By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: Petition of sundry business men of Columbus and Starkville, Ohio, favoring bills to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of Philadelphia Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, favoring passage of House bill 651, relative to duty of carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of Wyoming State Democratic convention, relative to woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Madeleine G. Hooton, of Binghamton, N. Y., favoring passage of bill to establish a probation system in United States courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, New York City, favoring passage of the Smith-Hughes vocational education bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of Gadsden (Ala.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring passage of the Shields water-power bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Automatic Printing Co., of Bridgeport, Conn., against passage of House bill 6458, relative to type-casting machines; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Iowa, against passage of the Sunday-observance bill in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Iowa, against passage of bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Paul E. Birkmeyer, of Baltimore, Md., favoring passage of Nolan bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Bakery and Confectionery Workers of America, favoring passage of House bill 10318, employers' liability act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of American Association for Labor Legislation and Cooperative Employment Bureau, favoring passage of House bill 15316, workmen's compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Newport Humane Club, relative to State inspection of food-producing animals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of New Britain (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring passage of the Pomerene bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Rhode Island Antituberculosis Association against Senate joint resolution 120, relative to Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Fred Mitchell, Alton, R. I., against House bill 14666, providing for registration of design; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Memorial of nine voters and Congregational Church of Royalston, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of Mrs. R. J. Fricke and 37 others, favoring public hearing provided for in the Emerson resolution looking toward securing a guaranty covering proposed shipment of milk; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of Knights of Luther and Ladies Auxiliary of Denver, Colo., against bills to amend the postal laws pertaining to religion; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petition of 48 citizens of Edwards County, Ill., favoring a Christian amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *May 29, 1916.*

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 18, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12193) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hollis	Oliver	Sterling
Bankhead	Husting	Overman	Stone
Brady	James	Owen	Sutherland
Brandegee	Jones	Page	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Pittman	Taggart
Chilton	La Follette	Poindexter	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Pomerene	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Tillman
Culberson	Lippitt	Reed	Vardaman
Cummins	Lodge	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Curtis	McLean	Sheppard	Walsh
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Warren
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Weeks
Gallinger	Myers	Simmons	Williams
Gore	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Works
Harding	Newlands	Smith, Mich.	
Hardwick	Norris	Smoot	

Mr. TAGGART. I desire to state that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] is unavoidably absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, at this time the Senate will proceed to vote without further debate upon the pending motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING], which is a motion to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I ask for the yeas and nays on that vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the motion may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the motion.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] moves that the pending bill (H. R. 12193) be recommitted to the Committee on Commerce with instructions to report a substitute therefor appropriating an amount not in excess of $20,000,000 for the maintenance of river and harbor projects adopted by Congress and now under improvement and for the further prosecution of work on rivers and harbors adopted by Congress: *Provided*, That the amounts for such maintenance and prosecution shall be apportioned by the Chief of Engineers under the direction of the Secretary of War.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING].

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAMES (when Mr. BECKHAM's name was called). My colleague [Mr. BECKHAM] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is absent. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "nay," and as I desire to do the same I feel relieved from my pair. Therefore I vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON (when Mr. GOFF's name was called). I wish to announce for the day that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. On account of his absence I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the explanation made by me on Saturday, and asking that the announcement may stand as long as the river and harbor bill is before the Senate, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TAGGART. I wish to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] is unavoidably absent, and that if he were present he would vote "yea." As announced, he stands paired on this vote with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is unavoidably absent from the Chamber. He is paired with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN].

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and let my vote stand.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to announce that I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. I would vote "yea" if I could get a transfer of my pair.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. TILLMAN. I am informed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] that I can transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I do that and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS. I will state to the Senator from South Carolina that I am informed the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was paired on Saturday with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. TILLMAN. I withdraw my vote under that statement.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to ask if the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. OWEN. I withhold my vote. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON], if here, would vote "nay." I would vote "yea" if I were not paired with that Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] with the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]; and

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Ashurst	Gallinger	Lodge	Sutherland
Borah	Gore	Norris	Taggart
Brady	Hollis	Page	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Husting	Pomerene	Thompson
Cummins	Kenyon	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Curtis	La Follette	Sherman	Warren
Fall	Lane	Smoot	

NAYS—41.

Bankhead	Jones	Pittman	Sterling
Brandegee	Lea, Tenn.	Poindexter	Stone
Broussard	Lippitt	Ransdell	Swanson
Chamberlain	McLean	Reed	Vardaman
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Walsh
Clarke, Ark.	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Weeks
Culberson	Myers	Shields	Williams
Dillingham	Nelson	Simmons	Works
Fletcher	Newlands	Smith, Ariz.	
Hardwick	Oliver	Smith, Ga.	
James	Overman	Smith, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—28.

Beckham	Goff	Kern	Phelan
Bryan	Gronna	Lee, Md.	Robinson
Burleigh	Harding	Lewis	Smith, Md.
Catron	Hitchcock	McCumber	Smith, S. C.
Clapp	Hughes	O'Gorman	Tillman
Colt	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Townsend
du Pont	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Underwood

So Mr. HUSTING's motion was rejected.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I renew the amendment I offered the other day, an amendment which was inserted in the river and harbor bill some two years ago by the Senate. I understand that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] will not press his point of order against it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the amendment has been read heretofore. The purport of it is quite well understood. I have no objection to its going into the bill, with the reservation that the whole subject to which it relates—and which is a broad one—will receive consideration commensurate with its importance when the matter reaches conference. I do not think it is well to take up any time at this stage of the consideration of the pending bill to go into the matter more elaborately; but I feel satisfied that that particular amendment, taken in connection with one offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and another by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], will constitute a fund of information and suggestion that will be valuable to the conference, and it may be that we can evolve some plan by which river and harbor items may be robbed somewhat of the criticism that is now directed against them.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, when this amendment was offered two or three days ago I made a point of order against it. I think that instead of being placed in this bill it ought to be considered as a separate measure; but in view of the statement made by the chairman of the committee, I shall not renew the point of order as far as I am concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before the amendment is accepted I want, if I can, to get a copy of it. There have been two or three amendments, and I am in doubt which one is before the Senate.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. If the Senator from Missouri desires to debate the amendment, I am willing to have it go out on a point of order.

Mr. REED (after examining the amendment). I have nothing to say, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS].

The amendment was agreed to, as follows:

SEC. 8. That a commission, to be known as the river regulation commission, consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the chairman of the Commerce Committee of the Senate, the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, is hereby created and authorized to bring into coordination and cooperation the Corps of Engineers of the Army and other scientific or constructive services of the United States that relate to the study, development, and control of waterways and water resources and subjects related thereto and to the development and regulation of interstate and foreign commerce, with a view to uniting such services through a board or boards in investigating questions relating to the development, improvement, regulation, and control of navigation as a part of interstate and foreign commerce, including therein the related questions of irrigation, forestry, swamp-land reclamation, clarification of streams, regulation of flow, control of floods, utilization of water power, prevention of soil waste, cooperation of railways and waterways, and promotion of transfer facilities and sites, and in forming comprehensive plans for the development of the waterways and water resources of the country for every useful purpose by cooperation between the United States and the several States, municipalities, communities, corporations, and individuals within the jurisdiction, powers, and rights of each, respectively, and with a view to assigning to the United States such portion of such development, promotion, regulation, and control as can be properly undertaken by the United States by virtue of its power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, and by reason of its proprietary interest in the public domain, and to the States, municipalities, communities, corporations, and individuals such portion as properly belong to their jurisdiction, rights, and interests, and with a view to properly apportioning costs and benefits, and with a view to so uniting the plans and works of the United States within its jurisdiction and of the States and municipalities, respectively, within their jurisdictions, and of corporations, communities, and individuals within their respective powers and rights, as to secure the highest development and utilization of the waterways and resources of the United States; and such river regulation commission is authorized to appoint as members of such board or boards such engineers, transportation experts, experts in water development and utilization, and constructors of eminence as it may deem advisable to employ in connection with such plans. And for the expenses of such organization, investigation, and plans the sum of $500,000 is hereby appropriated.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, at the end of line 17, it is proposed to insert:

Improving Savannah River at Augusta, Ga.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 4, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, $33,000.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I think, when I explain this amendment to the Senate and to the Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas], there will be no opposition to it.

The amendment I propose is to complete the project at Augusta, Ga. The appropriation was not included in the river and harbor bill because the Board of Engineers had not reported on it at the time the House of Representatives considered the proposition, nor had they reported on the project at the time the Senate committee considered it. Since then the Chief of Engineers has submitted a report urging this appropriation. In a letter addressed to Hon. F. M. SPARKMAN, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, the Chief of Engineers says:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, April 28, 1916.

Hon. S. M. SPARKMAN,
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives.

SIR: 1. Referring to your letter of February 7, 1916, inclosing a copy of a resolution by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the same date, requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review its report on the survey of Savannah River at Augusta, Ga., printed in House Document No. 615, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, with a view to determining whether, in its opinion, any further improvement of the locality is necessary or advisable in the way of additional revetment or otherwise for the protection of the work already done by the Government, as well as the probable cost of the same, I have the honor to inclose herewith a report of the board, dated April 12, 1916, in response thereto, together with a report by the district officer, Col. W. C. Langfitt, Corps of Engineers, dated March 17, 1916.

2. As a result of its further investigation of this subject, the board finds that there has been some erosion of the bank at King Mill tail-race, which, in its opinion, should be checked by revetting the bank for a short distance, at an estimated cost of $33,000, this revetment being considered advisable for the protection of the work already done by the Government.

3. After due consideration of the subject, I concur in the views of the board. The full amount of the estimated cost of the improvement should be provided in one appropriation.

Very respectfully,

W. M. BLACK,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

Mr. President, the situation is just this: We have spent a large amount of money on this project at Augusta, Ga. We thought we had completed it; but since this bill passed the House and since it was reported by the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, the Board of Engineers find that it is necessary to expend $33,000 in addition for revetment work, to preserve the work which has already been done and to save the money which we have already spent. I will only say that I ask that this amendment be put into the bill on the same terms that I asked for the insertion of the other amendment. I am sure that the conferees on the part of the other House will readily agree to it, and that the conferees on the part of both Houses will, in conference, conclude that it is an absolutely necessary item. Otherwise, I shall not expect the Senate conferees to insist upon its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. President, in view of the discussion which has prevailed here on the river and harbor bill for some days past on the various motions which have been submitted for the reduction of the appropriations for some of the projects therein contained and the motions to reduce the appropriations having been defeated, it is evident to my mind from the votes of those who are opposed to the reduction of such appropriations that they consider all of the projects embraced in this bill as meritorious. I therefore offer the amendment which I send to the desk, which I ask may be read and adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

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

SEC. —. That none of the appropriations herein made, except for maintenance and for projects partially completed, shall become available until the Secretary of War shall first determine that the improvement will promote or that it is essential to the interests of interstate or foreign commerce.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, that evidently revolutionizes the policy of framing river and harbor bills, as prescribed by act of Congress, and is therefore new legislation. I make the point of order against the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To what act of Congress does the Senator from Arkansas refer?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. To the act of Congress referring these projects to the Board of Engineers and their formal adoption by act of Congress. The provision of law is that when they are reported by the Board of Engineers and an appropriation has been made for the beginning of actual work, they are then in the sense of Congress adopted projects, and they are continued under that system until a different one is provided. You could add conditions to the expenditure of public money in an appropriation bill, but this amendment is not directed to any particular project; it undertakes to deal with all of them. It would require additional surveys, and it delegates to an executive officer the legislative function of discriminating between these particular projects which Congress heretofore has by formal action adopted. I, of course, could get together the different acts of Congress covering these subjects, if it be deemed necessary to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But, as the Chair reads the amendment, it is simply a limitation on the expenditure of these appropriations.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. It could not be a limitation on them so as to change the course of the appropriation without——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is inclined to think that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I will submit, if the Chair is going to rule in that way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a limitation of the appropriation. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. KENYON. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

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

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement of my pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], I withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement of my pair and its transfer as on the last roll call, I vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as announced on the former vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] and vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. I do not see him in the Chamber, and I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. HARDWICK (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] with the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]; and

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Ashurst	Jones	Oliver	Thomas
Brady	Kenyon	Page	Thompson
Fall	La Follette	Pomerene	Tillman
Gallinger	Lane	Sherman	
Gore	Lippitt	Smoot	
Husting	Norris	Taggart	

NAYS—37.

Bankhead	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Stone
Brandegee	Lodge	Reed	Swanson
Broussard	McLean	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Walsh
Clarke, Ark.	Myers	Simmons	Weeks
Culberson	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Fletcher	Overman	Smith, Ga.	
Hardwick	Pittman	Smith, Mich.	
James	Poindexter	Sterling	

NOT VOTING—38.

Beckham	Dillingham	Kern	Shafroth
Borah	du Pont	Lee, Md.	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Goff	Lewis	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Gronna	McCumber	Sutherland
Catron	Harding	Newlands	Townsend
Clapp	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Underwood
Clark, Wyo.	Hollis	Owen	Warren
Colt	Hughes	Penrose	Works
Cummins	Johnson, Me.	Phelan	
Curtis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Robinson	

So Mr. TAGGART's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENYON. I offer an amendment to come in as a new section to the bill.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Iowa if he will not, since that amendment proposes a new section, withhold it in order that I may offer an amendment which simply proposes an addition to one provision, leaving the bill otherwise as it now stands?

Mr. KENYON. I am perfectly willing to do that, but I do not see how it makes any difference. However, if the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is urgent, I am perfectly willing to withhold the amendment which I desire to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest that it will not make any difference as to which amendment is first offered.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] is of the same general nature as that offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], and, for the same reason, I hope that it will be included in the bill, so that it may be considered in connection with the general subject. I inquire which amendment is pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the Chair understands, the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] is pending.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That is what I supposed.

Mr. LODGE. It has not been read.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That is the amendment to which my remarks applied. The Senator from South Dakota may possess himself in patience. He will get an opportunity to present the amendment he desires to offer.

Mr. STERLING. Very well.

Mr. REED. Let the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The Secretary proceeded to read the amendment proposed by Mr. KENYON, which in full is as follows:

Add at the end of the bill as a new section the following:

"That a commission is hereby created and established, to be known as the national waterway commission, hereafter referred to as the commission, which shall be composed of five commissioners, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the commissioners shall be members of the same political party. The first commissioners appointed shall continue in office for terms of three, four, five, six, and seven years, respectively, from the date of the taking effect of this act, the term of each to be designated by the President, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of seven years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the commissioner whom he shall succeed. The commission shall choose a chairman from its own membership. No commissioner shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. Any commissioner *may be removed* by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. A vacancy in the commission shall not impair the right of the remaining commissioners to exercise all the powers of the commission.

"That each commissioner shall receive an annual salary of $6,000, payable in the same manner as the judges of the courts of the United States. The commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive an annual salary of $4,000, payable in like manner. The commission shall have the authority to employ and fix the compensation of civil engineers, clerks, and other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties and as may be from time to time appropriated by Congress, and in making appointments for continuous service the commission, so far as practicable, shall select its employees from the classified service.

"All property of the United States in the hands or under the control of Army engineers or other officials or of private individuals or public contractors, including dredges, steamboats, barges, yards, and other property used in the improvement of public waterways, shall be placed under the jurisdiction and authority of the commission.

"That the Secretary of War may, if practicable, detail such Army engineers as are requested by the commission to assist in organizing and establishing a comprehensive system of waterway improvement, providing that such details of engineers shall not be made to the detriment of their military duties.

"That the commission shall have the authority and it shall be its duty to make an investigation of all waterway projects now constructed in whole or in part by Federal aid. The commission shall prepare a complete and succinct statement, by years, of the amount heretofore appropriated for each project, the estimated amount required to complete such project, a report of the commerce now served and to be served, the character of such commerce given by separate items so far as can be furnished, the source of information, the interests to be served, the kind of water craft used, and such other information as may be useful in determining the public use and value of the project. The commission shall also furnish Congress, at the earliest practicable date, information concerning all harbors and waterways now improved or being improved in whole or in part by Government aid, showing the amount of commerce, character of terminals or landings, ownership thereof, and, so far as practicable, ownership of regular lines of craft used thereon; and the commission shall also report its recommendations for the finishing of the projects now being constructed or modification of existing plans or abandonment of work on any project, together with findings upon which such recommendations are based.

"The commission shall further ascertain and report what projects are now being improved for purposes other than navigation, and if for power development, a full statement of interests concerned, officers and stockholders, public use to be served, if any, private or public contribution toward expense of construction, and the commission's recommendations thereon. Said commission shall further ascertain and report what projects are now being carried on in whole or in part for land-reclamation purposes, the character of such project, amount of lands to be recovered, estimated value of such lands, ownership thereof, and contributions now being made by beneficiaries toward such expenditures, together with the commission's recommendations.

"The commission shall make a full investigation into all work now being performed by the Mississippi River Commission, the amount of money heretofore expended on such river, character and permanency of work performed, and reclamation interests now being served, if there be any, a full statement of contributions by public or private interests toward said work, together with a comprehensive and intelligible report of the probable cost of the present plans of levee construction or other river improvement now being undertaken, the percentage of project completed, and this commission's recommendation thereon. Such Mississippi River report shall be separate and distinct from reports on other projects now under improvement by the Federal Government.

"All of such data and all other available information of a pertinent character affecting particular projects or entire waterway improvements now being conducted by the Federal Government shall be collected in convenient form and presented to Congress in installments at the earliest practicable date.

"When the commission shall have reason to believe at any time that the proposed project is not for general use of the public or will not warrant further expenditures, or if contributions shall be required to be furnished before further appropriations are made or further expenditures authorized, such commission shall immediately report to Congress, with a preliminary recommendation thereon, and shall furnish a copy thereof to the United States Treasurer. That thereupon, when so recommended, the Treasurer shall withhold all funds theretofore appropriated not specifically obligated under existing contracts and shall refuse further payments until subsequent and specific action shall be had thereon by Congress.

"That prior to the presentation of any new waterway project appropriations the commission shall cause a careful survey of the proposed improvement, and if it shall appear such project is to serve a public use and is feasible, the commission shall thereupon collate data showing the estimated cost thereof, commerce to be served, water craft to be used, public terminals furnished, and contributions recommended to be made by public or private interests, together with such additional data as has heretofore been specifically required to be furnished on existing projects. The commission shall thereupon transmit to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a full report concerning such new project or projects, its recommendations thereon, and, if requested so to do, all other and further information that may be required by the Committee on Appropriations.

"Whenever the commission shall determine that any waterway project is primarily for power or land-reclamation purposes or to serve special interests, the commission may recommend Government aid for such project, notwithstanding the special interests to be served, and shall prepare data showing the proportionate amount of Federal aid recommended, together with suitable restrictions as to audit and payment of funds from the Public Treasury. Such recommendation shall be presented as a proposed separate bill to the Committee on Appropriations of the House and shall not be embodied in any general waterway appropriation bill by such committee.

Whenever any new survey shall be proposed for any waterway project the commission, prior to such survey, may require data to be furnished showing the public use and prospective commerce to be served and such other information as may be desired, and a brief synopsis of such information shall be furnished to Congress by the commission to accompany any recommendations made for new surveys.

All existing waterways, new projects, and new surveys shall be classified, so far as practicable, prior to each regular session of Congress, together with estimates of appropriations required for maintenance and improvement for the ensuing two-year period, and a brief report as to each project considered shall be separately prepared and, with the commission's recommendation thereon, shall be placed in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations of the House at the beginning of each session.

Whenever the Appropriations Committee so requires the commission shall furnish additional data concerning any project, and shall further aid the Committee on Appropriations when requested so to do in the preparation of the regular river and harbor bill, which shall be prepared and presented by the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

The commission shall further compile and cause to be published at the earliest practicable date for the use of Congress an intelligent, concise statement of past waterway expenditures by the Government and of amounts needed to complete all continuing projects, and shall further give estimates of future obligations to be incurred by new projects recommended for construction. The commission shall give preference in its recommendations to Congress of appropriations needed to complete the more important projects, and, so far as practicable, shall enter upon a program looking toward the early completion of such projects.

The commission shall make a thorough investigation of reasons for loss of river traffic and shall make recommendations for the reestablishment of such traffic. It shall ascertain and determine the most available craft for river use, and, as soon as practicable, shall prepare plans and build experimental craft for such purpose.

Whenever reason therefor shall appear the commission may fix reasonable freight rates on all interestate water-borne traffic by common carrier and upon all such traffic on navigable waters *wholly* within the State, subject, however, to the jurisdiction now conferred by law on the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix maximum joint rates between and over rail and water lines.

The commission shall determine the reasonableness of wharfage or water terminal charges, whether such terminals are owned by private persons or municipalities, and all river and harbor improvements, including terminal facilities, shall be under the supervision and control of the commission.

Whenever the commission shall determine that unprofitable railway freight tariffs are maintained in any given case in order to prevent waterway competition, it shall be the duty of the commission to make a report thereon in duplicate to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to Congress, with recommendations that Congress give power, if need be, to the Interstate Commerce Commission for fixing minimum railway rates.

The commission shall at the earliest practicable date adopt an intelligent system of natural waterway improvement and shall perform such other and further duties as may present themselves from time to time.

Whenever it shall be desirable to secure sworn testimony from any witness or witnesses relating to any project or to navigation generally, or whenever the commission shall have reason to believe that private interests are secretly or improperly seeking to influence the commission or to force the passage of any private or public waterway measure through Congress, the commission may cause a hearing or summary investigation to be held, and for that purpose may issue summons, subpœnas, or other writs in the same manner and under the same procedure as is more specifically set forth in the act to regulate commerce approved February 4, 1887, and the amendments thereto, which portions of such act relating to procedure, so far as applicable, are made a part of this act, and may bring before such commission all parties believed to be informed concerning the facts or interested in the passage of such measure. A complete record shall be preserved of the testimony taken at such hearing and a certified transcript thereof shall be transmitted immediately to the Committee on Appropriations.

That all unexpended balances to the credit of any project not specifically obligated under existing contracts shall from the date of the passage of this act be transferred by the Treasurer to the general fund, and all vouchers thereafter paid by the Treasurer shall be upon order of the National Waterway Commission.

That the sum of $200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same hereby is, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury, to carry out the provisions of this act.

During the reading,

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, it is not worth while to take further time with the reading of this amendment. I shall make, and I make now, a point of order against it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the point of order is made against this amendment, I will reserve the right, when the bill

reaches the Senate, to make points of order against all similar amendments in the bill.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I was going to say, Mr. President, that I supposed the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada went in with an implied understanding that if that went in others of similar character would go in.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I do not see any objection to the course indicated by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Missouri insists on the point of order, the Chair will be obliged to sustain it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, was the amendment read in full, or just part of it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Only part of it.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I am not willing that a proposition to which I am so absolutely opposed in principle as this shall go even to a conference committee, to be reported back here without an opportunity on the part of the Senate to discuss it. I shall insist upon the point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. I was not objecting to that, but I rose simply to ask the Senator if he had any objection to the balance of the amendment being put in the RECORD, so that it will be complete?

Mr. STONE. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be printed in the RECORD, and the point of order noted at the conclusion of it. The point of order is sustained, upon the ground that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I renew the offer of the amendment which I offered the other day, and which I believe the Secretary has. I send another copy of it to the desk, however. In deference to the suggestions of my colleague [Mr. JONES] and some other Senators, I have changed the amount of the salary of the inspector named in the amendment from $10,000 to $7,000. The whole matter is altogether tentative, and is submitted with the understanding that it will be dealt with very freely by the committee of conference. I myself think that if we are going to have an inspector at all to investigate great expenditures, such as are provided for by this bill, we ought not to higgle over his salary; but I will leave the amount at $7,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will not the Senator also change his amendment so as to provide that the officer shall be appointed by the President instead of by the chairmen of the committees of the Senate and the House?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I can not accept that suggestion, Mr. President. It is entirely inconsistent with the purpose of the amendment. The central idea of the amendment was that Congress, acting through its committees which deal with this subject, should have some special source of information. The entire conduct of the work as it is at present carried on is in charge of men subject to the orders of the President. The work is now operated under one of the executive departments of the Government. This proposition is that the legislative branch of the Government, which appropriates the money, shall have some check upon the manner in which the executive department expends it.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the amendment be stated, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will restate the amendment.

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

There shall be appointed by the chairmen of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives and the Commerce Committee of the Senate an inspector of river and harbor works. He shall be a trained and experienced civil engineer, not connected in any way with the Army. It shall be the duty of said inspector to thoroughly examine the several river and harbor projects which have been adopted by Congress, with special regard to the question of whether the moneys appropriated by Congress for these works are being expended to the best advantage from a standpoint both of economy and efficiency. In making said examination said inspector shall inquire whether the best methods are being used in the prosecution of said works to accomplish the improvement contemplated thereby. Said inspector shall also examine into the question of the needs of commerce for said improvements and the probable or prospective uses thereof in commerce and the probable or prospective results thereof on freight rates on railroads through the competition of such waterways; and for that purpose said inspector may ascertain the effect upon such rates of waterways heretofore improved and the uses that have been made of the same for purposes of transportation. Said inspector shall make in writing to Congress a full semiannual report of his observations and conclusions in the foregoing matters. He shall hold office at the pleasure of the committees above mentioned, and his successor shall be appointed as provided above. He shall be paid a salary of $7,000 a year and his necessary actual expenses, and shall have such clerical and other assistance as may be necessary, to be approved by the chairmen of said committees.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I make a point of order against that amendment. It is general legislation; it creates a new office, and it appropriates money not estimated for.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado is entitled to the floor.

Mr. LODGE. He does not have the floor against the point of order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not against the point of order, I judge.

Mr. THOMAS. If the point of order is made, I have nothing to say.

Mr. POINDEXTER. On the point of order, I should like to suggest that it seems to me a principle is involved here similar to that involved in the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana, in that it is a proviso for the inspection of the expenditure of the appropriations made in this bill. In that respect it is a limitation upon the appropriation. It provides a means by which Congress can be informed of the expenditures for which the bill appropriates, and in that respect, it seems to me, it is a condition attached to the appropriation, and, consequently, not subject to the point of order. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that it is an entirely different amendment from the others of which the Senator spoke a moment ago. It does not provide for any comprehensive examination.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is different in this respect, that one point could have been made against the others, but there are three points which can be made against this as being obnoxious to the rule. That is the only difference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order must be sustained.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, after line 15, on page 37, the following paragraph:

In the interest of navigation, and in view of the existing emergency, and to prevent further loss and destruction of property, the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for bank revetment work or other improvement at or near the city of Vermilion, Clay County, S. Dak.: *Provided, however*, That before this appropriation shall become available or any work is undertaken by the United States thereunder assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War shall be given that the said city of Vermilion, or county of Clay, or other agencies, will provide and contribute in money, labor, or materials an amount equal to 33⅓ per cent of the amount herein appropriated for such improvement.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire, if it is not out of order, how much that increases the appropriation.

Mr. STERLING. It increases the appropriation $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purpose indicated. I will simply say that I think all of it will be necessary, under a statement made by the Secretary of War under date of March 25. He seemed to think that the $100,000 provided for in the joint resolution which I offered would not do more than half the work of improvement; but I think that statement was made without due and careful investigation, and I believe $133,000 will do the work of making this improvement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, a few days ago an amendment was adopted with relation to the Brazos River—a provision that the money should not be expended if the Army engineers reported against the river. That amendment was proposed in the absence of the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. In conversation with me, he rather feels that it was taking an advantage of him, which was not intended, I am certain, and I know he feels it was not intended. But as he feels that way about it, I move the reconsideration of that amendment.

Mr. STONE. Which amendment is that?

Mr. KENYON. The one with regard to the Brazos River in Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was adopted.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. We had a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment before, and I think we should have it again. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, at the end of line 25, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That no part of the said appropriation of $200,000 shall be expended until the report of the Army engineers upon the reexamination of said project, as provided for by the last Congress, shall have been reported to Congress; and if said report shall be unfavorable to the further progress of said project, then no part of said $200,000 shall be expended thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD obtained the floor.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Do I understand that the motion to reconsider prevailed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It did.

Mr. STONE. Does this amendment relate to the Brazos River or to the Trinity?

Mr. KENYON. The Brazos.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation of the action taken by the Senator from Iowa. I am sure that he intended to take no advantage of the fact that I was not in the Senate Chamber when he moved the adoption of his second Brazos River amendment a few days ago. I reached the Chamber a few minutes after the Senate met, and found the roll call in progress.

I now wish to appeal to the Senate, in the interest of fair play, to reverse its action in regard to the Brazos River. Certainly the presumption is in favor of a project already under way, a project which the engineers and Congress have indorsed. Appropriations for two of the rivers for which reexaminations were ordered by the last Congress have been continued in this bill, although the reexaminations resulted in unfavorable reports. This amendment makes the continuance of the Brazos River appropriation dependent absolutely upon the forthcoming report of the engineers. The report, whether favorable or unfavorable, might be based on insufficient reasons, on frivolous reasons, on reasons that might not appeal to the Senate. In view of the fact that the same rule has not been applied to the other rivers, reexamination of which were ordered, I ask the Senate to change its action.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the only point with reference to this matter, concisely stated, is this: The Army engineers, under the provisions of an act of Congress, are now making a resurvey of the Brazos River. This amendment provides that the money appropriated by this bill for the Brazos River shall not be spent if the report of the engineers is against the project of the Brazos River.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me ask the Senator a question right there. The Senator has denounced the engineers when their reports were favorable to projects. Now he proposes to leave this river absolutely to their judgment. Where is the consistency of the Senator's position?

Mr. KENYON. I think my position is much more consistent than the position of the Senator from Texas, who, in all these matters, is following the Army engineers when they are in his favor, and when they are against him he does not seem willing to follow them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not necessarily. Let me say to the Senator that I do not take that position. I say, let this resurvey stand or fall on its own merits. Let the Senate reserve the right to pass on it when it is brought into the Senate.

Mr. KENYON. But if the Army engineers report against this project, no more public money ought to go into it; and this money ought not to go into it until the Army engineers do make their report. That is the position I take.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Congress has adopted this project, and the presumption is in its favor.

Mr. KENYON. And Congress has ordered a reexamination of this project. Now, what is the hurry? Why not wait until that report is made to Congress?

Of course it is true, as the Senator says about other projects, that resurveys and reexaminations are being made, and yet the money is going to be spent; and there is not any reason why the amendment should apply to the Brazos any more than to any of these other projects; but I do wish that we might save the money in the case of one of them if the report is against it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the Senator knows that the reexaminations of the engineers as to two rivers have been made and have resulted in unfavorable reports by the engineers, and yet the Senate declined to follow those reports. I say, let the result of the resurvey be known before it shall be approved. The Senate ought not to abdicate its proper powers.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I only know that where the Army engineers report in favor of a project they are wise and powerful men, and when they report against a project we overturn their report and go ahead just the same as if it did not exist. That is what we are doing in this case.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator takes the same attitude with a reverse viewpoint as to the engineers. If the engineers are for a river, he is against them; if they are against a river, he is with them.

Mr. KENYON. I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays were ordered on this amendment heretofore, and the Chair rules that the motion to reconsider keeps in force the original order of the yeas and nays. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Borah	Hardwick	Norris	Smoot
Brady	Husting	Oliver	Sterling
Broussard	James	Page	Stone
Chamberlain	Jones	Poindexter	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Pomerene	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Ransdell	Taggart
Culberson	Lane	Reed	Thomas
Cummins	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	Townsend
Curtis	Lippitt	Shafroth	Underwood
Dillingham	Lodge	Sheppard	Vardaman
Fall	Martin, Va.	Shields	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	Warren
Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Gore	Nelson	Smith, Md.	
Harding	Newlands	Smith, Mich.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, let the Secretary please state the amendment again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. The House text reads:

Brazos River, Tex.: Continuing improvement from Old Washington to Waco by the construction of locks and dams heretofore authorized, $200,000.

Following the figures "$200,000," the reconsidered amendment reads:

Provided, That no part of the said appropriation of $200,000 shall be expended until the report of the Army engineers upon the reexamination of said project, as provided for by the last Congress, shall have been reported to Congress, and if said report shall be unfavorable to the further progress of said project, then no part of said $200,000 shall be expended thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays were ordered upon the amendment. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMPSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. As I stated the other day when this amendment was up, I am permitted to vote upon it. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Upon this particular item I do not feel released from my pair. I therefore transfer my pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Borah	Gallinger	Lane	Smoot
Brady	Gore	Lippitt	Sterling
Clark, Wyo.	Harding	Lodge	Sutherland
Cummins	Husting	Norris	Taggart
Curtis	Jones	Oliver	Thomas
Dillingham	Kenyon	Page	Townsend
Fall	La Follette	Shafroth	Wadsworth

NAYS—32.

Bankhead	James	Ransdell	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Stone
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Swanson
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Underwood
Clarke, Ark.	Myers	Shields	Vardaman
Culberson	Nelson	Simmons	Walsh
Fletcher	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Hardwick	Poindexter	Smith, Md.	Williams

NOT VOTING—36.

Ashurst	Bryan	Clapp	Goff
Beckham	Burleigh	Colt	Gronna
Brandegee	Catron	du Pont	Hitchcock

Hollis	Lewis	Owen	Smith, Ga.
Hughes	McCumber	Penrose	Smith, S. C.
Johnson, Me.	McLean	Phelan	Thompson
Johnson, S. Dak.	Newlands	Pomerene	Tillman
Kern	O'Gorman	Robinson	Weeks
Lee, Md.	Overman	Sherman	Works

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENYON. I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and to substitute the following.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the maintenance and improvement of rivers and harbors, $25,000,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War. In the allotment of such funds provision shall first be made for maintenance and urgent commercial and military needs of harbors and waterways. Not exceeding $50,000 shall be used for new surveys and no allotment other than for necessary maintenance shall be made for any project heretofore recommended by Army engineers for abandonment or for modified improvement. And the engineers shall present to the next Congress, at the beginning thereof, a complete report of all expenditures with such further recommendations for abandonment of projects or modification as by them may be determined for the public good.

Mr. KENYON. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). Transferring my pair as last stated, I vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I announce my pair and its transfer as before and vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I announce the same transfer of my pair as before and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JAMES. I transfer the general pair I have with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] and vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN. Has the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. WARREN. I announce my pair with that Senator and withhold my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] with the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]; and

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—23.

Ashurst	Gore	Lodge	Taggart
Brady	Harding	Norris	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Husting	Pomerene	Thompson
Curtis	Kenyon	Shafroth	Tillman
Fall	La Follette	Smoot	Wadsworth
Gallinger	Lane	Sutherland	

NAYS—34.

Bankhead	James	Poindexter	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Jones	Ransdell	Sterling
Broussard	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Stone
Chamberlain	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Underwood
Culberson	Nelson	Shields	Vardaman
Dillingham	Oliver	Simmons	Williams
Fletcher	Page	Smith, Ariz.	
Hardwick	Pittman	Smith, Md.	

NOT VOTING—39.

Beckham	Goff	McCumber	Robinson
Borah	Gronna	McLean	Sherman
Bryan	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Burleigh	Hollis	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Catron	Hughes	Newlands	Townsend
Chilton	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman	Walsh
Clapp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Warren
Colt	Kern	Owen	Weeks
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Penrose	Works
du Pont	Lewis	Phelan	

So Mr. KENYON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 27, after line 12, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

That the Secretary of War is directed to investigate the character and drafts of vessels which would be accommodated by the Welland Canal when enlarged by the Dominion of Canada and what improvements would be necessary upon the Great Lakes and harbors thereof to secure the benefit of such ocean commerce as may pass through such Welland Canal.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate, but I feel the adoption of an amendment of this character would greatly improve the standards of this bill. It is a proposition national in its proportions. It has not the smell of "pork" upon it anywhere.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. GORE. Did the Senator from Wisconsin say this amendment did not have the "smell of pork" about it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did.

Mr. GORE. Then I should like to suggest that it is subject to a point of order. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair refers the point of order to the Senate to decide.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, Mr. President, the Senate would not sustain the point of order.

The Welland Canal was constructed in 1833. It connects Lake Ontario with Lake Erie. It is, as everyone knows, wholly upon Canadian territory. It was enlarged in 1871; and again enlarged in 1900. It is now being reconstructed or enlarged, and will be completed in 1918 to a depth and width to admit of ocean going vessels passing through it.

Mr. President, if all of the harbors upon the Great Lakes are to share in the benefits of the enlargement of this canal, if we are to be able to load and unload ocean going vessels in the harbors of the Great Lakes, it is absolutely necessary for us to investigate existing conditions and to determine what changes and improvements must be made in order that ocean going vessels may dock at the ports of the Great Lakes.

Mr. President, Great Britain—which country, as I understand, has succeeded to the control of the Welland Canal, considers the enlargement of the Welland Canal so as to carry ocean-going vessels to be a good business investment. Surely the United States should improve the harbors which will be accessible to vessels passing through the Welland Canal, to a depth sufficient to accommodate such vessels. This canal is being enlarged so that it will have a depth of 25 feet. However, the improvements are to be so constructed that the sills of the locks will have a depth of 30 feet. The locks are to be 800 feet in usable length by 80 feet in width in the clear. The canal on the bottom will be 200 feet wide.

The present available depth in the various harbors of the Great Lakes, as I understand, is from 20 to 22 feet, and we shall be shut out from the benefits that will come from the enlargement of the Welland Canal unless we begin to make provision for changing the depth of water in our Great Lakes harbors. Ultimately, I have no doubt this work will require a very considerable expenditure of money. It means, ultimately, the deepening of the entrance to the harbors, of those harbors, and of the basins necessary to the best use of those harbors to a depth that will accommodate ocean-going traffic.

But, Mr. President, if all that has been done and all that has been expended, upwards of $800,000,000 in the improvement of the harbors and waterways of this country, is to be given anything like a meaning that shall be a benefit to the people of the country, then we should not stop at the expenditure of whatever is necessary to bring ocean-going vessels to the harbors of this great chain of lakes, this great inland sea that reaches out almost half-way across the continent.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I am entirely in sympathy with this amendment; I think it is a most important one; but, merely for my own information, I desire to ask a question. Of course this deepening of the Welland Canal will admit very large vessels. What has been done about getting them up by the Lachine Rapids? Are they likewise enlarging those canals?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not advised about that, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. I suppose that will follow.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suppose that would naturally follow in order to secure the benefit of the deepening of the Welland Canal.

Mr. LODGE. I do not make that suggestion in opposition to the amendment at all. I think it is very important that we should have just this thing.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Very cheerfully.

Mr. GALLINGER. I chance to be very familiar with that part of the country, and I wish to say that I do not see how these great vessels could get through either the Lachine Canal or the Cornwall Canal, which are comparatively small waterways. Possibly the Dominion of Canada has great projects in mind of enlarging those canals in the same way that she is going to enlarge the Welland Canal, but I can not, for the life of me, see how ocean-going vessels, drawing the depth suggested, could possibly get up or down to the Lakes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, with the present watercourses, I do not believe they could.

Mr. GALLINGER. No.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But I apprehend, of course, that, in order to get the largest possible results from the development now going on at the Welland Canal, the British Government must contemplate enlarging these other canals; and I think it follows very logically that we ought to make this investigation, in order that the people of this country may avail themselves of the great benefit that will result from the enlargement of this canal.

I do not wish to take the time of the Senate another moment, Mr. President. I believe the amendment I have offered is meritorious and will commend itself to the judgment of the conference committee.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Wisconsin takes his seat, I wish to make a suggestion. I have the amendment before me, and I see that it provides—

That the Secretary of War is directed to investigate * * * what improvements would be necessary upon the Great Lakes and harbors thereof, etc.

I am not sufficiently familiar with the geography of that section of the country to be sure about it, but I have wondered whether that language would take in the connecting and adjacent waters—if there are any rivers between the lakes connecting them—or other adjacent waters or canals. I think it would do no harm to insert some words that would broaden the amendment, so that the investigation would not be confined to the lakes themselves.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think the amendment covers the situation; but if the Senator from Connecticut has anything to suggest in that connection, I should be very glad to accept it, because I think the investigation should be as broad as possible in its character.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am willing to leave the matter to those who are more familiar than am I with the geography of that section; but I was simply going to suggest that after the words "the Great Lakes and harbors thereof," there be inserted "and tributaries thereto and connecting or adjacent waters," or some such language as that. I do not insist upon it at all, for I have no doubt the conference committee would work out the proper language anyway.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it is not my information that there are any such tributaries which it would be important to have investigated; but I see no objection to accepting the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut. There may exist conditions of which I was not advised when I prepared this amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Having called attention to it, I am perfectly content to leave it to the conference committee to work out the proper language.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They will doubtless have full information on the subject.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. With the further indulgence of the Senate for just a moment, I wish to offer another amendment, which I send to the Secretary's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 34, after line 24, it is proposed to insert:

Improving the Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis., by enlarging the Superior Harbor basin in accordance with House Document No. 651, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, $180,000; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to enter into a contract for such material and work as may be necessary to complete the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate $180,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think I can say all that I care to say upon this amendment in five minutes, and perhaps it might be as well to put into the RECORD some facts which might obviate the necessity of my appearing before the conference committee upon this subject.

This amendment, of course, is in no sense local in its character. The Superior-Duluth Harbor is one of the great harbors of the world. The tonnage received and shipped at the Duluth-Superior Harbor is greater than that at any other inland harbor of this country or of the world. It is simply astounding. Thirty-three million tons is the measure of commerce received at that great inland port, the farthermost point to the west of this great chain of lakes that is, I believe, to be connected in the near future with the ocean transportation of the world.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for just a moment, I will ask if he knows the reason for the remarkable decrease, as great as are the figures he has suggested, compared with the commerce of that port the year before?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not able to account for that. I was going to call attention to it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I hope the Senator will, and I am sorry that I have troubled him.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The tonnage in 1914 was 33,000,000 tons. In 1913 it was 46,000,000 tons. I apprehend, Mr. President, that it will be found that the tonnage of other great world harbors fell off at about that time. I apprehend that there may have been an influence which was national, or perhaps world-wide, in its character affecting commerce everywhere.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment, that same argument would apply to every project in this bill against which continual assaults of that character have been made on this floor, would it not?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; if the comparisons are made only within that short period of time.

Mr. HARDWICK. Within those two years.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the most accurate information which I have been able to obtain upon the subject—and I have been somewhat amazed to find that there is not a department of this Government which can tell you what is the tonnage of the commerce of the great harbors or ports of the world, excepting as it has relation to customs duties—but from the best information that I could obtain in 1913 the tonnage in and out of London by water was only 41,000,000 tons; at Liverpool but 35,000,000 tons in 1913; at Chicago but 14,000,000 tons; while this great inland harbor, Duluth-Superior, located on Lake Superior, at the tip of the chain of lakes, at a point that is like an index finger reaching out toward the West, had a commerce in 1914, as I have said, of 33,000,000 tons.

Mr. President, there has been expended on that harbor a very large sum of money, but it has been justified by the national character of the commerce. It is a distributing point for a vast territory to the west; it is the assembling point for a vast territory that ships to the East and to the great ports of the world.

The total number of vessels arriving and departing at this port in 1914 was 9,712, with a net tonnage of 28,000,000. They have immense ore docks there; iron-ore docks, with a capacity of 797,000 tons; coal docks, with a capacity of 10,908,000 tons; grain elevators, with a capacity of 31,625,000 bushels. In 1895 there were received and shipped at this port only 6,000,000 tons of commerce; but it had grown by 1914, in less than 10 years, to be 33,000,000 tons.

Maj. E. D. Peck, the engineer officer in charge of the work at this harbor, in a report upon this project, gives some interesting and important data with respect to the business of this harbor. He says:

Through the existence and development of the large iron fields and the extensive grain-producing areas which are economically tributary to this port, and as the distributing and forwarding center for coal, lumber, and other commodities, Duluth-Superior Harbor ranks as of the first importance. The natural advantages of the harbor have been developed by the Government under various projects at a total cost of $7,418,002.25, as of June 30, 1914. The estimated value of commerce as of December 31, 1914, was $4,845,914,693.

The total number of tons received and shipped for the calendar year 1914, was 33,535,704 with a total valuation of $287,002,960. Total number of vessels arriving and departing 9,712; net registered tonnage of all vessels arriving and departing 28,216,139. The average number of tons of cargo received per day during the season of navigation for 1914 was 45,176; the average number of tons shipped per day for same period was 97,528. Interlake traffic covered a period of 235 days. The harbor has iron-ore docks with a total storage capacity of 797,592 gross tons, coal docks with total capacity of 10,908,000 short tons, and grain elevators with total capacity of 31,625,000 bushels, and these freight-handling facilities are being increased annually. From a total of 6,325,351 tons of freight shipped and received in 1895, the commerce has increased to 33,535,704 tons shipped and received in 1914. From the curve of increase shown in the harbor commerce, and with a knowledge of the sources of supply which create this traffic it is believed that the prospective commercial importance of this harbor is

very great, and that any reasonable necessary aid to insure the safety of vessels using it would be fully justified.

Representative SPARKMAN, in the discussion upon this bill in the other House, speaking of this project and this harbor, said:

Now, the gentleman [Mr. LENROOT] has a project that is a very important one. I have been there and I know what his harbor is. There is not a more important inland harbor in the whole country than his, and I think it not only worthy but urgent, and as soon as we have a bill with new projects in it I think that will be taken care of.

The Superior-Duluth Harbor, Mr. President, is not only the greatest inland harbor in the United States, but it is the second greatest harbor of our country, and I think, from such evidence as I have been able to gather somewhat hastily, that it ranks second amongst the harbors of the world. Because of its great commerce and because of the pressing need of this improvement I offer this amendment, with great confidence that it will not only commend itself to the Senate but to the conference committee.

This amendment proposes merely that, in accordance with the recommendation of the engineers, who have investigated this subject thoroughly, there shall be deepened a basin of 160.2 acres, sufficient to enable the vessels that come into that great port, either by the Superior entrance or the Duluth entrance, to make their turn and anchor safely. The engineers, who have experience in this business, recommend precisely the amendment which I have offered.

Maj. Peek, the engineer officer in charge, speaking of the general difficulties attending navigation at this harbor, has this to say:

These exist mainly in the opposing action between waves and outflowing currents at the Duluth entrance during the prevalence of northeast storms, which create a very turbulent condition of the water at the entrance, and at such times during high wind vessels entering are in danger of losing steerage way and being carried ashore or against the piers. The occurrence of logs and snow are also temporary deterrents to navigation.

At Superior entry during storms the entrance is accomplished by vessels with much less difficulty and risk than at the Duluth entrance. This is probably due to the wider entrance between breakwaters and canal piers, the protection afforded by the breakwaters and reduction of wave height through the stilling basin; but after entering the harbor from the canal the basin from east to west is only 1,500 feet wide, and the four ore docks of the Great Northern Railway Co. are situated opposite the harbor entrance. This limited distance is too short for the larger class of vessels to be manipulated with safety in approaching their docks during northeast storms, and it is of common occurrence for such vessels to go on the ground in the vicinity of the mouth of the Nemadji River in preference to going up against the docks without proper control. No accidents have occurred in the new entrance that are attributable to the existence of conditions resulting from the improvement. On June 27, 1914, during a severe storm, the steamer *Mataafa*, through an accident to its anchor equipment, let go her anchor and swung off on a long chain; unable to recover the anchor, its stern beat along the north canal revetment for several hours before rescued by harbor tugs and inflicted very considerable damage to the vessel as well as damage of a minor character to the revetment.

Gen. Black, in a report upon this improvement, said:

It will be seen from an examination of the map that there is practically no space available in the vicinity of Superior Entry for the anchorage of large vessels. Superior Harbor Basin and Superior Front Channel are used for through traffic and for turning purposes, and experience has shown that the area now available is not sufficient for the latter purpose. It is believed that the magnitude of the commerce to be affected is sufficient to justify the estimated cost of the work. The board therefore concurs in the opinion of the district officer and the division engineer that it is advisable for the United States to undertake the improvement as outlined by the district officer, at an estimated cost of $360,000 and $3,000 per annum for maintenance. The sum of $180,000 should be made available in one appropriation with authority for continuing contract for completion of the work.

Gen. Dan C. Kingman, Chief of Engineers, in his report to the Secretary of War concurring in and approving the reports upon this project, said:

The basin is designed for turning and does not afford facilities for anchorage. Its width is too small for the larger class of vessels to be handled with safety in approaching their docks during northeast storms, and it is a common occurrence for such vessels to go aground.

I will not take another moment of the time of the Senate upon this subject. It is a worthy amendment; it is an amendment of importance to all the people who live between the Atlantic and the Pacific in the great northern belt of States. It is in no sense local in its character. I have been voting, Mr. President, against amendments that were local and which seemed to me not properly a part of any national scheme of commerce and not properly a subject of appropriation.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to ask the Senator what amount of appropriation this amendment asks for.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The total amount necessary to make this improvement is $360,000, of which it is proposed by the engineers—and I follow their recommendations—that $180,000 shall be appropriated for this year. They also estimate that it will cost, as I remember now, $15,000 a year to keep the improvement intact.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Is it for continuing an improvement?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, no; this amendment provides for a completed project. All that will be required hereafter will be the expenditure of a small appropriation of about $15,000 to take out the silt and sand and deposits that may drift or be washed in there naturally by river currents or lake waves. But this appropriation will be sufficient to remove every permanent obstruction, and hereafter there will be required only a small annual appropriation for maintenance.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The engineers have made an estimate for it, I understand?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. My amendment is based upon the estimate of the department and the recommendations of the engineers.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. OLIVER. I rise to express the hope that the Senate will agree to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin. The harbor of Duluth is just as important to the industrial interests of western Pennsylvania as it is to the people of Minnesota and Wisconsin. Too much attention can not be paid, too much money can not be spent, in improving the harbors upon the shores of Lake Superior, from which we draw all of the supplies of ore with which to run our furnaces, and to which we send a large part of the coal produced in the great State which I, in part, represent.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, this item proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin undoubtedly has merit; and I want to call the attention of Senators to the fact that if the amendment proposing a lump sum of $25,000,000 had prevailed, just this kind of an amendment would have been entirely cut off. The new item proposed in the bill for the extra channel in the St. Clair River would have been cut off. The fourth lock at the Soo would have been cut off. Every new and meritorious item proposed in this bill, including the East River, the Los Angeles and San Diego Harbors, would have been cut off by a $25,000,000 lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Including Arcadia?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No, Mr. President; I think not. Every item in this bill to which criticism has been directed, without a single exception, is included in the items to which allotments were made by the Secretary of War from the lump sum that was last placed at his disposal. We of the committee feel that unless Congress is to abandon entirely the improvement of our rivers and harbors, special allotments made by the Engineer officers to going projects must be arrested. No project can be completed on such a plan. The Brazos River, the Trinity River, all of these items which have been criticized as undesirable, and yet they are favored with special allotments by the Secretary of War out of the lump sum voted last year and which Senators upon both sides of the Chamber vote for as though they were attempting to purge their consciences of some great sin.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, there is nothing objectionable about this item except the fact that the bill has already attained very large proportions.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am not opposed to this item.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The amendment comes to the Senate authenticated, as all items in the bill were at one time authenticated, by the approval of the Board of Engineers; and, so far as I have anything to say about it, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am not opposed to this item and shall vote for it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Let us get at it, then.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Nevertheless, I can not resist the temptation to say that if this whole river and harbor legislation should eventuate in the passage of a lump-sum appropriation—and I understand, now that $20,000,000 has been voted down and $25,000,000 has been voted down, that we are soon to have an opportunity to vote for $30,000,000—a lump sum of $30,000,000 placed to the credit of the War Department for river and harbor work would be allotted in part to the very items in this bill against which Senators have fought with such feeling, while items like this proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin, the East River item, and the one which was put into the bill at my instance for the building of a new channel in the St. Clair River, like the one for the building of the fourth lock at the Soo, which is absolutely demanded, would fall by the wayside. Not one of them would get an allotment under the twenty, twenty-five, or thirty million dollar lump sum which Senators upon both sides of the Chamber are urging should be appropri-

ated, instead of this carefully worked out plan proposed by the engineers of the Government.

