

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of sundry citizens of Catawba, Gaston, Union, Wayne, and Ramseur Counties, all in the State of North Carolina, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petition of 7,000 citizens of congressional districts 1 to 10 of the State of Illinois, protesting against nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, of New York City, against the interstate trade commission bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Frank Huff and 4 other citizens of Findlay, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the United Societies for Local Self-Government of Chicago, Ill., and citizens of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Roseburg (Oreg.) Commercial Club, relative to force in Architect's Office, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of 80 citizens of Millbury, 38 citizens of Shrewsbury, 60 citizens of Uxbridge, 100 citizens of North Uxbridge, 67 citizens of Hopkinton, and 2,416 citizens of Worcester, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 1,500 residents of Worcester, Mass., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Worcester, Mass., favoring investigation of the Menace; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Westboro Grange, of Westboro, Mass., favoring Bathrick farm-credit bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of the Commercial Club of Grand Forks, N. Dak., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 24, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray Thee to give us a profound sense of our obligation to Thee. We are not unmindful of the abundant providences that have been vouchsafed to us. We remember and are more and more impressed with the solemn fact that we must meet issues that are not only tried at the bar of human reason but the profounder issues that must stand the test of the Divine justice. We pray Thee to give us wisdom and grace for the duties that are upon us. Give us humility of spirit, sincere hearts, and an obedient will. Save us from mistakes of judgment, from pride of opinion, from conceits of ignorance. May we be clothed with the spirit of Christ, that we may perform the duties that are upon us in Thy fear and with Thy continued favor. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

STATUE OF ZACHARIAH CHANDLER.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent to take up House concurrent resolution 36 for immediate consideration.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a message from the House?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a House concurrent resolution. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to hear it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the thanks of Congress be presented to the governor, and through him to the people, of Michigan for the statue of Zachariah Chandler, whose name is so honorably identified with the history of that State and of the United States.

Resolved, That this work of art is accepted in the name of the Nation and assigned a place in the old Hall of the House of Representatives, already set aside by act of Congress for statues of eminent citizens, and that a copy of this resolution, signed by the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, be transmitted to the governor of the State of Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings incident to the dedication of this statue may be printed in the Record without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has heard the request of the Senator from Michigan. Unless there is objection, it will be granted. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The proceedings referred to are as follows:

PROCEEDINGS AT THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUE OF ZACHARIAH CHANDLER, STATUARY HALL, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, MONDAY, JUNE 30, 1913, 11 O'CLOCK A. M.

Senator WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH, of Michigan (chairman). The service which we have met here to perform will be opened with prayer by the Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., of Port Huron, Mich., Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

OPENING PRAYER.

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

Great God, our King and our Father, whose spirit pervades all space with rays divine, a very potent factor in shaping and guiding the progress of men and of nations through all the vicissitudes of the past, we rejoice that the long struggle for civil, political, and religious rights culminated in a Nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

We thank Thee that from time to time Thou hast raised up patriots who have woven their characters into the tissues of this Nation and made it strong and great. We are here in the memory of such a man, fitted by nature and by preparation for the work Thou didst call him to do. He gave to his State and Nation the best that was in him, and left behind him a record worthy of emulation. In placing his statue here in this Hall of Fame the people of his State honor themselves and add to the group of illustrious heroes and statesmen here represented a son of whom they may well be proud. Long may it stand, to speak in mute eloquence of "liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever."

Let Thy blessing be upon these services, that they may be recorded upon the pages of history and redound to Thy glory and to the good of mankind. In the spirit of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

ADDRESS OF THE CHAIRMAN, SENATOR WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH.

Senator SMITH of Michigan. My friends, as the senior in service of the Michigan congressional delegation, I have been directed to take charge of the program. My part shall be very brief, and in passing I desire to say that we have assembled in this historic place as the representatives of State and Nation to do honor to one whose public service contributed so much toward the welfare of the people and the glory of his country. It was peculiarly fitting that Zachariah Chandler should have represented Michigan in the Senate of the United States at a time when rugged faith and sublime confidence were so essential to the permanence of the Republic.

His giant-like form, his innate honesty, his unclouded vision, his dauntless courage, and his masterful personality shone like a beacon light through the darkness and gloom of our Nation's greatest peril, while the warmth of his stout heart and his ever-present sympathy cheered the faltering, ministered to the needy, and cared for the suffering on unnumbered battle fields. To him the sadly bereft and afflicted turned with confidence, while the unconsoling mother who had dedicated her only son to Lincoln's cause knew that Chandler would not countenance unnecessary danger or sacrifice, and the Government of which he was a part was made more glorious by his unflinching devotion to human liberty. [Applause.]

To the soldier at Gettysburg or in the Wilderness his eloquent voice was like a bugle call to action, and inspired our soldiers and national leaders with new strength and faith in the perpetuity of American institutions.

He was no traitor to his country or his party. His optimism was of that quality which could circumvent any disaster. His was the highest type of virile, western statesmanship, and his iron will could not be broken or blunted, while he wore upon his brow the cardinal jewels of his political faith.

He was a stranger to fear and a deadly foe to venality in every form. He was the generous product of mountain and valley and forest and sea, and his imperious form was unswayed by tempest and storm. The fiercer the groll of treason and disunion, the more dauntless his spirit and the more inspiring his leadership; the heavier the load, the more massive his form became, until the people of Michigan came to believe that there was no limit to his patriotism or endurance. When column after column broke, his Herculean shoulders stented the structure of state until the foundations could be repaired.

His last battle was relentlessly waged against the puerile political decadence of his time, and the stalwart blows he delivered against the financial fallacies of that period quickened the lagging spirit of the faint-hearted and smote the visionary doctrinaire in a vital spot.

It was, indeed, a farseeing eye that blazed the way for Zachariah Chandler's entrance into the public life of his coun-

try, and the century that has passed since he was cradled in the mountains of the Old Granite State has produced no more inspiring figure among the conservators of the Republic.

In this niche Michigan places her final contribution to this brilliant galaxy of the dead, and future generations can find much of inspiration in the lives of all, while not the least of these now takes his place at the instance of the State he so faithfully served.

I count it among the priceless privileges of my life to have been permitted to come into personal contact with this masterful man, and this hour could not be devoted to a worthier purpose than the initial step in the permanent perpetuation of his memory.

I pause to call upon Chandler Hale, grandson of the great Chandler, to unveil his statue.

[The statue, which was draped in a large American flag, was then unveiled by Mr. Chandler Hale. The appearance of the statue was greeted with applause.]

Senator SMITH of Michigan. In yonder Chamber, which was the immediate scene of his countless activities, we shall at some future time present some phases of his legislative career, and this present ceremony will now be conducted by those especially charged by the Commonwealth of Michigan to perform this patriotic duty.

I take especial pride in presenting to you Mr. Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Grand Rapids, Mich., the honored chairman of the commission, who exemplifies in his character and attainments the wholesome spirit of this occasion. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. ARTHUR HENDRICK VANDENBERG.

MR. VANDENBERG. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the Commonwealth of Michigan to-day challenges the attention of the Nation to the quality and fiber of Michigan manhood and citizenship as typified in one of the strongest characters illuminating the page of nineteenth century American history.

We have come from our beloved State to offer tribute to the memory of Zachariah Chandler, and to ask the people of the United States to accept from us this heroic statue, which shall stand through unnumbered years as the testimonial of a people who are free and nationally unified because such democratic noblemen as he dedicated their surpassing talents to the common good.

It was wise national legislation which brought this Statuary Hall into existence—here in the Capitol Building that breathes liberty in every stone and column—to perpetuate the memory of crusaders for humanity and good government.

In an all-too-forgetful age it is well that such patriotic shrines should reinspire the thoughts of generations which profit from the self-sacrificing labors of the fathers who toiled and builded and kept the faith that we might inherit our legacy unimpaired.

It was equally wise legislation—in the State—which two years ago nominated Zachariah Chandler to occupy Michigan's second niche in the Nation's Hall of Fame, because neither Michigan nor any other Commonwealth ever gave a statesman to the Nation who wrought in more imperishable deed for the preservation and the glory of his country.

In a time that tried men's souls—through rebellion and then through reconstruction—his intrepid courage was an inspiration for right and justice, his words resembled battles, and his countless achievements spelled service that counted large for the cause which martyred the saintly Lincoln and immortalized the resistless Grant.

I speak for the State commission which was intrusted with responsibility for the erection of this statue. Our task is done. We believe that Sculptor Charles H. Niehaus has faithfully portrayed the rugged greatness of a master among men.

We publicly acknowledge our debt of gratitude to all who have aided us in whatever measure of success our efforts have attained and, as chairman of the commission, I want particularly to pay my personal word of appreciation for the debt that I owe to my fellow members on the commission, Mr. Charles M. Greenway and Mr. Kirke S. Alexander.

I wish, too, to say a word for Sculptor Niehaus, who has continuously given us the benefit of his ceaseless efforts and untiring interest. And last, but not least, I must say to you that we are under everlasting obligation to Mrs. Mary Chandler Hale, the daughter of this great man, who has exhibited a continuous interest in our work, who has given us the benefit of inspiring suggestion, and who is kept from attendance upon this memorable occasion only by the serious illness of her own distinguished husband.

We believe that the statue will merit approval from Michigan and the Nation; and, pursuant to instructions from the commission, I make bold to sketch in briefest way the thoughts regarding Chandler which have inspired us in our task.

Michigan particularly extends greetings upon this memorable occasion to one of her elders in the sisterhood of States; for while Chandler's mature accomplishments were all inspired by the splendid glory of his western citizenship, his birthplace was amid the granite hills of old New Hampshire.

The Commonwealth which from early youth became the home of his loyal adoption is entitled to this honor of preserving Chandler's fame in this marble that will endure with all the ages through which the Republic is destined to live.

But the State which gave him birth, at Bedford, on December 10, 1813—one full century ago—may borrow a reflection of our pride.

New Hampshire is ostensibly represented in this Hall of Fame by two heroic figures into whose eternal association a third now comes.

Over yonder stands John Stark, a warrior patriot whose honors are written from Bunker Hill to Bennington in chapters of a life story dedicated to the establishment of this free and independent Government.

Near by is the mighty, masterful Daniel Webster, who first stripped the doctrine of nullification to a nakedness that shamed it before the world; Webster, who lived to save the integrity of union even as Stark lived to serve in its erection.

Yet, with full and appreciative acknowledgment of the self-sacrifice and patriotism of both these Titan figures, we of the West respectfully submit that when New Hampshire gave Zachariah Chandler to Michigan—there to be matured into dynamic manhood—New Hampshire sired a son who combined the uncompromising courage of a Stark and the sublime Union loyalty of a Webster—a son who wrought in word and deed for the preservation of free government in as exalted and effective degree as any single patriot who ever swore allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.]

If by some black art Gabriel's horn could sound an alarm of resurrection that should galvanize this bronze and marble congress into life, we should find ourselves in the intimate presence of many of the Nation's great—men whose lives chapter and vitalize the story of American development. It would be a wonderful assembly—such a parliament as never met in flesh and never will.

But among all these earnest, intellectual, stalwart, aggressive, patriotic, broad-brained men and women we are proud in our faith that there would be no peer to Lewis Cass and Zachariah Chandler, sons of Michigan, servitors of the Republic, representatives of that sterling citizenship which has electrified the great Northwest with currents of progress and patriotism—deserved favorites in history; none of better right to win perpetuated fame and endured affection in this inspired rotunda.

After Cass had honored Michigan through a lifetime of devoted service to the public weal, Michigan honored Cass in 1889 by accepting the Nation's invitation to here dedicate a shaft to his hallowed memory; and for nearly one-quarter of a century visitors to this most beautiful and most powerful Capitol in all the world have looked upon his rugged face and stalwart figure to catch from them a suggestion of that power and purpose which made him strong—aye, superb—as governor, ambassador, Senator, Cabinet counselor, and contender for the Presidency.

It is fitting now that Michigan's second contribution to this gallery of immortals should commemorate the one who took up the burden of leadership when Cass laid it down, who became the spokesman for his State and for his party fully as dominantly as Cass had been in much less perilous times, who donned the armor of a fearless crusader against slavery and secession, and who, among all his stalwart fellow statesmen, veritably became the plumed knight of free union to captain the brave-hearted band of heroes who upheld the hands of Lincoln in a Congress that was rebellion's lair.

Those bitter days are over, and what may be said to-day is said with fullest honor and appreciation for those whose consciences aligned them on the other side. Fields that ran red with blood in the chill of cold November are green with the harvest of July. Unity that was once merely constitutional has given way to unity that is both constitutional and loved. North and South each honor the other's Rebellion heroes. There is no statue in this Hall upon whose granite pedestal I would more gladly place a wreath of esteem and affection than that of the great Robert E. Lee. [Applause.] What we say of the record of this man to whom this day is dedicated is merely the unchangeable story of history which must be told as it occurred. And it is from the picture of fearlessness and courage and uncompromising conviction which the story yields that one may catch the reason why this particular favorite son has earned Michigan's belated favor at this hour.

Michigan's history is rich in men well worthy of honor in this Hall of Fame. Michigan wishes she might rear to all a memorial worthy of the nobility of each. But since one alone must be selected for the recognition of this hour, there can be little division of farseeing opinion that Zachariah Chandler is rightfully the colossus to whom belongs premier appreciation.

Among all the statues in this Hall I believe I am correct in saying that only one commemorates any of Chandler's confrères when he first entered national life in the Senate of the United States on March 4, 1857, and in the chamber now occupied by the Supreme Court took oath to support the Constitution of the Union—an oath as dear to him as life itself. That great Congress, which entered upon responsibilities surpassing almost any ever undertaken by parliament of man before or since, has been solely represented here by Samuel Houston, from the State of Texas—Houston, who made Texas free and then brought her into the Republic.

If Samuel Houston could speak this morning from his splendid pedestal over yonder, he would subscribe to every word of eulogy that may be said for Zachariah Chandler, and out of richly wonderful experiences in a Congress where Chandler never yielded jot or tittle to secessionist or traitor he would congratulate Michigan and the United States upon the glory of this hour. [Applause.]

Probably no man other than Lincoln himself was more steadfast, unyielding, grimly courageous, and unhesitatingly defiant in his opposition to slavery and secession. What this Nation owes to Lincoln for his leadership, partaking of divinity, during the dark days of the sixties it owes in proportionate measure to Chandler for his lesser but terribly potential work.

Chandler it was who early practiced the tenets of his faith in abolition through liberal support of "the underground railroad," of which Detroit was one of the most important terminals.

Chandler it was who led the party of antislavery as its nominee for governor of Michigan in its first great fight for recognition.

Chandler it was who headed the Michigan delegation to the first Republican national convention, where as a delegate he was one of the five who first voted for Lincoln as a vice presidential candidate.

Chandler it was who went to the United States Senate as the successor of Cass when Michigan demanded that her representative at Washington should reflect our sturdy faith in the perpetuity of the Union.

Chandler it was who immediately became the chieftain in the historic preliminary legislative battles which preceded the Civil War itself.

He knew from first to last no faltering, no doubt, no fear, and could never bring himself to look with patience upon any proposal for compromise.

Chandler it was who voiced the indignation of the patriotic North against the immortally notorious Lecompton constitution for Kansas.

It fixed Mr. Chandler's position definitely, not only as it demonstrated his ability, but as it raised him in the far advance of radicalism in the Senate, a position which he never deserted and for which he never apologized.

When Buchanan, with monstrous temerity, was ready to permit South Carolina to secede it was Chandler who arose to the emergency, "and men instinctively stood aside to give place to the national leader whom the occasion had raised up."

With a vigor and steadfastness for which this Nation must be forever his debtor, Chandler fought treason and its promoters at every turn of the road. He opposed the Crittenden compromise and condemned every suggestion that peace be purchased by dishonor. It remained for him to echo the Lincoln axiom in his famous letter of February 11, 1861, when, decrying the hesitancy of business men to face the possibility of war, Chandler wrote:

Without a little blood letting this Union will not, in my estimation, be worth a rush.

When Sumter fell it was Chandler who came back to Michigan and vitalized the presidential call for troops. Read this from authentic history:

Every Michigan soldier knew old "Zach" by name, thousands knew his face, and hundreds have him to thank for acts of kindness and words of cheer. The dustiest, ragged bluecoat applicant for his aid had a claim to royal precedence, and they all knew that if they needed influence or money they had but to ask him. Not the iron rule of Stanton himself could avail to delay him in such a service.

Chandler was the guiding spirit of the famous committee on "The conduct of the war," which throughout the terrific conflict was the inspiration and invaluable support of the President and his Secretary of War.

It would take a volume of endless size to tell the whole story. Every act of Chandler was an act of a staunch and courageous

patriot. No taint of dishonesty, no suggestion of dishonor, no intimation of selfish or improper motives ever attached to his slightest act.

He was the confidant of Lincoln and became the confidant of Grant.

He was Grant's Secretary of the Interior, where his administration is spoken of as "the best in its history."

I hold in my hand a letter from former President of the United States William H. Taft, whose honored father served in the Cabinet of Grant with Zachariah Chandler, which letter is as follows:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., June 14, 1913.

MR. A. H. VANDENBERG,

The Grand Rapids Herald, Grand Rapids, Mich.

MY DEAR MR. VANDENBERG: I have yours of June 10 with reference to the dedication of a statue to Mr. Zachariah Chandler. I am not very familiar with Mr. Chandler's life. My father valued his sturdy patriotism, the wonderful force of his personality, and his bluff directness and honesty of expression. He believed the country greatly indebted to him for his patriotic activities at a time when she was in great need.

Sincerely, yours,

WM. H. TAFT.

Chandler was chairman of the Republican national committee through the historic campaign which gave Hayes the Presidency, and in this trying position he displayed that executive capacity and relentless aggressiveness which contributed so fundamentally to his dominance wherever he was concerned. He seemed the very incarnation of resistless persevering power.

Had he been spared his sudden death, he would probably have succeeded Hayes as President of the United States. He was of presidential caliber and vision and popularity.

As a merchant before entering public life he exhibited a genius that brought him fortune.

As a statesman, after he left the ways of commerce far behind, he was a master.

As a staunch Republican he was unfaltering in his devotion to his party's cause, a devotion so sincere that it earned him the respect of enemy and friend alike.

And last, but far from least, as a husband and a father he was as kindly and considerate and thoughtful and good as man ever was or could be.

When this great Michigan giant suddenly passed into another life, during the night of November 1, 1879, there was national recognition of a national loss. Proof, suggestive of the place he held in universal esteem, shows in the following phrase borrowed from the comment of that time:

It may be doubted whether since the assassination of Abraham Lincoln any single announcement has so startled the public mind and moved the popular heart as when it was announced that Zachariah Chandler was found sleeping his last sleep.

A Nation as well as the State of Michigan—

Wrote Gen. Grant—

mourns the loss of one of her most brave, patriotic, and truest citizens. Senator Chandler was beloved by his associates and respected by those who disagreed with his political views. The more closely I became connected with him the more I appreciated his great merits.

The tributes to his virtuous, vigorous valor were legion. The peoples of Commonwealths from near and far came to mourn before his ashes. Garlands of love and appreciation piled high his bier. Eulogy was universal. A chieftain worthy the truest traditions of the race had crossed the bar.

Dr. Pierson spoke from the pulpit of Chandler's church in Detroit, the city which this great man had honorably served as chief executive when he first dedicated his masterful talents and intrepid courage to the common good.

The Doric pillar of Michigan has fallen—

Said he—

but the State stands, and God can set another pillar in its place. There is stone in the quarry, columns are taking shape * * * and in God's time they shall be raised to their place.

To-day, Mr. Chairman, the Doric pillar of Michigan is raised again in image.

After two years of faithful labor on the part of the commission of which I am proud to be a member the column has taken suggestive shape, and, true to prophecy, it has been raised where it belongs—here in the Nation's Hall of Fame.

May it not only breathe some small measure of Michigan's appreciation for one who honored her as few sons have honored Commonwealth, but may it also inspire to-morrow's citizenship to strive honorably, fearlessly, and in self-sacrifice that the Republic may always be preserved.

To you, sir, Mr. Governor, as the representative of Michigan's near 3,000,000 souls, I have the honor, on behalf of the commission, to tender you this shaft to the memory of Zachariah Chandler—this heroic statue which, by legislative authority, Michigan desires you to present to the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Senator SMITH of Michigan. I now take great pleasure in presenting the lieutenant governor of Michigan, Hon. John Q. Ross, who receives this statue from the commission, and in turn will present it to an official of the Government of the United States.

ADDRESS OF LIEUT. GOV. JOHN Q. ROSS.

Lieut. Gov. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, in this room, made sacred by so many important actions affecting the General Government, it is but fitting that we should gather for the purpose of paying our respects to one of the mighty men who was a vitalizing force in making this country what it is to-day.

I want, first, on behalf of the people of the State of Michigan, to thank this commission, whose earnest efforts have made the success of this occasion possible. In every undertaking, such as the erection of this statue, it is necessary to find men who are willing to give of their time and talents that the desired object may be accomplished in such a way as to meet the intent and desires of the people as a whole. I feel that it is but just that I should say here that the people of Michigan realize that no better selections could have been made as members of the commission in charge of this work. This statue will always stand as a testimonial to their faithful discharge of the duties imposed upon them.

The effect of events such as this is impossible for us to estimate. As we are here to-day, enjoying the blessings of this free Government, we are prone to overlook the things which have made this occasion possible. It is so easy for us to forget the men whose high ideals and whose devotion to duty have aided in the upbuilding and preservation of this Government. In the mad rush for place and power and competence which our people are making, the one thing which we need more than anything else is such object lessons as this statue as constant reminders that our happiness and our every opportunity are interwoven with the efforts and accomplishments of the men who have lived before.

It is an inspiration to live in such a country, but it is more inspiring to live in this country because of such men as Zachariah Chandler. The reading of his history spells opportunity to every young man.

The chairman of the commission has so eloquently pictured Senator Chandler's success that I hesitate to say anything in addition to what he has already said, although I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I did not again call attention to the fact that Senator Chandler overcame every handicap with which his early life was surrounded. He started in life with what would be considered at this time a very meager education; the money furnished to him by his father at the time he located in Michigan would not now be regarded as sufficient in amount to be of very substantial advantage in securing a start in business life. But he had something better than a college education; he had something better than a large sum of money—he had implanted within him that spirit which caused him to choose the right with invincible resolution, to resist the sorest temptations from within and without, to face the greatest storms of his business and political activities with that calm and fearless determination which could mean nothing but success. Some have urged that he lived in an age of opportunity; that his location in Michigan was at a peculiarly opportune time, and for that reason he should not be given full credit for all of the things his life and accomplishments stand for. That would not be a fair measure of the man and would lose sight of the fact that so many other men lived amidst similar surroundings, lured by the same beckonings by the goddess of fate, yet their lives meant nothing to the State or to the Nation at large. I am reminded of the words of John B. Gough, when he said that—

If you want to succeed in the world, you must make your own opportunities as you go on. A man who waits for some seventh wave to toss him on dry land will find that the seventh wave is a long time in coming. You can commit no greater folly than to sit by the roadside until some one comes along and invites you to ride with him to wealth and influence.

It was not opportunity that made him a success; it was that continual preparedness and fixity of purpose which took advantage of the opportunities that other men allowed to go by.

He applied business principles to every question that came up. His good sense, clear views, ready and retentive memory, quick discernment, and instinctive perception of the fitness of ways to ends qualified him for energetic and successful effort anywhere. These things recommended him to the people of his home city, and they chose him for their chief executive. His administration of that office more than demonstrated the wisdom of their choice. His fair dealing with his customers scattered over the State of Michigan made a host of sincere and admiring friends. He was one of the dominant spirits in the organization of the Republican Party, and when the opportunity came for the people

of Michigan to select a United States Senator who would be in thorough sympathy with and should faithfully represent their determined opposition to any further compromise in the matter of the question of slavery, which then hung like a cloud of doubt and disaster over this country, their minds naturally turned to Mr. Chandler, in whom they had implicit confidence because he had stood foursquare to every question which had come up. They recognized in him a strong and determined man. The very stumblingblocks which had caused others to falter and turn back had been for him stepping-stones in the pathway of success.

When he arrived at Washington as one of the Senators from our State he found the men of his own faith trembling for the future, ready and anxious to offer any compromise to avert further trouble or possible bloodshed. He was one of the men upon whom opposition acted as a tonic; who, upon hearing of a threat, rose refreshed and ready for the conflict. The opposition had intimidated by their attitude and their threats, and it awaited his advent upon the scene of action for the intrepid spirits of the Senate to get together and meet the opposition upon its own ground. His very determination and uncompromising attitude roused bitter antagonisms and caused to fall upon his head the most scathing denunciation, but to him this only meant more vigorous efforts. The intensity of his conviction, his tireless energy of action, inspired confidence, gave courage to the hesitating, and caused the timid and irresolute to stand erect. No one can measure the importance of his service in the preparation for and during that mighty conflict which we designate in history as the Civil War. The success or failure of the Union cause and what it stood for on many occasions hung by so slender a thread that the taking away of the strength and the determination of his support might have meant disaster.

His experience and training enabled him to obtain a broad view of the questions of government which he was called upon to consider; he could see and appreciate, as few were able to do, all of the phases of the matter under discussion.

After the war was over, and during the reconstruction period, he was one of the men whose counsel was most often sought. It is true that his idea as to the treatment of the men who had been in open rebellion against the Government was more drastic, possibly, than that employed; but this attitude grew out of his firm belief in the righteousness of the Union cause and the unrighteousness of the Confederate contention. The very intensity of his belief and of his devotion made him all the more determined in his opposition to the extension of any leniency toward those who had been the leaders in the Confederacy. Nothing in his whole life aroused so much criticism as this, and yet, viewed from this lapse of time, we must admit that this very attitude on his part and on the part of some of his conferees resulted in the course being taken which has proven to be most advantageous for all. His opposition was not toward any individual or because of any individual, but was against the principle which those individuals had represented. He believed in a union of the States which should for all time keep the Stars and Stripes floating unsullied in every hamlet and where no man should be held in involuntary servitude. The success of the principle he stood for is the glory of the Republic.

As a business man his success is measured by the good name he left as much as by the fortune he accumulated; as a statesman the appreciation of his accomplishments will increase with passing years; as an administrator he had the faculty of directing the efforts of those under him to do that which was necessary, shorn of any cumbersome detail; as the leader of a great party, he marshaled its hosts against united opposition and led them to the summit of victory; as an orator he never tried to get or hold the attention of his auditors by a mere play of words, but compelled their understanding by the force of his logic. He had the power to destroy the most eloquent and seductive sophistry by a few terse sentences.

It was given to him to read the future as it is given to few men. In his business he planned for the future of Michigan, and could see it grow and develop as the subsequent years have seen it grow and develop. In his contemplation of the affairs of the Nation he appreciated as fully as was given to anyone to appreciate what the differences between the North and the South meant to the Nation and to the future. He realized that while there might have been a time when these differences could have been settled without an open conflict, the vacillating attempts at compromise with a system which was inherently wrong had, before his entrance into national affairs, developed a situation which could only be adjusted by open conflict; that the sooner the conflict came, the better it would be for the Nation at large, and the more easy it would be to settle it in the manner in which it was settled and which is now admitted was the best for all. He believed in more vigorous methods than were adopted. He

insisted that the President should call 500,000 troops instead of 75,000. His counsel was never for anything except the most aggressive action in the prosecution of the war. His very nature was against any halfway measure. His faith was not a shrinking, half-believing faith; he believed with all the vigor and firmness of a perfect physical manhood. When his reason led him to a conclusion in his mind, that alone was right—that was the thing to work for and to fight for. Others might contend against his position, but his resolution was unchangeable.

It is impossible for me in the short space of time I shall occupy to enter into any detailed discussion of the wonderful personality or work of Senator Chandler. His was a life so filled with effort and accomplishment that we need to study it carefully in order to appreciate its real meaning.

No words of mine can adequately portray the significance of this statue; it means that the efforts of the men who came over to this shore to found a government of free men might have been wasted had it not been for the determination of character of Senator Chandler; it means that the flame of bitter antagonism of the early sixties, had it not been for his zeal, might have become national instead of sectional, and still be burning, separated by the Mason and Dixon line; it means that this reconstructed Government is better because of his having lived, that his standing for a sound financial policy made a more stable system of currency than we would otherwise have had; it means that the administration of the several departments of the Government are upon a more businesslike basis, that the Government is receiving a more adequate return in service from its employees, because, as Secretary of the Interior, he put into active practice in that department the same thorough, conscientious business methods which had made his own business ventures so signally successful; it means that in this great and reunited country, because of his life and achievements, every boy can more fully realize that he only needs a firm determination and a conscientious and constant application to write upon the scroll of his achievement, in living letters of brightest hue, that word for which we all strive, success; it means that the people of a great State are not forgetful of their obligations to those who, by their accomplishments and fidelity, have shed a luster upon them, and whose energy and ability and never-yielding patriotism have contributed in so large a degree to their success and material well-being. On behalf of that State, and with a thorough appreciation of all that this occasion means, and a firm belief that this Nation shall always continue to be the world's brightest hope for liberty and equality, I have the honor of presenting this statue to the people of the United States, that they may share with Michigan its glory and satisfaction in the life and achievements of Zachariah Chandler. [Applause.]

Senator SMITH of Michigan. It had been expected that Hon. Henry B. Brown, retired justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, would receive this statue in behalf of the Federal Government. Justice Brown has written a letter of singular beauty and appropriateness regarding the life of Senator Chandler. That letter is as follows:

WATKINS GLEN, N. Y., June 15, 1913.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am informed by Mr. Vandenberg, of Grand Rapids, that I am indebted to you for a most courteous invitation to participate in the ceremonies attending the placing of a statue of the late Senator Chandler in Statuary Hall on the 30th of this month. It is with much more than ordinary regret that I am compelled by my physical condition to decline an honor which would have been, of all things, the most agreeable to accept. The truth is, I am sadly out of health and am instructed to remain here until the 1st of August, and can not leave even for a temporary engagement without serious risk.

My inability to attend involves a personal sorrow in that it deprives me of the only opportunity I shall probably ever have of paying a public tribute of affection and respect to the memory of one who, at a critical period of my life, rendered me a service which it would be the basest ingratitude to forget. It was not only the most important one ever rendered to me, but was one which changed the whole course of my life and became the stepping-stone to all I subsequently attained. It was performed, too, at a time when he was not a Member of the Senate, but an ordinary private citizen, and was itself a proof of the strong personal influence he held, independent of any official connection with the Government.

It can never be forgotten of Senator Chandler that while his political methods were sometimes criticized even by members of his own party, he was one of half a dozen men who saved this Union in the most perilous hour of its existence. Like most men of strong character, he was an ardent supporter of whatever he undertook to do, and knew no such thing as a feeble determination or a half-hearted support. He was masterful in his nature and a born leader of men. When the great work of his life had been finished and the Union restored, he was as wise in the steps taken by him to cement that restoration and preserve the national faith un tarnished as he had been to suppress open opposition in the field. He was opposed to all forms of repudiation, and insisted upon the preservation of the national faith. He was steadfast with those who stood by us and relentless to those who opposed us. He was born for the age in which he lived, and passed away when the real work of his life had been accomplished.

Very truly, yours,

H. B. BROWN,
Ex-Justice Supreme Court United States.

In the absence of Mr. Justice Brown and at the unanimous request of the commission having this ceremony in charge, the statue will be accepted by Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER, of New Hampshire, the ranking Republican Senator and the ranking legislator in both branches of Congress, a rugged, stalwart figure from the State where Chandler was born. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF SENATOR GALLINGER.

Senator GALLINGER. Mr. Chairman and Lieut. Gov. Ross, I esteem it a special privilege to be permitted to participate in the exercises of this day, and in behalf of the Government of the United States to accept from your great State the statue of the illustrious man whom Michigan so rightly and justly honors—Zachariah Chandler.

New Hampshire, the State that I in part represent in the Senate, gave to other States of the Union a galaxy of men scarcely equaled in the history of our country. That little State gave Daniel Webster and Henry Wilson to Massachusetts, Salmon P. Chase to Ohio, Horace Greeley, Charles A. Dana, and John A. Dix to New York, William Pitt Fessenden to Maine, James W. Grimes to Iowa, and Lewis Cass and Zachariah Chandler to Michigan. The statue of Lewis Cass, contributed to the Government by Michigan, stands conspicuously in this Hall, a place dedicated to great men, and now the effigy of Zachariah Chandler is appropriately to become Michigan's second contribution to this collection of the chosen representatives of the several States of the Union.

The real name of Mr. Chandler was Zacharias, which was afterwards changed to Zachariah, but during his entire life he was known familiarly as "Zach." In his later years, when his friends wished to speak affectionately of him, the designation applied to him was usually "Old Zach," which he seemed to look upon as a term of endearment.

New Hampshire, equally with Michigan, honors the memory of Zachariah Chandler. The little town of Bedford, where he first saw the light of day on December 10, 1813, is not unmindful of his achievements after he left the ancestral home in search of fame and fortune in what was then a western State, and the people of New Hampshire as a whole feel a justifiable pride in the great services he rendered the country at a time when patriotism was sorely needed and a high type of both physical and moral courage was essential in dealing with the problems of that day. So, New Hampshire on this occasion grasps the hand of Michigan in joint recognition of the virtues and abilities of a true American statesman—a man of rare powers of intellect, whose life was devoted to the advocacy of the principles and policies upon which our Government was founded and the perpetuity of which are essential to its future success.

The life of Zachariah Chandler is a peculiarly interesting and instructive one. Born on a farm, educated in the little brick schoolhouse of his native town, which I believe still stands, and in the village academies of Pembroke and Derry, without the advantages that a liberal education gives, he took up the work of life resolutely and hopefully. After leaving school he engaged in farm work. He next taught school a short time, and then entered a dry goods store as clerk in the city of Nashua, near his birthplace. At the age of 20 the eyes of the young man were turned westward, as the eyes of so many young men in the East were in those days, and he emigrated to Detroit, where he continued to reside until his death, in the year 1879, in his sixty-sixth year. He carried with him to the West the intellectual ability and strength of character that he inherited from his Scotch-Irish ancestors. He carried with him also the physical vigor that the ozone of the New Hampshire hills implants in the human body, and with this equipment, aided by the stimulating influences of western push and energy, it is no wonder that his career in life was a remarkable one.

Shortly after reaching Detroit he engaged in business, in which he made a great success. In 1851 he was elected mayor of Detroit, and in 1852 was nominated as the Whig candidate for governor and was defeated. He was prominent in the organization of the Republican Party in 1854. He served for a time as chairman of the Republican national committee, and was Secretary of the Interior under President Grant.

In addition to these honors he was four times elected to the United States Senate, his service in that body, which were of a most distinguished kind, covering a period of 19 years. He died a Senator.

On the occasion of his death expressions of sympathy and appreciation came from all quarters. His funeral was a notable affair, attended by the militia, by hundreds of men in professional and public life from all parts of the country, and by a vast concourse of his sorrowing fellow citizens. The Nation

mourned the loss of a truly great man. The late James G. Blaine, in writing of his burial, said:

Thus was Zachariah Chandler buried. Living, he was honored. Dead, he was mourned. Though dead his labors and his example remain, and they form his fittest monument.

What greater tribute could be paid to any man than that? The country boy, born in the East, had achieved fame and power in a new field, and he died honored and mourned by all his countrymen. This statue can add nothing to his fame. It will stand here to be gazed on by his countrymen and by pilgrims from all lands, who will recognize in its strong and expressive features the likeness of a man whose intellectual powers, force of character, and integrity of life won for him universal respect and imperishable renown.

On behalf of the Government I accept the statue and beg to thank Michigan for this notable contribution to the National Hall of Fame. [Applause.]

Senator SMITH of Michigan. It would be a very easy matter in a gathering like this, composed of many soldiers and many citizens who knew Senator Chandler personally, to produce a symposium of eulogy almost without limit. I see before me many of his cotemporaries; but time will not permit, and the completeness of this service does not demand, that we prolong it further.

I am going to ask Dr. Couden, himself a soldier, who last saw the flag of his country upon the field of battle 50 years ago, to close the ceremony which he so appropriately opened with prayer.

CONCLUDING PRAYER.

Rev. Dr. Couden offered the following prayer:

And now, O God our heavenly Father, who hast watched over us in the past, and led us on step by step to larger and nobler life as individuals and as a people, let the spirit of Thy Son Jesus Christ come and dwell in our hearts, that we may go forth doing the work that Thou hast called us to do, honoring Thee, honoring our fellow men, and making for ourselves worthy characters that may reflect Thy glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, it was my misfortune to be absent on the business of the Senate when the exercises attending the unveiling in this Capitol of the statue of Zachariah Chandler were held, and now, in moving the adoption of the resolution asking for the acceptance of that statue by Congress, I desire briefly to pay my humble tribute to the memory, life, and public services of one of Michigan's most distinguished sons. From the long list of her illustrious dead she has selected for places in our Valhalla of Fame two men who typify not alone the greatness of her great men of the past, but whose characters, statesmanship, and patriotism made them peers of any man our country has produced at any time.

Lewis Cass and Zachariah Chandler were contemporaries, representing the different political theories and policies of their time. Cass was a Democrat, Chandler a Republican. While differing in their political views, they were one in uncompromising honesty and lofty patriotism. Both represented their State in the Senate, but not at the same time, Chandler having succeeded Cass in this body, where the former served for more than a fifth of a century. Their honorable rivalry as leaders of their respective parties produced a standard of politics in Michigan justly famous for its strength and ability. "There were giants in those days." The honorable friction of strong, honest, big men results in the development of strength and character. The lives of Cass and Chandler did much to mold and shape the history of Michigan. How fitting it is that these two men who, during a portion of their lives, worked together, should be selected by the State they honored with such distinction as her contribution to the Nation's chamber of immortals. In yonder hall their marble statues stand, surrounded by those of Washington, Adams, Webster, Benton, Calhoun, Morton, Garfield, and a score of other illustrious Americans.

What a galaxy of symbolized greatness! If their immortal spirits could invest those marble shafts, a convocation of the greatest minds, the most eloquent orators, the most able statesmen ever gathered at one time and place in all the tide of time could there be held.

The character and services of Zachariah Chandler have been eloquently and faithfully told on another occasion. What was said there will be published for the benefit of those who are interested in them, so I shall not take the time of the Senate to repeat in a feeble manner what will appear in the published report.

The great characteristics of Zachariah Chandler were his unshuffled honor, his uncompromising fidelity to principle, his absolute fearlessness in a cause which he believed to be just.

His public life and services were in a time which "tried men's souls."

He was a Republican of Republicans. He was at the birth of the Republican Party "Under the Oaks" at Jackson, Mich. He helped to shape its principles. He assisted in dedicating it to the cause of liberty. He directed as much as any other man its efforts to destroy African slavery. He was the unyielding enemy of treason and disunion. With merciless impartiality he flayed the secessionist, the northern copperhead, and the timid, time-serving Republican. He followed without the shadow of turning the direct path from offense to punishment.

His uncompromising force and energy made active and bitter enemies. No great man, fearless in effort and unyielding in determination, ever failed to make enemies, but of such men are made the leaders of principle, the avengers of wrong.

Chandler was the close friend and adviser of Abraham Lincoln. Upon him the President leaned for comfort and courage. His confidence in the Union cause never wavered, and when the clouds of the Civil War lowered darkest President Lincoln sent for Chandler, and immediately hope revived and courage was renewed.

Michigan has done well in embalming in enduring marble her distinguished son. In the Hall of Fame his effigy will be a decoration of honor to the Nation which he did so much to preserve.

I ask the Senate to accept from Michigan her statue of Zachariah Chandler. I ask for the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

VOLUNTEER FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. HITCHCOCK submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7138) to provide for raising the volunteer forces of the United States in time of actual or threatened war, 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 amendments numbered 4, 5, 7, and 8.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 6, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That when three-fourths of the prescribed minimum enlisted strength of any company, troop, or battery, or when three-fourths of the prescribed minimum enlisted strength of each company, troop, or battery comprised in any battalion or regiment of the organized land militia of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, organized as prescribed by law and War Department regulations, shall volunteer and be accepted for service in the Volunteer Army as such company, troop, battery, battalion, or regiment, such organization may be received into the volunteer forces in advance of other organizations of the same arm or class from the same State, Territory, or District, and the officers in the organized land militia service with such organization may then, within the limits prescribed by law, be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as officers of corresponding grades in the Volunteer Army and be assigned to the same grades in the said organization or elsewhere as the President may direct"; and the Senate agree to the same.

G. M. HITCHCOCK,

LUKE LEA,

H. A. DU PONT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JAMES HAY,

S. H. DENT, Jr.,

JULIUS KAHN,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

S. 656. An act granting to the trustees of the diocese of Montana of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for the benefit of Christ-Church-on-the-Hill, at Poplar, Mont., lots 5, 6, and 7, in block 30, town site of Poplar, State of Montana;

H. R. 13453. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915; and

H. R. 15906. An act providing an appropriation for the relief and transportation of American citizens in Mexico.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from officers and members of the Railway Employees' Department of the American Federation of Labor, in convention assembled at Kansas City, Mo., representing 350,000 railway employees, remonstrating against the conditions existing in the mining districts of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have heretofore presented a large number of petitions in favor of the proposed constitutional amendment for the prohibition of the importation, manufacture, sale, and so forth, of intoxicating liquors. I now present a memorial from 859 citizens of Portsmouth, N. H., remonstrating against the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment, which I ask may be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE. I send to the desk a telegram which I ask may be read with the names attached.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the telegram, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., April 23, 1914.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly urge avoidance of any steps involving war until whole complex Mexican situation can be examined by commission of inquiry that Congress and people may have full and accurate knowledge of facts. Further, that situation calls for immediate and express declaration by Congress that United States will in no event have any territory from Mexico by conquest.

JOHN D. LONG.
ALBERT E. PILLSBURY.
SAMUEL A. ELIOT.
CHARLES F. DOLE.
WILLIAM D. HOWELLS.
EDWIN D. MEAD.
JOHN GRAHAM BROOKS.

Mr. WORKS presented petitions of the congregations of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, of Cucamonga, and of the Nazarene Church of Milton, in the State of California, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CATRON presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Mexico, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHIVELY presented petitions of sundry citizens of Charlottesville and Remington, in the State of Indiana, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry druggists and pharmacists of Goshen, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called antinarcotic bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Division, No. 303, Order of Railway Conductors, of New Albany, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a literacy test for immigrants to this country, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Benevolent Order of Buffaloes of Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the retirement of superannuated civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. BRADLEY presented a petition of Local Division No. 271, International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Covington; of Lexington Division, No. 239, Order of Railway Conductors, of Ashland; and of Local Division No. 486, Order of Railway Conductors, of Paris, all in the State of Kentucky, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LIPPITT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Edgecomb, Me., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maryland, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PAGE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Windham County, Vt., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to compel the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Attleboro and Warwick, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GOFF presented memorials of sundry citizens of West Virginia, remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of West Virginia, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Clearing House Association of Wheeling, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve banks and trust companies from the burden of work and expense thrust upon them by the income-tax law, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Portsmouth, N. H., remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COLT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Upper Hay Lake Grange, No. 1552, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., praying for the adoption of a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Shelby, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a compensatory time privilege to post-office employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch, Scandinavian Aid and Fellowship Society of America, of Ishpeming, Mich., praying for an appropriation for the erection of a monument to the memory of Capt. John Ericsson, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a petition of the New Century Club, of Detroit, Mich., praying that an appropriation be made for the control and prevention of floods, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. KERN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Evansville, Ind., remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Frankfort, Nevada, Vincennes, Huntington, Newcastle, Richmond, and Washington, all in the State of Indiana, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Georgetown, Seaford, Lebanon, Rising Sun, Frankford, Ocean View, Clarksville, Selbyville, Millville, and Dagsboro, all in the State of Delaware, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Third Presbyterian Church of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a memorial of the Central Labor Council of Seattle, Wash., remonstrating against conditions in the mining districts of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SHIVELY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13542) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 443) thereon.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 5289) to provide for warning signals for vessels working on wrecks or engaged in dredging or other submarine work, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 444) thereon.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 2798) to provide for warning signals for vessels working on wrecks or engaged in dredging or other submarine work, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 145) for the relief of Charles Richter (Rept. No. 448); and

A bill (S. 1905) to prevent the desecration of the flag of the United States of America (Rept. No. 450).

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

A bill (S. 1988) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Armstrong (Rept. No. 446);

A bill (S. 1991) correcting the military record of Abram H. Johnson (Rept. No. 445);

A bill (S. 2550) to correct the military record of Jacob Scott (Rept. No. 449); and

A bill (S. 2882) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles M. Clark (Rept. No. 447).

THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 341, submitted by Mr. HITCHCOCK on the 20th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That for the compiling of data showing the results of insurance of bank deposits in Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota, also the compiling of the statutes on the subject in said States, and the judicial construction of said statutes in the courts of last resort, the Committee on Banking and Currency is authorized to employ expert assistance, the cost not to exceed \$50, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 5386) granting an increase of pension to Bersheba Wood Logan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5387) granting an increase of pension to James D. Beasley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOFF:

A bill (S. 5388) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Gamble;

A bill (S. 5389) granting an increase of pension to William W. Givens; and

A bill (S. 5390) granting a pension to Louise Capehart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 5391) granting a pension to Franklin Cochran; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 5392) to provide for carrying into effect of the agreement between the United States and the Muskogee (Creek) Nation of Indians ratified by act of Congress approved March 1, 1901, and supplemental agreement of June 30, 1902, and other laws and treaties with said tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 5393) granting an increase of pension to Naomi Feidler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 5394) granting a pension to Virginia C. Sawyer (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5395) granting an increase of pension to Albert White (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 5396) granting an increase of pension to Frederick J. Young (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 5397) concerning water-power plants hereafter located upon the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 5398) for the relief of Mrs. George M. Goodwin; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 5399) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hickman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A bill (S. 5400) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$41,800 for the maintenance of a division of the Railway Mail Service, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,220 for the salary of one assistant clerk to the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$200,000 for a water supply for 120,000 acres of irrigable land allotted to Indians in the so-called Wapato project, on the Yakima Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLEIGH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the general superintendent of the Division of the Railway Mail Service from \$4,000 to \$4,800 per annum, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,600 for the maintenance of an assay office at Salt Lake City, Utah, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. BRADLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES (S. DOC. NO. 472).

Mr. OWEN. I have received a letter from the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of persons found to be apparently equitably entitled to enrollment in the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma. I ask that the letter and accompanying statement be printed as a public document and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that action will be taken.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS, SPRINGFIELD, MO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3403) to abolish the office of receiver of public moneys at Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 4, after "shall," to insert "10 days"; on page 1, in lines 4 and 5, to strike out "31st day of December, 1913" and insert "passage and approval of this act"; on page 2, line 5, after "regulation" to insert "Provided, That all the fees and commissions now allowed by law to both such register and such receiver shall, 10 days after the passage and approval of this act, be paid to and accounted for by such register in the same manner and in like amounts in which they are now required to be paid to and accounted for by such receiver, but the salary, fees, and commissions of such register shall not exceed \$3,000 per annum"; to strike out all of section 2; on page 3, line 8, strike out "3" and insert "2"; on page 3, in lines 10 and 11, to strike out "on the 31st day of December, 1913," and insert "10 days from and after the approval of this act."

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I have a letter from the chairman of the committee for the preservation of American rights in the Panama Canal. It is brief, and in my judgment a very excellent statement of some of the practical phases of that question. I ask that it may be read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that the letter presented by him may be read. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read it.

The Secretary proceeded to read the letter.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Chair kindly state what is the document that is being read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a letter presented by the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], bearing upon the question of the repeal of tolls proposed to be laid on ships passing through the Panama Canal.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I objected the other day, so far as individual objection can go, to arguments on this question being inserted in the Record. There is no limit to them, and there will hardly be a limit to those to be made by Senators on the floor, probably.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut will permit the Chair to state that the Senator from Washington asked unanimous consent that the letter be read. The request was put to the Senate, and no objection was interposed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was not in the Chamber at the time, and I have nothing more to say; but I give notice that I shall object to the reading of such documents every time I am here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has not overlooked the attitude of the Senator from Connecticut. The Secretary will proceed with the reading.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the letter.

