necessary out of appropriation "Steam machinery" authorized in naval appropriation bill of May 13, 1908.

Mr. FOSS. In other words, if the same method of figuring the cost obtained in the New York Navy Yard in the building of the *Florida* which did obtain in the commercial establishment of the New York Shipbuilding concern, we would have to add \$500,000 to the \$2,269,000 which the *Florida*—the Government navy-yard ship—cost more than the *Utah*.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, in justice to this House I wish to say that there are several men who have not been given extra time on the statement of the Chair that no one should speak on an amendment more than five minutes. I therefore object. That rule ought to be carried out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] objects.

Mr. FOSS. Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that some one objects?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this question of the cost of the system of construction of these ships—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that all debate on these amendments has been exhausted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move to strike out the last word, or I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] has frequently discussed this question of indirect charges. In the act approved July 1, 1902, in which the *Connecticut* and the *Louisiana* were authorized, appears this provision:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby instructed to keep an accurate account of the cost of inspection and construction of vessels provided for in this act, whether built in Government yards or by contract, and report thereon to Congress at each session the progress of work and cost thereof, including the inspection of all the material going into the construction of said vessels, and upon the completion thereof to report a full and detailed statement showing the relative cost of inspection and construction in Government yards and by contract.

At the conclusion of the work on these ships it was reported that the *Connecticut*, built in a Government yard, had cost \$400,000 in excess of the contract-built ship. The *Connecticut* was the first ship built in a Government yard in over 13 years. The yard at that time was not equipped. One hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars was appropriated for equipment; and yet in spite of that fact, without experience, in a new work, working 8 hours in the Government yard as against 10 hours in the private plant, it made the private plant, for the first time in the history of warship construction in this country, build at such a rate as to build within the limit fixed in the contract to avoid being outdone by the Government plant.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman permit just one question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I want to ask the gentleman if the New York Navy Yard is now equipped to build this battleship?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have only five minutes. I will not yield further.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman knows—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will not yield. There is something more important than that. Ever since it was demonstrated that the Government could compete with the private yards the Navy Department has been endeavoring to devise some system of cost accounting to show that the cost of building in Government yards exceeds the cost of building by contract. The evidence is that the Government does work at less expense in the manufacture of all kinds of arms, armament, and ammunition than it can be done for by contract. Two years ago, upon information furnished me confidentially by an officer in the Navy Department, I brought a chart into this House and demonstrated that under the new system of cost keeping introduced in the Navy they had charged against the *Florida* about \$900,000 of indirect charges for expenses that were incurred in the yards regardless of whether a ship was being constructed there. The ordinary maintenance and upkeep charges of the yard, charges for the repairs of streets and maintenance of buildings and the lighting of the yard, all of which went on, because the yard was maintained as a military reservation and a repair plant, were diverted so as to increase the apparent

cost of the ship. I have always contended that the fair rule to observe is this one: A yard or plant is capable of doing certain work. It is doing it. If a ship can be built there without any increase of the ordinary upkeep charges, it is unfair to divert any of the yard charges to the cost of the ship; but every dollar additional to the ordinary maintenance charges that are imposed in the operation of the yard by reason of the building of the ship should be charged to the ship.

There were charged to the *Florida* \$1,431,360 indirect charges. My colleague from New York [Mr. CALDER] has read the bids on the *Pennsylvania*, recently opened. The bid of the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. on the *Pennsylvania*, the lowest of all the private plants, is \$7,285,000. The bid of the New York yard (a Government yard) is \$7,303,000, and that includes over \$800,000 of indirect charges. Some of them do not belong in the estimate as to the cost of the ship.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman state what the indirect charges are?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are as follows:

ACCOUNTS CHARGEABLE AS INDIRECT EXPENSES.

POWER EXPENSE.

Maintenance of power-plant buildings, boilers, flues, stacks, piping, and machinery; distributing system (heat, electric, pneumatic, hydraulic, steam); substation buildings, motors, and accessories; furniture, fixtures, and equipment; underground conduits and pole lines; loose and hand tools.

Attendance on light and power plants, fuel, miscellaneous power-plant expense, oil, grease, and waste; supervision.

GENERAL EXPENSE.

Maintenance of miscellaneous buildings, elevators, furniture, fixtures, and equipment for offices; telephone, telegraph, time clock, fire-alarm, water, and sewer systems; tracks, rolling stock, weighing apparatus, miscellaneous yard appliances, floating property, live stock, vehicles, and testing laboratory equipment. Janitor service, general office expense, drafting, testing and inspecting, hauling borings, turnings, etc.; examination of employees, handling material not chargeable to shops, and general superintendence.

They are distributed in this way: If a ship is being built in the yard and \$1,000,000 a year is spent on the ship and \$750,000 of repair work is being done in the yard, they distribute the indirect charges in proportion to the expenditure for work, and the charge against the ship would be in the ratio of \$1,000,000 to \$750,000, while there might not be a single dollar added for those indirect expenses because of the building of the ship. The figures of the department as to the cost of Government construction are unfair, unreliable, and indefensible. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Regular order!

Mr. JONES. One minute.

Mr. PADGETT. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. POWERS. I should like to have the amendment read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is there any objection to having it read?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Division! This is on the vote for two navy yards.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were 7 yeas and 65 noes.

So the amendment was lost.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], when he was addressing the House, if the New York Navy Yard was equipped to build a battleship at this time if permitted to do so. The gentleman replied that it was. My information is to the contrary. The last naval bill provided for the construction of a large collier, and that collier, as I am informed, is now being built at the New York Navy Yard.

Mr. CALDER. If the gentleman will pardon me, I want to state that that is not the fact.

Mr. JONES. Well, the gentleman ought to know. I have stated that my information was obtained from another. It is to the effect that a collier is now under construction at the New York Navy Yard, and that it can not be completed in less

than a year unless the Government expends as much as \$200,000 in enlarging the present equipment of the yard. My information was obtained from a gentleman who is unusually well informed in regard to these matters. If it is correct, then the building of this battleship must be delayed for at least a year, for the New York yard can not build two great ships at the same time. It is not equipped to do so.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not possible to equip some other yard than the Brooklyn Navy Yard under this amendment?

Mr. JONES. I think not. The funds would have to be appropriated by Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has not the committee just voted down a proposition that there shall be any competition at all, and if you build a ship in the navy yard you must build it at the Brooklyn yard?

Mr. JONES. That is true. Now, Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said about the propriety of building these ships in the navy yards of the United States. I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] for what he said upon this subject. He was not influenced in what he said, as some other gentlemen have been, by the fact that the New York Navy Yard is located in their city. I object to these gentlemen basing their action upon the ground that it is to the interest of the Government to build our battleships in Government yards when they are only thinking of the interests of their constituents who will be benefited directly and indirectly by the expenditure of millions of dollars in the communities which they represent. I need not name these gentlemen since we have all heard them to-day, but they are no more patriotic than the rest of us. They are actuated by the same motives that actuate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING], and myself. We each have in our districts large private yards and we naturally would like to see these ships built in those yards if they can be built there as cheaply and as well as anywhere else. The reasons which actuate the gentlemen from New York who advocate the building of battleships in the New York Navy Yard are not different from those which actuate Representatives who believe that a part of them should be built in private yards when they can be built as cheaply there. I believe, however, that they can be built much cheaper and better in the private yards. I believe, too, that the mechanics who work in private yards deserve every bit as much consideration at the hands of Congress as those who work in navy yards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say that I do not live in a district where there is a navy yard or where there are any citizens employed in that class of work. I am in favor of this amendment because it gives to the workman better working conditions, and because the work done is much superior to that done by private contractors for profit.

It is a good proposition for the Government to build its own battleships and manufacture other supplies. It has brought down the price of battleships per ton almost one-half, according to information I have received, since the Government started to construct its own ships. I am in favor of the amendment because it is a benefit to the men who work at this class of work, and it is for the best interests of the people.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, some gentlemen have indulged in criticism of the gentlemen from New York who are advocating this proposition. I have always believed that it was the duty of a Member from a district to advocate those things which especially relate to his district and which were a benefit to his district, leaving the other Members of the House to judge of the propriety of the proposition. On matters which do not relate particularly to our own district we are supposed to exercise broad statesmanship. I do not think it lies within the mouths of Members here to criticize my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who, from his position, as well as from his point of view, necessarily opposes a great many propositions for building buildings, the construction of river and harbor improvements, and the building of two battleships. The gentleman is properly advocating one battleship, which is all they can build at one time at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and he is performing the proper function of his office in representing the interest of his constituency in urging one battleship to be built in the Brooklyn Navy Yard. It is for the rest of us to determine whether he can get away with it. I apprehend he will, as usual. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to move that all debate on this amendment be now closed.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to yield me five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. I wish I could, but I can not. I must insist upon my motion, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that all debate on this amendment be now closed.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOSS) there were—ayes 60, noes 25.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOSS and Mr. BROWNING) there were—ayes 75, noes 26.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, while I think of it I desire to make some corrections in the text of the paragraph on account of former amendments. I ask that in line 21, page 54, the word "battleships" be made "battleship," and that the word "each" in line 22 and in line 25, be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendments will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 54, at the end of the page, add the following as a new paragraph:

"One armored cruiser carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessel of its class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, and to cost not to exceed \$20,000,000."

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, this is not only a question dealing with an increase in the Navy, but it is more particularly a question dealing with the tactical composition of the fleet. There are many Members who voted against increasing battleships who would be glad, I believe, to vote for building these battle cruisers.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if it is contemplated in this amendment to build such a battle cruiser as is recommended by the General Board and the Secretary of the Navy in his annual report.

Mr. HOBSON. It is just such a cruiser, and I want to point out that these cruisers are needed as fast wings for the battle fleet. It is like an army which is founded on its infantry, but which must, nevertheless, in order to make the infantry effective, have cavalry for its wings. Every nation in the world, as it has proceeded to work out the composition of a new fleet, has proceeded to develop this kind of a cruiser in proportion with the battleships. Take the case of England. England builds one battle cruiser to each two to three *Dreadnoughts*. Germany builds one for each three. Japan builds one to each *Dreadnought*, one for one; and Russia, that has the latest thoroughly developed new program, is building at the rate of one to two. The United States has 13 *Dreadnoughts*, if we count the *South Carolina* and the *Michigan*, and 14 with the one authorized to-day. We have not yet a single battle cruiser, and the composition of our fleet, if it had to meet an enemy's fleet of the same size having battle cruisers, would be at a decided disadvantage. These battle cruisers have anywhere from 6 to 7 and even 8 knots superior speed, so that they can go out and cap the battle column and either make the battleship run over the mines that have been dropped or change their course and run them into disadvantageous positions, just like an army could be if one army had cavalry and the other did not.

It is a question of the integrity of the Navy, as well as a reasonable expansion. In connection with expansion, or apparent expansion, let me remind Members who think they are maintaining the American Navy by building one ship, that we have between 7,000 and 8,000 tons of warship displacement which comprise machinery and plants that at any establishment in the world would be subjected to deterioration at the rate of 10 per cent a year, and any wise proprietor would write that much off. Simply writing off the depreciation, what you might call rust, would be more than equivalent to the tonnage of two battleships a year, and, as I pointed out a few moments ago, building two battleships regularly every year by 1916 puts us down to the fourth place and one battleship a year will put us down to the sixth place by 1920. I do not believe Members appreciate these facts. Certainly the people of the country do not wish their Navy to go down to the fourth place, much less the sixth place. Add this battle cruiser to the *Dreadnought*, which is authorized, and it will not really keep up the deterioration, make good the rusting of the existing fleet.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] referred to the upkeep of the vessels. If we will have new battleships,

then we can put the old battleships in reserve. We are keeping them—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I ask for three minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, we are keeping many of the old battleships on the battle line, because we have to have tactical units and are lacking in number of newer ships; these older ships are of lower speed than the newer battleships and really retard the new battle fleet and impair its effectiveness; these ships ought to be in the reserve. They are exceedingly expensive to maintain in comparison to their power. By the addition of new ships, two, for instance, this year, it will enable us to put four of our older battleships out of commission and put them in reserve. It is a simple question of efficiency, of the integrity of the existing Navy in making effective the Navy that we now have. Now, to make a specific comparison. Just for illustration, Japan is building four battle cruisers and one *Dreadnought*, indicating that her plan is to have in the future a fleet of greater speed than our fleet by four, five, or six knots. That would enable her, if she has a weapon that can fire at long range, and this indicates that she has a shell that would not be required to penetrate the armor after it strikes, a shell using explosives in large weights, then she could practically stay out where the lighter armor of her ships would be as much a defense against our fire as the heavier armor of our ships against their fire. Then, they would have the additional speed to enable them to take their location at the front and cap our fleet, and we would be placed at a very serious disadvantage.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to ask the gentleman how many cruisers we have?

Mr. HOBSON. Not one of the battle-cruiser type.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How is it the gentleman has not advocated them before, instead of these *Dreadnoughts*?

Mr. HOBSON. I have been advocating them and also the *Dreadnoughts*. The gentleman will remember I tried to get them authorized in the Naval Committee. I have been advocating them and the general board advocates them and every strategic board in the world is advocating them.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I understood the gentleman was trying to get the *Dreadnoughts*.

Mr. HOBSON. I have been trying to get both types.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this amendment be now closed.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hobson) there were—ayes 22, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, line 21, add the word "cruisers"; line 23, strike out the word "practicable" and insert in lieu thereof the word "attainable"; line 24, strike out the word "desirable" and insert in lieu thereof the word "attainable."

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in the line of the argument so ably advanced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] just now and in support of the figures which he has shown to the committee, and which will be found in the report of the chairman of the Naval Committee. To be a little more specific in this matter, England when its present naval program is completed will have 25 *Dreadnoughts* and 11 battleship cruisers; Germany will have 17 *Dreadnoughts* and 7 battleship cruisers; Japan will have 3 *Dreadnoughts* and 4 battleship cruisers, while Russia will have 7 *Dreadnoughts* and 4 battleship cruisers, showing a proportion a little more favorable toward battleship cruisers than Capt. Hobson stated. Now, I wish to add to the statement he has made in regard to the effectiveness of the battleship cruisers that from what I can learn of them a navy composed of *Dreadnoughts* with its auxiliary fleet would be entirely at the mercy of these battleship cruisers. The range of their guns is as long, their projectiles as effective as ours, and with the kind of ammunition they use they could pierce our heavy armored leviathans and with an explosive shell could sink them before the leviathans would be able to return a single shot in defense. So in order to have an adequate Navy we need to build up these battleship cruisers as rapidly as can be done, and it seems if we are to add to our appropriation extravagances this year some

\$7,000,000 or \$10,000,000, we should do it in a line which tends toward actual economy and efficiency. These ships are cheaper to build in regard to their armor, and they will be necessary if we should have a sea war.

And I believe that this committee, if it is really in favor of an adequate Navy and is not in favor of adding heavily armored ships for the benefit of the Steel Trust and the Armor Trust, should adopt this amendment. We have had during the sessions of this Congress three great investigations, the Steel Trust, the Money Trust, and we are now having, in the Committee on Naval Affairs, Mr. Chairman, the investigation of the Shipping Trust. And they all lead back to the same point. They all show whence this legislation is directed. They all show that the arms of the octopus stretch from Wall Street into the very vitals of the Nation here, and are grasping appropriations which we make, not for the benefit of an efficient Navy, not for the economy of the people, but for the benefit of the Money Trust of the Nation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Thayer].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, line 25, after the end of the line, insert:

"Provided, The draft of such vessels shall not exceed 35 feet."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to speak for two minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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 \$950,000 each.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, Mr. WITHERSPOON, and Mr. HOBSON rose.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] is recognized.

Mr. HOBSON. I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 55, in line 1, strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten."

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, as of the amendment just proposed, is to realize the fighting value of the battleships we now have. With the increase in the range of the modern torpedo to 10,000 yards and beyond, it has become absolutely necessary for battleships to have these destroyers cooperating with them. Every nation in the world has recognized this. The consensus of opinion of the experts of the world is that each battleship ought to have 4 destroyers with it. For instance, take the British Navy, counting 69 battleships, they have 184 destroyers ready. Take France, with 27 battleships, they have 84 destroyers ready; Germany, with 40 battleships, they have 131 destroyers ready; Japan, with 20 battleships, they have 67 destroyers ready; and the United States of America, with 38 battleships, has 56 destroyers, and some of those are getting old.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I would like to ask the gentleman what is the highest practical speed of a torpedo-boat destroyer?

Mr. HOBSON. Abroad they are running as high as 35 knots. I think ours would run about 31.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. What is the speed of a submarine torpedo?

Mr. HOBSON. I think submarines have gotten up to about 11 knots, submerged. They have a higher speed on the surface, but I do not believe they can obtain more than 10 or 11 knots when submerged.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How many destroyers are there? How many do you recommend?

Mr. HOBSON. I am recommending that we go from 6 to 10. The general board recommended 16.

Mr. SHERWOOD. That makes \$4,000,000 additional?

Mr. HOBSON. Approximately a little more. I do not care to take up the time and attention of this House further. I do feel, though, that a responsibility rests on me to point out what is so plain that every Member can see it if he would, that we ought to make the Navy we have effective. What is the use of having \$150,000,000 in battleships and then have 25 or 30 or 40 per cent of their efficiency in battle lost because we have not provided the relatively inexpensive destroyers?

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. POWERS. How many of these torpedo-boat destroyers have England, France, and Germany?

Mr. HOBSON. I have just quoted it. England has 184; France, 84; Germany, 131; and Japan, 67. It is the practice of all the world—

Mr. POWERS. And we have 42?

Mr. HOBSON. We have 42 built and 14 building, and of those building many are not up to date to be used with the *Dreadnought* class.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What is the draft of those vessels?

Mr. HOBSON. I should say about 16 feet; I guess about that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Could any of them pass in time of peace from one navy yard to another on the Atlantic coast by the inland waterways?

Mr. HOBSON. I think not; but I hope the day will speedily come when we can develop that inland-waterway system so that we can pass our torpedo craft through the inland waterways paralleling the coast.

Mr. MANN. Did the torpedo destroyers owned by France, Germany, and England cost as much as a million dollars apiece, or somewhere in that neighborhood?

Mr. HOBSON. Again, I speak from impression and memory merely. I do not think the average has been that much. I do not think our average has been that much heretofore, but I think that those that are being laid down to-day are that much. The trend of evolution is to increase of size of the destroyer and make her available as a scouting cruiser.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] moves that debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 55, in line 1, strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 24, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 55 strike out the paragraph, lines 1, 2, and 3, as follows: "Six torpedo-boat destroyers, to have the highest practicable speed, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$950,000 each."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The Committee divided, and there were—ayes 25, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Four submarine torpedo boats in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$2,478,936; and the sum of \$1,294,912 is hereby appropriated for said purpose.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House briefly to the expenses of our Naval Establishment. In 1896 we spent on the Navy \$29,000,000 in round figures. In 1897 we spent on it \$30,000,000; in 1898, \$33,000,000; in 1899, \$56,000,000; in 1900, \$48,000,000; in 1901, \$65,000,000; in 1902, \$78,000,000; in 1903, \$78,000,000; in 1904, \$81,000,000; in 1905, \$97,000,000; in 1906, \$100,000,000; in 1907, \$102,000,000; in 1908, \$98,000,000; in 1909, \$122,000,000; in 1910, \$136,000,000; in 1911, \$131,000,000; and in 1912, \$126,000,000.

I wanted to call the attention of the committee especially to this to show how rapidly this item is increasing in expense. I do not believe that a country is made greater, nor do I believe it is made stronger, by unnecessarily increasing the number of shoulder straps or the number of ships on the sea.

I do not believe that a nation is made stronger by increasing the burdens upon labor and increasing the expenditures upon those matters which will become fixed charges upon labor for all time to come. It is estimated that each battleship will cost annually two and one-half million dollars in maintenance: First, in maintenance of the ship on the sea; second, in repairs; third, in the number of additional employees necessary in the entire department of Government; fourth, the support of the battleship by the submarines and the auxiliary vessels that surround it, and the subsistence of the people who are employed. That is also an increased item of expense. Therefore it is estimated that for every new battleship authorized we put an annual expenditure of \$2,500,000 as a fixed charge upon the Treasury.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to place in the Record a statement showing the increased appropriations from 1875 down to and including the present time. I mean by that the expenses of the Government, including other items of expense as well as that of the Navy.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman insert in that table the amount carried by this bill as reported to the House?

Mr. Sisson. Yes; I will do that.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Appropriations fiscal years 1875-1912, inclusive.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS.	
1881	\$253,300.00
1882	335,500.00
1883	427,280.00
1884	405,640.00
1885	480,190.00
1886	585,790.00
1887	654,715.00
1888	1,028,730.00
1889	1,716,010.00
1890	1,669,770.00
1891	1,779,100.00
1892	3,428,153.50
1893	3,232,995.50
1894	3,323,500.00
1895	3,223,623.06
1896	3,303,750.00
1897	3,255,532.00
1898	3,182,902.00
1899	3,509,202.00
1900	3,726,022.00
1901	4,023,500.00
1902	4,582,420.00
1903	5,208,960.00
1904	5,978,160.00
1905	5,902,040.00
1906	6,882,690.00
1907	9,930,440.00
1908	9,447,290.00
1909	11,672,106.00
1910	12,995,036.00
1911	13,487,636.00
1912	16,900,016.00
ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.	
1875	27,788,500.00
1876	27,935,830.00
1877	27,621,867.90
1878	25,812,500.00
1879	25,593,486.01
1880	26,797,300.00
1881	26,425,800.00
1882	26,687,800.00
1883	27,528,000.00
1884	24,381,250.00
1885	24,454,450.00
1886	24,014,052.50
1887	23,753,057.00
1888	23,724,718.69
1889	24,471,300.00
1890	24,316,315.73
1891	24,206,471.79
1892	24,613,529.19
1893	24,308,499.82
1894	24,225,639.78
1895	23,592,884.08
1896	23,252,608.09
1897	23,278,402.73
1898	23,129,344.30

1899	\$23,193,392.00	1903	\$7,298,955.00
1900	80,430,204.06	1904	7,188,416.22
1901	114,220,095.55	1905	7,518,192.00
1902	115,734,049.10	1906	6,747,893.00
1903	77,730,136.41	1907	5,054,993.00
1904	77,888,752.83	1908	6,898,011.00
1905	77,070,300.88	1909	9,316,745.00
1906	70,396,631.64	1910	8,170,111.00
1907	71,817,165.08	1911	5,617,200.00
1908	78,634,582.75	1912	5,473,707.00
1909	95,382,247.61		
1910	101,195,883.34		
1911	95,440,567.55		
1912	93,374,755.97		
DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.			
1875	3,404,804.00	1875	5,680,651.96
1876	1,374,985.00	1876	5,360,554.55
1877	1,187,197.50	1877	4,572,762.01
1878	1,138,374.50	1878	4,829,865.69
1879	1,077,655.00	1879	4,746,275.70
1880	1,087,835.00	1880	4,713,478.58
1881	1,180,335.00	1881	4,657,262.72
1882	1,192,435.00	1882	4,587,866.80
1883	1,256,655.00	1883	5,229,374.01
1884	1,296,735.00	1884	5,538,655.91
1885	1,219,390.00	1885	5,859,402.91
1886	1,242,925.00	1886	5,762,512.70
1887	1,364,065.00	1887	5,546,262.84
1888	1,429,942.44	1888	5,226,897.66
1889	1,428,465.00	1889	8,263,700.79
1890	1,980,025.00	1890	8,077,453.39
1891	1,710,813.00	1891	7,262,016.02
1892	1,656,925.00	1892	16,386,284.86
1893	1,604,045.00	1893	7,664,047.84
1894	1,557,445.00	1894	7,854,240.38
1895	1,563,918.76	1895	10,659,565.16
1896	1,574,458.76	1896	8,762,751.24
1897	1,642,558.76	1897	7,390,496.79
1898	1,695,308.76	1898	7,674,120.80
1899	1,752,208.76	1899	7,673,854.90
1900	1,714,533.76	1900	7,504,775.81
1901	1,771,168.76	1901	8,197,980.24
1902	1,849,428.76	1902	9,747,471.09
1903	1,957,925.69	1903	8,986,028.10
1904	1,968,250.69	1904	8,540,406.77
1905	2,020,100.69	1905	9,447,961.40
1906	2,123,047.72	1906	7,923,814.34
1907	3,091,094.17	1907	9,260,599.98
1908	3,092,333.72	1908	10,125,076.15
1909	3,538,852.72	1909	9,253,347.87
1910	3,613,861.67	1910	11,854,982.48
1911	4,116,081.41	1911	9,266,528.00
1912	3,988,516.41	1912	8,842,136.37
LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.			
1875		1875	20,783,900.80
1876		1876	18,902,236.99
1877		1877	15,417,933.33
1878		1878	15,450,345.30
1879		1879	15,271,251.80
1880		1880	16,287,457.73
1881		1881	16,274,023.59
1882		1882	17,678,508.99
1883		1883	20,038,000.65
1884		1884	20,454,246.22
1885		1885	21,393,141.85
1886		1886	21,376,708.70
1887		1887	20,654,346.37
1888		1888	20,745,023.67
1889		1889	20,758,178.07
1890		1890	20,843,615.81
1891		1891	21,030,752.75
1892		1892	22,027,074.75
1893		1893	21,900,132.97
1894		1894	21,865,802.81
1895		1895	21,305,583.29
1896		1896	21,891,718.08
1897		1897	21,519,324.71
1898		1898	21,690,766.90
1899		1899	21,625,846.65
1900		1900	23,410,840.79
1901		1901	24,175,652.53
1902		1902	24,594,968.85
1903		1903	25,396,681.50
1904		1904	27,598,653.66
1905		1905	25,558,258.22
1906		1906	29,136,752.06
1907		1907	29,681,919.30
1908		1908	32,126,333.80
1909		1909	32,832,913.50
1910		1910	32,007,049.00
1911		1911	34,158,767.00
1912		1912	35,378,148.85
MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATIONS.			
1875		1875	339,835.00
1876		1876	364,740.00
1877		1877	290,065.00
1878		1878	286,604.00
1879		1879	292,805.00
1880		1880	319,547.33
1881		1881	316,234.28
1882		1882	322,435.37
1883		1883	335,557.04
1884		1884	318,657.50
1885		1885	314,563.50
1886		1886	310,021.64
1887		1887	297,805.00
1888		1888	419,936.93
1889		1889	315,043.81
1890		1890	902,766.69
1891		1891	435,296.11
1892		1892	402,064.64
1893		1893	428,917.33
1894		1894	432,556.12
1895		1895	406,535.08
1896		1896	464,261.66
1897		1897	449,525.61
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.			
1881	3,425,997.35		
1882	3,378,617.44		
1883	3,496,060.47		
1884	3,507,247.96		
1885	3,559,835.54		
1886	3,622,683.20		
1887	3,721,050.99		
1888	4,284,590.66		
1889	5,046,410.32		
1890	5,682,409.91		
1891	5,769,544.15		
1892	5,597,125.17		
1893	5,317,973.27		
1894	5,413,223.91		
1895	5,545,678.57		
1896	5,743,443.25		
1897	5,900,219.48		
1898	6,186,991.06		
1899	6,426,880.07		
1900	6,834,535.77		
1901	7,577,369.31		
1902	8,502,269.94		
1903	8,544,469.97		
1904	8,638,097.00		
1905	11,018,540.00		
1906	9,801,197.62		
1907	10,138,672.16		
1908	10,440,598.63		
1909	10,001,888.85		
1910	10,699,531.49		
1911	10,608,045.99		
1912	12,056,786.50		
FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATIONS.			
1875	904,000.00		
1876	850,000.00		
1877	350,000.00		
1878	275,000.00		
1879	275,000.00		
1880	275,000.00		
1881	550,000.00		
1882	575,000.00		
1883	375,000.00		
1884	670,000.00		
1885	700,000.00		
1886	725,000.00		
1887	3,972,000.00		
1888	1,233,594.00		
1889	4,232,935.00		
1890	3,774,803.00		
1891	2,734,276.00		
1892	2,210,055.00		
1893	2,437,004.00		
1894	1,904,557.50		
1895	7,377,888.00		
1896	9,517,141.00		
1897	9,377,494.00		
1898	4,909,902.00		
1899	7,383,628.00		
1900	4,909,902.00		
1901	7,383,628.00		
1902	7,364,011.00		

1898	\$479,572.83
1899	458,689.23
1900	575,774.47
1901	674,306.67
1902	772,053.68
1903	2,627,324.42
1904	652,748.67
1905	973,947.26
1906	673,713.38
1907	1,664,707.67
1908	1,929,703.42
1909	845,634.87
1910	2,531,521.33
1911	1,856,249.87
1912	1,163,424.07

NAVY APPROPRIATIONS.