I did not want this matter to come to a vote without calling attention to that very marvelous inconsistency that can hide its offense in a lump sum and appear in most virtuous garments when the vote is taken for specific improvements throughout the country, national in character. This bill has been carefully prepared under the immediate eye of the War Department and its Corps of Engineers, nine-tenths of it inherited by us from past Congresses, which had the approval of distinguished men whose character and reputation should make them safe from unfair and unjust criticism. I do not want it understood that any Senator can salve his conscience with a $25,000,000 lump sum which will go to old projects that have been criticized over and over again on this floor, and that he is committing a great offense when he votes for the specific items that bear the approval of the War Department and of the Engineer Corps of the Army, nonpartisan in character, now in the bill.

If Senators who live in the interior, and have no waterways to improve, could go down before the Engineer Board of the Army and undertake to get them to review projects that have received the disapproval of the local engineer, they would soon find the difficulties in their pathway. The members of that board owe no obligation to anyone, political or otherwise.

I think this amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin is a very meritorious one. I do not know just why it did not get into the bill in the first place; probably because the report may not have reached here in time, just as some of the reports for projects that have been approved, affecting my own State, have not reached here yet. This is probably a belated report; but it has my very warm approval, and I hope it will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on page 8 of the bill, I move to strike out line 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8 of the bill it is proposed to strike out line 3, in the following words:

Toms River, N. J.: For maintenance, $2,000.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate longer than a few moments.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. In view of the excoriation we received from the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] does not the Senator think he is rather rash to make this motion?

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator that one of the reasons I have for making it is to use this as an opportunity to reply somewhat briefly to what the Senator has said.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I was going to ask if this amendment had any relation to Arcadia.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is in the same Temperate Zone.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; it is of the same general character.

Mr. President, I do not expect even to ask for a roll call upon this motion. This amendment is one of 19 somewhat similar to this one that I had prepared and expected to offer if occasion should demand it—some of a little more importance, and involving a little more money. We have been discussing this bill for quite a considerable length of time, however; it has been very fully debated, and amendments similar to the one I have offered have been voted down over and over again. So it is quite apparent that it is not possible to make any motion to strike out any appropriation in this bill and succeed; and that having been determined by a fair and honest discussion extending over several days, I have no desire further to prolong it.

I do not believe, Mr. President, as I have said before, that the bill under consideration is constructed along proper lines and on the proper fundamental ideas. This particular amendment that I have offered applies to Toms River in New Jersey. It is a completed project. In this bill $2,000 is appropriated for the maintenance of the project. During the year 1914 there was commerce on this river of 92 tons. It can not be said, as it has been said with reference to other similar motions to strike out appropriations from this bill, that it is not a completed project, and therefore that it is not fair to say that when it is completed there will not be a very large commerce. This is a completed proposition. It is not a very expensive one. It has not cost the Government very much, but the Government is paying somewhere in the neighborhood of a dollar a ton for all the commerce on that river even for maintenance, without regard to interest on any of the money that it has invested in the improvement. It is interesting to know—we have been working on it for a great many years—that the official record, the report of the Army engineers, shows, in Document 346, Sixtieth Congress, on page 4, why it was desirable to develop this river. I quote now from Col. Taylor, of the Engineer Corps, in the document referred to:

Toms River is located on one of the three principal automobile lines of travel and has a large and increasing business from this source. Suitable depth in the river would increase this traffic, owing to the ease with which owners could communicate with their yachts at this point.

So we have developed this river for several years, and one of the principal and official reasons given for its development is that men who have yachts out on the ocean along the New Jersey shore, and who go from their yachts to their homes, riding from the harbor in automobiles, are able, since this improvement has been developed, to come nearer with their automobiles to their yachts. So we have expended several thousand dollars a year for quite a number of years in order that the owners of yachts may bring those yachts up closer to a connection with their automobiles.

In my judgment, this is no worse than a good many items contained in the bill upon which we have had roll calls, debate, and consideration. For that reason this amendment or any other amendment that I had intended to offer would not have any effect upon the legislation, and it would only tend to add cumulative evidence, I think, to the illustrations that are already in the RECORD.

It seems to me that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], although criticized and his motives sometimes impugned, has made a record in this case that is very commendable. In the face of that record, even though all of his amendments have been voted down, I doubt whether Congress or the Committee on Commerce will ever undertake to build another bill along the same lines as those on which this bill and past bills have been built. I say that without any criticism of the members of the committee. I am not criticizing them even for the form of this bill, because they are only following the precedents of the past. As we progress in government and in legislation it is not to be considered an offense, in my judgment, to criticize the methods that have been used in the past and to which attention has been directed by pointing out their defects.

It was said by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], who favored the Duluth Harbor appropriation, as I presume all of us did, that if we had passed a lump-sum amendment such harbors would have been stricken out. But the lump-sum amendment was not offered, the motion to recommit with instructions was not offered until the Senate time and time again had voted down motions to strike out of the bill the very items the Senator from Michigan said would get in under a lump-sum amendment. In other words, those who are opposed to this system of legislation did the best they could to strike out of the bill the items that we have criticized and believed were wrong, and in all those motions I think we always found the Senator from Michigan was opposed to striking them out. So, if it is continued, your river and harbor bill really will come down to this, that you can not get a good harbor improved unless the bill that provides for the improvement of the good harbor can be included with a whole lot of rivers and harbors and creeks and mudholes and bayous that, if they stood on their merits alone, would not get any support.

Those who have opposed the methods of thus legislating have not been and are not enemies of river and harbor development where the improvement of the harbors and of rivers is of national importance. The illustration of the vote for the Duluth Harbor is an instance of it, the New York Harbor is another instance where those Senators who have been criticized because they criticized the little creeks and rivers contained in the bill were doing the best they could to make liberal appropriations for such harbors.

If a lump-sum appropriation would cut out some good harbors, it is true that the lump-sum appropriation, if the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa had been adopted, would have saved nearly $28,000,000 to the taxpayers of the country. If those who are opposed to lump-sum appropriations for rivers and harbors would unite with those who have offered that kind of a remedy—to take out of the river and harbor bill these little creeks and rivers of no consequence—then lump-sum appropriations would be unnecessary.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator knows that we have passed no river and harbor bill for several years, and we have had lump-sum appropriations of $20,000,000 placed to the credit of the War Department to be expended on these identical proj-

ects. If you place another lump sum of $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 to-day you exceed by both appropriations the amount carried in this bill, and your improvements relate only to old projects that have been condemned by the Senator and others on both sides of the Chamber.

Mr. NORRIS. They have not all of them been condemned by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; because the projects are old and have been approved. I have read the reports, and they are exhaustive and favorable. We can not play fast and loose with such matters in justice to the communities served.

Mr. NORRIS. The speeches which have been made against these condemned harbors and streams have consisted mostly in reading the official reports into the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have read the reports, and I have heard the engineers. If you are going to stop river and harbor improvement, if you are going to say that the Engineer Corps can not govern or be trusted, if you are going to limit these expenditures to $25,000,000, they should be apportioned according to merit by the Engineer Department. If the Trinity River and the Brazos are included, well and good. Both improvements have been condemned by Senators but approved by the War Department.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if he did not vote for Trinity and Brazos River improvements?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I did, on the recommendation of the Government engineers.

Mr. KENYON. Why does the Senator complain about them?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am not complaining.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator also voted for propositions condemned by the Army engineers.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No, sir.

Mr. KENYON. Arcadia and the Arkansas River.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Arcadia was approved by Congress and by the President. The Senator speaks of Trinity River. When Trinity River has been improved as the Board of Engineers recommended it it may be a very useful improvement. The Texas Senators think so and the War Department says so. Take almost any waterway improvement. Even the Panama Canal must be completed before it is useful. In a partial state of completion it amounts to nothing. Take the New York Canal; in a partially completed state it is nothing. Yet over $100,000,000 has been appropriated by the State of New York for it. You have got to complete it before you can fairly get an accurate judgment as to whether it is a good project or not.

I am not going to condemn the Trinity River improvement, which was projected years ago—the first appropriations for it came from a Republican Congress and from distinguished Senators upon this side as well as the other—I am not going to condemn it now. The Engineer officers said it was feasible and Congress, appropriating the money, said it was practicable. If it costs $100,000 to complete a $3,000,000 improvement and the Government has spent the money, how puerile and idle it is to withhold the small sum necessary to its completion.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator claim that the Trinity improvement will be completed for $100,000, carrying 37 locks and dams?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; I think the improvement of the entire stream is more expensive. If the Government makes it navigable as far as Dallas, perhaps it may be useful. Congress said so years ago, and spent the money on the plan.

Mr. NORRIS. I hope the Senator will make his question short. I should like to proceed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If I do not make my question short, the Senator's speech will be very limited, I am afraid, and I apologize to him for the interruption.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Michigan is not justified in saying that. I have not given any indication of weariness yet. I may be able to talk until sundown, but I do not believe I will. It will at least be too long for anybody to read.

Now, Mr. President, I said at the beginning——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to occupy just a moment in connection with what the Senator from Michgian said of the Trinity River. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I desire to say that it was my privilege to live in the State of Texas for some five or six years, and I feel a deep concern in anything affecting the welfare or the prosperity of that great Commonwealth. I happened to live in the county of Navarro. Trinity River forms the eastern boundary of that county for some 50 or 60 miles as the crow flies, perhaps a hundred miles as the river flows. I have fished in that stream and without difficulty have stepped across it time and time again. I remember that I attended a meeting once called for the purpose of promoting the navigation of Trinity River, and that Maj. Miller in the course of his remarks opposing the enterprise declared that a raccoon could wade the stream from Dallas to the Gulf without getting his breastplate wet. Yet, I repeat, I feel an interest in the welfare of the State of Texas, and I regard the scheme to render the Trinity navigable as one of the most deserving projects in the pending rivers and harbors bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there is not any doubt but that if you dig a well out on the plains near a stream of water that is not half an inch in depth you could get out of that well water, and then if you dig a canal and you fix it so that it could not seep away and put a cover over it so that it could not evaporate, in time you could get enough water in that manner to navigate a battleship. That is what we are trying to do down on the Trinity. They have to build a dam every few feet, in order to hold the water back, to get it deep enough, so that a raccoon can not walk across it and so that it will hold a gasoline boat or something of that kind. That is the method of legislation that those who are opposed to this bill are opposed to. This bill is full of such things. You can get water enough if you have any kind of a supply, if you can keep the supply running and prevent its waste. So, when they canalize that river, the little stream that would not get over your ankles if you walked through it can be dammed and held back until it has a depth of 20 feet.

And when that is all done, Mr. President, it is done for the accommodation of just one city. If you canalize that river, instead of requiring one hundred thousands to complete it, it will require several hundred thousand dollars to maintain it after its completion. It will be like some other items that I remember calling attention to last year in the river and harbor bill, where the Government could have bought all the commerce, all the freight, that passed over it and paid for it at what it was worth for what it cost to maintain locks and dams on the stream.

Mr. President, that is not business. That is not what we ought to use public funds for. There is no reason why a man should not be able to say when he sees a little stream like the Trinity, as has been so well described by the Senator from Oklahoma, we can dam it up and hold the water back, and get water enough to float a ship, but it is not a practicable proposition to do. We can raise bananas up here on a farm if we will put in a heating plant and build glass houses over the farm. We can raise as good bananas here as they raise in Costa Rica, but it would cost about $5 for each banana perhaps. It is not a practical proposition. That is the trouble with very many things in this bill and other bills like it that we have passed in the past. It is the system, Mr. President, that is wrong.

Again, let me call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to the fact that the amendment now pending is not subject to the argument the Senator makes about the Trinity. Here is the Trinity, on which we spend several million dollars, and it will take several million dollars yet to complete it. The Senator said you must not criticize this river, because we do not know what is going to happen when it is completed; it may be a good thing. But the amendment before the Senate relates to one that is completed; it has a commerce of 92 tons on it; and we are paying $2,000 for maintenance to keep it up next year.

Mr. KENYON. How many tons?

Mr. NORRIS. Ninety-two.

Mr. KENYON. Is the Senator correct in his figures?

Mr. NORRIS. I was not there, but I read that from the record. It is in the committee's report, taken from the engineers' report. In 1914 it had a tonnage of 92 tons.

Mr. KENYON. The item, I suppose, received consideration by the committee?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. This is one of the items which they so carefully prepared, as the Senator from Michigan said, under the eyes of the engineers; and the argument that it may be a great place for commerce when it is completed will not apply, because it is completed. It is finished, and the result is that millionaires who have private yachts on the ocean can bring their yachts up closer to where they can get into their automobiles from their yachts.

Now, the Senator from Michigan is just as much opposed to striking this out of the bill as he is opposed to striking the Trinity River item from the bill. In the one case he says it is not completed, and therefore we ought not to strike it out, because it may develop into something great, and in the other case he

says it is completed, we have put all that money into it, and therefore we must not give it up.

It does not make any difference which dilemma you may take or which way you go, those who favor that kind of legislation are opposed to striking anything out of the bill. We could not strike them out, as we have been trying to do for several weeks here. Then we made a motion to appropriate a lump sum as a last resort, the motion offered by the Senator from Iowa, and we are criticized for supporting that motion, because as the Senator from Michigan says, if that goes through some of these worthless projects like Trinity River will get some of the money. It was not our fault that Trinity River and such places were left in the bill. So those who favor that kind of legislation profit by their own sins. It seems to me that they are opposed to taking these streams out, and after they have prevailed and they have been left in then they are opposed to a lump-sum appropriation because these streams might get some more money under that kind of a procedure.

Mr. President, it does seem to me that as to our river and harbor bills the details ought not to be left to Congress. I believe that a lump-sum appropriation is the best way to do it. It ought not to be confined to old items. I will admit that as far as I am concerned if there is a new item that is worthy it ought to be put in, but we surely ought not to go on forever appropriating for what, in effect, I think is conceded to be wrong, simply because it has been done in the past and, as the Senator says, because it was advocated by Senators and officials who were great and who were honorable. It does not mean that we are censuring the statesmen of long ago because we find fault with the methods that they pursued. They, in their day, criticized the methods of their fathers, and, in fact, unless that had been done we would have been in a state of barbarism yet. We would not have this country with its boasted civilization if it had not been that men had the courage to criticize things that had been done honestly by honest and great men who lived before them and who lived with them.

While this bill, of course, is going through as it has been reported and as it has been slightly amended, I believe that the great Committee on Commerce, presided over by one of the very fairest men I have ever known, will profit by the fight which has been made here by the Senator from Iowa, and that through him and those who will labor with him we shall have a reform in the system by which we will get better legislation and better improvements and have at the same time more economy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Does the Senator insist on a vote on the amendment?

Mr. NORRIS. I will not ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is unable to decide.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Gallinger	Myers	Simmons
Borah	Gore	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Brady	Harding	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Husting	Norris	Smoot
Chamberlain	James	Oliver	Sterling
Chilton	Jones	Overman	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Page	Taggart
Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Poindexter	Thompson
Culberson	Lane	Ransdell	Underwood
Cummins	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Vardaman
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Walsh
Fall	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shields	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. I offered an amendment a few days ago, which is now on the table. I ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 32, after line 2, insert:

Illinois River, Ill.: Improving the Illinois River from Utica to its mouth in accordance with House Document No. 762, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $1,050,000.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to say that I voted to recommit the pending bill. I shall not vote for its passage, whether the amendment which I have offered be adopted or rejected. I have never voted for a river and harbor bill during my service in the Senate; perhaps I never shall.

During my brief service in this body I have seen some $200,000,000 or $250,000,000 appropriated for the improvement of rivers and harbors. Of course, I share the pride other Senators entertain in the splendid merchant navy which burdens the waters of these inland highways. I rejoice in that magnificent, that golden stream of commerce which makes use of these highways. But, Mr. President, in my judgment, perhaps the major portion of the money carried in this bill and carried in preceding river and harbor bills has been wasted. If river and harbor bills can be judged by their fruit, by their returns, by the benefit which they render to the taxpayers, which they render to the public, which they render to the Republic, then we must condemn this measure as we must condemn other river and harbor bills.

There is no seasonable time to waste the people's money. We are the trustees of the public revenue and we ought to husband it even with greater scruples than if it were our private property.

Mr. President, I will vote for almost any project to improve a river if the Senator proposing the project will stand up in his place in this body and assert upon his responsibility as a Senator that if he owned the river and owned the money he would make the improvement as a private investment. Upon that standard I will commit myself to river and harbor improvements.

Mr. President, the situation of the Federal Treasury is unsatisfactory. The Treasury is depleted. It is a grim condition that stares us in the face. Before this Congress adjourns we must find ways and means to add $150,000,00, perhaps to add $200,000,000, to our annual revenues.

These revenues must come out of the people's earnings; the Government's income must come out of the people's income.

Mr. President, the European war has caused a falling off in our imports; has caused a falling off in our revenues. We have already passed one war-revenue measure. That emergency measure was designed to raise some $80,000,000 a year. We now have in contemplation another revenue measure which is intended to raise approximately $200,000,000 more. As I have already observed, our revenues have been falling off and we are threatened with increasing taxes in order to supply the deficiency. In disregard of that unfortunate situation, we are expending money—I had almost said recklessly—in the $43,000,000 carried in this river and harbor bill. As a result of the war abroad and the war mania at home, we are increasing our appropriations for the Army many millions of dollars. The naval appropriation bill this year will carry an additional $100,000,000 over the $150,000,000 of last year. It will aggregate a quarter of a billion this year. This is a result of the European war, or rather a result of the imaginary terrors, of the hysteria which has grown out of the war. Preparedness at any price is not a cheap blessing. Militarism is not an inexpensive curse.

This ought to warn us, Mr. President, to practice the most scrupulous economy, not only because we are under a solemn obligation to the taxpayers of this country to conserve their revenues, but there is an additional obligation resting upon the party in power. We came here upon the pledge of economy. We reprobated Republican extravagance. In its stead we promised Democratic economy. I am anxious to see that bond redeemed to the uttermost letter—not only the letter, but the spirit of the bond should be redeemed.

Senators on the other side will vote for these vast appropriations; they will vote to compel us to lay ourselves liable to the charge of extravagance. They will not share the responsibility during the coming contest; they will not defend the pending river and harbor bill; but they will array and arouse public sentiment against the Democracy on the ground that, instead of being economical, it has been extravagant; and, sir, what sufficient answer shall we find to that indictment?

Mr. President, I was amused and delighted with the unsophisticated amendment offered by the new Senator from Indiana [Mr. TAGGART]. I say "new" because "thereby hangs a tale." The Senator from Indiana has a keen sense of humor as a rule; he has an Irish sense of humor; but his service in this body has been brief. He takes the river and harbor bill seriously. He presumed to offer an amendment providing that the Secretary of War must find that any project in this bill must be either essential to and, if not essential, at least promotive of interstate commerce or of foreign commerce.

Think of it, Mr. President! Nobody but a neophyte in this body would have offered such an amendment as that. The Senator assumed that there was some relationship between the

river and harbor bill and interstate and foreign commerce. He was misled by an association of ideas which might very well characterize a practical man or a private citizen, but which could not be pardoned on the part of a Senator who had seen any considerable service in this body.

Now, I am afraid that Senators on the other side, while professing to support this bill in good earnest, are really voting for this bill because they think that it will render Salt Creek navigable—that is certainly the only stream it will render navigable—and they think that stream will be thrown open to navigation on the 7th day of next November on behalf of Democratic Senators and other Democratic candidates. Of course, I know the great honor and the glory which it brings to a Member of Congress to return to his constituency and to point to a lavish appropriation obtained for some spring branch in his district. He may point to it as a monument, Mr. President; but I fear that it may serve as a different sort of a monument, and may bear a real epitaph, not only of Senators and Representatives but of the Democracy itself, if we persist in this policy of overrigorous economy and overscrupulous redemption of our solemn pledges to the American electorate.

As I suggested before, I should be willing to vote for almost any project if the Senator promoting the project should assert upon his responsibility as a Senator that if he owned the stream and owned the money he would make the improvement as a private investment. Perhaps that is true now. Perhaps Senators have investigated these projects; perhaps their official conduct here is but typical of what they would do in case they occupied the situation which I have described. Perhaps they fondly believe that the faith which will remove mountains will also canalize rivers and even rivulets. Indeed, I have no right to assume the contrary, but I indulge that—I will not say "presumption"— I will take it for a fact in their favor.

Mr. President, there are a few projects which, in my judgment, deserve favorable consideration. The amendment which I have proposed involves one of those projects. It involves a great inland waterway, stretching from the Gulf of Mexico, by way of the Mississippi River, the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence River, to the Gulf of St. Lawrence; from the Gulf of Mexico, by way of the Mississippi and the Great Lakes, to the Erie Canal, to the Hudson River, to New York Bay. It would be an inland sea of 2,980 miles—the greatest inland waterway upon the face of the globe.

Mr. President, the Hudson River would constitute 212 miles of this majestic waterway. It can and will be completed in 1917 with a depth of 12 feet. This bill carries all of the appropriation necessary for its completion, save about $600,000. The Erie Canal would constitute some 365 miles of the proposed highway. It will be completed in 1918, at a depth of 12 feet, and at the expense of the State of New York.

I might add that in addition to the principal line from Lake Erie to the Hudson River, the Erie Canal has a branch up to Lake Champlain, and another to Lake Ontario at Oswego, N. Y.

Of the proposed waterway the Great Lakes would constitute 890 miles, already completed, with a depth of more than 20 feet, and already available for navigation.

In addition, the Illinois Drainage Canal is already completed to a length of some 30 miles, with a depth of 21 feet, extending from Chicago, on Lake Michigan, to Lockport. The State of Illinois has appropriated $5,000,000 to construct a canal from Lockport, the terminus of the canal just mentioned, to Utica, on the Illinois River, a distance of 65 miles. This canal is to have a depth of 8 feet. From Utica to the mouth of the Illinois River at Grafton, on the Mississippi, is a distance of 230 miles. The engineers have passed favorably on this as a feasible project at a depth of 8 feet. It would cost only $1,050,000 to complete this intervening link, which is the link involved in the pending amendment.

From the mouth of the Illinois River to St. Louis is a distance of 40 miles. To complete that link would cost $3,700,000. There is already available for navigation a channel from St. Louis to the mouth of the Ohio at a depth of 8 feet. The channel of the Mississippi is already available at a depth of 9 feet for a distance of 833 miles to what are known as the Passes of the Mississippi River. From the Passes to the Gulf, a distance of 240 miles, the channel is already available at a depth of 30 feet.

Mr. President, by the expenditure of $600,000 more on the Hudson River, by the expenditure of $1,050,000 on the Illinois River, and by the expenditure of $3,700,000 on the Mississippi from Grafton to St. Louis this mighty inland waterway could be completed, could be rendered available to navigation, and could be finished within the next two or three years.

Of course, there are two other things, in addition to mere water, which are essential to the successful navigation of our rivers. I waive, of course, the theory that you can navigate without water; I take no share in constructive navigation as a basis for the revision or reduction of railway rates. We ought to have the courage to make reasonable revision and reduction of railway rates without having recourse to this miserable fiction of artificial navigation.

In addition to that, however, terminals, docks, and wharves are essential to inland navigation. These do not exist on the Mississippi River. The same difficulty will be found to characterize many of the splendid thoroughfares provided for in this bill. In addition to that, we must safeguard the companies which embark upon inland navigation by legislation that will protect them against destructive competition on the part of railroads. I assume that that competition, if not destructive in the past, has at least been disastrous, but we have already commenced a policy of restraint to safeguard and to guarantee life to companies that undertake the navigation of our streams. What we have commenced we can and we ought to perfect.

With those two essentials the waterway which I have described would be the greatest inland waterway in the whole world. It would be many times longer than the Rhine. It traverses the most populous and the most productive region of the United States. Its entire cost of completion would aggregate only $7,000,000, less than half the cost of a battleship and only about one-third the cost of a fast battle cruiser. It would contribute, Mr. President, to the internal improvement—to the internal development of this country. It might be the cause or the instrumentality of preserving the prosperity of the great industrial centers in the Mississippi basin. I doubt if those industrial centers can maintain their standards of progress and of prosperity with the Panama Canal open to service, unless they obtain deep water to the sea. It is vital to their progress; it is vital to their prosperity.

I say, this inland waterway traverses the most populous, the most fruitful, the most productive region of the United States—the great Mississippi basin and through the entire State of New York from Lake Erie to the Hudson. It would contribute not only to the prosperity of these sections, but it would evidence the fact that in our rush to prepare for war we do not mean entirely to neglect preparation for peace.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have tendered relates only to the Illinois River from Utica to the Mississippi. That project carries only $50,000 in the pending bill. The engineers estimate that $1,050,000 will complete the work. Illinois has testified to her faith in the project by her action in authorizing the issuance of $5,000,000 of bonds for the completion of this project, and that expenditure will be of but slight service unless the United States shall join hands with the State and render the Illinois River navigable to the Mississippi.

In addition to this, we are improving the Mississippi from St. Louis to Minneapolis. The Hennepin Canal is already available from Hennepin, on the Illinois, to the mouth of Rock Creek on the Mississippi River and, if in real earnest we desire to promote inland navigation, there is no project in America more deserving of support than the one covered by the amendment which I have offered.

I believe that if you will select a few feasible projects and complete them and demonstrate their feasibility and their value to commerce, there will then be no complaint, there will then be no opposition to any real plan in the future for actual navigation; and if, upon completing the most promising projects, we are disappointed in our hopes, if they shall prove to be not feasible, if the coils of the railways have crushed them beyond all relief, let us ascertain that fact, let us arrive at a definite and a practical policy on which we can base our action intelligently for the future; abandoning a project if it be hopeless, and pursuing it vigorously to success if it be a practical project or if it renders a real return upon the investment. I am willing to vote reasonable appropriations to prepare for peace while others are voting such fabulous appropriations to prepare for war. Our permanent interest, our enduring glory must be found rather in the paths of peace than in the ways of war. I favor internal improvements; I favor real rational improvements. I desire the assurance that the people's money will be judiciously expended, that it will not be wasted, that it will be expended to promote the general welfare and will lay deep and broad the foundations of a more general and enduring prosperity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD, following my remarks, a letter from Gov. Dunne, of Illinois, upon this project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The letter referred to is as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Springfield, February 21, 1916.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 13th instant, containing Senate Document No. 230, being a response on the part of the Secretary of War to a resolution introduced by you in the Senate.

I have just read the document with much satisfaction. It discloses the important fact that if the State of Illinois be granted a permit to construct a waterway between Lockport and Utica at a depth of 8 feet, as provided for in the bill passed by the last legislature of our State, authorizing the issuance of $5,000,000 worth of bonds for that purpose, that there will be a navigable waterway from New York to New Orleans via the Erie Canal, the Great Lakes, the Illinois waterway, the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers, of at least 8 feet in depth, leaving only the section from Utica, Ill., to St. Louis, Mo., with a depth less than 8 feet. I note that the estimate for deepening this waterway from Utica to St. Louis is $4,760,000, and that this work can be completed within three years. It inevitably follows from this that the Secretary of War should grant a permit to the State of Illinois to build a waterway between Lockport and Utica at its own cost. If this be done and Congress appropriates $4,760,000 for the deepening of the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers between Utica and St. Louis, we will have a waterway from the Atlantic seaboard to the Gulf of at least 8 feet in depth over the whole of its course.

Senators LEWIS and SHERMAN of our State are enthusiastic for the granting of this permit, and I would respectfully suggest that you and other broad-minded Senators having this splendid proposition in view would unite in endeavoring to get the Secretary of War to grant this State the permit for which she has been asking since last July.

I congratulate you upon your interest in this great project. I think the completion of a waterway between New York and the Gulf, at this reasonable cost to the United States and the State of Illinois, one of the greatest projects for the development of this country that has been launched in many years.

Very truly, yours,

E. F. DUNNE.

HON. T. P. GORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator from Oklahoma submitted this amendment for the purpose of having an opportunity to make a very excellent speech, such a one as he always makes; but the amendment can not be considered in the face of objection, and I feel constrained to make the objection. It has never been referred to the Committee on Commerce. It was presented on the 9th of May and ordered to lie on the table and be printed. In addition to that, it has not been included in any estimate which has ever been made.

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator that there is an estimate in House Document 230.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. There is a plan provided for, probably, but the improvement never has been estimated for by the department.

Mr. GORE. I think the document contains an estimate.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. But the estimate is not contained in the Book of Estimates to which I have had access.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has an amendment to offer to strike out an amendment already inserted in the bill; and as it is the policy of the committee to have the bill completed as in Committee of the Whole, I move to reconsider the vote by which the item was adopted in order that the Senator from Wisconsin may make any motion in connection with it that he may see proper to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, let us understand what the amendment is.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I was going to make a statement about that. It is an amendment inserted in the bill at the instance of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], and is contained on page 31, lines 24 and 25 and several lines at the top of page 32. I notified the Senator at whose instance the amendment was adopted that it was the purpose of the Senator from Wisconsin to make a motion to strike it out. That notification was given to him this morning. I have made some inquiry as to his whereabouts since that time, but I understand he is not to be found readily. I do not know what that means, and I simply make the motion I do in order that the matter may receive such attention as the Senate sees proper to give it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was incorporated in the bill will be reconsidered. The question now recurs on the adoption of the amendment, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. On page 31, line 23, after the numerals "$55,000," the following amendment was inserted:

And the improvement of navigation of the Illinois River authorized by an act of the Illinois General Assembly, approved June 18, 1915, providing for an expenditure of $5,000,000 therefor by the State of Illinois, be, and is hereby, authorized in accordance with said act. The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby given power to fix reasonable charges and tolls for the use of and navigation upon the waterway created under said act of the general assembly of said State in all interstate transportation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to ask what Senator it was who submitted the amendment?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The amendment was offered in the Committee on Commerce by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I move to strike out the entire amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and just read by the Secretary. It includes the committee amendment as well as the additional amendment regarding the control of tolls by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I am constrained to believe, Mr. President, that if the Senate had understood the full import of this amendment proposed by the committee it would not have adopted it. I understand it was accepted by the committee without any discussion whatever, and without the presentation to the committee of the reports of the special board created by previous acts of Congress for the investigation of this important subject. It seems to have been offered in committee and adopted, as admitted by the senior Senator from Illinois when this subject was up earlier in the consideration of the bill, without any special consideration. When this subject was under discussion in the Senate the senior Senator from Illinois made certain statements which, without any intention upon his part, nevertheless, I am bound to say, were quite misleading.

It will be remembered by the Senate that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] proposed to strike out this amendment to the pending bill and submitted some reasons in support of his motion. He was unable to prevail upon the Senate to strike it out. In the course of the debate the senior Senator from Illinois said, among other things, the following:

Mr. President, before the Senator from Michigan concludes I will ask him if he knows that the War Department, acting through its engineers, has made no objection on the question of lowering the Lake levels; that their objection, speaking through the Chief of Engineers, was entirely on the question of the possibility of the State imposing an excessive freight charge, or toll, and on the ownership of the hydroelectric power to be developed by the waterfall? The objection was based on those considerations and not on the question of Lake levels. They have not raised that question.

Mr. President, there can be no fair understanding of the import of this important amendment in the pending bill without some statement of the history of the whole proceeding. The amendment provides:

And the improvement of navigation of the Illinois River, authorized by an act of the Illinois General Assembly, approved June 18, 1915, providing for an expenditure of $5,000,000 therefor by the State of Illinois be, and is hereby, authorized in accordance with said act.

That is the amendment which, with the provision as to the control of tolls added on motion of the Senator from Illinois at the time of the debate a few days ago, is the proposition which I propose should be stricken from the bill.

It is quite misleading to the Senate, Mr. President, to say that the proposed amendment does not involve the taking of any more water from the Great Lakes. Perhaps, as limited to the terms of the amendment adopted by the committee, that would be true, but as being the basis for further application to Congress as flowing directly from the consequences inevitable from the adoption of this amendment, it falls very far from covering the case.

In so far as the improvement of navigation of the Illinois River is concerned, the withdrawal of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second would be sufficient to provide all the water necessary for navigation purposes resulting from the improvement in question.

But, Mr. President, this proposition involves much more than that. It involves the withdrawing of the water from the Great Lakes for what are called sanitary purposes in connection with the Chicago Drainage Canal, and it involves the withdrawing of larger amounts of water from the Great Lakes for water-power purposes, which are also wrapped up in the legislative act which would be approved by the adoption of this amendment. If Congress approves the scheme for which the act of the Illinois General Assembly provides, and to the approval of which, by its terms, this amendment commits Congress, it will involve the withdrawal from Lake Michigan of a vast amount of water, far beyond the navigation requirements of the proposed waterway, and far beyond the requirements for flushing of the river for sanitary purposes. It will involve the withdrawal of the water from the Great Lakes for water-power purposes in the interests of this particular State. It is a very innocent-appearing amendment, but its adoption will commit Congress to a scheme that ultimately and logically will be made the basis of the withdrawal of vast quantities of water from the Great Lakes, which will so interfere with the commerce of those lakes that it will entail upon the Federal Government the expenditure of enormous sums of money to erect compensating

works and to dredge the harbors and the entrances to the harbors over the entire Great Lakes region so as to meet the needs of commerce by restoring a proper depth of water. It will involve this Government in serious complications with Great Britain, because of treaty provisions which exist with Great Britain respecting the use of the waters of the Great Lakes.

If Congress sanctions any scheme of withdrawal of waters from the lakes for water-power purposes, it will at once violate the provisions of the treaty which has been entered into with Great Britain regarding the use of the boundary waters of the lakes common to the two Governments.

In 1899 the city of Chicago, having planned for a canal that would flush the Illinois River and carry off the sewage of that city, applied to the War Department for authority to withdraw from the Great Lakes at that particular point some 5,000 cubic feet of water per second. As I remember now, Mr. Alger was Secretary of War at the time. He granted permission for the withdrawal of 5,000 cubic feet of water per second for the purpose of flushing this canal to take care of the sewage of Chicago through the Illinois River. Subsequently it was found that the withdrawal of that amount of water seriously interfered with navigation, seriously interfered with the tonnage which the boats plying on the Great Lakes could carry and make the harbors of the Lakes, and Secretary Root, I believe, if I remember correctly, reduced to 250,000 cubic feet per minute the amount of water which the State of Illinois was permitted to use through this canal.

In order to set before the Senate the difficulties and the controversies which have arisen between the State of Illinois and the Federal Government, I think I can not do better than to read a memorandum recently made by Gen. Black, Chief of Engineers, to the present Secretary of War upon this subject. It is dated May 13, 1916. I will ask the indulgence of the Senate while I read the entire memorandum, because it bears so directly and so pertinently upon my pending amendment and for the further reason that there can be no proper understanding of this proposition without a knowledge of the history of the efforts of Chicago and Illinois to divert the waters of Lake Michigan.

Gen. Black, in his memorandum, gives a brief history of the matter involved in the pending amendment. He said:

The Chicago Drainage Canal was built under authority of the State of Illinois for sanitary purposes, and has never had the sanction of Congress. When completed in 1899, application was made to the War Department for permission to connect the canal with the south branch of the Chicago River, thereby reversing the flow of the stream which originally flowed into Lake Michigan, and diverting the waters thereof into the drainage canal. A conditional permit was granted May 8, 1899, in which the diversion was limited to 5,000 cubic feet per second. Subsequently on complaint of navigation interests the permit was modified, and on December 5, 1901, the Secretary of War fixed the amount of water allowed to be diverted at 250,000 cubic feet per minute, or 4,167 second-feet, which is now the legal limit.

From the beginning the operations of the sanitary district of Chicago have been looked upon with disfavor by navigation interests, and questions connected therewith have been constantly before the department. The reversal of the flow of Chicago River and the drawing of water into the drainage canal affects navigation seriously on account of the tendency to lower the levels of the Great Lakes, and also for the reason that current velocities in the river and its branches are materially increased. These injurious effects were clearly foreseen by the department, and hence the diversion has been restricted to the amount stated, and the Secretary of War has not only declined to increase the amount, but has consistently adhered to the position that the permit granted was to be considered of a temporary character, and that any permanent diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan into another watershed required congressional authorization.

Notwithstanding this well-understood attitude, the sanitary district has persistently sought to secure from the department permission to abstract larger and additional amounts of water. In 1907 application was made for permission to take an additional 4,000 second-feet through the Calumet River, and after careful and thorough consideration the Secretary of War denied the application, referring again to the desirability of submitting the matter to Congress.

In 1912 the matter came before the department again on an application for permission to divert from Lake Michigan into the drainage canal 10,000 cubic feet of water per second. A public hearing was held by the Secretary of War for consideration and discussion of the questions connected with this proposition. At this hearing opposition to the application was made by representatives of 23 cities and 6 States interested in the commerce of the Great Lakes and the harbors thereon; by navigation interests on Chicago River, and by representatives of the Dominion Government and of the cities of Kingston and Montreal, as well as private navigation interests. The subject was most exhaustively considered, and on January 8, 1913, the Secretary of War rendered a decision adverse to the applicants, in which he held:

1. That the diversion of 10,000 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan would substantially interfere with the navigable capacity of the navigable waters in the Great Lakes and their connecting rivers.

2. That it would not be appropriate for the department to permit such a diversion without express congressional sanction.

3. That the provisions of the existing boundary waters treaty between Great Britain and the United States offer a further reason why no administrative officer should authorize a further diversion, manifestly so injurious to the interests of Canada.

Although the Secretary of War has fixed the limit of permitted diversion of 4,167 second-feet, and has repeatedly refused to grant any increase, it is known that the sanitary district has for many years been withdrawing a much larger amount of water. In fact, while this State organization has been prayerful as well as persistent in its application to the department, it has shown little regard for the decisions of the Secretary of War when rendered. Soon after the application of 1907 was denied the trustees of the sanitary district passed an order declaring the intention of reversing the flow of the Calumet River and withdrawing through it an additional 4,000 cubic feet of water, without the authority of the Secretary of War, unless prevented by injunction from so doing. Accordingly, in March, 1908, the Attorney General, at the instance of this department, sued out a bill of injunction restraining the sanitary district from reversing the flow of the river and from withdrawing water from Lake Michigan in a different way and in larger amount than was authorized by the Secretary of War. Again, in 1913, when the Secretary of War decided adversely to the application for permission to take 10,000 cubic feet of water, the sanitary district refused to conform to the decision, and another bill of injunction was filed by the Attorney General in October, 1913. These two suits were consolidated, voluminous testimony was taken, and the case, which has been ably argued, is now awaiting decision in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

It has been shown that since 1910 the average daily flow through the Chicago River into this canal has been in excess of 7,000 cubic feet per second, and measurements taken by the United States Lake Survey indicate discharges in excess of 8,000 cubic feet per second, or practically doube the amount allowable under the permit of the Secretary of War. This represents a daily average withdrawal from Lake Michigan of more than 690,000,000 cubic feet, which is about equal to the entire low-water flow of the Mississippi River at St. Paul; and, by way of further comparison, it may be added that the low-water flow of the Mississippi River at Keokuk, where the large power plant of the Mississippi River Power Co. is located and operated, is only about twice as great as that now abstracted from Lake Michigan into this drainage canal. The continuous withdrawal of this volume of water will result in the permanent lowering of the surface of Lakes Michigan and Huron to the extent of 5 inches or more and of Lake Erie to nearly the same extent. That the State authorities contemplate a still greater diversion, 10,000 second-feet or more, hardly admits of doubt. The calculations of the United States Lake Survey, based upon observations covering a period of 46 years, indicate that the withdrawal of 10,000 second-feet would lower Lakes Michigan and Huron 6.9 inches, Lake Erie 5.4 inches, and Lake Ontario 4.5 inches at mean lake levels, the reduction being much greater at low-water periods.

To lower the water surface 6 inches would reduce the permissible load of one of the large modern vessels by from 300 to 550 tons, and the International Waterways Commission has estimated that the loss to navigation interests would amount to $1,500,000 per annum. Moreover, there are more than 100 works of river and harbor improvement on the Great Lakes and their connecting waters, for which appropriations aggregating more than $90,000,000 have been made. The application of this vast sum has resulted in securing specified widths and depths of channel, and to diminish these depths, even to a slight extent, will not only prove a serious injury to traffic but will undo the work that has been accomplished and necessitate the expenditure of further large sums of money for restoration. It would seem that any project that tends to reverse or annul the orders of Congress as expressed in the various acts appropriating funds for improving the harbors and channels connecting with the Great Lakes should meet the disfavor of the War Department, unless it has been sanctioned and authorized by that body.

W. M. BLACK,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

Mr. President, I am constrained to comment here upon the fact stated by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] that the amendment which he proposed to this bill in committee was made without any discussion and without the presentation of any of these facts before the committee. It is but an indication, Mr. President, of how loosely river and harbor bills are prepared. The small attendance in the Senate Chamber at this particular time is a further indication of the lack of interest on the part of a majority of the Members of this body in a proposition which, as shown by all the authority upon which we act in regard to river and harbor improvements, menaces the interests of commerce in the interest of a State, not for the purposes of navigation but for the purposes of building up a water-power proposition which shall be made profitable to that State and to interests that can secure the benefit of this improvement because of their location within the State.

The act of the Illinois Legislature which this amendment would approve reads in its title:

An act to provide for the construction of a deep waterway or canal, to be known as the Illinois Waterway, from the water-power plant of the sanitary district of Chicago, at or near Lockport, in Will County, Ill., to a point in the Illinois River at or near Utica, in La Salle County, Ill., to provide for the issuance of bonds to pay for said deep waterway, to provide for the development and utilization of water power that may be generated from the water flowing through said waterway, to create a commission to be known as the Illinois Waterway Commission, and to make an appropriation to carry out the provisions of this act.

And in the first section of this law, after again describing the location of this waterway, the act contains this language:

And that there shall be erected, equipped, and maintained by the State of Illinois power plants, locks, bridges, dams, and appliances sufficient and suitable for the development and utilization of the water power of said waterway or canal.

Paragraph 9 of section 3 of the act of the Illinois Legislature contains the following:

The State of Illinois shall be liable for all damages to real estate or other property which shall be damaged by overflow or otherwise damaged by reason of the construction, enlargement, use of any channel, ditch, drain, outlet, embankment, wall, dam, crib, or other improvement or structure of that kind made under the provisions of this act.

But nowhere in the act is there any provision for the payments of damages which may be caused by the diversion of water from Lake Michigan. The act provides that the Illinois Waterway Commission shall collect tolls for the use of the said waterway, but is generous in that it provides for the free use of said waterway for the goods of and persons employed by the United States Government.

When the waterway is paid for and all the bonds which have been issued to pay for it have been paid, either out of earnings of the waterway or by the State of Illinois, then the channel which the act authorizes is to be turned over to the Government of the United States for navigation uses—

conditioned upon the proposition or agreement of said Government to maintain the channel as a waterway free from tolls for navigation and to operate and maintain the locks free of cost to the State of Illinois for all uses other than navigation, the channel and its appurtenances shall be and forever remain the property of the State of Illinois.

The mere quotation of these clauses from the Illinois statute is sufficient to demonstrate that the principal object of the State of Illinois in undertaking this improvement is not to create a navigable waterway, but is to create a great water power upon a navigable stream.

The public interest involved in this waterway is not alone that of the people of the State of Illinois or of those who reside along the banks of this river or who may be engaged in manufacturing upon the river.

It is so peculiarly situated that this waterway has an influence upon and may affect the well-being and the business of peoples situated along the whole chain of Great Lakes.

For a great number of years there has been public discussion as to the effect of the diversion of the water of the Lakes through the Chicago Drainage Canal. The water coming from Lake Michigan passes through the Chicago River, down through the canal, and finally finds its way into the Illinois River, and will be a part of the waterway which it is proposed to build under the act of the Illinois Legislature and which is authorized by the pending amendment.

When the diversion of water from Lake Michigan was first suggested it was for the purpose of cleansing the Chicago River. That river emptied into Lake Michigan and was an open sewer for the city of Chicago. By the creation of the drainage canal the course and the character of the river was changed, and instead of the river emptying into Lake Michigan it was made to empty into the waters of the Des Plaines River.

I fear, Mr. President, and there is good ground for such fear, that the sanction which this amendment gives to the development of the Illinois River will be made the ground for future action by Congress or by the War Department, which will authorize the diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan to this waterway to an extent greater than is now permitted and greater than the necessities of navigation would justify.

The Senate should appreciate the probable effects of this amendment. The report accompanying the bill discusses the improvement by the United States of the Illinois River from La Salle to its mouth at Grafton, but is silent with respect to the purposes and possible effects of the improvement to be made by the State of Illinois and to which improvement this amendment commits the Federal Government.

In 1909 there was introduced in the General Assembly of Illinois a bill to authorize the construction of a waterway from Lockport to Utica, Ill., and in the title of this bill, among other things, it is stated that its purpose is the—

development and utilization of the water power that may be created from the water flowing through said waterway.

That bill proposed that the State of Illinois should expend $20,000,000 in the creation of this waterway.

The river and harbor act approved June 25, 1910, authorized the Secretary of War to appoint a board of five members, and prescribed that such board shall report, among other things, upon the feasibility of the Illinois waterway, and also upon—

such measures as may be required to properly preserve the levels of the Great Lakes and to compensate, so far as practical, for the diminished levels in said lakes and of connecting waters thereof by reason of any diversion of water from Lake Michigan for the maintenance of the proposed waterway herein described, or diversion for any other purpose.

It further proposed—

that the report shall state the extent and character of the cooperation recommended and of the conditions considered necessary in connection therewith to fully protect the interests of the United States.

The board which made this investigation was composed of W. H. Bixby, brigadier general, Chief of Engineers, United States Army; C. MacD. Townsend, colonel, Corps of Engineers; C. Kelly, major, Corps of Engineers; J. B. Kavenaugh, major, Corps of Engineers; and John Boger, civil engineer.

This board filed its preliminary report November 1, 1910.

Under date of January 23, 1911, this board made another report and upon the subject of the conditions necessary in connection with cooperation between the United States and the State of Illinois to fully protect the interests of the United States, the report has to say:

A primary condition of that cooperation between the United States and the State of Illinois should be the exceptance in perpetuity of full responsibility for the State of Illinois or its agents for all damages by changes in lake levels, including cost of compensating works and for all damages to riparian owners, and the State should transfer to the United States the locks and the control of the waterway thus created so far as needed by navigation.

From this same report I also quote another paragraph as throwing light upon the real purposes behind the pending amendment.

This report further says:

By virtue of the act of Congress of March 30, 1822, dedicating to the State of Illinois the land necessary for a canal connecting the Illinois River with Lake Michigan, and the act of March 2, 1827, granting to the State certain public lands for the purpose of aiding in its construction, and the acceptance by the State of the conditions imposed therein, the State of Illinois obligated itself to construct a suitable waterway from Lake Michigan to the navigable waters of the Illinois River. In accordance with this agreement the State constructed the Illinois and Michigan Canal, from Bridgeport to La Salle, and improved the Illinois River by the construction of locks and dams at Henry and Copperas Creek.

For many years this waterway was a valuable route, but in recent years the State has neglected it and failed to maintain it abreast of the needs of commerce. The work now proposed by the State in connection with the canal of the Chicago sanitary district contemplates a waterway from Lake Michigan to Utica, which, although departing from the line of the old canal, substitutes a waterway more than sufficient for any probable navigation. This will, in effect, fulfill the original agreement between the State and General Government for this section and incidentally develop a water power which the State considers a profitable business investment. State or local agencies are better adapted than the General Government for conserving water power for their citizens.

The board believes that the State is more generous in its provisions for navigations than necessity requires, that the locks it proposes are larger than will be utilized, and that its original agreement would be amply fulfilled if it constructed locks 600 by 80 by 11 feet, and required at each lock ground sufficient for an additional lock should it ever be required, but it is also of the opinion that the State should be permitted to expend its own funds in such manner as it deems proper. With locks of the dimensions suggested by the board the $20,000,000 authorized to be appropriated by the State should complete this part of the waterway, and unless large expenditures are required for power rights even the larger locks could be constructed for that amount.

The report of this special board was submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and on January 30, 1911, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors indorsed upon this report its views. It did not concur with the special board that the United States should assume any of the cost of this waterway in excess of the $20,000,000 which the State of Illinois proposed to spend, and added these significant words:

Moreover, it suggests that the amount of diversion to be permitted from Lake Michigan should be determined, if practicable, before the project is undertaken. Not only may this affect the attitude of the State toward the work, but also when the approximate minimum flow is known, it may be found advisable to substitute open-channel work for the four existing locks and dams that are retained in the plan of the special board.

It is understood that the sanitary district of Chicago and the State expect to develop considerable water power on that portion of the waterway between Chicago and Utica. As it is proposed that the navigable channel between these points shall be built without cost to the United States, it is believed that the General Government should relinquish to those local agencies any right that they may have in the power to be thus developed.