[Letter withheld pending decision of question by Senate.]

Mr. McCUMBER and Mr. BRANDEGEE addressed the Chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I do not know that I could lodge any protest against mere falsehood and illogical arguments, such as are contained in the instrument which has just been read from the desk, but I do most earnestly protest against reading into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any statement from any person that makes malignant charges against any Member of the Senate, such as are contained in this particular instrument.

I also protest against it because it falsely states the attitude of Members of the Senate. We have all of us received the circular letter which has been read into the Record. One very cursory glance at it will show to anyone who is acquainted with the truth how far the statements are from the truth.

I have noticed in all of the arguments which have been based upon statements made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that they have been exceedingly careful to quote only a portion of his very logical address. The Senator from Massachusetts took the position that, taking the Hay-Pauncefote treaty by itself, he could read into it, and he did read into it, a right upon our part to differentiate in favor of any and all of our vessels. They fail, however, and very carefully fail, to insert the other portion of his argument, in which he declared that it was his belief, and is his belief, that both of the parties to the contract understood that it gave us no such rights, and that it should be construed according to the understanding of the parties when they signed that agreement.

I think this explanation of the position of the Senator ought to be placed in the Record following the statement in the letter of his position in the argument he made before the Senate; but my objection and my protest now are against reading into the Record any such slurs as are made in the letter upon the character, honesty, and integrity of Senators who have seen fit to discuss this question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question. In the first place, I will say that I would not have offered this letter to be read into the Record had I construed it in any sense as involving any slur, as the Senator says, upon any Senator. I do not believe that it does. I think that it is a legitimate discussion of the public views of public men upon a great public question.

Now, I want to ask the Senator to point out, if he will, the false statements which he says have been made in this document.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I will point out one of them, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should prefer to have the Senator from North Dakota do so now.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not the instrument at hand now, and from merely hearing it read the Senator knows that it would be impossible to state the specific language. Perhaps, if I were going to quote the false statements, I would put a quotation mark at the beginning and at the end, and include it all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, that statement renders it unnecessary to discuss further the Senator's allusion, because it is so extreme that it carries its own refutation with it. I had supposed that when the Senator made the allegation that there were false statements in the letter, he had in mind what he was referring to and could point out some false statement of fact. The statement of a conclusion or of a deduction can not be characterized as a false statement; it may be an erroneous conclusion, but the Senator can not characterize it as a falsehood merely because he does not agree with it. I agree with the views, both as to the interests involved in this controversy and as to the effect of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which are contained in this letter.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can very briefly state some of the false statements. In the very beginning of the letter, almost within the first sentence, is the false statement that the President has changed his position in now contending that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty bound us not to discriminate. Neither the President has changed his position, nor has anyone who supports the President changed his position in reference to that matter.

I could run through the letter if I cared to take up the time, and in every paragraph I could find some false statement. The Senator says a conclusion may be false without the statement being false; but both are erroneous here.

On the other proposition the Senator says that he did not understand that the letter made any improper insinuations or charges against any Senator. I read from the letter:

[Matter withheld pending decision of question by Senate.]

If that is not worse than a discourteous charge against a Member of this body, then I can not understand the import of the English language. I say to the Senator, candidly, that we ought to meet these arguments fairly and not merely by insinuation, and that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ought not to be the vehicle to carry to the public the spleen of everyone who desires to enter a protest against the position of any Senator in this body.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, this letter states that the greatest material interest in the United States is arrayed on the side of the "repealers," as it expresses it, and that that interest is the railroad interest. Does the Senator deny that statement? Are not the transcontinental railroads arrayed upon the side of the "repealers" upon this question?

Mr. McCUMBER. If they are, I have no communication to that effect and no means of knowing it. I assume that there are roads that would very naturally be interested in it, and I may as well assume also that the coastwise vessels are interested on the other side of the question; but the argument for us is not as to who is or who is not interested. I am speaking directly as to the improper charges that are contained in that letter, and I do not propose to go into the argument of the question now as to what class of people are interested on this or the other side of the question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the Senator has been so extreme in his statements that I want to comment upon them in a very few words. I see the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR] is not here; I wish that he were here; but I want to say that while I disclaim any either open or concealed reflection upon the motives of the Senator from New York, the Senator from New York has been the great leader of this fight, which I say is in the interest of the transcontinental railroads and of Great Britain. That is the statement of fact that is made in that letter. I do not interpret it as casting any reflection upon the Senator from New York.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I have not agreed with the legal argument made by the Senator from New York with reference to the interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, but I have never for one moment doubted the entire good faith, honesty of purpose, and patriotism of the Senator from New York in taking the position which he did, and nobody who knows him could for one moment doubt the purity of the motives which actuate him; but I call the attention of the Senator from Washington to this language in this letter which, it seems to me, if he had read it with care and had considered the extent

of its meaning, he would have refrained from presenting to the Senate.

The letter, upon page 3, says:

[Matter withheld, pending decision of question by Senate.]

And again, in the language to which the Senator from North Dakota has called attention, it is said:

[Matter withheld, pending decision of question by Senate.]

Mr. President, I undertake to say that that is language which a Senator standing upon the floor of the Senate would not be permitted to utter with reference to another Senator. That being so, it seems to me a Senator ought not to present a letter from a private citizen which makes those statements.

As a Member of this body, and desirous of maintaining its dignity, I protest against such documents being read into the Record, and I move to expunge the letter from the Record.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I desire to say that my interpretation of this letter is that it asserts that the railroad interests, which it denominates as a monopoly—and that is a very common opinion of the railroad interests; I think there is a common agreement and understanding between the transcontinental railroads of this country; there certainly is as to rates, and they have a monopoly—are simply following the leadership of the Senator from New York. I do not interpret the letter as meaning that the Senator from New York is in any sense a representative of those interests in this matter.

I think it is generally conceded that the speech of the Senator from New York upon this question reopened the matter, and the amount of money that has been used to circulate that speech by the Carnegie board has been the greatest factor in the propaganda upon the British and the railroad side of this question.

I think we can discuss those facts without impugning in any way the integrity of the motives of the distinguished Senator from New York. I disclaim any such reflection upon him, but the facts in the case are patent and obvious to everybody.

The Senator from North Dakota refers to the allegation in this letter that the President has changed his attitude as to the construction of the treaty. The fact that it is well known that he made a speech during the campaign in which he urged the exemption from tolls of coastwise traffic through the canal, and that since that time he has reversed his position upon the subject, is a sufficient answer to the Senator. I do not care to say anything further upon that subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the rule of the Senate provides that—

No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words, impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

In the letter from which the extract has been read repeatedly it is stated that the Senator from New York, in his speech favoring repeal, was leading the forces of monopoly. It does not make any matter how the Senator from Washington interprets it or how I interpret it. That is the statement. That statement would be out of order if made by any Senator on this floor in regard to another, and I hope it will be stricken from the Record.

Mr. WEST. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. When a Senator offers a letter of that character is it not a part of his speech?

Mr. LODGE. It is not a speech at all.

Mr. WEST. I know; but is it not considered a part of his remarks?

Mr. LODGE. Very well, Mr. President; then it is out of order on that ground, but I think the most direct way is to expunge it from the Record.

Mr. WEST. In other words, does not a Senator assume the responsibility of the letter going into the Record and whatever it contains?

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I wish to say that the majority of the people whom I represent are in favor of exemption of tolls for coastwise shipping, yet I have waited for the evidence before deciding what I will do. I am entirely independent and free in the matter, and feel myself so, and stated in my campaign that I would be; that I would vote for what I thought was right, quite regardless of my future political fate or anybody's objections to my course.

In listening to this letter, however, I must say that it struck me that it is an indirect and unfair and insidious attack upon a Senator whom I may oppose in voting on this question, and I do not think it is proper. I think the Senator who puts it in the Record should assume the responsibility for the statement and come out and fight in the open. It seems to me this is an unfair way of "reaching the feelings," if you please, of an opponent, and I think it is not in order.

A short time ago I made some remarks, as Senators may remember, about certain documents being "doctored." They were ruled to be out of order, and I had to take my seat. Yet this is a more serious and insulting thing. It is an insult, and it is an indirect one, and it is put in the Record in such a way that the opponent can not defend himself. I do not like it. While I wish to say that perhaps the majority of the people whom I represent here are in sympathy with the stand taken by the Senator who has introduced the letter, I know they would prefer an open and a fair fight.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I entered the Chamber but a moment ago, and I do not know what is in the letter to which reference has been made, but enough has been said since I came in to give me the substance of the matter about which the discussion proceeds.

I think I ought to say, and I do say, to the Senate that I do not know how the people who own or manage the railroads of the country feel regarding the Panama Canal tolls; but I do know that I have never at any time received any communication, written or verbal, direct or indirect, regarding the tolls upon the Panama Canal, or any exemption or discrimination in those tolls, from anybody connected with the management of any railroad—never. I have no reason to suppose they are not perfectly indifferent on the subject. They may not be; I do not know; but they certainly have indicated to me no interest whatever in the subject.

Mr. President, I believe the course of conduct upon which our country has embarked, unless checked, would dishonor the name of the United States. I care nothing about the interests of England. They are trifling. The one great interest which looms large in my mind in respect of the discrimination as to tolls upon the Panama Canal is the absorbing interest of good faith and honor for our country.

It is because I believe that and feel it with all the depth and strength of my nature that I made the speech I made in January of last year, and that I shall continue, so long as there is a possibility of affecting the action of the United States, to maintain the position I took in that speech.

Sir, I have no wish that our country shall compromise a debt of honor. I do not wish the question settled except it be settled right, except it be settled in accordance with the high standard of good faith which ought to characterize the great American democracy, except it be settled in accordance with the convictions which are entertained and have been expressed to Congress by the present President of the United States, whom I honor for his courage and his response to the dictates of his own conscience.

Mr. President, there is a group of Americans most of whom entertain the same feeling that I entertain and that the President entertains upon this subject. Right or wrong—we may all be wrong or we may be right—we feel alike, we think alike upon this question. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] has referred to that group. They have been brought together fortuitously to act as the trustees of a fund to be devoted to promoting the cause to which we all profess to be devoted—the cause of peace and good will throughout the world. Who are they? Charles W. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard, the great leader of American educators; Joseph H. Choate, the acknowledged leader of the American bar and leader in all good causes of public spirit and philanthropy; Andrew D. White, the founder of Cornell University, historian, scholar, ambassador to Germany, first delegate of the United States to the first peace conference at The Hague; ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, former governor of Virginia; JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, Senator from Mississippi; JAMES L. SLAYDEN, Representative from Texas; Robert S. Brookings, of Missouri; WILLIAM M. HOWARD, of Georgia; Samuel Mather, of Ohio; and a dozen others of the same type of American citizenship.

Have we come to such a pass of official restriction upon American freedom that these men are to be criticized and condemned because, holding opinions and convictions upon a matter affecting the vital interests and the good name of their country, some of them put in writing and print a statement of their opinions and spread it broadcast among their countrymen?

Ah, Mr. President, it is the highest duty of the men who are qualified to be leaders of opinion to be not timid but brave in doing their part in the great public discussions on questions of governmental duty.

These men addressed their countrymen upon the issue of discrimination in tolls upon the canal because they believed it involved the honor and good name of their country. May the time never come when free American citizens shall be afraid to go to the country on such a question. I protest against that righteous action—righteous whether they were right or wrong; righteous because they were performing the high duty of Ameri-

can citizenship in a free Republic—being made the subject of criticism and condemnation in this body of representatives of a free democracy.

I spoke, sir, here with the convictions of a lifetime, which I believe to be sincere and patriotic. I spoke in accordance with the convictions of my life, and I wish the words I said might have been stronger and more compelling of opinion. But such as they were, I wish I could get them to the eyes of every American and carry them into the heart of every American. The Senator from Washington by no devious and side approach of condemnation can drive me off the field of my rights as an American and my duty as a Senator of the United States to say what I believe to be for the honor and the good name of the country we all love.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the Senator from New York necessarily assumes somewhat the position of a leader in any cause in which he interests himself. There is no man within my knowledge who has rendered more conspicuous services to his country than the Senator from New York. I remember most distinctly when we were involved in a war the extent of which at that time we could not estimate or the dangers into which it might involve this country, and after a long period of peace our Army proved to be ill prepared to perform the functions for which an army is maintained, the Senator from New York, through the wisdom of the President at that time, was selected for the great post of Secretary of War. I remember how he brought order out of chaos and made effective what was deficient and ineffective. He has rendered similar service in other great departments of the administration and similar service in this great legislative body.

Now, Mr. President, far be it from me to question the right which the Senator asserts with so much eloquence, the right of the Senator from New York to take whatever position he may see fit to take upon this or any other question which comes within the field of legislative action. But while he asserts the right to take the position which he sees fit to take, I assert the right to take the position which I see fit to take and to criticize, as I claim it, not only on my own behalf but on behalf of every free citizen of this Republic, and to oppose, if we see fit, the great influence which comes from the distinguished services and from the great ability of the Senator from New York.

It is a new doctrine, if I understand aright the position of the Senator from New York, that every citizen of this country is estopped from criticizing the membership of the Carnegie peace board, or whatever the title of it may be, for the policies which they propose and are attempting to put into effect through the money power of enormous wealth which has been sucked, I will say, from the substance of the American people upon what is equivalent to a watered-stock mortgage upon their industries.

Mr. WEST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WEST. I should like to interrupt the Senator for a moment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WEST. Have there not been means employed, too, by those opposed to the bill to influence the Senate in its action?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There have been means employed, I admit, but there have been no improper means employed. There has been no great endowment or anything like that of Mr. Carnegie ranged upon this side of the question that I know of.

Mr. WEST. Well, I will ask the question plainer, then: Has there not been money spent to get the literature before the people? Did not the sending out of wires broadcast over the country require the expenditure of money, and has not that been done by the opposition to the bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I suppose, Mr. President, that individual citizens and organizations here and there throughout the country who are interested in this matter have spent their own money to present their views in sending a few telegrams and letters. There has been no such propaganda as has been carried on by the \$10,000,000 endowment of the Carnegie peace board.

The Senator from New York gives the names of the distinguished gentlemen who compose the executive committee of this board, and they are distinguished, and I have the highest respect for them all. But under whose patronage are they operating? Under the patronage of Andrew Carnegie. As I understand Mr. Carnegie—I have no prejudice against him at all—he is more of a British subject than he is an American citizen in his sympathies. I think he is a laird or landowner in some Scotch county, and takes great pride in the fact and spends a great deal of his time there. I do not regard Andrew Carnegie as a

typical American citizen or as imbued with American traditions or actuated by American ideals. I do understand that the campaign which this board is carrying on is in furtherance of the views of Andrew Carnegie in regard to the Panama Canal tolls and in regard to peace.

As the Senator from New York has said, we are all advocates of peace. What has Mr. Carnegie done for peace? He spent a great deal of money to promote his views ostensibly for peace; but, as a matter of fact, his endowment campaign which he has carried on in behalf of the British contention in this question has done more to put in the breasts of Americans a patriotic resentment against foreign interference in what they consider their own sovereignty than any other influence which has been exerted in a generation. Instead of bringing these two great nations together in harmony and peace and genuine friendship it has carried them apart, and has laid the ground for future differences which may lead to untold troubles.

I believe that this great accumulation of treaties which have been promoted at so much expense and so much persistence by Mr. Carnegie instead of being, as they are denominated, peace treaties, might be called subjects for controversy and difference. Instead of instruments of peace these so-called treaties bind this Government to enter into arbitration about unknown subjects which are held in the womb of the future, and which, if the interests and good sense of our people when they arrive refuse to arbitrate, put us in a position which we are charged with now in this Panama tolls question of repudiating our obligations when we do not repudiate them at all.

The Carnegie Peace Board is not accomplishing its professed object. I believe that it, and likewise the Rockefeller Endowment, just as was disclosed by a document in this RECORD here the other day, which has under its tutelage and is paying the salary of some 600 employees of the United States Government, are an evil influence; that they are perverting the great resources that have been accumulated in ways which have been criticized here and elsewhere from the American people to put into our Government, into our laws, into our international relations not American views but the views of Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. President, so far as this letter is concerned, when I introduced it, as I have stated, I had no intention of introducing any paper which cast any reflection upon any member of this body, and I do not think it was the intention of the writer of this letter. I think it is legitimate for men to use strong expressions, if they see fit to do so, which do not impute improper motives to others. If the expressions which have been referred to are construed as they seem to be construed, I do not desire to leave them in the RECORD. So I will ask leave, Mr. President, to excerpt from this letter the expressions which have been objected to.

Mr. LODGE. I object.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. So do I.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Objection is made, and the question before us, I understand, is the motion of the Senator from Utah to expunge the letter from the RECORD. I confess that I do not want to vote personally upon that matter. May I be allowed to suggest to the Senator that instead of asking leave to withdraw a portion of the letter he ask leave to withdraw the entire letter from the RECORD?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the letter is in the RECORD now. It has been read.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire not to vote upon the motion. I do not want the letter to appear in the RECORD, because I consider it to be a reflection upon a Member of this body. I do not want it directly expunged from the RECORD, because I do not want that action to reflect upon another Member of this body, who upon the floor has declared any intention of disrespect. I think that is a reasonable and a just and a fair disposition of the whole matter. The Senator from Washington has said to the Senate that he intended by the introduction of the letter no disrespect to any Member of this body. Some think there is, as a matter of fact, disrespect. I believe that the best way out of the whole situation is that the letter be withdrawn. It effects the same purpose exactly, and in that way reflects upon no Member of the body connected with the transaction.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I agree fully that it is not proper to read into the Record an attack upon a Member of this body; and yet if we were as punctilious on all occasions as we are invoked to be this morning page after page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this very morning would be expunged. I leave Senators individually to examine the Record to justify my suggestion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire pardon an interruption one moment that I may read one of the rules?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I find, on page 20, Rule XXI, which is as follows:

Any motion or resolution may be withdrawn or modified by the mover at any time before a decision, amendment, or ordering of the yeas and nays, except a motion to reconsider, which shall not be withdrawn without leave.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That does not apply.

Mr. SMOOT. That does not apply to this matter.

Mr. JAMES. It does not apply.

Mr. GALLINGER. In this discussion—and I had not intended to participate in it, and would not had it not been for some words that fell from the lips of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Root]—in this discussion I have been very much surprised to have it said that the President of the United States has not changed his position on the matter of tolls exemption for coastwise vessels.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair inquire, has the Senator from Washington yielded the floor?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I desire to retain the floor. I yielded temporarily to the Senator from New Hampshire. I have no desire to take the Senator from New Hampshire off the floor at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair merely wants to know the status of Senators in this debate. Anything is agreeable to the Chair.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not going to take many minutes of the time of the Senate.

Mr. POINDEXTER. After the Senator concludes I wish to make a further statement and possibly a request in regard to the letter.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have tried to be a careful student of this question, and it is astounding to me that any Senator, or anyone outside of the Senate, should say that there has not been a change of view both on the part of the President of the United States and on the part of many other men in public life. I do not criticize that, but it is a fact, and it is idle to deny that it is not a fact.

Mr. President, what I particularly desire to say, and I shall say it in a very few words, is that the Senator from New York on a previous occasion, as on this occasion, has held up to the country the idea that national honor can only be subserved by the repeal of the tolls clause of the Panama Canal act. Mr. President, some of us are just as sensitive upon this question of national honor as is the Senator from New York. Some of us take exception to that view and hold that we are subserving the national honor to a greater extent by standing by what we conceive to be the rights of the American people as against the protests from Great Britain by resisting the proposition to repeal the tolls clause of the Panama Canal act.

I find no fault with what the Senator from New York has done or said; I find no fault with any Senator for differing from the views I hold; but I do find fault with any suggestion that national honor can only be upheld and promoted by taking a different view from what we took when we passed the Panama Canal act, which was approved by the present President.

I do not know, Mr. President, that I care to find fault with Mr. Carnegie for his \$25,000,000 income pouring into his pockets every year being used to finance a propaganda to spread the views that he and the Senator from New York hold on this question, but I do think it is an unfortunate circumstance, if the charge that has been made in high quarters is true, that the arguments and speeches that have been made for a repeal of the tolls clause of the Panama Canal act have been scattered broadcast throughout Great Britain as well as throughout the United States. If that be true, Mr. President, as I believe it to be true, it is a very unfortunate circumstance indeed.

As to the question of national honor, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] is just as sensitive on that point as can be the Senator from New York [Mr. Root] or any other Member of this body. I was guided to a very considerable extent on a former occasion by the views

expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts as to our right to give exemption to our coastwise ships through the Panama Canal. True, the Senator from Massachusetts then, almost two years ago, as I remember it, voted his convictions, that while we could legally exempt our coastwise shipping, it is not good policy to do it, so that the question of national honor does not apply to those of us who support the free-tolls proposition.

Mr. President, what did the Senator from Massachusetts say on the 17th day of July, 1912? After reciting the fact that he was in London when the second Hay-Pauncefote treaty was written, that he had intimate familiarity with its terms, and with its purposes no doubt, a treaty that he reported to the Senate, the Senator from Massachusetts said:

When I reported that treaty my own impression was that it left the United States in complete control of the tolls upon its own vessels. I did not suppose then that there was any limitation put upon our right to charge such tolls as we pleased upon our own vessels, or that we were included in the phrase "all nations."

That was the view of the Senator from Massachusetts in 1912. He has repeated it in a recent speech of great power and influence. In that same speech in 1912 the Senator from Massachusetts said:

While I am on my feet, if the Senator will allow me, there is one other thing I should like to say. I said in my remarks a few days ago that my personal view was that we had the right to exempt American vessels from tolls. I did not go into the matter. I took a somewhat active part in the two Hay-Pauncefote treaties, as they are called. I voted against the Bard amendment. I voted against it in the belief that it was unnecessary; that the right to fix tolls, if we built the canal or it was built under our auspices, was undoubted. I know that was the view taken by the then Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Davis, who was at that time chairman of the committee. I certainly so stated on the floor. * * * I had that same view in regard to this treaty. I was familiar with the work that was done upon it in London at the time when it was concluded there and finally agreed to, and I was very familiar with it here. Although, as the Senator from Georgia correctly said, the question was not raised at that time, I personally have never had any doubt that the matter of fixing the tolls must necessarily be within our jurisdiction.

Mr. President, when it comes to a question of honor, if that is to be the issue, I submit that when the Senator from Massachusetts announced to the Senate in July, 1912, and has repeated it, that under a treaty that he himself reported to the Senate, with the construction of which he became familiar while in London, those of us who hold that view are just as much entitled to be considered as protecting the honor of the United States as are the Senators who take the opposite view.

I regret, Mr. President, that heretofore, as now, the integrity and the honor of those of us who differ from the great Senator from New York have been by implication called in question before the American people.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator with pleasure.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I only want to say one thing to the Senator from New Hampshire. Of course I realize that those who differ from me in my view of what it is proper to do in regard to the Panama Canal tolls are just as sensitive to the honor of the country and just as patriotic and sincere as am I. I never questioned that for a moment.

The point here, it seems to me—and I will ask the Senator if he does not think so?—is a somewhat narrower one. Here is an imputation of motive in this letter that has been read into the Record as to those who favor repeal. I should regard it as utterly out of order and against the rules of the Senate to have a letter read here saying that those who favor repeal are doing so because they led the ship combine. I should think it was an outrageous thing to do, and such a letter should be expunged from the Record. Here is a proposition read into the Record that one of the distinguished supporters of the repeal is representing the monopolists. I think both would be equally improper. That is the only question I see here.

Mr. GALLINGER. I quite agree with the Senator from Massachusetts on the particular point he has raised. On the other hand, the truth is that the charge has been openly made, and it can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that some of us are promoting the interests of a ship combine; but I care nothing about that. I substantially agree with the Senator from Massachusetts as to the propriety of printing the letter in full. I have taken the liberty to suggest to the Senator from Washington [Mr. Poindexter] that perhaps he ought to withdraw the entire letter from the Record, or at least modify it by striking out the objectionable passages; but whatever may be done in that respect I want to repeat that, inasmuch as this question of honor has again been raised in the Senate, it is proper that some of us who differ from the distinguished Senator from New York and others, should put into the Record the statement that we are quite as sensitive to the matter of na-

tional honor as are those who take the view that the toll exemption in the Panama Canal act should be repealed.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the Senator from New York proceeds, he will permit the Chair to get the record straight. At the time the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] made a motion to strike the communication from the Record, he did not have the floor for that purpose, but was interrupting the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER]. Does the Senator from Utah desire to make that motion now?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do desire to make the motion. I prefer, however, that the Senator from Washington should see his way clear to withdraw the letter.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I notice the Senator from New York has risen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York will be recognized after this matter is disposed of. Does the Senator from Utah renew his motion to strike the letter from the Record?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah. The Senator from New York will proceed.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I rise merely to say that I hope the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] does not think that I intended to impugn the motives or the good faith or the high-mindedness of anyone who differs from me upon this subject. I recognize in the fullest degree the right of differing opinions and the purity of motives and the high sense of honor of those who take the other view. It is as I believe, as I see it, as I think that I speak, and I must leave the Senator from New Hampshire to follow the dictates of his own judgment, as I must follow mine. I should protest as earnestly against any imputation upon the motives of those who differ with me upon this question as I protest against imputations upon my motives.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] ought to be permitted to take from this letter such portions of it as are objectionable, and that we permit the other portions of it to remain. None of us want to see incorporated in the Record anything which will impugn the motives of the Senator from New York [Mr. Root] or those of any other Senator upon this floor. The Senator from Washington offers to take from the letter any such statement that covers what might be regarded as an assault on the character or the motives of the Senator from New York; but, Mr. President, behind this proposition is the right of the American citizen to present his views to the Congress of the United States in the form of petition. This is the only way that he has a right to present them; and when the letter is stripped of the things that it ought not to contain and there are no personal references in it, we ought not to take the step of denying a citizen the right to interpose his views and have them in the Record. If the Senator from Washington proposes to strip the letter of those things which are objectionable, so far as I am concerned I shall resist to the last the taking of this letter out of the Record.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho a question. Does he interpret the right of petition as giving the privilege to a person who writes a communication and sends it here to have it printed in the Record? Must every communication, however abusive it may be, carry the right to be published in this official or semi-official publication?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if a citizen of the United States addresses his Senator in the nature of a petition upon a subject in which he is deeply interested, and desires his communication printed in the Record under the auspices of a Senator, he has a right to have it done. We have been following that rule ever since I have been here, for the last seven years.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. When a Senator rises under the call for petitions, and presents telegrams, letters, and so forth, they are regarded under the rule as petitions from citizens. We have been following that rule; and I am not willing in this instance that any other rule or any other interpretation of the rule shall be put upon this matter.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. I am just as anxious that all personalities be eliminated here as is anyone else; but I do not propose for a moment to consent to the proposition that men shall not have their views presented here by their Senators.

Mr. SUTHERLAND and Mr. CLARK of Wyoming addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, does the Senator from Idaho think that the right of petition includes the right of a citizen to send to this body a petition couched in such terms that it can only be construed as an insult or a reflection upon the integrity of a Senator?

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Utah might have saved himself the necessity of asking that question by having given heed to what I said. I said that the Senator from Washington had proposed to strip the letter of all offensive matter, and that when it is not in an offensive form it becomes such a petition as we ought to receive.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, Mr. President, does the Senator think that this body ought to take the blue pencil and edit the petitions that are sent here by striking out offensive matter, or does he not think that the dignity of the Senate demands that, when such a communication as that is sent to this body, it should be rejected altogether?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think the dignity of the Senate ought not to be so supersensitive as to preclude citizens of the United States from expressing their views upon important subjects.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, if I may be indulged for just a word, I think the right of petition is not a right that is granted by the Constitution at all. The Senator will seek in vain in the Constitution to find any such provision. The constitutional provision is that the right of the people "to petition the Government for a redress of grievances" shall not be abridged, recognizing a preexisting right upon the part of the citizen, and I never have understood that the preexisting right of petition included any right to send to this body or to any other legislative body a petition which insulted the body or insulted a Member of it; and I undertake to say that, so far as I am concerned, I would not consent to the Senate of the United States editing a document of that character by striking out of it such parts as were insulting and permitting the remainder of it to go into the Record.

Mr. GALLINGER. That has been done several times.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I am inclined to think that the Senator from Idaho misjudges the situation in some respects. This is not a petition to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BORAH. I regard it as such.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. If the Senator will yield to me, I will be glad to proceed.

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. As I understand the situation, it is a letter addressed to the Senator from Washington. The Senator from Washington has not presented it as a petition to the Senate of the United States, because if he had done so he would not have asked unanimous consent to have it recorded. The Senator from Washington asked unanimous consent that this letter might be read and placed in the Record, not at all in the sense of a petition, but as giving the views of one of his constituents upon a matter of public concern. There are many of us who, had we supposed the letter contained the language it does, would have objected to giving that unanimous consent.

My objection to the letter lies to the whole letter, to the whole tone of the letter, and therefore I made free to suggest to the Senator from Washington that to let us all out of an unpleasant situation the letter be withdrawn, and in that way no reflection would be cast upon anybody.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, when the offensive matter is taken out of the letter neither the Senator from New York nor his friends nor anyone else can object to it for a moment.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. If the offensive matter had been taken out before the letter was presented, that might have been true, but the whole tone of the letter, the whole subject matter, is offensive to some Members of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. When reference is made to the subject of offensiveness, Mr. President, the campaign which has been carried on by those who are in favor of the repeal of the Panama Canal exemption clause has been quite as offensive as anything found in this letter.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. If the Senator will yield to me just for a moment, I want him to understand that in many respects with the substantive view of the letter I am in thor-

ough accord, and I believe that the policy advocated by the letter is the correct one.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I received a copy of this letter and I read it. There are portions of the letter which did not appeal to me as being either argumentative or at all appealing as to the justice of the position the writer takes; but there are statements and arguments in the letter to which no one can take exception, and which present in a very forceful way the views of those who are against the repeal of the exemption clause.

We have been following the rule here ever since this question came up of introducing this and that matter, this telegram and that letter upon this subject; and if this letter is stripped of its offensive matter, why should we discriminate? You may, of course, say that technically it is not a petition; but if you go back to the days of John Quincy Adams, when he made his fight for the right of petition in the House of Representatives, you will find that he contended that if a communication came to him from the people, however unfortunately it might be expressed or whatever lack of form it might disclose, it was their conception of the manner of exercising that right under the Constitution and of expressing their views upon the question, and that he proposed to have it presented to the Congress of the United States, and he had it presented to the Congress of the United States. That question was all fought out.

Now, let us not be so supersensitive as to preclude that which disagrees with our views while we are anxious to have in the Record that which agrees with them. So long as it is an argument, if we can not meet it by counterargument, let us take the consequences.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there was some statement made by the Senator from New York as to a "side approach" by me in raising this question and of attacking Senators "in devious ways." I overlooked the matter at the time I replied to the Senator's statement, but I think that I ought to call attention to the fact that it is perfectly obvious that there has been nothing done here which is subject to that interpretation. This letter was presented. I am perfectly frank to say that there is some language in it, which my attention has been called to, that I would not have presented had my attention been particularly called to it before I presented the letter. I have offered to eliminate that language; but with or without that language, it is entirely unjustified on the part of the Senator from New York to refer to it as a "side approach." It is a perfectly direct presentation of the matter; and the statements of fact contained in this letter, leaving out of it all personal references to Senators, some of which have been disputed, I believe to be sound.

Reference has been made here to the right of Senators and the right of the President of the United States to change their minds. That is the right of every man. Nobody is questioning it. Yet we seem to be in the position here this morning of being criticized as doing something improper if we call attention to the fact that the President has changed his mind. We have come to a new pass, if that is the rule of propriety or the rule of ethics in the Senate. The statement is even made that the President has not changed his mind and has not reversed his position upon this proposition.

Mr. President, the situation is very much like that when, once before, a Democratic President went into office after a campaign in which he had pledged the American people to protect the sovereignty of the United States in a great area of disputed territory; and yet the first thing President James K. Polk did when he was inaugurated into office was to repudiate the platform of his party and the campaign cry of "Fifty-four forty or fight"; and we have to-day on our northwestern border 380,000 square miles of territory, full of the richest natural resources, which bears in its hybrid name, "British Columbia," the story of the repudiation of a campaign pledge by a great party which was given control of the Government upon the strength of it. Now, are we to be told that we can not call attention to these things; that we can not present here a letter from a citizen, in which he asserts that the President of the United States has reversed his position, without being accused of doing something improper?

Why, what is this campaign? To deny to the United States, the proprietor and builder of the Panama Canal, the privilege of passing its own ships through it under such terms and conditions as our domestic policy may warrant; and yet we are told that the administration has negotiated a treaty with Colombia in which there is given to her the same right which the friends and advocates of this repeal deny to the United States itself.

What has Great Britain to do with the Panama Canal? They say it has rights under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. The Panama Canal was, in large part, constructed before the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was thought of. They say that article 8 of the

Clayton-Bulwer treaty interferes with the free action of the United States with reference to this canal. What does article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty provide? It provides that if there shall be constructed not only a canal but a railroad across the Isthmus—and none but Nicaragua was at that time contemplated—Great Britain and the United States will do—what? Not that they will share it equally; not that they will give the same rights to one as to the other in that railroad or in that canal; but that they will come together and make a treaty with reference to it.

If we are to carry out the provisions of article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which, it is said, are perpetuated by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, then it still remains for the United States and for Great Britain to come together, and, upon the conditions and the circumstances which apply to the two countries at Panama, to make a just agreement in regard to it. My position is that there is no basis of negotiation or subject of joint controversy between the United States and Great Britain with reference to the Panama Canal.

The railroad which is referred to in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was constructed and in operation and doing business and carrying domestic commerce across the Isthmus of Panama for many years before the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was negotiated. Can it be said that article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty applied to that railroad, built by an American company, then acquired by a French company, and then bought by the United States from its then owners?

What did we buy from the French Panama Co. at the Isthmus of Panama for which we paid \$40,000,000? We bought a canal partly constructed. We bought a privilege of completing it, which was still in existence. We bought a railroad which, upon like terms as the canal, was subject to the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Yet, in spite of those palpable circumstances, those who are attempting to preserve the rights which we have purchased, those which have ripened by the completion of this great work, by the expenditure of vast sums of money, by the application to it of the skill and science and capacity of this great Nation, are impugning, it is said, the honor of the United States.

There is abroad in the land, and obvious at every turn in this discussion, the evidences of the effect of money upon our ethics and upon our morals. What is proposed to be done? The United States of Colombia, they say, are unfriendly to us. How do we propose to make them friendly? Why, by buying their friendship; by paying them \$25,000,000 as a salve for their wounded feelings. Great Britain, they say, feels that we have not been punctilious in observing our international obligations when we have settled this question by the enactment of a statute, after a full discussion and after a presidential campaign conducted upon it. How is it proposed that we shall restore the standing of the United States in the estimation of Great Britain? Why, by turning over to Great Britain our rights without questioning whether they are our rights or not.

Mr. President and Senators, I doubt very much whether we can succeed in restoring the respect of the world for the United States, if we have lost it, by any such means. The way to get and retain the respect of foreign nations is by retaining our self-respect. It is by the use of the power of the Government of the United States to its full extent, against whatever power may be asserted against it, to preserve the undisputed rights of the United States. When we do that we will not only preserve our own self-respect, but we will preserve the respect and with it obtain the good will of every respectable foreign country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have reread the letter very carefully. To me it seems to be couched generally in an offensive tone toward all of those who differ with the view taken by the writer; and it also seems to impute to all of us who take a view different than that a motive that is not in the light in which we desire to be placed. Only a very few minutes remain before the unfinished business will be laid before us; and I desire to ask the Senator, after this discussion, if he is now willing to ask that the letter be withdrawn for the reasons that have been urged against it, without questioning at all the motives of the Senator who introduced it. I should like to see it go out before we reach the unfinished business, because if the consideration of that goes on the letter would remain in the Record and be printed, unless the unfinished business should be laid aside to accommodate it. I thought, from what has been said, that the Senator himself was quite willing to do that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I do not like to be precluded from the opportunity, and what has been regarded as

the privilege, of presenting the views of the public upon this question by having them printed in the RECORD. Whatever may have been said as to the original form of the letter, if it is edited by excerpting from it any language which is deemed by any Senator to be personally offensive, I scarcely see how any part of it which merely deals with the subject matter can be offensive; and I therefore think the remainder of it ought to be allowed to be printed. I should like to dispose of it upon that basis.

Mr. McCUMBER. That could hardly be done at this time. The Senator at any future time, or even to-morrow, if he will withdraw it to-day, could then ask to put in such portions as he thinks would not be objectionable to the rule and which he thinks proper to have published in the RECORD. I am asking him if he can not withdraw it, at least for to-day, and then, when he has had time to read the matter over more thoroughly, present such portions as he thinks ought to go in.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am very much afraid that if that course is adopted, in view of some feeling that has been displayed, objection would be made to printing any portion of the letter on to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think so, Mr. President. I think that is, no doubt, true. I do not think any of this letter ought to be put in the RECORD now, and I hope the Senator will either withdraw it all or we will strike out all of it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that is the attitude of the Senator from Georgia; and I desire to say, in view of that—disclaiming, as I have done heretofore, any semblance of a desire to reflect upon the motives of any Senator, and I think my brief record in the Senate will bear me out in that statement—that I do propose, especially in view of what has been said upon this general controversy, to put into the RECORD the greater portion of this letter, which is a perfectly legitimate argument upon this great question which is before the American people.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I recall very distinctly that on more than one occasion during my service in the Senate communications submitted to the Senate have had certain paragraphs eliminated from them by consent, and I really think that would be the best way to solve this problem. If this letter should be stricken out—and it probably can not happen before 2 o'clock—the Senator could read into the RECORD to-morrow the unobjectionable parts of it, and hence those parts would get into the RECORD anyway. So if the Senator were permitted to strike from the letter the parts which I think have been properly objected to, I think that ought to be satisfactory.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have great respect and the most friendly feeling for the Senator from New Hampshire and for his opinions about these matters, and also for the Senator from Wyoming; but in view of what has been said upon both sides of this question, it seems to me there is a mere punctilio as to the disposition that shall be made of the balance of the letter. I am perfectly willing to submit it to any Senator who feels that he is affronted by anything in it, and allow him to exclude from it whatever he thinks proper; but in view of the issue which has been made that we ought to dispose of the matter to-day, I do not care to see printed at all the part which is objected to; and I have understood that at any time after a matter is presented—at least, it has been the practice—the Senator presenting it has the privilege of taking out of it such parts as he sees fit.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if he has made a formal request that the parts that are personal to any Member of this body shall be stricken from the letter, and that the remainder shall be printed? Has the Senator made that request?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; I made it. If it was not sufficiently formal, I make it now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington makes the request that certain parts of the communication which he has heretofore sent to the desk may be stricken out.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to ask who is to be the censor as to what is objectionable? I wish to say, for my part, that I believe this is a perfectly legitimate and proper publication. I need not say again that I am utterly opposed to the repeal of the exemption from tolls and will vote against it.

I have read the Bainbridge Colby letter. On a number of occasions he has addressed large audiences in the State of New Jersey, and very recently one at which a petition was most numerous signed, which I had the honor to present to this body, and which bore as well the signatures of very many other citizens of New Jersey.

God knows I have no personal spite or malice against the Senator from New York, but he has been in an unfortunate muddle and in unfortunate company with this band of—well, I will not say just what I would like to say. [Laughter.] While we wish to defer to his distinguished position and the distinguished State he represents, I feel that there is no reason in the world why the whole truth in this matter should be shut from the ear and the eye of the public.

I should like to know who is to be the censor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from New Jersey that perhaps he well remembers when the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] had a letter read at the desk, and certain portions of that letter were objected to because they referred to certain Senators in this body. He then asked unanimous consent that the parts of the letter that were objectionable should be stricken out; and it was left to the Senator from South Carolina and the Senators to whom offensive reference was made to agree upon what parts were to be stricken out. I think that would be a very proper course to be followed in this case.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. If that course should be pursued, I will not say that I will object; but I trust in view of the widespread sentiment that exists in opposition to the measure the parties who may act as censors will be wisely circumspect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived the Chair will make an announcement. The Chair is dissatisfied with his service here, principally because he has not been able to devise a remedy for the wide latitude of debate in the Senate. In practice many times such a debate as that now going on has been held to be out of order, because Rule VII provides that—

Every petition or memorial shall be signed by the petitioner or memorialist and have indorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, and shall be presented and referred without debate.

But now the debate can not be recalled. The debate is an interesting one and relates to a great question, and the Chair did not feel like interposing an objection to its continuation. Even now the Chair is in doubt as to whether this is a privileged question. A motion has been made to strike out of the RECORD the disputed matter as one which reflects on Senators. It may, however, be very easily disposed of by regarding as something in the nature of a privileged question the motion made by the Senator from Utah to strike it out of the RECORD because it reflects upon Senators. The necessity for deciding this particular question now may be obviated by informally laying aside the unfinished business and by permitting the motion of the Senator from Utah to be finally disposed of.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the unfinished business be informally laid aside.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Let it be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 120) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCUMBER. I simply desire to say that it is the consensus of opinion of Senators around me that the unfinished business should be laid aside that we may dispose of the pending matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That has already been done.

Mr. JONES. I beg pardon. If it requires unanimous consent to lay the unfinished business aside, I shall object.

Mr. LODGE. I move to lay the unfinished business aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the unfinished business be laid aside.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me appeal to the Senator from Massachusetts not to make that motion, because I have no doubt that the motion to lay it aside would carry, and therefore it might change the position it now holds. I hope, therefore, that the Senator from Washington will withdraw his objection. If it is removed from its place and we should adjourn without getting back to it to-day, it would be displaced.

Mr. JONES. I want to keep the Senator's bill in its position before the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am satisfied the Senate wants to dispose of the pending matter now, and I am certain that they would vote in favor of the motion made by the Senator from Massachusetts. I hope the Senator will not put the unfinished business in that position but will withdraw his objection. I appreciate the Senator's kindness and good wishes in the matter.

Mr. JONES. Of course, if the Senator in charge of the bill thinks it would embarrass the bill, I shall not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington withdraw his objection?

Mr. JONES. I will withdraw my objection under those circumstances. I am very much interested in the bill the Senator from North Dakota has in charge.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion of the Senator from Massachusetts is obviated by the announcement of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, nobody is fooling anybody else by this debate. The purpose of the reading into the RECORD of this paper and the purpose of the debate are all perfectly palpable to everybody possessed of common sense. "Tray, Blanche, and Sweetheart" are after the President of the United States as hard as they can bark, and they are not doing him much harm. It is pretty much the same old pack that were after him to defeat him for the nomination, and later on to defeat him for election. He wills and selects his ground tolerably well. What he has said to the American people has rung forth in very clear tones, and they have not misunderstood his words, nor his intention, nor his purpose, nor his spirit, nor his patriotism.

During this debate he has been called "cowardly"; he has been called "pusillanimous"; he has been said to be "unpatriotic"; he has been said to be "anti-American"; he has been said to be "pro-British." When I say "during this debate," I do not mean the debate this morning; I mean the debate as it has taken place in the Senate and outside of the Senate, in the newspapers by interviews with Senators, since the debate began. I have before me now an edition of the Washington Post containing a long statement of one of the Senators in which the President is accused of being all these things, and in addition to that, is accused of being just as mean as if he had committed petty larceny, on the ground that in the pledge of the platform he worked to get into office and then afterwards, not living up to it, repudiated his pledge, and that this amounts to petty larceny, or grand larceny, or something of that sort.

Now, you are not going to change the character of this debate by saying things of that kind. This debate will come down after a while to where the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] fixed it. What was the understanding of the high contracting parties at the time they entered into a solemn international agreement? Not what was his interpretation, not what was mine, not what is the interpretation of the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Michigan, but what was at that time the understanding of the parties themselves when they made the agreement. And then, secondary to that, the American people are going to insist that whatever that coming together of minds was it shall be carried out, regardless of any possible legal quibble as to an interpretation of the words as finally adopted. The President of the United States will stand just as clean in honor, just as clean in patriotism, just as clean in Americanism, as any President of the United States who ever occupied the White House.

I notice here an article, beginning "Brink of defeat and disaster," the intent of which is to scare Democrats to death, and then the fact is mentioned that Senators ROOR and LODGE, although Republicans, are on the President's side and the question is asked whether the Democrats are going to follow them or not. No; they are following us. They are following the President. They are following him because he is right. They are following him because his arguments are unanswerable.

Now, there is no use talking about whether a little stuff put in the RECORD this morning is insulting or not. That has not been half as insulting as a great many other things that have been said. I am not any respecter of persons or of public officials. I would just as soon insult the President of the United States as a policeman or a constable or anybody else if I thought he needed and deserved insult. I am no respecter of anything of that official sort; but in this particular case this particular President has deserved no insult, and the American people will not put up with any to him. He is not pusillanimous. His policy is not cowardly. His policy is not un-American. It is not pro-British. He is representing the very highest and the very best spirit of Americanism in every step which he has taken, and the hounds can not bark him down, because the real kennel in this country is the American people, and they are not barking him down. He stands here representing an

idea, and not only an idea but an ideal, and not only an ideal but the American ideal, and representing it he is going to stand acquitted before the American people in all that thus far he has said and done. The men who imagine that they have invited themselves to an ample field of cheap vote-getting in denouncing him will find themselves mistaken. From Maine to San Diego and from Portland to the southern parts of Florida they will find themselves mistaken.

Every sort of attack has been made upon him. He has been called "cowardly," "pusillanimous," "un-American," "unpatriotic," and "pro-British," and accused of surrendering to the dictates of a foreign power, and all that; and, furthermore, those who have stood by him have been called "sycophantic followers." I find that also in the public press coming from a Senator. When did we become sycophantic? When did any of us become cowardly? When did any of us become pusillanimous? When amongst gentlemen ever in the history of the world was it counted to be cowardly and pusillanimous to give way when you concluded you were wrong, if you were wrong?

Mr. Choate, who negotiated that treaty, says it was his understanding that there must be no discrimination against foreign ships. The gentleman across the border with whom he negotiated it says that that was his understanding. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] tells us that Secretary Hay told him that that was his understanding.

Now, suppose I enter into a contract with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], who is now doing me the honor of listening, and suppose that after he and I have an understanding and a coming together of mind I afterwards go and say, notwithstanding this coming together of mind, some particular language is capable of another interpretation, and I shall carry it into court and have it interpreted there, would that be square? Would that be honest? Would that be right? Would the Senator from Iowa have any respect for me after I had done it?

I voted when this question was up before for this exemption of tolls to our coastwise shipping. I voted for it because from a study of the language of the treaty I thought that I had the legal power and right to do it, and I still think that; but when I find that the coming together of minds was upon a different plane, that the understanding was different, and when I find, moreover that the civilized world differs with me about that interpretation of a treaty, then I plant myself as a Democrat very proudly by the side of the Senator from Massachusetts, Republican as he is.

I am not at all afraid that the Democratic President of the Democratic Party will go down before this sort of an assault. It will take something better than this to bury the President or the party, something better than the plutocratic newspapers of the United States, who for four or five weeks have nothing in their editorial columns except attacks upon the President and upon those of us who support him.

Now, one other word. I am a member of the Carnegie Endowment. Until I was appointed a member of it I had never seen Mr. Carnegie in my life and had never exchanged one word with him. I was appointed, I suppose, because I am a "peace fanatic." I proudly am. "My passion is peace." I do not believe in any sort of war in the world except private war as between me and another man when we are mad with one another and we fight it out and both risk ourselves in doing it.

This attempt to ring old Andy Carnegie into the debate as if he were an independent private nation of some description is on the ground that he has done what? Made millions of dollars by illicit tariff legislation, as all the balance of you did who could. There is not one of you who would not have engaged in any protected industry and made all the money out of it you could have made. It was just as Tom Johnson, of Ohio, said upon the floor of the House in the Fifty-third Congress. Somebody rose and said, "You are denouncing the tariff on steel rails. Have you not made half a million dollars or more out of the tariff on steel rails?" He said, "Yes; and I am going to keep on making it, too, as long as the people of the United States are fools enough to leave this law upon the statute book."