1875	20,813,946.20
1876	17,001,006.40
1877	12,742,155.40
1878	13,541,024.40
1879	14,152,603.70
1880	14,029,968.95
1881	14,405,797.70
1882	14,566,037.55
1883	14,819,976.80
1884	15,894,434.23
1885	14,980,472.59
1886	15,070,839.95
1887	16,489,907.20
1888	25,767,348.19
1889	19,942,835.35
1890	21,692,510.27
1891	24,136,035.53
1892	32,541,634.78
1893	23,543,385.00
1894	22,104,061.38
1895	25,327,126.72
1896	29,416,245.31
1897	30,562,660.95
1898	33,003,234.19
1899	56,098,783.68
1900	48,099,969.58
1901	65,140,916.67
1902	78,101,791.00
1903	78,856,363.13
1904	81,876,791.43
1905	97,505,140.94
1906	100,336,679.94
1907	102,091,670.27
1908	98,958,507.50
1909	122,663,885.47
1910	136,935,109.05
1911	131,350,854.38
1912	126,478,338.24

PENSION APPROPRIATIONS.

[Including deficiencies therefor.]

1875	29,980,000.00
1876	30,000,000.00
1877	29,533,500.00
1878	28,533,000.00
1879	29,371,574.00
1880	56,233,200.00
1881	41,644,000.00
1882	68,282,306.68
1883	116,000,000.00
1884	86,575,000.00
1885	20,810,000.00
1886	60,000,000.00
1887	82,075,200.00
1888	83,152,500.00
1889	85,258,700.00
1890	89,758,700.00
1891	123,779,368.35
1892	164,550,383.34
1893	154,411,682.00
1894	180,681,074.85
1895	151,581,570.00
1896	141,381,570.00
1897	141,328,580.00
1898	141,263,880.00
1899	149,304,702.40
1900	145,233,830.00
1901	145,245,230.00
1902	145,245,230.00
1903	139,842,230.00
1904	139,847,600.00
1905	142,360,700.00
1906	142,750,100.00
1907	143,745,500.00
1908	147,143,000.00
1909	173,053,000.00
1910	160,908,000.00
1911	155,758,000.00
1912	156,182,000.00

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

1875	35,756,091.00
1876	37,524,361.00
1877	34,585,701.00
1878	33,584,143.00
1879	33,256,373.00
1880	36,121,400.00
1881	39,093,420.00
1882	40,957,432.00
1883	44,643,900.00
1884	44,489,520.00
1885	49,040,400.00
1886	53,700,990.00
1887	54,365,863.25
1888	55,694,650.15
1889	60,860,233.74
1890	66,605,344.28
1891	72,226,698.99

1892	\$77,907,222.61
1893	80,331,276.73
1894	84,004,314.22
1895	87,236,599.55
1896	89,545,997.86
1897	92,571,564.22
1898	95,665,338.75
1899	99,222,300.75
1900	105,634,138.75
1901	113,658,238.75
1902	123,782,688.75
1903	138,416,598.75
1904	153,511,549.75
1905	172,545,998.75
1906	181,022,093.75
1907	194,695,998.75
1908	212,091,193.00
1909	222,970,892.00
1910	234,692,370.00
1911	243,907,020.00
1912	259,134,463.00

RIVERS AND HARBORS APPROPRIATIONS.

[Including amounts in sundry civil, deficiencies, and special acts.]

1875	5,218,000.00
1876	6,643,517.50
1877	5,015,000.00
1879	8,201,700.00
1880	7,846,600.00
1881	8,951,500.00
1882	11,441,300.00
1883	18,738,875.00
1885	13,949,200.00
1887	14,473,900.00
1889	22,397,616.90
1891	25,136,295.00
1892	2,951,200.00
1893	21,968,218.00
1894	14,166,153.00
1895	20,043,180.00
1896	11,462,113.00
1897	16,244,147.00
1898	20,832,412.91
1899	14,627,449.56
1900	25,110,038.94
1901	16,285,605.75
1902	7,046,623.00
1903	32,540,199.50
1904	20,233,150.00
1905	10,872,200.00
1906	28,726,007.41
1907	17,254,050.04
1908	43,500,813.00
1909	18,092,945.00
1910	29,190,264.00
1911	49,380,541.50
1912	30,883,419.00

SUNDRY CIVIL.

[Exclusive of amounts for rivers and harbors.]

1875	27,009,744.81
1876	26,644,350.00
1877	16,351,474.58
1878	17,133,750.06
1879	26,004,409.26
1880	21,656,340.06
1881	22,515,428.01
1882	21,984,194.12
1883	25,589,358.06
1884	23,679,575.44
1885	22,299,434.30
1886	26,079,257.49
1887	22,662,310.58
1888	22,386,540.96
1889	26,320,804.84
1890	25,297,341.65
1891	29,738,282.22
1892	35,459,163.00
1893	26,851,076.03
1894	27,550,158.15
1895	25,853,775.55
1896	35,106,045.40
1897	29,812,113.19
1898	34,490,379.47
1899	34,222,762.70
1900	38,467,735.86
1901	49,594,309.70
1902	54,749,285.21
1903	62,394,601.63
1904	62,130,210.10
1905	49,968,011.34
1906	56,269,318.66
1907	81,284,720.28
1908	104,376,481.30
1909	93,865,143.23
1910	117,942,109.36
1911	106,015,198.82
1912	135,236,967.14

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

[Exclusive of amounts for rivers and harbors.]

1875	4,083,914.26
1876	4,703,699.18
1877	2,908,177.09
1878	2,745,480.97
1879	14,138,742.29
1880	3,163,297.15
1881	4,207,226.44
1882	5,092,138.92
1883	12,992,025.16
1884	2,749,941.49
1885	7,057,509.00
1886	4,926,855.80
1887	7,866,719.62

1889	\$16,063,383.26
1890	8,330,518.30
1891	13,295,541.61
1892	8,364,148.62
1893	8,230,859.50
1894	8,127,301.51
1895	11,811,004.06
1896	9,825,374.82
1897	15,041,911.07
1898	9,096,417.34
1899	341,341,517.50
1900	24,905,912.26
1901	15,688,330.61
1902	15,917,446.94
1903	28,050,007.32
1904	21,465,660.25
1905	22,771,890.18
1906	27,183,288.72
1907	35,629,035.45
1908	11,408,998.91
1909	46,702,300.06
1910	31,571,750.68
1911	12,729,214.80
1912	7,240,971.24

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS.

1875	181,763,388.03
1876	177,303,280.71
1877	150,540,833.81
1878	143,330,087.92
1879	172,881,855.26
1880	188,531,424.80
1881	183,900,325.99
1882	217,081,572.87
1883	291,200,062.19
1884	230,080,923.75
1885	186,117,989.69
1886	217,417,634.98
1887	253,925,203.06
1888	243,860,879.35
1889	296,814,682.08
1890	276,390,665.03
1891	354,759,152.52
1892	399,260,333.45
1893	382,527,385.89
1894	403,515,586.11
1895	390,578,048.48
1896	383,636,896.97
1897	396,375,024.51
1898	407,907,801.40
1899	768,835,084.26
1900	517,558,212.05
1901	573,636,341.54
1902	597,990,337.32
1903	623,850,481.42
1904	617,527,447.37
1905	638,533,281.66
1906	669,973,228.24
1907	712,339,566.15
1908	770,172,923.18
1909	850,191,911.18
1910	894,307,669.40
1911	873,691,905.32
1912	892,333,650.79

MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS.

1875	1,921,614.13
1876	1,862,929.19
1877	4,012,805.84
1878	1,262,061.31
1879	2,049,638.61
1880	1,926,020.26
1881	5,618,865.22
1882	1,072,933.64
1883	6,111,540.10
1884	1,912,723.88
1885	9,592,598.40
1886	2,177,648.20
1887	9,989,410.19
1888	4,811,991.49
1889	10,170,862.55
1890	10,255,795.29
1891	7,010,905.27
1892	3,271,531.10
1893	3,208,922.82
1894	520,489.18
1895	577,956.55
1896	297,667.37
1897	416,010.06
1898	749,057.90
1899	6,560,311.29
1900	28,744,590.24
1901	3,802,301.34
1902	7,990,018.67
1903	52,852,795.13
1904	2,941,238.65
1905	1,167,273.52
1906	3,375,086.72
1907	27,173,299.01
1908	738,900.62
1909	4,011,337.26
1910	1,259,515.96
1911	23,275,128.74
1912	4,773,306.81

TOTAL REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS.

1875	183,685,002.16
1876	179,166,209.90
1877	154,553,639.65
1878	144,592,149.23
1879	174,431,493.87
1880	190,457,445.06
1881	189,519,191.21
1882	218,154,506.51
1883	297,311,602.29

1884	\$231,993,647.63
1885	195,710,588.09
1886	219,595,283.18
1887	263,914,613.25
1888	248,672,870.84
1889	306,985,544.63
1890	286,646,460.32
1891	361,770,057.79
1892	402,531,864.55
1893	385,736,308.71
1894	404,036,085.29
1895	391,156,005.03
1896	383,934,564.34
1897	396,791,034.57
1898	408,656,859.30
1899	775,395,395.55
1900	546,302,802.29
1901	577,438,642.88
1902	605,980,355.99
1903	676,703,276.55
1904	620,468,686.02
1905	639,700,555.18
1906	673,348,314.96
1907	739,512,865.16
1908	770,911,823.80
1909	854,203,248.44
1910	895,567,185.36
1911	896,967,034.06
1912	897,106,957.00

PERMANENT ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS.

1875	141,981,789.73
1876	148,961,989.42
1877	145,037,498.42
1878	151,414,544.98
1879	157,976,282.81
1880	181,062,184.24
1881	172,053,013.18
1882	147,810,973.32
1883	134,826,471.02
1884	123,304,227.60
1885	123,118,901.04
1886	116,844,630.02
1887	123,416,358.74
1888	110,338,652.68
1889	101,638,512.74
1890	98,875,907.29
1891	147,598,288.07
1892	111,892,154.94
1893	77,948,076.49
1894	75,896,581.79
1895	68,769,173.59
1896	73,153,780.38
1897	72,702,975.84
1898	76,345,185.42
1899	87,287,091.51
1900	144,364,886.25
1901	141,840,184.01
1902	151,627,108.73
1903	119,930,588.24
1904	116,109,716.74
1905	92,497,300.66
1906	92,205,305.10
1907	131,528,982.24
1908	147,450,505.27
1909	132,048,409.16
1910	132,939,385.58
1911	130,934,595.12
1912	129,575,924.12

GRAND TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS.

1875	325,666,791.89
1876	328,128,199.32
1877	299,591,138.07
1878	296,006,694.21
1879	332,407,776.68
1880	372,119,629.30
1881	361,572,204.39
1882	365,965,479.83
1883	422,158,073.31
1884	355,237,875.23
1885	318,829,489.13
1886	336,439,913.20
1887	387,330,971.99
1888	350,011,523.52
1889	408,624,057.37
1890	385,522,367.61
1891	509,368,345.86
1892	514,424,019.40
1893	463,684,385.20
1894	479,932,667.08
1895	459,925,178.62
1896	457,088,344.72
1897	469,494,010.41
1898	485,002,044.72
1899	862,682,487.06
1900	690,667,188.54
1901	719,278,826.89
1902	757,607,464.72
1903	796,633,864.79
1904	736,578,402.76
1905	732,197,885.84
1906	765,553,620.06
1907	871,041,847.40
1908	918,302,329.07
1909	986,251,657.60
1910	1,028,506,570.94
1911	1,027,901,629.18
1912	1,026,682,881.72

Total appropriation by each Congress.

Forty-third (1875-1876)	\$653,794,991.21
Forty-fourth (1877-1878)	595,597,832.28
Forty-fifth (1879-1880)	704,527,405.98
Forty-sixth (1881-1882)	727,537,684.22
Forty-seventh (1883-1884)	777,435,948.54

Forty-eighth (1885-1886)	\$655,269,402.33
Forty-ninth (1887-1888)	746,342,495.51
Fiftieth (1889-1890)	794,146,424.98
Fifty-first (1891-1892)	1,023,792,365.35
Fifty-second (1893-1894)	943,617,052.28
Fifty-third (1895-1896)	917,013,523.34
Fifty-fourth (1897-1898)	954,496,055.13
Fifty-fifth (1899-1900)	1,553,349,675.60
Fifty-sixth (1901-1902)	1,476,886,291.61
Fifty-seventh (1903-1904)	1,533,212,267.55
Fifty-eighth (1905-1906)	1,497,751,475.90
Fifty-ninth (1907-1908)	1,789,404,176.47
Sixtieth (1909-1910)	2,014,758,228.54
Sixty-first (1911-1912)	2,054,584,510.90

Mr. SISSON. These figures stagger the human intellect. This enormous burden of taxation increasing so rapidly is sure to bring disaster unless it is checked.

There has been one principle of the Democratic Party which has been present as an issue in every campaign, and it is the one declaration of the party about which there has never been any difference since the great founder of Democracy first promulgated the great declaration of principles in his first inaugural address. The first inaugural address of Thomas Jefferson is one of the greatest state papers of ancient or modern times. That address was for a number of years the only platform of the Democratic Party, and it will be for all time the heart and soul of Democracy; and when the party shall depart from the principles laid down in that address the Democratic Party shall have perished from the earth.

In that inaugural address, among the other declarations of principles, we find as a cardinal doctrine of Jefferson's governmental policy that the Government should be economically administered, that labor might be lightly burdened. There has never been a campaign, from Jefferson's time down to our own, that the great Democrats of this country have not all advocated this doctrine. I would call the Democrats' especial attention to the declarations of the party for the last fifty-odd years as laid down in the platform for those years.

The Democratic platform of 1856 declares that—

It is the duty of every branch of the Government to enforce and practice the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government and for the gradual but certain extinction of the public debt.

The Democratic platform of 1860, in its first resolution, reaffirms all of the principles announced in the platform of 1856.

The Democratic platform of 1864, which was made during the Civil War, is silent on Government expenses.

In the Democratic platform of 1868, in article 6, the party, in specific language, commits itself to—

Economy in the administration of the Government * * * so that the burden of taxation may be lessened.

The Democratic platform of 1872, in article 6, declares that—

We demand a system of Federal taxation which shall not unnecessarily interfere with the industry of the people, and which shall provide the means necessary to pay the expenses of the Government, economically administered.

The Democratic platform of 1876 declares:

We denounce the improvidence which in 11 years of peace has taken from the people in Federal taxes thirteen times the whole amount of the legal-tender notes and squandered four times their sum in useless expense, without accumulating any reserve for their redemption. We denounce the financial imbecility and immorality of the party which, during 11 years of peace, has made no advance toward resumption, no preparation for resumption, but instead has obstructed resumption by wasting our resources and exhausting all our surplus income, and while annually professing to intend a speedy return to specie payments has annually enacted fresh hindrances thereto.

The same platform further declares:

We demand a judicious system of preparation, by public economies, by official retrenchments, and by wise finance, which shall enable the Nation soon to assure the world of its perfect ability and its perfect readiness to meet any of its promises at the call of the creditor entitled to payment.

The same platform further declares:

Reform is necessary in the scale of public expense—Federal, State, and municipal.

The same platform further declares:

We demand a rigorous frugality in every department and from every officer of the Government.

The Democratic platform of 1880 declares, in article 14:

We congratulate the country upon the honesty and thrift of a Democratic Congress which has reduced the public expenditures \$40,000,000 a year.

The Democratic platform of 1884 declares that—

sufficient revenue to pay all of the expenses of the Federal Government, economically administered, including pensions, interest and principal of the public debt, can be got under our present system of taxation from the customhouse taxes on fewer imported articles, bearing heaviest on the articles of luxury and bearing lightest on the articles of necessity. We therefore denounce the abuses of the existing tariff, and, subject to the preceding limitations, we demand that Federal taxation shall be exclusively for public purposes, and shall not exceed the needs of the Government, economically administered.

The Democratic platform of 1888 declares:

Every Democratic rule of governmental action is violated when, through unnecessary taxation, a vast sum of money, far beyond the needs of an economical administration, is drawn from the people and the channels of trade and accumulated as a demoralizing surplus in the National Treasury. The money now lying idle in the General Treasury resulting from superfluous taxation amounts to more than one hundred and twenty-five millions, and the surplus collected is reaching the sum of more than sixty millions annually. Debauched by this immense temptation, the remedy of the Republican Party is to meet and exhaust, by extravagant appropriations and expenses, whether constitutional or not, the accumulation of extravagant taxation. The Democratic policy is to enforce frugality in public expense and to abolish unnecessary taxation.

The Democratic platform of 1892 declares:

The representatives of the Democratic Party of the United States, in national convention assembled, do reaffirm their allegiance to the principles of the party as formulated by Jefferson and exemplified by the long and illustrious line of his successors in Democratic leadership, from Madison to Cleveland; we believe the public welfare demands that these principles be applied to the conduct of the Federal Government.

The platform of the same year further declares:

We pledge the Democratic Party, if it be intrusted with power, not only to the defeat of the force bill, but also to relentless opposition to the Republican policy of profligate expenditure, which, in the short space of two years, has squandered an enormous surplus and emptied an overflowing Treasury, after piling new burdens of taxation upon the already overtaxed labor of the country.

The Democratic platform of 1896 declares:

We, the Democrats of the United States in national convention assembled, do reaffirm our allegiance to those great essential principles of justice and liberty upon which our institutions are founded and which the Democratic Party has advocated from Jefferson's time to our own.

The same platform further declares:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation and the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high, while the labor that pays them is unemployed and the products of the people's toil are depressed in price till they no longer repay the cost of production. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

The Democratic platform of 1900 declares:

We denounce the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and which threaten the perpetuation of the oppressive war levies. We oppose the accumulation of a surplus, to be squandered in such barefaced frauds upon the taxpayers as the shipping subsidy bill, which, under the false pretense of prospering American shipbuilding, would put unearned millions into the pockets of the favorite contributors to the Republican campaign fund. We favor the reduction and the speedy repeal of the war taxes and a return to the time-honored Democratic policy of strict economy in governmental expenditures.

The Democratic platform of 1904 declares:

Large reductions can easily be made in the annual expenditures of the Government without impairing the efficiency of any branch of the public service, and we shall insist upon the strictest economy and frugality compatible with vigorous and efficient civil, military, and naval administration as a right of the people too clear to be denied or withheld.

The Democratic platform of 1908 declares:

The Republican Congress in the session just ended made appropriations amounting to \$1,008,000,000, exceeding the total expenditures of the past fiscal year by \$90,000,000, and leaving a deficit of more than \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year just ended. We denounce the needless waste of the people's money, which has resulted in the appalling increase, as a shameful violation of all prudent considerations of government and as no less than a crime against the millions of working men and women, from whose earnings the great proportion of these colossal sums must be extorted through excessive tariff exactions and other indirect methods. It is not surprising that, in the face of this shocking record, the Republican platform contains no reference to economical administration or promise thereof in the future. We demand that a stop be put to this frightful extravagance, and insist upon the strictest economy in every department, compatible with frugal and efficient administration.

The Democratic platform of 1912 declares:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

The conclusion of the platform of 1912, upon which Woodrow Wilson and every Member of this Democratic Congress was elected, declares:

Our platform is one of principles which we believe to be essential to our national welfare. Our pledges are made to be kept when in office as well as relied upon during the campaign, and we invite the cooperation of all citizens, regardless of party, who believe in maintaining unimpaired the institutions and traditions of our country.

When those of us who are Members of this Democratic House cast up accounts during this Congress we are startled to find how much more money we have spent than any other Congress in the history of the country. How can we, in the face of our party declarations which I have quoted, face the American people without an apology? It is not sufficient to say that the country is growing, and while the political enemies twit us for the betrayal of our party, just to say, as Thomas B. Reed said when the expenses of one Congress of two years leaped to one billion of dollars, that this is a billion-dollar country, because

the expenses since that day have amounted to the stupendous sum of two billion dollars each Congress.

This vast sum of money taken indirectly from the people's toil without their being conscious of having paid it, is even a greater crime than if each citizen knew exactly just how much he was contributing to the support of the Federal Government. We the Democrats in Congress are the guardians of the people's toil and we should see to it that not a single penny is taken from them more than is necessary to pay the expenses of the Government, economically administered. We can not play the Tom Reed racket and save our faces, because our party has always denounced extravagance. The party has changed its position on the tariff, on the money question, on our foreign policy, on the construction of the Constitution, and on many other great questions, but this is the one question upon which Democrats in the past have always agreed. If our party should throw to the winds this great principle of economy there will then not be a political organization in existence in this great country that stands against heavy taxation and wild extravagance.

It is not my purpose to single out this naval bill and make an attack upon it. Under our present system of appropriating money it is entirely impossible for the membership of the House to know exactly what has been done until all of the appropriation bills have come from the various committees and passed the House, and even then we do not know what our financial standing is until these bills have passed the Senate, gone through conference, and been agreed upon by both Houses. But the attention of the whole country has been called to the great extravagance of this Congress, and I, along with other Members, did not realize at what a rapid gait we were going until within the last few weeks. These great supply bills have been born, as it were, back in the recesses of the committee rooms and the country was only startled when they were reported from these committees into the whole House. I am not blaming any one individual committee, nor am I blaming any individual Democrat. My criticism is directed at the present system.

I know of no better bill, however, to use as an illustration of the rapidly increasing extravagances of the Government than this naval bill. As reported from the committee, this bill carries over \$148,000,000, and the authorizations in the bill, which will have to be cared for during the fiscal year following, if added to the face of the bill, would make it close to \$170,000,000.

The Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, has many of the great supply bills under its jurisdiction, and this committee is the one committee that has greatly reduced its bills below that of the past Republican Congresses by many millions. Last year the sundry civil bill was \$33,000,000 less than in the last Republican Congress. At that time the Republicans charged us with cheeseparing for election purposes. But after the election, at this session of Congress, we reduced the sundry civil expenses \$4,800,000 more than the preceding year, making in round numbers a reduction of \$33,000,000 from the Republican bill. If every committee in the House had done as well, the total expenditures of the Federal Government would have been \$300,000,000 less than the Republican expenditures, and the efficiency of the Government would not have in any way been impaired.

The military expenses of the Federal Government are growing too rapidly. Our military establishment (including the naval establishment) is the most expensive in the world. By referring to the statement of expenditures in the naval and military establishments of the country you will see a startling increase, which means that this free Republic is rapidly drifting under the control of the military spirit. The history of the past shows that this military spirit has been the cause of the overthrow of liberty in every country.

The influences which sell the steel, and all the supplies of the great armies and navies of the world, out of which vast fortunes are being made, constantly surround the capitals of the world and fill the newspapers and magazines with sensational stories which cause the nations to unnecessarily dread each other and play one nation against the other. Instead of our magazines in the civilized nations of the world standing for "Peace on earth, good will toward men," they are standing for war for selfish reasons. The Steel Trust sells the steel; the Beef Trust sells the beef; the Arms Trust sells the arms; the Powder Trust sells the powder; the Clothing Trust sells the clothing; the Lead Trust sells the lead; and as the number of officers and men increase their political influence through their families and friends increases, and all of these influences and forces clamor for more pay and greater fields of activity. Each nation is striving to outstrip the other in military and naval establishments, in order that each particular nation may be stronger than the other when some war in the future may call them into play.

It would be interesting for some schoolboy to take the columns of figures to which I have called the attention of this House and add up the annual expenditures for our Army, for our Navy, and for our fortifications, and see how many billions of dollars have been wrung from the peaceful toil of the poor for these mighty establishments in the past 50 years. And then, if this same boy would get the expenses of England, France, Germany, Russia, Italy, Japan, China, Spain, and the other great or small nations of the world, and add this stupendous sum to that expended by the United States, he would find how many billions upon billions is expended each year, and how much has been expended in the past 50 years on armies and navies.

This great Republic ought to stand for peace and not for war. If we should be a Nation prepared to defend our labors at home, we should need but little standing army and a reasonably large navy to defend this happy and peaceful policy. On the other hand, if we are to be a nation of conquests and devote all of the people's toil to the establishment of an army and navy large and strong enough to overcome any other nation or nations in the world, then we have turned back the heart, thought, and mind of the people to the terrible age of force and conquests. We do not need these mighty establishments for defense at home. This military spirit would send us out Alexander-like to conquer the world.

The nations of Europe are already beginning to groan under the burden. The German press is in revolt against the heartless exactions of the Emperor for his army and navy. This German press is contending that while the German Government is preparing its mighty navy and army to fight some war that may probably arise in the future it is actually destroying the peace and prosperity of the people at home. The taxation in Germany is enormous, and the strength of that great nation is being sapped to keep up this mighty military establishment to defend the German Crown and the German Government, and this preparation for this defense is doing the German people quite as much harm as would be done if the German Government were destroyed and the people were to pass under the control of some other nation, and certainly the German people would be greatly relieved if they could pass under the control of some more peacefully inclined Government.

The poor millions of Russia are groaning under the burdens of taxation to keep up their mighty military establishment. The English people have exhausted almost every avenue of taxation in order that they may raise money to sustain its mighty army and navy. When will this folly cease? Never, so long as the Members of Congress and the Members of the Senate of the United States continue to clamor for preparations for war and constantly keep the nations of Europe uneasy about the United States' aggressiveness in world policies.

Since the Spanish-American War our Naval Establishment has increased 400 per cent, and the increase of the nations of the world has been at about the same proportion. These nations are beginning to fear the United States, because they have now learned that the United States is as selfish in land grabbing as the other nations of the world have been. And the reason that prompts the United States Government to increase her naval and military establishments is the same reason that prompts other nations to increase theirs.