So the Board of Engineers recognized the danger to the Lake levels by the diversion of water, and counsels that before this waterway shall be permitted to be built that the amount of water to be diverted from Lake Michigan shall be determined.

The amount of water to be diverted from Lake Michigan has not been determined. Congress has not acted with respect to that subject. The War Department in 1901 did act. It acted under authority contained in the river and harbor act of March 3, 1899. The Secretary of War granted a temporary permit, under which there was authorized a diversion of 250,000 cubic feet of water per minute, or about 4,167 cubic feet of water per second. The Secretary of War at that time felt so uncertain as to the effect which this diversion would have upon the levels of the Lakes and the commerce of the Lakes that he did not give a permanent permit.

The permit was temporary in character. It is still a temporary permit. Its terms have been violated by the sanitary district of Chicago, and instead of confining the diversion to the amount therein authorized, according to the Board of Engineers, there has been diverted water to the amount of more than 7,000 cubic feet per second.

The Illinois bill of 1909 proposed a 24-foot waterway. In the final report of the board that investigated it is stated that if the waterway was to be used by vessels capable of navigating

the ocean and the Great Lakes it should have a depth of not less than 24 feet, and if it was to be used for river traffic—

navigation does not require its depth to exceed 9 feet. A depth of 14 feet, which has been frequently urged for this waterway, is greater than is necessary for river navigation and entirely insufficient for either lake or ocean vessels.

The final report of the special board of engineers on the waterway from Lockport to Utica, Ill., was made under date of August 15, 1913. That report contains some interesting data with respect to the effect of the Illinois waterway upon lake levels.

The report is contained in House Document No. 762, Sixty-third Congress, second session. I quote the following:

It is therefore evident that when the Lakes stand at mean lake level a diversion of 10,000 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan through the Chicago drainage canal will ultimately produce a lowering of the water surface of Lakes Michigan and Huron and its connecting harbors and channels of 0.465 feet (5.58 inches), of Lake Erie of 0.448 feet (5.58 inches), and of Lake Ontario of 0.431 feet (5.16 inches); at lower stages the effect will be greater, due to the relatively smaller area of the cross section of the outlets.

The largest lake freighters recently built carry over 80 short tons of freight for each inch of loaded craft, and an uncompensated Chicago diversion of 10,000 second-feet would cause a loss to each vessel of at least 446 tons in carrying capacity for each down trip through the channels connecting with Lakes Michigan and Huron. This, based upon 25 trips per season, with vessels returning light, means a loss of at least 11,150 tons per year, and at a freight rate of 55 cents per ton represents a monetary loss of at least $6,000 per large vessel per year. During the season of 1912 there passed through the locks at Sault Ste. Marie over 72,000,000 tons of freight, the greater part of which was carried in vessels of such size as to be affected by any loss of depth caused by a Chicago diversion. The tonnage of 1913 bids fair to exceed the tonnage of 1912. The lowest estimate of the loss to American vessels alone that has been brought to the attention of the board is over $1,000,000 per annum, and the loss will increase with the increase in the number and size of vessels.

It is evident therefore that any diversion with consequent lowering of lake levels will cause a direct financial loss to vessel owners, and such a loss can be prevented only by the adoption of remedial measures.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors considered this final report of the special board and submitted its report thereon under date of December 16, 1913, and the Board of Engineers in 1913 reiterated and emphasized the recommendations made in 1911. It says:

The special board states that a primary condition of any cooperation between the United States and the State of Illinois should be the acceptance in perpetuity of full responsibility by the State of Illinois or its agencies for all damages by changes in lake levels, including cost of compensating works, and for all damages to riparian owners; and the State should transfer to the United States the locks and the control of the new waterway thus created, so far as needed by navigation, and the locks and dams at Henry and Copperas Creek, on the Illinois River.

Again evidently impressed with the need of preserving the lake levels, the Board of Engineers say:

The investigations and studies of the special board show that the diversion of water from the lakes lowers the levels progressively in proportion to the amount so diverted, the full effect not being observable for some time, and that for the 10,000 second-feet diverted through the Chicago Drainage Canal at mean lake level the water surface will be lowered to Lakes Huron and Michigan 0.465 foot; in Lake Erie, 0.448 foot; in Lake Ontario, 0.431 foot. Such lowering would materially affect the carrying capacity of the large freight vessels, estimated at 88 tons per inch of draft, and would cause a loss on American vessels alone, at the lowest estimate, of $1,000,000 per annum.

Three methods for compensating such diversion have been considered by the special board: (1) By the construction of submerged weirs with arbitrarily controllable sluices at the lower ends of the Lakes; (2) by reducing the area of the natural outlets by the construction of fixed contraction works therein; (3) by dredging harbors and connecting channels. The investigations of the board show with certainty the result of diversion of water through a new outlet is a lowering of Lake levels. The effect of the great storage capacity of the Lakes and of the natural fluctuations of level due to natural causes, such as the varying amount of rainfall and the varying amount and direction of wind pressures, is such that the absolute level at a given time at any given place can not be predicted, and human wisdom is inadequate to regulate a variation of discharge through the outlet in such a manner as to produce a definite desired result. Method No. 1 therefore must be classed as impracticable. Compensation by dredging is practicable, but on account of the extensive areas involved this method would be unduly costly. Of the three methods, the second only is therefore favorably considered. The special board proposes to hold up the level of Lake Erie by the construction of three submerged weirs in Niagara River, at an estimated cost of $150,000, and that of Lakes Michigan and Huron by submerged weirs in St. Clair River, at an estimated cost of $325,000, the total for compensating works being $475,000, with $15,000 annually for maintenance.

After reviewing the finding of the special board, the Board of Engineers, evidently fearful that the United States by cooperation with the State of Illinois, unless such cooperation was thoroughly safeguarded, would lose its right of control of this waterway, uses this significant language:

It is the distinct recommendation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors that the term "control of the new waterway thus created, so far as needed for navigation," shall be interpreted to include such control of the use of water for power purposes as shall be necessary to insure the conditions of flow required for navigation. Further, the board believes that the total volume of water to be diverted from the natural discharge channels of the lakes should be definitely fixed by Congress; that a project, with estimate of cost, for works necessary to compensate for such diversion should be prepared to the satisfaction of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War; that before any diversion is made beyond that at present existing, the State of Illinois shall transfer to the Secretary of War the funds necessary for such works as given by the approved estimate of cost; that the works shall be built by the United States with the funds so provided; and that the control and the maintenance of such works shall be in and at the cost of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have heretofore taken some little interest in this proposition, but do not claim to be familiar with its details. I will ask the Senator if the amount of water diverted from the lakes up to the present time has sensibly reduced the level of the lakes?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It has, Mr. President; and as is disclosed by Gen. Black's memorandum to the Secretary of War is the subject of litigation between the Government and the State of Illinois. The Federal Government started the proceeding for the protection of the commerce of the Great Lakes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was further intending to ask the Senator—and I ask these questions merely for information—whether or not the Canadian Government has ever raised an objection to the diversion of the water?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It has, Mr. President; and there are great, big questions—questions involving commerce of millions upon millions in value, questions involving international relations—back of a proposition placed in this bill in committee, without discussion, and approved by the Senate with very little discussion of its real merits.

Mr. GALLINGER. One further question, if the Senator pleases: We have an International Boundary Commission. Had the commission jurisdiction at all over this matter? Has it ever taken the question under consideration?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not able to answer that question.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. NELSON. We have a Waterway Commission, created under the treaty between our country, England, and Canada, of which Mr. Tawney, of our State, is a member. They have jurisdiction over these international waters.

Mr. GALLINGER. Over all matters affecting boundary disputes?

Mr. NELSON. Over all matters affecting the boundary waters of the country. They have jurisdiction over them. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I do not believe the Senator from Wisconsin wants to be understood as broadly as his naked statement would indicate. The Committee on Commerce have not included in this bill any item that has not received very considerable attention, nor have we overlooked the War Department in recommending the item as it now appears. In support of that suggestion I want the Secretary to read the letter that has been received from the Secretary of War, in which he says that congressional action on this subject is desirable.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; but, Mr. President——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Let the Secretary read the letter, please.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think I have a copy of that letter in my hand; and when the letter is read it will be observed that the Secretary of War proposes that if any such provision as is found in this bill should be adopted, there should be added provisions qualifying the indorsement by the Federal Government of this legislation on the part of the State of Illinois.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Let the Secretary read the letter, and that will be the committee's statement in support of its action.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If my proposition to strike out this provision should be voted down, then I propose to offer the recommendations of the Secretary of War contained in what I am led to believe is the letter which the Senator from Arkansas has sent to the desk.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. All of it has now been incorporated in the amendment except one proviso.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall have an amendment to offer to the pending committee proposition if my motion to strike it out should fail.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. May I ask the Senator from Idaho to suspend until the letter can be read? It is only a page or two.

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as suggested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 23, 1916.

Hon. JAMES P. CLARKE,
Chairman Committee on Commerce, United States Senate.

SIR: Referring to the action of the Senate of May 22 regarding the improvement of the Illinois River, as given in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I beg to state that while I think congressional action in this matter is highly desirable it is very important in the general interests of navigation, especially of those depending on the maintenance of the levels of the Great Lakes, that in addition to the proviso which was discussed yesterday, namely:

"The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby given power to fix reasonable charges and tolls for the use of and navigation upon the waterway created under said act of the general assembly of said State in all interstate transportation"—

certain additional provisos be added to the item, as follows:

"*Provided*, That the improvement may be made in general accordance with the plans heretofore submitted to the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, and subject to their approval, or on such modified plans as may be approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That the waterway shall be completed and open for navigation before any of the water now being, or hereafter to be, diverted from Lake Michigan shall be used for the development of power: *Provided further*, That the navigation features of the waterway and its appurtenances shall be operated and maintained in a manner satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, and any repairs or maintenance work that may be directed by the Secretary of War on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers shall be made within the time specified by him: *Provided further*, That when, under the terms of the act of the State of Illinois, the waterway shall be transferred to the United States for navigation purposes, the United States shall be given a clear title to such land as may be occupied by or used in connection with the locks and various appurtenances necessary for the operation of the waterway for navigation, together with all structures thereon: *Provided further*, That the amount of water to be diverted from Lake Michigan through this system of waterways shall never exceed the rate of 250,000 cubic feet per minute: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to prejudice or affect any rights the United States may have in the Illinois and Michigan Canal, or lands appurtenant thereto, or in any claims against the State of Illinois arising out of any failure upon the part of the State to maintain said canal as a navigable waterway."

It is true that consideration is being had by this department on an application by the State of Illinois for a War Department permit for this project. Decision in the matter has been delayed awaiting the receipt of certain papers relating to the case which had been promised to me, only part of which have as yet been received. At a hearing given to the governor of Illinois and other interested parties on the 15th instant all of these additional provisos recommended above for insertion were read to the applicants, who stated that so far as the interests of the waterway itself were concerned they were unobjectionable.

I would recommend that the item relating to the Illinois River improvement be amended by the insertion of these provisos.

Very respectfully,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, every one of the provisos indicated in that communication has been added to the pending amendment except the one which limits to 250,000 cubic feet per minute the amount of water which may be diverted. That has not been included.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as the committee amendment reads at present I do not find that any of the proposals of the Secretary of War has been added, aside from the one which suggests that the rates on interstate traffic through this canal shall be controlled by the Interstate Commerce Commission; and that provision would have become operative under the law without its enactment here.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That is an inadvertence, or else the Senator did not call for the reading of the amendment as it was amended here from the floor. These provisos did not appear in the amendment reported out of the committee. They were added on the floor, after the bill had been reported back; and they are part of the amendment now, except the one with reference to the limitation to 250,000 cubic feet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that he has before him the official copy, from which it appears that the amendments now stand as mentioned by the Senator from Arkansas. The amendments recommended in the letter appear to have been adopted, with the exception of the following:

That the amount of water to be diverted from Lake Michigan through this system of waterways shall never exceed the rate of 250,000 cubic feet per minute.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, that is the most important proposition which the Secretary of War makes, as appears from the memorandum of Gen. Black, which I read. The fact remains, Mr. President, that this committee adopted the suggestion of a member of the committee, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], as he had stated on the floor of the Senate, without having before it the suggestions of the Secretary of War contained in the letter just read from the desk. These suggestions were transmitted under date of May 23, and this bill was reported from the committee May 5. So the senior Senator from Illinois, as a member of this committee, put upon this bill a proposition giving authority to the State of Illinois to undertake this improvement without consideration of any of the provisions which the investigations, conducted at tremendous expense by the Federal Government, beginning away back in 1910, and bearing upon this whole proposition, had shown to be necessary, and many of which were embodied in the letter of the Secretary of War written to the chairman of the committee It was on the 22d day of May that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] rose in his place on this floor and attacked this amendment. It appears now that the letter of the Secretary of War came as a result of the attack made on this amendment upon the floor and resulted in the adoption of a portion of the suggestions made by the Secretary of War. But the recommendation of the Secretary which is of most vital importance was not adopted. That recommendation is that the amount of water which shall be diverted through this system of waterways shall never exceed 250,000 cubic feet per minute.

Now, I should like to have the Senate keep in mind these three propositions: So far as navigation is concerned, 1,000 cubic feet per second is all that this improvement ever will require, according to the judgment of the engineers who have investigated it from time to time; 10,000 cubic feet is desired by the city of Chicago for the purpose of taking care of its sewage. How much more will be necessary in order to make this waterway a commercial proposition as a water-power scheme remains to be developed. But I want the Senate to remember that by the very terms of the act of the Illinois Legislature which it is proposed here to ratify, it provides for the development of a water power. If we blindly commit this Government to an approval of the legislation adopted by the Illinois General Assembly, we shall be called upon in the future to furnish a quantity of water sufficient to insure a return upon the millions that the State of Illinois proposes to invest under that act for water-power purposes.

But what I protest against, Mr. President, is that this innocent-looking proposition in this bill in a few lines commits Congress to an indorsement of an act of the legislature, the provisions of which not one member of this body, I venture to say, outside of the Senators from Illinois know, and it will commit Congress to furnishing water to supply the great scheme of development which it is proposed that we shall authorize and indorse in this legislation.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if the act of the Legislature of Illinois referred to in this proposed amendment covers the other projects, such as sanitation and water power?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No, Mr. President; it does not deal with sanitation at all, except by referring to the fact that there is an improvement there for sanitary purposes; but it is, first and last, a water-power proposition. That is what it is. Of course, it throws over all of it the usual suggestion that it is in the interest of navigation, but, mark you, and I should like to have Senators keep this in mind, the boards that have investigated this from time to time in the last six years say that only a thousand cubic feet per second are necessary for the purpose of navigation.

There has been a constant struggle between the War Department and the State of Illinois to prevent the taking of water through the drainage canal in excess of the amount that navigation requires for the purpose of flushing the Illinois River for the sewage of Chicago.

Mr. President, it may be that it will afford the city of Chicago a cheaper means of disposing of its sewage to drain the Great Lakes to flush the Chicago River, but we can not do that except at the expense of commerce, and at the expense of the commerce of this country. Is it right that we should impose, as the reports of the engineers say it will impose, a loss of at least a million dollars a year upon the carrying capacity of the vessels that ply the Great Lakes if we permit the increase in the flowage from the Lakes which is demanded by the city of Chicago for what they call sanitary purposes?

The other cities on the Great Lakes are not calling upon the General Government to aid in the solution of their sewage-disposal problems. The city of Milwaukee at a very large expense, running to something like $15,000,000, is providing a great intercepting sewage system and a sewage-disposal plant. The city of Cleveland is solving this problem in a similar way.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the Senator from Wisconsin permit me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from New Hampshire, I think, asked the Senator from Wisconsin if the International

Boundary Commission did not have jurisdiction over this subject matter. My recollection was at the time the question was asked, and is now confirmed by the treaty itself, that except so far as the waters of Lake Michigan pass into international boundary waters the commission has no jurisdiction because Lake Michigan is not an international water. In so far as the waters from Lake Michigan pass into the international channel or boundary waters the commission has jurisdiction and not otherwise. So, it becomes all the more important that Congress itself should take jurisdiction of a question so threatening as is the question raised by the Senator from Illinois by his amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I quite agree with the Senator from Michigan. It is, I understand, true that the treaty with Great Britain provides that water may be used from these Lakes for sanitary purposes, and it therefore becomes a question of domestic policy on the part of the Government as to whether we will undertake to draw from these Lakes water for the purpose of taking care of the sewage of the cities bordering upon the Lakes to the extent of seriously interfering with the commerce of the Lakes.

I am not aware that there is any other great plan which does so interfere as does this Chicago plan, but I am certain from all of the investigation that has been made that the taking of more than 250,000 cubic feet of water per minute from the Lakes will result in such a lowering of the lake levels as will cost those who are operating vessels upon the Lakes something like a million five hundred thousand dollars a year through compelling them to load lighter in order to get into the harbors and alongside the piers and docks.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. It might serve to limit the disputed questions in the proposition offered by the Senator from Wisconsin for me to say that I shall offer to include in the amendment the proviso that was omitted, including the limitation suggested by the War Department. So the Senator may discuss it as if that proviso was in the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. For 250,000 feet?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Whatever it says, 250,000 cubic feet per minute. The Senator has the letter before him?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We will put that proviso in the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think it will serve to shorten this discussion considerably, and with that assurance from the chairman of the committee I will simply offer that as an amendment to the bill as amended and will discontinue discussing this matter any further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add to the proviso already agreed to the following:

Provided further, That the amount of water to be diverted from Lake Michigan through this system of waterways shall never exceed the rate of 250,000 cubic feet per minute.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. With that amendment added to the amendment already adopted, which, as I understand, fully complies with the suggestion that comes from the War Department, I am disposed to withhold any further suggestion which I had intended to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the amendment is not in order at this time.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Why not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is to adopt the amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The vote was reconsidered, and it is now open.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then I may offer that as an amendment to the pending committee amendment, may I not?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The amendment is open to further amendment. The proposition is to adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would rule that the Senator may offer his amendment as an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That is right.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I so offer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to state that it will be quite inappropriate there. Its proper place is in the part of the amendment which was subsequently adopted and which is not embraced in the motion to reconsider.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted. We can get at it that way.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That would open the whole matter.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas moves to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted appearing in the bill at page 32, after line 2, and after the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The amendment offered by the Senator which includes the omitted proviso has not yet been adopted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offer the entire proposition that the War Department sent down.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That is all right. I withdraw, then, that part of the amendment offered by myself heretofore. As the Senator from Wisconsin says he has included all the amendments recommended by the Secretary of War——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. So it appears as an entire amendment. I withdraw the amendment, the vote upon which has just been reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin in lieu of the Senate amendment, the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, and the amendment the vote on which has just been reconsidered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Pending the adoption of this amendment, I ask leave to add to what I have said the remaining portion of this communication addressed by Gen. Black to the Secretary of War, also a letter which I have received from the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, and in addition to that I will ask leave to incorporate in my remarks certain extracts from reports made upon this subject heretofore. It will save the time of the Senate not to read these, and the facts there stated will be of value to the committee of conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The letter of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee is as follows:

MERCHANTS AND MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Milwaukee, May 26, 1916.

Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your telegram regarding the amendment to the rivers and harbors bill was duly received. We thank you for the interest manifested.

The colossal diversion of lake waters into the Chicago Drainage Canal is becoming a serious menace to the commerce of the Great Lakes. You no doubt have access to all the reports, hearings, etc., etc., on the subject. Having made a study of the subject for the past 10 years, I may be permitted to present to you a historic outline of this controversy, and, at the same time, submit to you some of the views we entertain and the conclusions to which we hold.

Historic outline: In 1899 Secretary of War Russell A. Alger granted a permission to the sanitary district of Chicago to divert 300,000 cubic feet per minute of Lake water into the drainage canal, conditional, however, upon any evil effects that such diversion would have on the levels of the Great Lakes. In 1901 Hon. Elihu Root, then Secretary of War, reduced the grant to 250,000 cubic feet per minute.

Thereafter petitions made by the drainage canal authorities for an increased flow of water into the canal were denied by Secretaries William H. Taft and Henry L. Stimson. A petition filed early this year by the State of Illinois, permitting the extension of the canal, was denied by Secretary Garrison, ostensibly on legal grounds, but also because it involved a greater diversion of the lake waters.

Almost since the opening of the drainage canal more than 600,000 cubic feet, or more than double the amount originally granted, have been taken out.

Two years ago the United States Government brought an action against the drainage board seeking to enjoin them from taking the excess of 250,000 cubic feet per minute. The case is still pending in the Federal court at Chicago.

Lake levels and Lake commerce: The real issue hinges upon the question whether the illegal diversion of Lake waters really reduces the levels of the Lakes and whether the commerce of the Lakes is injured thereby. The answer to these questions is most decidedly in the affirmative.

The report of the International Waterways Commission, the reports made by Gen. Bixby, former Chief of the United States Corps of Engineers, Secretary Henry L. Stimson, the evidence brought out at the hearing called by Secretary of War Baker on May 15, 1916, the charts of the Lake levels kept on file by the Government engineers, all prove that the levels have been reduced from 6 to 10 inches and that such reduction has already caused a loss of millions of dollars to the navigation interests.

The drainage canal: The people of Chicago, in defending the illegal diversion of lake waters, hold that the physical welfare of 3,000,000 people is involved, and that therefore the loss to the lake commerce is of secondary importance. This would ordinarily be true if it were not for the fact that better means for the disposal of sewage are at the command of Chicago, just as they are to all other American cities.

The city of Milwaukee this spring voted the sum of $2,500,000 for a modern sewage-disposal system, which, when completed, will cost between $10,000,000 and $12,000,000. If each lake port city resorted to a wholesale diversion of water for sanitary purposes the harbors and navigable rivers on the Great Lakes, with the exception of those entering Lake Superior, would be destroyed.

The Chicago Drainage Canal will in future require more water, rather than less, if the growth of the city continues, in order to carry its sewage into the Illinois River and thence to the Mississippi River.

Navigation waterway: The project of utilizing the drainage canal, which now extends for a distance of over 30 miles from Chicago to Lockport, Ill., for navigation purposes has been entertained for some years. In this connection a movement was begun some years ago which exploited the Lakes-to-the-Gulf deep waterway, and which provided for a continuous channel at a depth of from 18 to 24 feet from Lake Michigan to the Mississippi River, utilizing the drainage canal on the east and the Desplaines and Illinois Rivers on the west to complete the navigation highway.

The engineers who studied the project soon discovered that such a waterway would not be feasible unless the Mississippi River could be developed into a deep and dependable channel. The Illinois authorities, therefore, after years of controversy, concluded to reduce the proposed waterway to an 8-foot barge canal. The present State administration of Illinois is committed to this project.

Creating water powers: Eight years ago the people of Illinois voted a bond issue of $20,000,000 for the purpose of constructing the deep waterway from Lockport, the present terminus of the Chicago Drainage Canal, to the Mississippi River, and equip the same with locks and dams and large power plants.

The campaign literature which was circulated throughout the State, and upon which the bond issue was carried, guaranteed to the people that the water powers so created would net the State, by the sale of power, the sum of $2,500,000 annually.

When the controversy as to the depth of the waterway led to the reduction of from 24 to 8 feet, with a proportionate reduction in the cost, the present administration agreed upon an expenditure of $5,000,000 instead of $20,000,000, and at the same time providing the retention of the proportionate water-power benefits.

In fact it soon developed that the Chicago Drainage Canal, which had originally been built for sanitary purposes, was rendering a larger service in the power that it provided, which power is now utilized for lighting a portion of the city of Chicago and in providing both light and power to a number of manufacturing concerns located along the canal region between Chicago and Lockport, than in any service it rendered as a navigation highway.

The Illinois State authorities therefore concluded that an extension of the canal with its alluring prospects for additional water powers would prove a most profitable investment. The vote of the people authorizing the bond issue had laid greater stress upon the earnings derived from the sale of power than upon the prospects of constructing a utilitarian waterway and upon the tolls that might be exacted.

The consent of the United States was deemed necessary, and a petition was accordingly presented to the Secretary of War, accompanied with the arguments made by Gov. Dunne that the petition by a sovereign State to dig an intrastate canal could not be denied, and with the further argument made by the attorney representing the State of Illinois that the Secretary of War enjoyed no discretionary powers in determining upon the merits of the project in hand.

Inasmuch as the project, however, includes the Illinois River, which is a navigable highway, and therefore under the jurisdiction of the United States, in that it contemplates the exaction of a toll and must employ the waters of the Great Lakes for its operation, the petition was adversely recommended by Gen. Kingman, Chief of the United States Corps of Engineers, and denied by Secretary Garrison.

The present Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, will in all probability deny the same petition, which is now before him. Hence the Illinois authorities will try to attain their object through Congress.

Argument and conclusions: The situation may be summed up as follows:

The disposal of sewage at Chicago can well be effected with the original grant of water, namely, 250,000 cubic feet per minute, and that the excess, illegally taken and constituting 350,000 cubic feet per minute, is used to operate the water powers at Lockport, Ill.

The ship-canal project is fostered more largely for the purpose of insuring the continued illegal diversion of water, or, rather, to secure a legal sanction of the same, than to provide a commercial utility. In other words, the real purpose behind the cry of sanitation and ship canal is the continued steal of a colossal flow of lake waters for power purposes.

We hold that the Great Lakes are a God-given blessing conferred upon a nation, that their use is dedicated to the cause of navigation, and that their waters can not be used for domestic or sanitation purposes in any unreasonable degree, and that there is no warrant in law or morals that could sanction their use for power purposes.

No section or locality has the right to use the gifts of nature at the expense and to the detriment of the larger unit. The State of Illinois can *not consistently* create a local advantage at the cost and to the menace of the commerce of the Great Lakes.

We therefore enter a most earnest protest against any action on the part of the Secretary of War or on the part of Congress that will sanction or legalize the present unwarranted diversion of lake waters into the Chicago drainage canal.

We address this communication to you not so much for the purpose of bringing any new facts or information to the subject, but to inform you just what our thinking and reasoning on the subject is.

Trusting that you will give it the attention that it may deserve, we remain,

Respectfully, yours, WM. GEO. BRUCE, *Secretary.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. The entire amendment as amended will read:

Beginning on page 31, line 23, after "$55,000" in line 23, insert: "and the improvement of navigation of the Illinois River, authorized by an act of the Illinois General Assembly, approved June 18, 1915, providing for an expenditure of $5,000,000 therefor by the State of Illinois, be, and is hereby, authorized in accordance with said act. The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby given power to fix reasonable charges and tolls for the use of and navigation upon the waterway created under said act of the general assembly of said State in all interstate transportation: *Provided*, That the improvement may be made in general accordance with the plans heretofore submitted to the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, and subject to their approval, or on such modified plans as may be approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That the waterway shall be completed and open for navigation before any of the water now being, or hereafter to be, diverted from Lake Michigan shall be used for the development of power: *Provided further*, That the navigation features of the waterway and its appurtenances shall be operated and maintained in a manner satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, and any repairs or maintenance work that may be directed by the Secretary of War on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers shall be made within the time specified by him: *Provided further*, That when, under the terms of the act of the State of Illinois, the waterway shall be transferred to the United States for navigation purposes, the United States shall be given a clear title to such land as may be occupied by or used in connection with the locks and various appurtenances necessary for the operation of the waterway for navigation, together with all structures thereon: *Provided further*, That the amount of water to be diverted from Lake Michigan through this system of waterways shall never exceed the rate of 250,000 cubic feet per minute: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to prejudice or affect any rights the United States may have in the Illinois and Michigan Canal, or lands appurtenant thereto, or in any claims against the State of Illinois arising out of any failure upon the part of the State to maintain said canal as a navigable waterway."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still as in Committee of the Whole and——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The amendment as amended has never been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was all treated as one amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Just so the record shows that the amendment as amended has been adopted, it is immaterial whether there is one vote or two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the amendment was offered by the Senator from Wisconsin in lieu of the entire amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; it must include the committee amendment. It would be unintelligible without the committee amendment. I think the amendment as amended should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to reserve the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] for a separate vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That reservation will be made.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. GALLINGER. Against the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], which has been reserved, I make a point of order that it is general legislation and that it provides an appropriation not estimated for.

I will state that when I withdrew the point of order on that amendment—and the point of order had been sustained—I withdrew it with the understanding that certain other amendments, and particularly one to be offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], would likewise be permitted to go on the bill, notwithstanding they were subject to a point of order. A point of order was made against the amendment submitted by the Senator from Iowa, and for that reason, in part, I make the point of order now against the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is disposed to believe that the point of order is well taken. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The question now is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Shall the amendments be ordered to be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I offer the following motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

That the pending bill, H. R. 12193, be recommitted to the Committee on Commerce with instruction to report a substitute therefor appropriating an amount not in excess of $30,000,000 for the maintenance of the river and harbor projects necessary for commercial and military needs and for the further prosecution of work on rivers and harbors heretofore adopted by Congress: *Provided*, That the amount for such maintenance and prosecution shall be appropriated by the Chief of Engineers under the direction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Broussard	Curtis	Gore
Bankhead	Chamberlain	Dillingham	Harding
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Fall	Hardwick
Brady	Clarke, Ark.	Fletcher	Hollis
Brandegee	Culberson	Gallinger	Husting

James	Nelson	Simmons	Townsend
Jones	Norris	Smith, Ariz.	Underwood
Kenyon	Overman	Smith, Ga.	Vardaman
La Follette	Page	Smith, Md.	Wadsworth
Lane	Pittman	Smith, Mich.	Walsh
Lea, Tenn.	Poindexter	Smoot	Warren
Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Sterling	Weeks
Lippitt	Reed	Swanson	Williams
Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Thomas	Works
Myers	Shields	Tillman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The pending question is on the motion made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. KENYON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. OVERMAN. Please have the motion stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the motion.

The Secretary again read Mr. SMOOT's motion.

Mr. SMOOT Mr. President, I intended to occupy a few moments this afternoon in calling the attention of the Senate to my motion to recommit the bill, but I know it is the desire of Senators that the vote shall be taken at once upon the motion and to immediately follow it with a vote upon the bill. I am informed that there are a number of Senators who wish to leave shortly, and they also have expressed a desire to vote upon my motion to recommit and upon the bill before they leave. I shall therefore content myself by simply saying, in my opinion, there is no question but that the $30,000,000 provided for in my motion will cover all the legitimate projects and that none such will suffer if my motion prevails.

Mr. President, I shall say no more at this time, except to ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They have been ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement to my pair and its transfer as heretofore made, I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and transfer as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMPSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], but on this vote I understand, if present, the Senator from Illinois would vote as I am about to vote. I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], but I feel at liberty to vote on this question, and I do vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN. I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] and therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea." I wish this announcement of my pair to stand for the day.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] with the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—34.

Ashurst	Brandegee	Curtis	Gallinger
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Dillingham	Gore
Brady	Cummins	Fall	Harding
Hollis	Lodge	Smoot	Wadsworth
Husting	Newlands	Sutherland	Warren
Kenyon	Norris	Taggart	Weeks
La Follette	Page	Thomas	Works
Lane	Pittman	Thompson	
Lippitt	Pomerene	Townsend	

NAYS—35.

Bankhead	Jones	Ransdell	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Sterling
Chamberlain	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Stone
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Myers	Shields	Underwood
Culberson	Nelson	Simmons	Vardaman
Fletcher	Oliver	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh
Hardwick	Overman	Smith, Ga.	Williams
James	Poindexter	Smith, Md.	

NOT VOTING—27.

Beckham	Goff	Lewis	Phelan
Bryan	Gronna	McCumber	Robinson
Burleigh	Hitchcock	McLean	Shafroth
Catron	Hughes	Martine, N. J.	Sherman
Clapp	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Tillman
du Pont	Kern	Penrose	

So Mr. SMOOT's motion was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to add to the amendment which I heretofore offered, and which was adopted, to the provision regarding the improvement of the Illinois River, an amendment which I send to the Secretary's desk.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That amendment has been submitted to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce and he finds no objection to it. It takes the form of an additional proviso to the amendment heretofore adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A peculiar parliamentary situation has arisen, the Chair should say.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, it is proposed to add this amendment as a new provision. As I understand, a new amendment may be added.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offer the amendment as a new provision, to follow the amendment heretofore adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the amendment heretofore adopted relative to the Illinois River, on page 32, it is proposed to add the following:

Provided further, That the water power developed through said waterway shall be subject to the limitations and regulations which may at any time be generally imposed by acts of Congress upon water powers located upon navigable streams.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will assume that this is a new amendment; and, without objection, it is agreed to.

The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments, the amendments will be ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. An amendment can now only be offered to the bill by unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent to the submission of the amendment?

Mr. GALLINGER. I object.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Let us hear what it is.

Mr. LODGE. The bill has been read the third time, Mr. President.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to have the amendment printed in the RECORD, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, that order will be made. The Chair hears none.

The amendment referred to was to add to the bill the following:

The expenditure of the appropriations herein made shall be supervised by Congress as follows:

"There shall be appointed by the chairmen of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives and the Commerce Committee of the Senate, an inspector of river and harbor work. He shall be a trained and experienced civil engineer, not connected in any way with the Army. It shall be the duty of said inspector to thoroughly examine the several river and harbor projects which have been adopted by Congress, with special regard to the question of whether the moneys appropriated by Congress for these works are being expended to the best advantage from a standpoint both of economy and efficiency. In making said examination said inspector shall inquire whether the best methods are being used in the prosecution of said works to accomplish the improvement contemplated thereby. Said inspector shall also examine into the question of the needs of commerce for said improvements, and the probable or prospective uses thereof in commerce, and the probable or prospective results thereof on freight rates on railroads through the competition of such waterways; and for that purpose said inspector may ascertain the effect upon such rates of waterways heretofore improved, and the uses that have been made of the same for purposes of transportation. Said inspector shall make, in

writing to Congress a full semiannual report of his observations and conclusions in the foregoing matters. He shall hold office at the pleasure of the committees above mentioned, and his successor shall be appointed as provided above. He shall be paid a salary of $12,000 a year, and his necessary, actual expenses, and shall have such clerical and other assistance as may be necessary, to be approved by the chairmen of said committees."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I want to take just about three minutes, and then I shall desire to have the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

This Senate is about to pass a bill that few Senators have had the temerity to defend.

This Senate is appropriating hundreds of thousands of dollars for streams where Congress has ordered a reexamination and no report has as yet been filed by the engineers.

You are so anxious to get rid of public money that you will not even wait for the Army engineers to report. You are dumping hundreds of thousands of dollars into streams where commerce is constantly growing less and in some cases is practically nothing. You are making appropriations for streams, some of them not over 1 foot in depth, and others where we are solemnly told by witnesses that they could navigate the streams if they could get the river in shape so that the stern would follow the bow of the boat.

You are appropriating for others where the testimony before the House committee was to the effect that you could not tell when you crossed the river.

You are appropriating hundreds of thousands of dollars on projects which the Army engineers have condemned. You have appropriated money running into hundreds of thousands for ridiculous propositions, for which no man conducting his own business would permit the money to be used.

You are about to vote from the Treasury, in a time of great national stress and strain, at least $20,000,000 in unjustifiable projects.

You have had an opportunity to correct them. You would not even correct the worst of them. This bill is to go through. Your motto is "Let the people squeal."

A few days ago the leader upon the Democratic side announced that the appropriations in this Congress would be $200,000,000 more than in the last Congress. Other leaders said, "We must practice economy." We are always willing to practice economy on those things which do not concern us.

We have tried to fight this bill in no partisan way. There is enthusiasm for it on this side of the Chamber. It could not pass without votes from this side of the Chamber.

The fight against this method of appropriating public money is going on. The rising tide of sentiment; the awakened public conscience is against it. Gentlemen may stand here and send out word to the country to talk more about progress and less about "pork," but the country will keep on talking about "pork" as long as bills of this character are passed by Congress. Cloakroom sneers or floor jeers will not stop the fight. The men who are voting for these extravagances will find out that the people do not intend to do all of the squealing, and that they have some notions as to the duty of Representatives in Congress toward the Public Treasury.

Some constituents take a different view. I have received many letters from the people along the Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers, one of which flows the entire length of my State, and the other along a portion thereof, condemning my attitude on this river and harbor bill, and telling what will be done to me at the next election.

Mr. President, if the price of holding my seat in this body is to vote for bills of this kind, the seat may go. If getting appropriations for my State is considered the essential thing by my people, then my usefulness to them in this body is ended.

I am not the seventh son of a seventh son, but I risk a prophecy, and that is that this is the last river and harbor bill, framed along the lines of the present bill, that will ever pass this Congress. New faces will be in the next Congress, fresh from the people, and they will pay some attention to the question of expenditures.

Some day a Congress will be here that will not consider those the greatest statesmen who can get the most out of the National Treasury. Some day a Congress will think along national lines and not State and district lines. And that day is coming just as certain as that to-morrow's sun will rise.

It is a pity that the whole Democratic Party must be held responsible for these expenditures, for this bill could not be passed by Democratic votes alone. There are men on this side of the Chamber who have and will give enthusiastic support to the bill and defend every item in it, and make possible its passage. There are men on the other side of the Chamber who have fought hard for economy.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has been one of the most consistent advocates of economy in this body. He is a credit to his State and an honor to the Nation. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] has fought hard to eliminate useless expenditures. Likewise the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and others who might be named, all of whom are entitled to the thanks of their constituents. The clarion voice of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] has rung out in warning, and the courageous stand of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. TAGGART] has been inspiring.

The people may be a little slow in getting at what is going on in Congress, but they are awakening to the fact that votes are cast for certain appropriations in order that reciprocity may follow fawning.

Mr. President, we are beaten perhaps in this preliminary fight, but this is not the end of the fight. We appeal our case from a Congress drunk with extravagance to a people sober, meditative, and very discriminating.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. OWEN (when his name was called). I ask if the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. OWEN. I am paired with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as heretofore to-day, I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. THOMPSON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to being at liberty to vote, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. The Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Dakota "nay" if present and not paired.

Mr. CURTIS. I am requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] with the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Bankhead	Lane	Poindexter	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Lee, Md.	Reed	Sterling
Chamberlain	McLean	Saulsbury	Stone
Clarke, Ark.	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Swanson
Culberson	Myers	Shields	Underwood
Fletcher	Nelson	Simmons	Vardaman
Hardwick	Oliver	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh
James	Overman	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—32.

Ashurst	Gallinger	Lippitt	Sutherland
Borah	Gore	Lodge	Taggart
Brady	Harding	Newlands	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Hollis	Norris	Townsend
Cummins	Husting	Page	Wadsworth
Curtis	Jones	Pomerene	Warren
Dillingham	Kenyon	Shafroth	Weeks
Fall	La Follette	Smoot	Works

NOT VOTING—29.

Beckham	Goff	McCumber	Sherman
Bryan	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Thomas
Catron	Hughes	Owen	Tillman
Chilton	Johnson, Me.	Penrose	Williams
Clapp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	
Colt	Kern	Pittman	
du Pont	Lewis	Robinson	

So the bill was passed.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House on the bill and the amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will later announce the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT OVER MEMORIAL DAY.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, to-morrow will be Decoration or Memorial Day, and there will be, as usual, some ceremonies at the Arlington National Cemetery. In order that there may be the fullest opportunity for all to attend and participate in the ceremonies, and that the Senate itself may pay proper tribute to the occasion, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL CONVENTIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the order which I send to the desk. I will say that I believe it is agreeable to Senators on both sides of the Chamber, and it is intended to enable Senators to attend the two national conventions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Virginia submits the following unanimous-consent agreement:

It is agreed, by unanimous consent, that on the 3d day of June, 1916, at not later than 6 o'clock p. m., the Senate shall adjourn until the following Thursday, on which day there shall be an adjournment until the following Saturday, and that adjournments every third day shall follow until Monday, the 19th day of June, 1916.

That between the said dates of June 3 and June 19 there shall be no action of the Senate on any pending measure, nor shall business of any kind be transacted other than the introduction of bills and resolutions, the presentation of petitions, and the reception of communications from the President and House of Representatives.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator does he mean by that to include the 19th of June as well?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Until the 19th; it does not include that date.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It excludes the 19th?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It does; that is my understanding of the unanimous-consent order, and that is the purpose of it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I should be very reluctant to object to that request for unanimous consent, but I am peculiarly situated with respect to a bill affecting my own State. It is local in its nature, but it has some features which are national in their importance. I refer to the measure known as the Oregon and California land-grant bill. The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which was rendered on the 21st day of June last, and which was entered of record in the lower court in my State December 9, 1915, practically requires the Congress of the United States to legislate on the subject of this grant within six months from the entry of the decree. That six months expires on the 9th day of June, and if Congress does not act it throws the matter into great confusion and probably might open it up to further litigation. If we can dispose of that bill the day after to-morrow, and I think we can do so easily in an afternoon, I shall be very glad to have the unanimous-consent agreement entered into.

Mr. GALLINGER. We would have Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday on which to legislate—four days. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will not become operative until Saturday.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will not commence until the 3d day of June.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I have an implied understanding with the Senate that they will permit me to take up the bill to which I have referred Wednesday or Thursday? The Senate can see the importance of it, because, unless it is disposed of by the 9th of June, the whole subject may be again opened up.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Oregon that there will be ample time for the legislation to which he refers to be considered by the Senate. I am sure that the importance of the matter to which he now refers is such that, when presented fully to the Senate, it will meet with such reception as he desires.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the bill to which the Senator from Oregon refers has passed the House of Representatives?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The bill has passed the House of Representatives, and I am ready to report on it this afternoon, with some amendments, from the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There will be no trouble whatever in regard to it. There will be ample time for the Senator to have his bill considered.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I may later ask that it be taken up and made the unfinished business for day after to-morrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have no objection to that, but I really do not think the Senator ought to ask for what amounts to putting the Senate on terms about this matter of his. I think the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is necessary for the convenience of the entire Senate, and I do not believe it will interfere with the matter which the Senator has in mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate can not make a bill the unfinished business by agreement.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senate can do almost anything it wants to do, if the President please.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is one thing it can not do, unless all the rules are abolished.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I can ask that it be done, whether the President agrees with me or not. I am not going to attempt to impose any conditions upon the Senate; I would not do that, even if I could, but I do want to let the Senate know that I shall ask for the disposition of this bill before we adjourn on June 3, and I shall trust the Senate to help me have it done.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will be glad to aid the Senator, so far as I am concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR BRADLEY.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the amendments of the House to what is known as the Philippine bill.

Mr. JAMES. I ask the Senator from Colorado if he will yield to me to give a notice?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Let us take up the Philippine bill for consideration, and then I will yield.

Mr. JAMES. I merely desire to give a notice, to which I am sure the Senator will not object.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well.

Mr. JAMES. I desire to give the following notice, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the notice.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Kentucky gives the following notice:

That on Saturday, June 24, 1916, immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, he will ask that the business of the Senate may be suspended that fitting tribute may be paid to the life and character of the Hon. WILLIAM O. BRADLEY, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT WILSON.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I have here the very able address delivered by the President of the United States last Saturday evening, May 27, 1916, at the banquet given by the League to Enforce Peace, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and also that it be made a public document. This is one of the ablest addresses yet delivered by President Wilson, and is of very great interest to the public at this particular time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I could not hear a word the Senator said.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Nor could anybody else.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like the Senator to repeat his request, as I did not hear a word of it.

Mr. THOMPSON. It was simply a request to have printed in the RECORD the speech of the President of the United States, delivered before the League to Enforce Peace, and also to have it printed as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can either have it printed as a public document or he can have it printed in the RECORD, I do not care which.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should like to have it printed in the RECORD and also made a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not want it made a public document if it is printed in the RECORD.

Mr. THOMPSON. I hope the Senator from Utah will withdraw his objection, owing to the importance of this address and the fact that it was made by the President of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. I do object. I have no objection to it being printed in the RECORD, nor have I any objection to it being printed as a public document; but the rule is not to print anything in both forms. The Senator can take his choice of one or the other.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, Mr. President, I will be satisfied to have it printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

"When the invitation to be here to-night came to me I was glad to accept it—not because it offered me an opportunity to discuss the program of the league—that you will, I am sure, not expect of me—but because the desire of the whole world now turns eagerly, more and more eagerly, toward the hope of peace; and there is just reason why we should take our part in counsel upon this great theme. It is right that I, as spokesman of our Government, should attempt to give expression to what I believe to be the thought and purpose of the people of the United States in this vital matter.

"This great war that broke so suddenly upon the world two years ago, and which has swept within its flame so great a part of the civilized world, has affected us very profoundly, and we are not only at liberty, it is perhaps our duty, to speak very frankly of it and of the great interests of civilization which it affects.

RIGHTS OF NATION AFFECTED.

"With its causes and its objects we are not concerned. The obscure fountains from which its stupendous flood has burst forth we are not interested to search for or explore. But so great a flood, spread far and wide to every quarter of the globe, has of necessity engulfed many a fair province of right that lies very near to us.

"Our own rights as a nation, the liberties, the privileges, and the property of our people have been profoundly affected. We are *not mere* disconnected lookers-on.

"The longer the war lasts the more deeply do we become concerned that it should be brought to an end and the world be permitted to resume its normal life and course again. And when it does come to an end we shall be as much concerned as the nations at war to see peace assume an aspect of permanence, give promise of days from which the anxiety of uncertainty shall be lifted, bring some assurance that peace and war shall always hereafter be reckoned part of the common interest of mankind.

"We are participants, whether we would or not, in the life of the world. The interests of all nations are our own also. We are partners with the rest. What affects mankind is inevitably our affair as well as the affair of the nations of Europe and of Asia.

"One observation on the causes of the present war we are at liberty to make, and to make it may throw some light forward upon the future as well as backward upon the past. It is plain that this war could have come only as it did, suddenly and out of secret counsels, without warning to the world, without discussion, without any of the deliberate movements of counsel with which it would seem natural to approach so stupendous a contest.

"It is probable that if it had been foreseen just what would happen, just what alliances would be formed, just what forces arrayed against one another, those who brought the great contest on would have been glad to substitute conference for force.

"If we ourselves had been afforded some opportunity to apprise the belligerents of the attitude which it would be our duty to take, of the policies and practices against which we would feel bound to use all our moral and economic strength, and in certain circumstances even our physical strength also, our own contribution to the counsel which might have averted the struggle would have been considered worth weighing and regarding.

"And the lesson which the shock of being taken by surprise in a matter so deeply vital to all the nations of the world has made poignantly clear is, that the peace of the world must henceforth depend upon a new and more wholesome diplomacy.

"Only when the great nations of the world have reached some sort of agreement as to what they hold to be fundamental to their common interest, and as to some feasible method of acting in concert when any nation or group of nations seeks to disturb those fundamental things, can we feel that civilization is at last in a way of justifying its existence and claiming to be finally established.

"It is clear that nations must in the future be governed by the same high code of honor that we demand of individuals.

"We must, indeed, in the very same breath with which we avow this conviction admit that we have ourselves upon occassion in the past been offenders against the law of diplomacy which we thus forecast; but our conviction is not the less clear, but rather the more clear on that account.

"If this war has accomplished nothing else for the benefit of the world, it has at least disclosed a great moral necessity and set forward the thinking of the statesmen of the world by a whole age.

"Repeated utterances of the leading statesmen of most of the great nations now engaged in war have made it plain that their thought has come to this, that the principle of public right must henceforth take precedence over the individual interests of particular nations, and that the nations of the world must in some way band themselves together to see that that right prevails as against any sort of selfish aggression; that henceforth alliance must not be set up against alliance, understanding against understanding, but that there must be a common agreement for a common object, and that at the heart of that common object must lie the inviolable rights of peoples and of mankind.

"The nations of the world have become each other's neighbors. It is to their interest that they should understand each other. In order that they may understand each other, it is imperative that they should agree to cooperate in a common cause, and that they should so act that the guiding principle of that common cause shall be even-handed and impartial justice.

"This is undoubtedly the thought of America. This is what we ourselves will say when there comes proper occasion to say it. In the dealings of nations with one another arbitrary force must be rejected, and we must move forward to the thought of the modern world, the thought of which peace is the very atmosphere. That thought constitutes a chief part of the passionate conviction of America.

"We believe these fundamental things: First, that every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live. Like other nations, we have ourselves no doubt once and again offended against that principle when for a little while controlled by selfish passion, as our franker historians have been honorable enough to admit; but it has become more and more our rule of life and action. Second, that the small States of the world have a right to enjoy the same respect for their sovereignty and for their territorial integrity that great and powerful nations expect and insist upon. And, third, that the world has a right to be free from every disturbance of its peace that has its origin in aggression and disregard of the rights of peoples and nations.

"So sincerely do we believe in these things that I am sure that I speak the mind and wish of the people of America when I say that the United States is willing to become a partner in any feasible association of nations formed in order to realize these objects and make them secure against violation.

"There is nothing that the United States wants for itself that any other nation has. We are willing, on the contrary, to limit ourselves along with them to a prescribed course of duty and respect for the rights of others which will check any selfish passion of our own, as it will check any aggressive impulse of theirs.

"If it should ever be our privilege to suggest or initiate a movement for peace among the nations now at war, I am sure that the people of the United States would wish their Government to move along these lines:

"First, such a settlement with regard to their own immediate interests as the belligerents may agree upon. We have nothing material of any kind to ask for ourselves, and are quite aware that we are in no sense or degree parties to the present quarrel. Our interest is only in peace and its future guarantees.

"Second, an universal association of the nations to maintain the inviolate security of the highway of the seas for the common and unhindered use of all the nations of the world, and to prevent any war begun either contrary to treaty covenants or without warning and full submission of the causes to the opinion of the world—a virtual guarantee of territorial integrity and political independence.

"But I did not come here, let me repeat, to discuss a program. I came only to avow a creed and give expression to the confidence I feel that the world is even now upon the eve of a great consummation, when some common force will be brought into existence which shall safeguard right as the first and most fundamental interest of all peoples and all Governments, when coercion shall be summoned not to the service of political ambition or selfish hostility, but to the service of a common order, a common justice, and a common peace.

"God grant that the dawn of that day of frank dealing and of settled peace, concord, and cooperation may be near at hand!"