I am not defending Andrew Carnegie; I do not care anything about him one way or the other; but some of you seem to think that the Carnegie Endowment is subject to his influence or his power, and that he tells us what to do. He does not.

In so far as the circular which went out from certain members of the Carnegie Endowment is concerned, I did not sign that. I refused to sign it, because I did not agree with the reasoning contained in it, and because I felt it was improper for the endowment as a body to engage in current American politics. So far as I am concerned, therefore, no attack can be made upon

me about that; but these other gentlemen did sign it, and they signed it as citizens of the United States. They had just as much right to do it as the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from Missouri have a right to sign a public circular to-morrow. I did not sign it, because I did not agree with it. I did not agree with its reasoning, and I did not agree with the idea that we ought as members of that endowment to sign anything of any description in connection with current politics or international affairs. But to deny to Senator Root, for example, or to any other man who happens to be a Senator the right to sign any circular that he chooses, presenting any argument that he chooses in connection with a public question is the veriest tyranny, and you know that as well as I do. There were five of us who did not sign it.

Now, as to this talk about British dictation, do you suppose you can scare any self-respecting man with that sort of talk? You certainly can not scare any man who is of a breed that wore the American uniform against the British when the British Government was wrong and when we were right. What right has anybody to assume that, simply because the blood in a man's veins is Welsh, or English, or Scotch, and is not Irish, or German, or Slav, or Polack, therefore that man is un-American? I take it, Mr. President, that those of us who have English and Welsh and Scotch blood in our veins have as much right to be proud of it as those who have Polack, or Slav, or German, or Irish blood in their veins. But you will never catch us calling ourselves Welsh-American, or British-American, or Scotch-American, or something else. We are plain American citizens, and we have severed our allegiance to Great Britain too many hundred years ago to talk about it even.

But when you come to try to appeal to me to indulge in an argument of hatred to Great Britain, or hatred to England and to Scotland and to Wales and to Ireland, I decline to indulge in it. Their law and ours is the same; their literature and ours is the same; their language and ours is the same, and it is the noblest tongue that God ever permitted any human being to speak or write. Their ethics of commerce and ours are the same. There is nothing more dangerous in the world than to cultivate the idea that you must or must not do something because it helps or hurts some other foreign people to whom you bear no allegiance, from whom you dread no harm, for whom you bear no partiality. I do not forget that William Shakespeare was the prince of poets, that Francis Bacon was the prince of philosophers, that Huxley and Darwin and Tyndall and Sir Isaac Newton were princes of science, that Gladstone and various other great men in Great Britain, as well as various other great-men of the English-speaking race, have been princes among the diplomats and governors of the world; and while I bear no hatred for any other man or any other lineage, I positively decline to apologize for my own. I am proud of the Ridley English in me, I am proud of the Allison Scotch, I am proud of the Sharp Scotch-Irish, I am proud of the Welsh Williams, and all of them to this extent only, that none of them were ever very great and none of them were ever perfectly contemptible; but at any rate I decline to apologize for the fact that I am not a hyphenated American, and I decline to join in any kennel that is unloosed upon the President of the United States denouncing his followers as pusillanimous and cowardly and un-American and pro-British, and as a blind surrender to Great Britain, and all that sort of namby-pamby nonsense.

There is not a sensible man within the sound of my voice who does not know that the President is not "cowardly," that he is not "pusillanimous," that his followers in this body are not "sycophants." We are doing what we are doing because, whether right or wrong, we think it right, and we are going to continue to do it.

I might, if I wanted, fill the Record with utterances from the Washington Post during the last three or four weeks, part of them quoted from Members of this body, not arguing only against the President of the United States, but grossly insulting him all the time. I do not care whether the letter which has been proffered by the Senator from Washington is expunged from the Record or not. I do not think it will add much to the undignified and insulting arguments or pretensions to arguments which have already been made and become either a part of the Record or of the public prints.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, however broad we may consider the right of petition to be under the Constitution, there is not a word in the Constitution that provides that any petition shall be printed in the Record. The issue that we have before us does not involve the right of petition. It is the right to print in the Record. Letters and petitions are printed in the Record by the unanimous consent of the Senate under our rules. The Senate unanimously agreed this morning, out of courtesy to the Senator from Washington when he asked it,

that a letter which he presented and wished printed in the Record might be printed in the Record. The privilege of printing did not follow on the theory that the Constitution gave a citizen a right to present his petition to the Senate. It was an entirely different procedure. It was a consent, after the letter was presented, to print in the Record because the request was made by the Senator from Washington.

When we heard the paper we found that it contained statements many Senators did not wish printed in the Record and which a Senator should not use on the floor with reference to other Senators and which certainly an outsider ought not to have the right by simply writing it in the shape of a letter to a Senator to put into the Record.

I object not only to the language used with reference to the Senator from New York, but I object to the general style of reference by this writer toward those of us who intend to vote to make the coastwise vessels pay tolls. There is not a statement of fact in the letter; there is not an argument in the letter. There is a style of cheap language intended to be an appeal to the public critical and discourteous toward those who differ from the writer.

I do not think that kind of matter ought to be put into the Record in the shape of letters. I do not believe that that style of argument should be used upon the floor of the Senate; not that I think it does the party criticized any harm. My custom has usually been when an opponent, whether a letter writer, a newspaper, or a speaker, indulges in that species of critical language, to pass it by, satisfied, as I am, that it is more calculated to injure the writer or the speaker than it is the person criticized. But to permit it to be placed in the Record by unanimous consent is quite different from merely ignoring it.

I really think the Senator from Washington owes it to those of us who consented to let the letter be read because he wanted it done, now that he finds we do not consent, to withdraw it. I think that is really what he owes us, because any one of us could have kept the letter out, and we did not do so, because he desired it in. I think the rule ought to be with regard to these communications which we permit to be printed in the Record by unanimous consent, as we begin to hear them read if any Senator objects to them the reading ought to stop, and they ought not to go into the Record.

Mr. WEST. Mr. President, one great trouble about that is that a great deal of stuff goes into the Record without ever being read.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would not say that was true. We do not often allow anything to go into the Record in the Senate without reading. We do not allow a great deal of it. We usually require matter read which goes into the Record.

Mr. WEST. I disagree with the senior Senator from Georgia, because time and again since I have been here matter has gone into the Record without having been read.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not say that is not true sometimes; but the practice is not usual to allow matter put into the Record that is not read.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course nothing could go into the Record without being read, unless by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. SMOOT. For about five or six years I tried very hard, indeed, to keep a great bulk of this stuff out of the Record. I also tried very hard, indeed, to stop the promiscuous publishing as public documents of every speech that was delivered by every man in any part of the country upon any particular subject that he might desire or think ought to be presented to the people; but I have almost become discouraged, Mr. President. I think we ought to be a little more careful in giving unanimous consent to have printed in the Record articles from outside sources.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think it is true that within the past two years the rule requiring matter which goes into the Record to be first read has been relaxed a good deal, and that has been so especially during the past 12 months.

Mr. WARREN. More than ever before.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes. I know the first year I was in the Senate very little went into the Record that was not read.

Mr. WEST. I will state to the Senator that both the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] in their speeches have incorporated matter that they did not even read here, and it was not read at the desk.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall not make a speech to-day upon the question of charging coastwise vessels for going through the Panama Canal. The letter which has been read undertakes to charge all Senators who are in favor of making the coastwise vessels which go through the canal

pay tolls with seeking to foster a monopoly; it undertakes to attribute the movement largely to the activities of the railroads which are interested in the subject. That is a very unjust and a very unfair style of discussion.

I would not for a moment suggest that the Senator from Washington was in favor of allowing the coastwise vessels to go through the Panama Canal free in the interests of the two corporations which control most of them. The report of the Alexander committee, of the other House, has recently shown that our coastwise vessels not owned by railroad companies are practically in the hands of two companies; that these two companies have a gentleman's agreement eliminating competition; and that they are making more money than is made by nearly any other corporation in the country.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. NELSON. Can the Senator from Georgia give the names of those two companies?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can not give their names; I do not recall them; but they are given in the report.

Mr. NELSON. I think the Senator is right in his statement, but I merely wanted to have the names of the companies given.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can not give the Senator the names at this time; but, I repeat, they are in the report of the Alexander committee. The names of all the companies and the agreements between the companies are printed, and the final conclusion is reached that, barring those ships controlled by the railroads, practically all the balance of the vessels engaged in coastwise transportation are controlled by two corporations. Then the statement is made that a gentleman's agreement exists between them by which they do not actually compete, but that they visit different ports and at different times. So the business is distributed between them.

Yet we might just as fairly charge the Senator from Washington with serving the prosperous corporations holding a monopoly of the coastwise transportation as can his letter writer charge that Senators who wish all vessels to pay tolls are influenced by monopolies.

The charge of the letter writer is unfounded and very improper.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, upon that point the Alexander committee shows very clearly that the transcontinental railroads control a very considerable number of the vessels engaged in the coastwise trade and that the railroads control—I will not say the transcontinental railroads—but that the railroads control all of the through business upon the Great Lakes; that as to those vessels which engage in the coastwise trade that might take them through the canal a large number of those vessels are controlled by the transcontinental railroads, and that substantially all the rest of the vessels, while they are owned by numerous companies, those companies are tied together by a system of interlocking directorates and stock control, which practically puts them under one management. There is a map showing the lines of connection between these different companies, and they are so numerous and cross and recross each other at so many points that the map becomes a curiosity and the eye can hardly follow the numerous lines. I say, in consonance with what the Senator has said, that I think there is not a doubt on earth that all of those vessels are practically in one combination.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, a little later I hope upon the floor of the Senate to present fully the status of these companies. We all know that they are protected against competition with foreign-owned vessels; we know that no vessel which floats any but the flag of the United States can engage in our coastwise trade; we know they are given a monopoly of the business by our statutes, which prevent foreign-owned vessels from doing any coastwise trade. This report shows clearly from them that they have been most prosperous. I am glad that they are prosperous. It can also easily be shown that the Panama Canal will be of vast benefit to them not only in the saving of time and in the matter of convenience, but the lessened cost of transportation will be from two to three dollars per cargo ton. The tolls proposed to be charged are from 40 cents to 80 cents per cargo ton.

Mr. President, I would not wish to introduce a letter dwelling upon these facts and saying that the Senator from the State of Washington had lined up behind this monopoly engaged in the coastwise trade, and undertake to reflect upon his conduct upon the theory that he was moved solely by the desire to serve this coastwise monopoly. I know he is not. If I had introduced

that kind of a letter and obtained the consent of the Senate to introduce it, and the Senator suggested that he objected to it, I would withdraw it.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. I did not hear read the letter which the Senator is discussing, but I have great confidence in the judgment of the Senator from Georgia. In the opinion of the Senator would the matter stated in that letter, if it had been used on the floor of the Senate in discussion or in an address, be objectionable?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think part of the letter would have been objectionable if the language contained therein had been used by a Senator on the floor, and that such Senator could have been called to order for it. I think other portions of it, to which I suggested an objection, might not reach the degree of impropriety, if used by a Senator, that would necessitate his being called to order; but I went beyond the mere language which would bring a Senator to his seat if called to order, and indicated a further objection to it in that it seeks to generally cast an aspersion upon Senators that they are simply backing a great monopoly and are moved by that purpose rather than an earnest desire to find out what is right.

Mr. KENYON. I heard on yesterday, Mr. President, the motives and patriotism of practically every Senator on this side of the Chamber—but one, I think, was excluded—assailed in a speech on this floor. If the motives of Senators are to be assailed, I really believe that it would come with better grace to have them assailed by those outside of the Chamber than those within it. While I hope this letter may be withdrawn, I feel that it goes no further than did the remarks that were made yesterday on this floor.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is this difference: Where a letter requires unanimous consent in order to be read into the Record, if we allow that kind of language used, we all become a party to it; while if one Senator sees fit to use language improperly severe with reference to another Senator, he alone is responsible for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND].

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I was merely going to ask the question as to whether the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] had made a request since the laying aside of the unfinished business to withdraw this letter. Did I understand the Senator to make such a request?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Before the Senator from Washington answers, I want to make one further statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield, and to whom?

Mr. BORAH. I have yielded the floor until Senators get through.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has yielded to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not think that I was encroaching upon the Senator from Idaho. I am perfectly willing to take my seat.

Mr. BORAH. I yielded the floor to the Senator, and I am perfectly willing to do so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, before the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] answers the question of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] I want to add to what I said a little while ago with reference to modifying the letter. If the Senator from Washington eliminates all that was objectionable from the letter, I do not think I will object to his presenting the balance of it to-morrow; but I think there is a great deal of it in a style of expression and in a tone of insinuation reflecting upon those Senators who are going to vote to make the coastwise vessels pay tolls, reflections that the Senator himself would not use in debate.

Mr. WEST. Mr. President, I should like—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WEST. I should like to ask my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia, a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield in a moment. So that all Senators may know just exactly the situation as to what is before the Senate, I ask the Senator from Washington if he has requested

the withdrawal of the letter since the unfinished business was laid aside?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I have not made any such request since then; in fact, I have not made it at all. I did request what the Senator from Georgia referred to, to eliminate from the letter such portions of it as contained any personal reference to Senators. My intention in reading this letter was concentrated upon the question of the canal tolls. I had not noticed, in fact, except in the most casual way, any reference to Senators. I know Mr. Bainbridge Colby, who wrote this letter and who is a very distinguished lawyer in New York, and from my knowledge of him I am satisfied that it was not his intention to make any insinuation of improper conduct against any Member of the Senate. I think he simply intended to point out in a forceful way the position which Senators had taken with reference to this question and the interests that were involved in it. I did request to be allowed to withdraw certain portions of this letter.

Mr. SMOOT. And that request was denied?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think it has been put to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was objection by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I objected to this letter, not alone because it selected certain Senators for criticism, but because the tone of the entire letter is insinuating and insulting to all of those who take a view different from that which is expressed by the writer of this letter, and as such it ought not to have gone into the Record at all. The first two paragraphs place all of those who disagree with the writer—

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. McCUMBER. In just a moment—in the position of fostering the interests of some monopoly or some railroad interest, or something of that character, and I can not find a single paragraph in the letter that is not along that same line.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, what I rose to ask the Senator from North Dakota was that he be kind enough to read those portions of the letter which are objectionable. I regret to say that I did not hear the letter read, and so I am ignorant of its contents.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, Mr. President, I do not care about going over the letter. The whole letter has been read into the Record; but the very first portion of it is:

First. That the reasons assigned by the repealers for the surrender of our rights in a matter of purely domestic regulation, such as the exemption of American coastwise shipping from toll payment, have been abandoned, one after the other, until the repeal is now sought on the ground that the forces behind the repeal—

I do not know what is meant by "the forces behind the repeal," but of course there is an insinuation of what those forces are when you follow the letter through—merely want it. They have fixed their desires upon it, and their "arguments" are now only reiterated requests for what they want.

Second. That the interests of monopoly, or of subsidy, or of special privilege—call it what you like—are fighting on the side of repeal.

The inference being that those who are battling in favor of this bill are necessarily in alliance and in connection with those interests. That sentence standing alone might not be given that construction; but if you will read the whole letter, you can not give it any construction different from that.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I have heard him use language in the debate which was to the effect that those of us who are favoring tolls exemption were favoring certain monopolies and certain monopolistic interests. That is the view which each side seems to entertain of the other side.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just by way of illustration, and to put this matter in its real, true light, I recall during the speech of the Senator from North Dakota on the general question a very striking statement, which arrested my attention at the time, something to the effect that the proposition to exempt domestic ships from the payment of tolls in the canal was burglary upon the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; I said the effect of that was burglary upon the Treasury of the United States; but I have accused no Senator or anyone else taking a different view from mine of being impelled by any motives other than those that are perfectly honorable; nor have I assumed that they, in expressing their views, were but the servants or the agents of any monopoly, and that is what this letter intimates as to those who favor the repeal of the exemption clause.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator will allow me, the necessary implication of the Senator's remarks was that all those who are aiding and abetting the exemption of American coastwise ships from the payment of tolls would be accessories before the fact of burglary.

Mr. McCUMBER. O Mr. President, the Senator can not bring any remarks that I made and put them upon a parallel with these in their intent or purposes.

I objected to the letter also upon the ground that from the beginning to the end the statements were false as to the position of those Senators and others who favored the repeal, and especially as to the President himself. I want to call the Senator's attention to one thing that I said was an unjust, unfair, and false accusation. It reads thus:

The statement with which the President introduced the question to the consideration of Congress, that the exemption of our coastwise shipping from toll payment is "in plain contravention" of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, is heard no more.

He says that the President has abandoned that position, and proceeds:

That the force of this proposition is felt by the repealers is shown by their shift from an appeal to "honor" to an appeal to our magnanimity. To use the phrase of the President, we ought to reverse our action without raising the question whether we were right or wrong, so that "we may deserve our reputation for generosity."

The President has not shifted his position, as the Senator from Washington and every other Senator knows. No Senator who has taken the view that I have upon this question has shifted his position at all. I have taken the position squarely that it was a question of honor with us to fulfill a contract obligation, and I believed that that was the only construction that should be given to that contract.

There is quoted in this letter the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] upon that question, but only a portion of it is quoted, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] quotes a portion of the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts as the basis of a reason why we should not vote for the repeal. I want to put into the Record right now the final conclusion of the Senator from Massachusetts, which should have followed that portion which was given by the Senator from New Hampshire, and I want to insert it at this point, so that we may see whether the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts was an argument that we were not bound in honor to give to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty a construction in accordance with the views that were given at the time it was adopted and as understood by both parties to that contract.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. I will state to the Senator that my purpose in rising is to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STONE. I should like to know whether this debate is proceeding by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would say yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. It has been proceeding on that line, and under the circumstances I ask that the Senator allow me to have inserted and read a single paragraph of the address made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I ask that it may be inserted as an answer to the deduction drawn from that address by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. STONE. Undoubtedly there will not be any trouble about that. I wish now to say that unless the debate on this comparatively unimportant question concerning this letter is very speedily concluded I shall make the point of order.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hardly think the point of order can be made, because I asked unanimous consent to lay aside the unfinished business, so that this matter might be discussed. Therefore I think its discussion comes within the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is another rule that might dispose of it. If any Senator should address the Chair more than twice on this proposition, his attention would be called to that rule before a great while.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think I have addressed the Senate more than twice.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is it not true that the Senate has given unanimous consent that this matter shall proceed until it is concluded, and then return to the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the fact.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is my understanding.

Mr. JONES. I understood that this matter was taken up on motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the unfinished business was temporarily laid aside, with direction to continue the consideration of the pending matter until disposed of.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. McCUMBER. In just a moment. Let me ask that this extract from the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts may be read, and then I will yield the floor.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, let me say before that proceeds that if this debate is going to be shortened by parliamentary tactics, I shall call for the regular order, and we will get this matter up so that we can discuss it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It can not be shortened by parliamentary tactics, because the Senate, by unanimous consent, has agreed that it shall go on.

Mr. BORAH. If that is the view of the Chair, as well as that of the Senator from Connecticut, it is all right.

Mr. STONE. I should like to have the Record read on that. I do not think that a unanimous-consent request to lay aside the unfinished business in order that a particular matter before the Senate may be proceeded with can be considered as a unanimous-consent agreement for the indefinite consideration of that matter. If the matter itself were the subject of a point of order, then the mere incident of laying aside the unfinished business that the Senate might proceed with the matter by unanimous consent would not prevent a point of order being interposed. But, in any event, I should like to know exactly what the observation of the Senator from North Dakota was at the time the unfinished business was laid aside. I will not press it just now; I will not interrupt the proceeding now, except to say that it seems to me that practically three hours of time consumed in the discussion of a matter that all of us must admit is of very secondary importance is quite enough. We are delaying other public business here of real importance and wasting the time of the Senate. I give notice that if a point of order will lie against this procedure, unless Senators in charge of the matter now pending shall conclude it at a very early moment, I shall certainly do anything I can to put an end to it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota has requested the reading of a certain document which has been sent to the desk.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understood the Senator from North Dakota yielded to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I simply wish to say, with reference to the remark of the Senator from Missouri that this is a comparatively unimportant matter, that I do not so regard it. I think that where a slander is perpetrated by an outsider upon one of the most distinguished Senators in this body, and introduced here, the Senate not knowing what it was giving unanimous consent to, and put in the printed and enduring record of the proceedings of this body, whether it shall be expunged or not, is not a trivial nor an unimportant matter. I think it is a matter of the highest privilege.

Mr. REED and Mr. JONES addressed the Chair.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask for the reading of the matter I send to the desk before I yield the floor.

Mr. JONES. Before consent is given to the reading I wish to ask the Senator a question. One of the criticisms the Senator makes against this letter is that it is a part of the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], but not all. Now, as I understand, the Senator asks to present part of it, and not all.

Mr. McCUMBER. I asked to present the other side of the matter already presented by the Senator from New Hampshire, because, while that presented one of the views of the Senator from Massachusetts, I thought it was very proper that the views upon which he based his conclusions should be also inserted, in order that we might the better understand what his views were. I think the Senator will agree with me that that is not only justice to him, but justice to those who agree with him on his conclusions.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, suppose it is expunged from the Record—then what happens?

Mr. McCUMBER. The argument is not expunged; it will be only the letter.

Mr. JONES. Is it the Senator's position that the Senator from Massachusetts does not clearly argue and clearly express the opinion that our action in exempting coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls is not a violation of the treaty? Does the Senator contend that the Senator from Massachusetts takes any other position than that upon our action, so far as it affects the treaty?

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will just listen to the reading of this—

Mr. JONES. No; that is exactly what I want to have determined. If the Senator takes that position—

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly I do; certainly.

Mr. JONES. Then I object to the reading of the speech unless all of it is read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We must conform somewhat to our rules. Does the Senator from Washington object to the reading by the Secretary of the document sent to the desk by the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JONES. I do, unless the entire speech of the Senator from Massachusetts is read.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will ask, then, for the return of the matter, in order that I may read it myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be returned to the Senator, who can read it himself.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McCUMBER. Just as soon as I finish this.

Mr. SMOOT. Just for a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the Senator whether he reads this to impugn the motives of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator knows me well enough to know that I impugn the motives of no Senator. It is not necessary for the Senator from Utah to ask that question of the Senator from North Dakota. He will look through the Record a long time before he will ever find an instance in which I have intentionally impugned the motives of a Senator. I have tried to be extremely careful in that respect.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the reason I asked the question was this: The Senator from New Hampshire referred to the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts for the purpose of showing that the motives of those who believe in exemption from tolls and who are against the repeal should not be impugned, and he quoted a part of the Senator's speech for the reason that improper motives had been imputed to the Senator from New York by the writer of the article asked to be printed in the Record. What I thought was that if now another part of a speech of the Senator from Massachusetts were read, it would be for some purpose, and I had no intention whatever of imputing to the Senator from North Dakota anything wrong, but thought to read a part of a speech to disprove the statement that the Senator from North Dakota was impugning the motives of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator knows that I would never, under any circumstances, impugn the motives of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been out of the Chamber from necessity for a little while; but I wish to say that I read from the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] of July 17, 1912, and I listened very attentively to the Senator from Massachusetts in his recent speech, and I understood him to say distinctly that he had not changed his views as to the right of our Government to exempt from the payment of tolls our coastwise vessels. I think I must have heard him correctly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understood the Senator correctly, and the Senator from New Hampshire states his position exactly correctly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator is about to quote from the speech of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I wish to ask the Senator if he indorses the position of the Senator from Massachusetts upon the tolls question?

Mr. McCUMBER. I stated that I indorse his conclusion. I stated that before.

The Senator from New Hampshire presented the view of the Senator from Massachusetts, which view was to the effect that taking the treaty by itself he could construe it, and did con-

strue it, to give us the right to differentiate in favor of our own vessels in the matter of tolls. That was correct. That was the position of the Senator from Massachusetts. He also stated, however, in connection with the same bill, that the other countries of the world did not view the matter in that light; that it was very questionable whether his own view was right; and that he gave the reason which I shall now read why his conclusion was that as a matter of national honor, from his standpoint—not from the standpoint of anybody else, not from the standpoint of the Senator from New Hampshire or from mine, but from his standpoint—we were still in honor bound to give it that construction. That is what I wish now to put into the Record in order fully and explicitly to place the Senator's position correctly before the people.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I take it the Senator does not argue that the Senator from Massachusetts, in his speech of July 17, 1912, made the observation which the Senator is about to make?

Mr. McCUMBER. No.

Mr. GALLINGER. That must have been in his speech of this year.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should have stated that if the Senator had allowed me.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a discovery the Senator has made since he made his speech in 1912.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; I must say I do not think the Senator from Massachusetts discovered it after that, because I think he has indicated that he had that view all along, as far as the understanding of the other parties is concerned.

I read from the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] on page 17:

I now come to another point which weighs very strongly with me in deciding against giving relief from tolls to American ships by the method employed by the canal act. Whatever our opinion may be as to the strict legal interpretation of the rules governing the matter of tolls imposed upon vessels passing through the canal, we can not and we ought not to overlook the understanding of those who negotiated the treaty as to the intent and effect of the rules which they framed. As to the nature of the understanding we have direct testimony. Mr. Henry White, who first laid before the British Government the desire of the United States to enter into negotiations for the supersession of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, has stated that Lord Salisbury expressed to him the entire willingness of England to remove all obstacles which the Clayton-Bulwer treaty put in the way of the construction of the canal, and desired only to maintain equality of tolls imposed upon all vessels, including those of the United States. Mr. Choate, who, as I have said, completed the negotiations which resulted in the second Hay-Pauncefote treaty, has publicly stated that the understanding at that time of both parties was the same as that given by Mr. White. The only other American concerned in the actual negotiations of the treaty was the late Mr. Hay, at that time Secretary of State. I know that Mr. Hay's view was the same as that of Mr. Choate and Mr. White. It is therefore clear on the testimony of our three negotiators that the negotiations as they were begun and as they were completed in the second Hay-Pauncefote treaty proceeded on the clear understanding that there was to be no discrimination in the tolls imposed as between the vessels of any nation, including the vessels of the United States.

I am well aware that an understanding of this sort, although an aid perhaps to interpretation, does not bind legally. But there is such a thing as honor in agreements and transactions between nations as there is in agreements between individuals.

That is the conclusion of the Senator from Massachusetts upon the duty that is now confronting us—not that we are legally bound, but that under all the circumstances, the parties to the contract understanding it in a certain way, we are in honor bound to give it the construction which both parties understood at the time they adopted it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me at that point to read another brief extract from the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator can read any of it he sees fit. I stated as clearly as I could that the Senator from Massachusetts took the position that under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty we were not bound to refrain from discrimination in favor of our own vessels. No part of his quoted argument would make it stronger than I have stated it.

Mr. JONES. I understood the Senator, in answer to a question of mine, to say that the Senator from Massachusetts did not take the position that we had the right to exempt our coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no; on the contrary, he did take that position, as stated by the Senator from New Hampshire and as quoted from him, both in his speech in 1912 and in his recent speech; but he stated further that the parties to the agreement had both given it a different construction, and indicated in that portion of his speech which I have quoted that he therefore felt we were in honor bound to give the agreement a construction which the parties to it gave when they adopted it.

HAY-PAUNCEFOTE AND HAY-BUNAU-VARILLA TREATIES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, in response to the resolution of the Senate of the 14th instant, a report of the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in relation to the negotiation and application of certain treaties on the subject of the construction of an interoceanic canal.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 24, 1914.

(Inclosures, as stated.)

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, after making at once the point that I purposed to make, I desire, at the conclusion of the call, to move an executive session; but before making that motion I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Borah	Hollis	Page	Smoot
Brady	Hughes	Poindexter	Sterling
Brandeggee	James	Ransdell	Stone
Burleigh	Jones	Reed	Sutherland
Burton	Kenyon	Robinson	Thornton
Cañon	Kern	Saulsbury	Tillman
Chilton	Lea, Tenn.	Shafroth	Vardaman
Clapp	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Sherman	Weeks
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Shields	West
Fall	McLean	Shively	Williams
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Mich.	Works
Goff	Overman	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. PAGE. I am requested to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE], the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] are necessarily absent on business of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That fact will be noted.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY], who has a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KEEN]; also the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], who has a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. GRONNA], who has a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. ROBINSON. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] on important business of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present.

Before anything further is done, the Chair desires to make an announcement. The Chair announced the reference of a communication from the President, together with accompanying documents, to the Senate Committee on Interoceanic Canals. He is now advised by the Secretary that in view of the nature of certain documents accompanying the message it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Unless there is objection, that will be done.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, on that very matter, do I understand that the Chair has referred the whole matter to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not look through the documents to select the different ones.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If I may be pardoned for doing so, I will state that the documents are sent in response to a resolution which I introduced as a member of the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, which is now holding hearings upon the bill to which the treaties relate. I do not know what caused the Chair to change his mind about the reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are documents here which have not been made public.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If the President of the United States, in responding to the resolution, considers it not incompatible with the public interest to send them to the Senate, need they go to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was the Chair's impression that they should have gone to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, but, representations having been made to the

Chair as to the character of the documents, the Chair has been constrained to change the reference.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was out of the Chamber at the time, and did not know such representations had been made. I asked for information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reference will be to the Committee on Foreign Relations, unless there is objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. STONE. Without printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without printing, of course.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I rise to a personal explanation. I have understood since coming into the Chamber that the RECORD seems to disclose that I made objection to the request of the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] to strike from the letter certain words which are considered offensive. I desire to say that I did not make that objection, technically speaking. I did say that I hoped the Senator would withdraw the whole communication, and that unless it were withdrawn I should feel like voting for the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND].

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to state that while I was occupying the chair a few moments ago the inquiry was made whether objection had been made to the request of the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] for unanimous consent to insert the letter with certain parts stricken out. I stated that objection had been made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], and so understood it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection was made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, in order to remove any misapprehension in regard to the matter, I will repeat the statement that I do not desire to have printed in the RECORD anything which is deemed offensive or which by any reasonable interpretation can be so construed. Therefore I again make the request to withdraw certain portions of this letter which are deemed offensive, and I will state that I am perfectly willing to abide by the advice of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] as to what should be eliminated from it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion before the Senate is that of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to strike out the entire communication presented by the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and read by the Secretary. The Chair presumes that might be amended so as to move to strike out certain parts of the communication that may be indicated hereafter.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think my request could be granted by unanimous consent, and I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the communication.

I think a petition to the Senate should be received, if it is couched in respectful language, and referred to a committee. I should not object in the case of ordinary matters to letters or petitions being printed in the RECORD. I gave notice a few days ago that there were so many people writing pamphlets and arguments on the Panama Canal tolls matter that if Senators should be allowed to print them in the RECORD a large portion of the morning hour every day, as has happened to-day, would be consumed, first, by the reading of lengthy communications, and then by a precipitation of debate on the floor upon the merits of the canal-tolls question.

That is what has happened here. I should have objected to this or any other paper on this subject being printed in the RECORD had I been on the floor this morning when it was presented. I was detained elsewhere by my public duties. When I did arrive, I asked what was being done, and was informed that unanimous consent had been given.

When Senators gave unanimous consent that this document should be read from the desk, and hence read into the RECORD, they did not know what it contained. They were granting a courtesy to the Senator from Washington. I not only regard this document as specifically slanderous as to a particular Senator, but I think its whole tone is unworthy of a respectful petition to any legislative body.

If it is the sense of the Senate that they want to pass this document around, quibble as to what is particularly offensive to each Senator and what he wishes to go out, and then have the shreds and remainder of it go in here in that expurgated form, they can vote to do so. I think this so-called petition ought to be refused admission to the RECORD. It is not really a petition. It is a circular letter, addressed to Senators, not even mentioning the Senators by name, simply "Dear sirs," slipped into the mails, one of them presented here not from the constituent of the Senator who presented it, and permission

asked to have it printed in the RECORD. It is a circular from a constituent of the Senator from the great State of New York, presented here by a Senator from the Pacific coast, and printed in the RECORD, containing a direct attack upon the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just on that point I should like to explain that the letter was sent out by a committee, and that a portion of the membership of the committee are constituents of mine.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That I did not know; but it does not change the fact that the letter contains the official heading of some association organized, I assume, to take sides in this controversy and contains the names of some of the officials. It is signed by Bainbridge Colby, a gentleman of whose acquaintance I have not the pleasure. The question for the Senate to decide in this matter is if this letter, couched in terms which have been read to the Senate, is to be admitted here. If it is, I do not know how the Senate can protect itself from attacks by outsiders upon individual Senators and upon the Senate itself.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not yield at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut declines to yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I for one will resent with as much heat, and, I think, with as much good cause, an attack on any Senator on this floor on either side of the central aisle as I would if it were made upon myself. It is an attack upon the body if an individual Senator is insulted in this way, and I think it is time the Senate should decide whether it is going to permit Senators to stand up here and introduce letters which are sent to them containing offensive matter and which the Senator introducing it afterwards admitted he had read only casually and did not understand the intendment of it, and then when his attention is called to it insists upon its going in the RECORD in an expurgated form. I think it is time this funneling into the RECORD of attacks by outsiders who can not be reached by Senators here, either by the Senate or by the Senator attacked, should stop. I for one would not hesitate one minute to refuse this document access to the RECORD, and I would do it with equal cheerfulness if it was an attack on the other side of the controversy; and I would not allow it to go to a committee of the Senate couched in this language.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut object to the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do.

Mr. BORAH, Mr. GALLINGER, and others rose.

Mr. STONE. I see two or three Senators rising, I presume, to address the Senate on this letter question. I think we have spent enough time upon it. If we could have a vote upon the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] at once, I would be very glad to yield for that purpose; but I am unwilling, for one, to continue what seems to me to be a useless debate.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator permit me just a word?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. I want to say to the Senator that if the Senator from Utah will accept the amendment to strike out the offensive matter I will consent to vote at once. Otherwise I shall not consent to a vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. STONE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will yield to me just a moment, I do not want to be unreasonable about this matter and I do not want to appear to be unreasonable; but it seems to me that a motion simply to strike out the offensive matter in this letter would not at all meet the situation. Here is a letter which has been presented to the Senate and has been read which contains some things that seem to me to be grossly offensive and insulting not only to the particular Senator who is attacked but to the Senate itself. Now, it does seem to me that for the Senate of the United States to take a document of that kind and solemnly sit here and edit it by striking out the offensive matter is not in keeping with the dignity of this body. It appears to me that the letter either ought to be expunged from the RECORD or the Senator from Washington should withdraw it. If the Senator from Washington chooses to withdraw the letter and it should be subsequently presented to the Senate with the objectionable matter eliminated, I, for one, should not object to its reception; but the thing I do object to is for the Senate to take the letter and go through the process of editing

it by taking out the offensive matter. The Senate has to maintain its dignity, and it seems to me it should reject the entire letter, it having been presented in this form. I could not accept in that view the proposed amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. STONE. Then I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before that motion is put, would it not be well to make some provision for withholding the document, which has been objected to, from the RECORD pending the final disposition of the motion of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STONE. If that can be done, I withhold the motion.

Mr. BORAH. The advocate of this letter has offered everything that is reasonable—that is, that all offensive matter be stricken out. Now, if that is not to be agreed to, those who believe that the rest of it ought to go in the RECORD will object to any compromise upon the proposition any further, and it will not be disposed of in any other way than under the strict technical rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In order that the Chair may be advised as to the strict technical rule, the Chair takes the liberty of asking his friend the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] whether the Chair has authority to direct that the document shall be withheld from the RECORD pending the disposition of the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I feel flattered at the suggestion, but not being in the chair I must decline to give an opinion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will take the responsibility of saying that the document shall not go into the RECORD until the motion is disposed of.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 3 hours and 10 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 253) reappropriating funds for expenditures at the naval station at New Orleans, La., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7138) to provide for raising the volunteer forces of the United States in time of actual or threatened war.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 7138) to provide for raising the volunteer forces of the United States in time of actual or threatened war, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

NAVAL STATION AT NEW ORLEANS, LA.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 253) reappropriating funds for expenditure at the naval station at New Orleans, La., was read twice by its title.

Mr. THORNTON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution, as it is an emergency measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILTON in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution. It authorizes the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the naval station, New Orleans, La., and not yet turned back into the Treasury, to be reappropriated and made available for expenditure at that station for such purpose as the Secretary of the Navy may direct.

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

On motion of Mr. THORNTON, the title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution reappropriating certain funds for expenditure at the naval station at New Orleans, La."

Mr. SHIVELY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 25, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 24, 1914.

SECOND SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

Warren D. Robbins to be second secretary of the embassy of the United States of America at Mexico, Mexico.

THIRD SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

John C. White to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States of America at Mexico, Mexico.

CONSUL GENERALS.

William J. Pike to be consul general at Coburg, Germany.
Alexander W. Weddell to be consul general at Athens, Greece.
Joseph I. Brittain to be consul general at Auckland, New Zealand.

CONSULS.

Samuel H. Shank to be consul at Palermo, Italy.
Richard M. Bartleman to be consul at Cienfuegos, Cuba.
George E. Chamberlin to be consul at Georgetown, Guiana.
Joseph E. Haven to be consul at Catania, Italy.
John A. Gamon to be consul at Puerto Cortes, Honduras.
Charles F. Brissel to be consul at Bagdad, Turkey.
Frederick T. F. Dumont to be consul at Florence, Italy.
Robert Frazer, jr., to be consul at Bahia, Brazil.
Nicholas R. Snyder to be consul at Reichenberg, Austria.
Wesley Frost to be consul at Cork, Ireland.
William W. Masterson to be consul at Durban, Natal.
Henry P. Starrett to be consul at Owen Sound, Ontario, Canada.

B. Harvey Carroll, jr., to be consul at Venice, Italy.
John A. Gore to be consul at Turks Island, West Indies.
Edwin Carl Kemp to be consul at St. Pierre, St. Pierre Island.
Henry C. von Struve to be consul at Curacao, West Indies.
John J. C. Watson to be consul at Roubaix, France.
Leslie A. Davis to be consul at Harput, Turkey.
Felix Willoughby Smith to be consul at Batum, Russia.
William J. Grace to be consul at Aden, Arabia.
Robertson Honey to be consul at Madrid, Spain.
Theodore Jaeckel to be consul at Maskat, Oman.
George M. Hanson to be consul at Sandakan, British North Borneo.

Thomas E. Heenan to be consul at Fiume, Hungary.
William H. Gale to be consul at Colon, Panama.
William P. Kent to be consul at Leipzig, Germany.
William A. Bickers to be consul at Hobart, Tasmania.
Percival Gasset to be consul at Malaga, Spain.
David J. D. Myers to be consul at Iquique, Chile.
North Winship to be consul at St. Petersburg, Russia.
Walter F. Boyle to be consul at Ceiba, Honduras.
Livingston T. Mays to be consul at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Canada.

Max J. Baehr to be consul at Berne, Switzerland.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Richard H. Mann to be United States attorney, eastern district of Virginia.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Frank M. Miller to be United States marshal, eastern district of Louisiana.

Thomas W. Taubman to be United States marshal, district of South Dakota.

Arthur P. Carpenter to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank A. McCall to be receiver of public moneys at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION.

Elmer E. Greenawalt to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Philadelphia, Pa.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Walker Taylor to be collector of customs for the district of North Carolina.

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT.

Robert H. Terrill to be a judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Carlisle P. Knight to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander William S. Whitted to be a commander.
 Lieut. Edward E. Spafford to be a lieutenant commander.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry K. Hewitt to be a lieutenant.
 Asst. Paymaster Harold C. Shaw to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Paymaster George Brown, jr., to be a pay inspector.
 Chaplain Eugene E. McDonald, with rank of Lieutenant commander, to be a chaplain in the Navy, with rank of commander.
 Chaplain Joseph M. F. McGinty, with rank of lieutenant, to be a chaplain in the Navy, with rank of lieutenant commander.
 Gunner Charles H. Foster to be a chief gunner.
 Gunner Charles H. Anderson to be a chief gunner.
 Asst. Paymaster Patrick T. M. Lathrop to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Second Lieut. Charles G. Sinclair to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Hermon Carlton, Lake Village.
 Charles B. Gregg, Jonesboro.

COLORADO.

Edward H. Kruchten, Flagler.

CONNECTICUT.

Robert T. Bradley, Newtown.

GEORGIA.

Frank M. Meaders, Dahlonega.
 Emmett A. Speir, Wadley.

IDAHO.

Gregory Jones, Blackfoot.

ILLINOIS.

Joel E. Cory, Jerseyville.
 Asa B. Fagan, St. Charles.
 Anson I. Graves, Dwight.
 John B. Henry, Lewistown.
 Arthur F. Hiland, De Kalb.
 Frank Howey, Albion.
 W. V. Lambe, Wheaton.
 J. P. Lawrence, Steger.
 J. E. Longenbaugh, Moweaqua.
 Torrence B. McGovern, Oneida.
 Carl Montag, Mascoutah.
 Matthew N. Price, Zion City.
 William H. Ryan, Minonk.
 Charles W. Shade, Lexington.
 Nelson B. Tyler, Gibson City.
 William Vollbracht, Camp Point.
 Charles C. Wescott, Chillicothe.
 Frank A. Winter, Highland.

INDIANA.

Mortimer Castle, Lowell.
 Sell S. Doty, Delphi.
 Edward C. Schultz, Brazil.
 George W. Zinky, South Bend.

IOWA.

A. T. Johnson, Essex.
 Harvey E. Southern, Collins.
 James J. Stansell, New Virginia.
 Jay Sullivan, Fontanelle.

KANSAS.

C. F. Hoefler, Inman.
 Harry V. Paxton, Greensburg.

KENTUCKY.

Gilbert Adams, Flemingsburg.
 R. L. Brown, Somerset.
 E. W. Hackney, London.
 Mark F. Kehoe, Maysville.
 James T. Stiman, Clay.

LOUISIANA.

Andrew J. Brewer, Mooringsport.
 Julius P. Hebert, Morgan City.
 Alexander C. Lormand, Crowley.

MAINE.

Josiah H. Hobbs, Camden.
 Harry Hinckley, Blue Hill.
 Joseph A. Linscott, Farmington.
 Amos Nichols, Searsport.
 Benjamin F. Pierce, Mars Hill.

Guy L. Thurston, Bethel.
 Lee M. Treat, Vinal Haven.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Thomas F. Coady, North Attleboro.
 John Dobson, Townsend.
 Frank E. Gray, Reading.
 Daniel M. O'Brien, Rockland.
 John H. Sheedy, Salem.
 Otis C. Thayer, Lancaster.

MICHIGAN.

John Butler, Sand Lake.
 Frederic M. Hall, Mason.
 Frank P. Hilbourn, Hart.
 John R. Ryan, Calumet.
 Prescott L. Varnum, Vassar.

MINNESOTA.

Clemens A. Lauterbach, Redwood Falls.
 Harry D. Smith, Plainview.
 William G. Stewart, Pine River.
 George G. Stone, Pipestone.

MISSISSIPPI.

Milton Asa Candler, Corinth.

MISSOURI.

Samuel W. Hatheway, Stanberry.
 Collins C. Kindred, Smithville.
 W. T. Newman, Desloge.
 Will T. Runyan, Norborne.

MONTANA.

Edward Burke, Anaconda.
 F. M. Byrne, Belgrade.
 Thomas Gibb, Miles City.
 John W. Hogan, Mondak.

NEBRASKA.

G. W. Campbell, Wymore.
 C. C. Carrig, Kearney.
 Robert Dunlay, Orleans.
 George W. Gilliland, Bradshaw.
 Keene Ludden, Osceola.
 William McMichael, Maywood.
 I. M. Rice, Valentine.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

George B. Cavis, Bristol.

NEW JERSEY.

Francis French, Tuckerton.
 Valentine Gleckner, Carteret.
 Peter Latourette, White House Station.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Walter Dunn LaRoque, Kinston.
 Frank A. Moseley, Snow Hill.
 James E. Muse, Carthage.
 A. H. Patterson, Kings Mountain.

NORTH DAKOTA.

H. W. Willis, Lansford.

OHIO.

M. A. Baldwin, Blanchester.
 David W. Cockburn, Shiloh.
 R. W. Grandle, Leesburg.
 Stephen D. McDowell, Prairie Depot.

OKLAHOMA.

B. A. Clark, Arnett.
 Simmie Farriss, Stratford.
 Ernest V. Schrimsher, Collinsville.

PENNSYLVANIA.

F. W. Brownell, Smethport.
 Martha E. Doebler, Mifflinburg.
 Bernard Doherty, Clifton Heights.
 Americus Enfield, Bedford.
 John T. Kennedy, Sharon.
 John A. Ketterer, Wampum.
 James C. McDowell, Rosemont.
 James C. Shields, Irwin.
 Charles R. Smith, Quakertown.
 Joseph White, Simpson.

RHODE ISLAND.

John Reynolds, Harrisville.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

P. J. Donohue, Bonesteel.
John T. Doyle, Plankinton.
Frank C. Fisher, Lead.
Charles S. Eastman, Hot Springs.
Frank P. Gannaway, Chamberlain.
Frank Junge, Leola.
George C. H. Kostboth, Canastota.
T. J. Ryan, Bridgewater.

TEXAS.

T. S. Hamilton, Italy.
W. D. McChristy, Brownwood.
Frank K. Sterrett, Albany.

UTAH.

Lake E. Young, Helper.

VIRGINIA.

Nina Moss, Beaverdam.
G. A. Sullivan, East Radford.

WASHINGTON.

Clifton A. Battles, Wenatchee.
George H. Bevan, Kettle Falls.
James Doherty, Olympia.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Owen J. King, Elkins.
Lawrence M. Rowan, White Sulphur Springs.

WISCONSIN.

Samuel P. Godfrey, Waupaca.
L. T. Keppler, Kiel.
John O'Sullivan, Washburn.
Adolph G. Pankow, Marshfield.
Matthew N. Stapleton, Rhinelander.
William J. Tobin, North Milwaukee.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate April 24, 1914.

POSTMASTER.

Robert Boyd to be postmaster at Dothan, Ala.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 24, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We give Thee hearty thanks, our heavenly Father, that though there are differences of opinion, diversities of thought among our people upon questions which seem vital to us as individuals, yet in times of great crisis, when the honor of our Nation is assailed, we can lay aside all differences and rally with one accord to the support of our flag. Strengthen, we beseech Thee, our patriotic fervor, that our Nation may continue to grow in all that makes a nation great and glorious, and Thine shall be the praise, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution authorizing the Vocational Education Commission to employ such stenographic and clerical assistants as may be necessary, etc.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7138) to provide for raising the volunteer forces of the United States in time of actual or threatened war.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following House concurrent resolution:

House concurrent resolution 36.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the thanks of Congress be presented to the governor, and through him to the people, of Michigan for the statue of Zachariah Chandler, whose name is so honorably identified with the history of that State and of the United States.

Resolved, That this work of art is accepted in the name of the Nation and assigned a place in the old Hall of the House of Representatives, already set aside by act of Congress for statues of eminent citizens, and that a copy of this resolution, signed by the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, be transmitted to the governor of the State of Michigan.

LOBBY ACTIVITIES.

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for printing under the rules a privileged report (No. 570) from the Committee on the Judiciary on the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] on December 9 last, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, touching the investigation of lobby charges. I desire to notify the House at this time that at some future date which will suit the convenience of the House the matter will be called up for consideration in the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Can the gentleman give the House some idea about when he intends to call this up? It is a privileged resolution.

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas. I will state that it is my purpose to call the matter up within a very short time and without unnecessary delay. I think it prudent, inasmuch as the report has not been made public, to give the Members ample time to study the report. I think I shall probably call it up within the next five or six days; but in doing so I will take into consideration the business and convenience of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FLOYD] submits a privileged report on the Garrett resolution touching the lobby investigation, to be printed under the rules.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I take it that this report will be referred to the House Calendar?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. It will be referred to the House Calendar and printed.

INCREASE IN FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from further consideration of House resolution 467, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 467.

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to report to the House of Representatives, for its information, all the facts within the knowledge of the Interstate Commerce Commission which show or tend to show that said commission has in many cases failed to grant an increase in freight rates to the railroads where no objections to such increase have been filed, and where the shippers in many instances have requested that such increase be granted on the ground that it was just and reasonable.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is not a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I take it that it is offered as a privileged resolution?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it calls for an opinion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the resolution calls for—

All the facts within the knowledge of the Interstate Commerce Commission which show, or tend to show, that said commission has in many cases failed to grant an increase in freight rates, etc.