The United States, having acquired Porto Rica and the Philippines, is preparing to defend these island possessions, one of which is 8,000 miles from our shores. And while it is stated that the Philippine Islands alone cost the Government about forty millions a year more than it would cost the Government if we would turn them loose, this forty millions is a mere bagatelle as compared with the mighty increase in our military and naval expenses, caused directly by our possession of the Philippine Islands.

The Democratic Party is committed to the freedom of the Philippines, and it is our highest solemn duty to carry out this pledge of the party to at once give the Philippines their independence and then at once stop the increase of our naval and military establishments.

The United States Government is doing as Spain did in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Spain built fortifications practically around the world, massive in their proportions and impregnable, apparently, from all attack. But these fortifications were gradually abandoned, because the burden of keeping them up was so great that the Spanish people could not bear it. We are fortifying Porto Rica, Cuba, Hawaii, Alaska, Philippine Islands, as well as our own coast. These fortifications are increasing in size, and necessitates an increase in men—all of which means an increased burden upon the American people. These fortifications will not add to our national strength, but they will greatly add to our national burden. Every soldier in the Army and every tar on the sea is a burden

on the back of the man who labors and toils in the fields, in the factories, and in the mines.

There are 16,000,000 families in the United States, the average of whose earnings is about \$600 annually, and in addition to supporting their families out of this \$600 they are compelled to pay their pro rata share for the support of the men in the Army and in the Navy. These Army and Navy officers live in magnificent houses that cost from nine to fifteen thousand dollars each. These houses are furnished and cared for at the expense of the people. These Army officers are furnished with light, heat, and water; and in addition to all of this they get salaries ranging from \$3,000 to \$5,000 a year. We have on the retired list some 1,800 or 2,000 Army and Naval officers, many of whom are physically able to perform duties in the Army and Navy, whose average salary is \$320 more than the salaries of the Army and Navy officers who are actually performing duty, and the number is gradually increasing. These Army and Navy officers, as well as the enlisted men, have lifetime jobs, unless they are cashiered or discharged for cause, and are cared for by taxing the people of the United States. Every time one of them is injured or hurt or health is impaired he is at once put upon the pension rolls for life, thus adding another burden upon the people.

It is too long a story to record all of the extravagances in the Army and Navy, much less go into the extravagances in the other departments of the Government.

I have put in my remarks the tables of our expenses and have gone somewhat into detail, so that I might justify my position in Congress as a Democrat in fighting extravagances wherever I find them. I have also set out the declarations of our party denouncing these extravagances, and I do this for the purpose of calling the attention of Democrats throughout the country to the condition of affairs in our Government, so that every Democrat in Congress as well as in the ranks may come out against it. Let us stand firm by our party pledges. Let the people know that our party pledges were made in good faith and not to be repudiated.

We have elected a great man as President of the United States. I call upon him as the leader of the party in the United States to hold up the hands of all of us who are trying to practice rigid economy in every department of the Government. The Democratic Party has a glorious opportunity to do the people of the country a great service by relieving them of Republican extravagance and by putting the affairs of the Government on a business basis.

The President of the United States has selected as Secretary of State the greatest Democrat on this earth. He is a man who believes in peace. He believes in the glorious doctrine of brotherhood taught by the Master when He was on earth. Let us follow this great leader in his efforts to bring about peace among the nations of the world. Let this great party, while it is in power, hold up the President's hands and the hands of Mr. Bryan, and all of the other great Cabinet officers that the President has selected, in their efforts to bring about in this world "peace on earth, good will toward men."

Let us by legislation and the practice of rigid economy remove these burdens from the backs of the people before the people rise up and remove the burdens by revolution. Revolution is expensive not only in property but in life, and it is a sad commentary upon the history of the past that the people have rarely been able to make advances and secure their rights except by the bayonet. The fathers of this Republic believed that with the ballot in the hands of the free men that they would be able to control expenditures without recourse to bayonets.

This is the plain duty of the party to-day. Will we live up to it? If we will, the Democratic Party will have a long lease of power. If we do not, we will surely go out of power, as we should.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I have followed with great interest the discussion on this bill. All three of the great national parties in their platforms expressed themselves on an American Navy. The Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore used this language:

The party that proclaimed and has always enforced the Monroe doctrine and was sponsor for the new Navy will continue faithfully to observe the constitutional requirement to provide and maintain an adequate and well-proportioned Navy sufficient to defend American policies, to protect our citizens, and uphold the honor and dignity of the Nation.

The Republican platform stated:

We believe in the maintenance of an adequate Navy for the national defense, and we condemn the action of the Democratic House of Representatives in refusing to authorize the construction of additional battleships.

The Progressive Party platform proclaimed:

We favor an international agreement for the limitation of naval forces. Pending such an agreement, and as the best means of preserving peace, we pledge ourselves to maintain for the present the policy of building two battleships a year,

In other words, the representatives of the American people in national conventions assembled declared themselves in favor of an adequate Navy. Who are the best qualified, the best posted of our public officials to determine the question of an adequate Navy from the facts and circumstances and a full and thorough consideration of the question? Is it the able and eloquent gentleman representing a district in Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] and the active and efficient Member from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE], or should we accept the weight of evidence submitted to us by the trained and experienced officials of the Navy Department who have devoted their lives to the Navy?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. If I can get a little more time, I shall be very glad to do it. In determining this question and weighing this evidence and the arguments submitted to us, should we take the opinion and the argument of these gentlemen who are lawyers and politicians or should we accept the statements and the evidence submitted to us by Admiral Dewey and the other faithful and patriotic men connected with the Navy who have served this country long and well in the Navy to determine this question, which should not be determined for political expediency or on political lines, but alone for the honor and glory of the American people and the American Government? [Applause.] Here is the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]. Does anyone question his fidelity to his country or his patriotism to the American people or his knowledge of naval affairs or his loyalty to the Democratic Party?

Mr. Chairman, every department of this Government has increased its appropriations from year to year in practically the same ratio as the Navy Department, as outlined here by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON]. This country has outgrown all other countries and it is natural that the expenses of every department should show an increase. Since the Spanish-American War the condition of the American Nation has materially changed in reference to our armament and our responsibility to the world. We have taken over the Philippine Islands. I believe it is going to be the policy of the incoming administration to turn them adrift, but in doing so you will only require additional ships to maintain their independence in the Pacific and to prevent their seizure by some other power.

We have Porto Rico, Hawaii, and virtually Cuba. Cuba ought to have been made a part of the United States when we first landed there. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto in five minutes, and that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] be given that five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, we ought to have declared Cuba ours when we sacrificed our millions of money and thousands of precious American lives for the freedom of that island from Spain. Since that time we have been forced to take our ships, sailors, and soldiers to maintain and reestablish order in Cuba at the expense of the American taxpayers. That course or policy will be repeated whenever you declare the independence of the Philippine Islands. We have an enormous coast line, and we are the custodian of Haiti, Santo Domingo, Cuba, Hawaii, and by and by of the Philippines, and do we only need one battleship a year for that great responsibility? Your party and my party stands committed to the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine, and can you maintain the enforcement of that doctrine as it affects an entire continent below us with a program of one battleship a year?

We have constructed the Panama Canal, at an expense of \$400,000,000. We have no merchant vessels to use it, and yet it must be protected. We ought to have and the American people believe in an adequate Navy, and I repudiate the idea that one battleship a year makes an adequate Navy under the present conditions that confront us and under our great responsibilities. We need not only a fleet, an all-around powerful fleet, in the Atlantic, but we need one also in the Pacific, and the Republican Party stands for it, and the American people will sustain us when they have a chance to pass upon the proposition. If you submit the question to the ballot box, the American people will repudiate the idea that the one battleship program means an adequate Navy for 90,000,000 of Americans.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. CLINE. I want to ask the gentleman whether there has been a period since 1823 when the Government did not enforce the Monroe doctrine under all circumstances when it was called upon to do so?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is quite true, but Germany and other European countries are sending their people to settle up the Argentine Republic, Brazil, and other South American countries. They are planting their banks and commission houses there, and no man can tell when a serious danger will confront and threaten that very doctrine itself. France and Austria invaded the American Continent and planted their flags and soldiers in Mexico until we succeeded in controlling the sea and drove them back home to their foreign shores.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a political question. It is a patriotic question, and it affects and concerns every American citizen. We are derelict in our duty if we do not stand for an adequate Navy—not an inefficient Navy, but a great Navy commensurate with the duties that confront us as a world power. Let me appeal to my colleagues in the interest of all the people, in the interest not of to-day but of to-morrow.

Let me appeal to you to prepare for war, prepare for any emergency now in the time of peace and prosperity. Let us stand by the American flag, planted upon our battleships—on the best ships that money can purchase—manned by the bravest and best of all sailors.

"Your flag and my flag,
There it flies to-day
Over your land and my land
Half a world away;
Blood red, rose red,
Its stripes forever gleam;
Pure white, soul white,
Our good forefathers' dream.
Sky blue, true blue,
The stars that shine aright—
A glorious guidon of the day,
A shelter through the night.
Your flag and my flag,
And oh, how much it holds—
Your land and my land
Safe within its folds.
Your heart and my heart
Beats quicker at the sight;
Sun kissed and wind tossed
The red, the blue, the white.
The one flag, the great flag,
The flag for me and you;
Glorified, all else beside,
The red, the white, the blue."

[Applause.]

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

One transport, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$1,850,000.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the Chair that my information is that two years ago, when the naval appropriation bill was under consideration, an item of this kind was in the bill, and, on a point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Stafford, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MANN, being in the chair, the point of order was sustained.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was not in the chair. He was away.

Mr. SISSON. The decision, as I understand it, is not in Hinds' Precedents, but my information is that it is in the RECORD. The parliamentary clerk has agreed to look the matter up. The point of order is this: That this is a new authorization of a vessel that is not a necessary part of the Naval Establishment. They could not begin a new line of vessels except by authority. Now, if they should begin on this line of vessels and Congress committed itself to this proposition, in the future they could add to it, but they could not begin a new proposition and a new project in this way, and for that reason I make the point of order in good faith.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it subject to a point of order. We have transports now; we have battleships; we have submarines; and according to the gentleman's own statement it is in order to increase them. We have the transports already.

Mr. SISSON. How many transports have you in the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. Three or four.

Mr. SISSON. Are they transports that have been heretofore authorized for soldiers, and is not that the only transport? Is it not a fact that two or three times you have made an effort to get a transport into the bill, and it has gone out on a point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recollect it so.

Mr. SISSON. Did it not go out of the bill three years ago, when this very item, or one like it, was in the bill, and went out on a point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember anything of the kind.

Mr. SISSON. Does the gentleman say it is not so?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I say I have no recollection of it.

Mr. RAKER. If the gentleman will allow me, I find on page 617 of the hearings that Secretary Meyer said:

Now, we are very weak on transports. We have only two, the *Prairie* and the *Buffalo*, one 20 and the other 22 years old.

Mr. SISSON. Oh, but those are entirely different vessels from this.

Mr. PADGETT. They are transports.

Mr. SISSON. The vessel spoken of in this bill is "one transport, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$1,850,000." It is an entirely different proposition from the transports referred to by the gentleman.

Mr. PADGETT. They are transports.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman will not find that this question was ever raised in this House on a point of order but that the point of order was sustained by the Chair, and the items have gone out.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Mississippi has any exact information of that fact, the Chair would like to have it.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I misled the parliamentary clerk by saying that the case occurred two years ago when my information is now that it was three years ago when the matter was up. To have this in order it has got to be a necessary part of the present Naval Establishment; they can not begin a new line of boats without some specific authority of Congress to do so.

Mr. RAKER. I want to say further that the hearings disclose that we purchased these transports during the Spanish-American War.

Mr. SISSON. My information is that they belong to the Army.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. They never did.

Mr. RAKER. The Secretary recommends two transports and the committee only put in one. The Secretary further said that it would be a great economy if the Government would construct these transports.

Mr. SISSON. I would like the Chairman to satisfy himself that the item is in order, because if my contention is correct then this is the beginning of a new line of ships in the Navy. If I am correct in my position, this item ought not to go in at all without some specific authority for the construction of this class of vessels in the Navy.

Mr. HOBSON. I want to say that we have two transports now, and they are in commission.

Mr. SISSON. How large are they?

Mr. HOBSON. I should say they were four or five thousand tons.

Mr. SISSON. Constructed on a naval bill for this purpose or transferred from some service?

Mr. HOBSON. They were purchased.

Mr. SISSON. Oh, they were purchased; bought for that purpose.

Mr. PADGETT. That does not make any difference.

Mr. SISSON. That does not authorize further construction. Because Congress authorized the purchase of a boat or certain specified boats, or because it gives the Navy Department the right to buy boats, does not confer upon the Naval Committee of Congress, under the rules, the right in the naval bill to add new construction.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Chair desires information as to the transports in the Navy.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask just one question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I will yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for a minute.

Mr. SISSON. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that the two boats spoken of were purchased during the Spanish-American War under the general act authorizing the President to conduct this war and which gave plenary authority to him under that act.

Mr. PADGETT. They were purchased during the Spanish-American War.

Mr. SISSON. And they were purchased under that act authorizing the President to conduct that war.

Mr. PADGETT. That does not make any difference, we own them and they are part of the Navy and we can add to them.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we have five transports in the Navy with a total tonnage of 26,595 tons.

I am quoting now from the official figures giving the different classes of vessels and the number in each class in the Navy, and I want to say just one word in addition. If the Chair desires to know, I am quoting from the Naval Yearbook for 1912, on page 780, and this information I am stating is obtained directly every year from the Navy Department and is official.

Now, the gentleman attempts to draw a distinction between a vessel that this Government constructs and a vessel that it purchases. I want to point out to the gentleman that it makes no difference how we get a vessel if we get her under due authority of law, and in the case of the two transports mentioned, the *Prairie* and the *Buffalo*, it is true that they were purchased during the Spanish-American War, but they were purchased pursuant to law, otherwise we would not have them in the Navy, and we never could have acquired them. There is no question whatever but that the Navy now has transports, and this authorization in this bill is not creating a new line or class of vessels. It is simply adding to a class which we already have.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order. Reference has been made to the *Prairie* and the *Buffalo*. They are in commission, but in addition to those we have two others, the *Yankee* and the *Dirie*, and I will read very briefly a statement of the service that those boats have been rendering. I read from the report of the Secretary of the Navy:

Since the close of the Spanish War these ships have been constantly engaged in transporting men on foreign stations, expeditionary forces of marines, and Naval Militia. Since 1900 there have been, for instance, no less than 24 expeditionary forces of marines dispatched to various parts of the world. From 1909 to 1911 there were transported in the *Yankee* and *Dirie* a little more than 20,000 men. During 1911 the *Prairie* made seven trips with enlisted men and two with marine regiments. The *Buffalo* made two trips to the Asiatic station—one trip with a marine regiment and one with Naval Militia of California. The need for transports is considered sufficiently urgent to warrant the omission of fuel ships for one year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have that type of ship in the Navy just as actually and really as we have the battleship type in the Navy. They are necessary to the performance of the functions of the Navy in the operations of the Marine Corps. The battleships and the cruisers which we have are not adapted to transportation of marines, and yet we are constantly required to transport those marines, and transports are far cheaper than the purchase of transportation from the commercial world, and we can not keep the Marine Corps of the Navy in its integrity without a transport service.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the marines belong both to the sea and land, and in case of war receive the first bullets, and are always on the firing line, and are a most important part of our national defense?

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. TRIBBLE. In order to place these marines at Panama, or at any other position, we have to have transports to carry them to the scene of war.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman's logic is sound.

Mr. DYER. I would like to have the gentleman state to the committee the character of transports we have—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has been recognized.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to submit just this observation on the point of order: I do not know as to the merits of the question whether there should be a transport constructed, but upon the point of order I submit this to the Chair: That if this is a vessel to be used as a part of the Naval Establishment, then under the long line of rulings that have been made it is not subject to the point of order. If this is to be part of the naval fleet, it need not necessarily be a battleship or a torpedo boat; but if it is to be used in the service of the Navy, then it is a part of the Naval Establishment, and under a long line of rulings it is clearly not subject to the point of order.

Mr. MANN. The rule which would affect this question is:

That no appropriation shall be in order unless in continuation of appropriations or such public works and objects as are already in progress.

The rulings are many that in the Lighthouse Service, which has lighthouse vessels, an amendment or proposition to build a new lighthouse vessel not previously authorized by law is subject to the point of order. The same is true of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the same is true of the Bureau of Fisheries, and the same is true in the War Department.

I have given a good deal of attention to this subject, because I was in the chair for several years when the naval appropriation bill was under consideration. There never has been any ruling of any Chairman holding any naval proposition in order for new work, new vessels, or anything of that kind, except for fighting vessels. Although the general rule was early laid down that the provision for a new vessel in the naval service

was not a continuation of a work in progress, by an arbitrary ruling many years ago of a Chairman it was held that it was in order to appropriate for a new warship. But the decisions have been uniform all the time by all the Chairmen ruling upon the subject that that arbitrary exception applied only to fighting vessels.

Hence the Chair, the other day, ruled out an item for a dry dock. Now, a dry dock is just as necessary for the running of the Navy as a transport is, and the Committee on Naval Affairs seem to confuse their legislative jurisdiction with their appropriating jurisdiction. They have the authority to bring into the House a bill providing for a dry dock if it be necessary; they have the authority to bring into the House a bill providing for a transport if that be necessary. But there never has been a ruling yet which authorized an appropriation for any new construction in the Navy, either by way of vessel or dry dock or building, except where it applied to fighting vessels, and then only after the type of vessel was already in the Navy.

For instance, there was ruled out of order a few years ago a provision providing for a new type of torpedo boat or torpedo-boat destroyer, and the ruling was that if there was in the Navy a torpedo boat of a particular type, then it was in order as a continuing work to provide for an additional boat of that type, but without legislation it was not in order to provide in the appropriation bill for a new type of fighting vessel.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. I suppose no one can ever make an argument without yielding, and hence I yield.

Mr. HOBSON. I just wanted to ask the gentleman a question. He is very familiar with the operations of the Navy, and when he recognizes—

Mr. MANN. I am more familiar with the operation of the rules than the gentleman is, and he is more familiar with the operations of the Navy than I am.

Mr. HOBSON. I want to thank the gentleman for the latter part of his statement.

Mr. MANN. The first part is equally true.

Mr. HOBSON. And it is no lack of compliment to admit the first.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman when he sees the operation of a fleet, for instance, as on the Central American coast, as we have just recently seen it operating, whether he regards the transports that were in that fleet—the transports that carry the marines who were going to be the landing weapons of the fleet when they reach shore—whether, when the fleet is sent to that coast and the transports are the main part of the fleet's operation, he would not consider those transports fighting ships?

Mr. MANN. I will ask the gentleman, then, whether he considers if we want to send the Army abroad it is not necessary to have ships in which to send them? And will the gentleman contend it is in order on the Army bill to provide transports for the Army? Or will the gentleman say that it is in order to provide a lighthouse tender in order that you may convey supplies to a lighthouse situated in the ocean that you can not get to without a tender?

Mr. HOBSON. No; but I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. MANN. They are equally pertinent questions.

Mr. HOBSON. I will say to the gentleman that the transport is a part of the fighting fleet.

Mr. MANN. It is the duty of the gentleman's committee, having legislative jurisdiction to report a bill providing for a transport not in the appropriation bill, to bring in such a bill.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I thought I heard the gentleman state a moment ago that if we had a type of torpedo boat and some type of boat already in the Navy, then it would be in order to provide for additional boats of that type?

Mr. MANN. I said that particularly as to fighting vessels.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is the distinction between a fighting vessel and transport or collier?

Mr. MANN. The Chairmen have always drawn that distinction.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I was asking the gentleman if he drew that distinction?

Mr. MANN. I do.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. And the fact that there are transports in the Navy would not make in order additional appropriations?

Mr. MANN. I do not think it makes any difference. I am quite willing for the Chair to rule either way. Everybody admits that the original ruling authorizing on an appropriation bill appropriations for building new vessels in the Navy was an arbitrary ruling, entirely in conflict with all other decisions made

under that rule. That arbitrary ruling, made years ago, has been followed.

Now, if the Chair desires to extend that, very well. That arbitrary ruling will meet the approval of those who are in favor of making up a monstrous Navy, because it is quite certain that if it had not been for that arbitrary ruling, made more than 20 years ago, at a time when people in the department were endeavoring to start a new Navy, we would not now have such a Navy as we have, and probably there would not be the enormous expense, either here or in other countries, from the endeavor of each to outdo the other in building up a navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. It has been held in order in the past to provide battleships in the naval appropriation bill, also to provide other classes of fighting ships. The question involved here, however, came up directly in the second session of the Sixty-first Congress, when the naval appropriation bill was under consideration, with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in the chair. The paragraph under consideration was this:

One repair ship, to cost not exceeding \$1,000,000.

On that occasion the following colloquy took place:

Mr. TAWNEY. I make the point of order against the paragraph just read. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order against the paragraph just read. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. TAWNEY. There is no authority, Mr. Chairman, for the construction of this repair ship, which is in the nature of a dry dock and subject to the same rule. It is not attached to any navy yard, and it is not proposed that it shall be. It is therefore, under the ruling of the Chair in similar cases, contrary to the rules of the House and not in order.

The Chairman on that occasion [Mr. MANN], in passing on the motion, held as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. In ruling upon an amendment which was offered on the naval appropriation bill two years ago, the present occupant of the chair, who was then in the chair, made this statement:

"While the Chair is not called upon to decide as to whether an appropriation would be in order for a destroyer or torpedo boat known as 'subsurface' or 'semisubmerged' as a work already in progress, the Chair is inclined to think that the rulings in regard to holding appropriations for new vessels in order on naval appropriation bills as a work in progress have gone quite as far as it is possible to carry them."

It is quite within the power of the Committee on Naval Affairs to bring into the House a bill authorizing the construction of any kind of a vessel which the committee favors, and for Congress to provide for such authorization by legislation, but it seems to the Chair that it is legislation where no authorization has been made, and that to say that any kind of a vessel in the Navy, outside of fighting ships, can be provided on the naval appropriation bill without previous authorization of law, simply as a work in progress, is not warranted. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

It seems that the only instances where it has been held in order in the past are where an appropriation bill provides for the building of other fighting ships, and on the ground that it is a work in progress, as stated in paragraph 3723 of volume 4 of Hinds' Precedents:

By a broad construction of the rule the principle of which is not generally applied in other matters, an appropriation for a new and not otherwise authorized vessel of the Navy is held to be for continuance of a public work.

But the provision or paragraph passed upon in that case was one in which provision was made for another fighting ship. The Chair is unable to find any ruling that would support the contention that this paragraph is in order. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

Mr. CLINE. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph has been stricken out. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

One supply ship, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$1,425,000.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to the answer to a question propounded to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Austin] when he was discussing the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most remarkable performances exhibited in this House was again reproduced last Saturday in the general discussion of this bill. During my membership, covering nearly four years, I have witnessed the annual recurrence of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] with his story of pessimism and prophecy. He opened his last "vision" with this remarkable statement, in referring to the Monroe doctrine:

The next element of our free institutions is the principle of equality of opportunity, which principle is being projected out by us into the competition for the commerce and the markets of the world. We should not forget that every great military nation in the world with a colonial government absolutely denies that principle.

In this connection, referring to the completion of the Panama Canal, he further said:

The completion of the Panama Canal will bring to a head the question of the future development of Central and South America. * * * These lands and these countries are going to be developed, and the

question must be settled as to whether they are going to be developed by the system of European colonization and restriction, which embodies the principle of privilege and special advantage of the distant mother country, or whether they are going to be developed under the Monroe doctrine, with the principle of equality of opportunity for all along with the freedom of those people. * * * The principle of equality of opportunity (involved in the Monroe doctrine), the very ends of justice lie at the foundation of the world's future happiness, and in my judgment is the foundation of peace between nations. America embodies it and is committed to it, and no other great military power of the earth admits it.

Let us have an understanding of what was originally declared in the so-called Monroe Doctrine. In December, 1823, President Monroe, in his annual message to Congress, said:

"We owed it to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those foreign powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonial dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments that have declared their independence we have on great consideration and just principles acknowledged we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any way their destiny by any European power in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition against the United States. * * * It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness, nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It was impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition with indifference."

Mr. Chairman, this assault upon the Monroe doctrine in the house of its friends is an astounding proposition. That a great overshadowing policy in our political institutions for almost a century, a policy that has been woven into our political life, should be challenged at this hour, that any question should be raised here as to our purpose and our ability to successfully enforce it, is a most unpatriotic declaration. Though couched in ambiguous language that the statement may be veiled, it is no less reprehensible. Appreciating the fact that I am liable to be charged with unwarranted assumption in even presuming to question the statements, I do not propose, as a representative of a patriotic people subject to the wanton criticisms of foreign powers, at this hour to permit such language to go unchallenged. It became necessary, even to initiate the imaginary necessity of the gentleman from Alabama for his six-battleship proposition, to first impeach at the very onset the integrity and the high purposes of his Government that has declared that the Monroe doctrine is now and ever shall be the fixed policy of this Republic and this Western Hemisphere.

The gentleman in his discussion refuses to give any credence of good faith of our Government in the execution of its treaties and conventions, and contemptuously refers to The Hague tribunal as a "collection of delegates without authority," and that in the face of the fact that the Senate of the United States accredited the representatives of that body as our representatives and accredited the proceedings had in conjunction with 43 other powers with its approval, and if The Hague conference shall at its next meeting organize an international court the Senate of the United States will again ratify its proceedings. Declarations that would discredit us, wipe out and destroy our treaties and conventions, and discount our good faith were necessary, however, for the mere substance of a basis for the vagaries of the gentleman from Alabama. I protest against an attack upon a policy national in its scope and in the perpetuation of which is inlaid the safety and security of our liberty and our institutions. The sovereignty of this Republic is supreme and constant, and the exercise of that sovereignty in enforcing the Monroe doctrine has become an international principle in the comity of nations that no statesman however eminent and no nation however powerful can deprive us of.

Mr. Chairman, neither the statement that the Monroe doctrine remains to be settled on the completion of the Panama Canal, nor that no great military power has never accepted it, is true. I propose to examine briefly, in the light of history, both of these propositions. It is a surprising statement that no great military power admits the Monroe doctrine as a fixed policy of this Republic. In the House of Lords on the 17th day of February, 1903, three days after the Venezuelan blockade was raised, referring to an incident to which I shall return later, the Duke of Devonshire, the Government's leader in the House of Lords, said:

Great Britain accepts the Monroe doctrine unreservedly, but to have abstained from enforcing a claim which she believed to be just and essential to her honor would be to make the Monroe doctrine an object of dislike by every civilized power.

But I go further, Mr. Chairman, and quote from Mr. Balfour, the premier of Great Britain, in a speech in Liverpool on the same day, as follows:

We know that public opinion is naturally sensitive upon what is known as the Monroe doctrine, but the Monroe doctrine has no enemies in this country that I know of. We welcome any increase of influence of the United States of America upon the great Western Hemisphere. We desire no colonization. We desire no alteration in the balance of power. We desire no acquisition of territory. We have not the slightest intention of interfering with the government of any portion of that

continent. The United States of America can perform no greater task in the cause of civilization than by doing its best to see that the international law is observed, and by upholding all that the European powers have recognized as the admitted principles of international comity.