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. from the Committee on Public Lands I report back with amendments the bill (H. R. 14864) to alter and amend an act entitled "An act granting lands to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Central Pacific Railroad, in California, to Portland, in Oregon," approved July 25, 1866, as amended by the acts of 1868 and 1869, and to alter and amend an act entitled "An act granting lands to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from Portland to Astoria and McMinnville, in the State of Oregon," ap-

proved May 4, 1870, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 494) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, my motion is that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the amendment of the House to Senate bill 381, known as the Philippine bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, this is the conference report, is it?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; it is a motion for concurrence in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado how much time he expects will be consumed in the consideration of his motion?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that so far as I am concerned I shall not speak five minutes. In fact, I am perfectly willing to have a vote taken at this time. It is simply a motion for concurrence in the House amendment, and it seems to me it ought to be disposed of very soon.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it will take some time to dispose of the House amendment to the Philippines bill. It is not the Senate bill. It is a new bill. I can assure the Senator from Colorado that it will lead to a good deal of debate, and it ought to have a good deal of debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest to the Senator from Colorado that he accompany his motion with a statement to the Senate that he will agree temporarily to withhold consideration of his bill while the bill that has just formed the basis of a unanimous consent of the Senate, in which the Senator from Oregon is interested, shall be considered and passed upon.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will, if it does not lead to considerable debate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is this motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is after 2 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. There can be no unanimous consent, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I suggest to the Senator from Colorado that he make the same request as the Senator from Alabama has made. If the Philippine bill is going to lead to a great deal of debate—and it seems that it will—then the time of the Senate will not be as much consumed by temporarily laying it aside, first, for the consideration of the bill in which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is interested, and secondly, for the consideration of the bill in which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is interested.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will do so if the bill does not lead to enormous debate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I want to suggest again to the Senator from Colorado that these appropriation bills are entitled to consideration, and ought to be considered as speedily as possible. The Post Office appropriation bill is perhaps the largest that will be presented during this session of Congress and is perhaps of more importance to the whole country than any other bill that will be presented. I suggest to the Senator from Colorado that if he will consent to take up this bill I will then move to lay it aside temporarily in order that my friend the Senator from Oregon may temporarily take up his bill, if it does not promise to consume too much time in debate.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I will make exactly the same proposition to the Senator that he presents here.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, Mr. President, let the Senate decide it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, this question of the Philippines has been discussed here for four or five weeks. All phases of the question have been presented, and all phases of the bill as it is now have been presented, because these bills were almost word for word the same when they were introduced. Therefore it seems to me that no unnecessarily long debate can take place on the Philippine bill, unless a filibuster is undertaken.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the bill now presented to the Senate from the House has not been before the Senate for weeks. It is the old House bill, which was set aside by our committee. I consider it of very great importance. I do not mean to delay it unnecessarily, but there will be more or less debate upon that bill—a good deal of debate, I think; and there ought to be debate. I do not think it ought to be allowed to stand in the way of one of the great appropriation bills which is now ready for consideration.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Massachusetts recognize that these bills were practically the same as introduced, and that the discussion on them was principally with relation to the Clarke amendment, as contrasted with the preamble that is contained in the House bill?

Mr. LODGE. I realize that they are very different. This is the old House bill, and the bill that came before us was a Senate bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It was practically the same bill as the House bill.

Mr. LODGE. The Senate committee did not amend the House bill. The Senate committee brought in a bill of their own, and this bill as a whole has never been before the Senate.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The bills contained practically the same provisions.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if they were the same, and if they had been discussed, that would be no guaranty that they would not be talked about to an illimitable extent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah will state his inquiry.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask whether the bill referred to by the Senator from Colorado has ever been laid before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no such bill before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I make the point of order that the motion of the Senator from Colorado is out of order.

Mr. SHAFROTH. On what ground?

Mr. SMOOT. Upon the ground that there is no such bill before the Senate. It has not been laid before the Senate as yet, and the Senator can not make that motion.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It has been laid before the Senate. The motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] was to concur in the House amendment. That was the proceeding of about a month ago, and discussion was started on it.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Nebraska, however, had no power to lay the message of the House before the Senate. The President of the Senate has not yet laid it before the Senate, and therefore the motion made by the Senator from Colorado is not in order. I make that point of order.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. We shall have to see what the RECORD shows about that matter. The Chair recalls that when the message came over from the House of Representatives the Chair was requested to hold the message until the return of the Senator from Nebraska. Subsequently the Chair was requested to hold the message until both the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Colorado were in the Chamber at the same time, and whether or not it was ever handed down the Chair does not know. The RECORD must be examined. But it has been on the Presiding Officer's desk all the while.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, on the 8th day of May the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] rose and moved to concur in the House amendment. That motion was discussed to a limited extent, and it was laid aside on a proposition from the Senator from Rhode Island.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is not any doubt about that having taken place, but whether or not the message was ever formally laid before the Senate the RECORD will have to show. The Chair has no recollection on the subject. The Chair will request the Secretary to look up the RECORD of the 8th of May and see.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If it was not laid before the Senate, I ask that it be laid before the Senate now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be.

Mr. STONE. Let us first find out whether or not it has been laid before the Senate.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will. The Secretary is looking that up right now.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, while the Secretary is looking up the RECORD in regard to that question, I think it is only reasonable for me to state to the Senate that I think the Senator from Colorado is in error in saying that this bill, or anything like it, has ever been reported to the Senate by any committee, or discussed by the Senate. As a matter of fact, the Philippine bill which was laid before the Senate, and was discussed and passed by the Senate and sent to the House, contained something like 20 amendments. There were something like 20 points in which that bill was very different from the bill that has now been returned here by the House. Many of those points go to the vital interests of the management of the Philippine Islands. They refer to provisions that have been

condemned by many of the responsible witnesses before the committee, and condemned in such a manner that the members of the Philippine Committee of the Senate unanimously agreed that there should be changes made in them.

Under these circumstances I think it is manifestly proper and, in fact, inevitable that the bill as now presented will lead to a very considerable discussion. Of course, it is within the power of the majority side of the Senate to decide which subject they wish to consider first. That is not the duty nor the privilege of this side of the Chamber. But inasmuch as the statement has been made here that this bill is something that has already been discussed and that it will take but a very short time to consider it, I think it is proper that I should state the conditions in the way I see them.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state, for the information of the Senator from Colorado, that the Senator's recollection is correct. The message was laid down on the 8th of May—legislative day of the 5th.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Under Rule IX, first in order and first to be entertained by the Senate is a motion to proceed to the consideration of an appropriation or revenue bill. Outside of the consideration of conference reports, that is a preferential motion in the Senate; and under that rule the Senator from Alabama was entitled to priority of recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not so believe. That rule is as follows:

> Immediately after the consideration of cases not objected to upon the calendar is completed, and not later than 2 o'clock, if there shall be no special orders for that time, the Calendar of General Orders shall be taken up and proceeded with in its order, beginning with the first subject on the calendar next after the last subject disposed of in proceeding with the calendar, and in such case the following motions shall be in order at any time as privileged motions, save as against a motion to adjourn, or to proceed to the consideration of executive business, or questions of privilege, to wit:
>
> First. A motion to proceed to the consideration of an appropriation or revenue bill.
>
> Second. A motion to proceed to the consideration of any other bill on the calendar, which motion shall not be open to amendment.
>
> Third. A motion to pass over the pending subject, which, if carried, shall have the effect to leave such subject without prejudice in its place on the calendar.
>
> Fourth. A motion to place such subject at the foot of the calendar.
>
> Each of the foregoing motions shall be decided without debate and shall have precedence in the order above named, and may be submitted as in the nature and with all the rights of questions of order.

Does the Senator from Georgia contend that that rule has anything to do with the procedure after 2 o'clock?

Mr. HARDWICK. Undoubtedly. That is the way I construe it. I do not want to add to the confusion, though, by arguing it. I believe that at any time after 2 o'clock this procedure applies as I have suggested, just the same as before 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not read it that way. This is an off-hand guess, and the Chair does not know whether he is right or wrong; but the Chair does not so read it. That rule is applicable to procedure before 2 o'clock.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, has the Philippine bill now been laid before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was before the Senate. There was an error about it. It has been before the Senate since the 8th day of May; and the motion of the Senator from Colorado, as the Chair understands, is to take it up and to agree to the House amendments. The Chair supposes the first question is whether the Senate will or will not consent to take it up.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I understand that under the rule the motion made by the Senator from Colorado can not be amended. In other words, I could not substitute another motion for it. Therefore my only remedy, in order to get the Post Office appropriation bill before the Senate, is to ask the Senate to vote down the motion of the Senator from Colorado; and if that motion is voted down then I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill. When I get the bill before the Senate as the unfinished business I will be willing to have it laid aside temporarily for certain emergencies. That includes the understanding with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the notice of motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has been on the calendar for days and days to the effect that the Philippine bill be taken up. We thought that an agreement of some kind was reached as to this bill when the river and harbor bill came up, but it was not. It seems to me that this bill, which has passed practically both Houses, ought to be taken up and considered now. I am willing to yield temporarily to the Senator from Oregon, and also for the Post Office bill, if it is taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House amendments to what is known as the Philippine bill.

The motion was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15774) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 4856) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented the memorial of Mrs. S. J. Pettit and sundry other citizens of Vancouver, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying for the establishment of the Mount McKinley National Park in Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the development of the Alaska oil lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying for an appropriation for the establishment of a radio station at Seward, Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Pattern Makers' Association of Hartford, Conn., praying for the granting of an additional 15 days' leave of absence to employees of navy yards and arsenals, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Lodge Framat, No. 51, International Order of Good Templars, of Ansonia, Conn, and a petition of sundry citizens of Waterbury, Conn., praying that the United States remain at peace, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Common Council of Stamford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to certain employees of the postal service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Somers, Conn., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Mothers' Club of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

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

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, remonstrating against prohibition in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit appropriations for sectarian purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to cer-

tain employees of the Postal Service, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to make the Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in convict-made goods, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish-American War, which were ordered to lie on the table.

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

Mr. MYERS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Sanders County, Mont., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LIPPITT. I present a petition of the National Association of Woolen and Worsted Overseers, urging industrial preparedness for an early increase of tariff duties on imports. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *May 20, 1916.*

The National Association of Woolen and Worsted Overseers is an industrial organization engaged in textile manufacturing and is nonpartisan in their attitude but thoroughly American in their patriotism and devotion to the best interests of these United States, and being desirous of expressing their opinions upon the great public questions of to-day, the most important of which, from their point of view, being the need of "industrial preparedness" against the evils resulting from the war in Europe and sure to follow its termination, appointed this committee of five members at their last annual meeting at Boston, Mass., in November, 1915, to prepare such resolutions for action at the next semiannual meeting at Providence, R. I., May 20, 1916, and we beg leave to submit the following as our report:

"Whereas the results of this great war in Europe as an industrial factor from an economic and competitive point of view, as applied to this country in a business way, is an unknown quantity, baffling the efforts of our keenest statisticians and ablest business men to form some safe conception of our national ability under present abnormal labor and wage conditions, with enormously increased overhead costs for everything entering into the manufacturing of goods of all kinds for sale here or abroad after the war ceases, when all the belligerent nations will of necessity have to immediately return to the pursuits of peace and industry, in order to provide for the payment in future of principal and interest upon their tremendously increased national debts; and

"Whereas the best interests of the 100,000,000 people living in these United States must be safeguarded without any further delay by our National Government at Washington, through the legislative functions of the Congress of the United States (our direct representatives), by the passage of such laws, or by changes in existing laws when found inadequate to provide us with proper protection, so as to prevent a threatened industrial or national disaster, through lack of industrial preparedness, which is as paramount as the strengthening of our Army and Navy for our common welfare, with which idea we are also in hearty accord; and

"Whereas we must collect many more millions of dollars to meet the greatly increased cost of a larger Army and Navy in some way not yet provided for, and our past experience has proved that the best way and the least expensive method for us is by the increase of duties on imports through out customhouses on goods entering into keen and close competition with the products of home industry and labor, as well as to reimpose duties again upon a larger percentage of goods imported than is now the rule (as 68 per cent of all the goods now imported are duty free), and the American people are not favorably disposed to a direct and unjust taxation as a means of collecting national revenues for our Government: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we respectfully direct the attention of Congress to these patriotic recommendations, based upon past practical experience, and we urge an early increase of the tariff duties sufficient in its advance to insure us from an industrial invasion of the products of foreign countries, making this market their dumping ground for the sale of cheaper goods than we can possibly produce under present abnormal conditions here, which conditions may remain for some time to come, owing to high costs of living here and to other economic reasons, which threaten us with disaster unless the present tariff duties are raised beyond the danger line to prevent our exploitation by foreign manufacturers, and the recovery by their nations of the gold sent here during the past 21 months for war munitions and supplies, and we appeal to the Congress to substitute patriotism and true Americanism for partisanship, and not to apply theory against practical business experience, in order that our Government of the people and for the people may still endure and continue to prosper."

M. J. SHAUGHNESSY, *Worcester, Mass.*
J. G. BURNES, *Providence, R. I.*
F. W. PHELPS, *Oldtown, Me.*
WM. F. SCOTT, *Madison, Me.*
JOHN F. BOLGER, *Chairman, Germantown, Philadelphia.*

Mr. THOMPSON. I present a petition of the Colonial Dames of America, praying for the immediate adoption of such measures for national defense as shall enable the country to defend itself from invasion and attack. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COLONIAL DAMES OF AMERICA,
167 East Thirty-fifth Street, New York City.

Whereas the Society of The Colonial Dames of America was created for the twofold purpose of holding in reverent remembrance those wise and valiant men who first established our free institutions and of helping to maintain and to perpetuate their ideals of liberty and justice; and

Whereas those ideals can flourish only under the conditions of honorable peace; and

Whereas to enjoy that peace we must be able to defend our liberties; and

Whereas it has lately become increasingly evident that we are not in any way prepared for such defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this society advocates the immediate adoption, by the Government of the United States, of such measures for national defense as shall enable us, if need be, to resist aggression, and shall insure the security and independence of our country, and thereby make it possible for us to maintain our ideals and to fulfill those obligations and responsibilities which, as a Nation, we have assumed: And be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President and Congress of the United States.

CLARA L. CHEESMAN, *President.*
E. B. BARROWE, *Secretary.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4550) granting to the Portland, Vancouver & Northern Railway Co. a license to cross the Vancouver Barracks Military Reservation at Vancouver, Wash., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 496) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 708) to make immediately available for the use of the State of Georgia in paying expenses incurred by said State in connection with the joint encampment held at Augusta, Ga., July 22 to 31, 1914, certain sums appropriated for arming and equipping the militia of said State, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 497) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 5441) for the relief of the heirs of Albert Sidney Johnston, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims, which was agreed to.

He also, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 21) to authorize aids to navigation, and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 495) thereon.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 5751) authorizing the addition of certain lands to the Wyoming National Forest, Wyo., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which was referred the bill (S. 5437) to further amend the act of Congress entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," approved June 25, 1910, to extend the same to elections for United States Senators and for presidential electors, and to regulate, control, and limit campaign and other contributions and expenditures in connection with such elections, and to define corrupt practices in connection therewith, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 498) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 6212) authorizing the Secretary of War to sell certain magazine rifles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 6213) granting a pension to Esteller Barrows (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART:

A bill (S. 6214) granting a pension to Duncan F. Edwards (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6215) granting an increase of pension to John Goldsmith (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6216) granting an increase of pension to John W. Bash; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 6217) to adequately compensate commissioned officers of the United States Navy for length of service, and to grant to warrant officers allowances and privileges allowed other

officers of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 6218) increasing the limit of cost for the purchase of a site for the erection of a public building at Rockingham, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 6219) providing for the appointment of civilian clerks in the Quartermaster Corps of the Army as pay clerks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 6220) granting an increase of pension to Tillie E. Reeves (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 6221) amending section 140 of the act approved March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 6222) to provide for admissions to the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $10,000 for pursuing such experiments and investigations to determine the most practical means of extending the operations of the parcel post in the direction of promoting the marketing of farm products and furthering direct transaction between producers and consumers, intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 10484), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. VARDAMAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $5,000 for a national library for the blind in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 15774), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment providing that no officer shall be promoted to a higher grade on the active list of the Navy and Marine Corps except in the case provided in the next section until he has been examined by a board of naval surgeons and pronounced physically qualified to perform all his duties at sea, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 15947), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $12,500 for the purchase of a site and the commencement of a post-office building at Rockingham, N. C., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 15836), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

TREATMENT OF TUBERCULOSIS.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 206), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the manuscript submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] entitled, "Animal Experiments upon the Acquirement of Active Immunity by Treatment with Von Ruck's Vaccine against Tuberculosis," by Frank J. Clemenger, M. D., Asheville, N. C., and Dr. F. C. Martley, M. A., M. D., Cambridge, England, be printed as a Senate document.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 15774. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 10484, making appropriations for the Post Office Department.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10484) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with amendments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am not going to object to that, of course. So far as I am personally concerned, I would be ready to take up the Oregon-California bill; but I hardly think it would be fair to the Senate, because the report has not been printed. It will be printed, though, by to-morrow morning, and I should like to take it up on Wednesday morning, when the Senate next convenes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to laying aside temporarily the Post Office bill?

Mr. LIPPITT. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an objection to laying it aside temporarily.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, as the Senator from Oregon is not ready to proceed with the Oregon land-grant bill, I shall ask the Senate to proceed with the consideration of the Post Office bill. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama asks that the bill be read first for Senate committee amendments, and that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, under the subhead "Office of the Postmaster General," at the top of page 2, to insert:

The Postmaster General is hereby authorized to have prepared the necessary plans and specifications and to enter into a contract or contracts for the construction of a reinforced concrete and all-glass, factory-type, fireproof building for the use of the Post Office Department equipment shops, such building to contain approximately 70,000 square feet of floor space; and sufficient land in the city of Washington, D. C., may be acquired, if necessary, by the Postmaster General, by purchase or condemnation, upon which to erect such building; and for the purpose of the purchase of said land and the construction of said building $200,000 is hereby appropriated and made available, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if any Senator desires information with reference to this amendment, I shall be glad to give it.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have whatever information the Senator has in regard to it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will ask the Secretary to read a letter from the Postmaster General in relation to this amendment. It gives the information in more precise form than I could.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
March 24, 1916.

I wish to call your attention to the inclosed House Document No. 103, containing copy of a letter I addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury in regard to an estimate for $200,000 for the construction of an equipment-shop building for the Post Office Department, which estimate was transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Your attention is also called to bill H. R. 6827, introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which would authorize the Postmaster General to construct such building.

I understand that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will make a favorable report on the bill, but that as yet the committee is undecided as to whether or not there will be a public buildings bill at this session of Congress. The need of the enactment of such legislation at this session is very urgent, and I do not want the possibility of there being no public buildings bill to interfere with the construction of a shop building by the department. I therefore have to request that you insert bill H. R. 6827 as a proviso in the Post Office appropriation bill, on page 1, after line 10, as introduced into the Senate, so that the paragraph as amended will read as follows, beginning at line 8:

"For rent of suitable buildings for the use of the Post Office Department, including the mail-bag repair shop, lock repair shop, and the Division of Equipment, $32,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General is authorized to have prepared the necessary plans and specifications and to enter into a contract or contracts for the construction of a reinforced-concrete and all-glass factory-type fireproof building for the use of the Post Office Department equipment shops, such building to contain approximately 70,000 square feet of floor space; and sufficient land in the city of Washington, D. C., may be acquired, if necessary, by the Postmaster General, by purchase or condemnation, upon which to erect such building; and for the purposes of the purchase of said land and the construction of said building $200,000 is hereby appropriated and made available, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated."

Inasmuch as the office of the Supervising Architect will be unable to prepare plans and specifications for such building, the Secretary of the Treasury has suggested that this department request legislation in the above form, so as to authorize the construction by the Postmaster General.

Hearings were held by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, at which time the chief clerk for the Post Office Department appeared in behalf of the bill. A copy of the hearings is inclosed.

A. S. BURLESON,
Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 11, after the words "civil-service employee in," to strike out "the Postal Service" and insert "post offices of the first and second classes," so as to make the clause read:

That hereafter the Postmaster General shall have authority to employ acting employees in place of all employees or substitutes hereinafter mentioned who are injured while on duty, who shall be granted leave of absence with full pay during the period of disability, but not exceeding 1 year, then at the rate of 50 per cent of the employee's salary for the period of disability exceeding 1 year, but not exceeding 12 months additional, and the Postmaster General is authorized to pay the sum of $2,000, which shall be exempt from payment of debts of the deceased, to the legal representatives, for the benefit of wife, children, or dependent relatives, of any railway postal clerk, substitute railway postal clerk, supervisory official of the Railway Mail Service, post-office inspector, letter carrier in the City Delivery Service, rural letter carrier, post-office clerk, special-delivery messenger, post-office laborer, or any classified civil-service employee in post offices of the first and second classes who shall be killed while on duty, or who, being injured while on duty, shall die within one year thereafter as the result of such injury: *Provided*, That no compensation shall be paid any such employee for any injury occasioned by his own negligence. To enable the Postmaster General to carry out the provisions of the above, $234,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 19, to insert:

For compensation of a special assistant to the Attorney General to assist in the defense of cases against the United States arising out of the transportation of the mails, and in other cases and matters affecting the postal revenues, $6,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in the first place, I do not think this amendment ought to be in this bill. In the second place, I notice that it carries a compensation of $6,000 for a special assistant to the Attorney General. The Solicitor for the Interior Department, under the Department of Justice, receives a salary of $5,000. The Solicitor for the Post Office Department receives only $5,000. The Solicitor of Internal Revenue receives $5,000. The Solicitor for the Department of State receives $5,000. This provision authorizes the appointment of a special assistant to the Attorney General at a salary of $6,000, $1,000 more than the solicitors for any of the departments receive. The item should rightfully come in an appropriation bill where all the salaries of all the other employees in the departments are provided for.

I will ask the Senator if he will not allow the amendment to be disagreed to and let the provision come in a regular appropriation bill. Not only that; whoever may be selected certainly should not receive a greater salary than the Solicitor General of the State Department or of any of the other departments of the Government.

I want to say to the Senator and to the Senate that just as sure as this item becomes a part of the bill for this particular position carrying $6,000 there will be a demand upon the Committee on Appropriations next year to increase the salary of every solicitor of every department of the Government, and what excuse can be given for denying it? How can we say that the Solicitor of the State Department should have only $5,000 and then provide for paying $6,000 to a man acting virtually as an assistant?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to have the Secretary read a letter from the Postmaster General, which furnishes perhaps the best explanation that can be given as to why this position should be filled at this salary. It is not a new position; it is not a new salary provided. The Assistant Attorney General now has a salary of $6,000 a year. The only purpose of this amendment is to transfer this Assistant Attorney General at $6,000 to the service of the Post Office Department to act especially in the Court of Claims and Supreme Court. The only purpose of the amendment is to provide that the salary shall be paid from the Post Office appropriations instead of being paid out of the appropriations for the Department of Justice.

I should like to have the letter from the Postmaster General read, if the Senator from Utah will yield long enough for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. I will wait until the letter has been read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1916.

Hon. J. H. BANKHEAD,
Chairman Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BANKHEAD: The large number of important suits filed against the United States by railroad companies and other engaged in the transportation of the mails made advisable the appointment of a special assistant to the Attorney General, who should be specially qualified, by reason of administrative knowledge of the service of the Post Office Department, as well as otherwise, to assist in the defense of the United States in such cases. Accordingly, on the 1st of September, 1915, such an appointment was made by the Attorney General at a salary of $6,000 per annum, payable out of the appropriation for "Pay of special assistant attorneys" under the Department of Justice.

Inasmuch as the work of this officer of the Department of Justice is concerned with suits arising out of the Postal Service, and as his duties make him an adviser of the Postmaster General in regard to the questions involved in these actions, it would seem appropriate that his compensation be provided for in the bill for the service of the Post Office Department. I therefore have the honor to suggest that the following provision be inserted in H. R. 10484, after line 6, on page 22, of the first Senate committee print, namely:

"For compensation of a special assistant to the Attorney General to assist in the defense of cases against the United States arising out of transportation of the mails, and in other cases affecting the postal revenues, $6,000."

Sincerely, yours,

A. S. BURLESON,
Postmaster General.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama having the bill in charge that we might just as well appropriate money for the payment of the salary of the Solicitor for the State Department, the salary of the Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, the salary of the Solicitor for the Internal Revenue Bureau out of the funds of the departments named as to have this particular employee paid from the funds of the Post Office Department. It has always been the practice of the Government to pay the solicitors out of the funds appropriated for the Department of Justice. They have always been under the charge of the Attorney General and all appropriations that have been made have been paid from appropriations made to the Department of Justice.

It seems to me, if the letter of the Postmaster General is correct, we are making a duplicate appropriation. If the position has been appropriated for it must have been in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which has already become a law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There never has been any specific appropriation for this purpose. It is simply paid out of a lump sum.

Mr. SMOOT. That is one of the evils of the lump-sum appropriations that I have spoken of so often.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am just trying to keep the record straight.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure the Senator does not believe that this position ought to carry a higher salary than the position of Solicitor for the State Department.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think we can give good reasons why.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to hear the reasons.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will permit me, I will state them now.

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield to the Senator. I would prefer that he should state now what the reasons are.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think there is a reasonable explanation for this proposition. Let us get the facts plainly before us. In the first place this office is now held by the former Second Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Stewart. He is paid, as the Postmaster General says, out of an appropriation for the pay of special assistant attorneys in the Department of Justice and is assigned by that department to the Post Office Department for certain work described by the Postmaster General in his letter.

The facts are these: Mr. Stewart is the greatest expert in the employ of the Government in that particular kind of cases. He is a very great expert about this class of cases, in which he has dealt for so many years.

The business of the Post Office Department, of the character described in the letter referred to, is very heavy, and it is especially heavy now, and has been especially heavy recently, in view of pending questions connected with the adjustment of railway mail pay. The railroad companies of this country have had the most brilliant talent that unlimited funds could employ, and we feel that probably a salary of $6,000 should be allowed Mr. Stewart in this case. We believe that the talent and industry with which this gentleman has served the Government fully warrant and justify it.

I think it required that sort of an explanation to let the Senator understand why we insist on it, or why we agreed to the departmental recommendation with respect to it. We believe that it is real economy to allow the department to employ the very best expert within the reach of the Government and within its means. For that reason and because of the especial service rendered necessary at this time we thought the recommendation of the department should be granted.

Mr. SMOOT. I still state that this is a duplicate appropriation.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator yield to me just there? Probably I did not cover all the ground. Undoubtedly if this amendment is retained in the Post Office appropriation bill that much more money will be available for the Department of Justice and they may employ another man. But the Post Office Department contends, and I think correctly, and I believe the Senator will agree with me that this man has devoted himself to this particular kind of work exclusively in the employment of that department and it is proper his salary should be paid out of the postal funds. If on that account $5,000 or $6,000 per annum is left unexpended in the Department of Justice, of

course, there will be no duplication in the expenditure. Whether or not the Department of Justice will try to appoint another man I do not know; the committee can not deal with that. It seems that the committee that handles the sundry civil appropriation bill or the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill ought to look after that.

Mr. SMOOT. I will assure the Senator right now that every cent of the lump appropriation provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill will be spent before June 30, 1917.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course, the Senator understands——

Mr. SMOOT. I say that, Mr. President, from the past experience I have had in the appropriation of money for any of the departments of the Government in lump sums.

Mr. HARDWICK. I quite agree with the Senator on that general proposition, but owing to the fact that this great expert is devoting himself to the Postal Service, in this particular kind of work, where there is a special need for his services now, he ought to be paid out of this appropriation and in connection with this bill I do not believe can very well be denied by the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that in the past he has been paid out of the lump-sum appropriation for doing exactly the same work and I see no reason why he can not continue to be paid in that way. I say frankly to the Senator that when the Committee on Appropriations were considering the legislative appropriation bill they knew nothing of this special position. I know Gen. Stewart very well. I know his ability as an attorney and his familiarity with these questions.

There is no question but that we have in the department men of the highest attainment, not only in the law but in the business affairs of the land that draw salaries not exceeding $5,000 per annum. No doubt the Senator remembers of my referring to some of them at different times. I called attention to such men as the Commissioner of Indian Affairs receiving a salary of only $5,000. The result of a direct appropriation of this kind for this particular work will be that when the next appropriation bill comes before the Appropriations Committee the heads of the departments will insist upon an increase in the salaries of the solicitors for their departments. They will insist that they receive $6,000 a year and will point to this very case as a justification.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if he knows an exception to the rule that when a larger salary is given to a person who occupies a position similar to that of several others the others immediately ask that they shall have their salaries increased to the maximum, giving as a reason that they are entitled to it quite as much as the man who receives it.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not remember of a case in any of the departments where that has not happened; and to be frank, Mr. President, I have always felt like there was justice in their demands.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true.

Mr. THOMAS. That is human nature.

Mr. SMOOT. There have been a few cases where a position has been hold at a salary larger than perhaps would be ordinarily paid, but it was specifically stated in the bill that it should only apply as long as the present incumbent lived. That only happens where a man has been faithful in a certain position of great responsibility for 20 or 30 years. At present I do not know of a case that is thus provided for in our appropriation bills. I think the late financial clerk of the Senate was the last one who was so mentioned.

I really believe, Mr. President, that this is a bad precedent to establish. By all odds I would prefer to allow it to go on the way it is going and pay Gen. Stewart $6,000 from the lump sum. We have already appropriated the money for the position and it has been paid from a lump-sum appropriation in the past. It would not make any difference to the department if continued, but it will make a great difference to the Committee on Appropriations when they are called upon to consider the next legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

I appeal to the Senator having the bill in charge to allow this amendment to be disagreed to. I would not ask it if it was going to affect Gen. Stewart. I can testify as to his ability and recognize his faithful services as any Senator in the Chamber. I know what work he has been doing, and I know he will continue to do it; but this amendment will come back to plague us in the future, and I ask that it be disagreed to.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I want to say only a word or two more in justice to the committee. I think I ought to reiterate the committee's position that this is an exceptional case. We are not always readjusting a great system of pay for the railroads of the country for hauling the mails. When the pay is once readjusted, it will stay readjusted. We do not expect this thing to recur. We do think that just at this time, when the railroad companies are represented by the most brilliant legal talent that limitless funds can hire, and they are urging with skill and force and tremendous ability their contention on questions relating to railway mail pay, there is a special and exceptional reason why this exceptional thing, if it is exceptional, ought to be done now, during the pendency of that controversy and only during its pendency. It seems to me it ought to cease immediately with the settlement of this question.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator claim that it will in any way interfere with the work of Gen. Stewart if this amendment is stricken from the bill?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer the Senator in this way about it. The Post Office Department, I think, has had the services of Gen. Stewart in his present capacity for only a few months, since the resignation of Mr. Otto Praeger. It is not an old thing; it is a very recent thing. The Department of Justice agreed to let them have one of these special attorneys, although they had already an Assistant Attorney General for the Post Office Department. The Department of Justice is under no obligations to continue this. For some reason the Postmaster General seems to think that he could not provide for Gen. Stewart otherwise except by the adoption of this amendment, and we really felt that it would be a calamity to the Government and to the department not to keep him, and unless this amendment is agreed to we were afraid it could not be done.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator the appropriation has been made in a lump sum to take care of every one who is in the employ of the Department of Justice, and we gave the Department of Justice every cent that they asked. The Committee on Appropriations did not restrict that department in any way. If the Senator will look up the bill he will find we gave an increase in numbers of employees and appropriations.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, I will suggest this possibility about it. If the Attorney General and the Postmaster General have an understanding that the Postmaster General will take care of this salary for Gen. Stewart and it is not included in this bill and we cut this amendment out, then we may lose the services of this man, and we can not afford to do it.

Mr. SMOOT. We can not afford to do it, and I would not do it.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is the reason why we urge it.

Mr. SMOOT. But I assure the Senator with all the assurance I can give, and it would almost go to a promise, that if the Government of the United States did not pay him I would. If this amendment is disagreed to Gen. Stewart will be employed just as he is employed to-day, and he will be paid out of the lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. HARDWICK. I merely wish to suggest to the Senator that Gen. Stewart is now trying a case for the department in the Court of Claims which involves $40,000,000. We can not afford to run any risk on that. If the Senator could be absolutely positive from his knowledge of the other bill that came from his committee that Gen. Stewart is already provided for and we were going to retain his services whether the amendment was adopted or rejected, I would not care whether he was paid out of this fund or not, but we think otherwise; at least we fear it.

Mr. SMOOT. That will never happen.

Mr. HARDWICK. We would have no assurance of it, and we do not want to run any risk. I do not think the Senator ought to insist upon his opposition to the amendment, because we can not afford to run any risk just at the present time of losing the invaluable services of Gen. Stewart in connection with these cases and with the particular work upon which he is engaged, as set out in the letter of the Postmaster General.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator will pardon the suggestion, if the facts stated by the Senator from Utah can be established before the conference committee——

Mr. HARDWICK. We will strike it out.

Mr. VARDAMAN. There will be no trouble in striking it out.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think that is a very good solution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. This is an office created for the man, not a man for the office. This man's services are especially needed, and it was agreed by the committee that he ought to be retained in the service, and that this was the most direct and satisfactory way of doing it. If the Members of the other House are in possession of the facts, which the Senator has just suggested may exist, there will be no trouble about eliminating the provision.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that this is not an exceptional case in the sense that we have already admitted that it was, for there are hundreds of appropriations which have been made, just as this is made, to fit a certain condition.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If that certain man is to perform a certain duty or a certain function, the Government makes a very good investment by taking that man.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but in this case the Government is already employing him, and the Government will continue that employment. He will do the exact work under the law as it now stands.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator from Utah were absolutely sure about that, I should agree with the Senator that the provision ought not to remain in the bill, but the Senator is not absolutely certain about it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can not say any more than I have said, but I am positive of it; there is no question of it in my mind.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I do not think I need take up the time of the Senate any longer. Permit us to have the amendment agreed to, and if we find that the Senator from Utah is right we will strike it out in conference.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am willing to leave the form that this matter shall take to the Post Office Committee, but I can not refrain from saying just a word.

I do not believe in jobs that only one man can perform. I heard an Irishman say one time with reference to a situation of that sort, when it was urged that only one man could fill a position, that, if that were the case, we must immediately abolish the job, because some day that man would die and the country would be in a terrible condition.

I am not impressed with the wonderful ability of the so-called Gen. Stewart, a title that he gets by courtesy because he was for a long time Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. HARDWICK. Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. REED. I believe he has gravitated from Fourth Assistant Postmaster General to Second Assistant Postmaster General, and then perhaps to some other position. I believe that this gentleman has been kept in the Government service through some extraordinary favoritism. He used to practice law in my town, just across the hall from me; and if he possessed any remarkable ability or any latent germs that might bud and blossom and bring forth the fruitage of extraordinary talent, then the fact was entirely concealed from the members of the profession to to which he belonged.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator from Missouri pardon me for just a moment?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. What I meant to say was—I may have been extravagant in the compliments I have paid to Mr. Stewart—that Mr. Stewart had great familiarity with these questions, in which the Government is obliged to have an expert. There is no doubt about that, I will say to the Senator, whatever may be the fact as to his natural ability.

Mr. REED. I think Mr. Stewart has had a good deal to do with a good many things. I remember one of the first tasks I had to perform after arriving here in Washington was to listen to the complaints of the editors of certain great agricultural newspapers who had been summoned or who had had issued against them orders to show cause why their papers should not be denied the privileges of the second-class mail. I am sorry that both the chairman of the committee and his able assistant have vanished from the Chamber. When I got through hearing the evidence which these gentlemen had to produce I made up my mind that the solitary offense of which these editors of agricultural papers had been guilty was not a violation of the postal laws, but the fact that they had printed a Democratic article in their papers shortly before the election. I remember that a large number of Representatives and several Senators went down to attempt to right that wrong, and found that it was based upon a construction of the law which was so arbitrary and so unjust that after some discussion it was hastily abandoned.

It may be that this indispensable gentleman, this man who manages to hold through all administrations and in all positions, is so essential to the Government that we can not get along without him. If it is necessary to appropriate this $6,000, I am willing to have it appropriated; but not upon the theory that Mr. Stewart is the only man in the United States who can do this work, for I undertake to say that any good lawyer can master every question that has to be presented and can put forward the Government's side in a forceful and complete manner, and that none of these alleged great experts employed by the railroads will have any advantage over a lawyer who is devoting his entire time to the preparation of these particular questions.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will yield for just a moment—I do not want to disturb him, because I surely do not want to prolong the debate—I will say that I think the Senator would be right, probably, if the man had anything like the preparation and training that Mr. Stewart has had; but I will say to the Senator that the particular work upon which Mr. Stewart is engaged is of such a character that, after some little examination of the questions myself—questions so intricate and so involved, with so many angles to them—I am of the opinion that a first-class lawyer could not do this work without a good many years of preparation.

Mr. REED. Of course, I do not want to prolong the discussion. Indeed, I should have been through before now if I had been allowed to drift along in my own mild way. The railroad lawyers who will be here to argue this proposition are lawyers in active practice, having hundreds of different propositions to handle. The man who represents the Government, if he be employed on this business alone, can speedily place himself in a position to meet whatever demands the railroads bring.

It may be that Gen. Stewart has great familiarity with the subject; but I have seen many men possessing great familiarity with a subject who could not handle it half so well as some man of superior talents who had been on the ground only a few hours. So I am not in favor of this proposition because it is going to take care of Gen. Stewart. If it is necessary to have the money, well and good; but I hope that the Senate of the United States will not commit itself to the doctrine that Gen. Stewart is indispensable to the welfare of the American Republic.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have just come in, and I desire to ask, Is the proposition to pay Mr. Stewart $6,000?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. I doubt whether, if we pay him at all, we should pay him more than we are paying the Solicitor of the Post Office Department, the Solicitor of the Treasury Department, or the Solicitor of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. HARDWICK. He is getting that salary already, because he is doing the work of a special attorney.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand he is being paid out of a lump-sum appropriation, and I am opposed to lump-sum appropriations. It is now proposed to fix his salary; but we ought not to fix it at an amount greater than is paid Assistant Attorneys General.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am sorry the Senator was not here when I tried to give the reasons for the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Did I understand the Senator to say that Gen. Stewart received pay in addition to the $6,000?

Mr. HARDWICK. No; the Senator did not understand me to say that. He is being paid by the Department of Justice from a lump sum, $6,000.

Mr. THOMAS. The same amount which he will get under this provision?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; but he will be paid through the Post Office Department.

For the benefit of the Senator from North Carolina, I am glad to state for the committee that Mr. Stewart is in charge of all the Government's contentions with respect to important questions that are now acute relating to railway mail pay. He has in charge one case before the Court of Claims growing out of that matter, and involving, I think, $40,000,000, in connection with what is called the divisor question. Just at present that question is before Congress, and it involves immense sums to the Government, to the railroads, and to the public; and so, as to this man, with years of experience and years of training in connection with this question, there are reasons why the compensation is not at all too great.

Mr. OVERMAN. What salary did he get as Second Assistant Postmaster General?

Mr. HARDWICK. I think the Senator probably knows as much concerning the salaries of Government officials as I do. I presume he got $5,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. He got the same salary as the other Assistant Postmasters General of the department got. He did every particle of the work which it is said he is doing now for $5,000 and had a more responsible position; and it is proposed to pay him now more than is paid the First Assistant Postmaster General, the Second Assistant Postmaster General, or the Third Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, during the time when Gen. Stewart was Second Assistant Postmaster General, this question was not acute in the form it is now.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand the reason why Gen. Stewart was retained in office was because he knew more about this matter than anybody else.

Mr. HARDWICK. I understand that there are other things of moment which the Second Assistant Postmaster General attends to besides the question of railway-mail pay.

Mr. OVERMAN. If we increase his salary, does not the Senator think we ought to increase the salary of the Assistant Postmasters General?

Mr. HARDWICK. No, sir. In the first place, we do not increase his salary at all.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; it is proposed to promote him to $6,000 instead of $5,000.

Mr. HARDWICK. If we should strike this amendment from the bill, he would get $6,000 anyhow.

Mr. OVERMAN. How?

Mr. HARDWICK. From the Department of Justice.

Mr. OVERMAN. He can only get it because he is paid from a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is how he does get it.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then, he is on an annual basis. Such appropriations are made from the 1st of July of one year to the 1st of July of the next year.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is all the time this appropriation continues in force.

Mr. OVERMAN. The departments can pay salaries of $10,000 out of lump-sum appropriations. They sometimes take lump sums and pay an employee $3,000 whose salary has been fixed at $2,000. I am opposed to paying the salaries of men out of lump-sum appropriations.

Mr. HARDWICK. Six thousand dollars is the amount of salary Congress has provided for in this particular case, and it is now being paid from a lump-sum appropriation by the Department of Justice.

Mr. OVERMAN. When it comes to fixing salaries, I will say to the Senator, if he will pardon me, that we ought not to fix them greater in this bill than we do in the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. VARDAMAN. That is just what this does. It is not a lump sum and the salary is fixed.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is what I am protesting against.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It fixes his salary at just what he is receiving now.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is what I am protesting against. We have a legislative bill to fix the salaries of all the officers of departments, but in this case they had a lump-sum appropriation, and from the lump-sum appropriation they employ this man and pay him more money than he was getting before for doing the same work; and here comes in another appropriation bill proposing to fix his salary at $6,000.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, I do not want to go over the ground again.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am sorry I was not here, and I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am willing, however, to do it for the Senator's benefit. The situation is different from what the Senator imagines. Gen. Stewart is not doing the same work. The question of railway mail pay has become acute. Congress is about to enact legislation one way or another concerning this matter in this bill. Before we get through the committee will submit a proposition looking to a thorough investigation of that question by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The railroads will be represented by lawyers of skill and ability and experience in these questions. They have unlimited funds, or practically so, I presume, with which to pay those attorneys. Mr. Stewart has had years of experience, and he seems to have, so far as the committee can judge, exceptional ability and knowledge of this question, and we thought that for the present it was well to make this provision. I will say to the Senator frankly that as soon as we can get through with this question of railway mail pay, and that matter has been adjusted, I will agree with him thoroughly. I agree with every sentiment that he has uttered in regard to general rules of this kind; but it does seem to me, as it seemed to all the members of the committee, that this was an exceptional case because of the conditions surrounding the question of railway mail pay and railway mail transportation, at this particular time, and the great controversy that is now raging about them.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will ask the Senator if the question of space has been passed upon by the committee?

Mr. HARDWICK. The committee has recommended that the whole matter be investigated by the Interstate Commerce Commission——

Mr. OVERMAN. That is under consideration now?

Mr. HARDWICK. And that the department and the railroads go there to argue the question out. Of course, we will come to that later.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am not going to take any time on this question now, because there are very few Senators present, and I want this bill to proceed; but I did want to protest against this kind of legislation, for if you provide for a man in one bill and for another man in the same department in another bill, what is the use of having a legislative appropriation bill?

Mr. HARDWICK. Abstractly I quite agree with the Senator. He is absolutely right—unequivocally right—and yet I say to him, after a careful study of this question, that I think this is such an exceptional case and the circumstances are so exceptional that the interests of the Government require that the action recommended by the committee be taken in this instance. That is all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I think perhaps the Senator from North Carolina does not quite understand this particular case. Gen. Stewart was Second Assistant Postmaster General and during that time for 15 years he dealt largely with railway mail pay questions. In his present position, however, he has nothing to do with the Second Assistant Postmaster General's office, but represents the Post Office Department in the Court of Claims and other courts, and recently he appeared in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. OVERMAN. You do not need an Assistant Attorney General, then, for that purpose?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not care what you may call him.

Mr. OVERMAN. We have an Assistant Attorney General, as the Senator knows, who does all that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But he does not do it as to this particular question. He, like many other great lawyers, does not understand all questions, and it seemed to the committee that it would be well to make this provision. This is an annual appropriation, it is true, but whether it stays in this bill or goes out, the salary of the office will be the same and the amount of money received will be the same. The committee thought—and it seems to me that that is a reasonable conclusion—that if he was under the control and jurisdiction of the Post Office Department representing alone the Post Office Department in the courts of the United States, including the Court of Claims and the Supreme Court of the United States, his salary ought to be paid from the Post Office appropriation bill. That is the only purpose of this item, and it seems to me there should be no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge if he will not consent to adjourn at this time. We have been meeting at 11 o'clock every day; this is the eve of Decoration Day, and there are very few Senators present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am very glad, indeed, to agree to the suggestion of the Senator from Utah, and I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m., Monday, May 29, 1916) the Senate, under the previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, May 31, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *May 29, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We bless Thee, Infinite Spirit, for the sublime faith which enables us to see back of all that we perceive with our physical senses a supreme Intelligence, a moral order, a spiritual realm, the kingdom of heaven. Help us to enter in and possess that realm that we may live in Thee, through Thee, to the larger life and render to our fellow men a truer, nobler service, after the manner of the Christ. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 27, was read and approved.

JEFFERSON DAVIS.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Saturday, June 3, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, the occasion being the anniversary of the birthday of Mr. Jefferson Davis.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] asks unanimous consent that on next Saturday, after the reading of the Journal and the clearing up of the business on the Speaker's table, he be allowed to address the House to not exceed 15 minutes, it being the anniversary of the birthday of Jefferson Davis. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify the order under which we are operating, to the extent of allowing general debate to proceed so that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] shall have 1 hour and 20 minutes and the

gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] 1 hour and 20 minutes to-day, and that general debate shall close at the end of that time.

The SPEAKER. Does that mean at the end of this general debate or at the end of the whole thing?

Mr. MANN. It means now. It will extend it a little time beyond the time fixed by the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the order heretofore agreed to shall be modified to such an extent as to allow the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] 1 hour and 20 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] 1 hour and 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3606. An act for the relief of contributors of the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund; to the Committee on Claims.

JEFFERSON DAVIS.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, next Saturday, as we know, is the anniversary of the birth of Jefferson Davis, who was born in my district. I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the reading of the Journal and immediately after the address of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] I be permitted to address the House on the life and character of Jefferson Davis and make some observations as to the Southern Confederacy.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. KINCHELOE. It will not take long; 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] asks unanimous consent that on next Saturday, after the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL], he be allowed to address the House for 20 minutes on the life and character of Jefferson Davis, who was born in his district. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT WILSON.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech of the President delivered Saturday night at the peace meeting in Washington.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech by the President of the United States delivered last Saturday evening at the peace meeting. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, would the gentleman have any objection to adding to his request that there be printed as a document all the speeches delivered at the recent peace conference?

Mr. COX. None whatever. I would like very much to get hold of President Taft's speech also. The papers did not carry it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed as a House document.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX]. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a House document the proceedings of the recent meeting of the League for the Enforcement of Peace, held in this city last week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the proceedings of the Peace League, held here last week, be published as a House document. Is there objection?

Mr. DIES. Reserving the right to object, how much of this stuff is there? Will the gentleman tell me?

Mr. STAFFORD. It will not be a very large document. Under the rules of the House, as the gentleman knows, there can be only so many documents printed within the certain amount allowed by law. They would amount to about 500. We are all interested in having all those very noteworthy speeches delivered at that league last week, among others the speech of ex-President Taft, and President Lowell, of Harvard, and other distinguished publicists. The public expense will not be great.

Mr. DIES. It occurs to me that if you print the speech of ex-President Taft and a few others in the RECORD it would be better than to print the whole flabdab——

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman refers to it as "flabdab." The gentleman does not know the character of the speeches.

Mr. DIES. I am not talking about the speeches. I am talking about the proceedings of the meeting.

Mr. STAFFORD. The proceedings virtually consisted of the addresses.

Mr. DIES. I mean to insert the addresses and leave the proceedings out.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a wholesale matter of this sort should come through the Committee on Printing. Why not introduce a resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. There have been many times when such things have been done without a committee resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15947) making appropriations for the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes. And the Chair will ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX] to preside temporarily until the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] arrives.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15947, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. COX in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15947, the naval appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15947) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] is recognized.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the naval appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 15947, the naval appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ESTOPINAL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ESTOPINAL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ESTOPINAL. Mr. Chairman, we recall that only two or three years ago the opponents of armed preparedness—or readiness, which is probably a better designation—were voicing, in the pulpit, on the stump, in lectures, in the press, and in the halls of Congress, the theory that the nations of Europe were heading toward bankruptcy on account of their military expenditures, and it was applied to our country in combatting the comparatively small annual increases which our Naval Affairs and Military Committees were wresting, so to speak, from the "watchdogs" of the Treasury and in contest with a strong opposition sentiment in the committees, in the House, and in the country.

In advocating the passage of one of our annual appropriation bills for the Navy I discussed this phase of the question, and showed by reliable statistics the comparatively small effect of these military expenditures even in Europe on the progressive development of commerce, trade, and industry in those countries, and as to the United States that the effect of our expenditures for these purposes was almost negligible in the march of our rapid progress in wealth production, industry, and commerce.

But, Mr. Chairman, were we to concede that even this showing—these comparisons of relatively small military expenditure with the financial, commercial, and industrial expansion of these European countries of the first class—may have left some slight grounds for difference of opinion as to the effect of this burden of "militarism" on their financial status, the unprecedented costs of the great upheaval which has been going on for the last 22 months with no sign of financial collapse make these claims absurd, for these first-class powers are spending more, probably, in two weeks of warfare than their total annual military and naval expenditures prior to the opening of hostilities. These nations certainly must have already expended in this war almost as much as the total amounts spent on their

army and navy for the past half century, including the cost of their wars. And it is equally absurd, Mr. Chairman, to claim that the state of military preparedness of these countries was the cause of the war, for the belief rests on rather conclusive evidence that if Great Britain had been as well prepared with her army as she was with her navy, there would have been no war.

And it is well to note that that country on the Continent which was best prepared has been able to keep its own soil almost free from invasion and to confine the hostilities to that of its enemies.

Now, the lesson in this for us, Mr. Chairman, is that preparation, with the expenditure of hundreds of millions annually, is far cheaper than war with the resultant costs in billions of dollars, in the red riot of death and permanent disability to perhaps millions of our bravest and best, and in widows and orphans and dependent mothers left to mourn in tears and suffer in poverty. For it is one of the surest of things that, with our national spirit and our growing world status, we shall be embroiled in warfare unless our state of readiness makes attack upon us too great a hazard to be ventured.

Mr. Chairman, the Navy Department has submitted a five-year building program and has recommended an appropriation for the next fiscal year for the construction of a certain number of vessels included in this program.

The General Board of the Navy, in its reports to the Secretary of the Navy as published by him, has recommended larger programs, especially in the number of ships to be authorized now. And many individual officers, the president of the War College, the commander-in-chief of the Pacific Fleet, and others, have recommended more extensive programs.