Unquestionably, to my mind, that calls for an opinion.

The SPEAKER. Wherein does it call for an opinion?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The language "which show, or tend to show," it seems to me, calls for an opinion.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the further point of order that this is not privileged, because the resolution is not addressed to the head of a department. In order to make a resolution of this character privileged it must be addressed to the head of one of the departments.

The SPEAKER. The difficulty about that contention is that the Interstate Commerce Commission is not in any department.

Mr. HAY. There is no provision in the rule which makes an inquiry addressed to the President, as this is, or to the Interstate Commerce Commission, privileged.

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes that matter was passed upon by the House in the celebrated case where the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Gillespie, presented a resolution which was exactly like this one. No one raised the question of whether it called for an opinion, and it went through.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Interstate Commerce Commission is an independent governmental function.

The SPEAKER. But the House settled that by passing the Gillespie resolution. The Chair refers to the point of asking the President for information. The Gillespie resolution was in

terms precisely like this one, and the House, by its action, decided that we could call upon the President for information from the Interstate Commerce Commission. That much of it is settled. Upon the other question which the gentleman raises, as to its calling for an opinion, the Chair will hear the gentleman. In the case of the Gillespie resolution no one raised the point that it called for an opinion, and some of us remember what the appearance of the newspapers here in Washington the next morning was after that transaction.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I was not apprised that this old resolution was to be brought to the attention of the Speaker and the House this morning. On yesterday there was some discussion between the Speaker, the author of the resolution, and myself, and the author, it appeared, under proper advice had introduced a new and proper resolution. That new resolution eliminates some of these words. That new resolution was referred to our committee. Seven days not having expired from the introduction of it, the committee was not called upon to act, or we probably would have done so at to-day's meeting. Being unaware that this resolution was to be again called up, I did not happen to come in in time to hear the prayer and the speech and motion of the gentleman from New York, but I wish to say, as the matter concerns the committee of which I happen to be the chairman, that the Gillespie resolution did not involve the question raised by the gentleman from Tennessee at all. After the resolution had passed the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Dalzell, moved to reconsider, in order to make the point that the President was not the head of a department. The committee never seriously insisted upon that; but the gentleman from Pennsylvania did it, and we allowed that to go.

Mr. MANN. Was not that after it passed the House?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, sir; after we passed the resolution the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my recollection is, moved to reconsider in order to make that point. But the point I make and the one the gentleman from Tennessee raised was not involved at all. The committee does not seem to have made much fight upon it at that time, but the point here, Mr. Speaker, is, if I may be allowed to impress my views upon the Chair, that this is not a call for facts at all. This language asks for an argument and opinion and requires an investigation to find out what the facts are that tend to show certain things. If he had asked the President to give him the facts shown, as to what the papers show, what the claims are instituted on in the papers or anything of that sort that are physical facts, it would be a different thing. This resolution proposes for the President to make inquiry to find out about certain cases filed by the railroads, to find out how many people objected to, if any, to find out how many were unobjected to as to the raise in rates asked, and report what the facts are which show or tend to show certain things. It is a direction to investigate matters not in the knowledge of the President. It is unnecessary; the facts are in the knowledge of the commission. It does not ask them definitely to give certain facts in the case. The committee did not believe it was a privileged resolution, and therefore the committee did not feel called upon to disregard and set aside more important business before the committee in order to rush a report on this resolution. If, however, we had not been misled by the introduction of the new resolution, and that this one would not again be insisted on, we would have reported this one back to-day with recommendation that it lie on the table.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, to answer my colleague—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has the floor unless he yields.

Mr. ADAMSON. I was through, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEVY. I would like to state—

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor and yielded to me.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman wants to ask me a question, I will try to answer it some way.

Mr. LEVY. I was not convinced yesterday, and I am not convinced now—

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, the gentleman knows there is a piece of poetry about convincing a party against his will, and that he is of the same opinion still.

Mr. LEVY. If my colleague will give me time and a hearing before the committee, but I have been unable to get a hearing before the committee—

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I was not aware the gentleman desired to be heard on this proposition.

Mr. LEVY. I told the gentleman so.

Mr. ADAMSON. He desired to be heard on a general proposition to raise railroad rates, but I had good reasons that I did not care to take up the time to hear him on that. I am willing to hear him if he wants to come and discuss parliamentary law on this resolution.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, have I the floor?

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman wishes to discuss the point of order, I will be glad to hear the gentleman first and then be recognized.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is clearly a question of facts, and I refer the Speaker to Hinds' Precedents, page 175, section 1873, where Mr. PAYNE made objection and the Speaker ruled:

Now, the Chair is perfectly clear, under the precedents, if the resolution is to be made privileged, it must be a resolution of inquiry as to facts existing.

That is plain.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman please send up the volume?

Mr. LEVY. Certainly. There is no opinion about it; it is a clear statement of facts. There are several hundred cases, with no objection whatsoever filed, where they have consented to them, and in the Toledo case the shippers themselves asked for the increase.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. LEVY. The Speaker is examining the Precedents.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it seems so very clear to me that the words "or tend to show" included in this resolution necessarily call for a reason, for the exercise of discretion on the part of the President, that it falls without the rule. How can the facts be reported that are called for under this resolution without the exercise of some discretion? How is it possible to conceive that the language, "or tend to show," does not call for a reason upon the part of the President or upon the part of whoever may make up the report? It is very clear it does not call simply for the facts. I may be confused about the matter in my mind.

Mr. LEVY. May I interrupt my colleague?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LEVY. I can not see how there could be plainer language. It is the facts. They are existing facts, and there is no opinion about it. It is simply a question of existing facts, public notoriety, and so forth.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The language says, "which show or tend to show that said commission has in many cases." In many cases.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Tennessee this question: What is the difference between facts which show and facts which tend to show, as far as this thing is concerned?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Because those which tend to show call for an opinion upon the part of the reporting authority. It calls for the exercise of his judgment as to whether they tend to show or do not tend to show. I think also, perhaps, that might apply to "which show," as far as that is concerned.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. MANN. Which calls for more of an opinion, that which calls for facts "which show" or facts which "tend to show"?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That would tend to strengthen the position which I have taken.

Mr. MANN. How would you call for facts without getting the opinion of an official of some sort as to facts relating to the subject matter?

Mr. FITZGERALD. "Facts relating to it" is different.

Mr. MANN. Unless you call for a specific paper, do you not have to call for facts, and the officer who responds furnishes facts which, in his opinion, meet the situation? Is not that calling for an opinion from him?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That may be; but that destroys the privilege of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to hear from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] again on that point.

Mr. MANN. I will likely take the floor in a moment. I was asking the gentleman if facts which show a thing do not require as much of an opinion as facts which tend to show a thing. This does not call for the opinion of an officer, but when you call for facts, unless you call for a specific paper, the officer must exercise his judgment as to what facts shall be presented. That is not calling for the opinion of the officer, but, of course,

he must exercise his reason when he responds to a resolution calling for facts of any kind.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Probably so; and when those are called for it destroys the privileged character of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. What destroys the privileged character of a resolution is calling for the opinion of the officer. We do not ask the opinion of the officer.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I beg the gentleman's pardon. If the facts called for necessitate the expression on the part of an officer or the use of discretion, it destroys its privileged character.

Mr. MANN. Take this case, which the gentleman will recall: A resolution was introduced in the House calling upon the War Department for facts, showing how much money had been expended on account of our possession of the Philippine Islands. I think the gentleman is familiar with it?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I made the point of order that it required the opinion of the officers, which point is practically sustained now, because they say they could not give the information. But the Speaker decided, although the officer might have to exercise his judgment in reporting, the resolution only called for facts. Now, of course, when you figure out how much the Philippine Islands have cost, that requires the exercise of reason, at best, to determine how much more is charged for the Army because officers are in the Philippines than would be charged if we did not have the Philippines, and the Speaker ruled, and I agreed with his ruling, and followed it afterwards, although I made the point of order, that all it called for was facts. It seems to me that case was stronger on the gentleman's side than the present case.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I remember the resolution.

Mr. MANN. I will agree with the gentleman about this, that I do not think such a resolution ought to pass.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not think such a resolution is privileged.

The SPEAKER. That is one thing, and another thing is whether it is privileged or not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I can make it any clearer than I have made it. Perhaps I have not made it clear. But if this does not call for the exercise of discretion on the part of the authorities that will report in response to it—

Mr. SHARP. Will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. SHARP. I was greatly impressed by what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said, and I think he is entirely correct in his position. Are not these words used purely as descriptive matter referring to a certain class of facts, and would they not mean exactly the same as though you used the words relating to that particular class of cases?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not think so at all. I think the words "relating to" would place it in a different class.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will ask how it would be possible for the President to comply with this information? In order to furnish the information he would have to be a mind reader in order to make the investigation. I do not think this resolution could require him to make this investigation.

Mr. LEVY. This is all public record.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It says:

That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to report to the House of Representatives, for its information, all the facts within the knowledge of the Interstate Commerce Commission—

And so forth. How is it possible for the President of the United States to know?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Texas that the House passed on that question, and the then Speaker passed on it. Both the House and the Speaker concluded that it was proper to pass a resolution like this—that is, so far as this one point is concerned—calling on the President to furnish the facts from the Interstate Commerce Commission, because the Interstate Commerce Commission is in no department. That matter is res adjudicata.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes, Mr. Speaker, but the question which the gentleman from Texas suggested was not whether it was proper to call upon the President or that it might be within our power to call upon the President, but how was it possible for the President to furnish those facts, under the wording of this resolution, without the exercise of discretion?

Mr. LEVY. If you will allow me, I will say that this is all of public record.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from New York, under those circumstances, should have asked for the record, and not for something that may call for exercise of discretion on the part of the President.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] this question: Suppose this resolution had been drawn to the effect that the President was thereby requested to furnish to the House the facts on which the Interstate Commerce Commission refused to do this thing; would not that clearly have been within the rule?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I doubt it.

The SPEAKER. How could you ever get at the Interstate Commerce Commission then?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. You can call for specific facts without calling for an action taken based upon those facts. You can call for the facts; but if you call for any conclusion or any proposition that requires the exercise of discretion on the part of a department or on the part of the President or on the part of such a body as the Interstate Commerce Commission, it falls without the rule. There is a way of getting at those things.

The SPEAKER. Well, it is to be presumed that if the Interstate Commerce Commission has done a thing or failed to do a thing which it is considering, it must know why it did it or failed to do it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes; but it does not have to state it to us, Mr. Speaker, under a resolution of the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, we reach the Interstate Commerce Commission through the President, because the President appoints the Commission, and we can not call directly upon the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Now, here is a resolution asking for facts which show, or tend to show, certain things. It is true that under the rules and the precedents we can not call upon the head of a department or upon the President as to what conclusions he may reach or what reasonings he may adopt. That is for the protection both of the House and of the department, because it is not proper for the House to ask the head of a department why he does not do a thing or why he wants to do a thing. But when we call upon the head of a department for certain facts, whatever the resolution may be, it involves the use of judgment by the head of the department to determine what the facts are that we call for, unless we call for a copy of a specific paper; and in order to do that you have to determine whether this specific paper that a department has is the one that is called for. The reasoning does not apply to a case where the officer must exercise a judgment in picking out the papers which he submits.

We did not ask for any information of the President as to why the commission did or did not advance rates or why the commission has or has not acted upon this question. I do not see how there is any escape from the conclusion that the resolution only calls for facts, and I again call the attention of the Speaker to a ruling which the Speaker made upon the resolution concerning the cost of the Philippine Islands to the Government. There was a question involving a great many opinions on the part of the department as to whether a certain expenditure was made because we owned the Philippine Islands, or whether we would have had the expenditure if we had not owned the Philippine Islands, and the Speaker ruled that the resolution, after all, only called for information, only called for facts.

It might be a very difficult matter of judgment for the officer to determine whether the facts which were called for were these or some others. It might be a very difficult thing to determine what the facts were. But, after all, what we were calling for were the facts. The Speaker held that the resolution was privileged. I do not myself believe that such a resolution as this ought to be passed at this time, with these matters pending before the commission; but when it comes to ruling what is in order the House ought to protect itself as to its right to call upon the heads of departments for facts which are in their possession, either now or at any other time, and not waive its rights.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that it is not facts that are called for in this resolution.

If it were a resolution that called for the facts regarding these cases where applications were made for increases, that would be one thing. But that is not what this resolution does. It does not call for the facts, but for a certain character or class of facts, and that character and class of facts can not be stated under this resolution without giving the opinion of the Interstate Commerce Commission, because this is the situa-

tion: This resolution asks for facts as to why they did not do a certain thing. A hundred facts may be before the commission. The commission may think that one of those facts is a sufficient ground or reason for their action or for their non-action, and this resolution calls for a specific fact or for specific facts, as the reason why they do not act, and the very description of those facts under these circumstances constitutes a statement of the reasons or grounds.

It seems to me that this is clear, that this can not be answered by anybody, either by the President or the Interstate Commerce Commission, unless they shall state what of the facts that may be before them are in their judgment sufficient grounds for not deciding, or withholding a decision, and that, of course, calls for a decision or judgment upon the reasons, and not the facts themselves.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] made the remark twice that this resolution ought not to be passed. The Chair has nothing on earth to do with that. That is one thing.

The only question involved here is whether this resolution calls for facts. The House passed a resolution with precisely the same words, down to the point where the specific facts are mentioned, when Mr. Gillespie, of Texas, offered it here, with nobody raising the question, and the Chair does not believe that the House ought to be too quick in throwing away its own rights about investigating the transactions of the departments, and what is almost equivalent to one, this Interstate Commerce Commission; and he overrules the point of order against this resolution.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] moves to lay the resolution on the table. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

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

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands a division. Those in favor of tabling this resolution will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-five gentlemen have arisen in the affirmative. Those opposed will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Eight gentlemen have arisen in the negative. The ayes have it, and the motion to table the resolution is agreed to.

PRINTING FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (H. DOC. NO. 919).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana offers a resolution and asks for its present consideration. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 477 (H. Rept. 574).

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a House document 60,000 copies of Supplement No. 10 to the Public Health Report, entitled "The Care of the Baby," 35,000 copies for the use of the Public Health Service, and 25,000 copies for the use of the House, the same to be distributed through the folding room of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I understand that these copies are to be printed for the use of the Public Health Service. I take it that the printing will be charged to the congressional printing fund and not to the printing fund of the Treasury Department?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; so I understand.

Mr. MANN. How much will they cost?

Mr. BARNHART. They will cost \$291.46.

Mr. MANN. That is for the 35,000?

Mr. BARNHART. No; the 60,000 copies.

Mr. MANN. Do they not have authority to print them now in the Bureau of Public Health?

Mr. BARNHART. They have the authority to print them now, but they say they have no funds.

Mr. FOSTER. They are limited in the amount of money they have.

Mr. MANN. I did not know whether they had authority to print an unlimited edition.

Mr. FOSTER. I think they have reprints.

Mr. MANN. How will they distribute the 35,000 copies?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, a letter from the Health Bureau says that they have already printed 15,000 copies. The edition has been off the press only about 10 days, and the Public Health Bureau has received requests for the publication aggregating in number 30,000 copies. The original edition was 15,000 copies. Many of these requests have been received from

Members of Congress, who ask for 25 to 500 copies each. The bureau is endeavoring to comply with all requests, at least in part, but the funds available for printing are not sufficient to meet the demand. The publication is a practical, plainly written little pamphlet, treating of the care of infants from the time of birth, and the requests that have been received for it are the strongest indorsement of its value.

Mr. MANN. Now, if the gentleman will permit, the Members of Congress have, some of them, applied for 500 copies of this pamphlet. Why should we give to the Public Health Service the copies which will go to Congressmen, instead of giving them to the House itself.

Mr. BARNHART. The reason for that is that applications to the Public Health Service have already been made for 30,000 copies.

Mr. MANN. That includes the requests of Members of Congress, some of whom have asked for 500 copies?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. They will be filed when the bureau is given the pamphlets.

Mr. FOSTER. Members of Congress would have their quota in the folding room, and then go over there and get additional copies?

Mr. MANN. What I am asking is, Why should we not decrease the number to go to the Public Health Service and increase the number which should go to the Members of the House?

Mr. BARNHART. Because in such instances those Members who want to send out the pamphlet they could be supplied on application to the Public Health Service, whereas if all are placed to the credit of Members in the folding room, half of them will never ask for their allotment, they will never be sent out, and therefore, as is too often the case, wasted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MANN. I have already reserved the right to object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Treasury Department this year has, I believe, \$340,000 for printing. It allots that printing fund to the various bureaus in the department. It has ample money to do the printing necessary. Why should any printing for any of the bureaus of the Treasury Department be done at the expense of the congressional allotment? That is an abuse, and some attempt has been made to stop it in recent years. This is a revival of an abuse for which there can be no possible excuse. If the gentlemen desire to print these bulletins and place them at the disposal of the two Houses and charge it to the congressional allotment for printing, that is one thing; but to print for the bureaus of the Government, that are given ample appropriations for their printing, and charge the additional printing to the congressional allotment, is an entirely different matter.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman says they have ample appropriations now for all their printing. The fact is that there are a great many documents issued by the Public Health Bureau that are desired by Congressmen because of the requests that come from people in the various districts, and the bureau can not furnish them because they have not sufficient means.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is because the Secretary of the Treasury does not give them the proper allotment out of the appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. That is possibly because Congress does not give the Secretary enough.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, we give them liberal appropriations for printing.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. There are a great many publications that we can not get from the Bureau of Public Health that are very desirable, because they have no funds with which to do the printing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the printing is to be paid for out of the allotment for printing for Congress, it ought to be placed at the disposal of Congress. If the printing is to be placed at the disposal of the department, it should be charged to the departmental appropriation.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that there is one way in which the constituents of the gentleman from Mississippi can get these publications, and that is by paying a very nominal sum for them.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. A great many people can not get them in that way, because there are not enough to go round.

Mr. SHERLEY. They have the power to print whenever there is a commercial demand for them; but these people want to get something for nothing.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The people do not want them because they want to get something for nothing, but they want them because they are valuable publications and very desirable. At least, this particular publication is very desirable,

and whether they are paid for out of the appropriation for printing for the Treasury Department or paid for out of the appropriation for congressional printing, they will be paid for out of the Public Treasury anyway. That question does not affect the desirability of the pamphlet, and it does not affect the fact that people get them for nothing. I take it there is nothing in that objection. What difference does it make?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does make considerable difference whether the appropriation that is made for printing for Congress is used to pay for printing for one of the departments or whether the department does the printing that it is authorized to have out of the appropriations given for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The publications of this particular bureau are very valuable, and they go to people who require publications of this character.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think they are valuable publications.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman says they already have ample funds. I do not think they have.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think they have, and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. SHERLEY. The trouble comes in this way: The very moment you have Congress printing for departments out of its allotment, various bulletins, you put the department in the position where instead of using their funds for matters they ought to use them for they select those things they can not get Congress to appropriate for printing and leave the pressure on Congress for things that there may be a wide public demand for. The result is a great increase in the annual bill for printing. The reason I made the suggestion was that we waste more money, proportionately, in public printing, than in any other activity of the Government, and we do it because we advertise to all America that they can get various things for nothing. Then the people make demands for them without any real knowledge of what they contain, and without any knowledge of whether they wish them or not, but simply because they are free. It ought not to be a burden on the citizen who pays for it in the long run to pay a nominal sum for the thing he wants, and then he will determine whether he wants it before he requests it.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is simply making the same argument that I made when the appropriation for the Children's Bureau was up—that the departments do duplicate educational endeavor. As far as the extravagance of congressional printing is concerned, I think this is only the seventh or eighth little bill that the Committee on Printing has brought in this session.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will say to the gentleman that I have not criticized the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SHERLEY. Neither have I criticized the gentleman's committee.

Mr. BARNHART. I am not saying that the gentlemen have criticized the committee, I am saying that the gentleman from Kentucky has stated on the floor just what I said when the appropriation was up for the Children's Bureau, namely, that the departments are overlapping each other. But this important and helpful printing, however, I find in my own State that the State board of health has sent out a little pamphlet similar to this—other States are doubtless doing the same—and therefore I limited the number of copies to the very least number I thought might be used.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Am I right in my understanding that the estimated cost is only \$291 for 35,000 copies?

Mr. BARNHART. For 60,000 copies.

Mr. MOORE. And one-half to go to the Public Health Service would cost \$146. May I ask the gentleman, who has children of his own, as I have, whether it would not be worth \$291 if only the life of one child was saved through the distribution of the 60,000 pamphlets?

Mr. BARNHART. Most assuredly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to say that I have more children than the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Indiana put together.

Mr. BARNHART. I am not a boastful man. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. So far as the "gentleman from Pennsylvania" is concerned, he does not acknowledge that the gentleman from New York is a rival in that matter at all, and never did acknowledge it. But having passed through several periods of "watchful waiting" [laughter], long midnight hours, as it were, he knows that if there had been at his service some of these pamphlets he might have been spared a great deal of time and saved a great deal of rest. In the interest of the fathers and mothers of this land, the gentleman from Pennsylvania ventures to think it is mighty small business to raise the question of economy

on the expenditure of \$291 in a matter that is of so much concern to the health of the children and the happiness of the home.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me say that if this expenditure would save the gentleman from Pennsylvania long hours of patient waiting and midnight walking the floors and would enable the gentleman to take on some flesh, I would not object. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHARP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; I will.

Mr. SHARP. I would like to ask the gentleman if it would not be the better part of wisdom and economy to provide a small appropriation of \$291 for this purpose than to waste twice that amount in useless talk?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is to put the question. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read the report (by Mr. BARNHART), as follows:

The Committee on Printing having had under consideration the House resolution (H. Res. 477) providing for the printing as a House document Supplement No. 10 to the Public Health Report, entitled "The Care of the Baby" reports the same back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to.

The estimated cost will be \$291.46.

The unencumbered balance of the allotment for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, is \$314,996.67.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out the words "thirty-five thousand" and insert in lieu thereof the words "ten thousand," and to strike out "twenty-five thousand" and insert "fifty thousand," so that 10,000 copies will be for the Public Health Service and 50,000 for the House. I understood the gentleman from Indiana to say that the Public Health Service had large demands from Members of the House for copies. If the printing is not to be done at the expense of the allotment of that service, but of the congressional allotment, it seems to me that the copies should be for the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 4, strike out the word "thirty-five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten"; line 5, strike out the word "twenty-five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CHARLES ALLEN SMITH.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend some remarks in the RECORD on Charles Allen Smith, a young sailor from Philadelphia, who was killed at Vera Cruz.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the death of Charles Allen Smith, reported by the Navy Department as having occurred at Vera Cruz, due possibly to a Mexican bullet fired from the housetops, adds to the roll of the Nation's heroes a second Philadelphian sacrificed in the service of his country. This young man resided in Kensington. Like George Poinsett, to whom I referred briefly on Wednesday last, he had just passed his twentieth birthday. He was truly representative of the spirit of the Navy. He had been in the service since August 31, 1911. During that time from the small stipend received from the Government he had contributed regularly to the support of his mother and his three minor sisters. Indeed, he was a prop to a family bereft of the husband and father, and his death, apart from the patriotic impulses which inspired it, brings positive distress upon the home he was helping to support. I have no further comment to make at this time except to say that although we are enlisted for the war and must maintain the honor of this country at any cost we should not be unmindful of its terrors and the desolation and distress it brings in individual cases like this.

IDEAL CITIZENSHIP.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. THOMAS W. HARDWICK, on April 15, 1914, before the Oglethorpe Club, of Savannah, Ga., upon the subject of ideal citizenship.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech delivered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] at Savannah, Ga., on the subject of ideal citizenship. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The speech referred to is as follows:

SPEECH OF HON. THOMAS W. HARDWICK, OF GEORGIA, AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE CRACKER CLUB, OF SAVANNAH, GA., ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 1914.

Mr. Toastmaster and gentlemen, first of all, permit me to express to the officers and members of this club my very high

appreciation of your invitation to be your guest this evening, and my very great pleasure at having been able to accept that invitation.

When you asked me to this beautiful and historic Georgia city, the splendid birthplace of our mighty Commonwealth, I felt that you were in deed and in truth inviting me home, and when my foot pressed your kindly soil on my arrival here this morning the same emotions stirred my heart and shook my soul that McGregor felt when he stood once more upon his native heath.

It has fallen to my lot, during the somewhat lengthy period of my public service, to make more public addresses in other sections of our country than I have made in the South, possibly because I have generally been on the firing line, and the Democratic Party has needed help more in other sections of the country than in ours; be that as it may, what I started out to tell you was this: Often I have been warned, usually in the most delicate and diplomatic manner, by friends in these other sections not to say too much about the South. It has not been easy for me to pay very much attention to these suggestions, for you had just as well tell the lion not to suggest in his roar the solitary forest jungle in which he dwells; you had just as well tell the eagle not to suggest in his scream the crag on which his nest is built, bleak, lonely, and barren though it be; you had just as well tell the mocking bird not to suggest in his song the sunny skies in which his life is spent, as to tell a true son of the South not to say something about Dixie land, especially if he is a long ways from home.

You may well surmise, then, the especial pleasure that I experience in addressing this audience and the peculiar satisfaction with which I, a genuine "Georgia Cracker" to the manor born, have accepted the suggestion that I shall to-night respond to the toast "The Georgia Cracker."

Before I undertake a discussion of the "Georgia Cracker" himself I would like to invite your attention briefly to the imperial domain that he inhabits—the largest State, territorially or otherwise, east of the Mississippi, and the biggest and best of them all, the great State of Georgia; to her mighty mountains, that stand like huge sentinels of granite and rock along her northern boundaries; to her great rivers, that flow in majesty to greet ocean and gulf along a coast line where the sunshine is eternal and where the roses never wither and the violets never cease to bloom; to her famous and luscious fruits that have invaded and conquered every market; to her endless rows of cotton, whiter than New England's snows and freighted with an annual treasure richer than the fabled fleece that Jason sought; to the flawless marble that sleeps beneath her sod; and to the everlasting granite with which her red old hills are ribbed.

It is indeed an imperial domain, an empire in and of itself, bounteously dowered by nature and richly blessed by nature's God. It is, in truth, a godly heritage, worthy of the splendid manhood and incomparable womanhood that it has produced.

What of the "Georgia Cracker" himself? What pen or voice is equal to the task of presenting a word portrait of him that will do full justice to the subject? It is with both diffidence and misgiving that I essay it. It seems to me that, wherever he lives, whatever he does, however he looks, he has certain general traits of character that are both notable and noteworthy. In the first place, he is shrewd; the man who picks him for a fool has another guess coming. He usually knows what he wants and how to get it. Of course, occasionally he makes a mistake; once in a while he is picked up; sometimes a new trick catches him, but never the second time. A stranger may impose on his good nature and his generosity, but not but once. An artful demagogue may deceive him, but not but once. A new fad may come along and sweep him from his feet, but not for long. He has dead loads of good common horse sense and a quaint philosophy that enables him to weigh with considerable accuracy both men and events.

In the next place, he is honest to the core, and on weekdays as well as on Sundays. He abhors the short yard and the scant pound. He pays his debt if it takes his last dollar, his last pound of cotton, his last ear of corn. He is not only financially honest, but mentally honest as well, for he despises sham and has the utmost contempt for deceit.

Then, again, he is brave, both physically and morally brave; he has demonstrated it on every battlefield in the Republic, in every war that we have had, and he has proved it still more conclusively in peace by the dauntless courage with which he resurrected his civilization from the horrors and ashes of the bloodiest civil war that ever devastated this earth and by the indomitable Anglo-Saxon spirit in which and with which he has met and solved the most stupendous race problem that ever confronted a people. He bends the knee to nothing on this earth or in the waters below it or the heavens above it save the woman he loves and the God he worships.

Then, again, this "Georgia Cracker" is patriotic. He loves his country with his whole heart, his whole mind, and his whole strength. True, it is a love that begins at home. He loves, first of all, the city and county in which he resides; then the great Commonwealth of Georgia, the old mother State; then this dear Southland of ours, with which and for which he suffered so much; and then last, but not least, this glorious American Republic, that has been so largely built upon the sacrifices and blood offerings of his fathers. He is at last back in the house of his fathers, in the Union of the States, but, thank God, he is there with no sackcloth on his back or ashes on his head; he is there not as a subject but as a citizen, not as a menial but as a master. True, there are some things in our past history that he can never forget. He can never forget that when it was no longer possible for a proud and self-respecting people to continue to endure the oppressions of an hostile ministry and a tyrannical king, it was the matchless eloquence of a great southern orator, the incomparable Henry, that lit those fires of resistance that were borne on the morning winds of the new-born continent to its remotest confines to light a nation into life. He can never forget that when a decent respect for the opinion of mankind impelled our fathers to declare the causes that led them to separate their political destinies from those of the British Crown that it was the glorious, genius-tipped pen of a great southern statesman, the immortal Jefferson, that drafted that unanswerable recital of our wrongs and that fearless declaration of our rights that became the birth certificate of a mighty nation. He can never forget that when the work of southern orators and southern statesmen was done and a mighty nation closed up its ranks and stood in battle array to assert its rights and redress its wrongs and its assembled councillors sought a chieftain who, like Saul of Israel, should tower head and shoulders above all his fellows, the choice fell upon that illustrious and immortal son of the South destined to become the "Father of his Country."

He can never forget that when the Federal Constitution, the greatest written chart of human liberty the world has ever seen, was framed, southern statesmanship was so deeply woven into its warp and woof that by universal acclaim the title "Father of the Constitution" was bestowed upon the scholarly Madison. He can never forget that while New England was plotting disunion and threatening treason at her Hartford convention, during the War of 1812, the South was beating her drums and calling the muster rolls of her volunteers, and that during that same war while northern generals were meeting one reverse after another along the Canadian border glorious old Andy Jackson was winning victories at Pensacola and New Orleans.

He can never forget that for the Mexican War the South furnished, in proportion to wealth and population, two dollars for every one, and three men for every one, that came from the North. He can never forget that in the Civil War itself we were not overcome by better generalship or braver soldiery, but by money, numbers, and supplies.

No; he can forget none of these things, nor is it necessary that he should, for he at last realizes, as does his brother at the North, that in the inscrutable providence of an all-wise God this chastening of the American people was necessary in order that they might know each other better and respect each other more, and upon the broad and lasting foundations of mutual knowledge and mutual respect erect the splendid superstructure of a new and mightier Republic, whose strength should exceed that of the old even as the strength of mature manhood exceeds that of raw and undeveloped youth, and whose glory should excel that of the old, even as the glory of the noonday sun excels that of the morning star.

One other thought, Mr. Toastmaster and gentlemen, in connection with the Georgia Cracker.

In the State of Georgia and throughout the South there lives to-day the most homogeneous white population in the entire Union. In Georgia 99.4 per cent of our population is native born, sprung from our own soil, acquainted with the traditions and history of our country, attached to its principles, loyal to its institutions, and American to the very core.

To add to the sum of our felicities in this matter it can be truthfully said of the inconsiderable proportion of our citizenry that is foreign born that as a whole and in most cases it is composed of men of high character, men who have readily assimilated with us, and who love the State of Georgia and the Republic and are useful and loyal citizens of both. That we are unusually fortunate in this regard can not be gainsaid by anyone who is acquainted with conditions in other and less fortunate sections of our country. Let us examine briefly the official reports as contained in the census of 1910.

First, let us start on the banks of the Potomac and go straight through the very heart of the South to the banks of the Rio Grande. What do we find? We find that in Virginia

only 0.9 per cent of the entire population is foreign born; in North Carolina, 0.3 per cent; in South Carolina, 0.04 per cent; Georgia, 0.6 per cent; Alabama, 0.9 per cent; Mississippi, 0.5 per cent; Louisiana, 3.2 per cent; Texas, 6.2 per cent, an average of 1.6 per cent for the above-named States. If we take the 11 States that formed the Southern Confederacy, we find that the average per cent of foreign-born population in them is 1.8 per cent. Turn for a moment to other sections of this country and what do we find?

We find 11 great States—3 in New England, 2 in the Middle Atlantic group, and 6 in the Northwest and in the far West—where the percentage of foreign-born population is so large as to be appalling. Let me give you the list of these States with their percentages:

	Per cent.
Rhode Island	33.
Massachusetts	31.5
New York	30.2
Connecticut	29.6
North Dakota	27.1
Minnesota	26.2
New Jersey	26.
Montana	25.2
California	24.7
Nevada	24.1
Arizona	23.9

An average for these States of 27.4 per cent. According to the same authority the average percentage of the foreign-born population of the New England States is 27.9 per cent; of the Middle Atlantic States, 25.1 per cent; of the Pacific States, 22.8 per cent.

It must be remembered, also, that these figures do not include citizens born on this soil of foreign parentage. I have not been able to find the official figures on this question reduced to the percentage basis, but in addition to the population in this country that is of foreign birth, the reports show that 18,897,837 are born of foreign parentage besides 13,343,583 of foreign birth. In the State of Georgia, however, we have only 25,672 citizens of foreign parentage, as against 1,391,058 born of native white parentage, and the other Southern States maintain almost as good an average on this question as does Georgia.

Such is the situation. These are the conditions that confront us, as disclosed by official reports of the Government. I do not advert to it in either alarming style or sensational fashion. Nothing is further from my purpose. I have full, yea, overflowing, sympathy with the noble idea that this great country of ours should afford to the oppressed and virtuous of every land an asylum of refuge from persecution and injustice. I acknowledge in ungrudging measure the great debt of gratitude we owe to those people of other and less fortunate lands who have sought and found a happier home in ours, giving generously of their brain and brawn to the progress and prosperity of the Republic, renouncing all conflicting allegiances to become true and loyal American citizens. To such men—and I thank God that the vast majority of our southern citizens of foreign birth or lineage can be so classified—no man can extend a heartier welcome than I; but I can not be insensible, nor can you, to the dangers involved in the situation. Because we welcome the worthy and virtuous from every land, where they are capable of assimilation with our own people, I do not believe that we can afford to welcome here the scum of the earth from every land, who come to this country not to become a part of it, but to strip it bare, to take the bread of labor from American mouths and to carry back in triumph to some foreign shore the spoils of their brief sojourn among us. Nor can I be insensible to the grave danger to our American system of Government that is involved in the continued and increasing influx of these classes of foreigners. They know nothing of American history, they care nothing for American traditions, and they are without sympathy for American institutions. In large part they do not speak and can not learn our language. They come here filled with all sorts of socialistic, anarchistic, and nihilistic ideas, impatient of all restraints imposed by law, and utterly and supremely indifferent to the welfare of that country in which they propose to linger only long enough to make enough money to support them in comfort elsewhere. It fell to my lot on one occasion to have all these truths impressed on my mind with startling force. It was on the occasion when the Committee on Rules of your House of Representatives investigated the great strike at Lawrence, Mass., in 1912. I gave my undivided attention to that inquiry and conducted a considerable portion of it myself for the committee.

When all the evidence was in it presented a picture of strong and contrasting lights and of startling significance. It was apparent that the poor people engaged in that strike, however guilty they might have been of riot, disorder, and lawbreaking, had suffered grievous wrongs and oppression from the driving slave masters in whose interest they had been induced to leave

their own countries by the glowing pictures of the American laboring man returning home at night from his day of toil with a bag of gold upon his shoulder, as some of them testified. But an examination of the witnesses disclosed that the minds of them all were filled to the brim with socialistic, anarchistic, un-American ideas. It appeared that there was almost endless variety of nationality among them and probably the greatest confusion of tongues since the day when the tower of Babel fell. So that when the climax of their bitter wrongs came they appealed not to the law and authorities of this country but to the ministers and consuls of at least 16 foreign nations. Here is where the problem presses hardest. These poor men were not then, and had no notion of becoming, American citizens. They had no place in this country; they did not belong here; they were simply brought here in droves and swarms in order that selfish and short-sighted capital might fatten on their labor while it turned a deaf ear to their wrongs and sorrows. They were unassimilated and undigested, and incapable of assimilation or digestion into our body politic.

Fellow Georgians, I have almost done. Let me say, from 12 years' experience and close observation at the political nerve center of the Republic, that I am convinced that the people of this country are confronting a crisis that challenges their very capacity for self-government. The issues that are forcing themselves upon us rise far above party, far above State and section. They involve the very life of our American system of government, that splendid system of government that more than inspired our own great Hill to his most brilliant flights of eloquence. Hear him to-night as he eulogizes it, "To him who loves liberty it is more enchanting than romance, more bewitching than love, and more elevating than the study of any other science." Hear him as he exclaims, "The snows that fall on Mount Washington are not purer than the motives which begot it; the fresh dew-laden zephyrs from the orange groves of the South are not sweeter than the hopes its advent inspired, and the flight of our own symbolic eagle, though he blow his breath on the sun, can not be higher than its expected destiny."

This system of government that the great Georgian so eloquently and so justly eulogized is the American system, our system; it is the best product of the minds and brains of your fathers and of mine, generously watered with their blood and sanctified by their sufferings. It is the system of liberty without license, of power without oppression, of strength without arrogance. It is the system of unified power for general and foreign purposes and of local self-government in local affairs. It is the system of coordinated powers, of checks and balances, of representative, orderly, free government. It is the system of individual opportunity and of civil and religious liberty, for it guarantees to every citizen of the Republic the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and to follow his own path in the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness so long as his course does not injure others. It is the system in which the individual citizen is the crowned and anointed king, and in which the laws are framed so power shall flow from the citizen down to his government and not from the government down to its subject.

I love it with all my heart and soul, and for that reason I tell you to-night that in the great ocean of our national life strange and terrifying currents are swirling; strange blood from other lands, in far too great quantity and of at least doubtful quality, has been injected into our body politic. Too many, ah, too vastly many, of these men know nothing and care less for the American system, for the American standard, for American ideals. They have brought with them from over the seas new and strange heresies that threaten to sweep us from our old and tried moorings into new and dangerous doctrines of paternalism and socialism. Do not misunderstand me; I am as progressive as anybody in this Union in demanding that the era of special privilege shall cease; as insistent as anybody, in any party, in demanding the restoration of competitive conditions and individual opportunity, but I shall never move an inch, whether in public life or private station, along the path that leads to the substitution of public monopoly for private monopoly. To my mind both forms of monopoly are equally intolerable and equally indefensible. If the Democratic Party is to remain true to its faith, loyal to its cardinal doctrines and principles; if the Union of the States is to preserve and retain the American system of Government, under which it has grown to be the greatest and richest and most powerful Nation of the earth, then I tell you to-night the saving grace must come from the South, the home of the purest blooded American people in the Republic, the last citadel of the old-time stock, and in the very vanguard of the host that must battle for the Government of our fathers, for representative government, for liberty, and for individualism, must stand the Georgia Cracker; and if, perchance, the future trials that God has ordained for this people shall demand, in the hour

of gravest need, some leader with the unselfish patriotism of a Washington, the deep philosophy of a Jefferson, and the dauntless courage of a Jackson, the country may turn again for such leadership to the southern portion of the Republic, the cradle of its liberties, the nursery of its early greatness.

CHICKASAW AND CHOCTAW INDIANS.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon the subject of the enrollment in the Chickasaw and Choctaw Tribes of Indians.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the enrollment of the Chickasaw and Choctaw Indians. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FLOODS IN MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 458 (H. Rept. 573).

Resolved, That the following reports—
First, Report of Bernard and Totten, 1822, House Document No. 35, Seventeenth Congress, second session;
Second, Report of Charles Ellet, jr., 1852, Senate Executive Document No. 20, Thirty-second Congress, first session; and
Third, Report of Gen. A. A. Humphreys, 1866, Senate Executive Document No. 8, Fortieth Congress, first session—
relative to the control of floods in the Mississippi River be reprinted as one pamphlet for the use of the House.

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

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. What would be the expense of this?

Mr. BARNHART. Four hundred and ninety-five dollars.

Mr. MANN. This would be printed in the usual manner. It is provided that it shall be printed for the use of the House.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I do not know any way of doing that unless the number be specified. If it is to be printed as a House document, then it would be printed in the ordinary form as a House document, and we would get a certain quota and the Senate would get a certain quota, but there is no number specified in the resolution and the Public Printer would not know what to do with it. If the gentleman just wants to have it printed, it better read "printed as a House document."

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, then I move to amend the resolution by inserting in line 12 the words "as a House document" in lieu of the words "for the use of the House."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 12, strike out the words "for the use of the House" and insert in lieu thereof the words "as a House document," so that the line would read:

"Reprinted as one pamphlet as a House document."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOP. What would be the number printed?

Mr. BARNHART. That would be 1,361, under the rules.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARNHART, from the Committee on Printing, makes the following report (to accompany H. Res. 458):

"The Committee on Printing having had under consideration the House resolution (H. Res. 458) providing for the printing as a House document the reports of Bernard and Totten, Charles Ellet, jr., and Gen. A. A. Humphreys, relative to the control of floods in the Mississippi River, reports the same back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to.

"The estimated cost will be \$495.

"The unincumbered balance of the allotment for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, is \$329,996."

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, that motion is not in order. The gentleman from Indiana has the floor, and if the gentleman from Oregon desires time he should get it from the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, then I ask the gentleman from Indiana to yield me three minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. Before I yield the gentleman from Oregon three minutes I yield the same time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I had not thought it would be necessary to consume any time. Does the

gentleman from Oregon desire to get information with respect to the particular documents that are to be printed?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Oh, I have no intention of opposing the resolution; but I desire to address myself to the subject of printing generally.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, certain newspapers in New York and elsewhere have recently complained that the congressional franking privilege is a graft and that it ought to be abolished. Let us see what the facts are. A Congressman or Senator having a speech or report printed for distribution in his district must bear all the expense of such printing. He must give the Public Printer a check on his private funds for such cost. My bill at the Government Printing Office the past three years has been a good part of my salary. The only thing the Government donates is the postal frank. I am perfectly willing that this postal frank be abolished, provided Congress will pass a law giving to Members and Senators the same postal rates that are now enjoyed by the same newspapers that are now complaining of the "congressional franking graft." The big daily newspapers only pay 1 cent a pound for sending out their papers, or \$20 a ton. If Congress will give me those same terms I can send a speech to each voter in my district for from \$20 to \$40 postage, which cost would be negligible. Besides getting a rate of \$20 a ton, which is less than the transcontinental freight rate, the newspapers may send their papers by mail anywhere in the county of publication, except at city delivery offices, free of any postage. Furthermore, the speeches of a Congressman or Senators are delayed in transmission, as dead-head matter, while newspapers go by fast mail. My speeches recently sent to Portland were delayed 10 days on this account. I should have preferred to pay the same insignificant 1 cent a pound that the newspapers pay and had my speeches delivered on time. But what the newspapers would like to see required of a Congressman is that he pay first-class postage on his speeches, or 100 times as much as the newspapers pay. The newspapers desire to be the only means of communication between the National Legislature and the people. The newspapers would then be able to mold public opinion completely and run the Government according to their own selfish ends. The public is waking up to its rights. Hereafter the newspapers will be servants rather than the self-appointed bosses of the country. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

GENERAL DATA ON LAKE SUPERIOR-MISSISSIPPI RIVER CANAL.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 460 (H. Rept. 575).

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a House document 1,800 copies of a report made by Government Engineers C. L. Potter, F. R. Shunk, and E. D. Peck, and designated as General Data on Lake Superior-Mississippi River Canal.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Printing having had under consideration the House resolution (H. Res. 460) providing for the printing as a House document the report made by Government Engineers C. L. Potter, F. R. Shunk, and E. D. Peck, and designated as General Data on Lake Superior-Mississippi River Canal, reports the same back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to.

The estimated cost will be \$144.18.

The unincumbered balance of the allotment for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, is \$329,996.

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

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE was granted leave of absence, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be heard for 5 or 10 minutes in explanation of my introduction of the privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY] asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes to give the reasons why he introduced his resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. LEVY. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objected.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to withhold the objection for a moment.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for five minutes, just to explain—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is trying to bring up his resolution and have a discussion on matters now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

VOLUNTEER ARMY BILL.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill known as the Volunteer Army bill, H. R. 7138, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia calls up the Volunteer Army bill and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to explain—

Mr. HAY. I will answer any question the gentleman desires.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (No. 589).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7138) to provide for raising the volunteer forces of the United States in time of actual or threatened war, 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 amendments numbered 4, 5, 7, and 8.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 6, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That when three-fourths of the prescribed minimum enlisted strength of any company, troop, or battery, or when three-fourths of the prescribed minimum enlisted strength of each company, troop, or battery comprised in any battalion or regiment of the organized land militia of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, organized as prescribed by law and War Department regulations, shall volunteer and be accepted for service in the Volunteer Army as such company, troop, battery, battalion, or regiment, such organization may be received into the volunteer forces in advance of other organizations of the same arm or class from the same State, Territory, or District, and the officers in the organized land militia service with such organization may then, within the limits prescribed by law, be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as officers of corresponding grades in the Volunteer Army and be assigned to the same grades in the said organizations or elsewhere as the President may direct"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES HAY,
S. H. DENT, Jr.,
JULIUS KAHN,

Managers on the part of the House.

G. M. HITCHCOCK,
LUKE LEA,
H. A. DU PONT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The Clerk read the statement as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE.

A statement on the part of the managers of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 7138) to provide for raising the volunteer forces of the United States in time of actual or threatened war.

Senate amendment 1 inserts the words "while in the service of the United States" in section 1 of the bill, and the House recedes.

Senate amendment 2 changes the enlistment period and makes it four years instead of for the war, and the House recedes.

Senate amendment 3 provides for the volunteering of the Organized Militia, and the House recedes with an amendment making clearer the conditions under which this can be done.

Senate amendment 4 strikes out the words "to promotion or" in the section defining the respective rights of the Volunteer and Regular forces, and the Senate recedes.

Senate amendment 5 changes the method of selecting the number of volunteer staff officers, and the Senate recedes.

Senate amendment 6 provides for filling temporary vacancies in the staff corps, and the House recedes.

Senate amendment 7 adds a new section to the bill providing for discharge of volunteer officers, and the Senate recedes.

Senate amendment 8 changes the number of the section, and the Senate recedes.

JAMES HAY,
S. H. DENT, Jr.,
JULIUS KAHN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HAY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will answer any questions.

Mr. MANN. Would not the gentleman, in view of the situation, be kind enough to state to the House not merely the amendments proposed but just how we increase our Volunteer Army by the bill itself, briefly, so we will all have it?

Mr. MURDOCK. And if the gentleman will explain in detail just what the difference is in amendment numbered 3 as agreed to by the conferees from what it is as carried as an amendment in the bill?

Mr. FOSTER. And also may I call the attention of the chairman to amendment numbered 2 and ask him to explain the reason for that change?

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, in the first place, this bill provides the mode by which the President, when authorized by Congress upon a declaration of war, can call out the Volunteer forces of the country. The mode of doing so is the same as that which has been heretofore made in the law except that in this case the President himself signs the commission of all officers instead of their being appointed by the governors of the States.

It was the experience in the Spanish War that a great deal of abuse was occasioned by reason of the political influences brought to bear upon governors of States for appointment in the Volunteer forces. This bill also provides how the Organized Militia—and that is an answer I will try to make to what the gentleman from Kansas desires—how the Organized Militia of the country may have the first call, as it were. It provides that when three-fourths of the minimum strength of any company, troop, battery, battalion, or regiment enlists or volunteers and is accepted, that they shall be taken in advance of the other volunteers, thus providing that the organized troops, those who have had the advantage of being drilled and have had the advantage of experience, shall first be taken in before untried men who have not had this advantage.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAY. I will.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what I think the first amendment to the bill did. Now, what does this other agreement to amendment 3 do in addition to that?

Mr. HAY. Well, it does not do anything in addition to that. It simply made clear that these troops had to be accepted by the United States before they were taken, for the reason that under the amendment adopted by the Senate if they volunteered they had to be taken in whether they were physically fit or not.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAY. And therefore the conferees thought it was absolutely necessary, in order to protect the Government in case of pensions and other matters of that sort, that they should be accepted by the Government before they should be allowed to volunteer. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand the gentleman refers to the manner of commissioning officers. He does not mean the appointment?