These statements not only show that the Monroe doctrine has no enemies in England; that her people are not only friendly but are in favor of that feature of our foreign policy. I quote from the St. Petersburg press of February 19, 1903:

Throughout the Venezuelan controversy the Russian press was emphatically in favor of the American people. The papers frequently published editorials defending the Monroe doctrine.

In the Reichstag, on March 19, 1903, referring to the Venezuelan difficulty, Chancellor Von Bülow said:

We found ourselves in a dilemma, but nobody can reproach us for acting without sobriety and calmness. We had to take care that our relations with other powers should not be disturbed through this relatively subordinate matter.

These citations are the declarations of three of the most formidable powers in Europe, two of them being statements in a representative capacity.

They constitute a complete refutation of the statement that "no great military country on earth admits the Monroe doctrine."

I am not content with these statements from representative men of those Governments. The attention of the House is called to the conduct of all these powers in connection with their business and political interests on this continent and their ready submission to the mere requests of this Government when the United States thought proper to make the request. At the very inception of the Monroe doctrine, after we had, through negotiations with England, concluded to stand behind the actions of the Spanish-American States in their decision to establish for themselves separate governments, independent of Spain, and turn this hemisphere away from monarchical government, the holy alliance, consisting of Russia, Prussia, Austria, and France, came into existence for the sole purpose of lending aid and support to Spain and to urge her to reassert with their support her sovereignty over the former Spanish-American States.

In this propaganda for the perpetuation of monarchical representation England refused to join, and in due course of time, because of our insistence upon our policy, the holy alliance became ineffective. Beginning as early as 1840 Spain began to open negotiations with Great Britain for the purpose of disposing of the island of Cuba. The American State Department informed Spain that at the time we declared for the doctrine known as the Monroe doctrine, in 1823, it found her in the possession of Cuba and other colonies on this hemisphere. It distinctly affirmed that with her then political relationship it did not propose to interfere, but that this Government would not permit the Spanish Government to transfer the island of Cuba to England or any other foreign power, and as a result of that instruction Cuba remained Spanish territory for more than 50 years, and until this Government, in the interests of humanity and popular liberty, in 1898, intervened and permitted Cuba to establish a separate and independent form of government. [Applause.] In 1863, when we were engaged in a great Civil War among States, England, Spain, and France seized upon the opportunity to concentrate their battle fleet at Vera Cruz, on the coast of Mexico, for the purpose, as they claimed, of enforcing a collection of debts due to the several countries from Mexico. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] knew that he misinformed the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] when he did not tell him the full truth of that matter in answer to my question.

The United States at that time was unable to assert and maintain her rights as defined in the Monroe doctrine until after she had settled her difficulties. In 1866, after the conclusion of the war, Mr. Seward, finding that the English and Spanish Governments had abandoned their purpose and France had established upon Mexican soil a monarchy, with Maximilian as Emperor, notified the French Government of its determination not to permit the continuance of a French monarchy on Mexican soil, and, after proper negotiations, Maximilian was dethroned, the French Government withdrew its troops, and Mexico was permitted to establish a representative government. [Applause.]

For the purpose of establishing beyond question that the Monroe doctrine is not only settled but is accepted by foreign powers as a fixed principle in our political institutions, let me again refer to the Venezuelan controversy of 1903. Germany, Russia, and England undertook to force from Venezuela the payment of large indebtedness to each of these countries. With their combined fleets they blockaded the Venezuelan ports and demanded settlement for their claims. The impression prevailed in this country that the blockade was not so much due to the debts due these several powers as an attack indirectly upon

the Monroe doctrine. On the suggestion of the United States, without the controversy between Venezuela and the several Governments even reaching the diplomatic stage, they consented to refer their claims to The Hague tribunal for settlement. They raised the blockade they had established, returned with their navies to their respective countries, and agreed to abide by The Hague conference.

In 1895 the question of the boundary between Venezuela and Great Britain, that had been pending since 1814, again came to the surface for what appeared to be a final determination. The American Government was unwilling that a great and powerful nation should take any advantage in a settlement of disputed territory over a weak and feeble Republic. England had pushed westward on the territory of this Republic with her boundary lines until she had taken from Venezuela more than 30,000 square miles.

For many years Venezuela had begged for an arbitration of its differences with England relative to the international boundary. Each offer that Venezuela made to arbitrate England imposed conditions that Venezuela could not accept. Upon proper representations being made to the United States this Government sent a commission to inquire into the facts. After the report of this commission, President Cleveland suggested the friendly offices of this Government to adjust the difficulties and establish the true boundary line. After some negotiations, full acceptance was made by both parties. [Applause.] I quote here a passage from Mr. Cleveland's message to the Congress of the United States on the 17th of December, 1895. Referring to the Monroe doctrine, he said:

The doctrine upon which we stand is strong and sound, because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a Nation and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions and the tranquil maintenance of our distinctive form of government. It was intended to apply to every stage of our national life, and it can not become obsolete while our Republic endures. If the balance of power is justly a cause for jealous anxiety among the Governments of the Old World and a subject for our absolute noninterference, none the less is an observance of the Monroe doctrine of vital concern to our people and their Government.

The mission of this Nation is to teach the world an example "of high-minded foreign policy." Let us throw the moral force of that example into every quarter of the world and stand for freedom and popular government. We are the world's teacher of national peace and personal liberty. We do not need great navies to eat out the substance of the people nor foreign allies to enforce a despotism against alien races. I would rather have the protection of the two great oceans of the world bordering on us than either the triple or quasi alliance of the great navies of Europe to guard the peace, happiness, and liberty of the people. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. CLINE was given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph. I had reserved the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, or corporations, or the 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, and unrestricted competition in letting contracts for the constructions of any of said vessels.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will state his point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. My point of order is that it is in conflict with the amendment just passed by this House a short time ago limiting the construction of these vessels in a navy yard belonging to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a matter for the Chair; that is a matter of legislation.

Mr. FOWLER. I presume that there are some other vessels to be constructed besides battleships, such as torpedo boats and the like, that might come within the provisions of this paragraph, but in so far as it relates to the construction of the battleship provided for in this act, it certainly contravenes the amendment which was passed prior to reaching this paragraph.

Mr. MAHER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer that will cover the point made by the gentleman.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that an amendment might possibly correct this paragraph and would be better than a point of order, but I can not tell whether the amendment would pass or not, and therefore I make the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. Because one section of the bill is in conflict with an amendment does not make it subject to a point of order.

Mr. MAHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 11, 12, and 13, on page 55, and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Secretary of the Navy shall build the battleship authorized in this act in such navy yard as he may designate, and shall build any of the other vessels herein authorized."

Mr. MAHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer that amendment to perfect that section, so as to have it in harmony with the Calder amendment.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] presumed to set himself up as the exponent of the Baltimore Democratic platform. I am sure that there is no gentleman in Congress who knows less about it or is less competent to define and interpret that platform than the gentleman from Tennessee.

But there is one whose word, it seems to me, should carry a great deal more weight as to its meaning that that of the gentleman from Tennessee, and that is the gentleman who did more perhaps to write that platform than any other living man. That is the gentleman who in a few days, if rumors are correct, is to be the premier of the next Cabinet. Now, Mr. Chairman, as interpreting that platform, I would like to read what Mr. Bryan himself has said of the proposition of a big Navy. [Cries on the Republican side of "Hear!" "Hear!"]

Yes; if you have the ears to hear, hear and be convinced if you have the brains to comprehend. [Laughter.] Mr. Bryan said in his Mohonk conference speech:

I believe that our people ought to try to get agreements with other nations to do the things that are good. But I do not believe this Nation ought to wait for any other nation to agree to do what is right. It ought itself to do what is right. I have faith in what I understand to be the Bible plan of bringing about peace. Suppose we had two men here who differed, honestly differed, as to the method of bringing peace among men. I would suggest this plan of testing the two plans on a small individual scale, that we might then judge as to how it would apply on a large scale. I would say to these two men to put their plans into practice. Let one of them strap revolvers around him and announce that he stood ready to avenge any insult, and he would bring peace by fighting for it. Let the other announce that he did not intend to do injury to anybody; that he would assume that nobody was going to do injury to him; that he was not going to arm himself. Which one would have the fewer scars at the end of 10 years? My friends, if this Nation announced to the world that it would not spend its money getting ready for wars that ought never to come; that it would rather try to prevent the coming of war; that, as it did not intend to go out as a burglar, it would not equip itself with burglary tools; that it had faith in the good intent of other people, and it expected other people to have faith in its good intent, do you think our Nation would suffer for that?

Some one has said here—I believe it was the distinguished president of Columbia University—that whenever there is an appropriation to be made for battleships it is preceded by vociferous expression of a profitable kind of patriotism—the spending of money for battleships. What he said is so. We have a navy league in this country—

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HURLEY] this morning called attention to the officers of the Navy League—treasurer, J. P. Morgan, jr., and counsel, Mr. Satterlee, a son-in-law of J. P. Morgan, sr.—a fine lot to advise Democrats—

they have one in Germany; they have one in Great Britain; and they have one in France. These navy leagues play one nation against the other. Whenever we build a battleship the picture of it is published in the literature of all the other countries, and the building of that battleship is urged as a reason why all the other nations should build at least one more, and possibly two. Then, when they get scared and build we get the picture over here, and we must build another. That is exactly what goes on and what has been going on for years. We are expected to get scared whenever another nation builds a battleship, and then we are to build two and scare them until they build three, and we get scared again and build four.

And if my colleague from Alabama, Capt. Hobson, could scare them a little more, they would build six.

That is exactly what is going on, and I am satisfied that President Butler put his finger upon the cause. It is this profitable patriotism that finds money in the building of ships and getting ready for war; and then as soon as we get our ships built the very same forces will forget their patriotism, and if they get a chance build ships for other nations to beat our ships. I have sometimes used this illustration: Suppose there was a large lake; and suppose that there were half a dozen landowners, with their lands bordering on this lake, living peaceably together, without trouble or sign of trouble. A man who builds ships goes to one of them and says, "You are very foolish; you are living here with no protection whatever. Don't you know that any of these men around you might build a battleship and come here, and you are absolutely defenseless? Now, let me build a ship for you, and you will get ahead of them." Suppose the man was foolish enough to take the advice. Just as soon as that ship was built the shipbuilder would go to the next neighbor and say, "Why, don't you see that man over there has got a battleship. What has he got that for? Do you suppose he is building it for nothing? Have you any doubt he has designs on you? Where else can he use it except on this lake? You had better get ready. Now I can build you two." And if this man is foolish he would build two. Then what an argument the shipbuilder would have when he got to the third man! "Why, there are two of them against you. They might combine, and you are absolutely defenseless." Now, with that argument he could go all 'round that lake, and after building ships for each one, he could go back to the first one and say, "You are out of date. Look at the improvements since you

built. And then you have only one and these other people have four or five or eight apiece. There is nothing for you to do but mortgage your land. Now you are in for it!" Now that is the race of the world, my friends—that is the mad race of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object I understand the gentleman is quoting now from Mr. Bryan?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has stated authoritatively that Mr. Bryan is to be in the next Cabinet.

Mr. BURNETT. I have not. I have said it was rumored that he was to be the premier, but I do state that he was the gentleman, above all others, who had more to do with the writing of the platform than the gentleman from Tennessee tried to interpret than any other man:

My friends, the building of these great battleships, these preparations by Christian nations to fight one another, is a challenge to the Christian civilization of the world; it is infidelity to the doctrine taught by the Founder of the Christian religion. Christ taught no such doctrine; he taught us the power of love, not the power of the sword; and those who have tried to put into practice this doctrine are the ones who have suffered least from the use of force. I believe that this Nation could stand before the world to-day and tell the world that it did not believe in war, that it did not believe that it was the right way to settle disputes, that it had no disputes that it was not willing to submit to the judgment of the world. If this Nation did that, it not only would not be attacked by any other nation on the earth, but it would become the supreme power in the world. I believe that our Nation can take a long step in advance now by announcing doctrines of this kind—announcing that its Navy will not be used for the collection of debt; that, as we do not imprison people for debt in this country, we will not man battleships and kill people because they owe people in this country; that we will apply to international affairs the very doctrines we apply to our national affairs, and, if anyone in the United States wishes to invest money in another country, he must do so according to the laws of that country and be subject to the authority of that country. Then every nation would be open to American investment, for that is the kind of investment they would look for. They have had enough of investments which are preceded by the purchase of a little land to be followed by a battleship that takes the rest of the country. I believe that, if our Nation would announce to the world that it stands ready to enter into a treaty of peace with every other nation, big or little, whenever there is any dispute which is beyond diplomatic settlement, that dispute shall be submitted to an impartial tribunal for investigation and report—if our Nation did that, it would not be a year's time before we would have treaties of peace of that kind with the leading nations and in two years' time with practically all nations. And when this Nation had entered into that kind of treaty of peace with other nations we should find the example such that it would result in treaties being made between other nations, and the day of war would be past.

[Applause.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Democratic platform at Baltimore declared for an adequate Navy. The gentleman from Alabama voted against building one battleship. Was he in line or out of line with the declaration of his party?

Mr. BURNETT. Absolutely in line. The gentleman has not gone far enough, either, in his desire to misinterpret it, or his misunderstanding of the Democratic principles or platform, when he does not state that it also states that it should be "a well-proportioned Navy"; and is any navy well-proportioned when it is stated authoritatively by members of this committee that we lack 3,000 officers and perhaps 20,000 men of having men enough to man the ships that we have? Would a man who owned a great department store be a good business man if, when he had not clerks enough nor bookkeepers enough to run that store, and could not get them, he would say that he would build another one, even if he had to let it stay out of commission, as some of our ships to-day are out of commission because we can not turn out men enough to officer the ships and can not get recruits enough to man them? I am for an adequate Navy. I am for a well-proportioned Navy. The Navy now is adequate for all our purposes in time of peace, and it is not a well-proportioned Navy because it has not men and officers enough to man the ships. The minority report on this bill is a patriotic paper. The report of the majority shows that we are building ships in a very unbusinesslike manner. Here we are talking about war, when next year we are to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of peace with England, and a century of peace between France and all English-speaking countries will be completed in 1915, and for 150 years there has been no war between England and Germany, and never has been between Germany and America.

Then of whom are we afraid and with whom do we anticipate war? Certainly not with Japan, a bankrupt nation who could not borrow \$100,000,000 if the life of the Empire depended on it. These cries of war have been raised by jingo politicians until we have ceased to be frightened by them. Let us talk peace and

internal development a while, and give the disappointed agitators for war a respite from their arduous labors.

Let us talk good roads for the men who never see a battleship. Let us talk vocational education for the boys of the farmer and the laborer, and cease pouring the taxes wrung from the toilers of the land into the coffers of the Steel Trust and the Shipbuilding Trust.

I have been abused for my advocacy of a public buildings bill. I have now thrown out the challenge to the advocates of a big Navy that if you will cease building battleships for the next four years and apply the \$30,000,000 that it costs to build two *Dreadnoughts* to the building of good roads I will not for that time advocate a dollar for public buildings, but will advocate that that also go to building or improving post roads.

But so long as the big cities with their navy yards, the Steel Trust with their thin cheap foreign labor, and the jingoes who are constantly predicting war with Japan insist on looting the Treasury for battleships and refusing anything for good roads I shall continue in my humble way to advocate the erection of post offices in the smaller cities. Let the man in the rural district at least see a small part of what he is paying taxes to keep up.

Mr. Chairman, I will here reiterate some things that I said on this floor last year on this subject:

Mr. Speaker, has any Member of the House stopped to think that the cost of one battleship alone would be sufficient to authorize 40 vocational schools under the Page bill, with \$7,500 to each school in every State in the Union, which would give to the farmers', the mechanics', and laborers' sons of the country an opportunity for higher and better preparation in the vocations to which they expected to devote themselves? We passed in this House what was known as the Shackelford good-roads bill. It went to the Senate, and the Senate, in its desire to substitute battleships for good roads, struck out the Shackelford proposition and put in the two battleships, costing \$30,000,000. Have any of the southern Members considered that it takes 300,000 bales of the farmers' cotton to pay the cost of one battleship, to say nothing of maintaining it after it is built? Has any western Member considered the fact that it takes 15,000,000 bushels of his farmers' wheat to pay for one of these dreadnoughts that is soon to be thrown in the junk pile? Yet we can not have any good roads; we can not have an appropriation for vocational schools. We can only get \$17,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture because we must pay to the Ship Trust and the Armor Plate Trust and people around the navy yard the money to build a big battleship. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This bill carries many million dollars more than the last Republican bill, and yet our party won its fight, in part at least, by the outcry against Republican extravagance and in favor of Democratic economy. The Democratic minority of the Naval Affairs Committee has joined hands with a Republican minority to embarrass Mr. Wilson's administration with a wild extravagance that is indefensible.

I wish to read a few extracts from the minority report on this bill, which report entitles every man who signed it to the love of every Democrat who stands for the people. They are Mr. GREGG of Texas, Mr. WITHERSPOON of Mississippi, Mr. HENSLEY of Missouri, and Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Their names deserve to be embalmed in the hearts of a grateful people.

The undersigned members of the Committee on Naval Affairs beg leave to submit the following report and to express our dissent and objections to the bill reported by the committee.

This bill carries \$146,818,364.53. This sum is \$23,666,825.78 more than the last appropriation and \$9,731,165.48 more than the Congress in the days of its wildest extravagance ever appropriated in one bill. Of this vast sum of \$146,818,364.53, \$105,587,948.53 is appropriated for the maintenance of the Navy, \$22,284,091 for the completion of naval vessels already in process of construction, and \$18,946,325 for the first year's work of construction on two battleships, six torpedo destroyers, four submarines, one supply boat, and one transport, which new vessels will cost an aggregate of \$46,418,925, and the construction of which will necessitate a larger appropriation next year than this.

In conclusion, we appeal to the Democratic Members of the House to stand by the policy of the party and uphold the wisdom of its caucus in decreeing three separate times that we need no more battleships. We urge them to fulfill the pledges of economy made in every platform of the party since 1832. We call their attention to the fact that the appropriations this year have already exceeded those of last year by \$121,000,000, and we urge them to show at least as much regard for the condition of the Treasury, as much regard for economy, and as much sympathy for the toiling masses, who are now groaning under the burdens of taxation and are looking with longing hopes and expectant hearts to the Democratic Party, as the Republican Party showed in nine different years when they had control of the Government.

[Loud applause.]

[Mr. HAMILL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move 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 New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a new paragraph to follow line 20, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, by inserting at the end of line 20, on page 55, the following as a new paragraph:

"That the U. S. S. Portsmouth be, and hereby is, transferred to the State of California upon condition that the said State of California, by and through its governor, accept said vessel, U. S. S. Portsmouth, for said State, after having been first duly authorized by the Legislature of said State of California, and upon the further condition that said vessel remain the property of said State, to be preserved and cared for by the said State of California at its own cost and expense, and the said vessel be turned over to the State authorities of California without any expense to the Government."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the point of order, I desire to ask the gentleman a question. If this amendment should go into the law, where would the *Portsmouth* be delivered to the officials of the State of California?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention and idea by this amendment that it would have to be delivered to the authorities of California on the eastern coast where the vessel now is—down, I think, at Newport News. That is the reason I have offered the amendment, so it will be turned over to the State where it is now, without any expense whatever to the Government of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Now, if this amendment goes into the bill in the House, does the gentleman anticipate that it will come back to the House without a Senate amendment providing that the fitting up shall be at the expense of the Government?

Mr. RAKER. I will say to the gentleman this: That the Legislature of the State of California—

Mr. MANN. I do not care about that.

Mr. RAKER. I will answer the gentleman, no; I am opposed to it, and I here state on the floor that I shall appeal to the Senators to leave the amendment as it is, to turn the vessel over to the authorities of the State of California, where the vessel now is, without any cost to the Government of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I sometimes wonder of recent days whether any Member of the House is entitled to take the statement of any other Member of the House in good faith. Only a few years ago we provided for the California Exposition with the distinct understanding that there was to be no Government appropriation, and only last year we passed a resolution for a hygiene congress at Buffalo with not only a distinct understanding but the inclusion in the law itself that there should be no Government appropriation. Then somebody who represents a locality near by is not bound by that statement. But if the House in good faith agrees to the amendment and the gentleman, whose faith I do not question, makes the statement, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman that if I remain on the conference committee—and I expect to—it will have rough sledding to get changed.

Mr. MANN. I know; but conferences are trading machines.

Mr. PADGETT. No; there will not be any trading on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up the time of the committee, and I would like permission to submit a few remarks upon this question, and I ask that I may do so in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article by Prof. Eugene Wambaugh, of the law department of Harvard University. It is a short article on the Panama Canal Zone taken from the Boston Evening Transcript.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, may I have the same permission?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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, to be available until expended, \$21,768,228.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. Strike out the figures "\$21,768,228" and substitute in lieu thereof "\$18,230,728." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 55, line 24, by striking out "\$21,768,228" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$18,230,728."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of the Navy; equipment: Toward the completion of equipment outfit of the vessels heretofore and herein authorized, to be available until expended, \$490,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in line 6, page 56, to strike out "\$490,000" and insert "\$370,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, line 6, by striking out "\$490,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$370,000."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of the Navy; armor and armament: Toward the armor and armament for vessels heretofore and herein authorized, to be available until expended, \$15,618,913.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 10, page 56, "\$15,618,913" and substitute "\$11,568,309."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, line 10, by striking out "\$15,618,913" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$11,568,309."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to go into a discussion of this matter at this time, but I intend to do so at some length, but I want to state here that I noticed in some publication, some magazine, which I will not call attention to, and have heard the statement made that this armor plate is costing the Government entirely too much. I know that some 15 or 16 years ago there was a great deal of scandal connected with the armor plate. At some other time I want to go more at length into this matter. I only desire now to call attention to the fact my information is that armor plate can be bought for something like \$75 or \$100 a ton and the Government is paying now \$200 a ton.

Mr. PADGETT. It is paying as high as \$420.

Mr. SISSON. That is worse than ever.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question in reference to these items? The gentleman has offered amendments to reduce the construction and machinery \$3,500,000 and equipment \$120,000 and a little over \$4,000,000 on armor and armament. What causes that?

Mr. PADGETT. One battleship went out that carried the other \$6,000,000, and one supply ship and one transport. That was the amount included in these appropriations for those three ships.

Mr. MANN. There are no reductions otherwise?

Mr. PADGETT. No reduction otherwise. It is the proportionate part.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 56, line 10, add "The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to offer and pay rewards to the person or persons who shall first furnish to the Government information or evidence which shall lead to the detection of violations of the antitrust act of July 2, 1890, in cases where violations have injuriously affected the Navy Department or of cases where the Government has been defrauded in the character, quality, or price of materials furnished and that where as a result of information or evidence so furnished the Government succeeds in recovering money or property as fines, penalties, forfeitures, or otherwise, the rewards shall be 10 per cent of the amounts so recovered."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withhold it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 56, line 10, add "Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to procure, by contract, armor of the best quality for any or all vessels above referred to, provided such contract can be made at a price which in his judgment is reasonable and equitable, but in case he is unable to make contracts for armor under the above conditions he is hereby authorized and directed to procure a site for and to erect thereon a factory for the manufacture of armor, and the sum of \$4,000,000 is hereby appropriated toward the erection of said factory."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY in the chair). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend at the beginning of page 56, by adding the following: "Provided, That no part of any sum herein appropriated shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government, who shall make, or cause to be made, with a stop watch or other time-keeping device a time study of the movements between the starting and completion of any job of any such employee; nor shall any part of the appropriation herein made be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any such employee in addition to his regular wage, except for suggestions resulting in improvement or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. It is legislation. It does not apply to anything in this part of the bill, and, besides, it relates to other matters of the Government that are outside of this present bill.

Mr. MURRAY. If the Chair desires, I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. The purpose of this amendment is to create a new section at the end of those sections placed in the bill on page 56 to restrict expenditure of the various items of appropriations. The Chair will see from even a cursory reading of the amendment that it is a limitation on every item of appropriation in this bill for the definite purpose of controlling these appropriations and the method of expenditure by the Secretary and officers of the various departments of the Navy. I think, Mr. Chairman, that since it is a definite limitation upon the method of expenditure of these appropriations, it comes clearly within the rules which are so familiar to the Chairman and to the Members that I need not definitely refer to them. Because it is a limitation as to how this money shall be expended in the various navy yards I believe it is in order.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it will be well to call the attention of the Chair and the committee to the evil which this amendment seeks to correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. In the judgment of the Chair the proposed amendment is a limitation upon the expenditure, and therefore in order. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MURRAY. Speaking to the merits of this amendment, I am very clear that Members should approve it. There was a committee of three Members of this House appointed in the early days of this Congress, before the first session of this Congress ended, to investigate what is known as the Taylor system of shop management.

That committee was composed, as Members will recall, of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILSON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor; of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REDFIELD]; and of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], who was appointed to fill a vacancy after my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LAWRENCE] was unable to serve. Those three men, serving as a committee, went to some of the various cities of the country and took the testimony of all who would respond to their invitation for the purpose of making a report to the Committee on Labor and to this House as to the wisdom or lack of wisdom in continuing this Taylor system of shop management.

I can only tell you that their work was well done, and cite as proof of it the fact that there is pending in this House now the bill H. R. 25305, introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PEPPER], and reported by the Committee on Labor, to regulate the method of directing the work of Government employees. And my amendment has been based, almost word for word, so far as I could do it and keep within the technical rules of this committee, upon that resolution of investigation, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Labor. There is a splendid report accompanying that bill. It is Report No. 1001, submitted to accompany the bill H. R. 25305, to which I have referred.

Now, the fact that in every navy yard in the country, in every Government plant in the country, there has grown up under the administration of affairs as recently carried on a method of standing over a man with a stop watch to see how long in minutes and in seconds it takes him to do a definite piece of work; to see how long it takes the most active and alert of his fellow workmen to do that piece of work, and establishing as a standard amount of time which will be permitted to an employee for a definite work the number of minutes and seconds in which the most alert and active workingman can perform that work.

I say that is a wrong system, and I say that, instead of promoting efficiency among the workmen in these various Government plants, it has resulted in the destruction of the spirit of the workmen. [Applause.]

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, by adding to line 10 the following proviso: "Provided, That"—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Does this purport to be an amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was trying to ascertain that by the reading of it. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if that is an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. CARY. It is not.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it is not in order until after the disposition of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY]. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MURRAY. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—yeas 51, yeas 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, by adding to line 10 the following proviso:

"Provided, That no contracts for the armor for any vessel authorized by this act shall be made at an average rate exceeding \$300 per ton of 2,240 pounds, including royalties, and in no case shall a contract be made for the construction of the hull of any vessel authorized by this act until a contract has been made for the armor of such vessel."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this is not new legislation. The Chair will find in the Yearbook of the Navy for 1911, on page 328, that such an act was passed March 3, 1890. I sincerely hope that the chairman of the committee will not make a point of order and that he will not oppose the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, from the testimony of Admiral Twining, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, it appears that we are paying for class A armor \$420 a ton for class A turrets, \$480; for class B, \$470; for class C, \$508.

Germany is paying \$490. France in private plants is paying \$490 to \$510 per ton. In Government plants she is paying from \$250 to \$325 a ton. Italy is paying from \$459 to \$617. The average is \$470.