These differences do not indicate a divergence of opinion between the Secretary of the Navy and the General Board and these officers of experience in regard to the number of vessels which may be needed to insure an efficient first-class line of defense for the country. This can be clearly seen by reference to the statements of the Secretary of the Navy to our committee, that, if he thought the money was available, he would recommend accelerating the program. This, of course, meant appropriating for a larger number of ships in the present bill. We have in some ways enlarged the recommendation for the fiscal year, but the balance of the five-year program we have left in abeyance. In this situation the House is, after all, the court of last resort so far as action at this end of the Capitol is concerned.

This question of funds available is a matter which is definitely up to Congress, and in view of the recommendation of the General Board and of the Secretary's statement that he would favor an accelerated program if money were available, we can not evade the responsibility of making the adjustment between the defensive needs of the country and the financial resources at the present time; and to enlarge our resources, or otherwise supplement them, to fit these needs.

The defensive needs of the country can not be based upon any absolute standard. The minimum number of ships required must be arrived at by a comparison with the fleets of the other great naval powers. All authorities agree that in the middle of the year 1914 Great Britain occupied first place and Germany second. The official records of our own Navy Department place the United States third, with a narrow margin over France in the fourth place. This margin, however, is so narrow that some authorities place France in the third place.

If none of the belligerents in the present war has laid down up to the present time, and does not lay down in the future, any additional ships, the five-year program recommended by the department would, in 1925, place the United States in second position in naval strength.

There is as yet nothing in the progress of this war to indicate that it will not end without a great naval battle. Indeed, it appears entirely possible, and many commentators believe probable, that no such battle will be fought; that peace will find all belligerents with their battle fleets as they existed at the beginning of the war, practically intact, and with great additions to their strength, due to the construction work which has been undertaken since the beginning of the war and pushed to completion with the utmost dispatch under the pressure of emergency conditions. For this year at least this would appear to be the only safe hypothesis for this country to proceed on in determining its naval program. If, at the next session, it is found that one or more of the European fleets have actually suffered great losses, the naval program for those years can be reduced. This would result in no greater expenditure over the next three years than would be involved by the authorization of the same total number of ships, but authorized piecemeal; that is, one-third each year. It seems to me that no one can question that this would be the safest course to pursue, in view of the extremely uncertain and unsettled international outlook.

Mr. Chairman, we have not been permitted to peer behind the curtain to see the extent of naval building of the belligerent nations. Therefore very little is known definitely of the amount of construction laid down by the various belligerents since the beginning of the war. Some facts are available, however, upon which a shrewd estimate may be based. It is known that the shipbuilding capacity, both of Great Britain and Germany, is far in excess of that of the United States. As an illustration of the shipbuilding capacity of Great Britain we may cite the statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty before Parliament, in November, 1914, in which he stated that between August, 1914, and December, 1915, there would be added to the British Fleet 15 dreadnaughts and battle cruisers. This number represented only vessels which had been laid down prior to the war in accordance with their ordinary peace-time program, and the construction of which had been carried along with the usual huge output of merchant tonnage.

One naval writer has estimated that the German yards are capable of carrying along the construction of about 25 capital ships at one time; and that there are enough smaller yards, not able to construct capital ships, to supply the needed auxiliaries without interfering with the construction of these capital ships. It is further known that men in the shipbuilding trades have been exempted from military services as they are being utilized to better national purposes in their usual pursuits. It is also known that every effort is being made to increase the output of shipbuilding establishments by resorting to overtime work, work in shifts, and a close supervision of all men to insure good timekeeping; and by Germany, the utilization of establishments in captured territory and the employment of alien civilian workers and prisoners. These facts lead to the inevitable conclusion that a huge amount of naval-construction work is being done in these countries. As supporting this presumption, there can be cited the recent speech, in the British Parliament, of Mr. Winston Churchill, formerly First Lord of the Admiralty, in which he warned the Government of the probability that Germany was adding a large number of capital ships to her fleet, with the consequence that it was of the highest importance that Great Britain should press, with the utmost speed, the construction of similar vessels; this despite the almost 2 to 1 margin of strength which she possessed at the outbreak of the war.

Summarizing the foregoing, it is believed that the statement of the Secretary of the Navy, that his recommendations for new construction were limited only by the question of funds available; the recommendations of the General Board of the Navy, and of individual officers of experience; the present uncertain position of the United States Navy in comparison with great foreign navies; the almost inevitable conclusion that at least some of the belligerents in the present war are adding to their fleets at an unprecedented rate; the probability that these navies will emerge from the present conflict far stronger, both as regards numbers and more experience, than they were at the beginning of hostilities, all place upon Congress the heavy responsibility of determining the extent of the program which should be laid down this year, taking into account the international, political, financial, and military factors of the present situation, some of which are ominous in the extreme, with but small room for any clarity of vision for us.

Mr. Chairman, in my remarks on at least two former naval appropriation bills I expressed the belief that science would finally dispose of warfare by making it impossible on account of wholesale destruction. The present conflict in the war zone of Europe seems to point to a realization of that prediction, with this amendment: That in addition to making it destructive in intensity and duration, science is making warfare futile, as well. When nations realize that, notwithstanding the cost of millions of lives and billions of treasure, a deadlock in operations is inevitable, the glamour of war will depart and self-preservation will dictate international agreement. But until international agreement shall give us security from attack we must be prepared spiritually and economically, as well as with armaments, for the preliminaries of larger military preparation, the passing of laws to increase the strength of our arms of service—especially to only the extent which we are preparing to go—is not sufficient to give us immunity from attack from any nation or nations of the first class which may seek that kind of an adventure with us. Behind these moderate military preparations we must come to a state of industrial manhood and spiritual completeness, with the labor forces of the country forming an integral part. Without these under-

lying conditions, it matters not to what conservative extent we finally plan our defense laws, we shall have but a shell inclosing a molluscous mass of weakness.

Patriotism, Mr. Chairman, is a soul quality, a habit of thought, the spirit of communion, the joy of living, which can not force itself up through the dead lava and ashes of ignorance, poverty, weakness, class divisions, religious prejudice, racial animosities, and grow and bloom in full perfection even in the free atmosphere of America. This country should lead the world in a new spiritual advance that will make these qualities predominant in its life.

Mr. Chairman, it is wholly compatible with the genius of our institutions for us to take the lead in this social evolution, notwithstanding that we are now far from first in organized action, for we have all the components, though yet uncoordinated, to produce the powers we need.

It has been said that it is difficult to mold the character of a people. But in this age of progress in inventions and discoveries of such astonishing character which contribute to the convenience of mankind we may see a sequel in an astonishing progress in social matters for the rapid advancement of mankind. We have only to find the way. We are leaping forward now in decades far more than the world first crept along in millennials.

Mr. Chairman, this is almost ultra vires so far as Government action is concerned, if we may thus distort that legal phrase. It is not a problem which government can solve, though wise laws may aid. It is one for the ingenuity of the educational forces and developing powers of this country to solve. Why should not these forces and these powers integrate America for a glorious consummation of the social ideal?

Mr. Chairman, there is provision in this bill authorizing the President of the United States to invite, after peace is concluded, all the great Governments of the world to a conference in the interest of an agreement for permanent peace. It seemed to us that such an invitation would be generally accepted and that some permanent plan may be the outcome, for this most heartless holocaust of war is shocking the civilized world, and its terms seem too hard, in suffering and desolation and death, for humanity to ever contemplate another. The world may be ready and eager to abolish the savagery of such wholesale wantonness and destruction. I shall not take up the time of the committee to read the clause, but will incorporate it in my remarks, if there is no objection. It is thus:

Upon the conclusion of the war in Europe, or as soon thereafter as it may be done, the President of the United States is authorized to invite all the great Governments of the world to send representatives to a conference which shall be charged with the duty of suggesting an organization, court of arbitration, or other body, to which disputed questions between nations shall be referred for adjudication and peaceful settlement, and to consider the question of disarmament and submit their recommendation to their respective Governments for approval. The President is hereby authorized to appoint nine citizens of the United States, who shall be qualified for the mission by eminence in the law and by devotion to the cause of peace, to be representatives of the United States in such a conference. The President shall fix the compensation of said representatives, and such secretaries and other employees as may be needed. Two hundred thousand dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated and set aside and placed at the disposal of the President to carry into effect the provisions of this paragraph.

[Applause.]

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

Mr. ESTOPINAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR], a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr Chairman, I do not like to be in the position of belittling our Navy or of minimizing its power, but candor compels me to say, in view of what I have learned as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that while our Navy is the best Navy this country ever had, relatively it is the weakest, and we are not in any position to defend ourselves against the attack of any formidable nation.

The President in his speeches to the country some little while ago spoke about the world, or half the world, being on fire, and said that a spark might ignite the flames that would include us in that great conflagration, and that a navy, not second in size but the greatest navy in the world, ought to be under our flag. The President in his addresses said we were fourth in naval strength.

Now, what caused the President to change from the position that the General Board occupied some time ago as to second place for this country? The information that he was getting through secret sources from foreign countries. The General Board had that information. Our committee had that information that the danger was not from an attack of one nation but from a combination of nations, and that two nations now actually in belligerency, one against the other, were coquetting with a view to getting a stronger position in the future. I can not harmonize the statement of the President with the program that was presented to the committee for its consideration, namely, 16 battleships in five years.

The President declared himself in favor of our having the greatest Navy on earth, and the Secretary of the Navy presented to our committee a program asking for 16 ships, which would not make any change in our position at its consummation. In other words, we are fourth to-day, and we are a poor fourth—that was demonstrated fully and conclusively to the committee when, under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, Lieut. McCandless appeared before us and presented in miniature the strength of the different navies of the world. First, Great Britain, with a navy twice as large as that of Germany; next, Germany, twice as great in strength as the American Navy; next, France, 15 to 25 per cent stronger than the American Navy; and I will venture this statement, that France is nearer 50 per cent than 15 or 25 per cent stronger.

Experts admitted that if we carried out the program of 16 ships in five years it would not change our position relatively. France would still be third and we fourth, and that it would not advance our position materially as a Navy.

Not only that, my friends, but I contend that if we carried out the 5-year program of 16 ships, which was given such publicity all over the country, with the claim of making our Navy wonderfully strong, Japan with her present shipbuilding operations at the end of five years would be fourth, and we would be fifth. That would be the result if those countries carried out their programs as in times of peace.

Now, what have those countries done? Great Britain has put a fleet on the ocean since the beginning of the war as great as our entire tonnage and so has Germany. Germany has 25 yards, in which it can build simultaneously 25 dreadnaughts, and other facilities for the construction of hundreds of the smaller craft. Great Britain can build that many dreadnaughts, and those two countries have been utilizing their yards to their full capacity in building ships.

One very comforting thing to me from the information that I have learned from these experts is that we can, by the utilization of the Government yards and encouraging the private interests to enlarge their yards, build at one and the same time 25 dreadnaughts, but we are not doing it. We are not spending the money that is needful to get these yards equipped. We have spent a little additional at the New York yard and some for the yard on the Pacific coast, and yet what have we on the Pacific coast?

Admiral Winslow makes the statement to us that one good dreadnaught would be able to destroy the entire Pacific Fleet. That is the statement of an expert who appeared before us. Another one told us that we are not equipped to protect and maintain control of the Panama Canal, in which we have put $400,000,000; that as against a nation the size of Germany we could not retain control of that canal; and, despite all our means of defense—our land fortifications, our submarines, and so forth—Capt. Sims told us that there are 116 places on our coast that the enemy could invade without coming in contact with those parts of the coast that are fortified.

The pacifists talk about furnishing submarines and providing mines. Admiral Grant, who is in charge of submarines, asked that we authorize appropriations for 111 submarines within one year. Only 20 are provided in this bill. All we have now are 27 efficient submarines. Others are contending for aerial fleets. Some Members say all we want is submarines, mines, fortifications, and airships. We have no airships worth mentioning. We need thousands of them in order to patrol our great coasts and to give us warning as to the oncoming of the enemy. According to the evidence presented to our committee, we are not now one bit stronger or more efficient in our ability to tell when the enemy is approaching us than we were in the War of 1812; and we who sit here within these walls are as vulnerable and defenseless as we were during that war when the British invaded Washington and burned the Capitol. Boston is defenseless and New York is defenseless against such attacks as could be waged against them. Those cities and many others could be destroyed with comparative ease.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do you remember that Admiral Fletcher stated that they could not attack New York?

Mr. FARR. No, I do not; and all the other gentlemen who appeared before our committee said that they could attack New York, and it is simply a matter of common sense to determine that they could. We have some fortifications there, but the guns are short ranged and the enemy ships could strike it, also land its forces at points near New York, and could enter there without any difficulty. The information before us is that they could easily shut off the water supply of that great city.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman let me read what Admiral Fletcher says?

Mr. FARR. I am not going to yield any further. The gentleman may do it in his own time.

My friends, the matter of cost ought not to disturb us when it concerns the question of safety. If we have a war, we will spend $25,000,000 a day, just as Great Britain is spending it to-day in that great war, and it is for us now to meet the wishes of our constituents and give them the adequate protection that our tremendous interests demand, the interests of a hundred million people, and all the great purposes of this Government. We ought to protect our liberties, which will be endangered in any great conflict with one of those big, formidable nations across the ocean.

They say we are not going to have any difficulty with Japan. I trust we shall have no difficulty; but the people of Japan must change their nature before ever they forgive us for the discrimination that California has shown against their people; and from what I have seen of the representatives from the Pacific coast on this floor, they will also have to change their natures before they recede from the position they have taken. We have this great question of the Monroe doctrine. My friends, we are not going to permit any foreign nation to establish itself in Central America or South America; but in the days to come, with the great rivalry for commerce, and for the reason that some of these nations must burst their boundaries, they are going to take possession in Central and South America, and we are going to have to fight to put them out. We are not ready to do it.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HARDY. Do I understand the gentleman to be in favor of our building in this fiscal year 25 battleships?

Mr. FARR. I would vote for 16 ships this minute. I would vote for 25 ships, because I believe that the country needs 25 ships for proper and adequate defense.

Mr. HARDY. I did not finish my question.

Mr. FARR. I believe in having an adequate Navy; and to my mind an adequate Navy is one that will defeat any navy that comes to invade our shores. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman also favor the 111 submarines?

Mr. FARR. I am in favor of 250 submarines, just as Admiral Grant advocated. He said we needed that number and more if we had trouble. I am in favor of thousands of airships, just as every one who appeared before us advocated.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman realize that his battleship and submarine program alone for this year would cost $625,000,000?

Mr. FARR. If we want to give this country adequate protection, we ought to spend this year $500,000,000.

Mr. HARDY. With that program for new construction just now urged by him and the program for maintenance, what size does the gentleman think our naval bill would be at this session?

Mr. FARR. I am willing to vote for $500,000,000 for naval appropriations at this session, because I believe that would be the means of giving us peace. If we have war, as I said before, we will spend $25,000,000 a day. Now, take 60 days of that war or 30 days of that war and see how much that will total. I want to spend that money now to prevent war. I do not want to wait until one of these nations attacks us, and invades our shores and destroys our liberties. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for just one suggestion?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman has already stated that he is in favor of a building program of $625,000,000 for dreadnaughts and submarines, and then the maintenance has got to be added to that.

Mr. FARR. All right. I am for adequate protection.

Mr. HARDY. But the gentleman says he is only willing to vote $500,000,000 all told, after demanding a program in excess of that sum for new building alone.

Mr. FARR. I am willing to vote $500,000,000. I am willing to vote for what the experts tell us we ought to have for the adequate protection of our great country. I want to protect that flag in all its glory. [Applause.] I want to perpetuate what it stands for. I am in a sense what might be termed a hyphenated American. My father was born across the ocean, and I have so deep an appreciation of what that flag meant to my father, and of the opportunities it gave to him and to me, that I want to see it protected in every star and every stripe, so that the millions to come may enjoy its blessings. I want it to float free in the breezes of heaven. I do not want it to come down in dishonor. [Applause.] And when I recall the things our country has gone through in my brief experience in this Congress, our visits to Mexico, the unpreparedness in which we found ourselves in Columbus, the killing of our poor people there, with no machine gun in readiness; when I recall the defiance by Huerta, whom we could not even compel to salute our flag——

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Does the gentleman recall that at Columbus we are supposed to have about 19,000 men around there?

Mr. FARR. We did not have them.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. If we had had a million there, we would have been in bad shape.

Mr. FARR. If we had had the soldiers there, those invaders never would have dared to come.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Does the gentleman recollect that the machine gun was about a mile and a half from headquarters?

Mr. FARR. That is unpreparedness. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. And that the newspapers tell us that the Mexicans picketed the colonel's tent while he was asleep.

Mr. FARR. And I know they stole our horses. I want to ask if that is not pretty serious evidence to the gentleman from Texas that this country ought to wake up, and that Congress ought to be willing to do something to protect our border and our people.

Mr. CANNON. Who is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy?

Mr. FARR. The President; and he asked for the largest navy on earth, and yet he approves of a program that will leave us fourth five years from to-day. That is the program. It does not advance us one whit; as the chairman of the committee frankly admitted on Saturday, it is a filler-in, to balance our fleet, to help utilize the strength of the present Navy, to make what we have effective. Five battle cruisers do not add such strength that they will be able to go out and destroy the enemy; they will get information and kill off the little scouts. The five battle cruisers will be helpful to our present state of efficiency, but do not take the place of dreadnaughts. We ask you to vote for 6 battle cruisers and 2 dreadnaughts. We ask you to give us 50 submarines; we ask you to enlarge the program of scout cruisers and destroyers; and ask a number of things that will give our people some chance to defend their lives and protect that flag. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. OLDFIELD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

H. R. 8068. An act for the relief of E. C. Hornor;

H. R. 10490. An act to prevent fraudulent advertising in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 12027. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 14771. An act granting the consent of Congress to commissioners of Charlton County, Ga., and Nassau County, Fla., to construct a bridge across the St. Marys River.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 22 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the peace of mind that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] wants is the peace of mind that the steel concerns of Pennsylvania would like to have. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Navy General Board recommended that we authorize all the facilities of the country in building. That would give peace of mind to the ordnance and ship manufacturers, and nothing short of that will. When the steel, shipbuilding, and ordnance manufacturers have peace of mind, when they are satisfied, the gentleman from Pennsylvania will have peace of mind. That is the peace of mind that will satisfy New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Massachusetts, and the coast country where the steel concerns do business,

where the stocks are held, where the navy yards are, and where admirals parade. That is the peace of mind they want—an assured market for all the product they can turn out.

PREPAREDNESS.

If we could rid this preparedness question of promotions, profits, and politics it would not be difficult to reach a sane and sound conclusion as to what we ought to have, nor as to what the danger of invasion is. I know better than to argue with the man who has a personal interest or the man who takes orders.

I do not expect to give peace of mind to either, nor convince those who have a different idea of the relation of the masses to the Government, nor to convince those who want a military establishment to change the traditional policies and purposes of this Republic. Many do not agree with my confidence in the willingness and readiness of the masses to defend their country in time of danger. They look at the military establishment as our sole defense should the unforeseen happen. I look to the American citizen in such case who has always been our defense and will necessarily always constitute our Army in times of war. They think a regular soldier, paid to fight, can alone be depended on. We are not going to maintain a sufficient number in times of peace to constitute the needed force in times of war; besides, I had rather depend upon a citizen defending his country and his home in time of supreme test than paid soldiers fighting for pay or fear.

If the Government were an entity which called the citizens when it felt the need instead of the machinery of the citizens through which they call themselves when they think there is need, the entity might call them many times to defend its imaginary ills and have no response. When the masses no longer regard this Government as their institution serving their interests and refuse to defend it, the Government will not be worth defending. When it has to maintain a military force subject to its call, which can be ordered to do its bidding irrespective of what the masses think of the cause, it will have ceased to be a truly representative Republic.

We want sufficient military establishments to protect us against every danger of invasion to be reasonably expected. We do not consider all the dangers possible to conceive of. Many dangers might be imagined. What are the probable dangers? That is the question. That is tangible. We can discuss the dangers reasonably to be apprehended. I have too much confidence in the sober judgment and sound common sense of the people to believe they are willing to spend real money to maintain a military establishment to protect us against imaginary dangers.

YOU CAN NOT BY FALSE GUISE MAKE A CAT'S-PAW OF PEOPLE.

I deny the right of profit seekers to disguise their real purpose and march under the banner of patriotism. If each of their leaders will disclose his exact connection with the concerns expecting profit, a great light will fall on their patriotism. If they will state definitely what they want as preparedness, what they want it for, and how they want and ultimately expect to obtain it, they will be entitled to more confidence.

We do not want a military establishment for conquest nor aggrandizement. We do not want to grind the faces of the masses to build up an army and navy to protect one class against another. We should not build up an army and navy at the expense of the whole people for the benefit of a preferred few.

Some contend that we should extend our trade by force. Bismarck said:

Commerce obtained and maintained by force always costs the Government more than it is worth.

He said:

A nation which can not obtain and maintain commerce with the price mark and diplomacy should strengthen its diplomacy and work on its price mark instead of attempting to force it with a military establishment.

He said that—

Commerce obtained by the price mark and diplomacy was the only commerce worth while.

THE NEED MUST BE REAL.

I can not agree with those who desire a military establishment to "protect and further some imaginary destiny of this Republic not to be seen with the physical eye; some intangible and visionary thing written in the lines of poets." When we vote money for an army and navy, when we vote to put citizens on the battle line, when we call on women to surrender their husbands, sons, and brothers, it should not be for some intangible, visionary destiny that you can not see; it should be real, practical, substantial danger. When we vote to send the taxgatherer to every home to support a military establishment on land and sea, it should not be to carry out some visionary destiny of America which lies written in the lines of poets; it should be for some real purpose that is tangible.

Mr. Chairman, with the people who want a military force to protect us from invasion, to protect our country, to protect our homes from every real danger to be reasonably apprehended, to protect our institutions, I join hands, and so do the earnest, honest citizens of the land from sea to sea. We are willing and ready to protect our homes and to protect our Government, but we are not willing to support a military establishment for conquest, nor to fight our own people, nor to force commerce, nor to further some intangible and visionary destiny of America which lies written in the lines of poets.

WE HAVE AN ADEQUATE MILITARY FORCE.

We have a military force at the present time ample to protect us against every danger which may be reasonably expected. Our ships, ship for ship, and our guns, gun for gun, at the time they were made are as good as any in the world. We excel in the weight of a broadside from our major guns every nation except Engiand. The weight of a broadside from our major guns is, according to Admiral Badger (hearings, p. 1962), 289,430 pounds. The weight of a broadside from the German guns, same class, is 284,610 pounds. We exceed the Germans by 4,820 pounds.

"Our Navy is in good condition," said all the experts before the committee. Some thought it could be improved by this and others by that, but all were agreed that it was in good shape. All of them wanted more navy; they wanted all they could get. They do not consider the cost of it. They said the expense of it was a matter of policy for Congress and the taxpayers to consider and not for them to take cognizance of.

We have 42 battleships, 75 submarines, 74 torpedo boats, 22 gunboats, and "more auxiliary craft," says Admiral Blue, "than any other nation maintains in time of peace."

We have—

Says Gen. Weaver, Chief of Coast Artillery—

the best coast defenses in the world. The guns now mounted and those contemplated will give us an entirely satisfactory defense.

Gen. Miles said:

During the last 30 years the Government has spent approximately $200,000,000 for our coast defense. I am prepared to say that our coasts are as well defended as the coasts of any country and with the same class of high-power guns and heavy projectiles. They are better in some respects than the guns that are mounted at the Dardanelles, which have resisted the most powerful ships of war of the British and French Navies.

We have back of that—

Says Gen. Miles—

10,000,000 men capable of doing effective military service should the demand come; more than a million men, considering those of military age who were in the Spanish-American War, those who have passed through the Army and the National Guard, who have received military instruction; 136,000 graduates from our agricultural colleges, drilled and instructed under Regular Army officers.

If we have in our Navy, in our fortifications, in our Army, and in 10,000,000 men capable of doing effective military service sufficient force, as it is to-day, to protect us, why further grind the faces of the people to maintain a more expensive organization and one that is a menace to our institutions?

THE DIFFICULTIES OF WAGING WAR ACROSS SEAS.

It is next to impossible to wage war across a great expanse of water. It has never in the history of mankind been successfully done against a Nation of anything like equal size.

Admiral Knight, president of the War College and member of the Navy General Board, said:

It would take me a very long time to go into that subject at all satisfactorily, Mr. CALLAWAY, and show you the difficulties under which a fleet 7,000 miles from its home ports would labor. Ships break down. Out of a large number of ships a certain number are bound to be crippled in one way or another. The supplies needed to maintain the fleet would be very extensive. Five or six hundred thousand tons of coal would be needed as a minimum for a very short campaign there. That coal must be delivered and transferred from colliers to ships. It can not be done at sea except under the most favorable possible conditions. It must be done in sheltered waters. The bottoms of the ships would gradually get foul. They ought to have docks where the bottoms can be cleaned. They are subject in their progress over that 7,000 miles, throughout a large part of the time, to the possibilities of attack from the enemy's torpedo craft and other craft of that kind. Their lines of communication, after they get to the point 7,000 miles away, are constantly liable to interruption and would inevitably be interrupted; and yet they depend on those long lines, stretching away back to the home ports, for the very vital things necessary to their life—for coal and supplies and reinforcements, if reinforcements become necessary, and all sorts of things. A fleet going out there would be accompanied, necessarily, by a tremendous attendant fleet, a train, as we call it, of auxiliary ammunition ships, hospital ships, and so forth. The problem of conducting such a train as that in going thousands of miles through hostile waters is probably the most serious problem that could possibly be put up to a commander in chief.

The personnel, the officers and men, of a fleet moving under those conditions would be subject to conditions which are so trying that it is very difficult to picture them without some little experience. Constantly on the watch, constantly threatened, constantly on the alert to guard against some danger which may come out of the darkness or out of the

fog at any moment upon them, after moving that distance they would be broken down, they would be tired, they would need rest. They would have no secure place to rest. Your fleet would get out there with its material in very bad condition, its personnel in perhaps worse condition, and when it got there it would have no place to go for refitting or for any purpose whatever. It would be not unlike the proposition which confronted Admiral Rojestvensky when he went out to the east and met the Japanese fleet, and you know what happened to him. He had a larger fleet than the enemy had, distinctly.

I would not like to be considered as attempting anything like a complete answer to your question, nor could I give such an answer without talking here all day.

If it is well-nigh impossible for this country to wage war against Japan because of the ocean, why fear Japan?

NO DANGER FROM GERMANY.

The German Imperial Chancellor, Von Bethman-Holweg, and Von Jagow, head of the German Navy, say the idea of Germany having any thought of war against the United States is preposterous. Germany can not even get milk from outside for her babies; we can not get analine dyes from her to color our Easter eggs. No danger from that quarter now. After the war is over, is she going to brave 4,000 miles of the deep, the perils of which have been infinitely multiplied by submarine and torpedo, in an effort to levy tribute on us? Germany, bankrupt and a cripple, with a navy, measured by the weight of a broadside from her guns, smaller than ours?

She has lost in this war in killed, wounded, and imprisoned more than 2,000,000 of her sons. There is crêpe on every door. There is a cripple in every home. She is bankrupt. Her mothers, sisters, daughters, and fathers are horrified by the grim specter of war. Is she going to cross 4,000 miles of ocean, with an enemy at her back, and attack the United States?

All the nations engaged in this war have incidentally injured us during its progress. We have been patient. We have sent them supplies, from bread and meat to Christmas presents. We have done what we could to alleviate their sufferings. Are they for that and in their condition at the close of the war going to arrange their differences, bury their hatreds, grudges, and suspicions and combine against us? Will the others of them forget their jealousies and allow one, if one of them could, to attack us for the purpose of recouping its bankrupt treasury? No; and no sane man thinks they are.

I will tell you the danger. It is not from any foreign power. It is that powder stocks, ordnance stocks, steel stocks, shipbuilding stocks, General Electric stocks, and International Nickel stocks will slump at the close of this war unless a new market is developed for their products. The stockholders, knowing full well the value of advertising, are working up a new customer. When the market abroad ceases they hope to have one developed here that will buy "all they can construct."

Admiral Knight said:

The dangers of transporting a fleet across a great expanse of water and maintaining it are almost insuperable. (Hearings, p. 2084.)

Admiral Fletcher said:

It has been recently forcibly demonstrated that ship attack on forts are futile. This war has conclusively demonstrated what every military strategist knew before—that it is impossible for sea craft to successfully attack land fortifications.

Gen. Miles said:

The results at Alexandria, Port Arthur, and at the Dardanelles furnish sufficient evidence that guns on board ship are no match for coast fortifications and submarine guns.

Germany would have 4,000 miles of ocean to cross, a navy, in weight of shells greater than her own, to put out of the way, the perils of the deep, which Admiral Knight says are almost insuperable, to brave, and then the forts to pass, which Admiral Fletcher and Gen. Miles say this war has demonstrated can not be done, before they could invade this country.

But that is not all. If a foreign country, bankrupt and on crutches, should leave homes that have crêpe on every door, horrified by the grim specter of war, brave the perils of the deep, and with an enemy at her back, sweep our fleet from the ocean, and pass our fort guns and mines, have they any chance still to imperil this country? We can live indefinitely and build almost without limit whatever we need for defense or offense without having access to the seas. When some country has braved the perils of the deep, annihilated or bottled up our Navy, and passed our land fortifications, they have still, said Gen. Miles—

to meet the physical strength of this Nation—10,000,000 men capable of doing effective military service, 1,000,000 who have received military instructions under Regular Army officers, and 136,000 graduates from our agricultural colleges to officer them.

Gen. Miles has a right to know what the American citizen is when called to arms. He had service with the Volunteers fighting by his side against volunteers during the Civil War. They were Americans meeting Americans. He went through four years of it. He is able to speak with authority on the citizen soldiers of the United States:

Mr. KAHN. You think the German conscript is a pretty good soldier, do you not?

Gen. MILES. Yes, sir. However, I would match a volunteer American, defending his liberties and his Government, against any German soldier.

Again, he says about landing troops on our shores:

I will suppose an unsupposable case. Suppose they could put an army on a fleet of 500 ships and move it across the Atlantic without being disturbed by any naval power and they could land. They certainly could not go into any port. They could not go into our ports any more than they could go through the Dardanelles. That has been demonstrated. Our forts are equipped and fortified as well as the Dardanelles. Suppose they got that far—as to land at some remote point—if we could not gather enough men in the Army and militia and by other means to destroy that army before they could send their ships back and get another load, I would want to move to some other country.

APPLY SOME COMMON SENSE.

Preparedness advocates contend that nothing but the experts should be heard. We have heard the experts. A civilian ought to be able to reason. If he has munitions to sell or stocks affected by "preparedness," I do not expect him to reason, and I hope the American people know better than to expect him to reason or to be just. He can talk, he can advertise, he can shout, he can villify, he can complain, he can march in a parade and write a book, but never delude yourself into the belief that he can reason. The matter hits him at the pocket, below the reasoning faculty. It strikes him at the place to make him active, but not logical.

One of the ridiculous phases of this preparedness agitation is the attitude of the New Yorkers, Bostonians, and Philadelphians. They are all for preparedness; and what they mean by preparedness is what the Army and Navy bluntly ask, "all they can get." The money is poured out along the Atlantic seaboard. It goes straight into the pockets of the Bostonians, New Yorkers, and Philadelphians, and other places along the Atlantic coast. Of course, they are for preparedness. It is money to their locality. They have had books written, moving-picture shows staged showing New York, Boston, and Philadelphia taken without the firing of a gun or the loss of a life; but when the question of turning loose the Philippine Islands—the most dangerous military liability the United States Government has—came up every mother's son of them voted against it. They are not only a liability from a military and naval standpoint—they cost this Government a hundred million dollars a year—but there is some trade to New York, Boston, and Philadelphia in them, and some citizens of those places have investments there. It has cost us since we have had them more than a billion dollars, yet these scared ones from Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania fought desperately against turning this scarecrow loose. Are they scared? Their wail to me has the sound of self-interest and hypocrisy.

REASON FOR NAVAL BOARD'S REPORT.

I think the public generally ought to know what led the Navy General Board to prepare the report which changed the program they had been following since 1903. They did not voluntarily change the policy and present a new program. They did not do it because of an emergency. They did not do it because of any apparent danger. They did it in obedience to an order.

Admiral Badger said:

Yes; the July program was only for one year, and the order by which that program was drawn up was stated as follows [reading]: "In July last the General Board was called upon to express its opinion to the department 'as to what the Navy must be in the future in order to stand upon an equality with the most efficient and practically serviceable,' and to submit 'a program * * * formulated in the most definite terms.'"

It was on that order that the July program was drawn up, based on utilizing all the facilities for building that could be obtained.

THE FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM.

Admiral Badger says, page 1967, hearings, that recommendation was not approved, and—

The board was instructed to get up a five-year program, to cost for new construction $500,000,000, or about a hundred million dollars a year, and the October recommendation was made in view of that instruction and to comply with it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Then the board submitted, in accordance with that request, a five-year plan?

Admiral BADGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CALLAWAY. And submitted it in accordance with that request to submit a five-year plan that would cost so much?

Admiral BADGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CALLAWAY. This five-year program did not have in contemplation any emergency, did it, Admiral?

Admiral BADGER. No, sir. That program was made according to order.

Now let us review this program and the reason for it. The Navy General Board was called on in July by the Secretary of the Navy "to express its opinion to the department as to what

the Navy must be in the future in order to stand upon an equality with the most efficient and practically serviceable." The board, encouraged by that request, submitted a plan which would "utilize all the facilities for building until our Navy reached the first place." What was the reason for the change from a normal and regular growth in 1914 to "the most adequate in the world" in 1915? Had any new dangers suddenly loomed up? Had there been any sudden change in our national or international policies? Had there been any sudden change in the relative size of the navies of the world?

The President in his annual message, December 7, 1915, said:

I have had in mind no thought of any immediate or particular danger arising out of our relations with other nations. We are at peace with all the nations of the world. I am sorry to say that the gravest threats against our national peace and safety have been uttered within our own borders.

No witness pointed out any emergency, nor any new danger, nor any new-developed reason for changing the policy of normal, regular growth. The President said there was none. Then why the call for a change?

The Secretary himself was before the committee. He did not give a reason. He sent the first order. The July program was furnished, based on what could be built by all the shipyards and ordnance factories working to the limit. Then a specific five-year program, costing $500,000,000, was called for. It was furnished in October. What reason for the first call? What reason for the second call? No danger is pointed out. The only reason I have heard was given in the News and Observer, Secretary Daniels's paper at Raleigh, N. C., under a Washington date line of October 20, as follows:

The plan of Secretary Daniels to increase the Navy for five years, until it is able to compete with that of any other nation, with one exception, has taken the wind out of the sails of the critics who say that the Wilson administration is neglecting national defense.

The President approves Mr. Daniels's plan and will urge Congress to adopt it. President Wilson and Secretaries Daniels and Garrison have virtually destroyed the "issue" of "preparedness" thrust upon the United States by the European war and seized by certain desperate Republicans for the political capital they could make out of it. Leading Republicans must now work and vote for the Daniels program or eat their words.

Five hundred million dollars to take the wind out of the sails of the critics! I can not agree to such a scheme to take the wind out of their sails. It is too expensive.

NAVAL BOARD AND MUNITION MEN IN HARMONY.

Mr. Chairman, what the Navy General Board wants is all the building facilities of the country can accommodate. They bluntly state it. I am going to read from the testimony of the president of the War College and a distinguished naval officer, Admiral Knight:

Mr. BUTLER. Admiral Knight, do you think that the number of ships you have recommended here at this time would enable us to catch up with the other fleets if they would continue to build as they have done?

Admiral KNIGHT. I do not. May I enlarge?

Mr. BUTLER. You may. It will be a pleasure to have you do it.

Admiral KNIGHT. I took some care this morning to make it clear that the program which I suggested to you was the program which I believed could be laid down at once. I also urged that a committee be appointed to investigate, organize, and mobilize the shipbuilding reserve of this country, so that next year we might be ready to do a tremendously greater amount than we can do now. If Mr. Browning is right in believing that the establishments of this country can this year lay down a larger number of capital ships than I have recommended, please understand me as recommending them with all possible emphasis. In general terms, I think that this year's program should provide for every ship that can possibly be laid down this year.

Mr. BUTLER. When would you have it in your own mind that it would be advisable for us to have on hand, ready for operation, the largest fleet in the world?

Admiral KNIGHT. To-morrow.

Mr. BUTLER. Would you advise calling upon all the industrial facilities of the United States to assist us in constructing a great fleet?

Admiral KNIGHT. I should. That is what I have already advised.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask you—I want to ease my own mind, if the committee will permit me—why should we prepare any defense if it is not one that will succeed? Anything short of actual defense means defeat, does it not?

Admiral KNIGHT. Yes. The General Board, in studying this subject, had before it two sides to the shield. First, what do we want and when do we want it? We want a Navy equal to the largest maintained by any nation in the world, and we want it now. That is one side of the shield. The other side of the shield is, When can we get it? We questioned them as to the present facilities of the shipbuilding yards of this country, including the navy yards, the facilities of the armor plants, etc. We then said in substance this: We are limited this year with regard to the amount of work that can be done, apparently. Let us provide for the doing of that amount of work this year. Let us at the same time encourage Congress and the Navy Department to get very busy to see if they are by any happy chance larger than we think they are, getting the shipbuilders together. Let us try to get everybody working together, in the hope that very soon we may be able to develop facilities which will enable us to enter upon an accelerated program.

* * * * * * *

We can go on from year to year, each year taking advantage of the best that we know at that time. Build all we can this year with what we know now. Build all we can next year with what we know next year.

Mr. KELLEY. And in view of the uncertainty of our needs, and the long time it would take to reach the point where you say we ought to be, don't you think this would be a good time to stick to the original plan we have followed for 20 years and just try to get into second place as quickly as we can?

Admiral KNIGHT. I do not think we ought to stop there. I think the situation is such that we ought to try to get everything that can possibly be built this year. I think it ought to be provided for. We will not make any mistake. It will not carry us too far.

Mr. KELLEY. Do you think the plan for building, for five years, a certain number, such as the General Board worked out, at the request of the department, is a better arrangement than the second-place plan which we have held to for so long?

Admiral KNIGHT. I think the plan which the General Board had in mind, of building every ship that it is possible to build this year and every ship that it is possible to build next year, and to keep on building as fast as possible, is the most rational plan.

I will also quote Admiral Blue, head of the personal bureau:

Mr. HENSLEY. Do you mean to tell me that you shape your views, your views as expressed here before the committee with reference to the needs of the Navy, upon what you glean to be the sentiment of the people of the country?

Admiral BLUE. To some extent; yes, sir. It has always been an axiom that we have to cut the cloth according to what we are likely to get. That is the principle upon which the Navy has been run ever since I have known it.

That is all the steel and ordnance manufacturers and ship yards want. They do not ask for more orders than they can take care of. The munition manufacturers seem to be in perfect accord. The Raleigh News and Observer said the five-year program would "take the wind out of the sails of the defense."

IT COSTS NOTHING.

That five-year program did not "take the wind out of the sails of the critics." The critics continued to demand a market for all the war materials the munition manufacturers could turn out, all they could furnish, and the naval officers are with them and argue that it costs nothing. That is the consolation they give the public. That is the sugar coating over the pill.

The Army and Navy News, published at San Francisco, Cal., December, 1915, in the discussion of the same subject, says:

The second alleged reason is utterly without foundation. Military preparedness costs us nothing. The few hundred dollars we spend for imported drugs for the medical departments of the Army and Navy is an entirely negligible item. Everything else we get right in the United States, and the money is kept right at home. We construct our own ships and guns in our own yards and factories from materials that come from our own mines. The wool and cotton for clothing come from our own fields; the provisions come from our own farms and ranches. No money leaves the country. It stays right at home, making our shipyards and factories hum with activity, and providing employment for thousands of good Americans. Instead of being hoarded, the money is kept in circulation and everybody is benefited.

But for fear somebody would say these were not up to the standard, I want to quote from an admiral who is regarded as one of the biggest in the Navy, Admiral Grant. I quote from his testimony before the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Mr. CALLAWAY. If one has to have his bigger than the other, and the other has got to have his bigger than the one, then what?

Admiral GRANT. You may not know, Mr. CALLAWAY, but I do not see that we are running ourselves to death by building a battleship. Some people consider that money thrown away. I do not, because of every cent that goes into a battleship half of it goes into the labor product and the other half for material goes originally for the labor and material to produce that material. It is not money wasted, in my opinion. You will find it universally stated—that is, a great many men state it—that this $18,000,000 for this battleship is money wasted and thrown away. I do not consider it so. That is my opinion only.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Your opinion is that the money is still among us?

Admiral GRANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CALLAWAY. And that the $18,000,000 put into labor and put into material is still with us, and that money is laid out here and there has been no waste at all?

Admiral GRANT. That is my opinion. That is the way I look at it.

Mr. HENSLEY. On the same theory, why should we not tear down these magnificent buildings and reconstruct them again?

Admiral GRANT. I do not think that is on the same line at all.

Mr. BRITTEN. We are using the buildings.

Admiral GRANT. I have known in the West, in the early days, of men who furnished money to laboring men to move sand from one side of a lot to the other to give them employment.

Mr. HENSLEY. Do you regard that as a necessity?

Admiral GRANT. Very philanthropic.

Mr. HENSLEY. A good investment?

Admiral GRANT. Good charity.

Hudson Maxim, in his book, Defenseless America, either an economic fool himself or taking the public for such, says:

The result is that the Nation as a whole is not impoverished in the least by the burden of armaments, but is rather benefited by their support. * * *

The money spent by the Government in building fighting ships could not be esteemed so much money lost, even if the ships were useless. The Government taxes the people for the money to build the ships, and then pays the money back to the people again for the ships. The people get their money all back, and the Government gets the ships. The people lose nothing, and the Government is the gainer to the value of the ships. The result is that the fighting ships have cost nothing. On the contrary, their production has benefited all. Everybody is made better and richer through the building of them. When we have looked upon our Navy, remembering what the pacifists have told us about its enormous cost, we are strongly impressed with the colossal expenditure, not realizing that the Navy has actually cost nothing. Its production has been a source of profit and benefit to the people.

If Maxim, Grant, and the Army and Navy News be correct, then why not stimulate all the industries of the country by feeding them from the Treasury. When all industries are fed from the Treasury, then pension all individuals and we will all live fat and easy.

The President said in his message of December 7, 1915, "These are the essential first steps." Was he at St. Louis indicating a second step when he said, "I want incomparably the most adequate navy in the world"?

Secretary Daniels said, according to newspaper reports on the naval appropriation bill, that his five-year program was considered by him the minimum that should be provided, not the maximum. The Secretary made a speech at Philadelphia on April 28 before the American Academy of Social and Political Science. He said:

My prediction is that Congress will authorize as many battleships, submarines, and destroyers as public and private yards can construct. We are beginning to take an inventory of every factory in America to see what it can do for preparedness. We must spend billions for munitions.

Take that statement with the President's statement at St. Louis February 3, "The American Navy ought, in my judgment, to be incomparably the most adequate navy in the world," and that ought to "take the wind out of the sails of the critics." Munition manufacturers and naval officers have not asked for more than that. They do not want any building to go abroad. They want it all done in this country and by themselves.

The paid and interested critics do not disturb me. I can not follow the President nor the Secretary nor the naval officers; neither do I have any sympathy nor tolerance for the munition manufacturers' demands that we furnish them a market for their wares when the foreign war closes. What the American people want and all they ought to have of militarism is enough to protect their country. More than that is more than the faces of the people should be ground to maintain; more than that is more power than should be concentrated in the Commander in Chief; more than that is more tax on the resources of the country in money and men than is justified; more than that is an unnecessary development of militarism, the thing that has destroyed every free government that has gone down; more than that is an unnecessary menace to our democratic institutions.

We buried the five-year program. The only reason I have ever heard for it was given in the Raleigh News and Observer:

The plan of Secretary Daniels to increase the Navy for five years has taken the wind out of the sails of the critics who say the Wilson administration is neglecting national defense.

The experts who testified before our committee state that the size of a navy is a relative matter and that no man can tell what the relative size of the navies of the world will be when this war is over. They said that in all human probability the war would close within a year. Secretary Daniels said the conclusion of the war would likely be the best time in the history of the world to bring about a general agreement for disarmament. All were agreed "that was a consummation devoutly to be wished." Admiral Badger said:

No man could tell how soon this war abroad would end; no man could tell what the relative size of our Navy and the other navies of the world would be at the conclusion of it.

That is the statement of Admiral Badger, ex-commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet and member of the board, and regarded as one of the ablest men in the Navy. He says the five-year program was made up on an order.

Mr. CALLAWAY. This five-year program did not have in contemplation any emergency, did it, Admiral?

Admiral BADGER. No, sir. That program was made according to order, without the General Board having under consideration anything outside, but being a direct order to produce such a program with those limitations.

There is no testimony in the hearings showing any reason whatever for a five-year program. On the contrary, the hearings are replete with testimony like Admiral Badger's, which shows that no man can tell what the navies of the world will be at the conclusion of the foreign war; that at its conclusion will be the best time to bring about a general agreement for disarmament; that none of the building authorized by the five-year program can, in all human probability, be completed for use either during or immediately on the conclusion of the war; and that the relative fighting value of ships now built may be shown by the lessons of this war to be obsolete altogether; that all building material is 50 to 100 per cent higher now than ever before. Then, why a five-year program? The only reason is that given in the Raleigh News and Observer, that it would "take the wind out of the sails of the critics." It did not even do that. The Secretary said on April 29:

Congress will authorize, in my judgment, all public and private yards can construct.

The President said at St. Louis, February 3:

I want, incomparably, the most adequate Navy in the world.

Secretary Daniels said, Washington Post, May 19:

The program I presented to Congress represented a minimum and not a maximum of each type.

The war was going on December 10, 1914. At that time the Secretary of the Navy recommended two battleships and said:

I think the war in Europe is going to exhaust the resources of the countries engaged in it, and I think there is less likelihood—I do not think there was much likelihood before—of our country in the future having trouble with these nations.

A YEAR AGO AND NOW.

With our policies and our American ideas, I think the policy recommended in my report and adopted by the last session of Congress is the steady development that is needed.

Two capital ships the year before and two capital ships that year. What has wrought the change?

The President said on December 8, 1914, speaking of our military needs:

There is no new need to discuss it. We shall not alter our attitude toward it because some amongst us are nervous and excited. The question has not changed its aspects, because the times are not normal. Our policy will not be for an occasion.

What is the difference in conditions now and then that made a two-battleship program sufficient and proper then and wholly inadequate at this time? The President has spoken; the Secretary of the Navy has spoken; the sea captains have spoken. What is the difference in conditions now and then? None of them have pointed it out. I have looked, listened, and asked for reasons for the change, but no reason has come from any source except the Raleigh News and Observer and that does not appeal to me.

Last year the R. M. Thompsons and S. Stanwood Menkens, the Gardners, and the Roosevelts, with their Navy League and their American Defense League, the officers of the Army and Navy, always "prepared" for promotions, were clamoring to Congress for additions to the Military Establishment, but they had not attempted to arouse the electorate, to frighten the people. It was not election year. The only place they could work then was on Congress. The arguments of the R. M. Thompsons, the S. Stanwood Menkens, the Gardners, the Roosevelts, the Navy Leagues, the American Defense Leagues disturbed it not. But, oh, what a difference on election year, when those same forces, with the same motives, have gone to the country with J. Bernard Walker's book, America Fallen, Hudson Maxim's book, Defenseless America, and the powder manufacturers' moving-picture show, The Battle Cry of Peace, shouting patriotism! It is not patriotism; it is promotions, profits, and politics.

The President said on his western trip that the peace which followed this war would be a prolonged peace; that the world would not endure another war like this. Secretary Daniels said before the Naval Affairs Committee:

The conclusion of this war would be the best time in the world's history to bring about a general agreement for disarmament.

Admiral Fletcher said before the committee that the conclusion of this war would be the best time in the world's history to bring about an agreement for disarmament. All the sea captains said that the lessons as to the fighting value of the different types of vessels, learned from this war, are not yet to be obtained and will not be until war is over. All are agreed that the developments of this war may make obsolete our fighting ships. No man can tell what the relative strength of the world's navies will be at the conclusion of this war. All are agreed that in all human probability it will close within a year. None of the ships we are now authorizing will be ready for service within that time. Then why lay out a program and make authorizations for continuing contracts for five years in the future?

FEAR OF STOCK SLUMP AFTER WAR.

Mr. Grace, president of the Bethlehem Steel Co., and Mr. Barba, vice president of the Midvale Steel Co., stated that the question with the steel, shipbuilding, ordnance, and powder concerns was how they would utilize their extra forces, their extra equipment, and their extra men that had been added to meet the war's demands when the war stopped. Mr. Grace testified that Bethlehem Steel stock had gone from $30 a share to $530 a share, and like conditions prevailed throughout the entire steel, shipbuilding, ordnance, and powder industries. The board's program would utilize the entire building facilities of the steel concerns, the shipbuilding concerns, the ordnance concerns, and the powder concerns. The Secretary's prediction of what Congress would do and the board's program would solve the question for the munition manufacturers. Will you solve the problem for them? Then to them you are a patriot. I refuse to rake their chestnuts out of the fire at the expense

of those who produce and at the expense of our representative Government.

"Billions for munitions!" Of course, to the ordinary mind, billions is meaningless. Analyze it. See how many thousand dollar homes billions of dollars would buy. "We must spend billions for munitions!" says Secretary Daniels. When I think of the underfed, the poorly clad, the badly housed, and the overworked producers that must in the end pay that bill I balk—I can not stand for it. I will not stand for it. The paid newspapers may criticize, abuse, ridicule, and malign me. The representatives of the steel, shipbuilding, ordnance, and powder concerns belittle and belie me; the coat-tail riding politicians may denounce me, but I will not, if I can help it, permit such a bill to be presented to those who commissioned me to represent them.

BUILD FOR POLITICS.

You tell me that it is politics, and we must do it to carry New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Delaware? I am not playing politics. I am representing 250,000 citizens who want their Government to do even-handed justice and not play politics.