Mr. HAY. Yes. I mean the officers of this force are to be commissioned by the President of the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have not finished the question yet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KAHN. If my colleague will allow me to suggest there, I believe the bill provides he shall issue the commission upon the recommendation of the governor.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was a question I was going to ask. Of course, this virtually means the calling in of the militia of the various States, does it not?

Mr. HAY. It means the calling in of the militia, and the militia in the sense of the Constitution is all the men who are of military age in the country.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand that. Now, the gentleman knows, of course, that the appointment of the officers of that force is by the Constitution reserved to the States?

Mr. HAY. No; I do not. There is a very great distinction between the Organized Militia and the Volunteers.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is what I wanted the gentleman to explain.

Mr. HAY. The Organized Militia of the State can not be called into the service of the United States as such to go beyond the confines of the United States under the Constitution. Therefore this bill provides a way by which the Organized Militia can volunteer and become Volunteers. And the Volunteers are entirely different from the members of the Organized Militia.

Mr. BARTLETT. Therefore the gentleman is confident that this bill, as he has drawn it and as it is sought to be agreed to by this amendment, will not conflict with the rights of the States appointing the officers in the militia?

Mr. HAY. In the Organized Militia; not at all.

Mr. HELVERING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAY. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HELVERING. Do I understand that they will be known as United States Volunteers or known as State Volunteers?

Mr. HAY. They will be United States Volunteers. They will volunteer into the service of the United States.

Mr. HELVERING. Then they will not be designated as certain regiments of Kansas and Missouri, and so forth?

Mr. HAY. Oh, they could designate them as "such and such" volunteer regiment of Kansas—"the Fifteenth Regiment," for example.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman be kind enough to relieve the mind of a constituent of mine, a man celebrated in military affairs, Gen. W. G. Price, who has spent a life among the military men of Pennsylvania? He is very anxious about this bill. It would confer no higher authority upon the President to accept the military organization beyond the size of a battalion?

Mr. HAY. A regiment.

Mr. BUTLER. He may now accept a regiment?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman answer another question for me? The first military organization to be accepted, if we need them, will be the regular Organized Militia?

Mr. HAY. If the volunteers can comply with the requirements of the law.

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman will be patient with me a minute, in order that I may understand, I would like to ask, if this bill passes it would authorize these men to go beyond the territorial limits of the United States?

Mr. HAY. Oh, yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Then they will accept, under those conditions, the Organized Militia as now organized, officers and men?

Mr. HAY. No; they will accept the Organized Militia as now organized if three-fourths of the minimum enlisted strength of any organization up to and including a regiment shall volunteer—

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. Will they then accept the officers?

Mr. HAY. There is nothing in the law which requires the President to do so, but I have no question but that the President of the United States would commission the officers of any organization which volunteered under those conditions.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, again, after the privilege is given to the Organized Militia to volunteer to go beyond our boundaries, after that is exhausted they go after what is known as volunteers?

Mr. HAY. No. They are the volunteers, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. They are just simply giving to the Organized Militia the privilege of volunteering first, and being taken first, before any other volunteers shall be taken from any State or Territory.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And permitted to volunteer as an organization?

Mr. HAY. As an organization under the requirements of the statute.

Mr. BUTLER. Then that would not cover an independent organization beyond the State militia, would it?

Mr. HAY. You mean independent of the Organized Militia?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAY. It would not.

Mr. BUTLER. This is only to cover, then, the State militia?

Mr. HAY. The Organized State Militia.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice, beginning on page 1, that the House had a provision that an enlistment in the volunteer forces shall be for a period terminating with the war, or, if war shall not occur, past the imminence of war, and the Senate added that the term of these enlistments should be four years. So I wanted to know the reasons why, if I could.

Mr. HAY. The House conferees and the House committee were strongly of the opinion that the enlistment should be for the war. It was thought that the experience and history of this country showed that it was better for men to volunteer for the war or to enlist for the war rather than for a definite period. The Senate conferees took the position that we ought to conform, as far as possible, to the requirements of the Regular Army, and as the enlistment period for the Regular Army

was four years, they thought that we ought to make the period for the enlistment of these volunteers four years.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me say this: If volunteer forces should be taken into the Army, and men should volunteer, and war was in existence, and that war should terminate within 30 days, these men would be held for four years?

Mr. HAY. No. The bill specifically provides that they shall be mustered out as soon as practicable, and that will be a part of their contract.

Mr. FOSTER. But it does not keep them there for four years unless war actually exists for four years?

Mr. HAY. Oh, yes. That is correct. Now I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

Mr. HULINGS. I have a telegram here from an officer of the Organized Militia, in which he asks this question:

Will the passage of the Volunteer Army bill, reported out of conference yesterday, eliminate the Organized Militia for war use and eventually obviate the necessity for maintaining State organizations in time of peace? It will also be an injustice to the present Organized Militia and the officers and the enlisted men who look forward to service in time of war.

Now, this bill when it was before the committee, as I remember it, did not provide for the organization of the volunteer forces until after the Organized Militia had been called into service.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman will remember that when the bill was before the committee and when the bill passed the House it did not give to the Organized Militia any preference over any other volunteers; but the Senate amended the bill by providing that when three-fourths of the minimum strength of any of those organizations should volunteer they should be received in advance of other volunteers; and the amendment agreed to in conference does not in any way interfere with that principle.

Mr. HULINGS. Now, there is one more question. I observe, on page 3, in line 17, this provision:

That when the raising of a volunteer force shall have been authorized by Congress, and after the organized land militia of any arm or class shall have been called into the military service of the United States, volunteers of that particular arm or class may be raised and accepted into said service in accordance with the terms of this act regardless of the extent to which other arms or classes of said militia shall have been called into said service.

Now, let us consider what the effect would be, for instance, in the State of Pennsylvania, with 10,000 Organized Militia, embracing 14 regiments. According to the language of this bill it would appear that none of the volunteer forces could be called for until after the Organized Militia have been called into the service, but the language of the last two or three lines is:

Regardless of the extent to which other arms or classes of said militia shall have been called into said service.

Suppose, then, that 1 regiment of those 14 that are now organized should be called in. Could they then organize the "volunteer forces" without calling in the other 13 regiments?

Mr. HAY. Not under this bill. If the gentleman will permit me, as I understand it, if the President calls for troops, or calls for volunteers, I should say—say he calls for 250,000 volunteers, and the quota of Pennsylvania under that bill would be 21,000, and you have 15,000 Organized Militia; as I understand it, if those bodies of Organized Militia volunteer, under the requirements of this act they would be first taken in before the 6,000 additional men are received.

Mr. HULINGS. I understand; and that was my former understanding of it. But how about this language that I have read that they can volunteer and then be accepted in the service without reference to the extent to which other classes of said militia shall be called into service? How about that?

Mr. HAY. That applies to classes of volunteers.

Mr. HULINGS. Then I understand from the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that the Organized Militia will first be called. After they are called, if the number is not sufficient, then this bill authorizes the organization of what is called the "volunteer forces." Is that right?

Mr. HAY. That is correct; yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HAY. I will.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish the gentleman to be patient with me, because I am not trained in military affairs.

Mr. HAY. I will.

Mr. MURDOCK. I believe that presently in this country the cry "On to Mexico City!" will begin. I am willing to leave the strategy of this campaign to the Army, but I want to find out just what this bill does. This measure provides the manner in which the President can call for volunteers. It does not authorize him to call for volunteers?

Mr. HAY. Oh, no. He can not call for volunteers until the Congress has declared war.

Mr. MURDOCK. In case our Army should start for Mexico City and it should be found that Gen. Funston's forces were not sufficient, or not thought to be sufficient, to go to the City of Mexico—although he has as many men as Gen. Scott had—and Gen. Scott made the trip easily, as I believe Gen. Funston can—then under this bill the President could call for volunteers?

Mr. HAY. Not unless the Congress first authorized it.

Mr. MURDOCK. We would first have to authorize it?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. And in that authorization we would fix the number of men?

Mr. HAY. No; the President fixes the number of men. After we authorize him to call out the volunteers he determines how many he will call out.

Mr. MURDOCK. Should the call be made, the Regular Army would be already engaged?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Under this bill would the State militia organizations volunteer their services and have the preference over other volunteer organizations?

Mr. HAY. They would if they came within the provisions of the law.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then the State militia generally would fill up the quota?

Mr. HAY. It would depend on how many the President would call. If he called for 250,000 men the present Organized State Militia would not suffice. There are only 118,000 Organized Militia now in the country, or about that, so that you would see you have a very large number—one hundred and thirty-odd thousand volunteers—to raise outside of the Organized Militia.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, if a militia regiment in Kansas, for example, would present itself, it would have a preference over a volunteer organization that was not State militia?

Mr. HAY. Exactly.

Mr. MURDOCK. After the Kansas militia had volunteered and had been taken into the forces of the United States as a volunteer regiment, and then another regiment, not State militia, should volunteer and be taken in, what would be the difference in the status of the officers of the two organizations? In the first instance, the officers are already serving. They have been appointed by the governor. Would they be recommissioned by the President of the United States?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. And would it be mandatory on the part of the department, therefore, to take the militia regiment?

Mr. HAY. It is; and there would be no difference whatever between the officers as to standing, or privileges, or anything else.

Mr. KAHN. Except in priority of commission.

Mr. HAY. That is all.

Mr. MURDOCK. In the case of the second volunteer regiment, which had not been a State militia regiment, would its officers be appointed in the first instance by the governor of the State?

Mr. HAY. No; they would be commissioned by the President of the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. And the governor would have nothing to do with it?

Mr. HAY. Nothing to do with it except to recommend; that is all.

Mr. MURDOCK. In the case of which we have been talking, the first regiment of volunteers would come from the State militia?

The second regiment to which I have referred would not come from the State militia. What proportion of those officers named by the President could be officers detailed from the Regular Army?

Mr. HAY. There is a provision in the bill for the detailing of not more than four Regular Army officers to any one regiment.

Mr. MURDOCK. The President, then, could appoint Regular Army officers to both of these volunteer regiments?

Mr. HAY. Yes; but he could not appoint more than four Regular Army officers to any one regiment.

Mr. MURDOCK. In the case of the State militia officers originally appointed by the governor and recommissioned by the President, are their rights to promotion under this bill the same as those of Regular Army officers?

Mr. HAY. They are.

Mr. TEMPLE. I should like to inquire about the process of transforming the Organized Militia into volunteer forces. Preparatory to asking the question, I should like to state first that I notice that the amendment inserted on page 3 is modified by the conference report.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What line?

Mr. TEMPLE. Page 3, line 8. The amendment as printed in the bill is as follows:

And the officers in service with such organizations may then be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as officers of corresponding grades in the Volunteer Army and be assigned to the same grades in the said organizations.

Now, I notice that the amendment as modified by the conference report provides that these officers may be assigned to the same grades in the said organizations—

Or elsewhere, as the President may direct.

Is it intended that the Organized Militia may be brought into the service of the United States, and then the officers taken away from their own regiments and scattered elsewhere?

Mr. HAY. I do not think it is intended to do that; but it is certainly necessary to give the President the power to transfer his officers anywhere he pleases. Therefore that provision was inserted there, so that the President could have complete control over the officers of the volunteer forces, as well as over those of the Regular Army.

Mr. TEMPLE. Then, an officer who would apply for a commission would not be applying for a commission in any particular regiment?

Mr. HAY. No; a man would apply for a commission as colonel, and when he was commissioned as colonel it would be for the President to say where he should serve.

Mr. TEMPLE. He might be assigned to his own regiment, or he might be assigned to service elsewhere?

Mr. HAY. He might be assigned to service elsewhere.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The chairman of the committee, in answering the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE], has answered one question which I desired to ask. If I understood him correctly, although the officers of the organized land militia would ordinarily go with the volunteer regiments which had been militia regiments, of course, as the chairman has explained, it must be left to the President in his option to assign them to such duty as he pleases. However, the chairman assures the committee that the officers of these organized units would under ordinary circumstances go with their companies and regiments as now organized.

Mr. HAY. I think so. I can not speak for the President, but that would be common sense.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I want to ask the chairman of the committee the meaning of the words—

And such volunteer forces as Congress may authorize.

Does that mean such numbers as Congress may authorize?

Mr. HAY. No; as I said a moment ago, the Congress authorizes the President to make the call for volunteers, and then the President determines how many volunteers he will call into the service.

Mr. TOWNSEND. When the President has determined how many, then must Congress authorize that number?

Mr. HAY. Oh, no.

Mr. HARRISON. The declaration of war does that, does it not?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It says—

And such volunteer forces as Congress may authorize.

Mr. HAY. Congress authorizes a call for volunteer forces, and then the President determines how many he will call out. The Congress then has nothing more to do with those forces, except to pay them and maintain them.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I want to get this clear in my mind. It says—

And such volunteer forces as Congress may authorize.

Must Congress first authorize a certain number of volunteers?

Mr. HAY. No; Congress simply authorizes the President to call out the volunteer forces of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAY. I will.

Mr. MANN. Is not this the procedure: First, we declare war—

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And then we authorize the President to call out the volunteer forces, or we do both at the same time.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. HAY. We may do both at the same time, and then the President determines how many volunteers he will call out, and then he will proceed to organize them under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman said that first there would be a declaration of war. This bill provides that in case of war or the imminence of war—

Mr. HAY. Yes; but then Congress must declare war.

Mr. MURDOCK. Before the authorization?

Mr. HAY. Yes. The Executive can not call for volunteers until Congress declares war, or authorizes the President to call them out.

Mr. STEENERSON. As I understand this bill, it does away with the Organized Militia to the extent that they come into this volunteer force.

Mr. HAY. It does away with the Organized Militia as such in time of war. That is, I mean if the Organized Militia wants to be a part of the force that is going to war it must volunteer.

Mr. STEENERSON. And it must cease to be an Organized Militia of the State.

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. The necessity for that is the opinion of the Attorney General rendered a couple of years ago that the Organized Militia law, act of March 21, 1908, the bill for which was reported by me as chairman of the Committee on Militia, providing that the militia might be called out and sent either within or without the United States—that that law was unconstitutional.

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. And it is to obviate that constitutional objection that this bill is written, endeavoring to transfer the militia into a volunteer army.

Mr. HAY. That is one reason.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is not that the principal reason?

Mr. HAY. I can not say that that is the principal reason for this bill. We would have to have volunteers anyway, because the Organized Militia would not be sufficient.

Mr. STEENERSON. If the ruling of the Attorney General should turn out to be erroneous, that the Organized Militia law amendment to the Dick law referred to, if that law should be determined to be constitutional, so that it would be legal and constitutional for the President to send the Organized Militia outside the United States, then the necessity for this provision would not exist.

Mr. HAY. No; it would not.

Mr. STEENERSON. I want to say to the House that the only authority was the ruling of Attorney General Wickersham on that point, and when the Committee on Militia considered the Dick law and amendment that was requested by the War Department it contained this provision, that the militia might be used outside the United States. The Judge Advocate General of the United States Army made an elaborate argument and cited many authorities, to the effect that when the President calls forth the militia, pursuant to a declaration of war, it is in reality and effect to execute a law of the Union, and therefore within the Constitution.

The opinion of the Attorney General of February 17, 1912, to the Secretary of War was in answer to the following question:

Whether or not under existing laws the President has authority to call forth the Organized Militia of the States and send it into a foreign country with the Regular Army as a part of an army of occupation, especially should the United States intervene in the affairs of such country under conditions short of actual warfare?

The question seems to have been unfortunately framed, for under the conditions specified it is at least open to grave question whether the President could legally send any army whatever into a foreign country. It seems to me that the sending of an army by the President into a foreign country "under conditions short of actual warfare" would, ordinarily, be an act of war and would be illegal unless previously authorized by law; that is, by declaration of war in due form enacted by Congress. Commenting on the clause of the Constitution, which says:

The Congress shall have power to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, to suppress insurrection, and to repel invasions:

The opinion says:

What is certainly meant by this provision is that Congress shall have power to call forth the militia in aid of the civil power, for the peaceful execution of the laws of the Union, wherever such laws are in force and may be compulsorily executed.

But Congress is nowhere authorized to call forth the militia. That power rests with the President. All that Congress can do is to provide by law for calling it forth. It is the President who, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia, does the calling and not Congress.

The whole opinion is based upon the theory that the laws of the United States have no extraterritorial force. Speaking of ordinary laws, that is true. But there are other laws of the United States that do have extraterritorial force and which do require to be executed. Congress has the power to "define and punish piracies and felonies on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations." Manifestly laws enacted in pursuance of this authority operate extraterritorially. Congress also has power under the Constitution "to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water." Obviously laws enacted pursuant to this authority also have an extraterritorial force and require to be executed. The same can be said of laws enacted pursuant to

the authority "to raise and support armies, to provide for the maintenance of the Navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces." There are three cases in which the militia may be called forth by the President: First, to execute the laws of the Union; second, to suppress insurrections; and third, repel invasions. The power to declare war is vested in Congress and is legislative in its character, and its exercise is an act of Congress and a law and is subject to the approval of the President. To repel invasions or suppress insurrections requires no declaration of war and hence no law. It is one of the duties of the Executive of the United States, incident to his office, to do both of these things without any further legislation; that is, suppress insurrections and repel invasions. But offensive war must be commenced by a declaration of war, and the power to declare war is in Congress, and therefore must be preceded by a law which requires execution.

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution the Regular Army consisted of 75 men; 50 were at West Point and 25 were at Pittsburgh, and the framers of the Constitution recognized full well that Congress was not under the slightest obligation to establish a standing army or to provide for any other military forces than the militia, with a view to national defense, and volunteer forces seem not to have been known to the framers of the Constitution, for it is a subject never mentioned either in that instrument or in the debates. The first appearance of volunteer forces seems to have been in 1812. The militia was used in the War of 1812, in the War with Mexico, and in the Civil War, and was sent beyond our borders whenever necessary, and when so sent they were sent to execute the laws of the Union, enacted pursuant to the Constitution.

The act of May 27, 1908, "To further amend the act entitled 'An act to promote the efficiency of the militia,' etc., provides for the calling forth of the militia by the President, and that he may specify in his call the period of time for which such service may be required, and that the militia so called shall continue in the service during the term specified, either within or outside of the territory of the United States. The question of the constitutionality of this provision was carefully considered before its enactment, and I have seen no reason since to change my opinion as to its validity.

The construction adopted by the Attorney General wipes out of the Constitution the first cause for calling forth the militia entirely and makes the clause read as if it said "to suppress insurrection and repel invasions for the purpose of enforcing the laws of the Union," but as the sole object and purpose of suppressing insurrections and repelling invasions is to enforce all domestic laws, both of the States and the Union, such a limitation on the power to call forth the militia would be absurd.

Besides declarations of war there are, as we have seen, other laws of the Union, authorized by the Constitution, that operate extraterritorially, and require to be executed. These laws do not follow, but accompany our flag wherever our forces may be. Assuming, therefore, that circumstances could arise when it would be lawful in time of peace to send an army of occupation into a foreign country, it could only be to execute those other laws of the Union, and therefore the use of the Army and the militia for such an enterprise rests exactly upon the same footing, and there is as much authority for the one as the other.

Mr. HAY. I did not yield to the gentleman to make an argument.

Mr. STEENERSON. Of course, we are going to pass this bill because of the emergency that now exists. We will stand by the President and give him what he asks for the defense of the Nation and its honor. At the same time it will be well to bear in mind that this measure, so far as it relates to the militia, is revolutionary in character. It wipes out the militia and allows its men a preference in enlisting in the new volunteer force. The Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have power "to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress." Under this bill not only have the States nothing to say about officering the transformed militia organizations, but only those men are accepted whom the United States accepts, the same as new recruits.

It is a repeal of the militia law, so far as service to the General Government is concerned.

Mr. MONDELL and Mr. SLOAN rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERLEY). To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 3 provides for the enlistment as volunteer forces of militia organizations under certain conditions, and in line 9, relative to the officers

of such militia organizations, it is stated that they "may be appointed" by the President as officers of the volunteer organizations. How does the gentleman construe the word "may"? Is it in any sense mandatory?

Mr. HAY. I construe it to mean that the President may appoint him or not, as he sees fit.

Mr. MONDELL. And it is a direction on the part of Congress that they shall be appointed if qualified and worthy.

Mr. HAY. I take it so; yes.

Mr. MONDELL. If a militia company, regiment, or a battalion volunteers generally that will be due largely to the influence of their officers and with the expectation that if the officer is qualified he will be appointed. But this language is in no degree mandatory.

Mr. HAY. No; and I do not think it ought to be.

Mr. MONDELL. I agree with the gentleman, but it would seem to carry with it the view of Congress that the officers should be appointed if qualified and fit for the service.

Mr. HAY. Yes; I think so.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, one question more. On page 4, section 4, there is a provision in the lines 8 and 9 as it passed the House which provides that no distinction shall be made between the Regular Army and the Organized Militia and the Volunteer forces while in the military service of the United States in respect to promotion, and so forth. Now, the conferees agree to strike out the word "promotion."

Mr. HAY. No; the Senate struck out the word "promotion" and in conference the Senate receded. The word "promotion" remains in the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand that with the language in the bill the two forces are to be considered one; that promotions would be made from the Volunteer forces to the Regular forces?

Mr. HAY. No.

Mr. MONDELL. But that in all respects promotions are to be made in the Volunteer forces on the same general rule and principles that they are made in the Regular Army.

Mr. HAY. Yes; in the Regular Army. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. The chairman said that the President may appoint four officers from the Regular Army as officers in each regiment.

Mr. HAY. Not more than four.

Mr. SLOAN. It may be that the four leading offices of a regiment from any one of the States may be officered by the appointment from the Regular Army by the President?

Mr. HAY. It might be, but I do not think that in any case it ever would be.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the chairman say that it is not contemplated that this shall be done?

Mr. HAY. I think I can say that the regular officers of a volunteer regiment will not all of them be given the highest rank of that regiment. Of course I do not know what the President or the War Department might do, but I am arguing from common sense, and I take it that these officers from the Regular Army would be put in the volunteer regiments for the purpose of training and teaching the volunteers the art of war and how to take care of themselves in war, and not for the purpose of imposing on the volunteer regiment regular officers and giving them the highest rank in the regiment.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the chairman, drawing his information from common sense and from conferences which he has had with the officers of this Government, say that he can give the country a reasonable assurance that probably the four leading officers of the regiments from the various States will not be made from the Regular Army, and that our men from the States, who have built up their State organizations, shall have the first call with a reasonable expectancy of occupying the four leading positions in the regiment?

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman that I have had no conference with the officers of the Army or with the President or with the Secretary of War. I only know and believe that they are reasonable men and that they are not going to do a thing like that, which would immediately discredit any administration which pursued such a course, and I am satisfied it will not be pursued.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. TAGGART. As I understand the bill, militia organizations already in existence and volunteer organizations to be afterwards organized are practically on an equal footing when they tender their services to the Government.

Mr. HAY. They are.

Mr. TAGGART. The only difference between the militia officers now in the service commissioned by the State governors and those men who may apply for appointment as commissioned officers in other volunteer organizations is this: That

the service of these militia officers will be taken into consideration by the appointing power.

Mr. HAY. I think so; yes.

Mr. TAGGART. That the President is not obliged under this bill to reappoint the same officers that any organization has now.

Mr. HAY. No; he is not.

Mr. TAGGART. But he may vary these appointments and may assign these Regular Army officers to any unit of any part of the regiment that may offer itself.

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. TAGGART. In fact, that all volunteers offered to the Government are on an equal footing, so far as the letter of the law is concerned.

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. TAGGART. And it is only recommendation and experience that will commend themselves under the law.

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the question I desire to ask has been asked a good many times this afternoon. I want to know whether this does not take away the power of the governors of the States to name the officers of the regiment?

Mr. HAY. It does not take away the power, because the governor has not the power now.

Mr. MADDEN. He has the power to name up to the colonel, has he not?

Mr. HAY. No. He has the power to do that in the Organized Militia, but when the Organized Militia volunteers in the service of the United States, under this bill, it ceases to be Organized Militia.

Mr. TOWNSEND. "While in the service of the United States."

Mr. HAY. And therefore the President is given under this bill the right to make these appointments, because they are volunteer forces and not Organized Militia.

Mr. MADDEN. So that no governor of any State can commission any man who goes into the volunteer service, even though a whole militia regiment may volunteer?

Mr. HAY. That is true.

Mr. TAGGART. And let me add this, that should at that time or now the governor of any State commission a soldier or officer in a militia regiment, that commission would remain until he tendered his services to the Government and they were accepted.

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. TAGGART. And then it would operate merely as a recommendation and not as any claim on the Government for any preference.

Mr. HAY. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KIRKPATRICK].

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, to my mind we are about to take a new departure in this matter, and in my judgment it will complicate matters somewhat. Heretofore and at the present time it is the custom that officers of companies and regiments are elected by the men, and, when so elected, they are then commissioned by the governors of the respective States. It is now proposed in this measure to give that privilege to the President of the United States, together with the advice and consent of the governor, which would not be so very bad except for the fact that, after that is done, it then goes to the Senate of the United States for confirmation; and if these appointments are hung up in the Senate, as we have seen them in so many cases in past years, would not that complicate matters in an emergency such as now confronts us?

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I can not conceive that the Senate of the United States would impede the progress of a war by holding up somebody's nomination.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. We can only judge the future by the past.

Mr. HAY. I have never known the Senate to do that in time of war. I have known them to do that for political reasons in time of peace.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. We have had an exhibition of dissent already in this House.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. As I understand, there are three propositions in the bill. The first is to get around the constitutional objection to taking the Organized Militia as a unit. As I understand, that is one of the objects of the bill. Organized Militia companies are simply permitted to volunteer as a unit.

Mr. HAY. Yes; we take them as a unit.

Mr. WINGO. Where three-fourths of the enlisted men of the regiment volunteer they are accepted as a unit.

Mr. HAY. Three-fourths of the minimum enlisted strength.
 Mr. WINGO. Yes. As to the proposition of commissioned officers, I understood the gentleman to say, in answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], that the appointment of officers below the grade of brigadier general—in other words, the regimental officers—was made mandatory upon the recommendation of the governor?

Mr. HAY. Oh, no. The gentleman misunderstood me. I did not state that.

Mr. WINGO. Under this bill, if it becomes a law, without expressing any opinion as to the alleged evil with reference to political colonels, then it would be impossible to appoint a political colonel unless the President approved?

Mr. HAY. That is true.

Mr. WINGO. In other words, one more check is added. At the present time the governor may, over his own judgment, appoint a man as colonel whom he recognizes from a military standpoint should not be appointed.

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. But if he yields to the pressure now the President will always have jurisdiction before the political colonel will be appointed.

Mr. HAY. In other words, the President makes the appointment, and not the governor. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. Suppose you have members of the militia volunteering under this system who would like to hold together under their own officers and who must take their chances, since the distribution of officers as well as of men is to take place at the discretion of the President after they have been mustered in. What becomes of those officers of a higher grade than colonel?

Mr. HAY. They will be appointed by the President if they are worthy of appointment, and therefore there has been no provision made in this bill for the appointment of general officers, for the reason that during the Spanish War the bill in that case provided for the appointment of general officers without any limitation upon the number, and the result was that a large number of general officers were appointed who did not have even a command, but went around with a staff. Now, what is proposed to be done is, when war is declared, if it is declared, that we will then know how many volunteers the President will call out, and then we will authorize the number of generals that he may appoint, so there will not be a lot of generals appointed without any soldiers to command.

Mr. MOORE. I have in mind the highest officer in the militia in my State, who is a major general and the commander of brigades, whom, I suppose, rank as brigadier generals. They would not come in under this system at all and would have to be recognized by the President in some other way, according to their experience and worth?

Mr. HAY. Yes; I have no doubt that Pennsylvania, with her brigade or division, that the President would appoint a brigadier general from that State who had experience with those troops.

Mr. MOORE. The bill does not provide for that, but it is left to the discretion of the President?

Mr. HAY. Undoubtedly; and I think the President should have this discretion.

Mr. MOORE. One other question, if the gentleman pleases. An organized body of men, trained in soldiery, and not attached to the Organized Militia of the State, is in my mind now.

Mr. HAY. City troops.

Mr. MOORE. Well, the city troops are attached to the State militia. They are organizations of high grade and historic interest; but I have in mind a body called the State Fencibles, and other bodies not attached to the regular militia of the State. How would they be treated in the event of the passage of this bill, not being of the Organized Militia?

Mr. HAY. The Organized Militia of Pennsylvania would first be called into service as volunteers. If they did not make up the quota of the State, then these other troops the gentleman is speaking about could volunteer, and doubtless would be accepted and would be upon the same footing.

Mr. MOORE. Now, we understand and these men may understand that after offering their services if there is not a sufficient number of regiments to make up the quota of the State in response to the President's call, they may come into the service if the President accepts them?

Mr. HAY. Yes. Now I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BARTON. At that point, suppose there were 250,000 volunteers called for and there were 118,000 militia. Now, in constituting its quota does the gentleman take into consideration the number of regiments that there are by the number of militia there are in each State?

Mr. HAY. No; each State is given its quota in accordance with its population.

Mr. BARTON. The point I want to ask is, in Nebraska—and I had a wire this morning that there were three regiments ready for service—suppose Nebraska's quota would not take up those three regiments?

Mr. HAY. Then Nebraska would have to furnish other volunteers to make up the quota.

Mr. BARTON. The gentleman does not understand me. Suppose they had more in the three regiments than their quota, would they have preference over volunteers in another State that did not have a sufficient militia quota?

Mr. HAY. They would not.

Mr. BARTON. That is the point I wanted to get clear in my mind.

Mr. HAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I desire to ask the gentleman this question for my personal information. In speaking of the preference to be given to militia organizations in the various States the gentleman and those who have interrogated him have referred to regiments. Do I understand no less organization than a regiment will be given preference?

Mr. HAY. The law provides that any troop, battery, company, battalion, or regiment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that the bill as it passed the House provided for the acceptance of the militia as individuals and not by companies. Now, I understand the Senate provision would incorporate them either by company, regiment, and brigade if three-fourths—

Mr. HAY. No brigade.

Mr. STAFFORD. By regiment if three-fourths are in favor of enlistment. I assume that the individuals constituting those three-fourths will, nevertheless, enlist as individuals and the minority of one-fourth will not be brought into the service, even though three-fourths should register their approval to enlist.

Mr. HAY. It is entirely voluntary on the part of the members of the organization of the militia; they do not have to do it if they do not want to.

Mr. HULINGS. I would like to ask what seems to me is a fundamental question, and we all ought to have it settled in our minds. The Constitution of the United States provides that all able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 45 shall constitute the militia; that the President shall be commander in chief of the militia when called into service; but that the right to appoint officers shall be reserved to the governors of the States.

Mr. HAY. That is the Organized Militia.

Mr. HULINGS. That is the militia. At the time of the Constitution they did not know anything about the Organized Militia. They stick to the word "militia."

Mr. HAY. If the gentleman will read the Constitution he will find the words "organized militia."

Mr. HULINGS. I have read the Constitution as often as you have.

Mr. HAY. I have not time to go into the constitutional question, but if the gentleman wants to ask me any question about—

Mr. HULINGS. I have asked you a question which I think is a fair one.

Mr. HAY. What is the question?

Mr. HULINGS. I have recited the Constitution to you, and I know what it says. I ask you how you get around that question?

Mr. HAY. I have stated to the gentleman that the Constitution says "Organized Militia" and not "militia."

Mr. HULINGS. The Constitution says the militia shall comprise able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 45, and does not speak of "Organized Militia."

Mr. HAY. It says:

Congress shall have the power to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline described by Congress.

Now, if there is no other question—

Mr. WILLIS. I want to be sure I understand the answer that you gave to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore]. Now, suppose that there are two organizations here. In a case where there are more volunteers from a State than that State is entitled to under its quota—here are a thousand men connected with the State militia, over here a thousand men in an independent organization—what I want to know is, does this State organization have any preference in being received in the service over the independent organization?

Mr. HAY. It has under the reading of this bill; yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Now, where is the language under which it has that preference? The amendment proposed by the conferees is as follows:

Provided further, That when three-fourths of the prescribed minimum enlisted strength of any company, troop, or battery, or when three-fourths of the prescribed minimum enlisted strength of each company, troop, or battery comprised in any battalion or regiment of the organized land militia of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, organized as prescribed by law and War Department regulations, shall volunteer and be accepted for service in the Volunteer Army as such company, troop, battery, battalion, or regiment, such organization may be received into the volunteer forces in advance of other organizations of the same arm or class from the same State, Territory, or District, and the officers in the organized land militia service with such organization may then, within the limits prescribed by law, be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as officers of corresponding grades in the Volunteer Army and be assigned to the same grades in the said organizations or elsewhere as the President may direct.

Now, is that language the only language that bears on the point?

Mr. HAY. You will find there, after the words in line 1 of the bill, it says:

Any battalion or regiment of the Organized Land Militia of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia organized as prescribed by law or War Department regulations.

Mr. WILLIS. If the gentleman will permit further, does it say that this State organization will have the preference? What I am getting at is that language where the word "may" is used. It says "it may be received" into the volunteer forces in advance of other organizations. Does that leave it entirely optional with the President?

Mr. HAY. I think so.

Mr. WILLIS. Then it is like the provision as to the appointment of officers. It is merely directory and not mandatory?

Mr. HAY. That is right. Now, Mr. Chairman, if there is no other question, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERLEY). The gentleman from Virginia demands the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

NAVAL STATION, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent. This morning I introduced a resolution to make available certain unexpended balances heretofore appropriated for various purposes at the naval station at New Orleans for the operation of the shops there during the exigency of the present situation. The resolution has not been reported. It is at the Speaker's desk with the Clerk, and I desire to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may be discharged from further consideration thereof, and that the resolution be considered now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the following resolution, and that the same be now considered. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 253.

Resolved, etc., That any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the naval station, New Orleans, La., and not yet turned back into the Treasury, are hereby reappropriated and made available for expenditure at that station for such purposes as the Secretary of the Navy may direct.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman either have read or inserted in the Record the letter of the Secretary?

Mr. PADGETT. I was going to ask for the reading of the letter.

Mr. MANN. How much is the available balance?

Mr. PADGETT. The unobligated balance is \$233,097.05, as shown by the detailed statement in the letter of the Secretary.

Mr. MANN. And the reason for this is to maintain the naval station at New Orleans because it is convenient to naval vessels now at Vera Cruz and Tampico?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. It does not contemplate the erection of any buildings or permanent improvements, but the Secretary said he might have to buy some few tools, but very few of those, for the operation and maintenance of the yard incident to the conditions existing in the Gulf.

Mr. MANN. What other navy yard is there now to which those vessels could go?

Mr. PADGETT. There is a small yard at Key West, Fla.,

Mr. MANN. And they have nothing else on the Gulf?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. There is Pensacola, up on the Gulf, but that is not in condition to operate at this time.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. This is the unexpended balance of the amount appropriated for that navy yard for 1914?

Mr. PADGETT. No. Money has been appropriated at various times heretofore, and there have been unexpended balances of appropriations made for that yard, and they have not been covered back into the Treasury.

Mr. BARTLETT. They have not?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. BARTLETT. Why have they not been?

Mr. PADGETT. Because they were for such purposes that they did not have to be covered back. They were for such purposes that they were available until used.

Mr. SLAYDEN. What is the aggregate amount?

Mr. PADGETT. Two hundred and thirty-three thousand and ninety-seven dollars and five cents.

Mr. MANN. Those amounts are all set forth in the letter of the Secretary?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; in detail.

Mr. BARTLETT. Are the purposes for which the money is to be used specified in the Secretary's letter also? I do not ask that the gentleman read it.

Mr. PADGETT. Not in detail. He states here:

The department strongly urges that the total amount not being now needed for specific appropriations be reappropriated for expenditure at the naval station, New Orleans, for such purposes as the Secretary of the Navy may direct. This in view of the existing emergency and the necessity for providing to the extent of the capacity of the New Orleans station for the numerous vessels operating in the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the resolution which the gentleman offers, but which I did not hear read, authorize the Secretary of the Navy to divert this fund from the purposes for which it was appropriated?

Mr. PADGETT. From the purposes for which it was originally appropriated.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; that is what I mean.

Mr. PADGETT. For such purposes at this station as the Secretary of the Navy may direct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, for how many years do these unexpended balances accumulate?

Mr. PADGETT. Some of them were from the act of 1904, some from the act of 1905, some from the act of 1906, some from the act of 1907, and some from the acts of 1908, 1909, and 1910.

Mr. MURDOCK. And how much is the total?

Mr. PADGETT. The total is \$233,097.05.

Mr. MURDOCK. And does the statement show the nature of the accumulated items, year by year?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. And the nature of the acts under which they were appropriated?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; the amounts remaining under each act.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. May I ask the gentleman if the yard is used at all?

Mr. PADGETT. It is to be used for these purposes. This money was appropriated for the New Orleans yard for certain specific purposes, and the Secretary wants to enlarge the purposes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Is it not a fact that the Pensacola yard is nearer the base of operations than New Orleans is?

Mr. PADGETT. It would depend on where the operations were.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Say, at Vera Cruz.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not believe it would be.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] this question: If this exigency had not arisen down there at this time, what would have become of these unexpended balances?

Mr. PADGETT. Later on, I presume, they would have been turned in.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is there any time limit on that sort of thing?

Mr. PADGETT. The funds are available until used, and every now and then the Secretary gathers up these unexpended balances and turns them back into the Treasury.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PADGETT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the House joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this letter from the Secretary of the Navy as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the letter referred to:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 23, 1914.

Hon. LEMUEL P. PADGETT,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. PADGETT: Under various Congresses certain sums have been appropriated for projects at the navy yard, New Orleans, La. From these appropriations there are now remaining unexpended balances. This is due either to the work having cost less than originally estimated, or not being considered necessary in the present status of the yard.

The amounts involved are as follows:

	Amount appropriated.	Unobligated balance.
Act Apr. 27, 1904:		
Shops for Steam Engineering and fittings and gradings (previous appropriation \$100,000).....	\$35,000.00	\$308.07
Coal bins.....	5,000.00	1,011.16
Floor, Construction and Repair shops.....	5,500.00	797.77
Fencing naval property.....	10,000.00	7,680.42
Act Mar. 3, 1905:		
Water system, extensions.....	5,000.00	465.57
Fire-protection system.....	10,000.00	1,327.68
Act June 29, 1906:		
Machinery and tools for Yards and Docks shop.....	3,000.00	7,235.92
Sawmill, boat shop, and storage for Construction and Repair.....	60,000.00	57,147.61
Act Mar. 2, 1907:		
Central electric light and power plant, extension (previous appropriations, \$162,500).....	50,000.00	59,718.87
Railroad system (previous appropriations, \$30,000).....	5,000.00	630.50
Pitting up yard buildings 8 and 16.....	4,300.00	1,800.90
Act May 13, 1908:		
Drainage system, to continue.....	5,000.00	1,303.44
Central heating plant, extension.....	10,000.00	8,995.81
Underground conduit system.....	5,000.00	343.61
Improvements to machine shop, building No. 4.....	6,000.00	3,522.77
Sewer system, extension.....	5,000.00	3,744.74
Improvement to river front.....	25,000.00	1,823.92
Act Mar. 3, 1909, levee improvements and grading.....	45,000.00	10,560.58
Act June 24, 1910, power house and plant.....	64,677.71	64,677.71
Total unexpended balance.....		233,097.05

The department strongly urges that the total amount not being now needed for specific appropriations be reappropriated for expenditure at the naval station, New Orleans, for such purposes as the Secretary of the Navy may direct. This in view of the existing emergency and the necessity for providing to the extent of the capacity of the New Orleans station for the numerous vessels operating in the Gulf of Mexico.

The department requests that a resolution may be passed as soon as possible, as follows:

"That the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the naval station, New Orleans, La., and not yet turned back into the Treasury, are hereby reappropriated and made available for expenditure at that station for such purposes as the Secretary of the Navy may direct."

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy.

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up bill H. R. 15692, granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] calls up the bill H. R. 15692, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15692) granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I know of no desire on the part of anybody to engage in general debate, and I ask that the Clerk be directed to read the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Colvin S. Roberts, late repairer of telegraph lines, Quartermaster's Department, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I notice that there is a typographical error in stating the name of this pensioner. It should be "Calvin" instead of "Colvin S. Roberts."

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman knows that to be a fact?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. It should be "Calvin." I move, Mr. Speaker, an amendment to correct it. I move to amend by striking out the word "Colvin," on page 24, line 23, and inserting "Calvin."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 24, line 23, by striking out the word "Colvin" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "Calvin."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

The bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

- | | |
|--|--|
| H. R. 701. Julia E. Angel. | H. R. 12690. James Shepherd. |
| H. R. 986. Arabella McV. Russell. | H. R. 12761. Charles E. Smith. |
| H. R. 1440. John M. Harris. | H. R. 12774. Andrew J. Halley. |
| H. R. 1551. Mary T. Frank. | H. R. 12818. Joseph Smyth. |
| H. R. 2288. James E. Murdock. | H. R. 12854. Jacob Wintner, alias Strisle. |
| H. R. 2295. John F. Bennett. | H. R. 12947. Henry O. Pixley. |
| H. R. 3048. Hannah E. Matteson, now Crowell. | H. R. 12991. Nancy J. Vanzant. |
| H. R. 3459. Lorena A. Weaver. | H. R. 13009. William H. Harper. |
| H. R. 3775. James F. Conway. | H. R. 13032. William Defoe. |
| H. R. 5189. John C. Judy. | H. R. 13053. Annette B. Wanson. |
| H. R. 5429. John McIntosh. | H. R. 13064. Martha Gage. |
| H. R. 5506. Helen E. June. | H. R. 13068. Absalom O. Halliwell. |
| H. R. 6173. Engelina A. Fischer. | H. R. 13098. Emma Woods. |
| H. R. 6288. Constantine Kelley. | H. R. 13117. James P. Hayman. |
| H. R. 6293. Martha J. Collier. | H. R. 13156. John P. Cadwell. |
| H. R. 6312. Samuel S. Brand. | H. R. 13235. Baxter Hamilton. |
| H. R. 6548. John E. Frymier. | H. R. 13244. William H. Moore. |
| H. R. 6557. Elizabeth A. Sheridan. | H. R. 13248. Luke Lea. |
| H. R. 6601. Henry C. R. Rudolph. | H. R. 13367. Thomas W. Moore. |
| H. R. 7079. Cora J. Church. | H. R. 13386. William D. Smith. |
| H. R. 7103. Henry A. Capen. | H. R. 13510. Edward B. Ockington. |
| H. R. 7108. Edgar V. Harris. | H. R. 13525. Rosamond Ensley. |
| H. R. 7341. Mary A. Vaughn. | H. R. 13536. Melvin J. Amos. |
| H. R. 7632. Maggie E. Parsons. | H. R. 13585. George Scruggs. |
| H. R. 7865. Louisa Wildman. | H. R. 13616. Ella R. Cochraue. |
| H. R. 7916. Luman A. Fowler. | H. R. 13656. Isaac T. Lee. |
| H. R. 7961. Ira Baker. | H. R. 13665. Solon G. Van Derkar. |
| H. R. 7987. James T. Herrington. | H. R. 13687. John P. Baker. |
| H. R. 8790. Frederick Gelger. | H. R. 13689. Michael Kuhn. |
| H. R. 9217. Thomas Foreman. | H. R. 13752. Adelaide B. Wales. |
| H. R. 9274. Anna A. Purviance. | H. R. 13757. Philip L. Davis. |
| H. R. 9358. Mary J. Smith. | H. R. 13763. Henry R. J. Bennett. |
| H. R. 9484. William H. H. Cooper. | H. R. 13795. Christian Harchelrode. |
| H. R. 9559. Julia W. Stevens. | H. R. 13837. John W. Sweet. |
| H. R. 9602. Samuel Ginger. | H. R. 13843. Mary F. Lukacart. |
| H. R. 9715. John Finkle. | H. R. 13858. Theresa C. Ganung. |
| H. R. 9724. John A. Scranton. | H. R. 13886. Charles G. Turney. |
| H. R. 9748. George W. Chilson. | H. R. 13892. William T. Merrill. |
| H. R. 9794. Samuel D. Hess. | H. R. 13957. John Krause. |
| H. R. 10008. Levi D. Bodley. | H. R. 13958. Catharine M. Upson. |
| H. R. 10017. Margaret W. Strunk. | H. R. 13974. George A. Hitchcock. |
| H. R. 10108. James McCarthy. | H. R. 13990. Solomon Stricker. |
| H. R. 10226. William Hammonds. | H. R. 13991. Cora Story. |
| H. R. 10320. Sidney Van Bibber. | H. R. 14013. Melissa L. Williams. |
| H. R. 10490. John Harl. | H. R. 14027. Fredonia Williams. |
| H. R. 10572. Elsie A. Owen. | H. R. 14073. Charles H. Lester. |
| H. R. 10887. Edward M. Willis. | H. R. 14092. Jacob Vanderpool. |
| H. R. 10890. Abbie C. Goebell. | H. R. 14099. Eliza M. Clark. |
| H. R. 10903. Marilda Howe. | H. R. 14100. Elza W. Evans. |
| H. R. 10963. Edward T. Parker. | H. R. 14105. Matthew R. Jones. |
| H. R. 10978. Mary E. Cole. | H. R. 14136. James P. Sloan. |
| H. R. 10995. James W. Shields. | H. R. 14150. Napoleon Slater. |
| H. R. 11205. Emma E. Kipple. | H. R. 14159. James K. Earl. |
| H. R. 11222. Anna M. Fox. | H. R. 14161. Thomas R. Oliverson. |
| H. R. 11341. Newton S. Long. | H. R. 14176. Willis G. Craddock. |
| H. R. 11398. Frances W. Stoddard. | H. R. 14177. John T. Stasel. |
| H. R. 11426. Jessie Byerly. | H. R. 14186. Hattie Parsons. |
| H. R. 11431. Thomas J. Richie. | H. R. 14198. Colvin S. Roberts. |
| H. R. 11532. Thomas T. Smith. | H. R. 14208. Helen B. Reed. |
| H. R. 11541. Carrie I. Bramer. | H. R. 14220. Thomas C. Rutter. |
| H. R. 11559. George Craig. | H. R. 14228. George R. Belcher. |
| H. R. 11785. Nancy E. Burse. | H. R. 14272. David S. Curtis. |
| H. R. 11844. Barbara Hamilton. | H. R. 14275. Juan F. Short. |
| H. R. 11853. Catharine McCombs. | H. R. 14317. Catherine Fitzpatrick. |
| H. R. 11923. Anna Davidson, now Titus. | H. R. 14345. William Green. |
| H. R. 11963. Pernina S. Owen. | H. R. 14391. Alexander S. Bowen. |
| H. R. 12002. Margaret Connelly. | H. R. 14402. John O. Drawbaugh. |
| H. R. 12020. Thomas E. Heskett. | H. R. 14418. Harriet A. Butler. |
| H. R. 12146. Luther L. Musser. | H. R. 14414. Hattie Allen, now Pringle. |
| H. R. 12164. Laura V. Tegethoff. | H. R. 14443. John R. Skidmore. |
| H. R. 12219. Elizabeth Chase. | H. R. 14448. William Bay. |
| H. R. 12348. Ann Rock. | H. R. 14506. Levi North. |
| H. R. 12383. George W. Morton. | H. R. 14531. William O. Strickland. |
| H. R. 12526. Joseph H. Peirce. | H. R. 14562. Jennie M. Bissonett. |
| H. R. 12621. Anna Call. | H. R. 14563. Mary Cook. |
| H. R. 12628. Joseph Barker. | H. R. 14579. Thomas C. Helming. |

H. R. 14598. Mary L. Lake.
 H. R. 14622. Carrie McIntosh, now Armstrong.
 H. R. 14632. Nancy Crouse.
 H. R. 14633. Eliza E. Hutcherson.
 H. R. 14640. John R. Barlow.
 H. R. 14659. Emanuel Garber.
 H. R. 14669. Celia Bulzer.
 H. R. 14674. Calvin E. Boynton.
 H. R. 14675. Mary L. Alverson.
 H. R. 14682. John Goodmiller.
 H. R. 14701. Charles Baxter.
 H. R. 14702. Charles Landon.
 H. R. 14723. Thomas B. Chilton.
 H. R. 14726. Levi E. Cross.
 H. R. 14790. Woodson S. Marshall.
 H. R. 14814. John C. Brown.
 H. R. 14815. Dennis Sanders.
 H. R. 14830. Patrick Keating.
 H. R. 14833. Albert N. Hopkins.
 H. R. 14837. Marcus Bradley.
 H. R. 14841. Jennie L. Maginn.
 H. R. 14861. John J. Smith.
 H. R. 14910. Quincey A. Selbold.
 H. R. 14911. Henry B. Dunning.