Russia pays from \$320 to \$385. England pays from \$438 to \$535. Japan, in Government plants, pays \$400 a ton.

I want to submit this evidence before the vote is taken. I believe that it would be unwise legislation to adopt this amendment. We are paying less than many of these other countries.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. In the confusion it was difficult to hear either the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY] or the explanation of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], but I gathered that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin reduces the price we are paying for armor plate about \$120 a ton. Is that correct?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it limits it to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total increase of the Navy heretofore and herein authorized, to be available until expended, \$41,230,416.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, in line 12, page 56, to strike out "\$41,230,416" and insert in lieu thereof "\$33,462,312."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no part of the work herein required shall be awarded to private contractors until the Government establishments which have facilities for doing said work are employed to within reasonable limits of their capacity.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the reason for offering this amendment is that some of our Government establishments have

only been running a small part of their time, which has made the work in these departments cost more than it would if they were running full time. They have the so-called overhead charges. They figure the interest on the investment, and so forth. If the Government is permitted to operate these plants their full time, it will be a great saving to the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCHANAN) there were—yeas 27, yeas 70.

The Clerk read as follows:

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. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I desire to refer again to my references to the Monroe doctrine. I would not do this but for the fact that my good friend from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] seemed to question my sincerity in laying down the Monroe doctrine as one reason why I thought we ought to have at least equilibrium in the Atlantic. I do not believe he meant that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order—that the gentleman is not speaking to the question.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman does not know what I am going to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman hear a suggestion from the Chair?

Mr. HOBSON. Very gladly.

The CHAIRMAN. The rules of the House provide that a Member shall address himself to the proposition before the House.

Mr. HOBSON. I am very glad to do so. This involves the whole bill.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may have five minutes in which to address the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be interrupted. I insist that the point I am going to make bears on the whole question of the naval policy. The Monroe doctrine—

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I insist that the gentleman's remarks are not in order.

Mr. HOBSON. The Monroe doctrine, it may be recalled, was promulgated early at the suggestion—

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to the question before the committee.

Mr. HOBSON. If the gentleman will give me a chance—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that as the debate has taken quite a wide latitude, the gentleman from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, the British Government cooperated with the American Government; in fact, it is said that it suggested to the American Government the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine, and when I refer to the Monroe doctrine I do not have in mind any possible contingency of its violation by the British Government.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do have in mind, and am very serious and earnest about it, that the continental nations of Europe have not accepted the Monroe doctrine. In 1863, as the gentleman pointed out, the French invaded Mexico. Our Government made a protest in the name of the Monroe doctrine, which was utterly ignored until, as the result of the war and its cessation, we had at that time the greatest Navy in the world. We had undisputed control of the seas, and then when we called on France in no uncertain terms to retire, France retired.

Now, coming down to the Venezuelan incident. The gentleman recalls that Germany sent her fleet to the shores of Venezuela. Our Government forthwith assembled her fleet at Guantanamo and sent Admiral Dewey to take command. At that time our fleet, as the result of the interest of the American people, and on account of the Spanish War, was second in the world. It was probably 60 per cent stronger than the German fleet. As compared with Germany, we had undisputed control in the seas. So when we called on Germany to retire and accept the Monroe doctrine, she did so with good grace and in peace.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will lay it down as a self-evident proposition that we are as far from territory covered by the Monroe doctrine as are the continental nations of Europe; that these

nations are proceeding to develop Africa, Asia, and the islands of the sea by the continental system, and that they will naturally and inevitably tend to develop South America by the same system. With the completion of the Panama Canal South America is going to be developed and will try to be developed by those over the sea, and our policy of the Monroe doctrine, or theirs, will prevail according to which one has control of the sea. If we have control of the sea the Monroe doctrine will never be questioned. We will never have any war on account of it, it will be accepted as a part of the practical politics of the world. If we do not have control of the sea there is historic precedent in the invasion of Mexico to believe that the continental nations will proceed in spite of us, and that will precipitate war.

The question of peace or war is vital to this whole bill, and, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama, withdraws his pro forma amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee rose; and a message from the Senate, by Mr. Curtiss, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the House of Representatives (H. R. 26874) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 27827. An act to amend section 70 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of any sum appropriated by this act shall be used for any expense of the Navy Department at Washington, D. C., unless specific authority is given by law for such expenditure.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill add as a new paragraph the following—

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. MANN. No; not with my consent. We can not adopt an amendment without it being read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill add as a new paragraph the following:

"There is hereby established a council of national defense, consisting of the President"—

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is the bill for the establishment of a council for national defense, it is very clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. It is that bill, Mr. Chairman, and I asked to dispense with the reading of it.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise—

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. But the Chair has recognized the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill—

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment before the committee rises.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Mississippi will wait until the Chair can find out what the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee is he will recognize him.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman would give the Chair a chance to recognize him he would permit him to offer his amendment.

Mr. Sisson. But I want to be sure of that.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman would be a little more patient we might proceed in order.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the period in line 7, on page 57, and insert:

"And provided, That all of the battleships, torpedo-boat destroyers, submarine torpedo boats, transports, supply ships, and all other vessels authorized in the 'Increase of the Navy' in this bill shall not be let to any bidder bidding for the contract to construct such battleship, torpedo-boat destroyer, submarine torpedo boat, transport, supply ship, or other vessel until after the Secretary of the Navy shall have prepared and had filed in his office detailed plans and specifications of such battleship, torpedo-boat destroyer, submarine torpedo boat, transport, supply ship, or other vessel; and copies of such plans and specifications shall be submitted to each bidder under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment. It is not germane at this point in the bill and it is new legislation.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is the only place where it is germane, and I submit that it is not new legislation. It is simply a limitation upon the appropriation for the increase of the Navy. It is a limitation for this reason: It simply provides that before the Secretary of the Navy can use any of the money provided for in the increase of the Navy he shall prepare or have prepared and have in his office detailed plans and specifications of the vessels authorized under the increase of the Navy. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] will recall that two years ago, I believe it was, I offered this amendment. It was discussed at that time at some length on the floor. My reason for saying it is a limitation is this: That it does not prevent the expenditure of every cent of the money just in the manner that the Secretary of the Navy sees proper and right to expend it, except that the detailed plans and specifications shall be made and on file in his office prior to the time that these contracts are let. In other words, this rule applies with reference to all other work or nearly all of the other work done in all of the departments of the Government, and I see no reason why this should not be the rule in the office of the Secretary of the Navy, involving as these battleships do the expenditure of so many millions of dollars. It was developed in the discussion two years ago that the only thing on file in the Secretary's office was the type of vessel. This does not change that rule except that the plans shall be in detail, so that the bidders when they bid on these plans may know just exactly the kind and character of vessel being bid for, and there is no way in the world by which the Government, the Secretary of the Navy, or Congress can protect the Government unless they do have detailed plans and specifications in the Secretary's office.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Is it possible that bids are taken until the plans and details are prepared?

Mr. Sisson. It is possible, and it is done every day.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, they have very full detailed specifications covering multitudes of sheets.

Mr. Sisson. The gentleman recollects that two years ago he stated to me that that matter would be gone into by the Navy, and unless the rule is changed, if the gentleman will look at the debate two years ago he will find he himself stated that at the time the contracts were let there was nothing on file but what is known as the general type, and the gentleman from Alabama then argued that it was impossible to have the detailed plans and specifications on file, as you do in reference to other contracts, such as a public building, which was then being discussed by me, and he said that when you let the contract for a battleship you let the contract for a certain type of battleship, and he argued that that was all that was necessary. Then, it was developed by discussion with the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, who knows more about naval construction than all of us combined know or ever will know, that these detailed plans and specifications were prepared as the vessel was undergoing construction, and that all of these detailed plans and specifications were not on file at the time the contract was let. But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss], then on the committee, made an objection to it, because he said that you could not construct vessels as you did other items, and for that reason, after having two years in which the Naval Committee might investigate and make this change, so that the detailed plans and specifications could be on file before the battleship was let, I have offered this proviso as a limitation upon the expenditure of the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The proposed amendment involves more than a limitation upon an appropriation. Under the existing law the Secretary of the Navy has discretion. The rule is that a proposition to establish affirmative directions for an executive officer constitutes legislation, and it is not in order on a general appropriation bill. It has been so ruled on numerous occasions

(Hinds' Precedents, vol. 4, sec. 3854), and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill 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. ALEXANDER, 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. 28812, the naval appropriation bill, and had directed him to report it to the House 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.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. To demand a separate vote on a paragraph in the bill.

The SPEAKER. We have not come to that yet.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. FOSS. I demand a separate vote—

Mr. HOBSON. I demand a separate vote on page 54, striking out the two battleships and inserting one, and on that I ask the yeas and nays.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I desire a vote on the same paragraph as that demanded by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Buchanan amendment, page 15, at the end of line 15, regarding powder.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment forbidding the purchase of foreign-made material.

The SPEAKER. Where is that?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It was offered last night.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, that motion did not carry; there is no such amendment.

The question was taken, and the other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, at the end of line 15, insert the following: "Provided further, That in expenditures of this appropriation or any part thereof for powder no powder shall at any time be purchased unless the powder factory at Indianhead, Md., shall be operated on a basis of not less than its full maximum capacity."

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, a division.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 157, noes 46.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, in line 21, strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "one."

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 174, nays 156, answered "present" 5, not voting 46, as follows:

YEAS—174.

Adair	Boehne	Cox	Flood, Va.
Adamson	Boehr	Cullop	Floyd, Ark.
Aiken, S. C.	Borland	Daugherty	Foster
Akin, N. Y.	Buchanan	Davis, W. Va.	Fowler
Alexander	Burgess	Dent	Francis
Allen	Burleson	Denver	Garner
Anderson	Burnett	Dickinson	Garrett
Andrus	Byrnes, S. C.	Dies	Gill
Anthony	Byrns, Tenn.	Difenderfer	Gillett
Ashbrook	Callaway	Dixon, Ind.	Glass
Barnhart	Candler	Doughton	Godwin, N. C.
Bartholdt	Cantrill	Driscoll, D. A.	Goeke
Bartlett	Carter	Edwards	Goodwin, Ark.
Bathrick	Claypool	Ellerbe	Graham
Beall, Tex.	Clayton	Evans	Gray
Bell, Ga.	Cline	Faison	Green, Iowa
Berger	Collier	Fields	Gregg, Tex.
Blackmon	Covington	Fitzgerald	Gudger

Hamlin	Lewis	Pepper	Stephens, Miss.
Hammond	Lindbergh	Post	Stephens, Nebr.
Hardwick	Lloyd	Prince	Stephens, Tex.
Hardy	Lobeck	Rainey	Sweet
Harrison, Miss.	McCall	Raker	Switzer
Hay	McCoy	Randell, Tex.	Taggart
Hayden	McGillicuddy	Rauch	Taylor, Ala.
Heffin	McKenzie	Richardson	Taylor, Ark.
Helgesen	Madden	Roddenbery	Taylor, Colo.
Helm	Maguire, Nebr.	Rouse	Thayer
Henry, Tex.	Mann	Rubey	Thomas
Hensley	Mondell	Rucker, Colo.	Tribble
Houston	Moon, Tenn.	Rucker, Mo.	Turnbull
Howard	Moore, Tex.	Russell	Underhill
Hull	Morgan, La.	Saunders	Underwood
Humphreys, Miss.	Morrison	Shackleford	Volstead
Jacoway	Morse, Wis.	Sharp	Watkins
James	Moss, Ind.	Sherley	Webb
Kent	Neeley	Sherwood	Whitacre
Kinkaid, Nebr.	Nelson	Sims	White
Kitchin	Norris	Sisson	Willis
Konop	Nye	Small	Witherspoon
Lamb	Oldfield	Smith, Tex.	Young, Kans.
Lee, Ga.	Padgett	Sparkman	Young, Tex.
Lenroot	Page	Stedman	
Lever	Palmer	Steenerson	

NAYS—156.

Ainey	Fergusson	Lafferty	Redfield
Austin	Focht	La Follette	Rees
Ayres	Fordney	Langham	Reilly
Bates	Foss	Langley	Reyburn
Brantley	French	Lawrence	Riordan
Broussard	Gallagher	Lee, Pa.	Roberts, Mass.
Browning	Gardner, Mass.	Levy	Roberts, Nev.
Bulkley	Gardner, N. J.	Linthicum	Rodenberg
Burke, Pa.	Goldfogle	Littlepage	Rothermel
Burke, S. Dak.	Good	Longworth	Scott
Burke, Wis.	Greene, Mass.	McCreary	Scully
Butler	Greene, Vt.	McGuire, Okla.	Sells
Calder	Gregg, Pa.	McKellar	Simmons
Campbell	Griest	McLaughlin	Slemp
Cannon	Guernsey	McMorran	Sloan
Carlin	Hamill	Macon	Smith, Saml. W.
Cary	Hamilton, Mich.	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Hart	Martin, Colo.	Speer
Cooper	Hartman	Martin, S. Dak.	Stephens, Cal.
Crago	Hawley	Matthews	Sterling
Cravens	Hayes	Merritt	Stevens, Minn.
Curler	Heald	Miller	Stone
Currier	Henry, Conn.	Moon, Pa.	Sulloway
Curry	Higgins	Moore, Pa.	Talbot, Md.
Dalzell	Hill	Mott	Talcott, N. Y.
Davidson	Hinds	Murdock	Thistlewood
Davis, Minn.	Hobson	Murray	Tilson
De Forest	Holland	Olmsted	Townser
Dodds	Howland	O'Shaunessy	Townsend
Donohoe	Humphrey, Wash.	Patten, N. Y.	Tuttle
Doremus	Jones	Patton, Pa.	Vare
Draper	Kahn	Payne	Warburton
Dupré	Kendall	Peters	Weeks
Dwight	Kennedy	Plumley	Wilder
Dyer	Kindred	Pou	Wilson, Ill.
Esch	Kinkead, N. J.	Powers	Wilson, Pa.
Estopinal	Knowland	Pray	Wood, N. J.
Fairchild	Konig	Pujo	Woods, Iowa
Farr	Kopp	Ransdell, La.	Young, Mich.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Driscoll, M. E.	Haugen	Howell	Taylor, Ohio
Fornes			

NOT VOTING—46.

Ames	Finley	Korbly	Pickett
Ansberry	Fuller	Lafean	Porter
Barchfeld	George	Lindsay	Prouty
Bradley	Gould	Littleton	Sabath
Brown	Hamilton, W. Va.	Loud	Slayden
Conry	Harris	McDermott	Smith, J. M. C.
Copley	Harrison, N. Y.	McKinley	Stack
Crumpacker	Hughes, Ga.	McKinney	Stanley
Danforth	Hughes, W. Va.	Mays	Vreeland
Davenport	Jackson	Morgan, Okla.	Wilson, N. Y.
Dickson, Miss.	Johnson, Ky.	Needham	
Ferris	Johnson, S. C.	Parran	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. FORNES with Mr. BRADLEY.

Until further notice:

Mr. STANLEY with Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. VREELAND.

Mr. MAYS with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH.

Mr. McDERMOTT with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. LITTLETON with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. KORBLY with Mr. PARRAN.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina with Mr. NEEDHAM.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky with Mr. LOUD.

Mr. HARRISON of New York with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia with Mr. LAFEAN.

Mr. GEORGE with Mr. JACKSON.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. HARRIS.

Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi with Mr. FULLER.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. DANFORTH.

Mr. BROWN with Mr. AMES.

Mr. ANSBERRY with Mr. BARCHFELD.
Mr. HUGHES of Georgia with Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL.
For the day:
Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. PICKETT.
For the vote:

Mr. SLAYDEN (in favor of one battleship) with Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio (in favor of two battleships).

Mr. HOWELL (in favor of one battleship) with Mr. WILSON of New York (in favor of two battleships).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the reading of the engrossed bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] demands the reading of the engrossed bill. The House can not proceed without the engrossed copy, if the gentleman insists upon his request.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I insist upon it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the general deficiency bill.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] rise?

Mr. PADGETT. I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I demand a second.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. I reserve my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, is it now in order for me to exercise the right to the 20 minutes?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is entitled to 20 minutes. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. A parliamentary inquiry. Does the reading of the bill precede the discussion?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, as the bill has been read, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the House will be in order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to debate the bill, and I shall reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves his time.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to consume 20 minutes in discussing the proposition involved in the motion. I shall take a few moments of the time of the House to make what appear to me timely observations. The discussion of this bill has been full, fair, covering several days. The will of the House, being a House controlled by a Democratic majority, has been expressed. I requested the reading of the engrossed bill and demanded a second, so that I might exercise my right to make just a few brief observations without encroaching upon the time that others desired to use in a discussion of the various paragraphs of the bill. In a moment this bill will pass. Where does it go then? It goes to another legislative body. When it gets there who of us expect that that bill in amounts appropriated will be returned to this body substantially or approximately as it appears when the House has acted upon it. I have no disposition to assume the position that another legislative branch is not coordinate and coequal with this. But the will of the American people has been expressed in the late month of November, and by their vote they have fixed the political complexion of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States as well for the Sixty-third Congress now about to convene.

And here is a Democratic House now that will be a Democratic House a week from now by its own voluntary action transmitting legislation to a Republican body that will no longer be a Republican body in less than a week from now, and we are

saying that we will put into its hands in the dying days of a Congress the power to vote two battleships or three battleships and no man can prophesy what other burdens for our countrymen to bear knowing that, thus increased, that body will send it back to us.

When it comes back in what situation does it find us? The death-bell notes of this Congress will be sounding and there will be great pressure for the conclusion of the public business. Able Members will rise and say, "The great supply bills must be passed."

Gentlemen, shall we place ourselves voluntarily in a position where, in order to pass the great supply bills, we shall inflict upon the backs of our countrymen \$20,000,000 additional taxes when, if we would but pause now and wait for a week, we can submit to a Democratic Congress the proposition of how much burden the people shall bear, how many battleships they shall at the plow and at the anvil beat out by their sweat, and how many soldiers or marines they shall adorn with the vestments of their service? Gentlemen, I desire to submit that it is an unwise public policy, that it is an unwise party policy at this time to transmit to the Senate this legislation under the present circumstances.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague [Mr. HARDWICK]?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. Why would not the same argument that the gentleman is making so eloquently now have applied against the public-buildings bill? [Applause.]

Mr. RODDENBERRY. It does not apply except for the technical relation between an appropriation bill and an authorization bill. When this naval bill passes the taxes are laid and the revenues are appropriated. When the public-buildings bill passed only an authorization was made, and it is no charge and becomes no charge upon the Treasury until a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate and a Democratic President say the people shall bear it. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, we have seen from the public buildings bill what will happen to us. The Senate's \$30,000,000 increase of the public buildings bill, the river and harbor bill, the Indian appropriation bill, and, in my judgment, the size of this bill, not only warrant this House in committing them to a Democratic administration, but indicate that if the people of this country could speak again they would say, "We have elected new Representatives, we have elected new Senators, and before you begin to revise the tariff, which is to lay revenue duties upon us, we would ask that our last-chosen Representatives and Senators shall determine upon the amount of money which is to be expended and which we are to pay by our taxes."

It is rational and it is just. I recognize the views of able men that the supply bills should be passed now. But there is no emergency, there is no reason until July, why this money shall be called for. In fact, with the exception of one bill, no general appropriation bill is sought to be made effective until the 1st of next July.

We have sent and are still sending these bills to a body that will force us to do one of two things: Either to kill them and not let them become laws for want of agreement in conference, which I trust will be done, or else in the last hour of Congress to yield to the conferees from the other end of the Capitol and add many millions of dollars to these appropriations as passed by the House. This course, in my judgment, places around the neck of the incoming Democratic administration a handicap and a weight that will give to the first Democratic President in many years the mightiest struggle to hold his party's head above the water and live up to the promises we have made to the country, and to the great duty we as legislators owe that has ever confronted a President in the history of this Republic.

These are my views. With perfect respect I regard other Members' views as being equally as honest and perhaps wiser than mine. The future months will tell whether or not a demagogue has exploited himself with folly or whether a truthful prophecy has been made.

Mr. Speaker, in so far as I can under the rules, I withdraw the demand for the reading of the engrossed bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is too late now. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill as amended.

The question being taken, and (two-thirds voting in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill passed.

REVISION OF THE PATENT LAWS.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file minority views on the bill H. R. 23417, the revision of the patent laws (H. Rept. 1161, pt. 2).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to file minority views on the bill H. R. 23417, the patent revision. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 28858) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1913 and for prior years, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 10 minutes, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the general deficiency bill; and pending that he asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 10 minutes, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] told me that he desired some time upon this bill. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] desire time?

Mr. OLMSTED. I desire to use about 20 minutes' time, but I do not care to take it this evening if I can get consent to speak to-morrow at some time.

Mr. CANNON. Suppose the gentleman from New York asks for 20 minutes on a side. I have not had an opportunity to see members of the committee on the Republican side. They have none of them made application to me, except the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, no time is desired on this side, and there are other appropriation bills to be considered.

Mr. CANNON. Unless there is objection upon the part of some member of the Committee on Appropriations—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, at this day in the session it is not usual to occupy time in general debate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman need not argue that question. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] says he will be satisfied to be recognized under the five-minute rule. I have no applications for time. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desire any time?

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. CANNON. So far as I am concerned, general debate may be closed by unanimous consent now.

Mr. OLMSTED. I had intended to ask for 20 minutes, but I will not object to this request, and will take my chances under the five-minute rule.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FOSS. I make the same request.

Mr. SISSON. I want to extend my remarks on the naval bill, and I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as one-tenth of all persons die from tuberculosis, and inasmuch as Dr. Friedmann has arrived in this country claiming a wonderful tuberculosis treatment, and inasmuch as the suffering consumptives of this country should be warned against raising their hopes too high, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KINDRED] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARY. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the naval bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the naval bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with general debate on the deficiency bill, and that when we go into the committee the bill be read under the five-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman had better ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill in the committee be dispensed with.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have asked that the bill be read under the five-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. MANN. I understood what the gentleman asked; but I think the House ought to understand the nature of the request, and therefore I suggested to the gentleman that he make that request.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think there will not be any misunderstanding of it after the gentleman's explanation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be dispensed with, and that the first reading of the bill in the committee be dispensed with, and that the bill be read under the five-minute rule for amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. FITZGERALD was then agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. ADAMS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the general deficiency bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 28858) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1913 and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate and the first reading of the bill has been dispensed with by order of the House, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE.

The accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of William H. Crook, disbursing clerk, Executive Office, the sum of \$505 disallowed by the Auditor for the State and Other Departments in his accounts of disbursements for the quarters ended June 30, 1911, and March 31, 1912, on account of expense incurred in painting the walls and woodwork of the rooms in the Winder Building, occupied by the Commission on Economy and Efficiency.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I ask the gentleman what became of the Commission on Economy and Efficiency?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is still at work.

Mr. MANN. How much has been allowed for it during the next fiscal year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nothing as yet.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Claims of American citizens for losses in Samoa in 1899: For the payment of the amounts found by the Secretary of State to be due to American citizens for losses growing out of the joint naval operations of the United States and Great Britain in and about the town of Apia, Samoan Islands, in 1899, the King of Sweden, by an international award, having found the United States and Great Britain to be responsible for such losses, \$14,811.42.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the paragraph. What special reason is there for the Committee on Appropriations assuming jurisdiction over private claims in this matter, when they were sent to the Committee on Claims?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They came to the Committee on Appropriations through a message of the President, and under the rules of the House claims arising under treaties are reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. This is not a claim arising under any treaty.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I looked at the matter carefully, and under the practice of the House the Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction.

Mr. MANN. Under the practice of the Senate the Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction of claims arising under treaties. My recollection is that when the President sent his communication to the House on the subject it was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These are in the nature of deficiencies. They are not for the support of the Government.

Mr. MANN. These claims have been pending for a good many years, now. Does the gentleman have the document referred recently in the House?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is in the document of February 7, 1913. It came in a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting deficiency items.

Mr. MANN. That is true, but the claims themselves were transmitted to the House recently, and by the House referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the gentleman is mistaken. The only way they came to the House, as I recall, is in a letter

from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting the estimates for deficiencies for the current fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. That is the reason the gentleman does not recall it, because it was not referred to his committee. There was a document transmitted by the President to the House on the subject and referred to the Committee on Claims, unless I am very much mistaken. It was quite a lengthy document, setting out what these claims are.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These claims have been duly adjudicated under the treaty. The King of Sweden was appointed arbitrator, and he determined that the various Governments were responsible for the injuries to the property of its own citizens. The claims of the American citizens amounted to sixty-four thousand and some hundred dollars. A representative of the State Department was sent to the Samoan Islands to investigate, and he reported in favor of the payment of \$14,000 of these claims. The citizens of other Governments have been paid by their Governments. Under the circumstances, it seems that we should pay the amount ascertained under the decision of the international arbitrator.

Mr. MANN. The international arbitrator only determines how much these countries should pay and how much the other countries should pay. This country was to pay one-half of certain claims and Great Britain one-half.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He held that each Government was responsible for the damages to the property of its own citizens.

Mr. MANN. Is not this the case: It was decided as to the claims of the German citizens that this Government should pay one-half and the Government of Great Britain pay one-half, and each of the countries, Great Britain and the United States, should take care of the claims of its own citizens?

If the committee gave consideration to the claims I shall not insist on the point of order, but if the committee took the estimate of the department upon the subject, without an examination of the document that was transmitted to the House—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I will say that I examined this document as well as I was able to under the pressure, and all of the testimony submitted to this representative of the State Department is contained in it. Claims submitted by American citizens amounted to over \$64,000. The commissioner appointed by the State Department reported favorably on about \$14,000. The State Department in view of that report recommended that it be paid.

Mr. MANN. As I recall the case, it is this: The American citizens on the island practically got the Navy to go there and interfere and shell the town. They exposed themselves, the whole operation being at their request and suggestion. Then, when they suffered some loss, they desired the Government of the United States to pay the claims. I can not see any special equity in the claims.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman will recall that a large amount of damages was claimed not only for direct, but for consequent damages growing not only out of the destruction of property by the bombardment and what was taken by the adherents of the two claimants for the throne, but that the claims were made for consequential damages, such as stealing of the property and plunder and everything of that sort. The agreement entered into between this country and Great Britain and Germany was that these claims were to be ascertained and each country was to pay one-half of the claims. That was afterwards abandoned, and the German Government and the British Government have paid their citizens. Everybody connected with it has been paid except the American citizens.

Mr. MANN. That is true, but the fact is that it was because of the activity of the American citizens that the trouble arose. They were the ones who brought the Navy there and who caused the bombardment to be made.

Mr. BARTLETT. They were the ones who brought the king back to have him reenthroned.

Mr. MANN. They were the ones who caused the whole trouble, and, having caused the trouble and suffered some damages by it, they want the United States Government to reimburse them. Of course, we will be liable for what was done to foreign citizens, and, the island being somewhat at that time under the jurisdiction of the three nations, it was decided that the United States should pay, as I recall it, one-half to the German citizens who were damaged, and Great Britain one-half, and that each of the nations, Great Britain and the United States, should take care of their own citizens.