A billion dollars—just one billion—would buy a million thousand-dollar homes. There are 219,575 tenant farmers in Texas. It would buy a thousand-dollar home for every tenant farmer in Texas and leave $780,425,000, or more than three times as much, unspent. There are 2,354,676 tenant farmers in the United States. Three billion, the amount Admiral Fletcher said it would take to build the largest navy in the world and maintain it for two years, would buy every farm tenant in the United States a thousand-dollar home and stock it.

Do you get any idea of what these munition makers are trying to obtain? More than the annual cotton crop for the Navy alone. Unselfish patriots! These patriots held a meeting in New York on the night of June 10, 1915, and at this one meeting raised thirty-odd thousand dollars in less time than it takes to tell it to push this propaganda.

BANKRUPTCY OR WAR.

The biggest Navy in the world? Admiral Fletcher says it will cost a billion and a half dollars to build it and $750,000,000 a year to maintain it, provided other nations do not go on building. If they go on building there is no telling what it will cost. Will they go on building? Admiral Fiske said in the North American Review of February:

It is vital to Great Britain, whose major policy is that she must be mistress of the seas, that she should be.

Admiral Badger said (hearings, p. 1974) that—

England's very existence depends on her supremacy on the seas.

Lord Roseberry said:

I know nothing more disheartening than the announcement made that the United States, the only great country left in the world free from the hideous, bloody burden of war, is about to embark upon the building of a huge armada. It means that the burden will continue upon the other nations and be increased exactly in proportion to the fleets of the United States.

Will the other nations go on building? If "England's very existence depends on her supremacy on the seas," if "it is vital that she be mistress of the seas," if "it means that the burden will continue in proportion to the fleet of the United States," and we must have "incomparably the most adequate Navy in the world," Admiral Fletcher's estimate is no guide.

Where does such a policy lead to? Admirals Fletcher and Badger testified:

Mr. CALLAWAY. If we start to build against them and they build against us, where will the end be?

Admiral FLETCHER. That is simply repeating the history of the world.

Mr. CALLAWAY. You stated the other day that it meant bankruptcy for the weaker nation, and since we were the most wealthy we would be able to bankrupt all of them.

Admiral FLETCHER. That is one phase it might take.

Mr. CALLAWAY. What is the other phase it might take?

Admiral FLETCHER. That one side would force the issue.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it your only hope that we are wealthier than any other nation in the world?

Admiral FLETCHER. That is the only hope of any nation.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Admiral Fiske states in the North American Review for this month that military and naval men have seen for years that these competing nations—that is, England and Germany, competing in naval strength and for commerce—would have to go to war some day in self-defense. Do you agree with that statement?

Admiral FLETCHER. Yes, sir. That has been regarded by many experts as the inevitable outcome of conflicting interests and the expansion of Germany upon the sea.

Mr. CALLAWAY. And as soon as they began to build against each other that became apparent to military and naval men, did it not?

Admiral FLETCHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CALLAWAY. If they entertain the same general views that you entertain with reference to it, would it be possible for us to ever equal their navy, with the start they have?

Admiral BADGER. I think that the financing burden of greater expansion would hamper them, and that if we adopted such a policy we certainly have the money in this country to carry it out. When we come near equality there might be some racing.

Tolstoi, in his open letter to the world, said:

No enlightened man can help knowing that the universal competition in the armament of States must inevitably lead them to endless wars or to a general bankruptcy, or else to both the one and the other.

Here you have the experts and a philosopher. Building for what? Take it from them, "bankruptcy or war."

They ask us to follow them. We ask where they are leading us. They answer, "Bankruptcy or war." "This is repeating the history of the world," says Admiral Fletcher. God of our fathers, is that what their system promises? That is not only what it promises; that is what it insures. Is the sweat of the masses to be coined into dollars for munitions manufacturers, shipbuilders, ordnance producers, powder makers, and officers bedecked with gold braid, that they may finally lead those whose faces they have ground to the trenches with pick and shovel, to bloody mines, to insanity, to slaughter? Tell me I must vote for it?

Go to, thou wretched babbler, and put thy gall in pickle; pour thy tale into the dull ears of ancient "toadeaters," and with it rob confiding partisans of their sense; but tempt not the righteous indignation of reasoning men.

Tell me I must be a party to it? No; I will not do it. If I must feed into the hopper depicted by Admirals Fletcher, Badger, and Fiske the masses that I represent or be the victim of the newspapers, the steel, the shipbuilding, the ordnance makers, the R. M. Thompsons, the S. Stanwood Menkens, and the Hudson Maxims, then victim let it be. And those who, cringing before the shining teeth of these vicious profit takers, surrender those they were elected to represent, have my pity and contempt.

THE REAL PREPAREDNESS LEADER.

Who is the real leader of this grand galaxy of self-styled patriots? Hudson Maxim. He wrote Defenseless America. He got up the picture show, The Battle Cry of Peace. He put it on in every town in the country, showing foreign soldiers in your bedchambers. Let us look at him. He says in his book he is a patriot. He is the crown prince of this band of preparedness patriots. I want to read a few extracts from his book. You all got one—

This country must first be whipped in order to prepare sufficiently to prevent being whipped. Therefore, our business at the present time is to pick our conqueror. I choose England. She would be satisfied with a good big indemnity which we could well afford to pay for the benefit that we should gain from the war.

He was born in Maine, married an English woman, invented smokeless powder, sold his patents to the Du Pont Powder Co., became stockholder and chief mechanical engineer in the Du Pont Powder Co. He has a brother in England, Sir Hiram Maxim, who is an inventor of ordnance and a partner in the Vickers Limited Ordnance Co., of England. He is the inventor of the Maxim rapid-fire gun, and was knighted because of his inventions. Of course, Hudson Maxim wants England to be the one to whip us. Sir Hiram would want us to be the one to whip England. Hudson and Hiram would furnish the ordnance at both ends of the line.

That is not all the interest that this Maxim bunch has in war materials. A Maxim munition company was incorporated on August 24, 1915, in Delaware, with a capital of $10,000,000. (Standard Corporation Service, Vol. IV, p. 939.)

Hudson Maxim, president (Standard Corporation Service, Vol. V, p. 1306), stated:

We have already acquired the services of a very efficient scientific mechanical staff. Hiram Percy Maxim, the inventor of the Maxim silencer, and the son of Sir Hiram Maxim, and his business partner, M. H. Hazler, are among our different technical advisers and supervisors. Edwin B. Hotchkiss, who has had charge of large munition works both here and abroad, and J. S. Conradi, who was for some time superintendent of the Vickers Gun Works at Dartford and Erith, England, is under contract to do similar work for us. We have sold to a very strong financial syndicate in this city (New York) 200,000 shares of our treasury stock.

Maxim Munitions Co. states:

Hudson Maxim has taken the old Maxim gun and made many very important improvements in it, transforming it practically into a new gun. We have a provisional contract with the Russian Government, which is only awaiting confirmation, to manufacture 15,000 of these guns. The price of them I am not at liberty to state, but a regiment of men would be mowed down if in range of one of them. (Nov 10, 1915, Standard Corporation Service, Vol. V, p. 1248.)

Says Hudson Maxim—

We could well afford to pay a big indemnity for the benefit we should gain from the war.

Can you imagine what benefit we common-sense common people would get from the war?

Here are the beauties he sees:

The unpleasant truth should be realized that invading armies must, with other luxuries, have women. As a result they leave a large progeny, wrens in the nests of the doves of peace. Hence, inasmuch as soldiers are the pick of the manhood of their country, they are likely to do about as much toward securing the survival of the fit in an enemy's country as they would have in their own country.

There is another very important consideration, which is that war is a great mixer of races, and that usually mixed types benefit enormously from their compound blood.

Furthermore, the mingling of races and peoples serves greatly to spread knowledge of one another, and they have always profited largely from the mingled knowledge.

He should have told us what benefits he expects for himself. He should let us know if he will be satisfied with a bunch of illegitimates. He is the real preparedness leader. He has done more with his moving-picture show to frighten the timid and make the public believe we were defenseless than any other dozen men in America.

We only have to read his book to find the benefits that interest him personally. On page 73 he says:

We have between forty and fifty million pounds of smokeless powder at the present time, whereas we ought to have 500,000,000 pounds.

He is chief mechanical engineer of the Du Pont Powder Co. Five hundred million pounds of smokeless powder, at 53 cents a pound, would amount to something like $250,000,000. Powder stock has gone, in some instances, from $8 a share to $1,100 a share since the foreign war started. The stockholders, of course, fear an invasion of their stock prices at the close of the war. The Book of Books says that where a man's treasure is, there will his heart be also.

Maxim says:

Every Congressman goes to Washington in the interest of his constituents. He goes there to dicker for them, to swap votes with other Congressman in exchanging congressional concession for congressional concession.

On page 18 Mr. Maxim gives his conception of the temperament and intelligence of the American people. He says:

In a small paragraph in an obscure place on the back page of a leading Boston paper I once saw the announcement that Herbert Spencer, the great philosopher, was very ill and not expected to live. On the front page of the same paper, under bold headlines, was a three-column article on the physical condition of John L. Sullivan. John L. Sullivan was a fighter, while Herbert Spencer was only a philosopher; hence the difference in public interest.

He and those who are like interested with him are trying to organize, crystallize, and capitalize the fighting public interest he saw manifested in that Boston newspaper and frighten the cowardly Congressmen by causing sentiment in their districts.

CONGRESS OBEYS PUBLIC SENTIMENT.

Nine Michigan Representatives voted for a standing army of 250,000 when the Army bill was on its first passage through the House. When it came back from the Senate, after the Ford vote in Michigan, only two voted for 250,000.

Congress is a barometer of public sentiment, if it can determine what the public sentiment is. In this instance these Michigan Representatives got scared too quick. The Ford vote gave them a different idea from the newspapers of what the public sentiment was.

THE FEAR THAT DISTURBS NEW YORK'S PEACE OF MIND.

Mr. Grace, president of the Bethlehem Steel Co., stated before our committee that under conditions existing throughout the entire steel, ordnance, and shipbuilding industries, the question with the directors of those industries was what they would do at the close of the foreign war to avoid a slump.

If we should follow the prophecy of Secretary Daniels, or the advice of the Navy General Board, and authorize all the building that shipbuilding, ordnance, and steel concerns in the country could take care of, the problem that confronts them would be solved, and the Congress of the United States, in their eyes, would be a galaxy of patriots for relieving them of the most serious problem that now confronts them.

The fear of a slump in stock values is the thing that is making New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Trenton, Paterson, and other Atlantic coast cities lie awake at night. Think of the concern of an individual who has 100 shares of Bethlehem stock, worth $3,000 before the war, to-day worth $53,000. Let him contemplate during his sleepless hours the sudden proclamation of peace abroad and $50,000 knocked out of his 100 shares of stock. Do not you know he is willing to parade and wants other people to parade? He is willing to encourage newspapers, and wants other people to encourage newspapers; he is willing to be taxed, and wants to encourage other people to be taxed to maintain that stock.

Fear of invasion? I have heretofore referred you to the statement of Admiral Knight, president of the War College, on the difficulties of transporting a fleet across a great expanse of water.

I want also to quote from Capt. McKean, a graduate of the War College, on the manner in which transports would be convoyed across a great expanse of water:

Mr. CALLAWAY. How much area would a fleet of 100 transports cover, with their accompanying fleet? That would carry about 100,000 troops?

Capt. MCKEAN. With the average transport; yes. They might, with bigger ships, actually accommodate more troops, but the transports you would not dare put in columns closer than a thousand yards apart, and 100 of them in a single column would be 100,000 yards long, or, if you put them in four columns a thousand yards between columns, that would be 25,000 yards long, or 5 miles one way and 4 miles the other way, and they would cover 20 square miles of the ocean.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Twenty-five thousand yards is lots more than 5 miles, is it not?

Capt. MCKEAN. It is 12½ miles; yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. It would be 12½ miles long and how wide?

Capt. MCKEAN. In four columns it would be 3,000 yards wide; but you would probably put them closer together than that and shorten it up. You would probably put five columns.

Mr. CALLAWAY. You would have to have a screen fleet around them?

Capt. MCKEAN. You would have to have an escort that would screen them; yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. To protect that troop of transports you would have to have a fleet one and one-half times greater than the opposing man's fleet to afford any character of protection, wouldn't you?

Capt. MCKEAN. To be reasonably safe; yes.

You will get from the above the difficulties that confront a commander in chief in an effort to carry troops across an ocean. You will get from Capt. McKean the immense area covered by the transports, surrounded, as they necessarily have to be, by a screen fleet. I now want to quote Capt. Sims, in my judgment one of the most capable men who appeared before our committee, certainly the most direct and straightforward, showing the impossibilities of protecting a fleet from night attack from torpedoes, scouts, and submarines. He said, in a letter of April 2, 1915, specifically describing the operations of a fleet attacked by torpedoes:

From the experience to date I think it may fairly be concluded that there is no solution to the problem of protecting a fleet against torpedo attack in the open sea. It seems equally clear that under similar conditions fatal damage could be inflicted by floating mines alone, and this without material risk to the attacking destroyers. As for sea-going submarines of high speed, it would be quite useless to try to keep them out at night by any form of screen at present known.

He stated to the committee:

It is true if you drive the scouts back on the fleet and your scouts are reporting to you every half hour the course and speed of that fleet, it enables you to wait until the sun goes down and launch an attack of destroyers through that screen, and we do not know of any means by which that attack can be resisted.

I also want to quote Admiral Fletcher, commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, and Admiral Badger, ex-commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, and at present a member of the Navy General Board:

Mr. CALLAWAY. You stated a moment ago that a fleet of battleships in the face of the auxiliaries would be in a most precarious condition. Now, analyzing that if the screen of the enemy is superior to your screen and drives it in, your battleships are unprotected in the face of the screen of the enemy?

Admiral FLETCHER. If the screen is annihilated our battleships rely on their speed and the power of their secondary batteries. Under these conditions our battleships would probably withdraw from the scene of operations.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I understood you yesterday that, when we had driven the screen fleet in and the battleships stood bare in the face of destroyers, swift cruisers, and submarines, that it was in a most precarious condition?

Admiral FLETCHER. If all our auxiliaries are destroyed and the enemy's auxiliaries and destroyers are still intact, our fleet would be at a serious disadvantage.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I understood you to say, when I asked you what they would do under conditions of that kind, that they would retire?

Admiral FLETCHER. They probably would; yes, sir; if they could not bring on a day action with the enemy's fleet of battleships.

Mr. CALLAWAY. My attention was called to a statement by Beresford in the Betrayal, in which he said that battleships are worthless against a night attack by cruisers and destroyers. I take it that statement was made prior to the development of the submarine, and to add to that submarines would make it much more forcible, would it not?

Admiral FLETCHER. That is true for unscreened battleships.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you accept that statement as true?

Admiral FLETCHER. He is assuming, and I am willing to agree with the conclusions.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I will follow that out. Do you consider Beresford as an A1 authority?

Admiral FLETCHER. He states that a battleship alone at night is helpless in the presence of destroyers, and I quite agree with that statement.

Mr. CALLAWAY. That is true?

Admiral FLETCHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How about a battleship fighting a submarine?

Admiral BADGER. She will get out of the way just as quickly as she can. There is nothing for her to do but to charge or run, using her guns, of course, when possible; but the best thing is to run, if conditions permit.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How about a battle cruiser fighting a submarine?

Admiral BADGER. The same thing; there is only one way, as far as I know. The submarine, being submerged, can not be hit by gun fire. The only thing to do is to charge it; go for it end on, with the hope that you will ram it, or to run.

If a fleet of battleships in the open sea can not protect themselves against night attack, and no screen fleet has as yet been devised capable of protecting them against night attack by torpedo and submarine, if speed and changing course continuously is their only protection, I can not understand how any sane mortal can get anxious for fear some foreign power will come across either the Atlantic or the Pacific and land on our shores until our entire fleet of destroyers, scouts, and submarines have been cleaned from the ocean. No man who knows the facts has any fears of any foreign power reaching our shores and making a successful landing.

THE INABILITY OF BATTLESHIPS TO STAY IN SUBMARINE TERRITORY.

It has been conclusively demonstrated that battleships can not stay in submarine territory. The statement is often made that when you control the surface of the sea you can destroy the effectiveness of submarines. A look at the operations of the British fleet at the Dardanelles will convince the most obstinate that submarines can drive a battleship fleet, however well protected by small craft, from any place from which submarines are not shut out by means other than the mere control of the surface by destroyers and scouts.

The British made the landing at the Dardanelles April 25, 1915. There were no submarines there. Ashmead-Bartlett, famous English war correspondent, says:

The Dardanelles expedition, if it served no other purpose, is an object lesson on the difficulties encountered by a hostile fleet operating many hundreds of miles from its base in the face of submarine attack.

Up to May 20 an immense fleet of predreadnaught battleships was able to lie off the coast and render the expeditionary army immense moral support by protecting its flanks and encouraging the troops who love to hear the great shells whistling over their heads. On May 13 the *Goliath* was sunk in the Straits during the night by torpedo attack. On May 20 the first submarine was sighted. The entire fleet had to weigh anchor and steer about to avoid giving a sitting shot.

And now we come to these superdreadnaughts that my friend from Illinois [Mr. Foss] told you were the fighting strength of the Navy. Dreadnaught! The dread nothing. Watch what they did at the Dardanelles:

The more valuable battleships, like the *Queen Elizabeth*, the *Agamemnon*, and the *Lord Nelson* (they are among the finest ships afloat) faded away toward the west and were not seen again. On May 25 the *Vengeance* was narrowly missed by a torpedo, and the battleship *Triumph* was sunk. On May 27 the battleship *Majestic* was also sunk. On the following day there was not a single battleship off the Gallipoli coast. All had been obliged to fly to protected harbors for safety.

The facts are plain; dreadnaught fleets are useless for offensive purposes provided you are dealing with an enemy supplied with submarines. They are a poor defense, as well because they can only deal with the enemy's fleet as a whole, provided it chooses to come out and fight. Local defense must be left to the submarines destined to remain in home waters.

Now for the submarine in attack. Supposing the United States were engaged in war against a European power or an oriental. If there is to be a naval war at all, it necessitates one of the belligerents crossing either the Atlantic or the Pacific. It would be utterly useless for either a European power or an oriental to dispatch a fleet to the Atlantic seaboard or the Pacific unless they were already in possession of a prepared base where that fleet could lie at anchor in security against submarine attack. * * * To send a great fleet of modern dreadnaughts to an indefinite objective, namely, to cruise up and down the enemy's seaboard on the off-chance of the enemy coming out to risk an engagement would be merely courting disaster. Such a fleet would be in the nerve-racking position of being exposed to submarine attack from the moment it left its own shores to the moment the survivors regained the shelter of home waters. * * * Even supposing there was a base available within short distance of its objective, the attacking force would be little better off, and you would merely have a repetition of the stalemate which exists in the North Sea at the present time.

Col. Isaac Newton Lewis, United States Army, retired, whose machine gun has practically revolutionized certain phases of operations in the European war, and who has just returned from the scene of hostilities, said:

The effectiveness of the submarine as a weapon can never again be disputed. It has now come to the point where it must be considered as the controlling element in sea power.

Admiral Knight, testifying before the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, was asked:

What show has a battleship against a submarine? What can it do in submarine territory?

Admiral KNIGHT. Of course, it is in danger; and that is all you can say of it. The battleship running at high speed and changing course frequently is not in much danger from a submarine.

Capt. Sims, reporting on the practice of our fleet trying out the different craft, said:

As for seagoing submarines of high speed, it would be quite useless to try to keep them out at night by any form of screen at present known.

If the only thing a fleet of battleships can do in submarine territory is run, what value would battleships be in protecting a fleet of transports when they can do nothing in the presence of submarines but run? If submarines are the controlling element in sea power, if it is useless to try to keep them out at night by every form of screen known, and if they are destined to remain in home waters because they must have a base from which to operate, what reason have we to fear attack from across either the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean?

THE VICIOUSNESS AND INTOLERANCE OF THE PREPAREDNESS PATRIOTS.

Col. R. M. Thompson, proprietor and operator of the Navy League, spoke at Poli's Theater May 28, 1916, in behalf of preparedness. He claims to be a man of very high character, inspired in his work by purely patriotic motives. He was discussing the Army bill just passed and the contemptible inadequacy of it, and said sneeringly that Virginia was a great State, once the mother of Presidents, but now she was satisfied with JIM HAY—just HAY. HAY is the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, one of the purest and best men in the House of Representatives. Parade, pomp, street shows, and make-believe do not appeal to him. He does not suit the chairman of the board of directors of the International Nickel Co., Col. R. M. Thompson.

He does not suit the New York and Chicago papers either. Referring to the bill they make the following observations about the measure and those responsible for it:

The New York Globe (Ind.) declares that "it will not provide for an adequate system of military defense" and "in the event of trouble it would be necessary to scrap it." The Chicago Herald makes the calm, scientific observation that "a chemist could run the brains of HAY and his little Army pals through a Pasteur filter without getting a trace of an intellectual process above the mental grade of the *Pithecanthropus erectus*."

The preparedness patriots want universal military service. They know a larger force than we now have can not be kept up by voluntary enlistment. That has been clearly shown within the last few months. Expirations and desertions from the Army have been as many as new enlistments. The only way to have a larger force is to force them in by law.

It has become proverbial that the daily press of the country follows its financial interest, but this is the first time it has been so nearly a unit on any question.

It not only puffs everything favoring enormous additions to our Military Establishment, but taboos everything coming from the other side.

Members of Congress in private conversation freely state that there is no danger from without and the danger is from within, but they say the country is wild, and they fly before what they think is popular opinion. They get their conception of public opinion from the daily press.

A few independent papers have stood out against it. May their tribe increase.

TAX FOR INCREASE IN ARMY AND NAVY.

The President suggested in his December message that the stamp tax on notes, deeds, telephone calls, telegrams, medicines, etc., be continued, and that the tax be extended to bank checks, gasoline, and power engines to get money for Army and Navy increase. I protested against that, and, with 31 other Democrats, notified Mr. KITCHIN, chairman of Ways and Means Committee, that we could and would defeat the measure should that committee report it. We notified him that tax for increase of Army and Navy would have to be placed on war munitions, inheritances, and incomes. He and members of the committee, realizing the potency of that statement from 32 Democrats, placed or agreed to place such tax on munitions, inheritances, and incomes. I am proud of this accomplishment.

GENERAL AGREEMENT FOR DISARMAMENT OF ALL NATIONS.

We have secured a provision in this bill that, I think, may be of inestimable value to the nations of the world in the future. When war abroad ceases, when they are exhausted, sick, and horrified by the grim slaughter, and have stopped long enough to coolly survey the fruitless wreckage, I think they will be ready to consider the question of abandoning the competition in armament.

We have provided in this bill for a commission from this country to intercede for such purpose, and we further provide, should such agreement be reached, that all building authorized by this bill shall cease.

Nations at peace have already begun to recognize the efficiency and farsightedness of this provision and wires are coming from across the ocean showing their appreciation.

Think not that helm and harness are signs of valor true,
Peace hath higher tests of manhood than battles never knew.

SUMMARY.

Our Navy, coast defenses, and Army, equipped as they are, backed by the citizens of the land, are amply adequate to defend this country against any and every assault.

No great nation wants to attack us. They want our friendship. It is necessary to them.

We are divided by great oceans, which the development of torpedoes and submarines makes it impossible to transport great bodies of troops across.

It is necessary before this country can be conquered that great bodies of troops be conveyed across broad oceans.

If you want a Navy or Army to force our trade around the world, or for aggrandizement and conquest, you may elevate your sights—a billion and a half for the Navy and a billion for the Army will not give it to you; and a billion per year will not maintain it.

If you want a military establishment to obtain or defend "something intangible and visionary, some vision of the mind never seen by the physical eye," I can not tell, you can not tell, and no mortal man can tell, where we are going nor what will be necessary.

I can not follow the army and naval officers who state that they do not consider the amount of money it costs, nor where it is to come from, and that their plan leads in the end to bankruptcy or war.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as my time is limited, I desire not to be interrupted until I have finished my statement. Mr. Chairman, I listened with considerable interest to the remarks of the gentleman who just preceded me, and particularly so when he criticized my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] for desiring a tranquil peace of mind among the people of Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, and other Eastern States. Does it ever occur to the gentleman from Texas that a satisfactory peace of mind is just as desirable for the border of Texas and the coast line of that great State as it is at other places in the United States? I believe the gentleman forgets that.

While the hearings on this bill have apparently been of a most exhaustive character, it was evident throughout that the muzzling of officers as well as the General Board itself by the Secretary had the effect of curbing free personal discussion in which the committee desired advice.

The bill as drawn is not a measure of real preparedness because it is unscientific, unbalanced, and a patchwork of log-rolling between pacifists and conservatives after the White House had radioed an S. O. S. to the Democratic members of the committee, when the little Navy men had their day.

This is probably the first time in the history of the country that the little Navy men on the committee actually framed the construction program of the Navy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Oh, I know you gentlemen of the South are pleased that this bill is framed by the little Navy fellows, but you probably forget—before I go to my other subject—you probably forget that the President went West recently to crystallize public sentiment in favor of a great Navy. He did not go into the South, where most of you gentlemen come from, in order to crystallize a sentiment that does not prevail there. Oh, no; he has got all you fellows and does not need any votes in the South, but he went into Illinois, into Iowa, into Wisconsin, and Ohio to crystallize public sentiment for a big Navy, and you gentlemen watch the votes on this floor on this bill next Friday afternoon and see how valuable his crystallization has been. Count the votes in favor of the bill after it has been properly amended, which will come from men of the East, North, and West, and not from the South, and that is where they always come from. Why does the President insist upon the Republicans in the House carrying the naval bill to a successful completion, as in the past, instead of going into the South where the crystallization of sentiment has evidently not yet occurred? Do you know that out of nine Southern States, including the great State of Texas, from which my distinguished friend [Mr. CALLAWAY] comes, that you only got eight votes two years ago for the one-battleship program? My friend CALLAWAY—and he is a very good friend of mine—was one of those who voted against authorizing even one ship, but after the White House radio S. O. S. he is out for five battle cruisers, at $20,000,000 apiece. That shows the effectiveness of wireless messages on the Navy. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. BRITTEN. I do not desire to be discourteous to my friend, but I said that I did not want to yield to anybody until I have made my point.

In his opening address on the bill the chairman of the committee referred to Admirals Fletcher, Winslow, Knight, Grant, Taylor, Fiske, and others whose testimony indicated a desire for battle cruisers. In this the minority members of the committee fully agree, but the chairman carefully avoided making clear that the advice of these experts was based upon a limited number of first-line ships, principally four, and not upon an unlimited number of battle cruisers as against dreadnaughts, the real fighting ships of the Navy.

The Chairman never once referred to the recommendation of the Navy General Board for first-line ships and evidently forgot that this great body of experts less than 30 days ago recommended 16 first-line battleships—10 battle cruisers and 6 dreadnaughts.

In his opening address to the present Congress the President requested 16 first-line ships, basing the increase on a five-year program at that time, which was entirely ignored by the committee. The Secretary of the Navy in his annual recommendation requested 16 first-line ships. Now gentlemen on the floor of this House and my distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee, when he referred to various programs that have been submitted to Congress and to the Secretary, entirely forgot that the Naval General Board made a recommendation within the last 30 days in which it stated that it would require 16 first-line ships to put our Navy into second place among the navies of the world. Now, I assume when the President was speaking for 16 ships and when the Secretary of the Navy was requesting 16 first-line ships they had done so after conferring with the General Board, the highest naval expert authority in this country. There is no question about it. Now it is up to this Congress—a Democratic Congress—to put our Navy in the second place among the navies of the world or to retain us in fourth place, where the President says we are to-day, and your vote on next Friday afternoon will determine whether or not we are going into second place, because the minority will offer amendments for the construction of eight ships this year. Now, we do not want anything unreasonable of the other side of the House. Your President is for 16 ships, your Secretary of the Navy is for 16 ships, and the Naval Board is for 16 ships. Why not use the Sixty-fourth Congress as a vehicle with which to put our Navy in the second place among the navies of the world, where it belongs? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Surely the President and the Secretary of the Navy can not have forgotten the letter of November 9, 1915, when the General Board advised the Secretary that "our present Navy is not sufficient to give weight to the diplomatic remonstrances of the United States in peace nor to enforce its policies in war."

If Members of the House will carefully read the testimony of the commanders in chief of the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets, as well as that of Admiral Fiske, the foremost strategist in the Navy, they can not fail to be convinced that an efficient, well-balanced Navy is impossible under the present administration, while the figures which I will quote as coming direct from the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair must further accentuate lack of ability to quickly provide a proper national defense in an emergency. With more than one-half of our fighting ships in reserve or repair and with diplomatic complications of a most serious character staring us in the face in Europe, Asia, and Mexico it is impossible for me to understand why the administration so ruthlessly ignores expert military advice.

The Secretary knows that 60 per cent of the crews of the various fighting ships now in reserve would have to be made up of green, untried men in the event of war—men who ordinarily should have had from six months to two years of actual training aboard ship in order to acquaint them with the many duties hurried upon them in the event of actual battle. He knows that our Navy has never been mobilized on account of lack of personnel and also knows of the acute diplomatic situation which brought forth from Germany a short, sharp reply to our note which was equally precise and undiplomatic. He must know that Japan very recently caused our administration to change its policy regarding the restriction of Asiatics as prescribed by the House immigration bill and so changed the phraseology of the measure as to make it look like a gerrymander of a political district to protect a favorite son rather than a piece of legislation covering a class of people. He surely knows that when Japan made this request she was prepared to back it up by force of arms and that her Navy is fully manned, fully equipped, and highly efficient.

It is a simple matter to bluff Germany, whose fleet is vastly superior to ours, when the British Navy stands between us, but

does the administration think that this condition will always exist and that we can look upon the British Navy as our protectors; and if so, is this really a desirable state of affairs? The bluffing of Japan is entirely a different matter, and her polite requests are granted, because we understand the Japanese spirit, while the equally polite request of China applying to our immigration bill is summarily rejected, because China is peaceful and has ignored military and industrial preparations while all other great powers were increasing in wealth and population and at the same time preparing to uphold their honor and dignity. [Applause.]

Let a Democratic Congress remedy the wrong that was made by a Democratic Congress, the Sixty-second, when they permitted the Navy to get out of second place, as they did in 1912, when they denied the recommendation of the Navy General Board and the Secretary of the Navy at that time for three battleships and two battle cruisers. We want to make it clear to you gentlemen. We are merely expediting the building of the 16 ships desired by the President of the United States. Instead of a five-year program, it is going to be a two-year program. Instead of stringing the appropriations over into the next Republican administration, we are giving the Democrats a chance to remedy a great wrong. The Democratic Congress allowed our Navy to get out of second place, and it should be a Democratic Congress that should restore the Navy to the second place among the navies of the world. That is all there is to this argument. I am firm in the belief that our Navy will never be efficient and adequate and will never be the second Navy in point of power among the navies of the world under the present administration, because they have not the ability nor have they the desire to put the Navy in second place excepting for political purposes, and I will prove it to you.

The President has been traveling around the country indicating to the public that the world was on fire, that a great emergency existed. It is perfectly natural that we will adopt or employ emergency measures if an emergency exists. Let us see what his lieutenant, the Secretary of the Navy, the honorable Josephus, has done with the 64 ships now being built for the Navy. Let us see how very ably he has conducted this emergency program and brought these ships to a successful completion in the shortest possible time.

Have any of you on the floor of this House ever heard of an emergency measure coming before Congress? Have any of you on the Committee on Naval Affairs heard the honorable Josephus say that the 64 ships now being constructed in different parts of the country should be rushed to completion? No. That is the best evidence that there is no emergency existing. Let me show you how we are getting along with our construction. And before I do this, I want to call your attention to a certain fact, and let my good friend from Texas, Mr. CALLAWAY, give me his ear. I would like to have his attention, because I hope to convert him to eight first-line ships before we get through. These figures which I have here, and dated May 10, this month, come from the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, Admiral Taylor. They show the percentage of completion of our ships being constructed in various parts of the country today when an emergency exists, and let me say to you right here on this side of the House that not even one auxiliary ship authorized under the present administration will be built during the four years of this administration. Think of it. During a great administration—the world on fire—the President telling us to keep cool, our diplomatic relations strained almost to the breaking point, with a most undiplomatic note to Germany and a most undiplomatic reply from Germany staring us in the face, and yet notwithstanding that 64 ships are being built by our Government, not one, not even an auxiliary ship authorized under President Wilson's administration will be completed before he goes out of office on the 4th of next March.

Now, of course, there is no need of playing politics with this country and saying that we on the other side expected you and your administration to authorize and build a battleship in the four years of your incumbency. We did not expect that. But when other countries are coming to this country and having ships built in four and five months, as they are doing with submarines, we certainly expect you to build a little submarine or a little destroyer in four years. But you can not do it, according to these figures.

Of battleships there are now seven dreadnaughts under construction. On June 30, 1914, the House authorized three dreadnaughts—the *New Mexico*, being built by the Government in the New York Navy Yard, under absolute control of the Government; the men, the materials, the time, the conditions, the money, and the place all under the control of the Government; and let us see how she compares in point of percentage completed with her two sister ships, the *Mississippi* and *Idaho*. Our good ship, the *New Mexico*, is 19½ per cent completed two years after being authorized. Her sister ships are 100 and 200 per cent nearer completion—that is, 100 and 200 per cent ahead of the *New Mexico*—and, of course, you gentlemen on that side of the House will say, "Well, that is because our honorable Josephus had nothing to do with the sister ships; he could not curtail their completion." But he certainly has water-logged the *New Mexico* in the New York Navy Yard.

Let us take the destroyers. We authorized six on June 30, 1914, two years ago. They are little ships, with no heavy armor or armament. We are constructing the *Shaw*, one of those six, in the Mare Island Navy Yard under the direction and supervision of the honorable Josephus. Let us see how that one has progressed. On May 10 of this year, two years after authorization, it is 31 per cent completed, so that two years from now it will probably be 60 per cent completed if the honorable Josephus lives and the present administration still stays in Washington. Let us see about the sister ships being constructed in private yards, over which the honorable Josephus has no control. The next nearest to the 31 per cent is the *Wilkes*, which is 62 per cent completed, and from that they go up to 87 per cent completed, all in private yards. Of course you understand the Government has nothing to do with the construction after it lets the contract. They can go ahead as fast as they please. Shipbuilders realize that an emergency exists to-day, the same as the General Board realizes it. That is the reason I claim there is an insincerity on the part of the administration in dragging these 64 ships to completion.

We have authorized $24,000,000 for the construction of submarines during past Congresses, and in March of this year we were informed that but six of these destructive water dogs were prepared to defend our thousands of miles of coast line on March 1 of this year.

England had 20 submarines completed in the United States last year in five months. Ten of them were built and reached England under their own power in that time, and 10 are still tied up in this country. Now, certainly if our manufacturers can build submarines for England, 20 of them in five months, surely the ones we authorized in 1914, two years ago, should be nearing completion. Let us see their condition.

Some of those ships are 5 per cent completed. They are 2 years old—5 per cent completed! Why, just imagine how many times this administration would have to be reelected in order to complete one of those ships. [Laughter on the Republican side.] We have heard much about being "too proud to fight," but the record of the Government construction of ships must surely be characterized as "too proud to work."

Mr. MEEKER. Amen! [Laughter.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, I requested that I be not interrupted, and my regular "amen" friend is not annoying me. [Laughter.]

The bill provides for an addition of 300 civilians to the Engineer Corps, to immediately become line officers in the Navy.

This paragraph was written before the House increased by 50 per cent the number of appointees at the Naval Academy and was purely an emergency measure for more officers. Since the House has acted in the matter, this paragraph is most offensive to the service and is sure to provoke an unsatisfactory condition aboard ship, which will militate against the highest efficiency and which, it is agreed by naval experts, is now entirely unnecessary.

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

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, can I get 10 minutes from the chairman of the committee, inasmuch as I am discussing the merits of the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I would like to give the gentleman 10 minutes, but I have not any time at all.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will give the gentleman some of my time.

Mr. BRITTEN. I thank you very much. I thought I might get a little time from the chairman of the committee, inasmuch as I am discussing the merits of the bill and the Navy building program proper.

A year ago, Mr. Chairman, we authorized 16 little submarines, the kind that England had built in five months. Let us see their condition. The first 8 or 9 of them have a zero mark after their names, meaning that absolutely nothing has been done on them during this period of emergency. What do you know about that? Would not that make you cross if you were a "big Navy" fellow? [Laughter.] One of those with the zero mark after it is to be built in a Government yard, under the absolute control of the Hon. Josephus and his department. I do not like to say it in a feeling of sarcasm or of criticism. I like the Secretary of the Navy. He is a very estimable gentleman, but he has not the ability to run the Navy Department. There is no use mincing

words about it. He is not big enough for his job, and you gentlemen on that side of the House know it. [Laughter.]

Now, let us take aviation. The General Board has recommended that $7,000,000 be expended on aviation. With a total of 16 aeroplanes at Pensacola, the only aeronautic station of the Navy, 7 of which are being rebuilt or overhauled, and which are therefore *not now* serviceable, surely the most economical Member of Congress will admit that this most important branch of the service has been shamefully neglected in the past and should now receive the whole-hearted support recommended by the Navy General Board.

Recalling the statement of Secretary Daniels before your committee on March 30, this year, that every first-class aviator in Europe who is making frequent flights is furnished three machines, we are now splendidly equipped to keep three first-class aviators busy scouting along 5,000 miles of seacoast, maneuvering with the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets, training recruits for the aviation service, experimenting with launching devices not yet constructed on the decks of battleships, assisting in target practice and "spotting," bomb throwing, torpedo launching, submarine chasing, and a few other duties of such importance that thousands of lives may be sacrificed or gained through their failure or nonexistence.

In view of the advance that has been made in aeronautics during the past year and the demonstrations now being made of the vital importance of a proper air service to both land and sea warfare, our present situation can be described as nothing less than deplorable. In our present condition of unpreparedness, in contact with any foe possessing a proper air service our scouting would be blind. We would be without the means of detecting his plans and unable to attack him from the air, while our own movements would be an open book to him.

Considering that an appropriation of $10,000,000 for aeronautics alone would still leave us behind England, Germany, France, Russia, Austria, Italy, Japan, Spain, and the Netherlands, and that Capt. Bristol, who was ordered to take charge of the development of aeronautics by the Secretary of the Navy more than two years ago, on February 21 of this year told your committee that $7,076,000 was the very least amount which should be appropriated this year, the minority members feel that in recommending an appropriation of three and one-half million dollars they are subjecting themselves to criticism for not properly supplying the Navy with this most efficient weapon of war, which both protects and destroys, and without which the battle fleet of to-day is blind.

The minority have concluded that the $7,000,000 recommended for aviation construction by the Navy General Board on May 2 of this year could wisely be expended during the Sixty-fourth Congress—one-half in each session—and to appropriate less will be but a pretense of giving the people of our country what they really want and what they are prepared and willing to pay for.

The construction of large sea planes, of which our Navy has none, to be used for launching torpedoes, is a matter for serious consideration during the coming months.

And you gentlemen on the other side of the House who framed this bill have provided only $2,000,000 for aviation. Why, do not you know that the people of this country, who have lots of money and are willing to spend it in military defense, will simply characterize that appropriation as shameful, as scandalous? That is what your two millions for aviation is. There is no question about that. Last month our exports were $411,000,000 and our imports were practically $200,000,000. That indicates that we are going ahead, that we are getting richer at the rate of $200,000,000 a month. Is there any reason why we can not provide adequate national defense? Are we too poor? [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE CREATION OF A COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The profound weakness of this unscientific, unbalanced, patchwork of logrolling between pacifists and conservatives is the more accentuated by its failure to provide for a council of national defense, so urgently demanded by every student of real preparedness irrespective of his political faith.

If political rivals will unite even now in enabling Congress to establish a council of national defense, they will render a service which heretofore they have failed to recognize as of the first necessity. They will remove a vital national question from the dangers and uncertainties of politics to which it is especially exposed during the year of a presidential election.

The prattle about "preparedness" on the part of politicians already appealing for votes in view of the approaching presidential election would not have the sound of insincerity had they been willing that Congress should possess the machinery necessary for a continuing, complete, and comprehensive program.

Neither the legislative branch nor any official of the executive department, however high placed, has, under the present system, or could have, a complete and comprehensive plan for the national defense. Congress has before it the suggestions of the Chief Executive, the recommendations of the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy. There are legislative proposals from important leaders in the Senate and House. There are also the various recommendations of the General Board of the Navy and of the General Staff of the Army.

The Secretary of the Navy appears to be the one stumbling-block against this important legislation, requiring practically no appropriation but of the utmost importance to the country.

In the year 1912 the Senate and House Committees on Naval Affairs each unanimously reported favorably to their respective branches of Congress bills for the creation of a council of national defense and at which time President Taft urged upon a Democratic Congress the desirability of establishing this council in order to provide machinery by which the readiness of the Army and Navy might be improved and the programs of military and naval requirements could be coordinated and properly scrutinized with a view to the necessities of the whole Nation rather than of separate departments.

When the chairman of the committee referred to the increase of 13,500 to the enlisted personnel of the Navy, he called attention to the recommendation of the Navy General Board of November 9, 1915, for approximately a like number of men, but failed to state that that recommendation was made upon a building program of $100,000,000 a year, covering a period of five years, which the committee entirely ignored.

A most substantial recommendation of the General Board applying to personnel increase was made in December, 1914, more than one year ago, when 19,600 additional men were recommended, and this report was completely smothered by the Secretary of the Navy, who had his own opinion about the requirements of the service, and since which time the General Board has shown a decided disposition to recommend nothing which might be displeasing to the Secretary, because of the fear that Mr. Daniels might some day wipe the board, which has no legal status, entirely out of existence.

Has it occurred to you that notwithstanding the advice of Admiral Dewey and the Navy General Board, dated August 3, 1914, nearly two years ago, of the necessity of getting the Navy into a state of preparedness, and notwithstanding the letter of Rear Admiral Fiske, dated November 9, 1914, the senior adviser to the Secretary, warning the Navy Department of the Navy's unpreparedness, that no personal increase has been made since then, and that the naval reserve of which he expected so much has developed into a startling fizzle of a little more than 300 men.

Not to be outdone by the then President, the wise men in control of the Democratic national convention in Baltimore inserted in the national platform the following language:

> We approve the measure reported by the Democratic leaders in the House of Representatives for the creation of a council of national defense, which will determine a definite naval program, with a view to increased efficiency and economy.

As the presidential election occurs in November, this will be the last opportunity of the present administration to live up to an agreement solemnly entered into with the American people.

Had the council of national defense been formed at the outset of the administration, in accordance with the platform resolution, we would have long since had a naval and military program and a financial plan to carry it into effect.

It would not be a commission to do the work of Congress, but it would place before Congress a working plan.

The minority proposed to include in this bill, H. R. 9906, which provided for a council of national defense composed of 16 members, 12 of which were civilions and 4 representing the Army and Navy.

The council would help to coordinate the plans of the Army and Navy and furnish a means of reconciling the military and financial interests before submitting to the President and the Congress recommendation for measures of national defense, and would furnish the President and the Congress a ready means of ascertaining at any time the condition of the Nation for defense.

The council would report to the President for transmission to Congress a general policy of the national defense and such recommendations or measures relating thereto as it has deemed necessary and expedient.

Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Italy, and Japan all have their national defense boards. The necessity of having a definite policy worked out in advance of war has become of greater and greater importance, and it is not overdrawing the fact to say that Germany's complete success in the terrible war now devastating Europe is chiefly due to the policy and preparations resulting from the cooperation of the civil and military, embodied in Bismarck, the statesman, and Von Moltke, the soldier.

Our own Civil War has brought out the staggering price in blood and treasure a nation may pay for having no definite policy of defense, while Von der Goltz, one of the greatest authorities on the art of war, has said, "Without a good policy, a successful war is not probable."

The great weakness of our Nation, from the standpoint of national defense, has been the want of a definite policy and the lack of cooperation between the various agencies involved.

Thank God, we Americans are not yet so low and mean that we will not gladly pay any price to keep our land from being ravaged, to keep our homes and our women and children safe from rapine, to keep our flag flying in bright honor, to keep our dear country so armed that we can meet any foes that may storm against her, and smash them to pieces with our victorious and terrible weapons of defense.

You gentlemen who are opposing increases to this bill do not believe that war can come upon us as it has come upon every other nation. I wish I could have had you all with me on yesterday when I motored through Arlington Cemetery, just a few miles across the river. In that spot, so sacred and so holy that it is hard to tread its paths without tears, sleep many thousands of our fathers, our brothers who died, not in vain, to save this country from partition and destruction. Those dead did their duty to their country simply, bravely, heroically to the death, and your country expects every man of you to do his duty in the House this week.

Let us not deceive ourselves that these blood-stained powers of Europe and Asia, emerging from their conflict terribly strong in war preparation and desperately bankrupt in wealth, will leave us in peace and in possession of their gold and their trade unless they appreciate our patriotism, our nerve, our wealth, and, above all, our preparedness for defense against any foe or combination of foes.

The President has repeatedly said that he desires unalterably the strongest Navy in the world. Every Member in this House can do his full duty in making the Sixty-fourth Congress the vehicle by which our Navy again assumes second place among the navies of the world.

Remember that the day may come when, because we were not only "too proud to fight" over matters really trivial but also too dull to prepare to face the realities of this world as the last year has proved them to be, our situation will be what is to-day that of France, if not of Belgium and Serbia, and when we shall be in the peril that Britain is.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] how many speeches he has on that side?

Mr. BUTLER. Only one, and I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee to consume all his time except the closing speech.

Mr. PADGETT. Very well. Then I will put in all I have except one. I will yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the same impassioned appeal made here to-day for arms and armament has been the prelude to war and bloodshed for a thousand years.

But I wish to speak to that paragraph of the bill providing for a conference of the great nations of the world when the European war is over.

The Biblical injunction, "For all that take the sword shall perish by the sword," has been vindicated by the history of all the warring nations of the world from ancient to modern times. I do not want this Nation to take the sword. Alexander the Great took the sword, and Greece perished by the sword. Darius and Cambyses took the sword, and Persia perished by the sword. Cæsar took the sword, and Rome perished by the sword. Napoleon took the sword, and France was humiliated and crushed by the sword. The charred ruins of mighty cities, the hoary columns of antiquity, the overgrown walls of fallen capitals, the crumbling remains of great architecture and ancient art all attest the criminal folly of military rivalry and war.

This is the hour of temptation in our Nation's history. If we abandon our ideals of peace for the standards of war, if we surrender moral force and the power of example to rely upon might, if we enter the contest for world power and control of the seas, if we yield to the alluring calls of rivalry in arms and armament, we will create distrust, engender antagonism, and arouse the world to enmity and the nations to unite against us. If we ignore the admonitions of Scripture and disregard the warnings of the past, posterity will read our history in a new chapter of the tragedy of nations. If we take the sword we will perish by the sword.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is even a higher reason why we as a Nation should now preserve the even tenor of our way in Navy building, why we should now maintain our traditional policy of peace and an Army and a Navy only for defense, why we should now renounce and disclaim a policy of military rivalry looking to world power and the control of the seas.

When the great European war is over and the smoke has lifted from the battle fields, when the echo of artillery has died away, when the censor's curtain screening the horrors of war has been rolled aside, and the world looks in upon the wounded, the mangled, and the dead; looks in upon the ghastly scenes of carnage and human slaughter; upon a continent littered with human skulls and the bleaching bones of the dead; looks in upon the havoc, the destruction, the devastation, upon the ruins, the débris, the desolation; when the world looks in upon the widows, the orphan children, the starving babes upon the breasts of frantic mothers, and the great multitude of cripples all left helpless and dependent upon the earth; upon the woe, the want, the destitution following in the wake of war; when the world looks in upon the bereaved and disconsolate survivors groping their way through the charred ruins, once their homes and abiding places, staggering under the crushing burden of a war debt, to weigh upon them and their children and their children's children for generations to come; when the great European conflict is over—I believe the world will realize the horrors and atrocities of war more than ever before; I believe the world will realize the awful crimes of war more than ever before; I believe the world will realize the awful costs of war, costs in life and limb and treasure, more than ever before; I believe the world will realize the supreme folly of war more than ever before; I believe humanity will be appalled; I believe the world conscience will be shocked and horrified; I believe civilization will stand aghast at the awful spectacle of blood and death and desolation; I believe mankind will revolt; I believe the inhabitants of the earth will appeal to us, as the last great Nation remaining neutral to rescue them from the horrors of human strife and combat; I believe the world will be ready to consider the end of war.

I believe that a great and glorious opportunity awaits this Nation, the opportunity of the centuries, the opportunity of the ages, the opportunity of all time in history, the opportunity to lead the way from cruel, devastating warfare in the settlement of international disputes to courts and commissions and to the planes of a higher and more exalted civilization. [Applause.] This opportunity coming to us is a rare opportunity coming to a nation or to a people; coming only once in a lifetime, only once in a century, only once in an age, only once in a long lapse of time.

I believe this opportunity is ours if we will only avail ourselves of it, if we will only hold ourselves neutral before the world, if we will only hold ourselves impartial before the world, if we will only hold ourselves blameless before the world, if we will only hold ourselves acceptable to the nations and to the peoples of the world. [Applause.]

I believe the opportunity is ours if we will only renounce and disclaim a policy of military rivalry, if we will only turn a deaf ear to the alluring calls for world power and control of the seas, arousing distrust and apprehension against us, arousing animosity and antagonism against us, arousing the enmity of the nations against us.

I believe the opportunity is ours if we will only resist the temptation to take advantage of the misfortunes of others and to gain power for ourselves while others are in war among each other, if we will only remain true to our traditional policies of peace and an army and navy only for defense, if we will only hold ourselves ready, acceptable, and qualified before the world for this great forward movement of civilization.

In the ordinary course of life men are naturally and necessarily more exclusively engrossed with their own, immediate and surrounding affairs; they are more concerned in their own home land where they live and move and have their being; they are more intensely interested in their own day and generation and the ever-engrossing present.

But there is a time when men should rise above their own immediate and surrounding interests for a broad consideration of the welfare of humanity at large. There is a time when men should look beyond their own home land to the world as their country. There is a time when men should extend their vision beyond their own day and generation to contemplate posterity, the future, and the generations to come. There is a time when men should realize their individual responsibilities in life and assume the obligations resting upon them separately as free moral agents among men. These are such times and these are questions upon which I do not surrender my convictions to any man, body of men, or to any party. [Applause.]