H. R. 14913. David R. Stauffer.
 H. R. 14916. Rosser Davis.
 H. R. 14917. William Elkin.
 H. R. 14922. Martha J. Waldo.
 H. R. 14923. Anna M. Grossweiser.
 H. R. 14933. Vesta V. Spears.
 H. R. 14959. Henry Wagener.
 H. R. 14963. Edwin F. Hall.
 H. R. 14964. Elizabeth Morgan.
 H. R. 14971. Jennette B. Beardslee.
 H. R. 14978. Oliver C. Cooper.
 H. R. 15010. William White.
 H. R. 15015. Henry H. Ross.
 H. R. 15050. Gideon Marion Jolly.
 H. R. 15055. Margaret Cauldwell.
 H. R. 15056. Nora Erney.
 H. R. 15059. Hiram Brandon.
 H. R. 15069. Jane A. Sibley.
 H. R. 15103. John H. Thomas.
 H. R. 15124. Lemuel Lewis.
 H. R. 15138. Caroline Jackson.
 H. R. 15225. Isaac J. Smith.
 H. R. 15391. Mary Jane Madary.
 H. R. 15454. James E. Power.
 H. R. 15455. William H. Simmons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RUSSELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 15959) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill by title.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will now read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

The bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 852. Asher P. Anspacher.	H. R. 9136. Charles B. Hoover.
H. R. 884. Benjamin C. Condon.	H. R. 9165. Harry G. Tharp.
H. R. 1066. John M. Upton.	H. R. 9541. William Preston Raines.
H. R. 1324. Frederick M. Ottmar.	H. R. 9624. Charles H. Bascombe.
H. R. 2338. Barney Gordon.	H. R. 9866. Susan C. Masters.
H. R. 2430. Margaret Roddy.	H. R. 10116. James D. Silman.
H. R. 2820. Alexander R. Blazer.	H. R. 10816. Kathryn M. Denoyer.
H. R. 3316. Clyde C. Elkins.	H. R. 11032. Julius A. Schneider.
H. R. 3533. Emily Patterson.	H. R. 11365. Julian C. McClure.
H. R. 4241. Elizabeth Fisk.	H. R. 11494. Tabitha P. Bissett.
H. R. 4365. John J. Opperman.	H. R. 12912. Edson P. Howes.
H. R. 4682. Charles E. Sleeper.	H. R. 12956. Charles D. Minard.
H. R. 5170. George H. Imboden.	H. R. 13006. John T. Holton.
H. R. 5650. James W. Alexander.	H. R. 13010. Ernest McFadden.
H. R. 6099. Ofa Johnson.	H. R. 13374. John Beloney.
H. R. 6266. Edward A. Mueller.	H. R. 13514. George F. Michel.
H. R. 6480. Susan M. Lampkin.	H. R. 13946. Dorcas Irene Stewart.
H. R. 6552. Thomas W. Botkin.	H. R. 14248. Thomas Comerford.
H. R. 6935. Rutherford B. H. Kinback.	H. R. 14446. Harry Landau.
H. R. 7177. Frederick Leidenberger.	H. R. 14503. Leonard D. McCutcheon.
H. R. 7186. Nazaire Beaupre.	H. R. 15147. Ellen D. Rotramel.
H. R. 7323. Martha Rebecca Young.	H. R. 15394. Ernest H. Peterson.
H. R. 8632. Ida E. Markwood.	H. R. 15493. Maggie Feavel.
H. R. 8652. Willis D. Miller.	

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

On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there are two short Senate pension bills. Would it not be well to take them up now?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (S. 4167) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and of other wars than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERLEY). The gentleman from Ohio calls up a bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there be no objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

The following committee amendments were read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 1, 2, and 3.
 Page 2, strike out all of lines 11, 12, and 13.
 Page 3, strike out all of lines 9, 10, 11, and 12.
 Page 3, strike out all of lines 18, 19, 20, and 21.
 Page 5, strike out all of lines 5, 6, and 7.

The bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 80. Isabella S. Snyder.	S. 1837. George W. Robinson.
S. 285. Charles L. Stevens.	S. 1877. Isabella Workman.
S. 404. Thomas W. Michael.	S. 2007. James E. Embury.
S. 425. John H. Broadwell.	S. 2290. John Doughty.
S. 772. William S. Curtis.	S. 2326. Kate Sloan.
S. 919. Agnes E. Brown.	S. 2412. Fred L. Bush.
S. 990. Oscar C. Shull.	S. 2487. Paul L. Bahr.
S. 1000. Schuyler C. Pool.	S. 2608. Mary C. Whitson.
S. 1048. Jennie E. Howell.	S. 2627. Otto Weber.
S. 1066. George V. Shaffer.	S. 2634. A. Fannie Pevatt.
S. 1135. Mary Meade Sands.	S. 3027. Mary E. Perry.
S. 1239. Maria Howell.	S. 3079. Frank J. King.
S. 1386. Barbara B. Haws.	S. 3473. Helen M. Glead.
S. 1648. Mary A. Connolly.	S. 4011. Albina M. Williams.
S. 1695. Edward G. Goodbub.	

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, the motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 4353) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio calls up a bill, the title of which will be reported by the clerk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 12, 13, and 14.

The bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 265. Mary E. Lock.	S. 2490. Walter F. Davidson.
S. 456. William H. Ryley.	S. 2507. Harriet N. Lair.
S. 868. Commodore P. White.	S. 3424. Ira W. Arnold.
S. 1849. Alexander Cowan.	S. 3487. Gertrude Smith.
S. 1996. Catherine Healey.	S. 3614. Emil Glinther.
S. 2489. Arthur W. S. Maw.	S. 3885. Malinda Ann Miller.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, H. R. 14034.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 14034) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky in the chair.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] to use some of his time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how much time has the gentleman remaining.

Mr. HENSLEY. I have 2 hours and 23 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to use most of that time now? I will say to him that on this side we have but 40 minutes, and it is my purpose to favor as much as I can the chairman of the committee. We will not have very much more general debate on our side.

Mr. HENSLEY. It is our purpose to use something like an hour now. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, the progress of this debate has removed one stumbling block in the way of a moderate Navy, and has dispelled one delusion of long standing, namely, that the German Navy is superior to the Navy of the United States. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] by a masterly array of irrefutable facts, has demonstrated that the German Navy is not superior to the Navy of the United States. He has clearly shown, therefore, that it is not a menace to the interests of this country, or to the security of our people. Hence there is no reason why the naval-construction program of the German Empire, should be matched, or paralleled, by the construction program of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I understand perfectly well that the events of the last week, are regarded as having in some measure given a jolt to the arguments of the friends of a moderate Navy. I understand further, that these events have created an atmosphere which renders it perfectly useless at this time, so far as any hope of present success is concerned, for the friends of peace, and the friends of moderation in the naval and military program, to press their views upon this House. I have no illusions on that subject. I know perfectly well that the spirit of the war god is marching on, in this country, and that in deference to his requirements, this House will bow the knee, and do his bidding. I know that much wise and constructive legislation will inevitably be lost in the haste to subordinate everything else, to legislation related to the military situation, that much unwise legislation will be enacted, and that at this time our efforts for moderation in armaments will be perfectly futile. I have no illusions on that subject, but I will not on that account fail to urge my views upon this body, or recede from the attitude which I have steadfastly maintained for many years past.

I know further that as a result of the atmosphere in which we will work, Congress will do many unwise things, will enact much injudicious legislation, and impose many burdens that in the future will require much painful effort on the part of the people of the United States, much toil, and many privations, to correct, and remove. I would be blind to the teachings of history, I would lose sight of the march of events under other circumstances analogous to those which now confront us, if I did not realize that all of these things will come to pass. And yet, Mr. Chairman, there never was a time when the wisdom of our views was more fully vindicated, when the logic of the argument was more decidedly in our favor, when the friends of a moderate Army and a moderate Navy, had more reason to felicitate themselves upon their attitude, than at this very moment. We have favored, and maintained a moderate Army, and that Army is to-day sufficient for our needs. We have opposed an extravagant Navy, and resisted the hysteria that has been clamorously demanding four battleships. We voted for one battleship last year. Who among the frothing jingoes is found to say that our present Army, and our present Navy, are not adequate to deal with either the present, or the prospective situation in Mexico? The arguments of the friends of a moderate Navy have not been overthrown. They have been sustained. There is not a feature of the situation now confronting us, there is not a possible outcome of the war that it is possible we may hereafter wage against the feeble, war-torn, distracted nation, that now faces us, that was not in contemplation as a possibility, by the men who have stood heretofore, and who stand now, for a moderate Army, and a moderate Navy.

On the other hand, the tragic events of the last week, have completely overthrown the arguments to which I have listened in this House, during the past eight years, to the effect that a great Army and a great Navy, would act as a preservative of peace, would keep us at amity with the world. The advocates of a big Navy have insisted that they did not favor such a Navy with an eye to war, but with an eye to peace, and the preservation of peace. They have insisted that a mighty program of naval construction was a peace movement, and a peace program.

Ah, how completely that argument has been overturned. There is no question of comparison between our armed forces, and those of our possible antagonist. Should we unfortunately become involved in war, it will be a war in which there will be neither glory, fame, profit, or advantage. What then has become of the argument that a great Navy would bring us peace, not war. In other words, our present Navy, great and mighty as it is, will neither keep the dominant nation from war,

nor hinder the people of the weaker nation from taking up the challenge of war, should that challenge be thrust upon them. Whose arguments then have failed, the arguments of the friends of a moderate Navy, or the arguments of the men who have clamorously insisted upon a greater Navy in the name of peace?

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is not the gentleman proud of the fact that we now have an adequate Navy in the Gulf?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am proud of the fact that the present Navy which is far short of the demands of the so-called Navy experts, has proved to be far in excess of the exigencies of the present situation. Fortunately, so far, we have not conformed our building program, to the views and wishes of the naval board, or the naval experts.

In response to the query of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], whose question implies that we need all of this naval force in our controversy with Mexico, I will say that two gunboats in the Mexican waters, would be amply able to deal with the Mexican fleet, and meet every possibility in the way of danger from that fleet. No one pretends that the great monsters now steaming south, are required to meet any naval peril in that quarter.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we would construct our Navy along the lines desired by the moderate-navy Members of this House, we would have less than 2 battleships at the present time instead of 25.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman with his extravagant ideas of naval expansion, is in a position to speak with authority as to the attitude of the friends of a moderate navy. I prefer to stand by our own speeches defining our attitude, and by our repeated declarations upon this floor, to the effect that the construction of one battleship a year, will provide us with a navy that will be adequate to every exigency that we may be called upon to meet. [Applause.] I have stood for that program in the past, I stand for it to-day, and I maintain that the course of events in Mexico, is a vindication of that attitude. Our present Navy is adequate in size, and is in the highest degree, an efficient fighting instrument.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did the gentleman vote for one battleship or two?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I voted for one battleship. What would be the naval program to-day if the so-called experts had been followed? Four battleships a year. What did they tell us that four battleships a year, or for that matter two battleships a year, would produce? Peace, not war—peace. Mr. Chairman, we will never be engaged in any future war, in which the disparity of naval forces will be greater, than in the one which confronts to-day. If a great naval program will bring peace, why are we not at peace with Mexico? If our present powerful fleet has not operated to maintain peace between this country and Mexico, does anyone believe that if we had been building four battleships a year for the past 20 years our relations to-day with that country would be on a more peaceful footing? You gentlemen might as well abandon your contention that a great armament means peace, and will bring peace. Frankly admit that you are building up a mighty Navy, with a view to war, and that you are thereby promoting militancy, and developing the war fever, and the war spirit.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. CLINE. Is it not a fact that the only argument adduced on the floor of this House in the last six years for a large naval armament has been that a large naval armament meant peace?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Absolutely.

Mr. CLINE. That is the only argument that has been advanced for a large armament?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, and so I insist that the logic of the present situation clearly shows that the argument for peace must be put upon some other ground, than upon numerous battleships, and a mighty Army.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did we not recently pass a peace resolution?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, but we are not so much concerned at present with the resolution which we passed, as with the fact that the battleships which we have constructed have not brought us peace. Let us keep our eyes on the main argument, and note the failure of your contention, in the light of subsequent events.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Has not the argument for a reasonably large line of battleships been that it would insure peace as against war waged against us, and not in contemplation of our engaging in an offensive war, which seems to be in progress to-day?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No. The argument was that this country did not propose to wage an offensive war, and that a great Navy was needed for the security of our people, for the maintenance of our institutions, and for the preservation of peace between the nations.

The logic of events has overthrown the contention of the militants. A great Navy has not secured peaceful relations between us and a feeble nation, but has brought us to the verge of war. If we favor peace, universal peace, it is evident that it must be secured by some other means, and by some other way, than by the battleship route. Peace must be attained by peaceful methods, by the peaceful attitude, by moderation, by conciliation, by an indisposition to stand on punctilios which are an inheritance of a barbarous and savage age. You will never advance the cause of peace by extravagant construction of the machines that breed the tendency, and the disposition for strife.

The military caste, and the naval caste, the world over, are the same. Military ethics, the military code, the military punctilios, are the same everywhere. When a nation trains men for fighting purposes, it ought to control and direct them. It should not allow the military caste to control and direct public thought and public policy, or to determine the relations of this country with the peoples of the world.

It seems impossible for the men who talk big armaments, to keep the facts of the record straight. I have witnessed two illustrations of that within the last two days. On yesterday I heard the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] assert that the gentleman from Mississippi had stated that the *Oregon* could meet, overthrow, and destroy six German dreadnaughts. In my own mind I was assured that the gentleman from Mississippi had made no such statement, though I am not concerned to make any defense for the gentleman from Mississippi. He can speak for himself. I am concerned, however, as one of the men who are presenting the same sane, deliberate, conservative, and patriotic proposition for a moderate navy, that we have heretofore presented, in correcting an unfounded statement. It was not the claim of the gentleman from Mississippi, it is not our claim, that the *Oregon*, which is an old-fashioned battleship, could overthrow and destroy six German dreadnaughts. Such a claim would be ridiculous, and has never been made on our part on the floor of this House.

I recollect very well what was said, and the gentleman from Alabama should have met, and overthrown, if he could, the facts put into the RECORD by the gentleman from Mississippi, when he compared the fighting strength of an out-of-date American ship, with out-of-date German ships. He should not seek to advance his cause, by setting up a man of straw, in order to triumphantly overthrow him. The gentleman from Mississippi put into the RECORD facts that it behooves the gentlemen who hold the opposing view, to deal with, and to meet squarely and fairly. What did the gentleman from Mississippi say in this connection? He contrasted the armament of the *Oregon*, with the armament of the German battleships of the same age and type. That was a perfectly fair argument, and a fair comparison.

Having referred to the superiority of the guns and armor of the *Oregon*, over the guns and armor of the German battleships that he selected for the purpose of comparison, he proceeded to state that the *Oregon* was superior to any six German battleships of the era of the *Oregon*. He did not compare the *Oregon* with the German dreadnaughts, for the reason that he had exhausted the resources of argument to show the superiority of the dreadnaught, and of the superdreadnaught of to-day, over the battleships of any era, or of any generation.

The gentleman from Alabama consumed much of his time in seeking to show the vast inferiority of the *Oregon*, to our later types of fighting ships. This proposition has never been challenged, never denied, never controverted by any advocate of a moderate, modern, and efficient navy. I desire to say in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that the assumption on the part of some of the protagonists of a greater navy, that their attitude is the attitude of patriotism, while the attitude of the friends of a moderate navy is due either to a crass ignorance of the vital problems of national defense, or to a pusillanimous preference for peace even at the expense of national honor, or the impairment of our territorial integrity, is not justified by any speech that has ever been made on our part on the floor of this House. I think that I am justified in saying that the advocates of a moderate navy are a body of sane, thoughtful, experienced, capable men, who are just as patriotic as the men who believe that our national honor, our national integrity, our national glory, require for their preservation a naval program of four battleships a year. [Applause.] And yet, as I said a moment ago, I am not blind to what is going on around me. The present state of the public mind, the atmosphere in which we are working, render possible the enactment of legislation

which would be whistled down the wind under other conditions, and other circumstances.

I realize fully that when confronted with a possibility of war, all sense of proportion is lost. Men lose their reason, and "judgment flies to brutish beasts." But if I have heretofore maintained with a full sense of patriotic duty any attitude toward a great public question like our naval policy, that attitude should not be abandoned, merely because I realize that under present conditions the forces of opposition will be successful. I am ready like every other patriotic man to vote the supplies that the urgency of the situation will require, but this naval program is for the future, not the present. The ships voted for in the present bill, will never take part in the present war, and there is nothing in the facts of the past 48 hours, to justify a departure from the construction program of a year ago. It is hateful to me to hear this possibility of war with a prostrate and feeble nation, made the occasion for a glorification of our fighting strength. The disparity between the contending parties is too great. There might be honor and glory in a war with some great power, a power that would cause this country to extend itself, but a war with feeble Mexico, will be too unequal. It will be a repetition on a greater scale of the war with the Filipinos. [Applause.] There is little occasion to applaud ourselves over our wars with inferior nations. They have been but little to our credit. We are a brave people, a vigorous people, a militant, dominant, overmastering, overpowering people. All these things may be truly said of us, so that I am proud to proclaim: *Civis Americanus sum*. But we have not been particularly gentle, or magnanimous in our dealings with inferior races.

Mr. SHARP. Will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SHARP. Is not what the gentleman has stated right now one of the best reasons for believing that in the interest of national peace this country of ours, above all others, can afford not to carry on this endless work of increasing our battleships?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have been developing that contention for the last eight years, and I trust that I have not been unmindful during all that time, of the honor, the reputation, the prosperity and the welfare of the American people, and the glory of the American flag. [Applause.] I wish to say in this connection, and I know that I speak for all of my colleagues in this matter, that to keep our flag in the forefront, as it now is, of civilization and progress, and to maintain everywhere our real honor and our real glory, there is no sacrifice that we would not be willing to make. [Applause.] But at a time like this we lose sight of the real relation of things. The sense of proportion is gone. Under the influence of the spirit now abroad, we love to applaud ourselves not only for the qualities that we possess, but for other qualities to which we have no claim, and to impute to ourselves motives, and conduct, and ideals, that are utterly at variance with the teachings of history. On yesterday I listened to the gentleman from Alabama as he sounded our praises. We love to be patted on the back, to be stroked as a cat is stroked, to have imputed to us, generousities that we have not displayed, and excellencies that we have not exhibited.

The gentleman from Alabama with the fervor of war upon him, proceeded to tell of the wars that we have waged, of the ideal conditions under which those wars have been prosecuted, of the generosity, magnanimity, self-sacrifices, and self-abnegation that we have showed, in comparison with what other nations have exhibited, when waging wars and making conquests. I do not know any country in the world, having in mind the wars that we have waged with weaker peoples, that has grabbed a larger portion of fat lands, as a result of war, than the United States. By war we pushed back the Indian aborigines, until now we own this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I do not stop to deny that in the ultimate this, in a large way, will be for the benefit of mankind, but we are not entitled to any credit for generosity, or magnanimity, in this connection. Whatever the motives, or the excuses, our acquisitions have been made by the stark use of the mailed fist. We have taken whatever was in sight. We went to war with Mexico over 50 years ago. History tells us that the causes for that war were trivial, yet as a result of it, we took a large slice of rich territory, and still further made broad our phylacteries, and extended the limits of the United States.

We did not fare so badly in a territorial way, as a result of the war with Spain. We came out of that war with Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands to our credit, and if we did not take Cuba, it was because, having reference to the declarations that had been made on our part, we could not have taken that island, and kept our face before the world. Since that time we have been near unto taking it on a very trivial pretext. At the conclusion of

the Spanish War, we insisted upon the Philippines. We were so anxious to secure these islands that we were willing to take them with a lien, in the shape of a native war. It was always thought until the official dispatches were published, that we took the Philippines to save the face of Spain, but later it was ascertained that the commissioners who were sent by the United States to negotiate the treaty of peace, were charged by the President of the United States to insist upon the Philippines as an irreducible minimum. Spain, however, has been amply revenged upon us in that connection. If she wished us ill as a result of that cession of territory, she has certainly seen that wish fulfilled. But the fact that we have been disappointed in our acquisition, the fact that the Philippines have not turned out to be the desirable possession that we fondly hoped that they would be, none the less changes the fact that as a part of the proceeds of that war, we insisted upon territorial additions, and secured what was deemed to be, at the time, a rich and desirable enlargement of our landed domains. We became landlords over the seas.

Now that the war spirit is abroad, now that this atmosphere of war has been created, the man who descends upon the glories and generosity of the United States in antecedent wars, touches a popular chord. I know that full well. I know, however, another thing, and that is that if the United States desires to cultivate the peace spirit, if it wants peace, peace with honor, peace with security, peace with the maintenance of national dignity, peace coextensive with the world, we must seek it by some other route than by an excessive expansion of either the naval, or the military arm. [Applause.] We must pursue a different course; we must lay a different foundation; we must adopt a different attitude; we must reach out, and create a different environment, if we desire peace among the nations, and the development of the peaceful spirit at home.

Another distressing feature of a time like this, is the extravagant laudation of everybody, and everything connected with war. I do not know why this should be true, but it is true, and it has always been true. Men can be induced to enact the most extravagant and unwise legislation, by laudatory references to acts done by an army, or a naval officer in the ordinary performance of duty. Why should he not do his duty? Why should he not fight? He does fight. The history of the American Navy is the history of fighting. Why not? We train our naval officers for that sole and exclusive purpose. We set them apart for that function. We create them for that, and for no other purpose. Why should they not do their duty, after we have educated them, given them opportunity, and relieved them from all anxieties and responsibility in connection with the mere details of livelihood. Why should they not do their duty, and do it manfully, when the time arrives for them to make some return to their country, for all that their country has done for them? I rejoice in the fact that the history of the Navy is the history of duty well done. For one, I will not allow myself to be put into a false position, or advance any statements that can furnish the ground for the unjust charge hereafter that I am attacking in a captious, or sneering way, either the military, or naval arm of the Government. The moderate-navy, and the moderate-army advocates, repudiate the imputation that we are indisposed to do justice either to the Army, or to the Navy personnel.

But it is an unfortunate thing that the discharge of duty by one arm of our Government, should be the subject of such extravagant and overweening laudation, that it destroys our sense of proportion, and lessens our capacity and our disposition to do justice to other equally meritorious and deserving public servants, and renders impossible the legislation that would build up the welfare, and promote the uplift of all the people of the United States. I say that this is an unfortunate thing. And yet we have many manifestations of this attitude.

On yesterday I heard the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] speak to a sympathetic audience when he referred to the "poor naval officers," doing their duty, without adequate public appreciation of their service, or of their value. I do not know any portion of the American people to which the phrase "poor" can be applied with less propriety, than to the men who serve in the Navy in the capacity of officers. Their ways are made easy for them. In many instances the Members of Congress have opened the doors of opportunity by their appointments to the Naval Academy. These fortunate appointees have in many instances chances for an education, and for a career, such as otherwise they would never have enjoyed. Their surroundings as cadets are of a most enviable character. They begin life with an adequate salary. They have no fear for the future. As they advance in rank, their salaries are raised. When the time comes to retire, they are liberally pensioned. Why speak of their unhappy lot, and in that connection use the word that was used on yesterday,—"poor"? Why say that the American

people have been ungrateful to them? What particular occasion was there for remarks of this character in connection with the pending bill? We create at Annapolis a body of men for certain specific purposes. They would be ingrates if they did not do their duty along that line for which they have been specially educated, and specially prepared.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. HENSLEY. Is it not a fact that within the last 15 years we have increased the appropriations for this department 400 per cent?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, on the money side, on the side of loaves and fishes, from every point of view, if you go into that inquiry, there is no portion of our public servants who are better provided for than the Army and Navy officers. As I said, we set them up, we give them an outlook on life, we give them opportunity, we pay them liberal salaries, we provide them with a comfortable environment. We have a right to expect good service. I remember an admiral who came from the little mountain town of Floyd in my district—"Fighting Bob" Evans. Probably if he had not received the appointment to the Naval Academy, he might in time have attained the high position of postmaster at Floyd. There are many mute, inglorious Miltons. Admiral Evans did his duty, and did it well. Why not? His country made him, trained him to do certain things, and had the right to expect an ample return of duty well done. Was he discharging any more sacred and solemn obligation of duty than the Members of this House, in their relations to the public welfare? Was he discharging any more solemn obligation of duty than many a fireman who goes to death under circumstances which exhibit a heroism as great as the Charge of the Light Brigade? Yet the fireman dies unwept, unhonored, and unsung. The ordinary policeman on our streets, taking the service year in and year out, incurs greater risks than the average soldier in the Army of the United States, and does his duty just as well. But we do not become enthused over him, we do not lose our sense of proportion, we do not create in his case an atmosphere that causes us to subordinate all other interests, and cripple other acts of needed legislation, in taking care of the policeman, or the fireman, or other men doing their duty under heroic circumstances.

Can the advocates of a greater navy distort these comments into a criticism of the Army, or the Navy? They must go far afield if they can find in them any carping criticism upon the one, or the other. I am simply trying to put before you things as they actually are, to strip away the surrounding glamor, which is a part of the accursed war spirit. It is the atmosphere of war which causes us to see things out of proportion, and to fall in our duty to other classes of society, and to other interests, which are fully as deserving of our fostering care, our admiration, our attention, and our appropriations, as either the Army, or the Navy.

I wish to say another thing in this connection, and that is that because you train a man to fight, and equip him to fight, and because he does fight—and we rejoice in the fact that when occasion arises our fighting men do their full duty—it does not follow that the disposition of the problems of national statesmanship should be committed to that man. This is the body that ought to fix and control the policies of the Nation. The man who drives an engine, may be efficient in that capacity, but we do not call him in as an expert to determine the question of the Government ownership of railroads. A mercantile firm may leave the care of its motor cars to its chauffeur, and may advise with him as to the best type of car. But the firm determines its policy with respect to the use of motor cars, how far it will go, in that direction, and how many cars it will purchase. The policy with respect to the use of motor cars is fixed by the firm, while the duty of the chauffeur is to do the work that he is retained to do. He is not called upon to determine the question of policy.

The advocates of a moderate Army and of a moderate Navy, insist that this body should fix our naval policy. They maintain that the solution of these problems ought to be relegated to the civilian statesmanship of the country. The problems that relate to the national welfare, the problems that relate to the national growth, the problems that relate to our future, to our security, and to our interests, are all committed to the care of the civilian statesmanship of this country, and we are false to our constituencies, and to our duty, when we allow the military, or the naval arm of the Government, to usurp a function that belongs to us, and to speak with authority in the establishment of our military policy.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] showed on yesterday that he was a technical expert. I grant it. The gentleman from Alabama has been a fighting man, with a glorious record. We all admit that. But the gentleman from

Alabama, neither by training, nor environment, has, as the result of that military education, any superiority or advantage over any other Member of this House, in determining what the naval policy of this country ought to be. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. What is the necessity, then, of our Navy General Board?

Mr. SAUNDERS. None. It ought to have been abolished long ago. [Applause.] Our Navy General Board was created for the express purpose of forcing us into still greater extravagances of naval construction than even the Naval Committee, or the House are willing to stand for.

I will answer further the question which the gentleman from Illinois propounded. If the naval board is entitled to speak with authority, why is it that the Naval Committee has not followed its recommendations?

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me again?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No; I do not wish to yield. I know the gentleman from Illinois will not regard me as being discourteous, if I decline to yield further at this time.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, if the gentleman will excuse me. I wish to answer the question which the gentleman from Illinois propounded. If the naval board is entitled to speak with authority, why is it that you gentlemen of the Naval Committee will not follow its recommendations?

Mr. BRITTEN. I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I say, if the naval board is entitled to speak with authority, why do not you gentlemen of the Committee on Naval Affairs follow its recommendations?

Mr. BRITTEN. We try to.

Mr. SAUNDERS. You do not. They recommend four battleships.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is because Members like the gentleman will not let us.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, you are supreme in the Naval Committee.

Mr. SISSON. What authority is there in law, and what law did Congress pass for the creation of this board?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know; but I am attempting to discuss the point suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, and assume that this board has authority of law for its existence.

Mr. HENSLEY. It is self-created.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The advocates of a big navy are supreme on the Naval Committee. That committee has been built up in such a way, that the advocates of a moderate navy on that committee, struggle for their beliefs, and seek to bring out the facts, under the very greatest difficulties, and at the very greatest disadvantage.

I would like the gentleman to tell me how the attitude of gentlemen like myself, hinders him and his colleagues who constitute an overwhelming majority of the committee, from reporting four battleships in his bill? What compulsion can we put upon you? You say that I am in the way, and that men like me are in the way; then how have you been able to report two battleships? We are as much opposed to two battleships as we are to four. Why does the gentleman speak of the naval board as having authority, and then refuse to follow it?

Mr. BRITTEN. I want to say that every member of the Committee on Naval Affairs who signed this minority report voted for no battleships for the year 1913 with one exception, and that gentleman was out of town, or he would have voted for no battleships also. If we have no battleships at all, we do not need a naval board. That is true.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Now what has the report of the feeble minority of 4 on your committee, to do with the recommendations of the majority, represented by the 17 other gentlemen? How could that minority, feeble as it is in numbers as compared with the 17 gentlemen who are sounding the tocsin of war, hinder you from reporting four battleships, if it was your desire so to do?

Mr. BRITTEN. The Secretary of the Navy recommended two battleships.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman did not ask me about the Secretary of the Navy. He asked me about the naval board, and the intimation carried in the question, was that that board was entitled to speak with authority.

Mr. BRITTEN. His information comes from the general board.

Mr. SAUNDERS. He did not follow the general board.

Mr. BRITTEN. Who passes the bill—the committee or the House?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The members of the Naval Committee ought to be superior to the naval board, to the Navy Secretary,

and to the power of the administration, when it comes to doing your duty as members of that committee. Holding the views that you do as to the Navy General Board, you occupy a ridiculous attitude when you reject their recommendations and are contented to report a miserly and inadequate program calling for two battleships a year.

The question of national defense is not a matter of compromise. The security of the country is the supreme law; and whatever is necessary for the security of the country ought to be done, and ought to be voted for, and ought to be provided for, to the exclusion of everything else. That is the position of the advocates of a sufficient Navy, of which I have the honor to be one. You will agree to that, I believe.

Mr. BRITTEN. Do you get security from no battleships?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentlemen who voted for no battleships on the occasion referred to, voted for that proposition on the very sufficient ground that in their view we already had all the battleships that we needed, without providing for any more at that time.

Mr. BRITTEN. And the gentleman was one of those.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I think not.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; I have looked up the RECORD, and the gentleman voted for no battleships.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Very well, I cast a mighty good vote if I did. I do not think however that I voted that way in 1913. My recollection is that I voted for one battleship, but if the gentleman has ascertained that I voted for none, he has done me a kindness. He has found one vote in my record of which I am proud. [Applause.] I voted for none because we had provided for two the year before. Hence, there was no occasion to provide for any in the succeeding year.

Let us go a little further. I am able to justify my attitude because I am satisfied after full investigation that a program of two ships a year gives us more battleships than we need. But you big-navy people have not done your duty. If you think that this naval board is entitled to speak with authority, and to fix the naval policy of this country, you ought to follow them, and bow with deference to that authority.

As I said a moment ago, the national security is not a thing to be paltered with, it is not a question to be compromised. It is a proposition to be met fairly and squarely. The security of the Republic is the supreme law. The old Latins had a magnificent aphorism, *Salus populi, suprema lex esto*. I stand by that.

What does the average naval expert say with reference to the proper defense of our country? Adopting the view taken by gentlemen like the gentleman from Alabama, the provision for two battleships is so pitifully inadequate, that it is fully as deserving of criticism as a provision for none at all. Do you suppose that Mr. Hobson is satisfied with two battleships? Why, I asked him on the floor of this House how many battleships he thought would be necessary to make us safe, and he said something like five a year. Either the naval board speaks with authority, or it may be disregarded. If it speaks with authority, then, you gentlemen who believe in it, can not falter, or take any middle ground. I do not believe in it, so I am not bound by its recommendations; not so with you gentlemen who recognize its authority. You do not do your duty to the country, nay you imperil the security of our country, when you fail to provide all the battleships that this board declares are necessary to preserve that security.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Alabama argued that we ought to maintain our equilibrium among the nations of the world.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, that is the new philosophy of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman tell us what he thinks about that?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not care to go as far afield as that. I suppose even my friend from Illinois is hardly prepared to subscribe to that doctrine. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] will have to be spokesman for that doctrine on the floor of this House.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield now for a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I agree thoroughly with what the gentleman has said to the effect that in the trouble in which we are now engaged, it appears that we have a sufficient Navy; but does not the gentleman know that this country is trembling to-day for fear of complications with foreign countries?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, I do not know anything of the sort. I for one am not trembling, and I do not believe the country generally is trembling.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And within a few weeks this Congress has been asked to give away our plain rights in the Panama Canal for the purpose of appeasing foreign countries.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Are you afraid of foreign countries? Are you trembling with apprehension? Are you afraid of a foreign invasion of this country?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Is it not true that almost every newspaper we read speaks of the danger of foreign invasion?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I think the statesmen of this country, and the Representatives in this House, have come to a rather low ebb, if we are to be turned from the plain course of our duty, by unfounded statements contained in irresponsible, fire-eating, jingo newspapers. [Applause.] I have seen some of the matter referred to, and I wish to say that it makes me ashamed of the intelligence of the country, to be told that such stuff should make any lodgment on our minds.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I venture the suggestion that if there should be intervention by one of these larger powers, every man on the floor of this House would regret that he had not voted for more battleships.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Suppose we consider that suggestion. In case of intervention by Great Britain, Germany, and France in the pending controversy, what would our provision for two battleships a year amount to? Such intervention is a possibility. If you argue in that fashion, you ought to insist that our program should carry 20 dreadnaughts a year. Suppose that tomorrow Germany, France, and Great Britain should make common cause against the United States, what security would our pitiful program of two battleships a year afford? We might as well have none; since our present fleet would be destroyed, with the consequent loss of all the millions that had gone into its construction.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I know my friend will agree with me that we would put up a good fight, if we had not anything but a pole to fight with.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, yes. The gentleman can not make any issue with me on that. I have already stated that when it comes to war I would like to have an antagonist worthy of our steel, one that would put us to our mettle, and develop the real fighting blood that is in us. I have already made that statement.

Mr. CLINE. How does the naval board come to get into this question of how many battleships we shall have?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know, except perhaps to show that the Naval Committee has disregarded their recommendations.

Mr. CLINE. Did the Naval Committee send for the naval board?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know. It is referred to as a body of experts for whose opinion we ought to have regard. Yet the committee disregards them. The very gentlemen who are urging two battleships, are disregarding the recommendations of the naval board. Speaking of possibilities—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I noticed in the paper this morning, and I have seen it in several papers lately, and I presume the gentleman has also, that the Secretary of the Navy has issued rush orders to have the *New York* completed so that she may be sent to Mexican waters. I want to ask the gentleman, if there is no prospect of some complication abroad, what is the reason of the Secretary of the Navy for desiring more battleships to be sent to Mexican waters?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Probably the naval board suggested to him that it would be well to do it, I do not know.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman think that the Secretary of the Navy would issue a foolish order of that kind?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I would not like to say that the Secretary of the Navy does foolish things, but he has done some things that I can not approve. Will that satisfy my friend? I want to say seriously that the environment of the Secretary of the Navy is such that it is hard for him to be other than the mouthpiece of the caste that surrounds him. While administrations come and administrations go, the environment of the Naval Secretary is always the same.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a friendly question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion on the matter of sending the entire fleet to Mexico at this particular time when, so far as I can see, there is not so very much to do except on the coast. Why is it all there?

Mr. SAUNDERS. It serves to show what a mighty naval power we are.

Mr. FESS. Show to whom?

Mr. SAUNDERS. To the world, I suppose. The advocates of one ship a year have insisted that we possess a mighty Navy. Now we have an ocular demonstration of the fact.

Mr. MADDEN. And this is a safe place, anyway.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, a very safe place. When the gentleman from Michigan asked me if we might not become involved with the nations of the world, he must have had in mind some combination of nations. Whenever you begin to argue for a big Navy upon the hypothesis of possible complications, there is no limit to the extent of naval construction that will thereby be imposed upon the country. It is possible that we may become involved over Mexico with a foreign power, it may be that we will be involved with two foreign powers, or possibly three foreign powers. One is as likely as the other. Having reference to these possibilities, what should be the program of naval construction?

I have been in this House long enough to see Japan as a possible adversary, worn threadbare. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson], when he first came to this House, and began to sound war's alarm, insisted that unless we built up such a Navy as he had in contemplation, it would be only a short while before this country would be involved in war with the Empire of the Rising Sun. Time has passed, and we are not only not at war with Japan, but we are farther away from war with that Empire than ever before. Japan is tottering on the verge of bankruptcy, and has materially reduced her naval program.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does not the gentleman know that the people of California can not enforce the school laws that they want because Japan has ruled otherwise, that they can not enact the land laws that the people want because they can not stand behind them, and the Secretary of State had to hurry to California to consult with the legislature?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Gentlemen have not the right to take the floor without the consent of the Chairman and the consent of the gentleman who holds the floor.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I beg the gentleman's pardon if I have been speaking without his permission.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman had my permission.

Mr. BRITEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has no right to interrupt without the permission of the Chair. In the last 25 minutes the Member who is addressing us has not spoken for 5 minutes without an interruption. We are entitled to hear the gentleman from Virginia. We can hear the other gentlemen anywhere in the lobby, or out on the street. What we want is information. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRITEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BRITEN. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that our naval program from year to year depends largely on our financial condition?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No. It depends upon a much higher consideration—the necessities of national defense. The American people should provide whatever is necessary for our security; the matter of dollars and cents should not enter into the question.

Mr. BRITEN. One more question. It appears to me that the gentleman's attitude is very inconsistent.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I think not.

Mr. BRITEN. There is no question but that the gentleman from Virginia voted for no battleships, and the other day he voted practically for a war resolution.

Mr. DONOVAN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Virginia yielded for a question, and the gentleman from Illinois is not asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia yielded to the gentleman from Illinois generally.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman from Illinois is seeking to develop an inconsistency in the gentleman from Virginia. [Laughter.] If I have been inconsistent, it was in a good cause, but I have not been inconsistent. I favor all the battleships that this country needs. To that extent I am in favor of a big navy. One ship a year gives us a big navy. We need no more. I wish to say in this connection, that I have been here long enough to hear the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] make a most able, impressive, comprehensive, and logical argument along the very lines followed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] a few days ago, namely, that Germany was not a menace to the United States. I listened with admiration to him, when he stood up boldly in front of the House, and in reply to the gentleman from Alabama who was making suggestions like those now made by the gentleman from Michigan, stated, "I am not scared." Those were brave words, but since that time, in some way, we have

seen our friend from Tennessee become infected with that mysterious influence with which he said the gentleman from Alabama had inoculated a former President of the United States.

In other words, our friend is now overthrowing his own arguments, and supporting the arguments of his quondam adversary, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]. How does he justify this reversal of attitude? President Wilson declares that many happy illustrations multiply about us of a growing sense of community of interest among the nations. This relates to the great nations of the world, not the small semi-barbarous States, with respect to which occasional wars requiring a small force, may be expected. I have seen another thing since I have been here. I have seen the sentiment for a big navy worked up in the most deliberate, and scientific fashion. Some one fires the train by stating that a foreign country is preparing to trample, or tread on the United States. Naturally that suggestion is irritating, and the country begins to bristle up a little. Then another actor in this comedy bobs up, and asks soldiers on the unprotected shores of the Atlantic coast? This inquiry causes us to further sit up, and take notice. Then another conspirator in this propaganda, rises to remark that Japan is preparing to occupy Magdalena Bay, and make it a great naval base. This suggestion sets the whole Pacific coast aflame, and the Representatives from that section are ready to vote for 100 battleships to protect them against Japan. A little later some one suggests that Russia is secretly preparing a great aerial fleet with which to destroy the Panama Canal, and wants to know what we are going to do about it? This suggestion starts a call for a great defensive aerial fleet to protect us against this antagonist, who is to fly across the stormy waters of the Atlantic. By this time the proper condition of alarm has been reached, and these skillful players pull out all the stops of pride, passion, and prejudice in the great organ of armed peace, and the volume of sound which they emit, straightway drowns out any still, small voices that fain would be heard for peace, or moderation.

In the view of the naval experts this country is not now, and at no period in its history, has ever been provided with either an adequate Army, or Navy, and yet we have managed somehow to bungle along, growing richer, and stronger, and greater, and more secure with each passing year. This matter of the naval board, is a very serious thing in the mind of my friend from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. -

If these people are entitled to the last word, if we must abdicate in their favor our position as custodians of the rights, dignity, security, honor, peace and protection of the American people, if we must turn over to this board the ultimate voice in determining what is necessary to be done, in order to adequately protect us against imminent dangers, if they are entitled to speak with authority, because they are fighting men, and, therefore, can adequately advise us what our policy should be, and how we may adequately protect ourselves, I ask you, I ask my colleagues in this House, whether we can afford to disregard this voice of authority, and to set up our poor, puny voices against them? The advocates of this bill say that it is a compromise between the views of the moderate naval people, and of the naval board. Is this a matter for compromise? Are the 17 members of this Naval Committee willing to compromise the security, the welfare, the future, the honor, and the dignity of the American people, by reporting two ships, when they ought to report four? Can you compromise a situation like this? Ought you to leave us in a state of insecurity, uncertainty, and alarm, when you have a board that tells you not only what you can do, but what you ought to do, in order that you may discharge your duty to your constituents, and preserve the integrity and welfare of the American people? I tell you, that the gentlemen who talk about this naval board, and the authority that its recommendations ought to carry, and then admit that they only believe one-half of what that board says, thereby do no credit either to the naval board, or to the 17 majority members of the committee. If the majority of the committee can weigh the arguments of this board, if it can reject 50 per cent of what they say, if it can present a bill for a less number of ships than this board recommends, then they admit by that action all I have undertaken to put forward in this matter, and that is, that after all has been said, the final voice in this great argument ought to be the voice of the American Congress, the voice of the American people, speaking through us, who are the servants of that people. [Applause.]

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

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ].

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, among other brave American lads who gave up their lives for their country at Vera Cruz on yesterday was Louis Oscar Fried, ordinary seaman, attached

to the U. S. battleship *Arkansas*, aged 19 years, a resident of Gretna, La., which is in the congressional district that I have the honor to represent. It must be a source of mournful pride to his father and his family and his friends, as it is to me, to realize that he was the first southern boy to make the "great sacrifice" for his country in this unfortunate war. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there is one feature of the pending bill to which but little attention has been directed during the course of the debate because of the keen criticism of some who are opposed to the naval program and who do not desire to see such great amounts as are recommended by the committee appropriated for battleships and for naval construction. It is most important that in the course of the discussion we should not lose sight of those features of the bill that have to do with navy yards and with things other than the construction of battleships and naval boats. It may not be necessary to remind the members of the committee that on Tuesday last the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES], who represents the congressional district which has the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. in it, and again on yesterday the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING], who represents a district with a private shipbuilding company in it, made criticism of the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy and the Naval Affairs Committee because they have recommended on page 22 of the pending bill that the Boston and Philadelphia Navy Yards be equipped for shipbuilding. There is an item in this bill, I am most happy to say, appropriating \$148,000 to equip Charlestown (Mass.) Navy Yard for shipbuilding. This amount of money, \$148,000, was put into the naval bill of a year or two ago through the activities of some of us who were familiar with the conditions of the marine barracks and officers' quarters at the Charlestown Navy Yard, and in spite of the fact that it required unanimous consent in this body, that a single objection could have caused the legislation to fall, we were able to convince the Congress that \$48,000 should be appropriated for officers' quarters at Charlestown Navy Yard and \$100,000 should be appropriated for marine barracks at that place.

Mr. Chairman, the honorable Secretary of the Navy when he was inducted into office had his own ideas in regard to the mobilization of the Marine Corps at a point farther south than the Charlestown Navy Yard, and he told some of us that he believed it to be an unwise expenditure to go forward with the construction of the officers' quarters and the marine barracks that had been authorized in the naval bill. The reasonableness of his argument was so sound that, so far as we were concerned, we agreed that the money might be withheld from expenditure for a time at least until we might see how the Secretary's plan should work out. It is this amount of money, \$148,000, already appropriated by the Congress for the building of officers' quarters and marine barracks that the Naval Affairs Committee recommends toward the equipment of the Charlestown Navy Yard for shipbuilding. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] spoke at length on this item, just as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] did, and they objected to the proposition on the score that it is unwise to have shipbuilding at Boston. They say that mechanics and workmen at Boston are paid 25 per cent more in wages than workmen and mechanics in any other place along the Atlantic seacoast. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of surprise to me to know that the wages of the Boston mechanics and workmen are so much higher than the wages of men in other places. I can not challenge the statement that was made by those gentlemen, because I have not the wage schedules, but I know that workmen in the Boston yards and in the private shipbuilding company at Boston challenge this statement in regard to comparative wages.

If they are paid 25 per cent more wages than the workmen in other places I am sorry to know that this condition exists in those places, because certainly we believe that the wages of the workmen at Boston are not now too high but rather too low. The objection is made that Boston ought not to be equipped for shipbuilding because the climate there is not so good for this work as the climate in other places along the seaboard. Objection is made by the gentleman from Virginia that we have so much rain at some times and so much snow at other times in the year that the climate there is not good for this kind of work, and, therefore, the Boston workmen and shipbuilding plants are at a disadvantage. It is an old, old thing to charge that the climate of Boston has many different kinds and varieties. It is a thing that is frequently referred to by humorists that the climate of Boston is the worst in the world and the most variable in the world. I have read, indeed, the witty things that Mark Twain said, with characteristic American humor, as to the climate of New England; but, Mr. Chairman, I never thought I would live to a time when in the Ameri-

can Congress it would be seriously asserted that the climate in Boston was the cause of withholding an amount of money to equip that place for shipbuilding purposes. I do not believe it is fair to say that the climate of Boston is not so good as the climate in Norfolk or at any place as far south as Washington for shipbuilding or any other kind of actual labor. Certainly I have always been more comfortable in the summer time in Boston than I ever have been in the summer time here in Washington, and any man who has had to do actual hustling work in each of the two places, as Members of Congress surely have to do, may bear me out in this statement in regard to comparative climatic conditions.

The gentleman from Virginia is a friend of the naval experts, because he rests his case largely on the proposition that the naval experts recommend a contract with a private company. The Secretary of the Navy is criticized by some of my colleagues because he is willing at times to follow the advice of the naval experts; he is criticized by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING], and by other men, because he fails in this matter to follow the recommendations of the naval experts. Mr. Chairman, I have seen some Secretaries of the Navy, have watched their conduct of the great Naval Establishment of the Government. May I digress a moment to say I have never known a greater Secretary of the Navy than the present Secretary, Josephus Daniels. I commend him because he listens to naval experts and to all who may advise him, and then he acts as he believes he should act for the national welfare. Some refer to him as an extravagant man. Let me tell you some of the great economies that he has practiced in the short time since he has been at the head of that department. It is not necessary to tell the men who are on the Committee on Naval Affairs, because they know full well that he saved as a result of competition in regard to the matter of some armor-piercing shells more than a million of dollars—in exact language \$1,068,750. It is not necessary to tell those men that in the contract for building ship No. 39, which is now under construction, he was able to save on special-treatment steel \$378,261. The gentleman from Mississippi knows as a result of his attendance on the hearings of the Committee on Naval Affairs that on the item of turbine rotor drums of battleship 39 he was able to effect a saving of \$102,836; that on medium steel plates, battleship 39, he was able to effect a saving of \$19,000; that on angle irons and small iron and steel material for battleship 39 he was able to save \$3,000; on forgings and shaftings, battleship 39, he was able to effect a saving of \$157,646.