Mr. BARTLETT. Congress has acted in this matter. The payment of the German and English citizens has been made by act of Congress. Twenty-five thousand dollars was offered as a settlement of these claims and that was declined, and then Congress afterwards appropriated one-half of \$40,000,

Mr. MANN. We were under obligations, under the treaty, to pay the foreign damages.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not understand it to be a part either of international law or of good conscience that if the United States, in carrying out its policy, shall injure the property and person of foreigners, and at the same time injure the person and property of its own citizens, it is bound more to pay the foreigner than its own citizen, yet that is what this would amount to.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I can understand very well how if at the instance of some people we bombard a town, the people who ask the bombardment being American citizens, that we are not under any obligation to pay them.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not say obligation. This may not be a claim that could be enforced as against sovereignty, but good conscience on the part of the Government may require, as we often do, to pay a claim of a citizen.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, while I do not think the Committee on Appropriations had any jurisdiction of this matter, and while I doubt the propriety of paying all claims, yet at this hour of the night I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to say this, we would not have paid it, if we did not think we were bound in conscience and decency to do so.

Mr. MANN. But that was for the Committee on Claims to determine.

The Clerk read as follows:

COLLECTING INTERNAL REVENUE.

To supply a deficiency in the appropriation for salaries and expenses of 40 revenue agents provided for by law, and fees and expenses of gaugers, salaries and expenses of storekeepers and storekeeper-gaugers, \$50,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to have unanimous consent granted to pass the provision on line 21, page 6, for the present, with the privilege of offering an amendment to it later.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have given everything that they have asked.

Mr. CANNON. I will state to the gentleman what I would be glad to offer at this point, namely, to hereafter pay a salary of a senior surgeon to Dr. Anderson, who is at the head of the Hygienic Laboratory.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I shall be compelled to make the point of order against it.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman is compelled to make the point of order against it of course that ends it; but I hoped the gentleman would not make the point of order against the matter, and I would like to ask unanimous consent—

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is a gentleman over there who will.

Mr. CANNON. No; I do not think so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. His committee last year reported a bill increasing the compensation of all the employees of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service. The gentleman from Georgia is usually alert and knows what is going on, and I am afraid he would make the point of order if I do not.

Mr. CANNON. I do not believe he would.

Mr. MANN. I will say to my colleague—

Mr. ADAMSON. I took it for granted, Mr. Chairman, the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had finally concluded to refrain from trenching on the territory of other committees, and I confess I have not read the bill which is before the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment increasing the compensation of an officer of the Public Health Service, and the gentleman's committee last year had reported a bill increasing the compensation of all the officers in that service, I thought perhaps he would offer to make the point of order.

Mr. ADAMSON. If in addition to the fatherly care in looking after and legislating on those matters which are within our jurisdiction the gentleman should conclude to go further and compel us to make points of order which we otherwise would not make, he would be a guardian indeed.

Mr. CANNON. I would like to offer this amendment and let the point of order be pending.

Mr. ADAMSON. I would like to hear the amendment read if I am required to raise the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. It is that hereafter the Director of the Hygienic Laboratory shall receive the pay and emoluments of a senior surgeon. Now, then, if the gentleman will reserve the point of order—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. And it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will reserve it.

Mr. CANNON. The pay of this Director of the Hygienic Laboratory here in Washington is \$2,900. This amendment will give him \$3,500—the pay of a senior surgeon.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It will also give him longevity pay and allowances.

Mr. CANNON. He is getting the same longevity pay on this. It only amounts to an increase of salary of \$600—that is all. Now, I ask unanimous consent that the point of order be reserved to make a statement. The sundry civil bill, which was passed and is pending in the Senate, very largely increases the expenditures for the Public Health Service. The hearings before the House committee on the sundry civil bill covered a day, and I have never heard a more intelligent hearing, not only from Dr. Blue, at the head of this service, but from the Secretary of the Treasury, and from Dr. Anderson, of the Hygienic Bureau; and the increase resulted after a full hearing touching the prevalence of pellagra, trachoma, spotted fever, and infantile paralysis, and the services which were rendered by this Hygienic Laboratory here in Washington, which has been doubled in capacity in the last year or two, and this man, so far as I know and believe, gives exceptional service at the head of this laboratory.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman will permit, I do not care to have time consumed. He has converted me, and I am perfectly willing to waive what little impropriety there may be in this thing; in fact, I believe the only disorderly thing about it is that there are several others whose salary ought to be raised a little, if the condition of the Treasury would permit, and I am going to withdraw the point or order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. I hope the gentleman will not make it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If I do not do what is expected of me in protecting the bill, I have absolutely no excuse to offer other gentlemen who desire to increase salaries.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman in charge of the bill will allow me, the services of this man in connection with the operation of that laboratory, of which he is the efficient head, can not be measured by any reasonable amount of money.

Why, we double these appropriations, and there is a great demand for this service. It is not often that I desire an increase of \$600, but here is a man who is earning twice the amount which he is getting, and can command twice that amount.

Mr. MANN. Will my colleague yield to a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. What my colleague thinks is that the present official ought to have this increase?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; or any official who is competent to be at the head of the Hygienic Laboratory, which has been doubled in its capacity in a very short time and which is making such contributions toward investigations for the public health.

Mr. MANN. What is the position which this man now has? What is his title?

Mr. CANNON. He is the Director of the Hygienic Laboratory.

Mr. MANN. Of course, I do not know about his salary; but when we drew a bill, which subsequently was passed last year, but originally drawn several years ago, Dr. Wyman consulted me. I was then the chairman of the committee. I first proposed to put in the salaries of a few of these men who were in those places. The statement was made to me at the time that these men would get the salaries provided for in the bill as surgeons or senior surgeons. That is the reason I asked.

Mr. CANNON. This is to put the director on the salary of a senior surgeon in this bill, and I think he is worth any senior surgeon and more, too, in the contributions he makes to medical science.

Mr. ADAMSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] if for some reason at the time we framed that bill this particular officer's salary was omitted. Was it not omitted under some statement made to us?

Mr. MANN. It was omitted because Dr. Wyman said it was not necessary. I thought at the time those men ought to receive a sufficient salary, but I supposed that they would get it as I have stated.

Mr. KINDRED. What would be the salary of the director of the Hygienic Laboratory, then?

Mr. CANNON. Thirty-five hundred dollars. It is now \$2,900.

Mr. MANN. It would be a total of \$4,500 and allowance for room.

Mr. KINDRED. Will the gentleman allow me to further interrupt to say that I have some personal knowledge of the value to the scientific world of the work that is being done in this laboratory, and I want to confirm and emphasize what the gentleman from Illinois has said relative to the scientific value of this man and his services who now fills the directorship there, because in the outside world, if he should have engaged in some other position where industrial chemistry was concerned, he could get twice the salary. I sincerely hope the gentleman's amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. As I understand, the present and former chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who collaborated on bills for the pay of this man, intended that this man at the head of this laboratory should get this compensation, and, familiar as I am with his work and equipment, I am willing to let the committee vote on the question.

Mr. MANN. The bill as originally drafted contained a specific provision in reference to the increase of the salary of the directors. There were several of them in these places, and we were then told by Dr. Wyman that it was unnecessary, and that they could get the salaries without putting them in the bills.

Mr. ADAMSON. And that was a mistake.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that Dr. Anderson appeared before the committee in connection with the estimates of the Public Health Service, and I think he made as profound an impression on the committee as to his capabilities and capacity as any man I have listened to in my experience. And the research work of the Public Health Service is really, in my opinion, the most important work of the whole service.

Mr. MANN. That is right.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I shall not insist on the point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] withdraws his point of order, and the Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. After the word "provided."

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, after line 21, insert the following: "Provided, That hereafter the director of the Hygienic Laboratory shall receive the pay and emoluments of a senior surgeon."

Mr. MANN. I think that should read "pay and allowances."

Mr. CANNON. Well, "pay and allowances," then. Put that in.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to regard the service of Joseph Lanzon, late ordnance sergeant, United States Army, as continuous from May 20, 1882, to September 2, 1912, the date of his death.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves a point of order on the item.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This man originally enlisted in the Army in 1882 and died a year or so ago.

Mr. MANN. On September 2, 1912?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. He was discharged on the 31st of May, 1892, after the expiration of his enlistment, and reenlisted on the 1st day of July. If he had reenlisted within 30 days his service, under the law, would have been continuous and he would have been entitled to certain increases of pay; but he died here within a year or so, leaving a widow and five children. They applied, in the settlement of his accounts, for the amount—\$220—that would have been due if the continuous service had existed, but in checking up they found that he had not enlisted within a day or two of the time necessary, and they decided that he had been overpaid in the amount of about \$570, and that his widow and children were not entitled to this money on that account.

Mr. MANN. This is to relieve an overpayment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; and to permit the payment of \$220.

Mr. MANN. I know; but practically to relieve an overpayment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. It makes the widow entitled to the payment of \$220. The man is dead, and it makes no difference to him.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether it makes any difference to him or not. The gentleman and I are not informed on that subject. [Laughter.] If it is simply to relieve an overpayment that was made, I have no objection to it.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is all.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The widow gets the \$220.

Mr. MANN. Then I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws his point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Assessor's office: Leave of absence with pay for an additional period of 60 days may be granted to A. E. Grant, clerk in the assessor's office, District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that item.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, on Christmas eve a young woman, a clerk in the assessor's office, was brutally assaulted, and—

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter all collections or reimbursements on account of charges paid or payable by the District of Columbia for the care and support of the insane of said District at the Government Hospital for the Insane shall be made to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the revenues of the United States and the revenues of the District of Columbia in equal parts.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Auditor for the District of Columbia called the attention of the committee to the fact that the commissioners have no authority to make the collections for pay patients, and the superintendent of the insane asylum says that he has none. He states that if the obligation is imposed on the commissioners to collect from those patients that are sent there, and for whom otherwise under the law the District should pay, the authorities can follow them up and collect the money required of the pay patients.

Mr. MANN. Are not their expenses charged to the District?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is for the pay patients.

Mr. MANN. I know; but whether they go as pay patients or not, are their expenses not charged to this District?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Half and half.

Mr. MANN. On the half-and-half principle?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is it half and half where we are making them pay back a lot of money?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That is the only thing I wanted to know about.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I want to make inquiry on a similar subject in relation to the language in line 18, page 12. The question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] causes me to inquire what particular significance have the words "provided by law"? What particular significance has that language?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The law provides the terms under which these patients shall be committed and the rates charged.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. The words "provided by law" relate to the conduct of the institution; this amount only to be paid for purposes and in manner provided by law.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; and the rate must be fixed in the manner provided by law.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. It in no way relates to the half-and-half proposition.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous expenses: For payment of such miscellaneous expenses as may be authorized by the Attorney General for the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and its officers, including the furnishing and collecting of evidence where the United States is or may be a party in interest, including also such expenses as may be authorized by the Attorney General for the Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, \$40,000.

Mr. SISSON. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. This is for the purpose of paying the expenses of the condemnation proceedings for the ground between the Capitol and the Union Station, but I see nothing in the item which indicates that it is for that purpose. I do not know exactly why the amount is carried in this particular language.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Because it is a miscellaneous expense for the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, authorized to be paid by the Attorney General.

Mr. SISSON. That may be true, but why is it carried in this language?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is the language of the annual appropriation under which it is to be paid.

Mr. SISSON. I will state to the chairman of the committee that that might be true perhaps if you were going to pay all the expenses, but in this particular item there is nothing that indicates that it is to be paid for that particular purpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is the fact. It is to be paid for that purpose.

Mr. SISSON. I understand that, but it might be used for any other purpose under the terms of this appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is not correct.

Mr. SISSON. Is there any law which authorizes the payment of the money in this language?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is the way in which the appropriations for such purposes are made, and it is out of this particular appropriation that such services are paid. The amount of the appropriation is not sufficient to provide the additional

money required. It is necessary to appropriate in the language of the original appropriation.

Mr. SISSON. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what information he has as to whether this is the last of these fees.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand this finishes up the whole proceeding. It pays for the commissioners and expert witnesses, printing abstracts, stenographers, and some other miscellaneous items.

Mr. SISSON. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: Suppose the House does not agree to the Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill providing for the payment of the entire amount at this session of Congress, would there be any additional expense, or would this cover the expense of the condemnation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This would cover the expense of the condemnation. The only additional expense would be the interest on the amount of the unpaid award until it was paid.

Mr. SISSON. I understand that that would be another matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This proceeding is complete. The awards have been confirmed. The only thing left to do is to pay for the property taken and pay the expenses incurred in acquiring it.

Mr. SISSON. Does the chairman of the committee think this \$40,000 will cover the entire amount?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My understanding is that it pays all the expenses incident to the proceedings.

Mr. SISSON. I have not looked at it in the last day or two, but my recollection was that the amount was \$41,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They had \$15,000, and they may have an unexpended balance of \$1,000 in the appropriation available for that purpose.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say before I conclude that this is the item to which I have been so seriously objecting for several years—not this expense item, but the condemnation of the property between the Capitol and the Union Station.

I do not feel that it would be proper that this appropriation should be made because the expenses were incurred under a statute passed by the House, but I did want the Record to show what the appropriation was for. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, just to make a few observations. This is the best conducted condemnation proceedings, so far as I have any knowledge, and I have knowledge of a great many in the District, that ever was had. As I recollect, in round numbers, the 12 squares cost about \$4,300,000.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I will.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman does not mean to state that all the 12 squares were taken?

Mr. CANNON. Well, west of the Arthur Place there was a small block that was not taken. This condemnation has been expeditions and was conducted at the minimum of expense.

We asked the Attorney General to make condemnations and he did so, detailing one of the Assistant Attorney Generals, who receives \$5,000 a year for salary. We ascertained what attorneys' fees would be if outside attorneys were employed, and in round numbers \$30,000 was the best bid we could get. The Attorney General assigned an Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Strickland by name, to do the work, and that is the only attorney's fee that is involved.

The attorneys' fees for the condemnation of three blocks facing on the White House grounds were between \$30,000 and \$40,000, and I think nearer \$40,000. This Assistant Attorney General, to my knowledge, did not confine himself to this work during office hours, but he worked almost constantly. There were over 400 owners of this real estate.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I will yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SISSON. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that my statement in reference to the matter was not in criticism in the least of the amount of money expended nor of the condemnation proceedings.

Mr. CANNON. I understand that thoroughly. Now, there is no legal obligation to pay this man who has done this work at a salary of \$5,000 in less than a year, where it would have cost the Government, if outside attorneys had been employed, \$30,000, and where it did cost the Government nearly \$40,000 in the case I have mentioned. Now, in the Lord's chancery we have from time to time for meritorious and efficient services granted officials something by way of extra pay. We granted the Superintendent of the Capitol for his four years' work, outside of his salary—and it was worth many times the amount—\$15,000, in recognition of that meritorious service.

I would be glad, having the personal knowledge about the efficiency of this man, to see this committee grant unanimous consent to pay \$5,000 to this Assistant Attorney General, who has performed these services. I know it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I shall be compelled to object to that. A year or so ago a provision was enacted that all condemnation proceedings should be placed in the hands of the Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; but that did not prevent, as had been done in former years, the employment of other attorneys.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That may be true; but I can not consent that that be done on this bill. I know that the gentleman is a very efficient man.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], has been doing very good work in the House, and has endeared himself to me and other Members of the House for efficient service. He has not been in Congress very long. He came in at this end of the Capitol. Although the Capitol faces east, on the south side of the Capitol is the House side and on the north side of the Capitol is the Senate side. It is the Senate side of the Capitol that looks out upon these grounds which have been condemned between the Capitol Building and the Union Station. My distinguished friend from Mississippi in future years will walk out of the Senate Chamber, where he will be an honored Member, into the Marble Room, gaze out on the beautiful grounds which lie between the Capitol Building and the Union Station, and say to himself many times, "Well, after all, I was wrong and Uncle Joe was right." [Laughter and applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

It is hereby declared to be the settled policy of the United States, after July 1, 1915, to make no appropriation whatever for the relief of sufferers from flood, fire, or other disaster in any State whose legislature shall have been in regular session prior to July 1, 1915: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to sufferers from any such disaster, the extent of which may be so widespread as to be beyond the resources of any State in which the same may occur, or shall exceed all reasonable measure of relief authorized by the legislature of any State to be expended to such sufferers by the governor or other competent authority thereof.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] really think at this time in the session, even with the large number of Members present, that it is desirable to fix a settled policy of the United States for a date after July 1, 1915?

Mr. CANNON. Mighty good as a buffer.

Mr. MANN. Is that one of those emergency matters which the gentleman thinks ought to be acted on now?

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman remembers we put a settled policy in the Indian bill in reference to sectarian schools about 15 years ago.

Mr. MANN. That was after a prolonged fight and a very large attendance. It hardly seems to me, with even the aggregation of brains now assembled here, that we ought to endeavor to fix a settled policy for the United States after July 1, 1915, and I make the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Before the gentleman makes the point of order, this is as good as a declaration that might serve as a buffer. For instance, the gentleman knows as well as I do when the floods come Members of Congress come and say, "Oh, we must have relief"; and the question is asked, "How about your State?" "Oh, my State legislature is not in session," and so on and so on. Then, without having any individual in mind, my friend knows as well as I do these appropriations for the relief of suffering at times have been abused and at times they have served a good purpose, though the States ought to do this work; but it is perfectly legitimate that they should be anxious to serve their constituencies, both Senators and Members, and it seems to me this might be good as a buffer.

Mr. MANN. Well, if this proposition had been presented to the House this afternoon at half past 4 or 5 o'clock, with the attendance which was then here, I should be perfectly willing to leave it to the House to determine what should be the settled policy of their successors; but I question whether the number who are here now ought to attempt to do that.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the gentleman think it might possibly be done better now?

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard upon the point of order? The Chair sustains the point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose, and Mr. Rouse 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 a conference of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 28607) making appropria-

tions for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 27148) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 22913) to create a Department of Labor, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 36.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound 1,500 copies of the proceedings in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives and before the Judiciary Committee thereof, in the matter of the impeachment of Robert W. Archbald, additional circuit judge of the United States from the third judicial circuit, and designated a judge of the Commerce Court, of which 500 shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Credit in the accounts of Capt. D. L. Stone: The accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Capt. D. L. Stone, United States Army, the sum of \$13,046.33, disallowed against him on the books of the Treasury.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why there should be a lot of these accounts credited with certain sums of money. Why do these officers not keep their books better?

Mr. FITZGERALD. To which particular one does the gentleman refer?

Mr. BOOHER. This is the case of Capt. D. L. Stone.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in this instance the Quartermaster General recommended to the Secretary of War that authority be granted for the construction of field officers' quarters at Fort Sill, and it was his opinion that the limitation fixed by Congress on the cost of quarters did not apply to appropriations for military posts, but only to barracks and quarters, seacoast defenses. There was expended at Fort Sill in excess of the limitation \$13,046.33. The comptroller held that the limitation applied to appropriations under both titles, so that the expenditures made by the officer who happened to be in charge of the work there, amounting to \$13,000, were disallowed in his accounts, and he is charged with this money. The money was expended in good faith and the work was done. These cases are all different. The committee went through them very carefully and eliminated a large number and allowed those where it seemed that the officer acted in good faith, and there was no justification for holding him personally liable for the money expended.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, the explanation is satisfactory.

The Clerk read as follows:

For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, 1910, \$2,070.01.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 23, line 20, by striking out "\$2,070.01" and inserting "\$52,070.01."

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to do what many of us think is just simple, plain justice to the men who are employed in the navy yard in Washington. Ever since 1906 these men have attempted to secure a raise of pay. Gentlemen are aware that the method of fixing the amount of pay for the laborers and mechanics in the Washington Navy Yard is decided by what is known as a wage board. This board consists of three officers of the Navy, and beyond them these laborers and mechanics have had no appeal except to the Secretary of the Navy. The matter was brought before the Naval Affairs Committee, and for the last year, at odd times, the subject has been discussed, and the Naval Affairs Committee, after looking into all of the facts in connection therewith, decided that these men were entitled to a raise of pay. But before this was decided upon a special committee, consisting of men from the navy yard, of the workers themselves, and representatives of the department, was appointed by the Secretary, and they went to the various cities and factories where this same character of work is under way in order to investigate the amount of wages paid as compared with the wages paid in Washington, and also to investigate the difference, if there was any, in the cost of living in these cities as compared with the cost of living in Washington. They came back with a vast amount of information, gathered in that impartial manner. It

was placed before the department, and, after investigating it thoroughly, the Secretary of the Navy wrote a letter, from which I will read:

NOTE.—At the request of the Naval Committee of the House of Representatives, the department appointed a board to investigate the question of wages at the navy yard, Washington, D. C. The board has completed its labors and in a voluminous report, a copy of which, accompanied by certain memoranda, has been transmitted to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, has recommended an increase in wages at the Washington Navy Yard, based upon the increased cost of living in Washington as compared with other cities from which data were secured, amounting to approximately 10 per cent and involving an estimated increased expenditure of \$120,000 for the remainder of the current fiscal year, \$50,000 of which would be chargeable to the appropriation "Ordnance and ordnance stores, 1913," and the remainder, \$70,000, to the appropriation "Increase of the Navy, armor, and armament."

While no deficiency has been or seems likely to be incurred under either of said appropriations, the adoption of the board's recommendations would involve either a deficiency or a reduction in the force unless additional funds are provided.

Mr. HAMILL. When was that report made?

Mr. BATHRICK. January 8, 1912. In other words, they can not put into force the granted increase of wages unless this amount of money is included in this deficiency bill until after this fiscal year. The naval bill, which was passed to-day, carries a provision for taking care of the increase for the year 1914, but these men, after seven years of waiting and trying to get the wages that ought to be paid to them, are now obliged to wait until June 30, at the end of this fiscal year, unless my amendment is included in this bill. I think they have waited long enough. In order to bring about the payment of an increase it is necessary to make two amendments, the first of which I have offered, and which is to add \$50,000 to this item, and the second of which I will offer after line 24, under the required head of increase of the Navy. Some gentlemen who are economists on the question of the increase of the Navy ought not to get excited, because this does not increase the Navy. It only increases the pay of the highest class of our American mechanics, who build the most intricate parts of our naval vessels.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted. This proposes to increase the amount of \$2,000, which is authorized to be credited from one account into another, and to close up the account for 1910 in the appropriation for ordnance and ordnance stores, by \$50,000. It can not possibly be paid out for the purpose the gentleman desires to pay it out. It could not be used for the purposes he wishes.

Mr. BATHRICK. If we appropriated this money in this bill, why can it not be paid out?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Because under the language of this provision, to which the gentleman proposes to attach this appropriation, there is no appropriation of this kind made. This provides as follows:

To reimburse "General account of advances," created by the act of June 19, 1878 (20 Stat. L., p. 167), for amounts advanced therefrom and expended on account of the several appropriations named hereunder in excess of the sums appropriated therefor for the fiscal year given, found to be due the "general account" on adjustment by the accounting officers, the accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to credit by transfer from unexpended balances of appropriations for the Naval Establishment, fiscal years 1912 and 1913, amounts as follows:

And then for the ordnance and ordnance stores for the Bureau of Ordnance for the fiscal year 1910 they asked a transfer and credit to the general account of advances, \$2,070.01. The gentleman asked to increase the amount that they may transfer to the credit of that, in order to close out their accounts, to \$50,270.01.

Mr. MANN. And that is for the fiscal year ending three years ago.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Exactly.

Mr. HAMILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. HAMILL. Has the gentleman any criticism to make of the justice of the increase asked by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK]?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I have. I object to doing it in this bill in this way. At any rate, the gentleman does not wish to increase this item, because if it were adopted by the committee it would not result in the increase of compensation of a single man. This is simply a bookkeeping matter to enable them to close their accounts.

Mr. BATHRICK. Let me ask the gentleman this question: The department has hitherto claimed they did not have the money. If we appropriate in this bill they will have the money, and is it not in the discretion of the department as to where they will put this money in this instance?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; not in this instance. This is authority to transfer on the books—to make a book credit from one account to another—the appropriation for the fiscal year 1910, in order to close up their accounts. The increasing of the amount does not accomplish anything. It would simply result

in their coming back next year and asking us to authorize them to do it, so that we could finally close up the accounts for that fiscal year.

Mr. HAMILL. Now, what, in the opinion of the gentleman, would be a proper place, or where would be a proper place, to insert this amendment?

Mr. MANN. There is no proper place in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I doubt if I shall take my time to furnish that information. I do not think the appropriation should be made.

Mr. HAMILL. The gentleman has not made any criticism about the merits of this.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not had a chance. I have already stated to the gentleman that I had an objection to it. I first wish to call attention to the fact that this would be inoperative, and I did say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I would state my objections when I had an opportunity, and he should not complain that I have not done it, because he does not give me the opportunity.

Mr. HAMILL. The gentleman yielded the floor of his own accord.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not yielded at all. I still have the floor. I have yielded to questions. The gentleman is propounding questions to me, and still making it impossible for me to discuss the merits of the proposition, if I were disposed to do so at this time.

Mr. GARNER. Has the amendment any merit whatever?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This amendment has no merit.

Mr. HAMILL. We are going to give the gentleman the opportunity right now to tell us.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will take the opportunity at the opportune time. I simply wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the gentleman is asking to increase the amount in the bill, inadvertently, I take it, to an amount that he desires.

Mr. BATHRICK. In that case, do you not think it would be subject to a point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It may be, in a different form.

Mr. BATHRICK. The gentleman can make a point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is not subject to a point of order in this form, or I should have made it. This authorizes credits from one account to another to close up that account. We close up an account three years old. That is all I wish to say about this amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK] that this is a just claim, and go further and say that it is a claim that the Government is obligated to pay by right and, it seems to me, if it was not paid, if it were against a private individual, they would have a legal status in the courts. These men have followed the custom of securing an increase of wages. It has been the practice to have wage boards formed. They have asked for this wage board for some time before receiving it. In fact, there were strikes threatened in the navy yard on account of not being given the consideration of receiving their claim for the right of an increase under the rules of that department. That this was brought up is due to the fact that I introduced a bill to secure an increase, which was taken up by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and there was a subcommittee appointed to take it up with the Navy Department. That department took the matter up at the suggestion of the subcommittee, and, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK] has told you, it resulted in these men substantiating their claim and showing that they were justified; that under the rule they were not only entitled to an increase of wages at this time but if they had been given a chance to bring the proper evidence before any fair wage board they would have been receiving it a year previous to that.

Now, I say it is not only a matter of justice but it is also a matter of obligation on the part of this Government to fulfill what you might say is a promise. A written promise to pay could not be any stronger than this claim that these navy-yard employees are urging. Not only that, but it has been demonstrated time and time again that you have got among the ablest men in the country in that navy yard. They are producing the best guns and the best materials in the world, and the fact has been established, almost without any denial, that they are among the most efficient workmen in the country. They have been patient in this matter and have exercised good judgment, and finally they brought the matter to what you might call an arbitration. Their claim is a just claim, and it has been justified. It was justified when this amount of increase was awarded. It is the same as if the Government had promised to pay this claim, and therefore the Government is in honor bound to provide for the payment of this increase.