This is a duty which we owe not only to the people of our own country but to the people of all countries. This is a duty which we owe not only to our own Nation but to all nations. This is a duty which we owe not only to humanity here but to mankind everywhere; a duty we owe not only to our own civilization but to the civilization of the world, not only to our own day and generation but to posterity, the future, and the generations to come.

If we will only hold ourselves ready, acceptable, and qualified before the world for this great opportunity, our gain and material reward will be great by it. But let us forget the gain and reward of it. Our fame in history will be great by it. But let us forget the fame in history of it. Our glory in the world before men will be great by it. But let us forget the glory of it; let us forget all but the cause of humanity and the civilization of the world. [Applause.]

[By unanimous consent, Mr. BRITTEN was given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as an extension of my remarks some figures and explanations relative to the construction program.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The memorandum referred to is as follows:

MEMORANDUM.

MAY 26, 1916.

1. The naval appropriation act approved March 3, 1915, authorized the construction of 2 battleships, 6 torpedo-boat destroyers, 2 seagoing submarines, and 16 coast-defense submarines; also 1 oil-fuel ship.

2. The battleships *Nos.* 43 and 44, now named the *California* and *Tennessee*, are now under construction, the former at the navy yard, Mare Island, Cal., the latter at the navy yard, New York, N. Y. The usual time required between the authorization of a battleship and the placing of the contract therefor is from three months up. The lowest time possible is about three months, and in the past this has been accomplished only in several isolated cases where the vessel has been a duplicate of vessels authorized a year previously. Sixty days is the minimum time which has been allowed bidders to prepare their estimates. After the bids have been opened several weeks are required for a careful consideration of the bids submitted and the necessary legal formalities in connection with the signing of the contract. The following gives the length of time which has elapsed between the date of authorization and the date of contract for all battleships authorized subsequent to 1898:

Virginia, 23½ months.
Nebraska, 24 months.
Georgia, 23½ months.
New Jersey, 8 months.
Rhode Island, 8 months.
Louisiana, 3½ months.
Connecticut (navy yard).
Kansas, 3½ months.
Minnesota, 3½ months.
Vermont, 3½ months.
New Hampshire, 8 months.
South Carolina, 16½ months.
Michigan, 16½ months.
Delaware, 13 months.
North Dakota, 5 months.
Florida (navy yard).
Utah, 6½ months.
Wyoming, 7 months.
Arkansas, 6½ months.
New York (navy yard).
Texas, 5½ months.
Nevada, 10½ months.
Oklahoma, 10½ months.
Pennsylvania, 6 months.
Arizona (navy yard).
New Mexico (navy yard).
Mississippi, 5 months.
Idaho, 4½ months.
Tennessee (navy yard).
California (navy yard).

It will be noted from the above that in a number of cases a year or more elapsed between the authorization and placing of contracts. In each of these cases the delay was primarily due to the desirability of giving the most careful consideration to the major features of the design of the vessels in question, these features being based on the current developments in naval science. At the date of authorization of the *California* and *Tennessee* the great European war was in progress. The experience during the first months of the war, when a number of vessels of war were sunk by torpedo attack, had impressed upon the department the necessity of improving the methods of defense against underwater attack for capital ships. For some months before the authorization of battleships 43 and 44 an experimental investigation in this connection had been in progress, and this had already developed the great desirability of improving this particular feature. Upon the urgent recommendation of the chief constructor it was determined to hold back the designs in order to introduce such improvements as the experiments might indicate. By July, 1915, the experiments had shown the possibility of very great improvement and indicated the general features of the construction to be desired. It was necessary, however, to make numerous detailed experiments before the best arrangements could be settled on. This work was being pushed all the time to the limit of the facilities available.

3. As soon as there was a preliminary determination of the torpedo protection, which was radical departure in details from former practice, these vessels were advertised for on September 20 and the bids opened November 17, 1915. It was realized at the time of the advertisement that the final information would not be available until early in 1916, and one proviso under which the vessels were advertised required the contractor within three months of the date of contract to make the necessary improvements in this feature, being reimbursed if the changes from the plans as advertised involved any additional expense. All of the bids received refused to accept this condition except on condition of delay in construction.

4. By undertaking the construction of these ships in navy yards the department was enabled to adopt for them the indirect electric-drive method of propulsion, a method which hitherto the private bidders have been loth to adopt or bid upon, presumably in view of the fact that it requires them to purchase machinery instead of building it at their works. This method of propulsion enabled the department to rearrange the machinery in a manner which added very much to the protection of this vital feature against torpedo attack. Incidentally it enabled the speed characteristic to be made 21 knots instead of 20½ knots, as provided in the original design bid upon by outside contractors. By very prompt action in contracting for the structural material for these vessels in December the department was able to obtain it before the enormous rise of the last few months had made much progress. At present market prices the structural material contracted for in December would have cost about $1,450,000 more than the prices actually being paid.

5. The navy yards were instructed to prepare for the construction of these vessels and to proceed with the ordering of material about December 1, 1915, and the plans were entirely revised and completed before the end of February, 1916. It will thus be seen that the order for the construction of these vessels was placed within 9 months of the date of authorization, which compares favorably with the intervals given in the above table in the case of previous battleships. The three months required for the revision of plans was necessary whether these vessels were built in navy yards or by private contractors, as the revision was necessary to incorporate new features of the most vital importance, and the Navy Department would have been liable to the most serious criticism if it had proceeded with the construction of these ships without making provision for these features.

6. The destroyers authorized by this appropriation bill are *Nos.* 69 to 74. Their designs were completed and issued to prospective bidders on August 2, 1915, five months after their authorization. Bids were opened after the usual estimated period of 60 days, on October 6, 1915, and the notice of awards of contracts were issued to private bidders and to navy yards on October 20, 1915, about 7½ months after the date of authorization. The contracts were placed for delivery in 20 months after the date of contract which is the shortest contract period for building of destroyers which has ever been allowed by the Navy Department. This shortening of contract period for destroyers has been obtained despite the fact that American shipbuilders are busier on merchant work at the present time than ever before in their history.

7. The act provided for two seagoing submarines to have a surface speed of 25 knots or more, if possible, but not less than 20 knots. This required a design involving an unprecedented speed, not only as compared to previous United States submarines, but also as compared to any foreign submarines of which the Navy Department has any knowledge. The design for these vessels was completed in December, 1915, which is considered to have been an exceptionally short period for the preparation of a design involving now problems of such magnitude. Bids were opened after the usual 60-day period on February 16, 1916. Only one bid was received within the limit set by the appropriation, and this bid was made contingent on the acceptance of the vessels, even though they might attain a speed as low as between 19 and 20 knots. Under the wording of the act the department could not legally place a contract under these conditions and circumstances were accordingly reported to Congress under date of March 3, 1916. It will therefore be seen that the responsibility for not proceeding with the construction of these vessels rests upon Congress which made mandatory in the law a speed characteristic which no contractor in this country was prepared to accept.

8. The 16 coast-defense submarines authorized by the act were advertised May 29, 1915, less than three months after the passage of the act. The original date set for the opening of bids was August 2, 1915. The date of opening, however, was postponed to September 30, 1915, pursuant to a request of one of the shipbuilding companies which had not previously entered the field of submarine construction. This delay was justified in that it was for the purpose not only of obtaining a wider field of competition, but also for incouraging additional builders to enter this field, thereby increasing the country's resources for constructing this type of vessel. Notices of award of contract for these vessels were issued on October 20, 1915, only 7½ months after the date of authorization, which is a much shorter period than has generally been attained in the case of previous vessels of this class. In spite of the large amount of merchant shipbuilding on hand, and the great difficulties experienced in obtaining material of all kinds, the contracts for these vessels called for completion within periods ranging from 21 to 25 months, which is a shorter average contract period than has heretofore been provided for any class of submarines.

9. The oil-fuel ship authorized in the act of May 3, 1915, was assigned to the Mare Island Navy Yard. On April 19, 1915, the department authorized the construction at the Mare Island Yard, directed material to be assembled, etc. The keel was laid on December 15, 1915. The date for launching has been now fixed for June 17, 1916, having been accelerated beyond the date originally contemplated in order to clear the ways for the battleship *California*. The present estimates are that this vessel will be completed in March or April, 1917, or about two years from the date of its authorization.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time have we left on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. Forty-seven minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, the necessity for self-defense is not debatable. When that is lacking, there is nothing to defend and nothing to debate; but no informed man will or can truthfully assert that our country is in any sense defenseless. On the contrary, he must admit that it is immeasurably better defended than ever before in its history. While making no claim that our Navy is as large or as strong as it should be, yet to those really seeking information as to its present strength and needs, I cordially commend to their reading the very informing and full statement by Admiral Fletcher, the commander of the Atlantic Fleet, and also the comprehensive statement of Rear Admiral Benson, chief of naval operations, made before the House committee at this session. They will there find a full

answer to many of the misrepresentations so persistently uttered and circulated against our Navy and its present efficient head.

I briefly quote from Admiral Fletcher's hearing as to the efficiency of the men and ships:

The personnel now with the fleet meets every requirement. There is no body of officers in any navy of the world that are better educated. There are none more skilled in their profession and none required to maintain a higher standard of efficiency than those in our Navy. * * * The enlisted men who man our battleships are the best the country could produce. * * * As far as can be ascertained, there is no fleet that is more constantly drilled or exercised than our fleet on the Atlantic coast, or any fleet where more exacting requirements are demanded. This is borne out by the results shown in our maneuvers, our war games, our tactical problems, and our target practice. * * * In my annual report there I pointed out some defects in the matériel of the fleet and its needs and requirements to make it a more effective fighting force. These are of long standing, and are only now emphasized by events abroad. The Navy Department has done everything that lies within its power to remedy the shortcomings and carry out the recommendations from the fleet, but most of these requirements are beyond the control of the department and require the legislation of Congress.

The program now proposed in the majority report is the most noteworthy in the history of the American Navy, carrying not only for new construction by far the largest appropriation ever recommended to any Congress, but at the same time offering more far-reaching and constructive legislation than has ever been recommended before. In the type of ships, both capital and lesser craft, which the report recommends we have followed the best and highest expert advice of naval officers, and, if this report is adopted, it will not only add a large number of very effective and badly needed units to our fleet, but will mark a long forward step in the full development of a well-balanced and thoroughly efficient Navy.

With these additions we may still be short in numbers, as compared with some, but not in quality and high military efficiency.

Mr. Chairman, I now desire to address myself to the remarkable report filed by the minority members of the committee. It is to be regretted that in this report they have injected politics into the discussion of this important subject; partisanship should always stop at the water's edge, but nothing seems to deter the minority from considering every question from the standpoint of partisanship. In this report, remarkable for the great number of its gross inaccuracies and misleading statements, a comparison is made between the building program of capital ships under the present administration of President Wilson and that under the four preceding Republican administrations commencing with that of President McKinley, in the Fifty-fifth Congress, 1898.

A list of the capital ships authorized under each of these administrations is set forth on page 2 of the minority report, and the very surprising statement is made that following the Spanish-American War the United States, under Republican administration, entered upon a policy of building and maintaining a Navy superior to that of any great military country of the world, and that so long as we adhered to that policy our Navy was second only to that of Great Britain. It asserts that the decline of our Navy from second place began with the Sixty-second Congress, and would have you believe that during the 16 years of Republican administration the American Navy was elevated from a lowly position to that of the second naval power of the world, and held there just so long, and only so long, as the administration remained Republican.

While again condemning the injection of politics into this discussion by the minority, I gladly accept the challenge they offer in order that the truth may be made known. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is surprising, in the light of the real facts disclosed by the information given the minority at their request by the General Board, and on which they have based their report, that they would have the temerity to assert that it was decided upon by Republican administrations to build a Navy second only to that of Great Britain. It is true that a Navy superior to that of Germany was the desire of the General Board, which submitted its first report in 1903. The German laws of 1898 and 1900, with subsequent amendments, laid down a definite program of building ships and providing personnel. This was public law, of which every administration was fully informed. It was with full knowledge of these laws and the ships they proposed to build that the General Board was influenced in submitting the programs it recommended year by year, including 1903 and thereafter. The recommendations of the General Board, however, were never accepted, nor even were they considered deserving of transmission to Congress or of publication for the information of the people by the Republican administrations referred to in the minority report. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Not until the present Secretary of the Navy came into office in March, 1913, were the reports of the General Board made public.

No Republican Congress provided ships in any measure equal to the number recommended by the board. Any program providing fewer ships than were recommended by the General Board, it is admitted, could not have retained second place for us; and since no Republican Congress or Secretary ever recommended or provided ships to the number required by the program, how can the minority now assert that it was the policy of the Government under Republican administration to build and maintain a Navy superior to that of any great military country in the world? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Do you know that during the six years of President Roosevelt's administration a Republican Congress built just one-half of the capital ships recommended by the General Board, although the amount recommended by the General Board was necessary, if the policy was to be adhered to of placing our Navy in second place? [Applause on Democratic side.]

What is more, in December, 1905, President Roosevelt sent a message to Congress in which he stated that our Navy was large enough and that he did not wish to increase its strength, but only desired in future to provide a building program to take the place of ships that might become obsolete or worthless from time to time, and in this message recommended that the naval strength could be maintained by providing only for the addition of one battleship each year. The General Board recommended three for that year; a Republican Congress and a Republican President only provided one. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Again, in December, 1906, President Roosevelt, emphasizing the same statement, said:

I still feel that it should not be our policy to increase the strength of the Navy. We have only to maintain it at its present strength.

This, he again said in his message, could be accomplished by the building of one battleship a year. The General Board that year recommended the building of three, yet a Republican President and a Republican Congress again only authorized one. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Do these facts prove the assertion made in the minority report as to the policy of maintaining our Navy as the second great naval power of the world?

But this is not all. In 1903, when the General Board first submitted its recommendations to the Republican Secretary for current and future building, the United States enjoyed a superiority in tonnage of about 100,000 tons over the German Navy. France was at this time the second naval power and the United States was third. The Navy of to-morrow can be measured only by the Navy of to-day plus the new construction on the stocks. We might have to-day a superior Navy, and yet a few years hence an inferior one, if, while a competitor builds, we remain idle. How was it that our superiority over the German Navy, which was about 100,000 tons in 1903, had been reduced to about 60,000 tons in 1907 and 50,000 tons in 1908, and that in 1909, long before the Democrats came into control of the House, it surpassed us? [Applause on Democratic side.]

The action of a Republican Congress, following the recommendation of President Roosevelt, and the absolute disregard of the recommendations of the General Board by Republican Secretaries, clearly account for this rapid decline. Facts in the possession of the minority leader, and on which the minority report is based, show that according to the General Board the United States fell behind Germany in 1909, if you gauge the naval strength by the ships built and building. This was at least two years before the Democratic Congress in December, 1911, assembled. Yet in the light of these undisputed facts, the assertion is brazenly made in the minority report that the decline of the Navy from second to third place began with the Sixty-second Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There is another comparison that this list set out on page 2 of the minority report suggests. The minority have very wisely omitted to set out the sums appropriated at each session of Congress under Republican administration during the 16 years which they have called attention to. Now, I want to supply this omission. Under the first McKinley administration you appropriated $48,000,000 in four years for capital ships. The greatest amount at any session of Congress during this four years was $20,000,000, and the amount carried in the bill now brought in by a majority of the committee at this one session of Congress represents for capital ships a sum five times what you appropriated at any single session under the McKinley administration and represents more than twice what you appropriated for this purpose during the first four years of the McKinley administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The amount appropriated in three years under President Wilson's administration, including the amount now recommended

in this bill, is more than was appropriated in 12 years under the McKinley, McKinley-Roosevelt, and Roosevelt administrations, and when the next session of this Congress shall have ended the facts will show that in four years under President Wilson's administration more money has been appropriated for capital ships than under the entire 16 years of Republican administration, to which the minority refers. Yet, in the light of these facts, this minority report undertakes to insist that more should now be appropriated than is recommended in the majority report. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If you will take the trouble to estimate the military efficiency of the capital ships authorized and yet to be authorized under the Wilson administration, according to recognized military formula, you will find that, stated in percentage, the military efficiency of such capital vessels is greater than that of all of the capital ships authorized in the 16 years of the Republican administrations to which the minority report refers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, if our friends on the minority side of the House can get any comfort out of the comparison which their report invites, they are welcome to it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When it is remembered that this bill carries an appropriation for capital ships alone from three to five times greater than any ever carried by any bill offered or passed at any single session of any Republican Congress, it may be interesting to inquire for some explanation of this seemingly enthusiastic desire on the part of the minority Members to add to this already ambitious building program. Perhaps I may be able to suggest such explanation by recalling an interesting incident which occurred during a recriminating discussion between two well-known Republicans.

Back in the Fifty-fourth Congress there was a distinguished Republican on the Naval Committee from the State of Indiana, Mr. Hanly, afterward governor of that State. Mr. Boutelle, of Maine, was the chairman of the Naval Committee at this time, and it so happened that in a Democratic Congress, just a short time preceding this date, Mr. Boutelle had spoken with great earnestness for 10 battleships. In the year now when he, shortly afterwards, became chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, in a Republican Congress, and when the war clouds were hovering around, to which frequent allusions were then made, as now, in fervid speeches urging an increase in the naval building program, which Mr. Boutelle had just reported and which carried an appropriation for only four ships, to cost not exceeding $20,000,000 in all; Mr. Hanly, speaking in favor of an increase of the number from four to six ships, made this very significant observation—I quote from Mr. Hanly, on page 3141 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Fifty-fourth Congress:

> It has been dinned into my ears constantly in the committee room and out of it, Mr. Chairman, on every hand, that we ought not to make this appropriation because our Democratic friends would not make one when they were in power. Looking back over the debates I find the Democratic Party as a rule has been enthusiastically in favor of appropriations for the Navy when they were out of power and not responsible, and I find the Republican Party has pursued the same policy. Why, sir, the chairman of this committee, speaking in a Democratic Congress urged an appropriation for 10 warships. Why not now? Why not now when clothed with power and authority? Let him answer it. I do not for myself favor that kind of politics. I am heartily sick of it all, and so are the people of these United States.
>
> It seems [continued Mr. Hanly]—
>
> The age of virtuous politics is past,
> And we are deep in that of sold pretense.
> Patriots have become too shrewd to be sincere—
>
> And we need not be surprised if the people are too wise to trust us.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

I wonder how many Hanly-pictured Boutelles there are among the signers of the minority report? [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, in conclusion, let me say that in the preparation of this bill the committee have not been unmindful that Congress, in providing for our Navy, should consider any potential dangers from without that address themselves to the calm judgment of reason; yet we have not undertaken, and I hope we never will, to prepare for national aggression, and so long as our preparedness is impressed with the character of self-defense, as opposed to aggression, there can be no merit in the argument that we are drifting into militarism. All recognize that an adequate Navy is the best bulwark of our safety, if the time should ever come when necessity and might become the supreme law. Yet our people have never, and I hope will never, give assent to that declaration attributed to Lord Nelson in the years gone by, to the effect that "a line-of-battle ship is the best negotiator in Europe."

Our country looks with confident hope to the time when peaceful argument can be relied upon in the settlement of national differences, and it was significant that only last week representative citizens from every section of our country gathered at the Capital of the Nation and discussed in serious and hopeful vein the probability, after the close of that almost indescribable struggle across the ocean, that the nations of the world might, by common consent, establish, along practical lines, some tribunal to which differences could be referred for advice and determination, subject to the final approval of the nations involved. This bill carries an appropriation of $200,000, which may be expended at the discretion of the President, in calling an international conference looking to this end.

It is but a recognition of that human truth that to strike a blow in wrath is simply the operation of passion, but to manfully restrain national passion, even under provocation, is the result of human reasoning. If civilization means anything besides the mere technical achievement, it is self-restraint, and the degree to which it is practiced is the measure of our real culture. It should be practiced by nations as well as by individuals.

And in the building program of the future, while it must be always sufficient for adequate defense, may we always remember that a Navy more powerful than is necessary for defensive purposes might invite its abuse and might prove, instead of a protection, a menace to the peace of the world and to our own liberty. Surely none of us will ever want to see our country in the rôle of an international bully. Let us hold to those traditions we have always been taught, and which enjoin on us to always set the world an example in the love of liberty and peace and in the ways of justice and fair dealing in all our relations with others.

What a nation does exclusively for themselves passes away; what they have done for the world remains. For a nation to place all people of all lands under a debt of conscious obligation, because of her real service to humanity, for that nation to send forth light from her high places to illumine the earth, to realize within herself that real righteousness which exalteth a nation, to champion the cause of justice, and to sacrifice the glory of conquest for the right of universal peace—this is indeed to conquer the world, and happy are they who can play a part in it. [Prolonged applause.]

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

Mr. OLIVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, for leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the leave is granted.

Mr. OLIVER. Under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to say that it is evident from the discussion that the bill will pass substantially as reported, and I now desire to write into the RECORD some conclusions as to what the evidence, offered before the Naval Committee at its recent hearings, shows has been accomplished under the present administration by the Navy Department, and I am especially induced to do this by reason of the many incorrect statements set out in the minority report, and some of which have been reiterated on the floor of the House in the discussion of the pending bill.

It is my opinion that the Navy is to-day better organized, better balanced—though not well balanced—better officered, better manned, better armed, and better supplied with ammunition, and is more efficiently and ecomonically administered than ever before in its history. Every branch of the service has been improved and the organization of both the Navy Department and the Atlantic and other fleets developed to a high state of efficiency.

Quoting from Capt. J. O. McKean's hearing before the Naval Committee:

> We have made more real progress in the last two years than any previous five-year period in my experience in the Navy. I do not think I have ever known a time when everybody in the service, from top to bottom, was working as hard with their heads and hands to prepare the fleet for active service.

Admiral Benson, the Chief of Naval Operations, asserts that—

> Cooperation between the various bureaus and offices of the department with the office of the Chief of Naval Operations has been most cordial and complete, and the practical result has been all that could be desired.

And he adds:

> A thoughtful consideration of the work that has been accomplished will show that all is being done now that could reasonably be expected from a so-called General Staff. In my opinion the organization that exists in the department, and that is now in successful operation, is accomplishing in a purely American and businesslike manner all that could possibly be expected from the creation of a general staff, and is, I believe, doing this in a much more satisfactory way.

Says Admiral Dewey:

> Our own General board is, I think, the best General Navy Staff in the world.

Rear Admiral Knight, president of the War College, where high officers of the Navy are instructed in strategy and tactics, testified that—

Secretary Daniels has done more for the War College than any of his predecessors.

In his testimony, Admiral Winslow, a recent member of the War College faculty, after testifying to the great value of the institution, testified that it had nearly been done away with under several Secretaries, but had received better backing from Secretary Daniels than it has ever had.

The door of opportunity and of advancement has been opened to the enlisted man. He has been assigned hours for study that he may avail himself of the new opportunities for promotion. In the four years under President Taft only 3 enlisted men were commissioned ensigns from the ranks. In three years under Wilson 17 have been so promoted; commissions in the Pay Corps have been opened to enlisted men, and 15, who succeeded in passing the examinations, have been commissioned assistant paymasters. The positions of pay clerk and chief pay clerk, formerly held by civilians, have been reserved for enlisted men, and 187 have been appointed to these grades; a law has been passed allowing the Secretary of the Navy to appoint 15 enlisted men to Annapolis each year, and in its first two years 13 entered the Naval Academy. This year more than the number allowed have qualified.

The ironclad enlistment has been modified so that a man, under certain circumstances, may obtain his discharge before the expiration of his enlistment, if his presence at home is essential to the welfare of his family. In the last year over 2,000 men have been granted this privilege. Desertions, which were formerly so prevalent that in the four years of Taft they aggregated 10,360, have been so greatly reduced that they now number less than 90 a month and are steadily decreasing. In three years the number of prisoners, owing to the substitution of more enlightened, though stricter regulations, have decreased from 1,800 to 700.

The result is that the Navy has been increased in three years by 6,331 men, which is nearly double the increase made in Taft's four years. In his four years Secretary Meyer recommended an increase of only 5,000 men and left the Navy over 5,000 short of the number authorized. With this shortage overcome and the ranks now recruited to the maximum allowed by law, we are now proposing an increase allowance of 16,550 men. This number will be recruited probably during the year, making a total increase under Wilson of about 20,000 men, to less than 4,000 men under Taft.

The reenlistment of men discharged in good standing has increased from 52 per cent to 85 per cent, and the efficiency of the Navy greatly enhanced by the retention of these valuable seamen.

For 16 years the Republicans talked about a naval reserve. In their second year the Democrats authorized one. The provisions of this bill will be modified by this Congress in a manner regarded by naval authorities as the most certain to give us the best reserve possible, mustering into the Navy the ex-service men, seafaring people, yachtsmen, and mechanics whose services would be required in time of war. Anticipating the enactment of this legislation, the Navy Department has arranged a summer cruise for civilians, which will immediately add about 4,000 to the reserve of men with naval training.

The number of midshipmen at Annapolis has been increased by about 830 to overcome deficiencies in officers inherited by the Wilson administration, and to provide for the large program which this Congress is authorizing.

The appointment of civilian aviators, civilian engineers, and civilian instructors at the Naval Academy is provided for, that an immediate increase in the number of officers available for military duty may be effected without waiting for the graduation of the increased number of midshipmen appointed to Annapolis.

The Bureau of Ordnance has designed and ordered for new vessels a 14-inch gun, which will shoot farther, shoot straighter, and hit harder than any gun now in use in any foreign navy. It has designed and rested a 16-inch gun, which will be ready for use any time the experts of the Navy regard it as advisable to substitute 16-inch for 14-inch guns on our new ships. We had no antiaircraft guns, but have designed, manufactured, and tested a superior weapon of this type, and are now mounting them on board the ships of the fleet.

The amount of ammunition has been increased to an unprecedented extent, shortages which have existed for years being in the process of correction. For every 100 torpedoes on hand when the Democrats took hold there are now 158 more, making our stock on hand and in process of manufacture two and one-half times as great as it was three years ago. The capacity of our torpedo works has been increased 533 per cent. We have already increased the number of mines 244 per cent, and over $3,300,000 is being provided for the acquisition of more mines, this amount being sufficient to meet our requirements as estimated by the General Board.

The capacity of the Navy's powder factory has been increased from about 3,000,000 to 6,000,000 pounds per annum.

A system of providing for the supervision of the industrial departments of the navy yards by industrial officers instead of seagoing officers has been introduced, placing this most important work in the hands of officers who make it their speciality.

The Government's enormous investments in navy yards are being utilized to the fullest extent. Prior to 1913 these stations, costing millions, were considered mere repair shops and the enormous quantity of construction work went, without competition with the Government yards, to private concerns. Only two yards could construct ships, and only four ships were under construction. To-day seven yards are equipped for construction and are building, all told, four battleships, three destroyers, three submarines, three auxiliaries, and other small craft. Construction work at many yards renders more permanent the employment of skilled artisans, the pay of whom has been increased in every navy yard during the last three years.

By installing electric propulsion aboard the battleships *New Mexico*, *California*, and *Tennessee*, authorized by this administration, we have set the pace for the world.

Radio equipment has been successfully installed on submarines. A system of high-powered radio stations, extending over half the earth, is being pushed to completion, and antiquated radio equipment has been displaced by the most improved material available on over 100 ships.

From 4 unsatisfactory flying machines and 4 aviators our air fleet has grown to 17 machines and 30 aviators. The idle navy yard at Pensacola, Fla., representing an investment of nearly $8,000,000, has been utilized as a training station for aeronauts, and 13 officers and 120 enlisted men are now receiving instruction there. With a view to the development and acquisition of satisfactory motors, the cooperation of the great automobile manufacturers has been obtained and officers of the navy sent to their plants for study and investigation.

Since the United States has spent more money on its modern Navy than Germany, some contend that the American Navy should be that much superior to the German Navy. Since in Germany the pay of officers and enlisted men is infinitely less than the pay in the American Navy, and as the cost in wages in their Government dock yards, of living expenses, and of materials, is proportionately smaller, a dollar went further in Germany than it did in the United States; but the Navy Department, under this administration has shown that its affairs could be administered far more economically than they had been in the past.

Insistence upon competition among the armor-plate manufacturers in this country by Secretary Daniels has obtained reductions in the prices of armor under those paid by Secretary Meyer, which has already saved the Government $1,110,084. The establishment of a Government armor-plate plant will end the era of extortionate prices, and if we should accept the maximum price now offered by the armor-plate factories, it would mean a saving of about $500,000 on every battleship hereafter constructed.

Insistence upon competition among the projectile manufacturers saved the American people $1,077,210 on one contract, by manufacturing powder at a gross cost of 34.1 cents per pound, including all overhead charges, or in reality a net cost of 24.9 cents a pound, the difference between the cost and 53 cents was saved on every pound produced at the Navy's great powder factory, which will shortly produce about 6,000,000 pounds a year.

The cost of manufacturing torpedoes has been reduced from $4,202 to $3,245 each. This reduction has already saved over $300,000. By manufacturing our torpedoes instead of purchasing them, we save $1,000 on each torpedo. Thus it is that with $20,000 we could buy only four torpedoes, while we can, with the same amount of money, manufacture five.

We do not buy mines, we manufacture them; and every mine we manufacture costs the Government $145 less than the mine would cost if purchased.

These are some of the savings which have been effected among the big items that make up the Navy's enormous budget. Many other savings, small in amount but so numerous as to aggregate a very large sum, have been saved to the people each year. Only a year ago, out of savings effected in this manner, Congress was able to authorize an expenditure of $1,000,000 for aeronautics and $800,000 more toward the construction of submarines.

In the fleet, the out-of-date organization, inherited by this administration, has given way to the best the fleet has ever had,

The grades of admiral and vice admiral have been restored, so that when our fleet is obliged to cooperate with that of any other nation in handling a foreign situation the American representative will have all the prestige of his rank and not find himself subordinate to the representative of another nation at the head of an insignificant command.

The commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet has been relieved of many administrative duties so that he may have more time for the big problems of his position. The battleships of the fleet are now under a vice admiral instead of constituting, as formerly, four separate groups, each responsible to the commander in chief. A rear admiral has displaced a captain in command of our destroyers. The submarines, which were so poorly regarded by preceding administrations that they were attached as an appendix to the destroyer flotilla, have been organized into an independent command under a rear admiral. and officers of experience have been assigned to submarine duty in an effort to develop its efficiency to the very maximum. Formerly no officers, except the youngest and most inexperienced from the Naval Academy, had been assigned to this most important duty. A cruiser squadron, under the command of a rear admiral, has been organized of vessels which formerly could not be commissioned because of lack of personnel. This squadron has been assigned to foreign patrol duty, relieving the battleship fleet, so that the fleet might give undivided attention to gunnery practices and fleet exercises. The auxiliaries of the fleet have been organized into a division, under a rear admiral.

We had no mine service in the American Navy up to three years ago. The last division of the fleet to be organized was a mine-laying and mine-sweeping division, and a division of armored cruisers is now being equipped for handling aeroplanes and will shortly join the fleet, and enable aeroplanes to cooperate in all its exercises.

Speaking of the organization of these divisions, Admiral Fletcher recently said: "During the past year the number of units assigned to the fleet has increased 15 per cent," and that "the addition of these vessels has provided a fleet better adapted for carrying on the various operations of war."

To back up the fleet, all merchant vessels, from trans-Atlantic liners to harbor tugs, which could be utilized in time of war have been surveyed and assigned a specific duty. This work was left undone for 16 years by Republicans, whose unfortunate experience in obtaining auxiliaries during the Spanish War should have prompted immediate action.

Every mile of the coast has been organized into naval districts for defensive operations, independent of the fleet, in time of war. This summer Naval Militia will be assigned to battleships of the reserve fleet, and for the first time in our history a general mobilization in time of peace will be effected.

When a fleet finally puts to sea its success depends upon its tactics and its marksmanship. Tactics and strategy are taught at the War College, where in 1913 there were 5 students under 6 instructors, and to-day 34 officers are receiving instruction in person, and 400 more by mail. As for gunnery and the execution of tactical problems, the fleet has devoted to them more time than ever before, and excellent results have been achieved. Marksmanship was at its lowest ebb in years when this administration entered office. "Our target practice," said Capt. Sims, "was all right until 1909, when it began to decline." By 1914, this administration had the problem well in hand, and Admiral Fletcher, commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, recently reported that—

> The scores recorded are higher than ever before made in the open sea, and show not only an increase in accuracy of pointing but in rapidity of fire as well.

It would be simple for the gunners, who last winter fired at 18,000 yards with such accuracy that from 10 to 20 per cent of the shots fired could have been landed on a battleship, to duplicate the best records ever made before.

The sufficiency of the Navy depends alone upon Congress. Its efficiency upon the Navy Department. The proof before our committee is convincing that it has been the effort of the present administration to make the Navy 100 per cent efficient, and more progress in elevating its standards has really been achieved in the last three years than in any other similar period, and the goal has been more nearly attained than ever before.

Statements have also been made during the discussion of this bill reflecting upon the rapidity with which work has been pushed upon ships authorized in this administration, one favorite allegation being that no ship authorized in President Wilson's administration will be completed before his present term expires. In this form this statement, I think, is incorrect, as a number of the vessels authorized in this administration will be completed before the 4th of March, 1917.

As regards capital ships, not only for this administration but for all other administrations, this statement is correct, and for a very simple reason. Each administration begins on the 4th of March. The first Congress of the administration assembles in the following December. The first naval bill of an administration is passed sometime in the following summer, or some 15 months after the administration begins. The result is that from the first authorization of a capital ship to the expiration of an administration is about 2 years and 9 months only, and this time is inadequate to prepare plans, advertise, award contracts, and complete the construction of a capital ship.

As a matter of fact, progress that has been made on ships authorized in this administration and the prospective progress between now and March 4, 1917, compare very favorably with that of preceding administrations.

The table below shows the number of vessels authorized during the first two years of the present and the three preceding administrations, and their average percentage of completion at the end of the administration, the percentages being estimated as regards the work under the present administration between now and March 4 next.

Progress of work on naval vessels authorized during first two years of present and three preceding administrations.

	Administrations.			
	1901–1905	1905–1909	1909–1913	1913–1917
Battleships authorized first two years	7	2	4	5
Average percentage of completion at end of administration	49	75	52	58
Destroyers authorized first two years	.....	5	14	12
Average percentage of completion at end of administration	.....	66	87	93
Submarines authorized first two years	.....	5	8	26
Average percentage of completion at end of administration	.....	69	65	88

Percentages for March 4, 1917, estimated from present and prospective progress.

The table below gives a list of all the vessels, both authorized and completed, during one administration since the administration beginning March 4, 1901. As before, the completion estimated during this administration is estimated, but there is no reason at the present time to doubt the accuracy of the estimates:

All vessels of the Navy authorized and completed during the same administration.

1901–1905	1905–1909	1909–1913	1913–1917
2 tugs	None	2 tugs 1 collier 6 destroyers	6 destroyers. 1 submarine. 1 fuel ship.

Particular stress has been laid in some statements upon the fact that vessels being built directly by the Government are much behind sister vessels being built by contract, it being stated, for instance, that the *Mississippi* and *Idaho*, being built by contract, are 100 and 200 per cent ahead of the sister vessel *New Mexico* being built at the New York Navy Yard. This is another case of figure juggling. When these three vessels were authorized by Congress, it was directed by the law that one of them should be built in a navy yard. The navy yard, New York, was the only yard fitted at that time to build battleships, and the single ways at that yard were already occupied by an earlier battleship—the *Arizona*. It was necessary to get this battleship launched and out of the way before the construction of the *New Mexico* could be undertaken. Hence the *New Mexico* was started some six months later than the sister vessels being built by contract. At the time she was started her sister vessels—using the methods of the critics—were some thousands per cent ahead of her, instead of a puny one or two hundred. On May 1, when the *New Mexico's* keel had been laid some six and one-half months, and that of the most advanced sister vessel over 15 months, the total percentage of completion was 59 in the case of the latter and 26 in the case of the former. The other sister vessel—the *Mississippi*—which had been under construction only a little over a year, was 44 per cent advanced.

As a matter of fact, at the present time work on the *New Mexico* is being pushed to the limit. This limit is fixed at present by the number of men available in the shipfitting trades. Many more men could and would be worked if the prevailing scarcity of skilled labor did not prevent them from being obtained. Though it has not been possible to obtain sufficient men to work shifts upon this vessel, certain shops are being worked night and day, and upon the ship itself the single shift available

is being worked overtime at materially increased expense wherever it will facilitate speed.

The truth is that the backward status of the *New Mexico*, as compared with the *Mississippi* and *Idaho*, is due primarily to the requirement of the law that she should be built in a navy yard when the ways were already occupied. Since laying the keel, her progress compares favorably with the progress of sister vessels for the same period, and she is now gaining on the latter.

The *Shaw*, building at the Mare Island Navy Yard—the first destroyer to be constructed in a Government Navy Yard—is progressing thoroughly satisfactorily, and there is no reason to doubt that she will meet her estimated date of completion, which is January 1, 1917, or only a month or two behind the date for completion of sister vessels building by contract. This is not a bad showing for the first Government-built destroyer where material had to be shipped to the Pacific coast, 3,000 miles away.

The critics are still repeating the story that England had 20 submarines completed in the United States last year in five months. They do not give the facts, which are that 10 submarines were assembled for England in Canada, and 10 built in the United States. The time was not 5 months but 10 months, and these submarines were duplicates of an old class of small submarines built for the United States, which the critics now allege are worthless.

The submarines being built for the United States are very different boats, and much superior. The submarines authorized two years ago vary from 56 to 63 per cent in their completion, with the exception of the *Schley*. The fact that on May 1 the *Schley* was only 12½ per cent completed is the foundation for the allegation that, as regards the submarines authorized in 1914, "some of these ships are 5 per cent completed." The *Schley* was contracted for a good deal more than a year ago, the contract date of completion being March 19, 1918, and the contractors express confidence in completing her by their contract date.

Quite as rapid progress has been made by the Wilson administration as under any former administration. This, too, in the face of the fact that to-day every shipbuilding yard is overcrowded with work; it is difficult to secure material, and it is impossible to obtain enough skilled labor to carry the three shifts which the Secretary of the Navy has been endeavoring to put at work to hasten construction. Under former administrations it was easier to obtain material quickly, there was a surplus of labor looking for work, and it was much easier to rush work than under present conditions. Democratic prosperity has done many good things, but the demand for skilled labor has made it impossible to secure enough labor to enable that quick construction which the Navy Department is doing everything possible to secure.

It may be interesting to here state that Mr. Foss in 1907, while chairman of the Naval Committee, stated on the floor of this House, as will appear from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that the battleship *Nebraska* had been building more than six years and was only then nearing completion, and that many of the other ships building were then more than two years over contract time.

An examination of the records will further disclose that when the *Kentucky* and *Kearsarge* were first authorized under Republican administration they carried only an appropriation for $100,000 to cover the estimated cost of preparing the designs for these ships, and it was more than seven months from the date of authorization before any appropriation was even recommended to Congress for the building of these vessels.

A battleship requires time for its construction. The shortest time in which one has been built is three years and one month—the *North Dakota*, which was completed April 11, 1910, but its engines have never been satisfactory, and in order to make that ship fit for the fleet this Congress must appropriate $400,000. The time of building our other battleships has varied from eight years and three months to three years and four months, as the following table, giving the date of authorization, date of signing the contract, and the date of completion shows:

Vessel.	Builder.	Date authorized.	Date contract signed.	Date completed.	Time to complete from authorization
					Yrs. mos.
Virginia	Newport News	Mar. 3, 1899	Feb. 15, 1901	May 5, 1906	7 2
Nebraska	Moran Bros., Seattle	....do....	Mar. 7, 1901	May 31, 1907	8 3
Georgia	Bath	....do....	Feb. 18, 1901	Sept. 21, 1906	7 7
New Jersey	Fore River	June 7, 1900	Feb. 15, 1901	May 12, 1906	6 0
Rhode Island	....do....	....do....	....do....	Feb. 12, 1906	5 8
Louisiana	Newport News	July 1, 1902	Oct. 15, 1902	May 21, 1906	3 11
Connecticut	Navy yard, New York	....do....	Navy yd. N.Y	Sept. 29, 1906	4 3
Kansas	New York Shipbuilding Co	Mar. 3, 1903	June 16, 1903	Apr. 5, 1907	4 1
Minnesota	Newport News	....do....	June 20, 1903	Mar. 4, 1907	4 0
Vermont	Fore River	....do....	....do....	Feb. 11, 1907	4 0
New Hampshire	New York Shipbuilding Co	Apr. 27, 1904	Dec. 27, 1904	Mar. 14, 1908	3 11
South Carolina	Cramps	Mar. 3, 1905	July 21, 1906	Nov. 5, 1909	4 8
Michigan	New York Shipbuilding Co	....do....	July 20, 1906	Aug. 31, 1909	4 6
Delaware	Newport News	June 29, 1906	Aug. 6, 1907	Feb. 15, 1910	3 7
North Dakota	Fore River	Mar. 2, 1907	....do....	Apr. 11, 1910	3 1
Florida	Navy yard, New York	May 13, 1908	Navy yd. N.Y	Sept. 15, 1911	3 4
Utah	New York Shipbuilding Co	....do....	Nov. 24, 1908	Aug. 30, 1911	3 4
Wyoming	Cramps	Mar. 3, 1909	Oct. 14, 1909	Sept. 23, 1912	3 7
Arkansas	New York Shipbuilding Co	....do....	Sept. 25, 1909	Sept. 14, 1912	3 6
New York	Navy yard, New York	June 24, 1910	Navy yd. N.Y	Apr. 15, 1914	3 10
Texas	Newport News	....do....	Dec. 17, 1910	Mar. 12, 1914	3 9

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE].

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have listened very attentively all during this day and also Saturday to the many speeches on both sides of this question, and I confess that the longer I have listened to the debate the more I am impressed with the importance of a bigger Navy. [Applause.] I come from a city wherein lies one of the navy yards of our Government, and during my life I have come in contact with the men who have made up the personnel of that Navy. I compliment the committee on the work that it has done, but I wish that it had gone further. [Applause.] I have listened to the speeches of the eloquent gentlemen from the South, who sit here and tell us of this war hysteria that is growing all over the country, and I realize that in a few days they will return to their pleasant homes in Texas, where they can smoke the pipe of peace and look over their lands in peace and comfort, while we who live along the shores of the Atlantic can look out upon the ocean and see before our eyes, as we have seen in the past two years, the smoke curling from the smokestacks of the British men-of-war as they parade up and down our seas. That is the condition that prevails in our part of the country to-day. I want to call the attention of gentlemen who wish us to believe there is no need of a Navy to the fact that the best insurance that this Nation has or ever will have is a Navy adequate to protect the shipping industries of the Nation. As I look about the harbor of the city that I have the honor in part to represent and see there the ships of foreign nations, and never see the flag of my own country flying from a ship carrying the commerce of the nations to these shores and our commerce abroad, I wonder what the reasons are, and the answer comes back, "No merchant marine and a Navy too small to protect the little we have." The House has been presented with this great document for preparedness and increase and upbuilding of the Navy, and as I sat in my seat I wondered where all of these ships were to be built. I wondered, as did the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY], whether or not these were to be built by the large shipbuilding companies now already overtaxed with orders for merchant marine, and think that the time has come when we should fit up our own navy yards so that we can build our ships for the Navy. I want a Navy large enough to protect our people in case of war, a Navy large and powerful enough to protect our merchant marine, and a Navy large and powerful enough so that no country would dare to molest it, and the lives of our people on the high seas would be protected. I want a Navy so large that when the mails of our merchants and our people

are on the seas that the English man-of-war will not dare to interfere with it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COPLEY].

Mr. COPLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY].

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, the United States will not become involved in the European war so long as we can honorably and morally keep out of it. We are a peace-loving people, and if we do become involved it will not be on account of our violation of international law and the rights of neutrals nor caused by any overt act that has been or will be committed on this side of the Atlantic. Our country has never yet resorted to war except as a last recourse and never primarily for the acquisition of territory, exploitation, or for commercial expansion, and it never will; but we are a courageous and a patriotic people and, when necessary, always have and always will fight to defend our rights and to protect our liberty.

One of the duties of Congress is "to provide for the common defense." We can only do that by providing an adequate and efficient Navy at sea and an Army trained to fight on land, and supplying the Army and Navy with munitions and equipment. Of course, the Regular Army should be supplemented with a trained reserve, but this is not the time to discuss that feature of military preparedness. It has been said time and time again in the course of this debate that nations are like men—disarm them and they will not commit murder. We have been reminded that in Texas all but peace officers are disarmed. That law, however, is enforced by an armed constabulary. If the law of Texas disarmed law-abiding citizens, but allowed desperadoes to carry concealed weapons, it would not have stopped murder in that Commonwealth. I have no patience with the "peace-at-any-price" maudlin sentimentality that would sacrifice on the altar of the idea of universal peace this free Government of ours.

Under existing world conditions it would be little short of treason for Congress to refuse to make adequate appropriations for the enlargement, development, and maintenance of our Navy and our Army.

There are worse things than war. Loss of liberty, the sacrifice of the Nation's honor, peacefully submitting to vassalage is worse than death on the battle field, worse than devastating war. No people ever yet obtained liberty except by wielding the conquering sword, and no nation ever retained liberty longer than the people had the moral and physical courage and ability to defend it in battle on land and sea.

Our country was born of blood, was baptized with blood, and was saved and cemented by the shedding of blood. While the desire for liberty is as old as the aspiration of the human heart for higher and better conditions, the liberty we enjoy is a new thing in government and dates practically from the Revolutionary War. It is the result of the best thoughts and the best efforts of the best minds that have inhabited and benefited the earth by right living and exalted thinking. It cost unnumbered precious lives and untold treasure. It was, under Divine Providence, wrested from tyrants by the power of the sword. It is our obligation to transmit it to posterity as pure as we received it from the founders and preservers of the Republic who courageously fought the battles of liberty and who "pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" that they and we might be free. We can only so transmit it by being prepared to defend our country and our liberty with force of arms whenever the occasion may require.

The CHAIRMAN. Forty-seven minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS]. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to appear discourteous to any Member of the House, but I do wish to continue my remarks without interruption until I have concluded, and if when I have concluded the things that I have in mind there is time remaining, I shall be very glad indeed to devote it in answering any questions that gentlemen may desire to ask.

The naval bill reported out this year, as stated by the chairman of the committee, contains a great many splendid features, things that are sadly needed in our Navy. On nearly every feature in that bill the minority does not quarrel with the majority. We are in accord, except respecting matters that have been pointed out in the views filed by the minority, which relate chiefly to the amount of money provided by the majority for aviation, to the number of men to be added to the enlisted personnel, for the so-called increase of the Navy as contained in the building program to be authorized, to provisions for speedy construction of ships to be authorized, and to the inclusion in the bill of provisions for a council for national defense.

I am going to take up first the matter of aviation. Last year Capt. Bristol, who is in charge of aviation in the Navy Department, asked that he be given $1,187,000 for new construction, together with $500,000 for maintenance of the aeronautical service, a total of $1,600,000, in round numbers. The committee, against the protest and influence of the Secretary of the Navy, granted $1,000,000 for aeronautics. This year Capt. Bristol recommended to the Secretary of the Navy an appropriation in this year's bill of $13,000,000 for aeronautics.

Of that amount $6,000,000 was for aircraft ships costing $3,000,000 each. Upon the suggestion of the General Board he agreed to eliminate this $6,000,000 from the estimate and said that the remaining $7,000,000—and I speak in round numbers—was the least amount that the Navy should have for aeronautics in this bill. The General Board, under date of May 3 of this year, have said that to place our Navy in second place there should be appropriated $7,000,000 for aeronautics, and the minority of the committee, having in mind the deplorable condition of England to-day because of her failure to recognize in season the great importance of aeronautics, believed that the amount we suggest, one-half of that named by Capt. Bristol, one-half the amount recommended by the General Board, namely, $3,500,000, is the least amount this Government should provide this year for this great and important service.

Capt. Bristol says that on the basis of the so-called five-year program recommended by the Secretary of the Navy for our battleships and other subsidiary and auxiliary ship construction we should have in 1921, 330 aeroplanes, 32 dirigibles, 70 kite balloons, which would cost $20,850,000, and that number of aircraft will require 638 officers and 1,160 enlisted men. I submit that if we are in any reasonable degree to meet the requirements of our service for aircraft we should increase this miserable, pitiful sum of $2,000,000 for the purpose to at least $3,500,000. What is the condition of England in aircraft service? For months the administration controlling the affairs of that country have been apologizing as best they could to the people of the country because of the lack of preparation to meet the German air attacks that are occurring almost daily and nightly. Mr. A. G. Balfour, First Lord of the Admiralty, said on the floor of the House of Commons:

> With regard to Zeppelins, looking back on events, I am sorry we did not develop that type of vessel, not so much for aggression and defense as for maritime and other scouting. We are doing what we can to remedy this state of things, but I do not pretend that when we began the race 10 years behind the enemy there is any reasonable probability of catching up. However, something must be done, and what can is being done.

Is not that statement most significant when our little Navy and our pacifist friends tell us that if the emergency comes we can supply quickly all the aircraft needed?

The First Lord of the Admiralty of England says that England started 10 years behind and can not now catch up. Are we to place this country in the deplorable position, that some time in the future, which may be months—and pray God may be years and many of them—we will need this most important weapon of offense and defense, that the country will look back to us and say, "Why did you not make provision when you could? Why did you not make preparation in this most important means of defense?"

Mr. Bonar Law, Secretary for the Colonies, stated:

> I make no pretense that the Government is satisfied with this branch of the service [the air service], but I assure the House that we are trying to effect remedies for all defenses.

Mr. Tennant, Under Secretary of War, stated:

> While we have made strides in providing proper equipment and defense for the arsenals and vulnerable points of the country, the safety of every part of the United Kingdom from attack by long-range aircraft never can be complete.

Why? Because they were 10 years behind in the race for preparation. Now, what are conditions in this country? Bear in mind that the Army of the United States was the first army in the world to have an aeroplane—in 1909—and that our Navy was the first to have a seaplane—in 1911. Where do we stand to-day in comparison with other nations? Why, the little, insignificant country of Bulgaria, which is hardly larger than the State of Maine, has 300 aeroplanes, and we in our Army and Navy combined have less than 100. France, which started behind us in the development of aeroplanes, has to-day in its air service more officers and men than are in the entire Army of the United States, and England has more officers and men in her air service than we have in our entire Navy, while Germany has not less than 9,000 aeroplanes.