A total saving, Mr. Chairman, on this single battleship as against battleship No. 34 of \$662,743, which is exclusive of the saving of \$782,117 which they saved on armor of various kinds. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Navy has told graphically in the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House that he effected these savings by establishing competition between these private shipbuilding companies. He told there in most eloquent style that he requested the representatives of the private shipbuilding companies and of the armor-plate companies to come to Washington, and that he told them the law required them to make affidavit that they were not in any combination or in any agreement to keep up the price, and asked them if they were mindful of that law. These men told him that they knew of the law and that they had not had any conference before they submitted their bids. And yet the bids of three different companies which were submitted for the armor for this battleship were identical, and the Secretary, when he received the assurance that they had not compared notes, told them that when three large companies, with contracts amounting to very large sums, made identical bids to a cent the burden of proof was on them to show that they had not conferred about the matter.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who reads the testimony of the Secretary of the Navy before the Naval Affairs Committee must know the reason why the Secretary recommends that these yards be equipped for shipbuilding purposes. It must be because there is collusion between the private contractors, and he feels that the Government of the United States ought not to be at the mercy of any combination of men engaged in private shipbuilding enterprise.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman think the Government would save that amount of money in a Government armor-plate plant?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Of course I do, and so does the Secretary of the Navy, for he says so. The reason they would save is this: You have got to have either one of two things in this country, competition between men who are engaged in private enterprise based on the old economic idea of

the law of supply and demand, or ownership by the Government of plants that will guarantee competition. If you have real earnest competition, that competition will be sufficient to regulate these matters without Government interference; but if you have in the land, as we see in this instance, collusive bidding instead of competitive bidding, if we see three great companies submit identical bids to the Government of the United States for armor plate, for shipbuilding, for things which the Government needs, you know there is no competition, you know there is no accidental identity between these various bids, but that there is collusion; and you know that the Government of the United States in order to get away from the results of that kind of collusive bidding, and in order that it may not be put at the mercy, Mr. Chairman, of these men who are engaged in these things, not from patriotic purposes but for the profit that may accrue to them, must equip its own navy yards for shipbuilding and build its own armor-plate factory. And in the end the cost is bound to be less than it would be if the Government was at the mercy of these collusive bidders.

Mr. BARTON. The Secretary was criticized some for buying supplies abroad. Was it not the only possible way he could get these supplies at reduced prices?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Of course it was.

Mr. HENSLEY. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts intend to be understood as saying that any gentleman who stands with ourselves withholds his indorsement of the Secretary for all these things that he did for the purpose of reducing these things?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. No. I thank the gentleman for asking the question. I am directing my thought particularly to the gentlemen who have spoken—the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING]. I know that the gentleman from Missouri and his colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], and those who join with them on the committee and who are trying to get real economies, are in sympathy with the Secretary in this work, because these men are sincere and earnest in their desires to reduce the burden of taxation that is now resting so heavily on the people of this country. They realize that the Secretary is doing these things in a sincere effort to establish real economy and are in active cooperation with him.

We have seen one great political revolution in this country on the proposition of the high cost of living. I have seen the time when the annual budget of the city of Boston amounted to more than \$20,000,000. I have seen the State taxes of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts mount up to \$8,000,000, as they were last year, and almost certain to be increased to \$10,000,000 this year.

The national budget is now considerably more than \$1,000,000,000. I am not one of those who protest against large expenditures simply because they are large. But I wonder how long it is going to be before there will be a political revolution on the proposition, not of the high cost of living, which we have already seen, but on the proposition of the high cost of government, which we surely can see if we will just look at the figures. There may be places where it is wise, where it is the proper thing, where it is the duty of a Representative to protest against expenditure; but, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that those who protest against this expenditure of \$148,000 for the equipment of the navy yard at Boston for shipbuilding purposes are not real economists, but rather are basing their arguments on a proposition that will not meet the measure of discussion and analysis that I hope it will be given in debate on this bill under the five-minute rule. The control of prices is a most important consideration in this matter. The Secretary points out that if he allows the Navy Department and the Government of the United States to be put at the mercy of the men who control the prices of these things, they will be able to run those prices up to suit themselves. But he says if there are Government yards equipped to do this shipbuilding in competition with private companies, then there will not be a surrendering of the control of prices by the Navy Department, but rather there will be a retaining of control of prices, and we shall have real competitive bidding for these ships and not the collusive bidding that we fear.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say one further thing about this matter. There are those who seem to believe that the equipment of this yard for shipbuilding purposes means simply its equipment for great battleship construction. I suppose we may hope in the course of time to see a battleship constructed there, just as battleships have been constructed in the New York Navy Yard and at other places. But I wonder if these men are mindful of the extent and the number of ships of one kind and another that are needed and used by the United States Government in its various departments.

Let me direct the attention of gentlemen to these tables that show the extent of work done in navy yards on ships of the War Department, the Treasury Department, and of other departments of the Government during the year 1912:

NAVY-YARD WORK ON VESSELS OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT, 1912.

Name of vessel.	Navy yard.	Estimated cost of work.	Actual cost of work.	Difference—actual cost.		Cost of unestimated work.	Total actual cost of all work.
				Below estimate.	Above estimate.		
Lieutenant Hayden Y. Grubbs.....	Portsmouth, N. H.	\$378.70	\$758.73	\$19.97			\$758.73
Plebe.....	Boston, Mass.	None.	126.16			\$126.16	126.16
Mayflower.....	do.	100.00	42.59	57.41			42.59
Executive.....	do.	None.	1,830.34			1,830.34	1,830.34
Harwood.....	do.	None.	780.80			780.80	780.80
Jessup.....	do.	None.	64.91			64.91	64.91
Batchelder.....	do.	None.	35.79			35.79	35.79
Gedney.....	New York, N. Y.	10,360.95	9,097.16	1,263.79			9,097.16
Sumter.....	Charleston, S. C.	596.10	729.96		\$143.86	2,413.78	3,143.74
General Weeks.....	do.	25.00	18.78	6.22		2,350.91	2,390.69
Dawho.....	do.	1,248.40	1,203.92	44.48		58.90	1,262.82
General Ord.....	do.	194.00	245.35		51.35		245.35
Winyah Bay.....	do.	85.63	103.49		17.86	2,709.22	2,812.71
Waterloo.....	do.	2,799.25	1,457.81	1,341.44		117.33	1,575.14
Peedee.....	do.	2,044.25	1,408.27	635.88		125.54	1,533.91
Sherman.....	Mare Island, Cal.	3,195.00	2,673.38	521.62			2,673.38
Manufacturing 7 lifeboats, Army transport service.....	do.	5,285.00	5,392.68		107.68		5,392.68
Angel Island.....	do.	548.48	532.26	16.22			532.26
Col. Geo. Armistead.....	do.	2,081.00	1,941.13	139.87			1,941.13
Dix.....	Puget Sound, Wash.					1,779.43	1,779.43
Burnside.....	do.	2,458.25	2,775.46		317.21	2,192.08	4,967.54
General Hunt.....	do.					44.11	44.11

NAVY-YARD WORK ON VESSELS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR, 1912.

Lightship No. 73.....	Boston, Mass.	\$740.50	\$691.27	\$49.23			\$691.27
Lightship No. 41.....	do.	20,847.09	9,991.85	(1)			
Lightship No. 53.....	Charleston, S. C.	40.00	18.18	21.82		\$48.99	67.17
Lightship No. 34.....	do.	6,948.75	6,998.87		\$55.12		6,998.87
Lightship No. 84.....	do.	1,830.50	1,788.28	42.22		12.75	1,801.03
L. H. T. Camellia.....	do.	201.80	211.21		9.41		211.21
L. H. T. Cypress.....	do.	3,291.10	3,391.74		100.64	1,269.87	4,661.61
Unloading buoys.....	do.	97.50	5.62	91.88			5.62
Lightship No. 76.....	Mare Island, Cal.	10,389.00	10,700.83		311.83		10,700.83
Seegonia.....	do.	5,637.00	5,256.81	380.19			5,256.81
Lightship No. 70.....	do.	1,878.25	1,785.20	143.05			1,785.20
Lightship No. 83.....	do.	3,805.00	2,754.50	1,050.50			2,754.50

NAVY-YARD WORK ON VESSELS OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT, 1912.

Gresham.....	Boston, Mass.	\$2,489.29	\$2,587.48		\$98.19		\$2,587.48
Itasca.....	do.		27.60			\$27.60	27.60
Mohawk.....	New York, N. Y.	2,211.00	2,071.05	\$139.95		119.20	2,190.25
Gedney.....	do.	10,360.95	9,097.16	1,263.79			9,097.16
Seneca.....	do.	634.00	553.32	80.68			553.32
Yamacraw.....	Charleston, S. C.	795.00	948.64		244.86		948.64
McCulloch.....	Mare Island, Cal.	15,657.85	10,167.97	5,489.88			10,167.97
Madrono.....	do.	4,722.10	4,552.32	169.78			4,552.32
Bear.....	do.	137.00	121.62	15.38			121.62
Apache.....	Norfolk, Va.	1,568.00	1,223.34	344.66			1,223.34
Chase.....	do.	865.80	2,045.52		1,179.72	(2)	2,045.52
Itasca.....	do.	1,522.00	1,220.54	301.46			1,220.54
Mohawk.....	do.	313.00	155.86	157.14			155.86
Onondaga.....	do.	7,089.85	10,850.88		3,260.73	(2)	10,350.88
Portsmouth.....	do.	6.89	6.89				6.89
Seminole.....	do.	372.00	485.69		113.69	(2)	485.69
Manning.....	Puget Sound, Wash.	987.30	1,615.88		628.58	119.30	1,735.18
Smohomish.....	do.	2,755.00	3,191.12		456.12	1,775.92	4,967.04
Thetis.....	do.	435.00	446.04		11.04	79.96	526.00
Tahoma.....	do.	1,076.00	1,791.83		715.83	2,737.20	4,529.03
McCulloch.....	do.					17.65	17.65

¹Work not completed.

²No estimates were submitted on many job orders in connection with this work, it having been authorized in advance.

From: The Aid for Materiel.

MEMORANDUM.

FEBRUARY 25, 1913.

To: The Secretary of the Navy.

Subject: Work done at various navy yards on vessels belonging to other departments.

1. There are forwarded herewith data sheets showing the amount of work done in the various navy yards on vessels of other departments of the Government during the calendar year 1912. Since January 1, 1913, the following additional work of this nature has been undertaken or authorized in the various yards, showing increased activity along these lines since the inauguration of the policy approved by the President on December 10, 1912:

Vessel.	Navy yard.	Number of days' work in—			Probable date of completion.
		Equip-ment.	Steam en-gineering.	Construc-tion, ord-nance, and repair.	
Light Vessel No. 41.....	Boston.....		36	18	Indefinite.
Light Vessel No. 85.....	do.....		(1)		Completed.
Lighthouse tender Mayflower.....	do.....		3	16	Indefinite.
George E. Warren.....	do.....		(2)	(2)	Completed.
Seneca.....	New York.....			2	Absent.
Mohawk.....	do.....			3	Do.
Manhattan.....	Philadelphia.....		30	12	Indefinite.
Delaware.....	do.....		35	10	Do.
Mohawk.....	Norfolk.....		24		Do.
Onondaga.....	do.....			1	Absent.
Light Vessel No. 53.....	Charleston.....	4	28	30	May 1, 1913.
Ross.....	do.....			6	Completed.
Manning.....	Mare Island.....		60	65	May 1, 1913.
Madrono.....	do.....		25	20	Feb. 28, 1913.
Light Vessel No. 70.....	do.....		25	20	Do.

¹Install air compressor.

²Renew propeller.

³Docking.

2. In addition to the foregoing there is being built at Mare Island, Cal., a 67-foot vessel for the Revenue-Cutter Service; at Puget Sound, Wash., 3 gasoline launches for the use of the Agricultural Department in Alaskan waters; and at the navy yard, Boston, 3 motor dories for the Lighthouse Establishment.

Several of those ships are ships that are assigned to the Treasury Department. Several are in the Lighthouse Service and in the Revenue-Cutter Service and in the Public Health Service, engaged in every kind of service where any department needs vessels that are not battleships in any sense of the word. They are vessels of peace and not vessels of war.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Has the gentleman any data before him that would indicate the difference in price if the work that he mentions had been done in a private shipbuilding yard?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. No; I have not; but I understand—

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is satisfied it was done more cheaply at the navy yards?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that it was largely repair work, not construction work. In these cases bids are usually asked for in the first instance for this repair work, and if the bids are lower in the private shipbuilding companies' yards than in the Government yards, it is the custom, I understand, to allow that work to be done by the private companies. The opening of the Panama Canal will certainly cause many ships of the Navy to be kept on the west coast to a greater extent than they have been in the past, and that will cause the repair work on these ships to be done on the west coast rather than on the east coast.

The time has come, Mr. Chairman, when the very existence of the navy yard at Charlestown, Mass., and the future of that navy yard must be determined. For a great many years—practically from the days of the Civil War—the Charlestown Navy Yard has been a repair yard rather than a yard for construction work. The vast amount of work that has been done in that yard has been done in repairs on ships assigned to Charlestown as their home station. If some of these ships are taken away and kept on the west coast, the Charlestown Navy Yard will not be available for their repair.

The property the Government has there is worth more than \$16,000,000, and many millions of dollars in addition have been expended during the history of the country for maintenance. The location of the yard is right at the very head of Boston Harbor, at the confluence of the Mystic and the Charles Rivers, and it takes a very large water-front area right in the most desirable place, where shipping and commercial activity might be had.

Mr. Chairman, if that yard is to be continued only as a repair yard, certainly it is going to be a place where only a few hundred workmen will be employed and where there will be not much industrial activity. There is a tremendous sentiment against allowing that yard to be given back to private enterprise and to be used for commercial activities.

I know that this is so, because since I entered Congress in 1911 the Navy board recommended that the Charlestown Navy Yard should be discontinued and that a great naval base ought to be established at Narragansett Bay, R. I. I had my own ideas on the matter, and I knew that, from my own personal point of view, that change ought not to be made; but I realized that my duty is to be a Representative in Congress, and so, rather than reflect my own personal ideas in regard to the matter, I sent out a circular letter to everybody in the district which I have the honor to represent, asking them for an expression of opinion as to whether or not this navy yard should be continued or whether the vast area there should be made available for commercial activity and for water-front development. Mr. Chairman, I only state the facts when I say that of the thousands of replies I received less than a dozen letters came back to me favoring the change from a governmental yard to a place of commercial activity and private enterprise. The reasons that were given were most varied and most eloquent in the expression of a general opinion that that yard ought to be utilized almost entirely for the Navy. The terms in which those letters were expressed were not the naval terms. Perhaps they were not couched in the kind of language that the men of the naval board would use in expressing their ideas, because the letters were free from technicalities. But reasons of almost every kind were given, and it was a most instructive thing to me to use that referendum method of finding out what Boston people think about the matter, and I believe it would be instructive to the men of this committee if they could read some of the letters that I received.

The time has come, then, when the yard can not be continued solely as a repair yard, and if it is to be further used as a navy yard it must be equipped for shipbuilding purposes; not for the building of great battleships alone, but for the building of

the various kinds of Government ships that can well be built there—the ships for the Lighthouse Service, the ships for the Revenue-Cutter Service, the ships for the Public Health Service, the ships for the various kinds of governmental activities that we have come to need in the conduct of this great business enterprise, the Government of the United States.

I congratulate the Secretary of the Navy that he has made the recommendation, because I know it is a matter of wise economy. In the recent special election that was held in Massachusetts we had to meet the proposition that "the South is in the saddle" in the control of the Navy Department and of the various departments of the Government. My colleague [Mr. ROGERS] made a speech a few weeks ago that may be remembered by some of you, when he pointed to the fact that a southern gentleman was in control of this and that and the other department, and he said that the people of New England would not get a square deal in regard to the conduct of these governmental activities. Mr. Chairman, let me briefly say we had Moody of Massachusetts in the Navy Department, we had Meyer of Massachusetts in the Navy Department. Neither one of them would recommend the equipment of the Charlestown, Mass., yard for shipbuilding purposes; but when we had a southern gentleman, Josephus Daniels, in that department, the recommendation was made; and is now reported to this Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union by the Naval Affairs Committee, and I hope it will soon be enacted into law. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, from the earliest days of American history the men of Massachusetts have been interested deeply in shipbuilding and in shipbuilding.

Previous to the establishment of the Charlestown Navy Yard a number of vessels had been built in the vicinity of Boston, several of which subsequently became well known. In the very earliest days of the settlement the importance of ships was recognized, and as early as 1629 we find records of six shipwrights having been sent out from London. Gov. Winthrop, who reached Boston Bay in 1630, records in 1631 the launch of the *Blessing of the Bay*, the first ship of the infant colony, and on August 9 of that year states: "The governor's bark, being of 30 tons, went to sea." This small vessel was later converted into a cruiser against pirates and may, therefore, lay claim to the honor of having been the first American vessel of war.

The *Massachusetts* was built at Germantown, a promontory in the town of Quincy, in 1780. The frigate *Constitution*, launched in 1797, was built at Hartt's shipyard on the site now known as Constitution Wharf, and the frigate *Boston* (the second of that name) was launched from the same yard in 1799.

It was undoubtedly the work already accomplished in shipbuilding, as well as the importance of the settlement and the facilities offered by the harbor, that suggested Charlestown as a desirable location for a navy yard.

On January 25, 1797, a resolution was reported from the Naval Committee of the House recommending the establishment of a Government dockyard. There seems to have been no direct authority from Congress to purchase a site or build a dockyard; but, on February 25, 1799, an act was passed authorizing the building of six ships of war of not less than 74 guns each, and appropriating \$1,000,000 for this purpose. Hon. Benjamin Stoddard, then Secretary of the Navy, recommended the purchase of the site, which was approved by the President. The earliest record of the transaction was a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, dated June 2, 1800, to Dr. Aaron Putnam, of Charlestown—who appears to be the agent selected for negotiating the purchase—stating:

It is desirable, for the purpose of establishing a navy yard for building ships or vessels of war at or in the vicinity of Boston, to purchase, on account of the United States, from 10 to 50 acres of land if it can be obtained on reasonable terms.

And inclosing a list of the property referred to amounting to about 47½ acres. A later letter from the Secretary to Dr. Putnam, dated August 13, 1800, states:

The President having determined that the 47½ acres of ground at Charlestown described in the plat herewith sent should be purchased for a ship and dock yard, I have the honor to request, upon satisfying yourself of the goodness of the titles, you will make the purchase, taking deeds to the United States for same, which, after having recorded, you will be pleased to send to me. * * * I have already remitted you \$10,000 on this account, and will remit the residue when I am informed you want it.

In accordance with the above letter the first site of the Charlestown yard was purchased, the original purchase amounting to about 34½ acres, and the purchase price being about \$37,356. Further purchases were made, as follows: In 1817, from Isaac Hull, 5,186 square feet, for \$3,889.50; in 1862, from Oakman & Eldridge, 115,210½ square feet, for \$123,100; and in 1867, from A. Hull, 2½ perches, for \$7,000. The amount pur-

chased, with the filling in of the marshes and flats, made, in 1880, 87½ acres; and with the extension of harbor line and further filling in since that time makes the present area of the yard proper about 111 acres, of which 80 acres are land and 31 acres water.

The first commandant of the yard was Capt. (afterwards commodore) Samuel Nicholson, who remained in office until his death, December 29, 1811. The records show but very few improvements in the yard up to this time. The commandant's house, afterwards the old museum, was built prior to 1808, the exact date not being recorded. There were also erected a brick store, marine barracks, a hospital, a powder magazine, a wharf, and a few temporary sheds.

Commodore Bainbridge was the next commandant, and he took a very active interest in the affairs of the yard and vicinity, surveying the harbor and recommending improvements, but the appropriations were very meager, the expenditures for accommodations and improvements at the yard in 1811 and 1812 amounting to but \$5,742.43, although during the year 1812 13 vessels received repairs amounting to \$245,225.13. The first vessel launched at the yard was the sloop of war *Frolic*, on September 11, 1813, and the next was the *Independence*, on September 22, 1814, and from that time up to the commencement of the Civil War 21 vessels in all were launched at the yard.

Among these were several of historic fame—the *Cumberland*, which was sunk by the Confederate ironclad *Virginia—Merrimac*—in Hampton Roads in March, 1862; the *Merrimac*, the first steam frigate launched for our Navy was built at the yard in 1854-55. The history of this vessel need hardly be told to any American—how she was left at the navy yard, Norfolk, in 1861, and converted by the Confederates into an ironclad and created such havoc with our vessels until she was defeated by the little *Monitor* in 1862 and was afterwards destroyed by the Confederates.

On January 1, 1858, the keel of the historic ship *Hartford*, the flagship of Admiral Farragut, was laid, and she was launched in November of that year.

The cost of improvements at the yard up to 1859, including the cost of site and dry dock No. 1, which was built in 1827-1833, amounted to \$3,671,521.

During the Civil War there was great activity at the yard, and between 1861 and 1866 39 vessels of war were built and 43 purchased vessels were equipped; the number of vessels repaired, provisioned, and so forth, is up in the hundreds. At times there were as many as 5,000 men employed. The *Monadnock*, a double-turreted monitor, launched in 1864, was the first vessel of the kind to go from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, arriving at Mare Island in 1866, and being afterwards rebuilt and converted into the vessel now of the same name.

In 1874 the iron torpedo boat *Intrepid* was launched at the yard and was the first vessel of that kind added to our Navy.

From 1832 to 1880, inclusive, \$10,618,716 was expended for general maintenance of the yard. This does not include the expenditures on ships built or repaired or pay of workmen employed on them. Only one vessel, a small training ship, the *Cumberland*, has been built at the yard since that time.

From 1880 until about 1900 very little was done to improve the buildings in the yard, but from 1900 on until the present time remodeling and building has been continuous.

The estimated value of the property on June 30, 1913, was \$16,211,678. This includes only the property, buildings, and plant in the yard proper, and not the value of the hospital and other outlying branches of the station.

The old ship houses have been razed and modern shops or buildings have taken their places. With the addition of a few large tools the yard would be fitted for a first-class repair station. The capacity for such work would be limited, however, by the berthing space, and as any extended increase in this space would not only require very heavy expenditures, but would conflict with the maritime interests of the port, development in this line would be difficult. If therefore the full capacity of the yard is to be utilized, shipbuilding must be resorted to, and fortunately the yard is susceptible to such development without extravagant expenditure.

A recent report of the board of inspections for shore stations contains the following statements in regard to the facilities at hand for such development:

The yard possesses an available site for building ways. This site is situated between the ship fitters' shop and the electrical shop, the latter building being also used as a storage house for electrical supplies as well as for the storage of anchors and chains. At the head of the projected ways is the forge shop, and only a few hundred feet to the westward is the group of shops of the machinery division. As regards therefore its relative location to the principal industrial shops of the yard the site possesses distinct advantages.

Necessary retaining walls, cranes, crane runways, together with pneumatic, electric, water, and steam lines, would likewise have to be provided. The yard authorities estimated that an expenditure of about \$130,000 would provide all equipment and improvements essential to the fitting up of building ways adequate for the construction of a collier.

The site now reserved for recreation grounds and recommended by the above-mentioned board to be used for a third dry dock could also be utilized for building ways for larger vessels. Upon the completion of the 1,000-foot dock projected by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the necessity for using this space for a dock would be considerably diminished.

Following the history of this yard, we find that one of the reasons for the original selection of its location was the fact that it had been demonstrated that the necessary facilities and talent were then at hand. The War of 1812 demonstrated the fact that the art of shipbuilding had not been lost by the workmen in that vicinity. Again, during the Civil War the resources of the yard were severely taxed and the response was such that the Nation may feel that high interest was paid on the money invested.

During the latter period as high as 5,000 men were employed, although the facilities were not half what they are to-day. We find at the present time that a varying force of from 1,300 to 1,800 men is employed, not half utilizing the increased industrial facilities. The effect of this variation in the working force is bad in every way—for the employees in having irregular employment, breeding dissatisfaction and frequently causing distress to honest, hard-working men; for the Government, loss of efficiency, due to deterioration of plant and force, owing to lack of work and the dissatisfaction of employees. The history of this yard calls for some consideration for its employees. One of the means of maintaining a steady working force is by having new construction work (shipbuilding) done at the yard, and it would be to the interest of the Government to place such work at the yard instead of doing it by outside contract, even if the price was higher. But when bids were opened in December, 1913, for a supply ship, the bid of the Charlestown Navy Yard was found to be below all others, navy yards or private establishments.

To build this vessel at the yard it will be necessary to provide a building slip, for which a site is available, as stated above, and a provision for this purpose appropriating \$148,000 has been inserted in the pending naval appropriation bill. This will mean a permanent improvement to the yard, with practically no expense to the Government, as the bid of this yard for the supply ship in question was more than this amount below that of any private firm.

When the Panama Canal is opened and the fleet passes through to the Pacific coast, the amount of repair work for the yards on this side will be greatly reduced, and it is vital to the interests of the Boston yard that they should have other work to keep the men employed. The Government can not afford to have these men scattered and the force disorganized, and surely the record of Massachusetts men who have built so many of the vessels that have made Americans proud of their Navy deserves some consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] to consume the remainder of his time.

Mr. HENSLEY. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON].

Mr. BUTLER. Before the gentleman yields, I wish to say that on the Republican side there remain about 40 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] will follow the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON]. He will occupy 12 minutes, and I desire to give the balance of the time, 28 minutes, to the chairman of the committee [Mr. PADGETT].

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield two minutes to me before that?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom I agreed to assign the time, says that he will cheerfully give the gentleman two minutes. So I will then yield 26 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] is recognized for 1 hour and 17 minutes.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I ought to apologize to the House for trespassing any longer on your patience, because I have had more than my share of the time already.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum. I think we should have a quorum here to listen to Judge WITHERSPOON.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado makes the point of no quorum.

Mr. PADGETT. I hope the gentleman will not insist on that. It will take half an hour, and it will make Judge WITHERSPOON'S speech rather late in the day.

Mr. KEATING. I think it is quite essential, Mr. Chairman, that we have a quorum here when Judge WITHERSPOON addresses the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). There are 53 Members present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk began the calling of the roll.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, if I may withdraw the point of no quorum, I will do it.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman can not do that now. The gentleman can not interrupt the roll call.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Alken	Finley	Konop	Pou
Ainey	Floyd, Ark.	Korbly	Powers
Barchfeld	Frear	Kreider	Prouty
Bartholdt	Gallivan	Lafferty	Ragsdale
Beall, Tex.	Gard	Langham	Rainey
Brockson	Gardner	Lee, Ga.	Rauch
Brodbeck	George	Lee, Pa.	Roberts, Mass.
Broussard	Gillett	L'Engle	Rothermel
Browne, Wis.	Gillmore	Lenroot	Rucker
Bruckner	Godwin, N. C.	Lesher	Rupley
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	Lever	Sells
Burke, Pa.	Goodwin, Ark.	Lindquist	Sherwood
Burke, Wis.	Goulden	Lobeck	Shreve
Burnett	Graham, Pa.	Loft	Smith, Md.
Byrnes, S. C.	Green, Iowa	Logue	Smith, J. M. C.
Calder	Griest	McClellan	Smith, N. Y.
Campbell	Griffin	McCoy	Sparkman
Candler, Miss.	Gudger	McDermott	Stanley
Cantor	Guernsey	McGuire, Okla.	Stevens, N. H.
Cantrill	Hamill	Mahan	Stout
Carew	Hamilton, N. Y.	Maher	Switzer
Carlin	Hardwick	Manahan	Taggart
Carr	Haugen	Mann	Talbott, Md.
Carter	Hawley	Martin	Taylor, Ala.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hay	Merritt	Thacher
Clancy	Hayes	Metz	Towner
Clark, Fla.	Heflin	Miller	Treadway
Clayton	Helgesen	Morin	Tribble
Coady	Hobson	Morrison	Tuttle
Collier	Holland	Moss, Ind.	Underhill
Connolly, Iowa	Howard	Moss, W. Va.	Vollmer
Conry	Howell	Neeley, Kans.	Volstead
Cooper	Hoxworth	Nelson	Walker
Copley	Hughes, W. Va.	Norton	Wallin
Crisp	Humphrey, Wash.	O'Brien	Walsh
Dale	Humphreys, Miss.	Oglesby	Walters
Danforth	Kahn	O'Leary	Watkins
Difenderfer	Keister	O'Shaunessy	Webb
Donohoe	Kelly, Pa.	Palmer	Whitacre
Dooling	Kennedy, Conn.	Parker	Wilson, Fla.
Doremus	Kennedy, Iowa	Patton, Pa.	Wilson, N. Y.
Driscoll	Kent	Payne	Winslow
Drukker	Kettner	Peters, Mass.	Woodruff
Dunn	Key, Ohio	Peterson	
Edmonds	Kiess, Pa.	Plumley	
Fairchild	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Porter	
Ferris	Knowland, J. R.	Post	

The committee rose; and Mr. UNDERWOOD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the naval appropriation bill, found itself without a quorum, and had caused the roll to be called; that 249 Members had answered to their names, and he presented a list of the absentees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present, and the committee will resume its session.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] is recognized for 1 hour and 17 minutes.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I was about to apologize to the committee for trespassing again upon its patience, and I want to state that my excuse for this is that I have seen the newspapers and magazines of the country and learned from them and from talking with people everywhere that there is so much misconception about the American Navy that I have been deeply impressed with the importance of at least the House of Representatives knowing the facts about it. I have spent several months in gathering up the facts, and I feel it my duty to give my colleagues in this House the benefit of what little I have learned. When I closed my remarks of last Saturday I had just demonstrated, as I claim, the superiority of the battleship *Oregon* in every particular to every battleship in the German Navy.

In addition to that, I want to call your attention to the fact that while we have not tested lately the *Oregon*, yet we have tested a ship that is far inferior to it. We have made a test of one of the monitors, the *Tallahassee*. This was done at the re-

quest and under the direction of the Naval Affairs Committee, and we know from observation what that boat can do. There had been some question raised as to whether the armor-piercing shells that we use are effective. We are spending millions of dollars for them, and have been for many years, and some question has been raised as to whether it is an effective shell, and in order to demonstrate whether it is or not we made a test, and we used the *Tallahassee*, one of these monitors that they do not count as an American ship, to test that question.

If that test was bona fide and honest and fair, then that ship was a representative ship of the American Navy. What the result of that test was is regarded as a secret, and I shall not give you the details of it. But when Admiral Strauss was before the Naval Affairs Committee, and he is the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, I asked him what his judgment about that test was, and he said it demonstrated the power and efficiency of these shells and guns that were used on these monitors. I asked him this question: I said, "Admiral, if a modern dreadnought had been in the place of that target when the *Tallahassee* was shooting at it, what would have been the result?" He said, "It would have been put out of action." I asked him how long it would have taken the *Tallahassee* to put the dreadnought out of action if it had been in the place of a target, and he said, "A very short while."

Admiral Vreeland told us that the *Oregon* and the *Indiana* and the *Massachusetts* were more efficient ships than the *Tallahassee* is. That is the testimony of these naval experts, upon whom the Secretary of the Navy says that he relies.

Now, I want you to understand also that while they come here and tell you that the *Oregon* and the *Indiana* and the *Massachusetts* are old, obsolete, worn out, inefficient ships, that the Navy Department does not exclude them from comparison in comparing navies on the ground that they are old, obsolete, and inefficient. It states plainly and clearly in the Navy Yearbook the reason why it excludes them. It is under an arbitrary rule that they have adopted which declares that no ship shall be counted unless it was launched within 20 years, unless within the last 5 years it has been reconstructed and rearmed. It is under this arbitrary rule. The Navy Department seems to regard the launching as very important. Now, I asked Admiral Vreeland when he was on the stand to tell us what was the real test of superiority between two navies. He said types, numbers, and men. I said, "Suppose the German officers and sailors were exactly equal to ours in every respect, then does not it all depend on the destructive power of the guns?" Well, he says, "Yes." I said, "It makes no difference what is the type of the vessel, the number of the vessel, the style of the vessel, the tonnage of the vessel, the speed of the vessel, if the men on the vessel have not the skill to make the shells hit and the shells have not the destructive force when they do hit, all these other things amount to nothing." And he said, "That is certainly true." It was not necessary for a naval expert to say that to any man who will use his reason about it. Then I said, "Admiral, the whole question depends on the skill of our men and the destructive power of the guns." He said, "That is certainly true."

Yet it is the age of the ship from the launching that the Navy Department has made the test. They have not followed the advice of their own experts in this particular.

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

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. SHARP. When was the *Tallahassee* reconstructed, if it has been?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The *Tallahassee* has never been reconstructed, but the *Oregon* and the *Massachusetts* and the *Indiana* have.

Mr. SHARP. When was the *Tallahassee* constructed?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will tell the gentleman about that.

Mr. SHARP. I ask because I saw that great demonstration myself, and saw all these shells fired, and I was curious to know when the *Tallahassee* was constructed.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The *Indiana* was kept in the navy yard two years, the *Oregon* five years and five months, and the *Massachusetts* four years and four months, and on the three ships they have expended in reconstruction nearly \$8,000,000. If I recollect correctly, the reconstruction was completed in 1910 and 1911.

Mr. SHARP. When was the *Tallahassee* built?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I think about 1898. I am not sure about that. It is not nearly so old as these other boats. I asked the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance why it was when they expended \$6,000,000 reconstructing these three ships if their guns were defective that they did not then put new guns on them—modern guns. His answer was not that they could not do it. He did not suggest there was any difficulty about doing it, but

his answer was that at that time we had not discovered that it was necessary.

These great naval experts had not found out in 1910 and 1911 that the guns of the *Oregon*, the *Massachusetts*, and the *Indiana* had any defects about them at all. They have just discovered that within late years, since there has been such a movement and uprising all over the world to stop this battleship folly. So I say that there is no reason why these ships should be excluded; but no Member of this House yet, so far as I have heard, has attempted to answer the demonstration that the *Oregon*, the *Indiana*, and the *Massachusetts* are superior in every respect to every one of the 20 German battleships. And if you want to believe that they are not effective war vessels, if you do not think that a ship carrying a gun that will penetrate 11.76 inches of Krupp steel at a distance of 12,000 yards is a good fighting ship—if you do not believe that, then at least I can appeal to your patriotism to be fair to your own country and to exclude every German ship that is not equal to her. [Applause.] And if you do that, you will knock out 20 of the German battleships and leave the two fleets with 36 American battleships and 19 German battleships. [Applause.]

I call your attention again to the fact that in order to juggle the figures and minimize the American Navy, in the Navy Yearbook they have divided them into three classes—battleships, dreadnaughts, and cruisers. I have already discussed the battleship division. I call your attention to the second class, the dreadnaughts, and if you will get the Navy Yearbook of 1913 and look on page 832 you will find there a list of the German ships—dreadnaughts—on one page, and ours right opposite to it on page 833, and you will find that they have a list of German ships, dreadnaughts, numbering 17, and a list of American dreadnaughts numbering 12, in order to make it appear to anyone who examines that book that our dreadnaught fleet is far inferior to the German dreadnaught fleet.

This is accomplished in two ways, first, by taking two particular dreadnaughts out of our list and putting them in the common battleship list above. I refer to the *South Carolina* and the *Michigan*. That is one way in which it is accomplished. The other is to take four German ships, the *Nassau*, the *Westfalen*, the *Posen*, and the *Rheinland*, which are really battleships, out of the battleship class and put them in the dreadnaught class, and by taking some of ours out and putting more of Germany's in they make a longer list of German dreadnaughts than they do for American dreadnaughts. I want to call attention to the facts about that. They say the *Michigan* and the *South Carolina* are not dreadnaughts. If you will examine the list of battleships and dreadnaughts, as given in all the authorities that are ever published in any country in the world, you will find this to appear on its face as the difference between a battleship and a dreadnaught. In the old battleship class you will see four big guns, and all the balance of its main armament small guns. In a dreadnaught class you will see all of the main armament consisting of big guns and no small guns, and that is the difference between the two. The *Michigan* and the *South Carolina* have all big guns. Their main battery consists solely of eight 12-inch guns each, and that makes them dreadnaughts, and every man who tells you they are not dreadnaughts is either showing that he does not know what a dreadnaught is or he is trying to fool you, one or the other.

Now, I have stated and I can prove that the *South Carolina* and the *Michigan* are not only dreadnaughts, but they are the first dreadnaughts designed and planned. Now, it is a common idea that England built the first dreadnaught. She built the ship that is called *Dreadnaught*, which has given the name to the entire class, but before she had built that ship or designed it the genius of the American Navy had designed and planned the *Michigan* and the *South Carolina*, and England and all other countries have patterned after us in that as in everything else that is good. [Applause.] Now, I want to show you what foreign authorities say about that. I read first from the Naval Pocketbook, giving the navies of the world for the year 1913, just out, and on page 391 it gives a description of the *South Carolina* and the *Michigan*, and then at the bottom of the page it has these words:

These ships were designed before the *Dreadnaught*. They are, therefore, the first all big-gun ships.

That is what this foreign authority says about it. Now, I would call your attention to Janes's Fighting Ships, where it says about it—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield just there?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman state for the information of the House, if you please, the speed and the tonnage of the *Michigan* and the *South Carolina*?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Oh, yes; I will state that. They are ships that have a tonnage of 17,617 tons, according to this book. That is the full-load displacement and the normal tonnage is 16,000 tons; and since my friend has asked me that question, whenever you prove that the American Navy is superior to the German Navy, whenever you bring up facts to demonstrate our superiority, then the battleship crowd begin to talk about tons and speed. You do not shoot tons, you shoot shells at the enemy. [Applause.] Speed is a thing that enables you to get away. I admit that the ships of other countries can outrun the *Oregon* and the *Michigan*, because many of them are built upon the principle that "he who fights and runs away may live to fight another day." [Applause.]

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Not right now. But I have never detained you on the question of speed and tonnage. I have tried to address you on something that amounts to something. That has nothing to do with it. Talk about speed, you just as well say that a bulldog can not whip a greyhound because he can not catch him. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman suggests foreign ships can get away from the *Oregon*; can the *Oregon* get away from foreign ships?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. She does not want to.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentlemen want her to be sunk?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No, sir; the *Oregon* does not belong to that class that wants to get away.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman has not yet stated the speed of the *South Carolina* and *Michigan*.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Oh, you can put it at 10 or 15 knots; you can put it at 10 knots if you want to do so; I do not care what the speed is. Whenever you get ready for the *Oregon* to go out on the sea and sink the ships of the enemy I want her to be as long getting there as possible. I take no pride in the hurry and the haste of destroying what belongs to other countries.

Now, so far as the *Oregon* running, the man who asked that question does not understand about battleships. It is not like getting into a fight with a fellow, and you find he is getting the best of you and, finding there is no chance for you, you take to your heels. Then, that is a question of speed, but it is not so with a battleship. If a battleship wants to run, no other battleship that has anybody but a lunatic to manage it is going to pursue it. If it does, it will be destroyed by torpedoes. The great trouble about torpedoes is they have not been developed up to the point where they can probably reach the ships of an enemy in battle range. Say two fleets are fighting at 6 miles apart. We have no torpedoes where one could shoot at the other and do any great damage, but if one ship is running and the other is pursuing it, the ship that is fleeing could shoot its torpedoes at the other 6 miles away, because a fast ship goes nearly as fast as a torpedo, and it would meet the torpedo half way and be destroyed by it. There is absolutely nothing in all this talk about ships running. Whenever they go out to battle they are going to fight, and ours are going to fight until they win or go down to the bottom of the sea.

Mr. LEVY. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. LEVY. Is it not a fact that we have more large guns than has the German Navy?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Oh, yes, sir; it is a fact. I have stated that repeatedly.

Mr. LEVY. The number is nearly doubled.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I have stated that.

Mr. SAUNDERS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I understand from the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi that certain of our dreadnaughts have been called battleships in the authority that he referred to, and certain of the German battleships have been called dreadnaughts, and then you have been asked about the tonnage of our dreadnaughts, which have been improperly styled battleships, and you have given that tonnage. Can you give us the tonnage of these German battleships that have been improperly called dreadnaughts? It would form an interesting comparison.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Their tonnage is a little larger, 18,900, and if a ship becomes a dreadnaught on account of its tonnage, the *Mauretania* and the *Lusitania* are the greatest dreadnaughts on earth. [Laughter.] There is not any sense in the tonnage business, and I do not want to waste any more time on it.

I have read you what the Naval Pocket Book says of the *Michigan* and *South Carolina*. Janes's "Fighting ships of the world" says that these ships were laid down and projected be-

fore the British dreadnaughts, and so they may be considered the first dreadnaughts—that is, all big-gun ships. On page 176 this author describes these two dreadnaughts and then uses this language:

Authorized 1905. These ships, though laid down after, were projected before the British dreadnaught and so may be considered as the first dreadnaughts (i. e., all big-gun ships).

That is what this authority says about it. Now, they are not only regarded as dreadnaughts by all foreign authorities, but I want to say this to you, that the Navy Department knows they are dreadnaughts, and if you will take a Navy Yearbook of 1912, just one year before they found out they were not dreadnaughts, and look on page 788, you will see the list of our dreadnaughts there, and the first two ships given in that list are the *Michigan* and the *South Carolina*, put there by the Navy Department. [Applause.] So I say, they know that they are dreadnaughts. Now, why have they dwindled down from dreadnaughts to common battleships within the last 12 months? What has caused it except the necessity to minimize and make look small our dreadnaught list in order to induce Congressmen to vote for more dreadnaughts? If there is any other explanation for it I would like to hear what it is.

Now, let me call your attention to some of the facts about these four German dreadnaughts, the *Westfalen*, the *Nassau*, the *Posen*, and the *Rhineland*. In the first place, those ships are armed with 11-inch guns, and if they are dreadnaughts then they are the only dreadnaughts in the world that have their guns smaller than the 12-inch guns. I defy anybody to produce a foreign authority of any navy in the world to show any other dreadnaughts that have 11-inch guns except these four that they have crowded into the German dreadnaught list in order to make it look bigger than ours.

Now, I want to read to you a description of those four vessels from James's "Fighting Ships of the World," on page 907. He gives the *Westfalen*, the *Nassau*, the *Posen*, and the *Rhineland*, and after giving you a complete description of the ships he makes this note:

Ammunition supply to 6-inch gun unsatisfactory.

That is one thing about it. They have not room enough there to place the ammunition so that in case of battle the men can easily get it. That is one defect. Now, he says further:

As originally designed the *Nassau* was to have carried eight big guns. These ships steam well, but they draw more than the designed draft by at least a foot. They are very cramped internally, and it is difficult to accommodate the crews. They are only moderately successful, being overgunned for their displacement.

The truth is that these four pretended dreadnaughts with their 11-inch guns are designed as battleships, and only intended to have eight 11-inch guns, but when these dreadnaughts in America and the English dreadnaughts were built, they decided to change them, and instead of eight guns, according to the original plan, they now have twelve 11-inch guns on them, which is more than the ships were planned to receive. The consequence is that it gives them a draft of at least a foot, according to that authority, and maybe more, that they draw over the draft for which they were designed. In fact, they are loaded down with too many guns and turrets, and it makes them unsatisfactory ships, and in order to make room for so many more guns than were intended the whole thing is cramped; they have not room enough for their powder, and they have not room enough for their men to turn around in, and yet they are crowded into the dreadnaught class in order to make it look big. That is the fact about those ships. It has been suggested that you can put a heavy load on the *Oregon* and thereby sink its armored belt so deep in the water as to deprive it of armor protection, but these four so-called German dreadnaughts are so weighted down with too many guns and turrets that it is not necessary to put a big load on them to sink their belts into the water.

Now, if you were to remove the *South Carolina* and the *Michigan* from the battleship list into the dreadnaught list and move these four pretended dreadnaughts of the Germans from the dreadnaught list to the battleship list, it would result this way: That Germany instead of having 20 battleships would have 24, and we would have 25; and Germany would have 9 dreadnaughts and we would have 9.

That is the way the thing would result, and it is just a question of juggling figures. You divide a thing into two classes and crowd into one list ships that do not belong there and take from the other list ships that ought to be there, and then you get up and say that the way to compare these navies is to compare the capital ships. And that is the way they make our Navy inferior to the German Navy.

Now, I want to call your attention to another thing. The third class is the cruisers. Germany has 16 armored cruisers. They say that we have only 11. I want to call your attention to what they do say about that in the Navy Yearbook of 1913.

On page 833 you will find, down at the bottom, "armored cruisers," giving the list of our ships and the grand total 11 armored cruisers. Then, over on the other side you have the German cruisers. At the bottom of it, "Grand total, 16 armored cruisers," as if Germany had 5 more than we had. Down at the bottom of the page you find this note:

The *Charleston*, *Milwaukee*, and *St. Louis*, three armored cruisers of 9,700 tonnage, are left out of this grand total of 11.

They say with reference to these ships:

Officially these ships are protected cruisers. They are actually armored cruisers, and so treated by all standard publications. If included in above table, they would give a grand total of 14 armored cruisers.

Now there are three armored cruisers left out, not because they were not launched in time, not because they are not actually of the class that is listed there, but according to the declaration of that book on its face, they were left out because they are actually one thing and officially another.

Now, why should a thing be actually one thing and then officially another? Why should the Navy Department want to take some of our ships and degrade them from what they actually are down to something that they are not? How can you explain that upon any other principle than upon the same principle by which you are forced to explain why it was that they left out three of our battleships, why was it that they took two of our dreadnaughts out of the list, and why was it they crowded four German battleships into their dreadnaught list? Why is this, except for the studied purpose to minimize and depreciate and belittle the American Navy?

But when we add the three armored cruisers, the *Charleston*, *Milwaukee*, and *St. Louis*, which the yearbook admits are actually armored cruisers, and each of which exceeds in tonnage any one of five armored cruisers counted in the German list, exceeding one of them 953 tons, exceeding two of them 756 tons, and exceeding the other two 347 tons, it increases the grand total of our armored cruisers from 11, as stated in the yearbook, to 14. But this is not all. Even this list of 14 does not include the *Saratoga*, which was formerly called the *New York*, and which won so much fame at the Battle of Santiago. The *Saratoga* is the smallest of our armored cruisers, but the weight of the metal in a broadside from its guns and the muzzle energy of a broadside are both greater than that of the smallest German armored cruiser. When the tonnage of a German ship is greater than ours the tonnage is all important, and is the excuse for excluding the *Michigan* and *South Carolina* from the dreadnaught class, but when it was necessary to exclude four of our armored cruisers from the comparison, neither tonnage, weight of the broadside, nor muzzle energy weighs a feather in the estimation of these naval spendthrifts.

But after that, after making the list of our ships as small as possible, if you will look at this Navy Yearbook, on page 838, you will find where they attempt to compare the big guns of the two navies. They give the German guns and they give the American guns side by side in order to show that the Germans' are superior to ours. I want to call your attention to that. This list gives Germany one hundred and seventy-four 12-inch guns and sixteen 15-inch guns. She has no 13-inch guns. She has no 14-inch guns. But she has one hundred and seventy-four 12-inch guns and sixteen 15-inch guns. Then follows the American list. It gives us one hundred and forty-eight 12-inch guns, twenty 13-inch guns, and fifty-four 14-inch guns.

Now, every American gun there is reduced below the actual number. It says that we have fifty-four 14-inch guns, while anybody that knows anything about the Navy knows, as the testimony in the hearings shows, that we have sixty-four 14-inch guns.

We have the *New York*, the *Texas*, the *Oklahoma*, and the *Nevada*, four great dreadnaughts, with ten 14-inch guns each, which make 40; and then we have the *Pennsylvania* and *No. 39*, each having twelve 14-inch guns, making 24. Adding those to the 40 makes sixty-four 14-inch guns. Yet this comparative table knocks off 10 of them. What did they want to knock off 10 of them for? What is the purpose of that? You can not say that they were not launched. That is not the reason for knocking them off. They are just constructing these ships now. The ships, except two of them, have not been launched at all. Why, then, do they leave off these ten 14-inch guns. Is it possible that actually we have 64, but officially we have only 54?