We have heard much about arbitration in the industrial world. Certainly this is an arbitration that every fair-minded

man stands for throughout the country. A great many people are trying to establish the principle of arbitration in order to avoid strikes and other industrial troubles. It seems to me, if we are trying to encourage that spirit among private employers and employees, we should feel that we are obligated as Members of Congress to carry out what seems to me to be at least an arbitration agreement to which the Government is a party. I think, therefore, there ought to be some way, either in the deficiency appropriation bill or in some other appropriation bill, for these men to secure what rightfully belongs to them.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Why did you not report this item in the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The item in the naval appropriation bill was for the next fiscal year. In that bill we were not appropriating for this present fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. I know; and that would have been subject to a point of order, but a great many other items included in the naval bill were subject to a point of order and were stricken out. Why was this not put in the naval bill last year?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The increase was not awarded until January, 1913, after the naval appropriation bill had passed.

Mr. MANN. Has the increase been given now?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It was given, I believe, on the 1st of January, and the increase was to take effect at the time it was awarded. The workmen claim that their rent, in view of the former rate, was lower than it is now.

Mr. MANN. How much higher is this rate than that which they are now receiving?

Mr. BUCHANAN. This gives them about a 10 per cent increase.

Mr. MANN. Are they getting it?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; the money has not been appropriated to cover it.

Mr. MANN. Have they been awarded that higher rate?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; they have been awarded that higher rate, but there has been no money to pay them.

Mr. MANN. All they have to do is to see to it that an estimate is sent in by the proper officers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. If the Secretary of the Navy had exercised his power and responsibility and fixed the compensation of these men, the money would have been appropriated.

Mr. MANN. That is all that is needed to be done.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the wages of the employees in the Washington Navy Yard are fixed by a wage board. When the Naval Committee made the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, the pay of these men was fixed on the basis of the pay then allowed them by the wage board. Afterwards, about the 1st of January of this year, the wage board increased their wages, and it was binding from that day on. Now, then, from the day the wage board increased the rate up to the 30th of June, 1913, there is no appropriation to pay the men this increased rate, because the bill, in making the appropriation, appropriated only on the basis of the old wage scale. There is now no provision to pay this increase which has been allowed them.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, then, provides a sufficient amount to meet this increase?

Mr. GREGG of Texas. It is intended to pay that increase. Whenever the wage board passed on the question and gave them this increase, from that date their wages under the law were increased. Now, the Government owes this amount, and it has got to pay it at some time. Why not pay it in this bill?

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The Government owes a great deal of money that it does not pay until it is called upon to pay it in the regular course.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. I do not see anything irregular in this.

Mr. MANN. Certainly it is irregular. The deficiency appropriation bill is made up in every case of items that come to Congress from the departments as deficiencies.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. This is a deficiency, and if the deficiency bill does not cover it, how can they get it?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We were of the opinion that it was a deficiency.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. This deficiency item carries the amount of the increase.

Mr. KITCHIN. And the Navy Department have recommended the amount covered by this deficiency.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, I will read from page 75 of the hearings on this bill to

show that the statement of the gentleman is correct. This is from the statement of Commander Clark:

The CHAIRMAN. Commander, you have an estimate of \$50,000 to provide for an increase of approximately 10 per cent in the schedule of wages for the navy yard, Washington, D. C., during the remainder of the fiscal year 1913.

Commander CLARK. At the request of the Naval Committee the Secretary of the Navy ordered a board to investigate the question of wages at the navy yard, Washington, D. C., and they found the cost of living exceeded the cost of living in the surrounding district, which extended up to Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, by about 11 per cent, and the House committee apparently wanted to increase their pay. We had not estimated for anything of the kind, so we said we would have to have more money. It amounts to \$50,000 in one appropriation and \$70,000 in the other.

So that evidently there has been an estimate, and there was one before the committee.

Mr. AUSTIN. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if the statement made by the gentleman from Wyoming is correct, namely, that there was an estimate from the Secretary of the Navy covering this amount?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. The situation is this: This board met and decided that there should be an increase of a certain percentage in the compensation of these employees. The estimates were sent. Representatives of these men appeared before the committee. I stated then what I repeat now, that if the Secretary of the Navy believed these men should have their compensation increased it was his duty to increase the compensation, and then ask Congress to appropriate the money to supply the necessary deficiencies in the appropriation. Instead of doing that the department has been endeavoring to place the responsibility on Congress—to make Congress appropriate money for the specific purpose of increasing this pay.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that if the Secretary of the Navy failed to do what was simple justice to these men, let us not shirk the responsibility, but let us meet it and make the proper appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I might say to the gentleman that I have information about the wages of some other people in my own district. I come from a community where there are four or five thousand men employed in a navy yard. They appeared before this naval wage board. They asked for an increase of compensation, and they submitted overwhelming evidence that they were not receiving the prevailing rate of wages in various lines. My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER], employs certain mechanics in these lines, and he stated of his own personal knowledge that he was compelled to pay certain compensation, and that these men were receiving less than the prevailing rate of wage which they are entitled to under the law.

The wage board, instead of recommending an increase of compensation, made recommendations to reduce certain rates of compensation for practically every class of mechanics. An appeal was taken. Now, if Congress is to assume this new position, that it will appropriate in advance money to increase compensation, when the entire matter is an administrative one and an administrative officer has the authority and the duty imposed upon him by law of fixing the compensation to be paid under certain conditions, then we absolutely relieve him of this responsibility and throw into Congress this involved, controverted question of what the compensation of mechanics in the various establishments throughout the United States should be.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to ask if it is not a fact that the wage board has awarded an increase of pay?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has not; and it has no authority to do that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The Secretary of the Navy has recognized it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He has not; he has recommended that the wages be raised.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Upon what authority does the gentleman say that the board has not awarded an increase?

Mr. FITZGERALD. On the authority of the information that comes from the Navy Department.

Mr. BATHRICK. But here is a letter from the Secretary saying that he had.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The board had no authority to award an increase; the Secretary fixes the increase. Gentlemen on the Naval Committee ought to have more accurate information about the power of wage boards and the heads of departments than they exhibit on the floor.

If the Secretary of the Navy performed his duty, if he fixed the compensation for these various employees in accordance with the recommendation of the labor board, the matter would have been disposed of and a deficiency would have been created which Congress would have been compelled to meet and appropriate the money for. But he has shirked, he has evaded, and tried to place the responsibility on the Committee on Appropriations for increasing the compensation. That is the fact of

the matter. I decline, either for myself or for the committee, to have the committee assume the duties and obligations of heads of departments, and they know it. I sent word to the Secretary of the Navy, telling him what his powers were under the law, since he seemed to be unfamiliar with them. I notified the representative of these men that, if the Secretary of the Navy was sincere and wished to give them the compensation he believed they were entitled to, all that it was necessary for him to do was to sign the order and they would be given it from the 1st of January.

Mr. BATHRICK. The gentleman from New York states the position. We have taken this matter to the Secretary, and the Secretary has told us that they could not do anything unless we had the assistance of Congress, and they were furnished the money. Look at the shuttlecock that has been made of these men for seven years trying to get an increase from the United States. The officers of the navy yard, having in charge these men, will come before the committee and tell us that they do the highest class of work in the country.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the law and the situation in this case, the law requires that these men shall be paid the prevailing rate of wages for the class of labor in the neighborhood in which the plant is located; and that this board is organized for the purpose of ascertaining and determining what the prevailing rate of wages is. That board has considered the question and during the month of January decided that the prevailing rate of wages was 10 per cent higher than the rate that had been previously paid, and the men engaged in that plant were entitled, as a result of the existing law, to this 10 per cent increase in wages.

Now, the Secretary has taken the ground that he can not pay that increase of wages because the appropriation for the current year is not sufficiently large to pay it. As a result these men, entitled to their wages under the law, by the decision of the board that this is the prevailing rate, are being kept out of the increased wages.

Now, whether the Secretary is at fault in refusing to pay the higher rate of wages after it has been determined by the board, the fact remains that the men are entitled to it, and we can not shirk the responsibility when the facts are brought to our attention. I do not know whether this is the proper place for the amendment, but whatever the proper place is, there the appropriation should be made.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman know that in the New York Navy Yard higher grades are established sometimes and pay given to mechanics? For instance, last December we established a higher grade for machinists, and some of the machinists received higher wages from January 1.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I know that is the case, but we have sometimes changed the territory from which they take the prevailing rate. They sometimes extend the territory to take in other communities not previously taken in, and they sometimes throw out territory in determining the prevailing rate. The prevailing rate is changing continually.

Mr. CALDER. I would like to know why they can not raise the pay of the navy-yard men in Washington, the same as they do in other yards about the country.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I would like to know that also; and the fact is, the board has awarded this increase of pay, or has decided this 10 per cent increase is the prevailing rate, and having decided it is the prevailing rate under the law, they should be paid that rate. The fact that the Secretary has not seen fit to pay them the additional rate is no reason why they should not be paid it. If there is anything more than another that makes the workingman have a contempt for wage contracts it is the fact that employers, public or private, at times themselves violate the wage contracts that are entered into. One of the things that will work for industrial peace in this country is a recognition of the fact that when a contract is once entered into relative to wage rates, that contract is sacred during the period for which it has been entered into. This wage rate becomes in reality a contract between the Government of the United States and those men who are engaged in those plants that they shall be paid the prevailing rate of wages. The board has established what the prevailing rate is, and whether the Secretary is willing to pay that rate or not this Congress should furnish the means to pay that prevailing rate and it should be included in this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BATHRICK) there were—ayes 15, noes 20.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For repairs of barracks, Marine Corps, 1910, \$84.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend. page 23, by adding at the end of line 24 the following: "For increase of pay at the navy yard, District of Columbia, for the fiscal year 1913, \$120,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is new legislation and that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For repairing dry dock *Dewey*, \$6.74. In all, \$2,382.41.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 8, page 24, add the following:

"Provided, That the increased wages awarded by the wage board be paid to the employees at the Washington (D. C.) Navy Yard from and after the date of the passage of this bill for the fiscal year 1913."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to pay, from the appropriation "Recruiting, Bureau of Navigation, 1912," four vouchers, set forth on page 12 of House Document No. 1365, of the present session, amounting to \$136.84, covering advertising placed in the following papers for recruits for the Navy by the naval recruiting officer, naval recruiting station, New Orleans, La., during the month of June, 1912, in advance of authority from the Secretary of the Navy, as required by section 3828, Revised Statutes.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Mr. Chairman, I notice a provision there in line 2, page 25, about certain advertising placed in "the following papers." Where are the following papers?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The papers are enumerated in a document. The words "the following" should be stricken out and the word "news" inserted in their place.

Mr. RODDENBERY. As a matter of fact the four vouchers contain the names of the papers?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. The advertisements were inserted in advance of the authority.

Mr. RODDENBERY. It seems to me that language should come out of the paragraph.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. I offer the amendment to strike out the words "the following" and insert the word "news."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend. page 25, line 2, by striking out the words "the following" and inserting the word "news."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS.

To supply a deficiency in the appropriation "Provisions, Navy," including all objects mentioned under this title of appropriation in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1912, \$747,092.56.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Mr. Chairman, I have been unable to obtain the report of the committee, if there is one, accompanying this bill. I sent to the Clerk some time ago.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Here is a copy of the report.

Mr. RODDENBERY. May I inquire of the gentleman about the provision on line 5, page 26? The item seems to be for \$747,092.56, including all objects mentioned under this title of appropriation in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1912.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is due to the increased cost of the rations to supply the Army.

Mr. RODDENBERY. The rations?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. They are paying now, I think, 36 cents.

Mr. RODDENBERY. That is what I desired to develop. The addition in the cost of provisions at this time, as compared with what it was one year or two years ago, necessitates a deficiency of nearly \$1,000,000. Is that the idea?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The increased cost from the time the estimates were submitted. The estimates for the current fiscal year were submitted about 18 months ago, and that was one reason. Another reason was the estimates were reduced \$200,000 for the current fiscal year upon a report from the Pacific coast that it was believed that by a change of certain methods \$200,000 could be paid. That proved to be erroneous, so that the deficiency is really about \$1,000,000 instead of \$747,000, because \$200,000 of it was due to this reduction in the estimates, which should not have been made.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Would it be the opinion that subtracting \$200,000 from the \$740,000 it would leave about \$500,000, which sum represents the increased cost of provision?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Almost entirely.

Mr. RODDENBERY. And it is not an increase due to the amount consumed, but to the price the Government has to pay?

Mr. FITZGERALD. To the price of the different articles going into the rations.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC WORKS, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

For concrete and granite dry dock, \$1,310.99.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 4, page 27, insert: "For payment of the prevailing rate of wages as determined by the wage board in accordance with law at the Washington Navy Yard, District of Columbia, for the fiscal year 1913, \$120,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order it is not germane; it is not offered at the proper place; this is under the head of Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, and the amendment of the gentleman is not germane to that point and it is legislation.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I contend this amendment is germane to the work and operation of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. That is the place where the men work, and that is the place where the men are paid; consequently it is germane to insert this item in this paragraph, and as far as being in accordance with the law, we have a law determining how wages shall be made, that is, by a wage board, and the wage board is instructed to pay the prevailing rates, and my amendment asks that the prevailing rates be paid as determined upon by the wage board. I think the gentleman's contention, that it is either not according to law or that it is not germane or that it is new legislation, falls.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is clearly in error. This is under the head of Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Mr. BATHRICK. Bureau of Yards and Docks; that is right.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman's amendment provides for an increase of compensation to men employed largely in the Ordnance Department. Under this head of public works there is no provision for the payment of mechanics at all. Certain public works are authorized, and this is a special deficiency in the sums required to complete them. The gentleman is attempting to put in under that heading an item to supply money to increase compensation of men employed in other departments in the Washington Navy Yard. The rule is explicit that these matters must be offered at the proper place in the bill. This is not the proper place.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced, as far as the gentleman's viewpoint is concerned, there will be no proper place in this bill, and I believe this amendment is according to law and that it is only requesting that the department pay the prevailing rate as fixed by the wage board. The board has plenty of warrant in the law to fix the prevailing rate. The board has fixed the rate, and we now ask that the money be appropriated for these payments.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand the naval appropriation bill which has just passed the House to-day, reported from the committee of which the distinguished gentleman from Ohio is an honored member, having the same heading that there is in the deficiency appropriation bill, "Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, navy yard, Portsmouth, N. H., for fitting room, for storage of crane, garbage crematory," and other items—railway system, remodeling buildings, power plant, improvements, moving boiler shops, and such things as that—all public works, and which have nothing whatever to do with the men which the gentleman desires to increase, coming under the head of pay allowed under the increase of the Navy.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Would it be possible to do any work that is provided for in that division the gentleman has cited without the employment of men to do it?

Mr. MANN. I presume not.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. So that even in that it requires the employment of men in yards?

Mr. MANN. It does not carry any salaries whatever and there is no salary carried under the head of public works and in the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and the gentleman's committee makes up the form and the ruling has always been that you can not introduce in one part of the bill items that relate to another part of the bill, and the Committee on Appropriations has merely followed in this form the distinguished committee of which the distinguished gentleman from Ohio is a distinguished member. [Laughter.] That ought to hold the gentleman for a while.

Mr. BATHRICK. That ought to hold me; I think so. But this is not a joke with the men who are not receiving enough wages, notwithstanding the gentleman's facetious comment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, because the item that carries the appropriation in the naval bill for this increase for the fiscal year 1914 does not appear in exactly the place where the gentleman in order to support his contention would like to see it, it does not prove that the amendment I have offered is not germane to this section. There are many places where it could be put in, if the gentlemen who were opposed to us would be willing it should be there. And I think this is a hair-splitting proposition. I refer to the contention of the gentleman that it is not germane to a part of this bill that has to do with where the men are paid and where they receive the salary for their work.

TI. CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think this amendment is germane to the paragraph, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, we seem to be operating strictly under the rule. I therefore make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MANN. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Enforcement of antitrust laws: For the enforcement of antitrust laws, on account of fiscal years, as follows:

For the fiscal year 1913, \$65,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My understanding is that this is a recommendation for a deficiency appropriation for the remainder of the fiscal year, from the 4th of March to the 30th of June, for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. My recollection is from the hearings that this appropriation provides, up to the present time, for all moneys expended during this fiscal year and all moneys that will be expended under existing prosecutions and existing contracts until the 30th of June.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman permit? It is to cover services to be rendered in pending cases. In other words, wherever the fees are either agreed to or are to be paid, this amount is to cover what they owe and what they expect to pay for the services rendered in pending cases.

Mr. CANNON. In pending cases? That is as I understand it. The gentleman can always state it more correctly and tersely than I can myself, and I thank him. There is not one dollar provided by this bill for any additional case or cases?

Mr. BARTLETT. Not now begun—

Mr. CANNON. Any additional prosecutions of this great army, of this terrible army, on land and sea, the octopuses that are swimming about in the sea and flying in the air. Not one cent for expenditure for the commencement of proceedings and the enforcement of the antitrust act?

Mr. COX. They will obey the law under Democratic rule.

Mr. MANN. That is, the suits will obey.

Mr. COX. No; the men themselves and the corporations.

Mr. BARTLETT. All the money for pending suits is provided for.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely, but no new suits can be instituted during the remainder of this fiscal year by the incoming administration, by virtue of this appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CANNON. One moment. By virtue of this appropriation—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken in his facts.

Mr. CANNON. If I am, I am ready to be set right.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This carries sufficient money to carry on the fixed force; that is, octopus hunting; and to discharge the obligation of the Government up to the 30th of June to these high-priced Republican special counsels who have rendered various kinds of services, legal, political, and otherwise, and it is expected after the 4th of March the Attorney General will appoint as Assistant Attorneys General lawyers who will be able to do the work, and not necessitate the hiring of special counsel.

Mr. MANN. That is the reason you made the appropriation \$300,000 for the next year instead of \$230,000 for the current year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Now, if I may be permitted to make my own talk, I will be very glad. [Laughter.]

I say again that there is not a dollar provided for the institution of new suits.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is a mistake. There is money provided for new suits, but there is no money provided to put on a lot of useless special attorneys. The Democratic administration will discharge all of these men who were on the per-

manent organization and put in real lawyers in place of those former distinguished officials of a former administration.

This bill provides money, for instance, to pay former Secretary Dickinson the balance of a \$40,000 fee for services in the steel case. The incoming Democratic administration will appoint good Assistant Attorneys General, who will be able to handle the cases at an annual salary and do the work much more efficiently than did those high-sounding, distinguished gentlemen who got big money and did little work. You did not have any of those efficient Assistant Attorneys General in the former administration, but we may have them after the 1st of July. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad, after the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has stated for the second time what he stated the first time, taking up most of my five minutes, and after the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] has sandwiched his remarks into the middle of what I tried to say, to have five minutes for myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois thinks he can subserve any useful purpose thereby, I hope he will have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the Sherman antitrust act has been enforced with greater vigor under the present administration than it was ever before enforced since its enactment in 1890, and it is efficient work that has been done.

Oh, the gentleman from New York speaks of the "high-priced lawyers." Yes. These octopuses that the gentlemen dream of at night [laughter] can hire high-priced lawyers, and do hire them, and the United States Government has undertaken, in the prosecution of these various combinations, to get counsel that were equal to those that the people prosecuted could get. The district attorneys, you know, are busy in the various districts attending to current business. I recollect very well when the gentleman from Georgia, in 1903, I believe, when this item was being appropriated for on the legislative bill—

Mr. BARTLETT. In 1902—

Mr. CANNON. Yes; in 1902, when the gentleman from Georgia, on the legislative bill, which did not carry those appropriations, if I remember correctly, moved to appropriate and succeeded in appropriating \$500,000—or was it a million?

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, no. I offered an amendment for \$250,000, and the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Smith, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois, who was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, said: "Oh, make it \$500,000."

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; \$250,000 was proposed, and it was made \$500,000. Now, that was when we had the administration, and these appropriations have been made, the prosecutions have been instituted, convictions have been had, and the law has been and is being construed from day to day; but when you come in there is not one cent in this special appropriation for services in cases to be instituted between now and the 30th day of next June. If you think that is all right, so be it, and all I desire to do is to call attention to what you propose. Possibly you may think—I do not know—that there will be no time to pay any attention to the enforcement of the law while you gentlemen over there are disposing of the pie counter. [Laughter.] That is all right.

The gentleman speaks of "distinguished lawyers." Those lawyers, so far as I know and believe, who have been employed from year to year under these appropriations have been paid well, but they have brought wonderful results. Great heavens, what has this House itself done in paying attorneys' fees? Take your Untermyers, take your Brandeises, and others. What have they done? What results have they brought?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Nothing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, we left but two States in the Republican column, and those are the smallest in the Union. That ought to be enough for the gentleman from Illinois in one year. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and now that you have got it, what will you do with it? [Laughter.] This is the beginning. The gentleman says, "Two States in the Republican column." Yes; the Republican Party was divided and you conquered.

Now, I had no thought when I rose of doing anything more than to call attention to what this appropriation falls to do, or fails to enable the incoming administration to do; but no sooner had I tried to state what I desired to in a mild-mannered way than the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] figuratively flapped his wings and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] figuratively flapped his wings and proceeded to try to set a back fire.

In conclusion I want to say to you gentlemen on that side that it is up to you to make this appropriation. If you do not want any money for the incoming administration for this purpose for the coming four months you have the right to withhold it. The octopuses may grow in the meantime. God knows, it may be that they will flee unto the mountains and gnaw a file. I hope so, but they did not under your former Democratic administration and will not under this coming administration unless the laws are enforced.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, on the 1st of February there had been expended of the \$200,000 appropriation but \$104,000. According to the statement of the Assistant Attorney General in charge of this work, the \$96,000 remaining unexpended was ample to meet all the obligations incurred as a result of the maintenance of a permanent organization which has been effected in the Department of Justice to carry on prosecutions under the Sherman antitrust act. Sixty-five thousand dollars additional is required to pay counsel who have been employed in this administration, especially in certain cases, for services rendered or to be rendered up to June 30 of this year. The committee desired to discharge such obligations, and recommend the amount necessary to do so. They believe that the money available to maintain this permanent organization will be sufficient to carry on the work of the prosecution of offenders under the Sherman antitrust law until the 30th of June, and on that day there will become available an appropriation of \$300,000 for this work.

In view of the fact that on the 4th of March a new administration is coming in to take possession, it will necessarily take some time, a few months at least, to effect its own organization and arrange to carry out its own policies. The committee therefore saw no necessity to appropriate any additional money at this time, in view of the lack of information as to just what purpose any additional money could be applied to. I believe gentlemen on that side need not worry very long after the 4th of March as to the lack of effectiveness and efficiency and aggressiveness of the Democratic administration in enforcing the Sherman antitrust law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals and their deputies, including the office expenses of United States marshals in the District of Alaska, to include payment for services rendered in behalf of the United States or otherwise, and including services in Alaska and Oklahoma in collecting evidence for the United States when so specially directed by the Attorney General, \$125,000.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee a question. On line 1, page 34, I see the words—

For services rendered in behalf of the United States or otherwise.

What is meant by the expression "or otherwise"? What service is that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some of the services rendered by marshals are not on behalf of the United States, but are on behalf of parties to litigation.

Mr. HAMLIN. Do you mean to pay the costs that the Government is liable for, for serving subpoenas, processes, and so forth, for parties to litigation?

Mr. BARTLETT. That sometimes happens, where the defendant is too poor to pay the fees.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am very well aware of that fact, and I wanted to find out if that was what this means.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is all it means.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And when fees are covered in, payments are made out of the appropriation.

Mr. HAMLIN. I suspected that; but I wanted to know about it.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is it.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF STANDARDS.

The following additional positions are required in the Bureau of Standards for the period from March 5, 1913, for the balance of the fiscal year 1913, namely: One watchman, at the rate of \$720 per annum; one fireman, at the rate of \$720 per annum; one assistant engineer, at the rate of \$1,500 per annum; two laborers, at the rate of \$600 each per annum; in all, \$1,372.66, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On page 41, line 9, it says, "The following additional positions are required in the Bureau of Standards." The gentleman from New York and I are somewhat particular as to the language of bills. Should not that read, "For the following additional positions in the Bureau of Standards"?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The words "are required" should be stricken out.

Mr. MANN. And insert the word "for" at the beginning.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting at the beginning of line 9, page 41, the word "for" and striking out the words "are required."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 41, line 9, insert the word "for" at the beginning of the line and strike out the words "are required."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For allowances to the following contestants and contestees for expenses incurred by them in contested-election cases, as audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections.

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, I notice in the expenses paid for contestants and contestees in election cases that one is allowed \$2,000 and another party \$1,200. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why this difference in amounts?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Under the statute the Committee on Elections has jurisdiction to examine, audit, and report the amount that should be allowed for the expenses for the contestant and contestee within the sum of \$2,000. These are the sums certified by the Committees on Elections under the statute.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that the Committee on Elections, unless some objection is made, usually allows within the \$2,000 the claims presented by the contestant and the contestee. These are the exact amounts that appear to be claimed by both the contestant and the contestee. In the one case mentioned by the gentleman from Connecticut the full amount was claimed and allowed, and in the other, I suppose, the contestant claimed but \$1,200, and that was the amount that the committee certified to upon the vouchers presented to the committee by the contestant.

Mr. REILLY. Has his committee any knowledge outside of the certification of the Committee on Elections?

Mr. BARTLETT. None whatever; we take the certificate of the Committee on Elections.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I notice, on page 42, line 15, an item for George E. McLean, \$2,000, and on page 43, George R. McLean, \$2,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is a duplication, and an amendment will be offered striking one out.

Mr. WILLIS. I am familiar with the one case, but did not know about the other.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It happened in this way: The matter was first certified with one initial by an acting chairman, and later certified with a different initial by the chairman of the committee. The committee thought it was two different persons, but upon further investigation, the matter being discussed, it was found that it was the same man in the same contest.

Mr. WILLIS. My recollection is that George R. McLean is the correct name.

Mr. MANN. Doubtless the gentleman is correct, and these two names are the same person. My observation has been in contested-election cases, and I have served on the committee a long time and have had considerable experience, that both the contestant and the contestee put in claims. I notice that there are just 20 names here that cover 10 contested-election cases. Now, if one goes out it leaves one man short somewhere. We have a claim pending now before the House asking for pay of expenses in a contested-election case from New Mexico that occurred about the time I was born.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In one of the Oklahoma cases the sitting member was allowed \$225 and the contestant was allowed nothing; that will account for it.

The Clerk read as follows:

George E. McLean, \$2,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all of line 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, line 15, strike out all of the line.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If the \$2,000 allowed to George E. McLean, on line 15, page 42, be stricken out, the total should be corrected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it is customary to correct the totals at the end of the bill. It saves considerable time. The Clerk is usually given authority to correct the totals.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman stated a moment ago that not more than \$2,000 was allowed to any contestant. That is the existing law, as I understand it. Here is an expenditure of public money which, as amended, will amount to \$31,815.07. This item might well attract the atten-

tion of the economists of the House, as well as those Members of the House who desire to faithfully perform their services as Members. There is no more annoying performance than that of a contest, and sometimes there is mighty small reason for the contest, but the knowledge which the contestant has that it is possible for him or his attorneys to obtain \$2,000 in the event of his instituting a contest, practically makes an inducement for those defeated candidates for Congress who desire to annoy the sitting Members to file contests.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MANN. There is one item in this bill in favor of one contestant who has been carried in some form, either for a larger or smaller amount, for the last 10 or 20 years, every 2 years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; and it apparently pays that contestant to bring his contest every session of Congress.