Not only that, but take the 13-inch guns. They have put down twenty 13-inch guns. They knock off 12 of our 13-inch guns. We have 8 battleships, each armed with four 13-inch guns, which makes thirty-two 13-inch guns, and anybody who will take the list of our battleships and count them can see that we have 32. And yet in this table, made up to enable people to compare our Navy with the German Navy, 12 of them

are knocked off, and we are credited with only 20. Now, another thing about that: If you say the 13-inch gun is not of any account, if that is the explanation of it, why did they not knock off the whole 32? All 32 of them are just identically alike. They have the same caliber, the same length, they carry the same charge of powder. They have the same muzzle energy. They have the same destructive force. Now, why should they knock off 12 of them and leave the other 20? What explanation can you give of that except the disposition to minimize the American Navy in order to induce Congressmen to vote for more battleships?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Osterize them.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes. Now, take the other one hundred and forty-eight 12-inch guns. We have 158. These one hundred and forty-eight 12-inch guns are the number of 12-inch guns that you will find on our battleships and dreadnaughts. But we have ten 12-inch guns on the monitors, and one of those 12-inch guns on the monitors was the one that was used when they made that test that I told you about, the test that showed that those guns, according to Admiral Strauss, would have put a dreadnaught out of action in a few minutes if it had been in the place of the target. Those 10 are the kind of 12-inch guns that are left out in this comparative table.

Of course mistakes occur. One mistake might be explainable; but I ask Members of Congress to consider all the facts together. Why are three battleships left out? Why are two dreadnaughts taken out of the list and put where they do not belong? Why are four German battleships crowded into the German list of dreadnaughts? Why are four armored cruisers left out? Why are ten 14-inch guns, twelve 13-inch guns, and ten 12-inch guns left out? Could all of those things happen by mistake? Or do you believe that it is just intended to furnish to this Congress and the American people evidence of the inefficiency and smallness of our Navy, in order to induce you to vote for more battleships?

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RAKER. By what authority is this Naval Yearbook printed? The gentleman has referred to the Navy Department. Is this yearbook printed by the Navy Department?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I am glad to say that the Navy Department disowns the book. They are ashamed of it.

Mr. RAKER. You did not have the author of this book before you, did you?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No, sir. I do not know who publishes it.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to state that this book that the gentleman has been reading and commenting upon is published by the clerk of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs and is not published by the Navy Department.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I am glad to say that the Navy Department is ashamed of it.

Mr. RAKER. When the officers of the Navy were before you, did they explain the discrepancy?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I am coming to that right now, and I am glad you asked me that question.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The gentleman says the Navy Department disowns that book. I want to ask if it is not a fact that the big Navy men point to that book as the reason for making an argument that we have a small Navy, and that we ought to have a larger one?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; and if you will take the report of the majority of the Naval Affairs Committee, the report brought in by the 17 members of the Naval Affairs Committee, you will find about 40 pages in that report that are copied literally from that same Navy Yearbook that the Navy Department disowns. [Applause.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Are we to understand that the chairman who presented the report was a party to that, knowing that the book was not to be depended upon?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Oh, I do not think I can say that.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman has called attention to the book as not being trustworthy, and about 40 pages of the report is based upon that.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to state to the gentleman that it is nothing of the kind; and if the gentleman will permit me, it is based upon an official report from the Navy Department, which I have here. It is copied from that.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I decline to yield, because I have not time to discuss that thing. It is one of the old things that has been issued; I have studied it, and it does not show that any

navy on earth has a single gun. It just shows tons and speed and things like that. I have not time to waste in such foolishness as that. Now, the gentleman from California asked me how they explain that.

Mr. RAKER. That is important, and I think we ought to know.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. When Admiral Vreeland was before the Naval Affairs Committee, sent there by the general board, I asked him these questions, and he gave these answers, about this very table where all the guns were left out. And if you will listen to this statement, you will see what the representative of the general board, Admiral Vreeland, states—that even if you knock out, as the Navy book has done, ten 14-inch guns, twelve 13-inch guns, and ten 12-inch guns, knock all these guns out, and still, according to his statement, which I will read to you, our Navy is superior to that of Germany. [Applause.]

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Assuming that this Navy Yearbook is correct—

That was a violent assumption that I made—

Assuming that this Navy Yearbook is correct in its statement that Germany is now building ships on which they will have sixteen 15-inch guns, that we are building ships on which we will have fifty-four 14-inch guns, that Germany has none, that we have twenty 13-inch guns and Germany has none, would you say that that statement, if true, would show that the German Navy is superior to ours?

Admiral VREELAND. That statement by itself would mean that our Navy is superior.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Admiral Twining stated before this committee last year that a 14-inch gun has a destructive power 50 per cent greater than a 12-inch gun and that it shoots with 30 per cent more accuracy. Do you agree in that statement?

Admiral VREELAND. I should say, coming from the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, that it was correct.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. You have never gone into that?

Admiral VREELAND. It would require a table of ballistics.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Do you think the statement of Admiral Twining in that regard was probably correct?

Admiral VREELAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. You agree with him, so far as you know, without examining the tables and refreshing your memory?

Admiral VREELAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. You said that, assuming that the showing in this yearbook as to the number of 13, 14, and 15 inch guns is correct, it would show that our Navy is superior. Assuming, then, also, that in the German Navy they have one hundred and seventy-four 12-inch guns and we have 148, giving them 26 more than we have, and considering our superiority in 13 and 14 inch guns, and considering the probable accuracy of the statement of Admiral Twining that a 14-inch gun shoots with 50 per cent more destructive force and 30 per cent more accuracy than a 12-inch gun, what would you say as to the relative strength of the two navies, assuming all that to be true?

Admiral VREELAND. I would say that the German Navy is more powerful than ours.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Would you think that their superiority in the number of twenty-six 12-inch guns would overcome our superiority in 13 and 14 inch guns?

Admiral VREELAND. We have not any 13-inch guns, except on ships that are obsolete. Using only your figures, I would say that the argument was on your side.

There I took the comparative statement as to the big guns taken from the Navy Yearbook, leaving out the ten 14-inch guns and the other guns that I have referred to, and put up to him the comparison between these big guns, and he says that our Navy is superior and that the argument is on my side. If I had then put the question to him, which I was not so unkind as to do, what he would think if you would add to our list all the big guns that were left out, why, there is no doubt but that he would have said our Navy was twice as powerful as the Germany Navy.

Now, having determined what we have in our Navy, having determined that we have 39 battleships and 15 cruisers, and Germany has 39 battleships and 16 cruisers, I want to give you a comparison of these navies. I have a table showing it accurately. I am not going to detain you by reading all the figures in the tables, but I will content myself with giving you the totals. However, I have here the size and caliber of every gun in both navies, with the weight of the shells from each gun and the muzzle energy of each gun, and I will put all of those tables into my remarks when I extend them, so that any Member of the House who desires to verify can get the tables and do it. But I will not detain you by going into details.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Certainly.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Do your tables give any information as to the character of shells used in the German Navy, whether they are armor-piercing shells or not?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. They are all armor-piercing shells as far as I know.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Has the gentleman any definite information upon that?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Very little. The committee has never gone into that. We do not know much about that; but I understand from the books that all these are armor-piercing shells.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Armor-piercing shells depend entirely, or almost entirely, for their destructive power upon penetration and explosion after penetration, do they not?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I will not have time to yield to my friend to make a speech.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. But my inquiry is not a speech. It is a question.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I thought the gentleman was making a statement. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. My question was whether the armor-piercing shell does not depend largely, if not entirely, for its destructive power upon penetration and explosion after penetration?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; it does entirely.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. To what distance will it penetrate before exploding?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. That depends altogether upon the shell and the gun. Some of them will penetrate a great deal farther than others. Big guns will have a longer range than smaller ones.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I mean the largest ones.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. My recollection is that the table shows that the 14-inch gun has a penetration of 14 inches at 12,000 yards.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Take the Battle of Santiago. The Oregon, as well as some others of our ships, poured shot after shot into the Spanish ships and did not sink one. How was that?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Simply because they did not hit them in the right place.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Oh, yes; they hit them nearly everywhere. Then the Spaniards ran the ships aground.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. There were no ships sunk in the Spanish-American War or in the Japanese War.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois (interrupting). Oh, yes.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Excuse me.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I can not yield any further. I was going to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Has the gentleman read Capt. Semenoff's history of the Battle of the Yellow Sea?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I can not yield any more. I have not the time.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I am sorry the gentleman's information is not more accurate.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, we have in the dreadnaught fleet of America 492 guns—thirty-two 13-inch guns, seventy-eight 12-inch guns, one hundred and forty-four 8-inch guns, eighty-eight 7-inch guns, and one hundred and fifty 6-inch guns. That makes a total of 492, and the total weight of a broadside from all of those guns is 171,730 pounds. The Germans have a total of 380 guns, 112 guns less than we have, and a broadside from those guns weighs 80,920 pounds. In other words, it weighs 90,810 pounds less than a broadside from the American battleships, or the American broadside is 11,000 pounds more than twice as great as the German broadside. I refer now to the battleship fleet.

American dreadnaught fleet, weight of metal in broadside.

	Pounds.
32 13-inch projectiles, 1,130 pounds	36,160
78 12-inch projectiles, 870 pounds	67,860
144 8-inch projectiles, 260 pounds	37,440
88 7-inch projectiles, 165 pounds	14,520
150 6-inch projectiles, 105 pounds	15,750

492 guns, total weight of metal..... 171,730

German dreadnaught fleet, weight of metal in broadside.

	Pounds.
40 9.4-inch projectiles, 419 pounds	16,760
160 5.9-inch projectiles, 101 pounds	16,160
40 11-inch projectiles, 661 pounds	26,440
140 6.7-inch projectiles, 154 pounds	21,560

380 guns, total weight of metal..... 80,920

171,730—80,920=90,810 excess of American over German.

Compare those two parts of the fleets as to muzzle energy. The same guns give a muzzle energy to the American fleet of 7,762,842 foot-tons, while the Germans have a muzzle energy of 4,202,300 foot-tons. In other words, we exceed them in muzzle energy by 3,558,542 foot-tons, or nearly twice as much as theirs. Of course, that depends on what you put in the battleship class and the dreadnaught class. If you take these four German battleships which I have discussed out of the dreadnaught class and put them back where they belong in the battleship class, then it would give the muzzle energy of the German battleships at 6,101,740 foot-tons, or, in other words, leave us ahead of them only 1,661,102 foot-tons. When you take so many of the German ships out of the first class and put them in the second it makes ours over twice as great as theirs, but when you arrange them as they should be, it still gives us a

large superiority over the German fleet. The following table gives the number of each type of guns and the muzzle energy of each gun, and the total muzzle energy of all the guns on the 20 German battleships and on the 25 American battleships, as follows:

<i>American dreadnaught guns—muzzle energy.</i>		Foot-tons.
32 13-inch 35-caliber, muzzle energy 40,388	-----	1,292,416
6 12-inch 35-caliber, muzzle energy 26,596	-----	159,576
40 12-inch 40-caliber, muzzle energy 40,768	-----	1,630,720
32 12-inch 35-caliber, muzzle energy 48,948	-----	1,566,336
40 8-inch 40-caliber, muzzle energy 7,948	-----	317,920
104 8-inch 45-caliber, muzzle energy 13,360	-----	1,389,440
88 7-inch 45-caliber, muzzle energy 8,338	-----	733,744
42 6-inch 40-caliber, muzzle energy 3,365	-----	141,330
108 6-inch 50-caliber, muzzle energy 4,920	-----	531,360

492 guns, total muzzle energy..... 7,762,842

German dreadnaught guns—muzzle energy.

		Foot-tons.
140 6.7-inch 40-caliber, muzzle energy 8,275	-----	1,158,500
160 5.9-inch 40-caliber, muzzle energy 5,335	-----	853,600
20 9.4-inch 40-caliber, muzzle energy 16,835	-----	337,100
20 9.4-inch 40-caliber, muzzle energy 22,215	-----	444,300
40 11-inch 40-caliber, muzzle energy 35,270	-----	1,410,800

380 guns, total muzzle energy..... 4,204,300

7,762,842—4,204,300=3,558,542 in favor of United States.

If we should here rejugle the figures and place the *Westfalen*, *Nassau*, *Posen*, and *Rheinland* back in the battleship class by adding their muzzle energy to that of the other 20 German battleships, then they would have a total muzzle energy of 6,101,740 foot-tons, or only 1,661,102 foot-tons less than the 25 American battleships, but this would lessen the muzzle energy of the German dreadnaught fleet 1,897,440 foot-tons, and therefore displease those who want more dreadnaughts. They prefer to make the American dreadnaught fleet appear to be twice as great as that of the Germans, in order to make our dreadnaught list look as small as possible.

Having compared those parts of the two fleets consisting of battleships and shown that the American fleet of battleships is about twice as powerful as the Germans, let us now compare the dreadnaughts of the two navies in respect to the weight of the metal in their broadsides and in respect to their muzzle energy. The weight of the metal in their broadsides is shown in the following table:

Weight of metal in broadside American dreadnaught guns.

	Pounds.
80 12-inch guns—shells, 870 pounds	69,600
64 14-inch guns—shells, 1,400 pounds	89,600
144	159,200

German.

	Pounds.
48 11-inch guns—shells, 661 pounds	31,728
138 12-inch guns—shells, 860 pounds	118,680
16 15-inch guns—shells, 1,676 pounds	26,816
202	177,224

177,224 pounds minus 159,200 pounds equal 18,024 pounds in favor of the German.

The muzzle energy of American dreadnaughts.

	Foot-tons.
24 12-inch guns—muzzle energy, 52,483	1,259,592
56 12-inch guns—muzzle energy, 48,948	2,741,088
64 14-inch guns—muzzle energy, 65,606	4,198,784
144 Total	8,199,464

The muzzle energy of German dreadnaughts.

	Foot-tons.
48 11-inch guns—muzzle energy, 39,530	1,897,440
138 12-inch guns—muzzle energy, 45,500	5,979,000
16 15-inch guns—muzzle energy, 90,350	1,445,600
202 Total	9,322,040

9,322,040 foot-tons minus 8,199,464 foot-tons equal 1,289,136 foot-tons in favor of the German dreadnaughts.

I am counting among the dreadnaughts these four ships armed with 11-inch guns, and I have this result, that we have a broadside from our dreadnaught fleet of 159,200 pounds and from the German fleet 177,224 pounds; in other words, they have a superiority over us of about 17,000 pounds. Counting those four ships that I claim ought to be in the battleship class as dreadnaughts, if you put them where they ought to be, then the broadside from the German dreadnaught fleet would be about 15,000 or 16,000 pounds less than ours. Of course you can make either one or the other the greater by juggling the figures. It is an easy matter to make either our dreadnaughts or theirs superior, according to the way you arrange the ships.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes, sir.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does not the gentleman think, speaking of the German dreadnaughts, that the battle cruisers ought to be counted as dreadnaughts?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No; because the battleship crowd have divided the Navy into three classes—battleships, dreadnaughts,

and cruisers—and I am discussing it in the very way that the battleship crowd has arranged it. Now, the gentleman wants to mix them up. I noticed my distinguished friend from Michigan the other day, in making his speech, when he compared the American Navy with the German Navy took 19 of their dreadnaughts and then the gentleman took 7 of their cruisers and added them together, making 26, and then he compared all of those taken from the two classes with our dreadnaughts. Now, I tried to illustrate the other day that it was not fair when you are going to compare a horse with a donkey just to take the ears of the animals [laughter], but my friend from Michigan has done worse than that. He has gotten up two donkeys and taken the ears of both of them and compared them with the American dreadnaughts. [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Well, Mr. Chairman, have we any ships in our Navy that are comparable with those seven battle cruisers which I classed as dreadnaught cruisers?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; we have many ships in our Navy that would destroy them in a short time. They are not made to fight; they are made to run; their speed is about 30 knots an hour.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. With all big guns?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Their armor is thin. Why, they have no more big guns than our ships have.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They have all big guns.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Suppose they have; they are very few. Why, they have not as many big guns—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Ten or twelve big guns on a ship.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. On a ship. On the American predreadnaught class does the gentleman know how many big guns we have? Tell the House, if the gentleman knows.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not know exactly how many.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, I know exactly how many. We have one hundred and ten 12 and 13 inch guns on our battleship fleet. How many have they on the battle cruisers—tell the House.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The point I wanted to make to the gentleman from Mississippi is that in discussing these ships he ought at least to call the attention of the House to the fact that these seven battle cruisers are a different class from the ordinary armored cruisers in our Navy.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, I have not gotten to the cruisers; I am discussing dreadnaughts. I will come to them and I will discuss them in due time, but I do not like to mix things up. I can not discuss everything at one time. Now, in this dreadnaught comparison I want to call attention to the muzzle energy of the American dreadnaught and the German dreadnaught.

The table shows that we have 144 guns on our dreadnaughts, with a muzzle energy of 8,199,464 foot-tons, and that the Germans have 9,322,044 foot-tons. That gives the Germans an excess in the muzzle energy of their dreadnaughts of 1,122,576, counting in those four ships that I say really are battleships. Now, if you take them out it makes the muzzle energy of our dreadnaughts exceed the muzzle energy of the German dreadnaughts 774,864 tons. That is the comparison. I submit to this House that it is not a fair comparison to divide fleets up into parts and then compare the parts. You can not tell anything about that, and I was struck when I examined the British Naval Annual to see that that great authority—and it is regarded as the highest of all the naval authorities, I think, by naval officers—does not classify them like we do, but it puts down all the battleships and dreadnaughts and armored cruisers and battle cruisers in one long alphabetical list, so that you can see how many there are altogether. That is the way they compare it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Suppose that what the gentleman says is all true, that our Navy is in these respects superior to that of Germany; just conceding for the sake of argument that that is true, what does that prove, and how does that militate against this bill?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. You are trying to get me into something I have not reached.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What are you talking about, then?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I am comparing these two navies now. I have compared the predreadnaught fleet and the dreadnaught fleet separately. Now I want to present the comparison to you, combining the two, and that shows that a broadside from our 39 battleships, including them all, is 330,700 pounds, and a broadside from the German 39 battleships is 257,000 pounds, giving us an excess of 73,730 pounds in the weight of a broadside from our entire 39 battleships over those of Germany. That is what the figures show.

Now, you take and compare the two in muzzle energy. The total muzzle energy of our 39 battleships is 15,962,306 foot-tons. The total muzzle energy of the German 39 battleships is 13,526,340 foot-tons, and giving us an excess in muzzle energy between our 39 battleships and their 39 battleships of 2,435,966 foot-tons.

Now, having compared all the battleships, I come to the armored cruiser, which is the next in order, and you will find that a broadside from the 15 American armored cruisers weighs 38,790 pounds, and from the German cruisers, including battle cruisers and all, it is 66,536, or an excess of 27,746 pounds over ours. The cruiser fleet of Germany is superior to ours. It is larger. It has more guns and has more muzzle energy and the broadside has more pounds in it. But if you were just going to compare these cruisers alone and determine it on that, if you think that the strength of a fleet consists in armored cruisers, then you ought not to pass this bill. You ought to strike these battleships out and tell your committee to go and bring in a bill here with cruisers in it. But all of our naval officers tell us that the armored cruiser and the battle cruiser is not the fighting ship that the battleship is, and for that reason they do not build them. We did build armored cruisers for a good many years. We spent \$66,000,000 on them, but our experts decided they were not a good investment, and we have ceased to build them. Now, since we have ceased to build them and Germany continues to build them, the proposition is to compare the two fleets by showing that Germany has a larger armored-cruiser fleet than we have.

Now, taking the muzzle energy of our armored cruisers, it amounts to 2,203,630 foot-tons. Taking the German, it amounts to 4,185,480 foot-tons. But I submit to you that the fair thing to do is to compare the entire fleets, and I ask your attention now while I give you the figures showing the muzzle energy of all the American armored ships and all the German ships. Our American predreadnaughts, dreadnaughts, and cruisers have a total muzzle energy of 18,155,930 foot-tons; that of the Germans, including my friend's battle cruisers, is 17,711,820 foot-tons. In other words, the American exceeds that of the German in muzzle energy by 444,110 foot-tons. Now, you take the broadsides and compare the entire fleet in that respect. The American battleships, dreadnaughts, and cruisers have a broadside with a weight of 369,490 pounds; the Germans, 325,536 pounds, or the total weight of the metal in a broadside of our fleet exceeds the total weight of the metal in a broadside of the German fleet by 45,954 pounds. [Applause.]

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

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have permission to extend my remarks in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, 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. 14034, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter signed by the Clerk of the House in reference to a correction in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] asks unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter about a correction of the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the letter referred to:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CLERK'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1914.

Hon. L. C. DYER,
Washington, D. C.

RE: On March 21, 1914, the following brief appeared by mistake in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the head of petitions: "By Mr. DYER: Petitions of 25,533 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary."

It was discovered the next day that this petition did not come from St. Louis, and that it was not filed by Mr. DYER. Proper corrections were made and said brief does not appear in the permanent Record of the House of Representatives.

Very respectfully,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the privileged question that was discussed this morning by inserting a few letters and telegrams.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the privileged question discussed this morning. Is there objection?

Mr. GORDON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what are these things about? This rate proposition?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio objects.

CAPT. WILLIAM O. KEAS.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak of a young man from my district who was wounded yesterday in battle at Vera Cruz, Mexico.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH] asks unanimous consent to address the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, among the marines landed yesterday at Vera Cruz, Mexico, was Capt. William O. Keas, chief turret captain on the battleship *South Carolina*. He was a resident of Hillsdale, in the third congressional district of Michigan, which I have the honor to now represent. Capt. Keas served on the *South Carolina*. He was the first, or one of the first three, from the State of Michigan to shed blood in the present war with Mexico. He is of most exemplary character. He belongs to one of the first families of Hillsdale. His father is the present sheriff of his county. He is a distinguished officer—brave, fearless, and patriotic. He was wounded under the flag.

Whatever the result of that war may be, I am sure that the people and the citizens of the State of Michigan will do their full share to support the dignity and add luster to the banner of our country; and in the end we shall receive not only the plaudits of the world, but we shall take such advanced position, and our course will be so beneficial to civilization, that this war will go down in history as one of the most humane and beneficent that was ever waged on the American Continent. Let us all hope for his speedy recovery, and that his young life may be extended to many years of usefulness and honor in his own beloved land. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, on what subject does the gentleman propose to extend his remarks?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. In regard to one of the sailors that was killed at Vera Cruz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3403) to abolish the office of receiver of public moneys at Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the following joint resolution:

House joint resolution 253.

Resolved, etc., That the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the naval station, New Orleans, La., and not yet turned back into the Treasury, are hereby reappropriated and made available for expenditure at that station for such purpose as the Secretary of the Navy may direct.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 15906. An act providing an appropriation for the relief and transportation of American citizens in Mexico;

H. R. 13453. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915; and

H. R. 7138. An act to provide for raising the Volunteer forces of the United States in time of actual or threatened war.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 656. An act granting to the trustees of the diocese of Montana of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for the benefit of "Christ Church on the Hill," at Poplar, Mont., lots 5, 6, and 7 in block 30, town site of Poplar, State of Montana.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 13453. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915; and

H. R. 15906. An act providing an appropriation for the relief and transportation of American citizens in Mexico.

NAVAL STATION, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up House joint resolution 253, which was passed this morning, with a Senate amendment, amending the title, and move to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will not bring that up to-night. There are only 25 Members here at the present time.

Mr. PADGETT. It is only to amend the title. The resolution was passed in the House this morning by unanimous consent, and in the Senate by unanimous consent. It is a measure incident to this Mexican trouble, and it is only amending the title.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is only a technical correction?

Mr. PADGETT. That is all.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, what is the amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. It amends the title to the resolution that was passed this morning.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Putting a title to it?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. One moment. What is the purpose of this resolution?

Mr. PADGETT. The resolution is to make available certain funds of unobligated balances of appropriations that had heretofore been made for the naval station at New Orleans, making them available for purposes incident to this present trouble. It passed this morning by unanimous consent, and it has passed the Senate; and this is to amend the title.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask that the gentleman let it go over for the present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] objects.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. PADGETT. It has already passed the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask that the gentleman withhold it now and take it up in the morning.

Mr. PADGETT. The department was anxious to get it through.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no doubt about the attitude of the department, Mr. Speaker. This, however, is a deficiency appropriation. The present situation is not one in which we should be slipshod in our methods of appropriating the public money. There are some things of importance which should be attended to and looked after here regardless of the wish of the department. So far as I am concerned, I propose that the House shall not relax its vigilance in the control of the public money. Whatever is needed in reference to the present emergency I am sure will be granted. It will not hurt to let this resolution wait until to-morrow.

Mr. PADGETT. It has already passed the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It would not have passed the House if I had been present. I was engaged in committee on other business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Very well. I will withhold it until to-morrow morning. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] withdraws his request, and moves that the House do now adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 25, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

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. FLOYD of Arkansas, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 341) directing the House to determine whether certain officers and agents of the National Association of Manufacturers have not been guilty of practices rendering them liable to punishment for contempt, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 571), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 342) directing the House to determine whether, under the report of the select committee on lobby investigations, Representative JAMES THOMAS McDERMOTT has not been shown to be guilty of disgraceful and dishonorable misconduct and venality rendering him unworthy of a seat in the House, and justly liable to expulsion from the same, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 572), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRIFFIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (S. J. Res. 121) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish one United States garrison flag to William B. Cushing Camp, No. 30, Sons of Veterans, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 578), which said resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KENT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the resolution (H. J. Res. 250) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make an approximate classification of the unreserved unappropriated public lands of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 579), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. O'HAIR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. J. Res. 241) for the appointment of four members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 577), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11411) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Malsom; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12863) granting a pension to Tony Jud; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1575) granting a pension to Emma L. Wallace; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10986) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Houlihan; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15783) granting an increase of pension to Mae W. McClure; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 15982) providing for the survey of the Maumee River and its tributaries, Ohio and Ind.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 15983) to restore homestead rights in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.
Also, a bill (H. R. 15984) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannon and balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 15985) to authorize the city of Mankato, in Blue Earth County, Minn., to construct a dam across the Minnesota River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 15986) to prohibit the transmission through the mails of false statements in writing for the procuring of credit thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 15987) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as reenacted and amended by act of February 23, 1909; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 15988) granting to the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., certain unsurveyed lands for park purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15989) to revise and amend the laws relating to patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 255) authorizing the Secretary of State to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the International Dry Farming Congress, to be held at Wichita, Kans., October 7 to 17, inclusive, 1914; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 493) authorizing the printing of 3,000 copies of Chapter XV of the Military Policy of the United States, entitled "The Military Policy of the United States during the Mexican War"; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 15990) for the relief of Thomas Amick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 15991) granting a pension to John E. Colvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 15992) granting an increase of pension to Daniel P. Holcomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 15993) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Rounds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas: A bill (H. R. 15994) for the relief of Louis Boerner; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15995) for the relief of ex-Collector of Internal Revenue Webster Flanagan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 15996) granting an increase of pension to Frances Dewese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 15997) to correct the military record of Andrew B. Ritter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 15998) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Scholl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 15999) granting a pension to Sarah Putnam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DERSHEM: A bill (H. R. 16000) for the relief of John W. Graham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 16001) granting an increase of pension to Francis E. Strout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HART: A bill (H. R. 16002) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert J. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 16003) granting a pension to Vina Herd; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 16004) granting a pension to Caroline Philpot; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16005) for the relief of Martin Ball, heir of Stephen Ball, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 16006) granting a pension to Myrtle Mary Hoffman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 16007) for the relief of William Henry Clifford; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MCKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 16008) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Nash; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16009) granting a pension to William J. Ladd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 16010) granting an increase of pension to Georgie E. Keenan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 16011) granting an increase of pension to John G. Meltabarger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 16012) granting an increase of pension to John T. Langstaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 16013) granting a pension to Jefferson L. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 16014) granting a pension to William B. Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16015) granting a pension to Julia Kibby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 16016) granting an increase of pension to Edward Pennfeather; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 16017) granting a pension to Ervin Everson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 16018) to correct the military record of Gordon A. Dennis and to reinstate him as second lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16019) to authorize the transfer of Lieut. Sydney Smith from the retired to the active list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 254) relating to the awards and payments thereon in what is commonly known as the Plaza cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio and Pennsylvania favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the Socialist Party of Philadelphia, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against President's action in declaring war on Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of the International Brotherhood Welfare Association of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the deplorable condition of affairs existing among the unemployed of the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

Also (by request), memorial of sundry citizens of Nome, Alaska, constituting the Knights of Robert Emmet, against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), resolutions of the North Side Board of Trade of New York, indorsing action of President in his effort to bring order out of chaos in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Louisiana, Mo., and Pike County, Mo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of sundry citizens of Tedrow, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the United Societies for Local Self-Government of Chicago, Ill., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petitions of Samuel Moody, H. Schilling, John Bartley, S. Young, Eli Walters, Harry Walters, G. H. Beegle, W. T. Ressler, Grant Edmundson, E. N. Lindsey, L. A. Johnston, Samuel Massie, W. D. Montgomery, George Montgomery, Frank Wilt, H. Montgomery, A. G. Wilt, and F. E. Lindsey, all of Duncansville, Pa., for passage of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protests of Albert Guillerman, E. F. James, jr., Fred Hoffman, S. J. O'Brien, Ernest Klein, Walter Stormer, N. Niessner, John Lipp, Henry Dietz, Karl Dembeck, Hubert Moyer, John S. Grumme, Andy Matek, C. A. McGuire, Frederick Perian, Conrad Now, Hugh McConnell, John McKenry, W. M. Saly, Karl Weber, Herman Niesner, Walter Stormer, Jacob Wacker, Fritz John, Grant Laird, John H. Stork, John Schwing, L. P. Shelly, William Schmalz, Charles Bullmann, Charles Umbaugh, H. C. Shaffer, Albert Heilman, Robert P. Bell, Joseph

Gradwohl, Gilbert F. Howard, William F. Pfler, P. J. Doriam, Thomas Rhoades, Thomas J. Davis, T. F. Brady, Andrew B. Costlow, T. Proctor, Charles Bischoff, John Rosenbaum, Joseph Bremer, Frank Bischoff, L. A. Geis, Otto Mitchell, John Berg, Charles Diefenbach, B. J. Egerter, Ignatius Karcher, George E. Raab, Jacob Schmadel, W. H. Noran, H. A. Knee, and Charles G. Lynch, all of Johnstown, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protests of Richard Jones, Mrs. Daniel Paul, D. H. Miller, Albert Peden, Mrs. Mary Geisel, Mary C. Miller, C. D. Bateman, E. M. Redelstein, Mrs. William Burkholder, Mrs. W. A. Slick, Miss Myrtle Boucher, Mrs. E. J. Sheburn, Mrs. E. D. Block, Mrs. H. G. Isenburg, J. W. Watt, John T. Zimmerman, Annie Zimmerman, J. D. Block, all of Johnstown, Pa., against passage of House bill 7826, the Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 521, United Mine Workers of America, of Jamestown, Pa., favoring Federal intervention in the Colorado strike; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Margaret Walker, Mrs. Lydia Harris, Mrs. Annie Krider, Myrtle Mountz, Mrs. J. C. Gibboney, Edna Walker, Mrs. Yeckley, Mrs. Amanda Yeckley, Mrs. David Ott, Mrs. Herbert Burk, Pearl Walters, Mrs. Eli Walters, Mrs. William Ressler, Mrs. G. W. Beegle, Clara E. Lindsey, Ella Black, Mrs. Emma Black, Mrs. Alice Massie, Mrs. T. E. Carnitt, Mrs. A. W. White, Mrs. H. J. Montgomery, Mrs. Lee Walker, all of Duncansville, Pa., for passage of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of 18 citizens of the second congressional district of New Jersey, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARNHART: Petition of sundry citizens of Elkhart, Ind., against enactment of Sunday-observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of 13 citizens of Elkhart, Ind., relative to amending the civil-service law; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of 100 citizens of Mishawaka, 120 citizens of Walkerton, 286 citizens of South Bend, 220 citizens of Greentown, and sundry citizens of Elkhart, Goshen, and Door Village, all in the State of Indiana, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petitions of the Automobile Gasoline Co., the Laclede Gas Light Co., the North Breese Coal & Mining Co., the Corrugated Bar Co., the John Wahl Commission Co., the Von der Aw & Cluss Manufacturing Co., the Kaltwasser Carpet Co., and a number of other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the prohibition amendment now pending; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Rabbi Spitz, of the Jewish Voice; the Blanke-Wenneker Candy Co.; the Broderick & Bascom Rope Co.; the West Disinfecting Co.; the St. Louis Iron & Machine Works; the Howe Scale Co., of Illinois; and Joseph Freund, all of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Pitzman's Co. of Surveyors & Engineers, the F. B. Instrument Co., the Interstate Printing Co., the St. Louis Dairy Co., and the Rice-Stix Dry Goods Co., all of St. Louis, Mo., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Charles G. Arras, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of House bill 13305, to prevent discrimination in prices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of D. J. Mahar, of Clayton, Mo., and W. H. Stilwell, Paul Huebner, and E. J. Jocker, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Mercantile Trust Co. of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of House bill 14328, relative to false statements in the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BATHRICK: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lordstown, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEAKES: Petition of 237 business men of the second district of Michigan, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of members of C. B. Hall Post No. 364, of Coleman; De Galyer Post No. 110, of Hudson; Comstock Corps No. 230, of Manchester; Edward Pomeroy Corps No. 5, of Jackson; Fairchild Corps No. 6, of Grass Lake; Morgan Parker Corps No. 137, of Petersburg; John and Alfred Ryder Corps No. 84,

of Newburg; Fairchild Post No. 228, of Grass Lake; Myron Baker Corps No. 64, of Morenci; all of the State of Michigan, in opposition to any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the First National Bank of Morenci; the Union Bank, of Jackson; the Jackson State Savings Bank, of Jackson; the River Rouge Savings Bank, of River Rouge; the Union Savings Bank, of Manchester; the First National Bank of Ypsilanti; the Commercial Savings Bank, the Adrian State Savings Bank, the Lenawee County Savings Bank, the Waldby & Clay State Bank, and the National Bank of Commerce, of Adrian; and the Wyandotte Savings Bank, all of the second district of Michigan, favoring an amendment to the income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Memorial of the Retail Druggists' Association of Chicago, Ill., favoring passage of House bill 13205, the Stevens price-maintenance bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petitions of James B. Davis and others, of Mount Ephraim, Blockwood, Glendora, Camden, and Collingswood, all in the State of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas: Petitions of sundry citizens and lodges of the State of Texas, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 80 citizens of Bartlett, Tex., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brenham, Tex., protesting against Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 15996) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Frances Dewese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Medical Society of Milwaukee County, Wis., and the legislative committee of the Wisconsin State Medical Society, favoring House bill 6282, the Harrison antinarcoctic bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of J. A. White and 36 other citizens of Ocala, Fla., against Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of 1,116 citizens of Jacksonville, 140 citizens of Daytona, 120 citizens of Callahan, 100 citizens of Gainesville, and 55 citizens of Redland, all in the State of Florida, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Camp 17, United Confederate Veterans, relative to subscriptions for expenses of Confederate veterans to reunion at Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Henry C. Manil, of Rochester, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE: Petitions of 4,500 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, favoring establishment of a bureau of farm loans in the Treasury Department (H. R. 11755); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Wade Pinckney and other citizens of Grand Marsh, Wis., and vicinity, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSSON: Petition of John Anderson, Henry C. Barron, and 16 other citizens of Hagerman, N. Mex., favoring compensatory time for postal employees within 30 days following the Sunday on which service is performed; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of 200 citizens of Alamogordo, 50 citizens of Artesia, 250 citizens of Carlsbad, 250 citizens of Dawson, 825 citizens of East Las Vegas, 200 citizens of French, 40 citizens of Las Cruces, 22 citizens of Las Vegas, 100 citizens of Levy, 76 citizens of Maxwell, 102 citizens of Onava, 170 citizens of Roswell, 150 citizens of Vaughn, 500 citizens of Wagon Mound, and 200 citizens of Watrous, all in the State of New Mexico, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John Anderson, Henry C. Barron, and 18 other citizens of Hagerman, N. Mex., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FESS: Petitions of sundry citizens of Lebanon, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of 330 voters of the seventh congressional district of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORDNEY: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petitions of sundry citizens of St. Elmo and Noble, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of St. Elmo and Noble, Ill., protesting against the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 7826); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GERRY: Petition of 557 citizens of Rhode Island, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. Eugene B. Smith, of East Providence; Rev. John Proude, of Greystone; Rev. W. H. Lane, of Shawomet; Rev. H. E. Hatchman, of Oak Lawn; Rev. Charles S. Frost, of Cranston; Rev. E. A. Corbett, jr., of Providence; Charles E. Hausen, of Providence; and Miss Dorothy R. Nason and P. B. Leathers, of Oak Lawn, all in the State of Rhode Island, for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Albert S. Abbott, of Providence; Thomas E. Bartlett, of Pawtuxet; Mrs. Irving H. Baker, of Rockland; Hartford P. Brown, of Hope Valley; Edw. N. Whilford, of Hope Valley; E. A. Corbett, of Providence; Rev. John E. Duxbury, of Centerville; Thomas F. Butler, of South Auburn; and Albert E. Titchener, of Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, of North Scituate; the First Presbyterian Church of Providence; the Rockville Sabbath School, of Rockville; the Baraca Class, United Presbyterian Church, of Central Falls; the Calvary Baptist Church Sunday School, of Westerly; the Second West-erly Seventh-day Baptist Church, of Bradford; the Loyal Temperance Legion of Bradford; and the Trinity Union Methodist Episcopal Church, of Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Phenix; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Center-ville; the Oak Lawn Baptist Sunday School, of Oak Lawn; the White Shield League of Providence; the First Presbyterian Church Sunday School of Providence; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bradford; the Woman's Christian Tem- perance Union of Richmond and Hopkinton; the Rockland Christian Sunday School, of Rockland; and 400 citizens of Central Falls, all in the State of Rhode Island, for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. T. Spencer, of Hope Valley; Lester H. Walmsley, of Quindnick; Gilbert B. Cutler, of North Scituate; Dr. Frank B. Smith, of Washington; A. M. Bailey, of Hope Valley; A. B. Arnold, of Anthony; Rev. C. Freemont Roper, of Riverpoint; and Rev. George S. Wheeler, of Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Greenville Baptist Sunday School, of Greenville; the Broadway Baptist Church, of Providence; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Greenwich; the Methodist Episcopal Church of East Greenwich; F. E. Ide, of Scituate; George W. Cole, of Rockland; and V. M. Warner, of Rockland, all in the State of Rhode Island, for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Centerville Methodist Episcopal Church of Centerville, R. I., and petition of 241 members of the First Baptist Church of Hope Valley, R. I., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegrams from the Pentecostal Sunday School, of North Scituate; B. Franklin Spooner, of Providence; the North Scituate Sunday School, of North Scituate; the Baraca Classes of First Baptist and Methodist Episcopal Churches of East Green- wick; the Loyal Builders' Class and Knotty Oak Sunday School, of Anthony; and the Edmonds Prohibition Alliance (50 mem- bers), of Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 149 citizens of Providence, 19 citizens of South Kingstown and Richmond, 125 citizens of Wakefield, 80 citizens of Greystone, 150 citizens of East Greenwich, 40 citi- zens of Ashton, 50 citizens of North Scituate, 50 citizens of Westerly, 150 citizens of Anthony, 31 citizens of Phenix, 110 citizens of Kingston, and 62 citizens of Pawtuxet Valley, all

in the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegrams from 330 members of the Second Presbyterian Church of Providence; Central Baptist Sunday School, of Anthony; Men's Baraca Class of the First Baptist Church, of Wickford; 90 members of the Baptist Sunday School of East Greenwich; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Scituate; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, urging national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegrams from the Federation of Women's Churches of Providence, by Chester A. Phillips; the Pentecostal Institution of Providence; the Christian Endeavor Society of Providence; the Natick Baptist Church, of Natick; the Friends' Bible School, of Providence; and the Advent Sunday School, of North Scituate, all in the State of Rhode Island, urging national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of the United Societies for Local Self-Government, of Chicago, Ill., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Board of Aldermen of Somerville, Mass., favoring Hamill civil service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the South Weymouth (Mass.) Grange, relative to parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of sundry citizens of the fifth congressional district of Iowa, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the United Societies for Local Self-Government, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, relative to conditions in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of various members of the bar of Laurel County, Ky., against House bill 12049, relative to appointment of clerks of United States courts by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, of New York, relative to antitrust bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Petitions of various churches, granges, and citizens of the State of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART: Petition of 114 citizens of Phillipsburg, 100 citizens of North Hackensack, 112 citizens of Sussex, sundry citizens of Passaic and Bergen County, and 200 citizens of Dumont, all in the State of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of H. G. Cleveland, of Ridgewood, N. J., and John Gallagher, of Bergen County, N. J., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petitions of various voters of the fourth congressional district of Iowa, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of C. C. Conrad, of Harrisonburg, Va., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 110 citizens of Charlottesville, Va., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the California "Dry" Federation, of Los Angeles; 260 citizens of San Luis Obispo; 75 citizens of Mountain View; and 100 citizens of Fillmore, all in the State of California, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. Boecker, of Madrone, Cal., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELVERING: Petitions of several hundred citizens of Miltonvale, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of George H. Saltygeber, the F. R. Rice Mercantile Cigar Co., the Bucks Stove & Range Co., the Louis Lange Publishing Co., all of St. Louis, Mo.; and Henry C. Maine, of Rochester, N. Y., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petitions of the Pleasant Unity Presbyterian Church, of Bakertown; the Harmony United Presbyterian Church, of Barrisville; the Westminster Presbyterian Church, of Saxenburg; the Grace Reformed Church, of Harmony; the Buffalo Presbyterian Church, of Sarver; 765 citizens of Mars; 50 citizens of Scottdale; and 200 citizens of West Newton, all

in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: Petition of 43 citizens of Galesville, 620 citizens of New Haven, and 3,026 citizens of Waterbury, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of sundry citizens of Pawtucket; the North Scituate Sunday School of the First Presbyterian Church of Providence; Rev. Edward Russell Evans, of Pawtucket; and the Central Falls Woman's Christian Temperance Union, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of the Evansville Lodge, No. 85, Loyal Order of Moose, by J. A. Evans, dictator, and A. A. Miller, secretary, of Evansville; Posey Aerie, No. 1717, Fraternal Order of Eagles, by Holbert Alexander and others of Mount Vernon; Germania Court, No. 165, T. B. H., by Victor Schon, chief, and Henry Rosenthal, scribe, of Evansville; to the Liederkranz Maennerchor, by Charles Bromm, president, and Ed von Hatzfeldt, secretary, of Evansville; and the Central Turnverein, by Bernard De Vry and others of Evansville, all in the State of Indiana, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Wadsworth Council, No. 39, Order United American Mechanics, of Manchester, Conn., protesting against any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Wilton; the Union Service, of Mechanic Falls; the Free Baptist Church of Sabattus; the Baptist Church of Rockland; and sundry citizens of Edgecomb, all of the State of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petitions of various voters of University Place, Nebr., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of General Shields Woman's Relief Corps, No. 7, of Madison, S. Dak., against changing United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Grand Council of South Dakota, United Commercial Travelers of America, favoring Senate bill No. 2337, to create a coast guard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill 6670, for relief of Sarah J. Watson, or Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'LEARY: Petitions of various voters of the second congressional district of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petitions of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Newport, R. I., favoring machinists' wage bill (H. R. 12740); to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of E. T. Colton, of Providence, R. I., favoring Underwood anticoupon bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of B. U. Richards, of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring Harrison antinarcotic bill (H. R. 6282); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Harriet E. Thomas and Mrs. Joseph Howland, of Newport, R. I., and Mrs. Frank W. Matteson, of Providence, R. I., favoring appropriation for Children's Bureau; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of George M. Parks, of Providence, R. I., favoring the naturalization commission bill (H. R. 5819); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, relative to antitrust legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. F. Jameson, of Washington, D. C., favoring House bill 15653, amending the last public-buildings act; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Commercial Club of Roseburg, Oreg., relative to force in Architect's Office, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. POST: Petition of the United Societies of Local Self-Government, of Chicago, Ill., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 190 citizens of North Hampton, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED: Petitions of A. S. Hamilton, John M. Ready, James Ferretti, Arthur L. Boulanger, Peter J. Thornton, George E. Smith, I. F. McCann, D. F. McDonnell, H. J. Bethum, W. E. Woodod, James J. Hogan, E. F. Colby, John Schmidt, Fred Knight, A. I. Mathieu, A. C. Squire, Frank J. Lynch, and F. T. Arbuckle, all from Manchester, N. H., opposing national prohibition of liquor traffic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of 2,607 citizens of the eleventh New York district, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 45 citizens of Stapleton, Staten Island, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of James Morano and 10 other citizens of the eleventh congressional district of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH: Memorial of the United Societies for Local Self-Government of Chicago, Ill., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Night Chapel of the Peterson Linotyping Co., of Chicago, Ill., favoring passage of the Bartlett-Bacon bill (H. R. 1873 and S. 927); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUNDERS: Petition of 25 citizens of Houston, Va., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various citizens of the State of Oregon, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of the Baptist Church, Tampa; 794 citizens of Arcadia, Alva, and Montbrook; 865 citizens of Bradentown, 197 citizens of Palmetto, 60 citizens of Candler, 23 citizens of Lake Kerr, 187 citizens of Largo, 250 citizens of Tampa, 25 citizens of Fort Myers, 242 citizens of Manatee, 100 citizens of Dunnellon, and 193 citizens of Winterhaven, all in the State of Florida, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Santa Monica and Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against Sunday-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Los Angeles (Cal.) Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 78, protesting against increase in postage rates on second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Santa Monica and Los Angeles, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 12928, relative to Sunday work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of 65 citizens of Greenville, Ky., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 602, United Mine Workers, requesting Congress to bring about Federal interference in the Colorado miners' strike; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of various business men of the first and second congressional districts of the State of Massachusetts favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of 1,691 names signed to petition of South Philadelphia Gun Club protesting against an act of Congress approved March 4, 1913, prohibiting the shooting of reed birds in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 2,234 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of Vincent Telnek and 440 other citizens of Iowa, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Petitions of 575 citizens of Montevideo, 100 citizens of Lynd, 60 citizens of Lake Benton, 25 citizens of Redwood Falls, 92 citizens of Clinton, 18 citizens of Hanley Falls, 62 citizens of Dawson, 185 citizens of Marshall, 200 citizens of Hector, 467 citizens of Benson, 304 citizens of Browns Valley, 80 citizens of Ottawa, 116 citizens of Echo, 265 citizens of Fairfax, sundry members of Bethel Methodist Episcopal Church of Lynd, the Baptist Church of Storden, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Tracy, all in the State of Minnesota, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of sundry citizens of Weatherford, Okla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition signed by E. A. Hallett and 40 others, of Marietta, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by John W. Beckett and 50 others of New Concord, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: Petition of 58 citizens of McDavid, Fla., and 50 citizens of Cottage Hill, Fla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINGO: Petition of 400 citizens of Magazine, Ark., and 275 citizens of Huntington, Ark., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 25, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live, move, and have our being, we desire to come into Thy presence, even into the inner sanctuary where Thy Honor dwelleth, that we may behold Thy glory. Our eyes have been too much fixed upon the glory that fadeth away. We desire to come to the changeless order, to understand that above us, and not in conflict with any human interest, is the exceeding glory of our God. With Thee there is justice and judgment. Mercy and peace are mingled together before Thy throne. Grace and truth abide in fullness before Thee. So do Thou enable us to enter into Thy presence, abide under Thy protection, follow Thy guidance, and do that which is pleasing in Thy sight. For Christ's sake. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11269) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 152) reappropriating certain funds for expenditure at the naval station at New Orleans, La.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4167) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and of other wars than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4353) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 15692. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 15959. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. J. Res. 242. A joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to loan equipment for the purpose of instruction and training to sanitary organizations of the American National Red Cross.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3403. An act to abolish the office of receiver of public moneys at Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes; and