Mr. MANN. It pays him! Why, he lives on what he gets from this allowance.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It annoys and harasses the sitting Member so that it makes it impossible for him to properly perform his duty as an official of the Government.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman from Pennsylvania give the name of that contestant?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to mention any names just now, but I wish to say this, that my belief is that certain contestants have come to regard this \$2,000 not only as a possibility but as a sure thing, and that the \$2,000 inducement to bring a contest against a sitting Member is sufficient to harass that Member during the whole of his term. We have here 20 instances of the payment of money to those who instituted contests, and to those who were obliged to defend contests in this House. It is not fair to a man who comes to Congress, elected by the people, having a majority of the votes, that he shall be annoyed from the very beginning of his term by some one who has the time and the opportunity and the financial inducement to follow on his heels either personally or by counsel throughout the whole of his two years' service. I have no doubt that the various committees on contested-election cases were called upon to testify they would say that they have evidence that it appears to them that there are some attorneys as well as some contestants who have gotten it into their heads that the mere filing of a notice to a man who has succeeded in an election is sufficient to either be bought off by the man who holds the seat or to warrant ultimately the payment of a sum not exceeding \$2,000 to bring the contest and harass the sitting Member and make out of it what is to be made. A number of contests were brought at the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress that have already been withdrawn, and in some instances the same attorney has appeared more than once. That is to say, he has appeared in more than one case, and it does seem as if the time had come when for their own protection the Members of this House should repeal the law which provides a premium of \$2,000 to a man to bring a contest and to put the burden of proof upon the contestant rather than to put the annoyance upon the contestee.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is correct, that one of these contestants has been coming here for years?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think one of these individuals has appeared here with persistent regularity.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to give me his name, so that I may move to strike it out of the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is in line 17, page 42.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. chairman, I move to strike out line 17, page 42.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 42, line 17, by striking out all of the line.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman, before the House undertakes to strike out this line, let us, in fairness, consider whether it should take the step or not.

I fully agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] in his opinion that men who bring contests captiously, who come before the Elections Committees without a valid or probable cause of contest, and whose only purpose is to obtain the allowance given to the contestant, ought to be discouraged in their actions. There is no more disagreeable thing to the Committees on Elections than to have contests referred to them that have no just cause for complaint. It annoys the committee; it is unjust to the House. This man Prioleau is a colored man who has been contesting the seat of one of the Members from South Carolina. The members of the committee were well aware of the fact that a contest had been brought

by Prioleau a number of times. They were fully suspicious that in bringing this contest the contestant may not have been honest, and that his purpose was only to obtain the fees, and because of that this case of Prioleau against Legare received the most careful consideration of the Committee on Elections No. 2, both by the Republican and Democratic members.

They came to the conclusion that there was merit enough in this suit to justify them in giving the amount of \$1,000. Now, somebody said here that this man had contested this suit for something like 12 times. I do not care if he has contested it for 50 times. We try each case on its own merits. We are not trying any man on the actions of his life; we are judging a particular state of facts that exist in the case under consideration, and we were satisfied by a unanimous vote—by the vote of every man on the committee, Republicans and Democrats—after a discussion that lasted over an hour, that this man was entitled to this \$1,000, and that he ought to receive it. Now, I have no interest in the case; I do not care whether you strike out this \$1,000 or whether you retain it. I do know, however, there is no member of this committee who wants to be unjust; who does not believe that if this man had a just cause to bring this contest to this Congress he should receive the money he is honestly entitled to.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILL. With pleasure.

Mr. HAMLIN. If the gentleman found merit in the claim why did not he present a claim to cover the full \$2,000?

Mr. HAMILL. He presented a claim for about \$2,000. The committee then audited the claim. There is no oral testimony; there is no one to give oral testimony, but you take the sworn statements—

Mr. HAMLIN. I understand you took the receipted vouchers.

Mr. HAMILL. Sworn to; and then considered whether the items in them were proper or not.

Mr. HAMLIN. If you passed it clearly on the question of merit, how did you find it was just one-half meritorious? Why did you not allow the full amount if you thought it was a meritorious claim?

Mr. HAMILL. I will explain to the gentleman. It did come to something over \$1,000, probably to about \$1,100, and in order that the committee might be on the safe side and not vote the public moneys hastily, after due deliberation we thought that \$1,000 would be a fair amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAMILL. I ask for sufficient time to cover my remarks; they will not last more than a few minutes.

Mr. HAMLIN. I ask that the gentleman may have three minutes more. I took up some of his time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAMILL. We figured those things out in a very reasonable way, and we came to the conclusion in the same way as other committees in making up their accounts that this man was entitled to \$1,000. Now, as I said to you gentlemen, I do not care whether you adopt this amendment or defeat it. I think the man is entitled to \$1,000. I have considered it carefully, and so have all the members of the Committee on Elections No. 2. If you gentlemen who have not considered it and to whom the statement of this case is, perhaps, new desire to strike the appropriation out of the bill you are, so far as I am concerned, at perfect liberty to do so.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Did he have any counsel before the committee?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes; he had counsel before the committee.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman remember how many votes this man received at the last election?

Mr. HAMILL. I do not remember anything about the case just now, but the papers amply support—

Mr. MANN. Well, the case was directly before the gentleman's committee, and he does not remember anything about it.

Mr. HAMILL. Do not let the gentleman be too hasty. Let me say this to him: That he filed depositions showing he received over a thousand votes.

Mr. MANN. I venture to say the gentleman is mistaken, and that he never received a thousand votes in all the time that he ran for Congress.

Mr. HAMILL. I have not the slightest hesitancy in assuring the gentleman that he is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. I heard the case three or four times.

Mr. SHERLEY. Was the same contest made this time that was made in the Sixty-first, the Sixtieth, the Fifty-ninth, and Fifty-eighth Congresses?

Mr. HAMILL. I do not know what the grounds were in the other contests.

Mr. ANDERSON. The fact of the matter is the ground of the contest was purely constitutional?

Mr. HAMILL. Not purely.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, almost entirely so.

Mr. HAMILL. Not almost entirely so. That was one of the questions involved in the case.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say that this man claimed he received over a thousand votes?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I will venture to say there is no such evidence in the case.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The majority of the elected Member was overwhelming, was it not?

Mr. HAMILL. No. It was overwhelming after we refused to concede votes that the contestant himself claimed he was entitled to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman enlighten the House as to the procedure in election contest cases? I think the majority of the Members have not given it very much thought. Is it not a fact that after an election, within 30 days from the time the returns are certified, the contestant may, by writing a letter to the sitting Member, bring on a contest without any other formality whatever?

Mr. HAMILL. So far as the committee is concerned with the case, here is what happened: The case was referred to the committee by the Speaker of the House—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not understand.

Mr. HAMILL. The printed briefs are given to us and—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Pardon me, the gentleman does not understand the purport of my question. If I am contesting the gentleman's election, I am obliged to give him notice within 30 days?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Within 30 days after his election is certified by whatever authority it is certified. That compels him, the elected Member, to at once respond to me, the contestant, and from that time forward practically to be at my beck and call anywhere in this wide land of ours to take testimony. Is not that a fact?

Mr. HAMILL. That may be a fact.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can not a contestant take a Member off of the floor into another State in order to defend himself in an election case?

Mr. HAMILL. I do not know whether he can or not. I am only interested in showing that this contestant ought to get \$1,000.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand the New York World Almanac, containing the election returns from that district, and this candidate's vote is given at 75.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was in a presidential election, too.

Mr. AUSTIN. In a presidential election. There is not a stronger Republican on this floor than myself, and it is all folly to talk about a Republican being elected in South Carolina under present conditions in that State. It is an insult to the membership of this House for a man to come here year after year with a contest from South Carolina and impose upon the taxpayers of the United States to pay him from one to two thousand dollars for such alleged contest. Now, let this candidate go into some other industry. [Laughter.]

The member of the Committee on Elections [Mr. HAMILL]—and I have no criticism to make of him—speaks about doing justice. We must do justice by the people who are taxed and whose money is in the Treasury, out of which we are to pay this \$1,000. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMILL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I would just as soon go up to the Treasury Department with a dark lantern and abstract a thousand dollars of the people's money as to vote for this item in this bill, and I will not do it.

Mr. HAMILL. Of course I can not help the gentleman if he wants to vote without evidence. That is something he must decide for himself. We have decided it according to the evidence and according to the procedure before us. That is the great difference between myself and the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am speaking about evidence. Every time this man has had a contest in a Republican or Democratic Congress the committee have carefully given him a hearing, listened to his testimony, and have come in here in every instance with a unanimous report against him.

Mr. BARTLETT. And the contest has already been made on the identically same grounds for all the years past.

Mr. AUSTIN. Every Republican member of the committee and every Democratic member of the committee has written in every report "You have no case," and in every instance his contest has been followed by an appropriation to pay him from \$1,000 to \$2,000 for instituting it; and I venture the assertion that if this money is voted here to-night, although this man re-

ceived in the last election only 85 votes, according to the figures, he will be here with another contest in the next Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to these items. There are 20 of them, for contestants and contestees. Here are 10 contests, and out of that number I believe one man has been unseated.

Mr. FOSTER. Two of them have been unseated.

Mr. COVINGTON. There were 10 contests.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; there were only 10 contests and 2 have been unseated. Then 8 have made contests in which they failed, and I believe that in each contest the committee that investigated the case has recommended this allowance.

Now, I know it is uncomfortable for a man who gets a certificate to have a contest made on him, and yet, after all, contests are at times necessarily and worthily made. Some years ago—I think it was 20 years ago—the expenses of contests were so great that a provision of law was enacted as to contests, limiting the amount that could be paid in each case to \$2,000. Frequently the expenses in those days would mount up to ten or fifteen thousand dollars, and I think in one case in Ohio they ran up to \$19,000.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. HAMILL. In one of these cases I know that the contestant and the contestee spent over \$5,000 apiece.

Mr. CANNON. There is no such provision of law with respect to the Senate. It affects only the House. I am not complaining of the law which provides that the allowance shall not exceed \$2,000, and yet if there be real grounds for a contest and a man is trying to establish his right to a seat that he is prevented from occupying on account of fraud, everybody is interested; each citizen is interested in it.

I do not know this man, and, like the gentleman on the committee who has addressed this committee, I do not care, so far as I am concerned, what becomes of this item. But the committee has unanimously recommended this \$1,000. If we are to go back and revise, without looking at the record, and say that this man has made many contests and that no man can be elected from South Carolina who is a Republican, I suppose we shall get into trouble. I do not know whether this man is a Republican or not, or whether he has any politics or not—this man who has made the contest. [Laughter.] But I am not willing to turn down the recommendation of this committee, and I may say I have just as much knowledge touching this contest as I have with respect to the other nine contests. So far as I am concerned I am going to vote against this amendment. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The question was taken, and the chairman announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. CANNON and Mr. HAMILL demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 53, noes 36.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the remaining items in this group be passed over for the present. It is a question whether some provision has not been made for some of the persons included in these paragraphs. I want to have an opportunity to look into the matter.

Mr. MANN. A provision made when?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In the last general deficiency bill. I ask that they be passed over for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that the items of these paragraphs be passed over for the present. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To continue the employment of seven messengers, at \$100 per month each, in the post office of the House of Representatives, from March 4 until December 1, inclusive, 1913, \$6,230.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment on page 43, line 16, to strike out the words "March 4" and insert the words "April 1." You will find on examination that existing law provides for payment up to and including March 31.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 43, line 16, by striking out the words "March 4" and inserting the words "April 1."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it may be that the committee has knowledge of the necessity of employing these seven post-office messengers during the vacation after the special session. Of course, I do not have. They might be competent to do the work

at that time, but they are not competent to do the work well at this time.

There is universal complaint in the House about the post office of the House. I do not know whether it is the lack of numbers of messengers or the lack of something else, but there is a decided lack somewhere in connection with the House post office. I do not know that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] is to be held responsible for that, though I believe he is the head of the patronage committee. Why should this provision be made beyond the end of the session? What will these messengers do in the summer time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They will deliver mail, as they have done for the last 16 years.

Mr. MANN. I think they have not delivered mail for the last 16 years.

Mr. BARTLETT. This is the same thing which has been carried heretofore.

Mr. MANN. I do not think you will find this provision in any former appropriation bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have always been carried.

Mr. MANN. They have not always been carried.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They always have during my service.

Mr. MANN. I think they have not always been carried during the gentleman's service in the House. How long they have been carried I do not know. We have had several resolutions concerning these messengers in the House post office. Will the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] say how long since we passed such a resolution?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, just before the close of the last session, providing for the interim.

Mr. MANN. We passed a resolution at this session relating to employees of the post office, I think. There is not the slightest use for these messengers during the recess, when Congress is not in session. They may need one, but they do not need the seven. The fact is that before the House Office Building was constructed we used to have these messengers deliver mail at the residences of Members of Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT. We do now.

Mr. MANN. Some Members may receive their mail at their residences now. I receive a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at my house, delivered through the House post office, though generally it comes after the one delivered through the city post office, and it does not come in respectable shape. It does not always come at all through the House post office, but always comes through the city post office. But since the House Office Building was constructed most of the mail is delivered there at some time during the day or week.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized later to change the totals. They must be computed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to change the totals. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ADAIR, 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. 28858) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1913 and for prior years, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

FLOODS ON THE MISSISSIPPI (H. DOC. NO. 1453).

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document a report of Maj. J. E. Normoyle, of the Quartermaster's Department, on the work that he had charge of last summer in connection with the floods on the Mississippi and the distribution of the fund for the relief of the flood sufferers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks to have printed as a public document the report of Maj. J. E. Normoyle on the floods on the Mississippi River last year. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 26874, the Indian appropriation bill, and disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman better ask that it be printed with the Senate amendments.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The Senate has printed the bill. Mr. MANN. It can be printed by to-morrow, with the Senate amendments numbered.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will change my request, and ask to have it printed with Senate amendments numbered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered. There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] at a later day, when the Speaker recognizes him, and the public business is in such a condition that he can receive recognition, may have 40 minutes in which to address the House on the subject of a budget.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that at such stage of the proceedings as the Chair can recognize the gentleman from Kentucky, he may have 40 minutes to address the House on the subject of a budget.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, which I do not intend to do, how will the Speaker determine that? Is the request that the Speaker may recognize him at any time?

The SPEAKER. The request is that when the public business is in such a condition that he may receive recognition the Speaker may recognize him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], who is shortly to leave us and who desires a little time when it is convenient.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the same request for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

A BUDGET.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, which was read, ordered printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, together with the accompanying documents, for the Committee on Appropriations to determine what should and what should not be printed. [For message, see Senate proceedings of this day.]

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 27827. An act to amend section 70 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3947. An act to provide for a bridge across Snake River, in Jackson Hole, Wyo.

GIBBES LYKES.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 6176, an act for the relief of Gibbs Lykes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint Gibbs Lykes, late a second lieutenant of Cavalry in the United States Army, to be a second lieutenant of Cavalry in the United States Army, to take rank at the foot of the list of second lieutenants of Cavalry: *Provided,* That no back pay or allowances shall accrue by reason of the passage of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. FOSTER. I demand a second.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds voting in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

TIMBER CUT ON PETACA LAND GRANT.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 7385) to relinquish the claim of the United States against the grantees, the legal representatives and assigns, for timber cut on Petaca land grant, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States of America hereby forever relinquish, release, satisfy, and discharge all right, claim, and demand which they have or may have against the original grantees, their

heirs and assigns, of the tract of land which is known as the Petaca grant, being private land claim No. 72, situate in the county of Rio Arriba, in the State of New Mexico, for timber and lumber cut and removed therefrom by said grantees, their legal representatives or assigns, prior to December 18, 1899, being the same tract of land which was recommended to be confirmed by Congress to Jose Julian Martinez and others and their legal representatives or assigns by James K. Proudfoot, surveyor general of the Territory of New Mexico, on February 20, A. D. 1875, which said tract of land was thereafter officially surveyed and platted in the said surveyor general's office and found to contain 186,977.11 acres, and the whole thereof, as so surveyed, having been held and claimed in good faith as their property from 1836, by said Jose Julian Martinez, his associates and their heirs, legal representatives and assigns, until December 18, 1899, when on an appeal from a decision of the Court of Private Land Claims, which had confirmed said grant in favor of said Jose Julian Martinez and his associates, their heirs and assigns and legal representatives, the Supreme Court of the United States reversed said decision and limited said grant to a less amount of said land, said timber and lumber having been cut and removed therefrom while they so held and claimed said land in good faith, and from the portions thereof adjacent to the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] No second being demanded, the question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the committee printed in the Record in connection with the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

TO RELINQUISH CLAIM OF THE UNITED STATES FOR TIMBER CUT ON PETACA LAND GRANT.

Mr. HOWLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report to accompany S. 7385:

The Committee on the Judiciary, having had under consideration the bill S. 7385, reports the same back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that it do pass.

A statement of the facts on which this recommendation is based is contained in a letter from the Attorney General of the United States dated January 28, 1913, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and which is printed in full as a part of this report.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Washington, D. C., January 28, 1913.

HON. HENRY D. CLAYTON,

Chairman Committee on the Judiciary,

House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have yours of the 25th instant, handing me copy of bill (S. 7385) to relinquish the claim of the United States against the grantees, their legal representatives and assigns, for timber cut on Petaca land grant.

This bill proposes to relinquish, release, satisfy, and discharge all right, claim, and demand which the United States may have against the original claimants of the Petaca land grant for timber cut and removed therefrom by the claimants, their legal representatives and assigns, prior to December 18, 1899, and I understand your committee desires all the information in the possession of this department relative to the propriety or advisability of the proposed legislation.

I have the honor to advise you that from information furnished by the Interior Department it appears that the Petaca land grant in New Mexico was favorably reported by the surveyor general of the then Territory of New Mexico, and a preliminary survey was made of the grant, showing the same to embrace an area of approximately 187,000 acres. This report of the surveyor general was transmitted to Congress January 21, 1887, by the Secretary of the Interior, who expressed the opinion that the area should be limited to the quantity occupied and cultivated by those who claimed the grant in 1848, and ought not in any event to exceed the limitation of town grants, namely, four square leagues.

The grant was never confirmed by Congress, and when the Court of Private Land Claims was established proceedings were had before that court which resulted in a decree, entered December 1, 1896, whereby the court held that the title to the land claimed, embracing a total of approximately 187,000 acres, was valid and the title thereto confirmed in the claimants. However, an appeal from that decision was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, where a decision was rendered reversing the action of the Court of Private Land Claims and confirming the grant for a very limited area (United States v. Pena, 175 U. S., 500). The timber mentioned in this bill was cut from the area excluded from the grant under the Supreme Court's decision.

As early as 1883, one S. S. Farwell claimed an interest in the grant, and some time later he, with L. Z. Farwell, of Freeport, Ill., and Marcus Z. Farwell, of Denver, Colo., made a contract with one Harry S. Buckman, of Colorado Springs, Colo., authorizing the latter to cut timber on lands within the claimed limits of the grant. Under this contract Buckman cut some 27,000,000 feet of timber. On August 12, 1886, L. Z. Farwell and S. S. Farwell entered into a contract with R. W. Stewart and E. H. McConnell whereby the two latter were permitted to cut timber from the grant at a stumpage price of \$2.50 per thousand. Under this contract Stewart and McConnell cut some 33,000,000 feet of timber.

Based on recommendations from the Interior Department, suit has been instituted against Buckman and the Farwells to recover the value of the 27,000,000 feet cut by Buckman at \$2 per thousand, and suit is contemplated against Stewart and McConnell and the Farwells to recover some \$82,000, the value of the 33,000,000 feet cut by Stewart and McConnell under their contract. The Interior Department regards both trespasses as innocent and for that reason recommended suit for the stumpage value of the timber only.

The timber was cut in both instances more than 20 years ago, and at a time when the Farwells, who claimed to own the grant, and probably everybody else interested in the matter believed the title to be good. So far as this department is advised there is no evidence whatever to show any bad faith, and, while the Government has a legal claim against those who cut the timber, because the lands having been eliminated from the grant by the decision of the Supreme Court, actu-

ally belonged to the United States, it seems exceedingly harsh to attempt to enforce the Government's claim at this late day. Some of the original parties are dead, and the suit must necessarily be brought against their heirs.

In view of the entire situation, I think that Congress should grant the relief proposed by this bill, and I therefore unhesitatingly recommend its passage.

Very respectfully,

GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM,
Attorney General.

REGULATING TRAFFIC IN ADULTERATED AND MISBRANDED GOODS.

Mr. COVINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 22526) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded and poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland calls up a conference report, and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1579).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 22526) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, 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 amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and the insertions made by said amendment, insert the following:

"That reasonable variations shall be permitted, and tolerances and exemptions as to small packages and containers shall be established by rules and regulations made in accordance with the provisions of section three of this act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. C. ADAMSON,
J. HARRY COVINGTON,
F. C. STEVENS,

Managers on the part of the House.

GEORGE T. OLIVER,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
E. D. SMITH,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H. R. 22526, an act to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, submit the following statement:

This bill as it passed the House amended section 6 of the pure food and drugs act of 1906 so as to require the weights of the contents of all packages of food products entering into interstate commerce to be plainly stated on the outside of the package. The bill then provided that reasonable variations should be permitted and tolerances established by rules and regulations made in accordance with the provisions of the pure food and drugs act. The rules and regulations would be made under that law by the Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Agriculture, and Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

The Senate amended the bill by striking out that proviso and authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture alone to establish rules and regulations where in his judgment exactness in the weight of the contents of the package is impossible, and providing an absolute exemption for all articles in packages selling at retail for 6 cents or less.

The effect of the receding by the Senate from its amendment No. 1 and the insertion in lieu thereof of the proviso as agreed upon by the committee of conference is to restore the bill practically to its original House form.

The effect of the receding by the House to Senate amendment No. 2 is simply to make the bill become effective six months later than provided in the House bill.

W. C. ADAMSON,
J. H. COVINGTON,
F. C. STEVENS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Maryland if the bill gives the variation as to weight that was provided in the House bill?

Mr. COVINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report restores it to the same form that the bill was originally in when it passed the House, with the exception that there is now inserted after the word "tolerances" a provision that the three Secretaries shall in addition establish reasonable tolerances and exemptions of small packages. It really leaves it in practically the same form that it was when it passed the House.

Mr. MANN. What we intended originally?

Mr. COVINGTON. Yes. It now provides for those reasonable variations which the legitimate manufacturers must make in order to substantially comply with the statute.

Mr. MANN. And is satisfactory to the manufacturers?

Mr. COVINGTON. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Is the report signed by all of the House conferees?

Mr. COVINGTON. The report is signed by all of the House and Senate conferees.

Mr. RAKER. I understand that the bill in substance, so far as the legal features are concerned, is practically the same as the House bill.

Mr. COVINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. RAKER. And this brings it back in that shape with the exception of the handing by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. COVINGTON. It eliminates that also. This restores it to its original form, and it is handled by three Secretaries, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the original pure food and drugs act of 1906.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 27, 1913, at 10.30 o'clock a. 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 Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, for the consideration of Congress, supplemental estimates of deficiencies in appropriations for the service of the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 1433); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting that the sum of \$11,000 be included in the general deficiency bill for maintenance of marine hospitals, Public Health Service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 1434); 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. WILSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 27251) to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia in any mill, factory, manufacturing or mechanical establishment, or workshop, laundry, bakery, printing, clothing, dressmaking, or millinery establishment, mercantile establishment, store, hotel, restaurant, office, or where any goods are sold or distributed, or by any express or transportation company, or in the transmission or distribution of telegraph or telephone messages or merchandise, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1574), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHARP, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. J. Res. 402) extending the operation of the act for the control and regulation of the waters

of Niagara River, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1577), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DUPRÉ, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3925) providing for an increase of salary of the United States marshal for the district of Nevada, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1575), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 28858) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1913, and for prior years, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 28860) to provide an equipment maintenance allowance for carriers in the Rural Delivery Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 28861) to amend section 118 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 404) providing for the appointment of a committee of four Members of Congress, two appointed by the President of the Senate and two by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the purpose of inquiring into 1-cent letter postage and other matters relative thereto; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CURLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 405) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Massachusetts favoring constitutional amendment to establish uniform hours of labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial from the Legislature of Oregon favoring the passage of H. R. 13500, the Asiatic exclusion act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 28850) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 28862) granting a pension to W. H. Odom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 28863) granting an increase of pension to Paulina Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMIL: Resolution (H. Res. 870) to pay Nathan B. Williams \$150 for services to the Committee on Elections No. 2; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request: Petition of the Pokagon Tribe of Pottawattamie Indians of Michigan and Indiana, protesting against the passage of House bill 28453, to facilitate the reclamation of shore lands for the Burnham lake front improvement project; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of special committee of the United Smoke Committee of the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to the elimination of smoke from river steamboats, and asking an investigation of same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the System Federation of the Harriman lines, favoring the passage of legislation for the strict enforcement of inspecting locomotive boilers and safety appliances for railway equipment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON: Petition of citizens of Wykoff, Minn., favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the joint session of the board of directors of the Board of Commerce, Commercial Club, Manufacturers and Producers Association, and Traffic Bureau of Knoxville, Tenn., favoring the passage of legislation for the reduction of the tariff on aluminum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the A. J. Hilbern Co. protesting against the passage of legislation for placing any duty on perfumes, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of the branch of Andrew Jackson of the American Continental League, Boston, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Root bill for the repeal of the free tolls portion of the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Harvard Men's Class, Dorchester, Mass., favoring the passage of the Kenyon red-light injunction bill to clean up Washington for the inauguration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURRIER: Petition of school children of Warner and Bradford, N. H., favoring the passage of the McLean bill for the Federal protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of joint session of the board of directors of the Board of Commerce, Commercial Club, Manufacturers and Producers' Association, and Traffic Bureau of Knoxville, Tenn., favoring the passage of legislation for the reduction of the tariff on aluminum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C., favoring an amendment to the naval appropriation bill providing for the building of one of the new battleships in one of the Government navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of citizens of the fifth district of Iowa protesting against the passage of the Johnston bill (S. 237) for the proper observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of citizens of Hartford, Conn., favoring the passage of the McLean bill for the Federal protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of the E. R. Brady Post, No. 242, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of the bill for making pension payments monthly instead of quarterly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Pennsylvania favoring the passage of the McLean bill granting Federal protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Tuesday Club, of Sacramento, Cal., favoring an increase in the appropriation for the suppression of the white-slave traffic; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the allied boards of trade of Knoxville, Tenn., protesting against the passage of any legislation for the reduction of tariff on aluminum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Italian-Swiss colony, of New York, protesting against the passage of the Jones-Works bill for the regulation of the liquor traffic in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Standard Gas Engine Co., San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the passage of House bill 28579, to provide for the uniform regulation of boats engaged in the towing service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of the International Association of Machinists, favoring an amendment to the naval appropriation bill providing for the building of one of the two new battleships in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of New England Water Works Association, Boston, Mass., protesting against the passage of any legislation tending to destroy the present national system of forest conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of citizens of McKenzie, Tenn., favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute to their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petition of the Newark Hardware & Supply Association, Newark, N. J., favoring the passage of the Weeks bill for a 1-cent letter postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.