Lord Montague, in the House of Lords, on the 9th of March of this year, said:

At the present time the air service is merely auxiliary to the fighting forces of the army and navy. I can see a time coming when the air service will be more important than the army and navy. We must get into the habit of looking at the air service not as an auxiliary to the army and navy but as a great service which is an establishment of itself and to which we shall have to look in future years for the defense of this country.

Lord Beresford, in the House of Commons, said:

The new air warfare is going to be of so tremendous a character that it may supersede the army and navy. Anyway, we should be ahead in the air, the same as we are on the water.

Another British statesman, in debate on the floor of the House of Commons, said:

The supremacy of the air lies ready to any Government which has sufficient initiative to see to it.

With such testimony by men familiar with air craft and their uses abroad, who with farseeing wisdom look into the future and foresee the effect of future conflicts between nations, I say again it is the part of blindness, of foolhardiness, for this country, which invented the aeroplane, to lag behind all the other countries of the world in its development and utilization, and that the minority of the committee are well justified in differing from the majority in the insignificant sum provided for aeronautics.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the enlisted personnel: The enlisted personnel of the Navy is of equal importance, to say the least, with its matériel. By matériel I mean vessels of war, capital ships, subsidiary fighting ships, and auxiliaries necessary to make them effective. Without the men to man your ships they are so much expensive and useless junk. The General Board, other than which there is no greater naval authority in this country, have stated, on November 9, 1915, in their report to the Secretary of the Navy, that we should have in our Navy in the year 1917, to man the ships already built and that will be commissioned in that year, not less than 67,000 men.

A substantial addition of 17,000 men required on a peace basis.

The majority of this committee, in their endeavor to have the House believe they had complied with the request of the General Board in the number of men, say in their report:

The committee recommends that the enlisted personnel of the Navy be increased by 13,500 men and the Marine Corps by 3,079 men, a total increase of the enlisted men in active service under the Naval Establishment of 16,579.

Now, mark these words:

Which in effect carries out the recommendations of the General Board regarding the increase of the enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps.

The impression sought to be conveyed is that the committee have met the requirements of the General Board for 17,000 men. To do so, however, the majority of the committee are including as the strength of the Navy to-day 1,500 men in excess of the authorized strength, plus 3,500 apprentices, boys under instruction, and 3,079 marines.

Now, the chairman of the committee and the majority members of the committee well know that the General Board in its estimates of men required exclude the 3,500 boys under instruction and exclude whatever increase of the Marine Corps may be made. The minority believe that we should at least furnish our Navy with the men required to man it in time of peace. And a little later I shall give you some reasons why that should be done.

In considering this number of authorized strength of the Navy, bear in mind the further fact that the bill now under consideration takes out of the effective fighting men of the Navy 3½ per cent of the combined authorized strength of the Navy and Marine Corps and puts them into a hospital corps, which would mean that, whatever the authorized strength of men in the Navy, 3½ per cent of that number plus 3½ per cent of the marines, were not fighting men. Their duties aboard ship and ashore are merely to care for the sick and the wounded. They take no part whatever in the battle or in the maneuvering of the ship. Their duties are purely the duties of the doctor and the nurse, and they can not and should not ever be classed as fighting men in any military organization.

Now, why should we have at least 17,000 additional men for our Navy in time of peace? Admiral Fletcher, before our committee, stated that the fleet he took into southern waters for drill last winter was short 5,000 men. He stated in answer to another question that of the 35 or 36 battleships, which include the dreadnaughts we now have, if he were called on to-morrow to put to sea and to meet an enemy he could man but 18 of those battleships. The other 18 would have to remain at the dock. Why? Because we have not men enough in the Navy to man all our battleships, and he further said, which was extremely significant on this question of men, that to man his 18 battleships it would be necessary to reduce the crews of the battle cruisers and the destroyers and all other subsidiary fighting ships, which would materially affect the efficiency of his 18 battleships.

Do you realize that since October 1, 1914, there have been placed in the reserve, with what is called a skeleton crew aboard, not exceeding 40 per cent of the usual complement, the battleships *Louisiana*, *North Carolina*, *Virginia*, *Georgia*, *Nebraska*, *New Jersey*, *Rhode Island*, and *Connecticut*, all ships less than 10 years of age, and that those ships were placed in reserve in order that we might find crews for three of our modern dreadnaughts, namely, the *Oklahoma*, the *Nevada*, and the *Pennsylvania*?

That is why the minority of the committee find their differences with the majority so great and so radical as to be irreconcilable, and come before this committee and ask that our Navy be provided with the minimum number of men, that the greatest authority that we have in naval matters says is necessary, in 1917.

We further believe that there should be provision of law whereby the President of the United States, in his judgment, knowing better and quicker than any other person can know the exigencies of our foreign relations, should have authority to enlist additional men from time to time and in such numbers as he may deem prudent and the necessities of the Navy require, up to and including the number recommended on a war basis.

Now, the number recommended in order to commission all our battleships with full crews, all our subsidiary craft and auxiliary ships, is 82,000, and some 700 or 800. We believe that the safety of the country demands that there be authority of law reposed in the President to quietly, without having to call Congress together and tell the world that we are getting ready for a fight, enlist the men that will be needed to put our ships on a war footing when he sees the danger coming. And to that end we make recommendation that the President be given the authority to enlist from time to time the number of men in excess of those provided for in this bill that will be necessary to put our vessels in full commission on a war complement.

That brings me down, Mr. Chairman, to the greatest point of difference between the majority and the minority of the committee. There have been before the committee during its sessions of these last four or five months, in one form or another, four different plans for the upbuilding of the Navy, based on four distinct and separate fundamental ideas. The first plan—and it should be borne in mind in considering the testimony of all the officers quoted by the chairman of this committee and all of the members of the majority that those officers testified when the committee had officially before it plan No. 1, to wit, the so-called five-year program—providing for the first year two battle cruisers and two battleships. That was the basis of the testimony of every officer who appeared before our committee—a plan covering five years—that for this year called for two battleships and two battle cruisers. I might say in passing that this five-year program, inadequate, as the minority believes, to meet the exigencies of the situation, the Democratic majority threw to the winds, although it had the indorsement of their Secretary of the Navy and of the President of the United States.

The next plan we had before us, and that was one, as you recall, which came out of the administration——

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I asked not to be interrupted, and I must decline.

It came out very reluctantly from the administration. It was only secured by the application of the senatorial corkscrew in the form of a resolution, and that was the General Board's program of July 30, 1915. That program, as stated by the General Board, was gotten up in compliance with the oral order of the Secretary of the Navy to express its opinion at the earliest practical date as to a policy which should govern the development of the Navy and a building program.

The General Board reported:

The Navy of the United States should ultimately be equal to the most powerful maintained by any other nation of the world.

That, you remember, is the attitude of the President to-day, that our Navy should at least be equal to the most powerful maintained by any other power of the world. Now, that program called for the building of four battle cruisers and four dreadnaughts this year. That I call the program No. 2. Then we had program No. 3, which was furnished to the committee in answer to a request that I made of Capt. McKean, which was that he inform us what would be necessary in the way of building program, munitions, and additional facilities to round out and balance the existing fleet we have. That came in and called, among

other things, for 12 battle cruisers and 12 large scout cruisers, 48 destroyers, 48 colliers, 48 tank ships, 100 trawlers. Those were some of the things recommended as necessary to make effective the battleships we already have built, building, and authorized. The fourth program before the committee was sent in by the General Board under date of May 3 of this year, and that program was to inform the committee what would be needed to place the American Navy in second place in three years. Among other things they recommended 6 additional dreadnaughts, 10 battle cruisers, 21 scout cruisers, 80 destroyers, and 78 additional submarines. Now, with four distinct programs before the committee, I ask any man on this floor to read those programs, then read the recommendations of the majority, and say if the strictures of the minority are not justified when we say they have ignored all competent naval authority and have gone contrary to the opinion of all naval experts who appeared before the committee.

The chairman of the committee, in his opening remarks, took perhaps half an hour or more in reading extracts from the testimony of various officers who had appeared before the committee. Well, now, let me say in the beginning, the minority does not differ with the majority as to the usefulness and the necessity of battle cruisers; not at all. Yet the quotations of testimony made by the chairman of the committee, if they mean anything, mean that they are strong arguments in favor of this, to our Navy, new type of capital ship. Where, in the testimony of any man who appeared before the committee do you find a recommendation of five battle cruisers this year? The only odd number recommended by any officer was nine, by Admiral Knight, and the same by Capt. Sims. Is it not a fair charge to say that when the majority comes in with only five, when their authority calls for nine, they have disregarded it and paid no attention to their recommendation, except in authorizing a particular type of ship?

Mr. Chairman, there is one feature of these extracts read by the chairman which I think is an injustice to the officers quoted. A great deal of testimony was taken, covering thousands and thousands of pages. By raking this testimony with a fine-tooth comb, they were able to extract such an answer as they wanted only when the officer was pushed into a corner, and asked to say, "If you must choose in the building of four ships, will you have them two and two or all of one type?" Some of them said, "All battle cruisers."

Admiral Fiske, who has been cited as an authority, says he would build two, four, or six battle cruisers this year, if we are to build only that number of capital ships, but when asked if we were to build eight capital ships replied, "I would have four and four."

[Page 2907.]

Admiral FISKE. I testified on Friday, in answer to a question here, that I would follow the recommendations of the General Board of July 30, which would mean if you are going to build eight capital ships, you should build four and four.

The CHAIRMAN. How would you get away from the six?

Admiral FISKE. There you are again. If you are only going to build six, I would make them all battle cruisers.

Mr. CALLAWAY. You had better answer according to your own judgment rather than to take the judgment of the board.

Mr. BROWNING. If you are going to build eight ships, what would you do?

Admiral FISKE. In that case, four battleships and four battle cruisers.

Mr. BROWNING. You would?

Admiral FISKE. Yes, sir; if you are going to build eight capital ships.

The CHAIRMAN. If you are going to build six ships, you would build six battle cruisers, and not four battle cruisers and two battleships?

Admiral FISKE. I do not contend that this is logical, and you must understand that in my judgment anything like this ought to be played out on the game board and worked out very carefully. But to answer and give a good "horseback" opinion here like this difference between six and eight is impossible, in any logical way I know of. It is impossible to say what you should do, but I do think we need the battle cruisers now much more than we need the battleships. If you are going to build a great many battleships, I would be in favor of some battleships and some battle cruisers; but if you are only going to build a limited number—four or six—I would be in favor of all battle cruisers.

[Page 2926.]

Admiral FISKE. The Secretary and I had a number of conferences on that matter.

Mr. BRITTEN. Have you seen the Navy General Board's recommendation of July 30, 1915, wherein they recommend the construction of four battle cruisers, four dreadnaughts, six scouts, etc.?

Admiral FISKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRITTEN. Do you agree with that recommendation?

Admiral FISKE. Would you mind letting me see that?

Mr. BRITTEN. I will hand it to you. The lead-pencil figures inside the General Board's figures are the number of ships of various kinds carried in this year's appropriation bill, and the printed figures, of course, are those from the General Board.

Admiral FISKE. I think that this comes from the best authority in the Navy in regard to its requirements, and from that point of view I agree with it. Personally I might differ as to some small particulars, but I think the General Board is the best thing you have now for telling what we need.

Mr. BRITTEN. And if Congress were to authorize four first-line ships this year, what, in your opinion, should they be—battle cruisers, or what?

Admiral FISKE. If they are only going to recommend four?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Admiral FISKE. Battle cruisers.

Now, Admiral Taylor, Chief Constructor of the Navy, when asked by Mr. CALLAWAY, "Why build two battleships and two battle cruisers if the cruisers, in your judgment, have an advantage over the battleships?" replied:

I think I have stated it is a very small advantage, and we need them both badly.

Mr. KELLEY. Do you mean why not build four battle cruisers?

Mr. CALLAWAY. If they are the thing to build; yes.

Admiral TAYLOR. The question put to me was, "If we had to sacrifice one or the other, which would I sacrific first."

Mr. FARR. You do not believe in sacrificing any of them, do you?

Admiral TAYLOR. No, sir.

I think Admiral Grant was quoted as being for all cruisers, the inference being that he was against battleships as well. I read:

Mr. KELLEY. You did not mean that it was a better fighting ship than the battleship?

Admiral GRANT. I do not think it is.

Mr. KELLEY. We need them more because we have not any?

Admiral GRANT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you build all battle cruisers or would you build part battle cruisers and part dreadnaughts?

Admiral GRANT. If I had an unlimited amount of money, I think I would build both; having only a limited amount, I would probably build battle cruisers alone.

There comes in what I stated before, that we were only considering a program of four battleships. I read further:

Mr. CALLAWAY. Admiral, you were stating what we need in vessels besides the 183 submarines, the 4 battle cruisers, and the scouting vessels. You stated, I believe, the number of scouting vessels, but you did not state the number of destroyers and vessels of other character which we would need. I wish you would follow that out.

Admiral GRANT. I think I told you, Mr. CALLAWAY, that I am a poor person to give you much information on that subject, because I have not made it a study. It is work for the General Board and the War College. I can tell you briefly what I think right now, but I would not give it much credit.

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

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. No; I must decline. I stated at the outset that I must refuse to yield. The gentleman, if he was not here, must understand it now. I decline to yield. I do not mean to be discourteous to him.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I did not want to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Now, Admiral Grant is one of the witnesses they bring here in support of the five battle cruisers and the exclusion of battleships. Capt. McKean, another able and efficient officer, in answer to Mr. FARR's question:

Do you favor the recommendation of the General Board as presented?

And bear in mind the General Board's program was a five-year program, two and two—

Capt. McKean says:

I do not know any body of officers or any officer whose opinions about the necessities and preparation I would take against the General Board. Each officer that appears here, as you must have noticed, will give his point of view, but the best, complete, studied opinion that there is in the Navy to-day is represented by the official opinion of the General Board. There is not a set of officers better trained to give it. They have the information from the Office of Naval Intelligence; they have the assistance of the War College, trained people; they are officers of splendid judgment, splendid training, and they think over this thing in cold blood, and they do not get excited by events on the game board.

Mr. FARR. Following that up, I should like to ask whether you favor the recommendation of the General Board as presented now?

Mind you, two and two. Capt. McKean replied:

I would feel that I would be most egotistical if I attempted to oppose it.

And yet he is brought in here by the majority as a witness in opposition to the board which he says is of the highest authority in the Navy.

Again, on page 1769:

Mr. CALLAWAY. Since we have 17 battleships of the first line, it is your opinion that we should have 1 more battleship and 6 battle cruisers, and then keep that ratio running along?

Capt. MCKEAN. That would give you about the right ratio; yes, sir; the right number of divisions and the right proportion between the ships, according to my personal opinion.

Mr. CALLAWAY. In your judgment, we should not build any more battleships until we get the right proportion of battle cruisers?

Capt. MCKEAN. I did not say that.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I am asking you

Capt. MCKEAN. I think we should build so that when the program is completed it will be in about that ratio, and then I would build in about the proportion of three to one.

Admiral Winslow has been quoted as being for all battle cruisers. On page 1424 he says:

Admiral WINSLOW. I think you will find that there is opinion that we should build battleships; that there is other opinion that we should build battle cruisers, but I think that you will find the majority of opinion is that we should build both.

Mr. BROWNING. Both?

Admiral WINSLOW. Both battle cruisers and battleships. I think you will find that that would be the majority of opinion. I myself

am very strongly in favor of battle cruisers. We have no battle cruisers.

Mr. BROWNING. How many would you build this coming year of each?

Admiral WINSLOW. I would build all that the country can build.

Mr. BROWNING. Would you build four of each? I think that was the recommendation of the General Board.

Of each, bear in mind. Is he a witness to uphold the claim that we should build only battle cruisers? Mr. BROWNING asked him:

Would you build four of each. I think that was the recommendation of the General Board.

Admiral Winslow answered:

No; I would build more than that.

So it goes right through the testimony offered. Take Admiral Knight. He says, on page 2013:

Admiral KNIGHT. I am sorry to say that I can not answer that definitely. I have talked of that matter with many officers. It has not come up officially before the General Board at any time when I have been present. You understand, perhaps, that I only attend the monthly meetings on the last Tuesday of each month. I am not usually present at the other meetings of the General Board. I should hesitate to speak for the other members. I am quite sure some of them would agree with me. You must all understand me as insisting that we must keep on building battleships.

[Page 2072.]

Mr. OLIVER. How many capital ships do you calculate you will have to build in order to have a navy of that strength? I will ask you how many additional capital ships you will have to build?

Admiral KNIGHT. I should like to go over that carefully and count these up.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not care for that. Just approximately, without making it too lengthy; just in numbers?

Admiral KNIGHT. Approximately 20 dreadnaughts.

Mr. OLIVER. Twenty more dreadnaughts?

Admiral KNIGHT. Twenty more dreadnaughts.

[Page 2073.]

Admiral KNIGHT. When I said what Great Britain had at the beginning of the war, I meant built and building.

Mr. OLIVER. Now, give me the number of capital ships that we should have.

Admiral KNIGHT. I think it should be approximately 20 more dreadnaughts.

Mr. OLIVER. And of battle cruisers, how many?

Admiral KNIGHT. It would be 20 capital ships in all.

Mr. OLIVER. Twenty capital ships in all, in addition to what Great Britain has.

Admiral KNIGHT. In addition to what she has built and is building and what we have built and are building.

Mr. OLIVER. Fifteen cruisers. That makes 35. I believe you gave us 20 dreadnaughts and 15 battle cruisers; 35 capital ships in all?

Admiral KNIGHT. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. How many scouts would you say?

Mr. BUTLER. Do you mean additional?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; in addition to what we have now.

Admiral KNIGHT. We have none now. I would say 24.

That is Admiral Knight, president of the War College, whose statement is the strongest authority for including only battle cruisers in the bill this year.

Admiral Fletcher, on page 2385, says:

Mr. CALLAWAY. If I understand your recommendation at this time, it is that if we were going to build two capital ships that we build battle cruisers and if we were going to build four capital ships that we build battle cruisers, and if we were going to build more capital ships than that that we add some dreadnaughts. Am I right about that?

Admiral FLETCHER. Yes, sir; that would be my conception, but I stated that I had not given this particular subject any study such as is given to it by the General Board, and I would prefer to accept their conclusions.

[Page 2392.]

The CHAIRMAN. During the whole of the war of 18 months battleships have been the controlling factor on the sea?

Admiral FLETCHER. The battleships are controlling the situation to-day, as they have ever since the war opened. It is the power of the battleships that has kept the German fleet and the German commerce off the sea.

The CHAIRMAN. Kept the German fleet locked up and her commerce destroyed.

And so I might go on, filling the RECORD with quotations.

Showing that the authorities cited by the majority of the committee, instead of sustaining the contention that we should build only battle cruisers, are battleship men as well, and want to see both types added to the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I am going to say just a few words on the submarine feature of the majority program.

Mr. REILLY. Will the gentleman yield just at that point?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I can not yield. I have asked not to be interrupted. The General Board stated that to place us in second position we need 78 coast submarines in addition to those we now have built and building. The General Board say we need in all about 150 submarines, which means that we should have added to those now built and building in the neighborhood of 80.

Admiral Grant, who was before the committee on the matter of submarines, having been detailed to take charge of that very important branch of the naval defense, said to the committee that we could use 250 to 300 submarines. And yet, having in mind the extraordinary and wonderful performance of the submarine in the European war, its great effectiveness against even the battleship itself, its utility in coast defense and as a commerce destroyer, considering that we have only 72 built, building, and authorized, with our thousands of miles of coast to defend; considering the statement of Admiral Fletcher, the commander in chief of the fleet, that in no way can we as well defend our coasts in a limited time and with so small an amount of money as by submarines, the minority of the committee say that we should increase the number of submarines to be authorized in this bill to at least 47 of the coast-defense type. There is no difference between majority and minority on the three 800-ton experimental fleet submarines that are authorized. But we do say again that the United States, the home and birthplace of the submarine, is lagging far behind all other great powers in utilizing that device; and considering its great value to us in the defense of our seacoast alone, not to consider its usefulness in connection with fleet operations, this Congress will be derelict in its duty if it does not make adequate and liberal provision in this year's bill to make up a sufficient number of submarines for our coast and fleet needs.

As to destroyers: I must confess with a degree of shame that in the years past I have not been sufficiently impressed with the necessity of destroyers in our fleet and have been voting in years past against an adequate number of destroyers. I never yet, however, have voted against reporting any. We are 80 short in that most efficient subsidiary fighting ship. The majority, "to partly balance the Navy," recommend 10 to make up that great deficiency of 80. And mind you, that deficiency increases every time you increase the number of capital ships, for the plans of the General Board estimate 4 destroyers to each battleship. And if you do not provide for the additional destroyers at the rate of 4 to each battleship, every time you authorize a battleship, you make the discrepancy in destroyers that much greater. The minority of the committee believe there should be put into this bill at least 28 of these vessels and the others within the life of this Congress, so as to put our fleet where it belongs and where, until 1911, it was, in second place.

It must have struck many of those who heard the chairman's opening remarks, and those who have taken the trouble to read the report of the majority, that the majority of this committee have acted not on any definite, well-considered naval program to do anything particularly for our fleet, but with one eye, and I am not sure but both eyes, on the Treasury. Mr. Chairman, this is not a time when we should unduly consider the Treasury. If we are to believe the highest authorities, we know there is a critical time in the affairs of the world, there is a possibility of more critical times for this country by reason of the disturbances abroad, and we ought to do what we can and as quickly as we can without regard to a few million dollars more or less out of the Treasury in meeting the needs of the country to-day. If the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] will give me his ear just a moment, I do not want to say anything behind his back—the gentleman from Alabama by a very skillful juggling of what he alleged to be facts, of words and dates, would have it appear that this administration has been doing wonderful things for the Navy, because of the large total amount of appropriations. When my friend has been on the committee a little longer, and when he has read past naval history a little more thoroughly he will know that the total amount appropriated in any one bill or by any one administration by no means measures the increased strength of the Navy by reason of that greater expenditure. Battleships of to-day are two or three times larger than those of 10 or more years ago and cost about twice as much. It follows logically and conclusively that we must look to numbers rather than to the amounts expended if we are to form a correct idea of the relative strength of our fleet at different periods of its development.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. [Applause.]

[Mr. KITCHIN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. PADGETT. I have no further time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under special order all time has expired and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. BORLAND (interrupting the reading). I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the bill must be read without interruption.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. PADGETT. That can not be done, Mr. Chairman, under the rule which directs it must be read.

Mr. BENNET. It can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I do not think so. The first reading of the bill has already been dispensed with and the bill ought to be read once.

Mr. BENNET. Under the rule general debate was to stop at 1.30, but it did not.

Mr. PADGETT. There was a unanimous-consent agreement. There are two readings of the bill and the first reading was dispensed with and under the rule this ought to be read.

Mr. BENNET. Of course, the gentleman can object. A Member has a perfect right to ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman allow the Chair to put the request? The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment embracing several items to correct misprints in the bill just before we take up the offering of other amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 18, strike out the word "sixteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "seventeen."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. What is the amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. To correct the fiscal year, which was a misprint.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Under the rule adopted by the House on Friday last providing for the offering of amendments to any paragraph or any portion of the bill after the reading of the bill to-day, which has just been concluded, if an amendment is offered, for example, to paragraph 2 of the bill, adopted or rejected, and the committee then consider an amendment to paragraph 12, will it be in order at any time before 2 o'clock on Friday to offer another amendment to paragraph 2?

Mr. PADGETT. If it is a germane amendment, it would.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. In other words, when a paragraph of the bill is under consideration for amendment by one motion, must all motions to amend the paragraph be made before action is had on that particular paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The rule does not provide for that.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I wanted to understand. Then we can go back and forth in the bill ad libitum until 2 o'clock on Friday and amend paragraphs as the committee sees fit?

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. I did not quite understand the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts inquired whether if an amendment was offered to any particular paragraph all amendments to that paragraph must be proposed before that paragraph is left, and the Chair stated the rule did not require it.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. I have an amendment to offer to page 6. May I offer that after we pass page 6 before the vote on Friday?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be offered at any time before the time fixed——

Mr. WILSON of Florida. And debated?

Mr. PADGETT. When the gentleman gets recognition he can offer his amendment.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENNET. Under the rule as finally adopted an amendment may be offered even after 2 o'clock on Friday.

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be offered under the rule after 2 o'clock.

Mr. PADGETT. But not debated.

Mr. BENNET. An amendment may be offered and debated up to 2 o'clock on Friday.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BENNET. At 2 o'clock on Friday a vote will be taken on the then pending amendments, and after that any number of amendments could be offered and voted on without debate.

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 18, strike out the word "sixteen" and in lieu thereof insert the word "seventeen."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 14, strike out the word "sixteen" and in lieu thereof insert the word "seventeen."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 17, strike out the word "sixteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "seventeen."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 7, strike out the word "sixteen" and in lieu thereof insert the word "seventeen."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 69, line 7, strike out the word "sixteen" and in lieu thereof insert the word "seventeen."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 70, at the end of line 15, strike out the colon and insert a period.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 73, line 4, strike out the word "sixteen" and in lieu thereof insert the word "seventeen."

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

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Chairman now to recognize Mr. BUTLER or Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts who has an amendment in reference——

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Pennsylvania yields to me for this amendment which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 87, after line 17, insert the following:

"The provisions of sections 1493 and 1494 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall apply to the Marine Corps."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that this motion be disposed of at the present time and either adopted or rejected. It will not need any discussion. I think two or three moments of explanation will convince every member of the committee of the absolute justice of making these provisions of law apply to the Marine Corps, the same now applying only to the regular officers of the Navy. The conditions are these:

Under section 1493 no officer of the Navy can be promoted to a higher rank unless the board of examining surgeons certify that he is physically capable of performing all the duties of that higher grade. Section 1494, however, provides that any officer who has been wounded in battle can be promoted to a higher grade if the board of surgeons certify he is capable of performing any of the duties of that higher grade. Under that provision of law many officers of the Navy who have received wounds in battle have gone up to high rank, because they could perform some of the duties of each grade to which they were promoted. Perhaps the most conspicuous instance is that of Admiral Winterhalter, who lost the sight of an eye under such circumstances, and has gone up by various degrees of promotion to the rank of admiral. Had section 1493 only been enforced, he would have been retired the next time he came up for promotion because the loss of one eye would have prevented him from performing all the duties of an officer of higher grade. It is supposed that all these provisions were service provisions—that is, they applied to officers of the Marine Corps as well as to officers in the Navy, and under those two provisions Maj. Leonard, who, I believe, was second lieutenant of marines in the Boxer rebellion, and lost an arm in that campaign, was promoted from second lieutenant to the grade of major, because he could perform some of the duties of the office.

Now, a case comes up, which was decided last Wednesday by the Judge Advocate of the Navy, too late to be brought up in the Naval Committee, under the following conditions: A young Marine Corps officer, a second lieutenant, was shot in a battle in Nicaragua during the early occupation of that country by our marines. He was shot in both feet. As a result of the wounds a portion of one or both feet was amputated, and when the wound healed the cords attached themselves in such a way as to make it impossible for him to get out and march with the

troops without great physical suffering; in fact, he could not do it. He came up for promotion, under the commonly accepted interpretation of sections 1493 and 1494, from second to first lieutenant and passed all his mental and professional examinations. He is a fine specimen of physical manhood. It was then discovered by somebody that these sections were not service provisions and did not apply. The Judge Advocate General has rendered a decision that these two sections, while applying to the officers of the Navy wounded in battle, do not apply to officers of the Marine Corps under similar conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for a minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. And the purpose of this act is to extend those provisions to all the officers of the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. And to the Marine Corps on the same terms.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. On the same terms. It seems to me there could be no objection in the mind of any man to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield? Has the term "active list of the Navy" heretofore received any construction to exclude members of the Marine Corps?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. This is the first instance I find on inquiry among officers of the Marine Corps where there has been any exclusion of any officers of the Marine Corps in at least 30 years, and the memory of the officer I consulted did not run back beyond that.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the pending bill there is phraseology of like language to include not only the Navy but the Marine Corps. As a matter of fact, there should be some change made to incorporate some members of the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. This legislation is proper in order to put the Marine Corps on the same basis as the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS].

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee if I shall offer this amendment now?

Mr. PADGETT. I shall be glad to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 97, line 20, strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me just a moment, I wish to call attention to the suggestion that has been made——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman suspend a moment?

Mr. PADGETT. Does the gentleman intend to offer this entire thing as one amendment?

Mr. BUTLER. I have a statement to make as soon as the gentleman from Tennessee has finished.

Mr. PADGETT. I wish to explain the agreement that has been made between us.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish you would explain it, please.

Mr. PADGETT. The suggestion was made that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would offer this amendment as a whole.

Mr. BUTLER. It includes the whole building program.

Mr. PADGETT. It includes the whole proposition in reference to the increased building program, with the understanding that we will vote on the different items separately. For instance, it would be offered as one amendment and be debated and considered until 11.30 o'clock to-morrow morning, and then we would take a vote upon the first proposal and follow that later with a vote upon the other several items, voting upon the items separately.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Let me see if I understand it.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me first make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the gentleman first report what is proposed in the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. There are several amendments there, Mr. Chairman—23 in all. Let me add this to the request made by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs: To-morrow morning at 11.30 o'clock we will vote on the first amendment, which is on page 97, line 20, without debate; that then we proceed to the next amendment, and so on, voting separately upon all these amendments.

Mr. COX. There will be no debate to-morrow at all on those amendments?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. It has been suggested by my colleagues that if any gentleman desires under the five-minute rule to debate any of the other amendments he will have the opportunity.

Mr. PADGETT. That is, under the rules of the House there will be five minutes' debate for and five minutes against?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; there will be five minutes for and five minutes against.

Mr. PADGETT. Not general debate.

Mr. BUTLER. No; not general debate; but debate under the five-minute rule on all the items excepting the first one, which we will vote on to-morrow, providing for the increase of one battle cruiser.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does this agreement supersede the tacit understanding that on to-morrow morning the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] was going to offer the armor-plate proposition, and that we were to vote on it at not later than 2 o'clock?

Mr. PADGETT. I did not agree to that—to vote on it not later than 2 o'clock. I said I would call it up to-morrow morning as soon as opportunity was offered, and these proposals would be voted upon; but we could get rid of those under this understanding not later than 1 o'clock. Then we would take up the armor-plate amendment and debate that and vote upon that to-morrow.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the understanding of the gentlemen of the committee on both sides, as I understand it, is that after the disposal of the various propositions involved in the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], then the gentleman from Tennessee is to offer the armor-plate proposition and have it considered, and have a vote on the armor-plate proposition to-morrow afternoon not later than at what hour?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, I do not know what debate there will be.

Mr. EMERSON. Has any debate been agreed upon?

Mr. PADGETT. No; no debate has been agreed upon. That is an important question. We will allow a fair and proper debate.

Mr. STAFFORD. The understanding is that a vote will be had to-morrow afternoon on the armor-plate proposition?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the chairman of the committee if he does not think the increase of the Navy, including the proper number of cruisers, battleships, and other craft, is an important matter that ought not to be choked off by a five-minute speech on each side?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, it has been so much discussed, and, as people have said to me, everybody has his mind made up, so that if necessary we should go ahead and vote on it without any debate at all.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. And would not that be true as to armor plate, too?

Mr. PADGETT. I am willing to do that as to armor plate. I am willing that debate should be had for those who want to talk on it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The gentleman says he is willing to debate the armor-plate proposition, but he is not willing to give full debate on battleships and cruisers.

Mr. PADGETT. That has been debated fully in this Congress and in other Congresses. It has been fully covered in the general debate on this bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I will offer one amendment and see where we come out. That is the one on the battle cruisers. It is the one that was read at the Clerk's desk.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. OGLESBY. Does this amendment which the gentleman offered include all of the propositions of the minority as amendments to this bill in substance?

Mr. BUTLER. On the building program; yes, sir.

Mr. OGLESBY. Now, I understand the gentleman proposes to introduce one, instead of the whole series contained in the resolution.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. I find that over on this side I had not consulted with all my colleagues, and therefore I will offer only what the rules permit me to offer; that is, one amendment, on page 97, line 20, to strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six," and with that I will stop. There can be no objection taken to that.

Mr. PADGETT. Let me ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman has made an agreement with me to offer this whole resolution as an amendment, and to let it be pending, with the understanding that we would vote upon the different items when they are reached to-morrow morning at 11.30?

Mr. BUTLER. I did. I know.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, then, upon that agreement Members on both sides of the House, Democrats and Republicans alike, came to me and asked me about the arrangement, and I told them what it was, and they have gone away from here.

Mr. BUTLER. And it would not be fair toward them to change it.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it would not be fair toward them for the gentleman to withdraw that agreement.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, Mr. Chairman; let me make a promise to my friend: Never again will I make an agreement of any kind, even to stay home at night. [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. I think if you carry out your agreement it will not militate against anything.

Mr. BUTLER. I can not carry it out. If the gentleman will give me time for a minute, I will gather myself together. [Laughter.] I am not going to break my word, and——

Mr. PADGETT. Let me say this to the gentleman: I know he is not going to break his word. Let me say to him, Go ahead and offer it as one amendment, with our understanding that it will be debated until 11.30 to-morrow morning, and then the other items will be considered under the five-minute rule of the House.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. But then, if occasion presents itself, where it appears proper that there should be an extension of the five-minute rule to more than one to a side, I am not going to take advantage of technicalities, but I am not going to allow just ad libitum debate.

Mr. BUTLER. I discover that if we consume to-morrow upon the discussion of this proposed building program it may result in postponing the consideration of the proposed amendment for the construction of an armor-plate factory until another day, and that that postponement will disappoint some of my colleagues. I had not thought of that when I agreed with the gentleman that I would offer this blanket amendment. Now, I will make my offer, because I agreed with the gentleman that I would do it, but I promise my colleagues right now to make no further agreements.

Mr. PADGETT. This is not going to displace the other. We will dispose of both the others to-morrow.

Mr. BUTLER. I am not sure about that. If I were sure about that, then I would feel more cheerful.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think there is any trouble about disposing of it, because nearly all of those amendments are to correct the amounts.

Mr. BUTLER. They involve the important features of the bill, in our judgment.

Mr. PADGETT. I know; but you have there simply the question of battleships increase, the battle cruisers increase, the submarine increase, the destroyers——

Mr. BUTLER. Scouts.

Mr. PADGETT. Scouts and certain other ships.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. There are four or five auxiliary craft.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, when they are voted on, if they are voted down the amounts in the bill stay as they are. If the House votes to increase the number, all you have got to do is to add the appropriate amount of money corresponding to what is now in the bill, applying to that increased number of ships.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment? Who has the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] is supposed to have the floor, but gentlemen are evidently trying to reach some understanding.

Mr. BUTLER. Then there is the question of proposing to limit the time for construction of these battleships and other warships, which, to my mind, is more important than any other feature of the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. When one vote is taken upon that it will determine the feeling of the House on that question of policy.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the request be put.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I desire to offer this suggestion as a compromise and a way out of what is to me a difficulty. Under the agreement made between the chairman of the committee and the minority leader we provide for a vote on all features of the increase of the program by 11.30 to-morrow.

Mr. PADGETT. No; we commence voting at that time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. With practically no speeches, or limited to five minutes on a side.

Mr. BENNET. No.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Now, I have never known the building program of the naval bill to be jammed through with only one five-minute speech on each side on this great and important part of our naval bill. In addition to that there are two other features involved in this so-called motion to recommit amendments that are of very great importance, and I want to be sure that there will be an opportunity for a separate vote before we come to 2 o'clock on Friday. My suggestion is that the minority leader offer all of the amendments that will be embodied in the minority motion to recommit, and that it be understood that at 1 o'clock to-morrow we begin voting on all those amendments, as stated by the chairman of the committee. Many of those amendments will take no discussion and no time in voting, because they will be immaterial if the main motion on which they are predicated is defeated. If the main motion is carried, then many of those subsidiary motions will necessarily have to be put.

Mr. PADGETT. I think it would be too long to extend it until 1 o'clock. I am willing to make it 12 o'clock. The minority leader [Mr. MANN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], and others had all agreed on the idea of commencing voting at 11.30, and they thought that would be sufficient. This debate is not going to change anybody's opinion.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Would 1 o'clock be acceptable to the minority leader?

Mr. PADGETT. I will agree to make it 12 o'clock instead of 11.30. Then we will commence voting, and go on down.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. And all the amendments be embodied in one motion.

Mr. BUTLER. And have one hour's debate to-morrow?

Mr. VARE. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether this rule would preclude the offering of additional amendments.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no.

Mr. VARE. Has there been any time fixed for voting on the armor-plate proposition?

Mr. PADGETT. No. I was trying to expedite this thing so as to make some provision for that.

Mr. BUTLER. It is impossible, Mr. Chairman, for me to join in any agreement to fix any specific minute in the day. I believe it is our business to do what we ought to do and sit here until it is done. [Applause.] I will agree that to-morrow, after one hour's debate, we shall vote on the different amendments, and vote them up or down and dispose of them.

Mr. PADGETT. I have no objection to that. Let the gentleman offer his amendments as one amendment, and then I ask that to-morrow morning we have one hour's debate, and at the conclusion of the hour's debate we proceed to vote on the various amendments.

Mr. STAFFORD. That we shall vote on the first amendment and then proceed to vote on the other amendments under the five-minute rule.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I understand that all the amendments are to be offered at one time, and after having one hour's debate on it, then we take them up and begin to vote on them under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PADGETT. With the understanding that the five-minute rule shall be adhered to, I agree to that.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I presume that we might take up some of them immediately after the amendments are read and dispose of them.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I have notified Members that we would not take a vote to-night—that there would be no vote this afternoon—under the agreement I had made with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to endeavor to state a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent to present this amendment, as a whole. It comprises a number of separate amendments. I ask that debate shall proceed upon all of these amendments this afternoon and to-morrow morning for one hour. At the expiration of that time we shall vote on the first amendment. That then we shall proceed to the discussion and consideration and disposition of these other amendments under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PADGETT. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to offer at this time a series of amendments; that debate on these amendments shall take the remainder of the session this afternoon and for one hour after the committee convenes to-morrow morning; that at the end of the hour a vote shall be taken on the first amendment; and that thereafter the other amendments shall be taken up in order under the five minute rule, considered, and disposed of. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 97, line 20: Strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six."

Page 97, line 25: After the word "each" insert "said battle cruisers to be constructed within 24 months from the date of signing contract."

Page 98: At the top of said page and before the words "Four scout cruisers, etc.," insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Two first-class battleships to be of identical design in all respects as the battleships *Tennessee* and *California* authorized to be constructed in the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, approved March 3, 1915, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed $10,500,000 each; said battleships to be constructed within 24 months from the date of signing contract."

Page 98, line 1: Strike out the word "four" insert in lieu thereof the word "six."

Page 98, line 5: After the word "each" insert "said scout cruisers to be constructed within 15 months from the date of signing contract."

Page 98, line 6: Strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-eight."

Page 98, line 9: After the word "each" insert "said destroyers to be constructed within 15 months from the date of signing contract."

Page 98, line 14: Strike out the word "twenty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifty."

Page 98, line 17: After the word "each" insert "said submarines to be constructed within 15 months from the date of signing contract."

Page 98, line 17: Strike out the word "seventeen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "forty-seven."

Page 98, line 20: After the word "each" insert "said submarines to be constructed within 12 months from the date of signing contract."

Page 98, line 21: Strike out the figures "$4,257,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$9,387,000."

Page 99, line 3: Strike out the word "one" and insert in lieu thereof the word "two."

Page 99, line 4: Insert after the figures "$1,265,000" "said fuel ship to be constructed within 15 months from the date of signing contract."

Page 99, line 6: After the figures "$2,600,000," insert "said ammunition ship to be constructed within 15 months from the date of signing contract."

Page 99, line 7: After the figures "$2,250,000" insert "said hospital ship to be constructed within 15 months from the date of signing contract."

Page 99, after line 7, insert:

"One transport, to cost not to exceed $2,450,000; said transport to be constructed within 15 months from the date of signing contract.

"One supply ship, to cost not to exceed $2,230,000; said supply ship to be constructed within 15 months from the date of signing contract.

"One destroyer tender, to cost not to exceed $1,950,000; said destroyer tender to be constructed within 15 months from the date of signing contract.

"One repair ship, to cost not to exceed $2,600,000; said repair ship to be constructed within 15 months from the date of signing contract."

Page 99, line 22: Strike out the figures "$47,366,860" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$73,133,852."

Page 100, line 4: Strike out the figures "$30,707,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$44,196,689."

Page 100, line 7: Strike out the figures "$11,245,925" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$20,296,850."

Page 100, line 9: Strike out the figures "$98,859,378" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$152,296,984."

Page 100, after line 9, insert the following paragraph:

"To secure the speedy completion of all ships authorized in this act and to cover the additional expense incidental to the employment of more than one shift of men a day the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to increase the limit of cost of each of said ships not to exceed 10 per cent."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to speak to this amendment at this time. I have no control over the time, but I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. CANNON, from Illinois, may now speak on the amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on this amendment be divided, and that one half of the time may be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the other half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the time for debate on these amendments be divided, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Under the unanimous-consent agreement recently made are all motions to amend to be held out of order from now until the motions made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania have been voted on to-morrow?

The CHAIRMAN. Unless they are amendments to the pending amendments.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. And no amendments can be offered to any other section of the bill from now on until some time to-morrow afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN. No other amendment will be recognized by the Chair.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That was not my understanding of the agreement.

Mr. PADGETT. That was the agreement. I understood the gentleman wanted to put in the RECORD some amendments that he desires to offer with reference to the personnel, aviation, and so forth, and if he does, I will ask unanimous consent that he may print them in the RECORD for information so that they can be made familiar to the Members when they are offered later.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD for information several amendments that appear on pages 1 and 2 of the printed list, down to and including the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD certain proposed amendments to be offered by him later in the consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendments to be offered by Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts are as follows:

AVIATION.

Page 6, line 2: Strike out the figures "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,500,000."

TRANSPORTATION.

Page 8, line 19: Strike out the figures "$862,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$904,000."

RECRUITING.

Page 8, line 24: Strike out the figures "$174,670" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$194,340."

OUTFITS—FIRST ENLISTMENT.

Page 9, line 25: Strike out the figures "$1,428,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,638,000."

THREE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED ADDITIONAL MEN.

Page 36, line 21: Strike out the words "sixty-one thousand five hundred" and insert in lieu thereof the words "sixty-five thousand."

FULL COMPLEMENTS FOR SHIPS.

Page 36, line 22: After the first word, "men," insert the following: "and the President is hereby authorized to enlist, in his discretion, and from time to time, such additional men as the needs of the Navy may require, not to exceed a total authorized strength of 82,762 men."

PAY OF MEN.

Page 36, line 23: Strike out the figures "$27,563,988.50" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$28,436,488.50."

CHANGE OF TOTAL.

Page 37, line 8: Strike out the figures "$46,876,246.86" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$47,748,746."

PROVISIONS.

Page 67, line 9: Strike out the figures "$8,848,933.85" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$9,088,508.85."

PAY CLERKS, MARINE CORPS.

Page 82, line 4: Strike out the word "seven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eight."

PAY OF ADDITIONAL OFFICERS, MARINE CORPS.

Page 82, line 6: Strike out the figures "$1,328,749" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,377,849."

SERGEANT MAJOR—QUARTERMASTER SERGEANTS.

Page 88, line 4: Strike out the word "seventeen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eighteen"; also strike out the word "seventy-two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eighty."

FIRST SERGEANTS—GUNNERY SERGEANTS.

Page 88, line 5: Strike out the word "sixty-five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "seventy-four"; also strike out the second word "sixty-five" in said line and insert in lieu thereof the word "seventy-three."

SERGEANTS—CORPORALS.

Page 88, line 6: Strike out the words "three hundred" and insert in lieu thereof the words "three hundred and forty-two"; also in said line strike out the words "five hundred" and insert in lieu thereof the words "five hundred and seventy-eight."

DRUMMERS—INCREASE OF MEN.

Page 88, line 7: Strike out the first word "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty-seven"; also in said line strike out the words "two thousand" and insert in lieu thereof the words "two thousand five hundred and forty."

PAY OF MARINES.

Page 88, line 20: Strike out the figures "$3,434,582.52" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,509,850.52."

COMMUTATION OF QUARTERS.

Page 90, line 2: Strike out the figures "$56,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$59,000."

TOTALS.

Page 90, line 25: Strike out the figures "$5,331,406.30" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$5,458,774.30."

PROVISIONS—MARINE CORPS.

Page 91, line 15: Strike out the figures "$1,150,068.90" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,195,068.90."

CLOTHING—MARINES.

Page 92, line 5: Strike out the figures "$926,423.50" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$996,073.50."

FUEL.

Page 92, line 11: Strike out the figures "$217,092.66" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$220,692.66."

MILITARY STORES.

Page 93, line 13: Strike out the figures "$713,648.78" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$810,002.78."

TRANSPORTATION AND RECRUITING.

Page 94, line 13: Strike out the figures "$459,711.65" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$492,156.65."

FORAGE.

Page 95, line 3: Strike out the figures "$39,246" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$42,246."

COMMUTATION OF QUARTERS.

Page 95, line 15: Strike out the figures "$107,512" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$121,048."

CONTINGENT.

Page 97, line 7: Strike out the figures "$654,345" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$692,845."

TOTALS—QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT, MARINE CORPS.

Page 97, line 9: Strike out the figures "$4,469,048.49" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$4,771,133.49."

TOTAL—MARINE CORPS.

Page 97, line 16: Strike out the figures "$9,800,454.79" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$10,229,907.79."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have not sufficient technical knowledge touching the Navy or the provisions of this bill to enable me to offer much from a technical standpoint for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole House. I have, however, generally, very decided notions about what the Navy ought to be. Of course, if I had to draw the designs to construct the ships and aeroplanes, there would not be any constructed. I believe in an efficient Navy. If I believed as some gentlemen do who have addressed this House, particularly upon the other side, and especially the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY], I would not vote for a single ship and I would destroy those that we now have, because we are all going to be good, and if we are not all going to be good, we are so far away from the balance of the world that they could not cross the ocean and get at us. I understand that to be the position of the gentleman. He was greeted with great applause, though not universal, upon the other side of the House, and by a goodly number of "Amens."

I am not very uneasy about the Army of the United States. I believe that we must rely principally for the national defense against the world upon the Navy, the first line of defense. It is free from any complications that we get with the Army. Why, you can not now fully utilize the National Guard, for there is a large number of people in the United States organized, who say, "You are members of our organization, and if you enter into the service of the National Guard or the militia, you lose your job." There are a good many people that most of us are afraid of who hold that notion. So we just want enough of an Army, say, 150,000 to 200,000. I would like to have 2,000 men for every million of inhabitants, and I think that would be sufficient to take care of Mexico and Central America and the Monroe doctrine, as far as the Army is concerned, as well as to take care of us at home if it is necessary for us to be taken care of.

Gentlemen say that the world can not get across the ocean to attack us. They do not have to. Take, for instance, Great Britain. She has Vancouver, Victoria, near by, right at the very entrance of the Sound upon which one of our principal navy yards is located. Then there are the Bahamas and the Bermudas, the British West Indies, and the French West Indies—not so difficult for Great Britain and France to get over with their navies, after all is said and done. Gentlemen of the minority as well as of the majority have commended this bill as far as it goes, and the only difference as I gather from the debate and the amendments offered is as to whether you have gone far enough—oh, I will say not the only difference, but practically the only difference upon each side of the House.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman like me to yield him more time?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman desires to yield it to me, I would like to have a little more.

Mr. BUTLER. It would be a great pleasure to all of us. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the gentleman and members of the committee. I believe this bill is short in making sufficient provision at this time. I do not believe it provides for a sufficient personnel of the Navy. I am told and I gather from what gentlemen say that probably one-half of the ships of our Navy have not sufficient men to man them in the event that we did have trouble. What is the use of having ships unless you have men to man them? I am told we are short of ammunition, short on this and that and the other, and I presume that is true and I assume it to be true; and it is a mistake equivalent to a crime not to be ready to fight the ships that we have. [Applause.] And they should be manned as rapidly as possible. It can not be done in a minute. Oh, too expensive, too expensive, it is claimed. One gentleman who addressed the House to-day harked back to old Isaiah:

> And they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks.

I have heard it preached a hundred times; and we are as far off from that time as they were in old Isaiah's time. [Applause.] You have got to reconstruct the human animal before we will all be good. Nations in all the history of the race went with the strong hand to despoil the enemy who had the goods that they wanted. Why, God's chosen people marched out of Egypt and wandered 40 years in the wilderness; and they went in with, "Thus saith the Lord, according to his prophet," and seized the promised land and killed all the men, women, and children who were in possession of the land. They did it—all except one tribe, you know, that came in with moldy bread and tattered clothes and agreed to be slaves. So it has been and so it will be until the human race is, in my judgment, largely reconstructed.

Mr. MADDEN. Regenerated.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, you talk about the millennium, and pray for the millennium. But the millennium has not arrived, and until it does arrive we must protect our own against all nations who covet our possessions. Now, I am not afraid of any nation, not at all, but as I read the history of our country in the earlier part of the late century during the Napoleonic wars, because we would not take sides either with Napoleon or with Great Britain, we got into trouble and they seized our ships and declared them good prizes, each one of the contestants, and they will do it again if they have the power to do it. But it is said the world is afraid of us. It may be so. But nations will not be afraid of us unless we have the disposition to care for our own and are prepared to care for our own. If you take the hand off China, she would conquer the world from the frozen ocean to the Equator by her patient labor. We can not compete with her and therefore we shut her out, and yet she is dominated by Japan. Nobody has much respect for China. We can not take care of the Philippines; we can not take care of the Monroe doctrine; we can not take care of Porto Rico; we can not take care of the United States proper unless we have what is equivalent to an insurance policy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That insurance policy is a Navy sufficient to be efficient against all comers. I am for peace, but the only way to have peace is to be ready to fight for peace if necessary.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. BROWNING].

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, one amendment offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], on page 98, at the top of said page, and before the words "four scout cruisers, etc.," reads: Insert a new paragraph, as follows:

> Two first-class battleships, to be of identical design in all respects as the battleships *Tennessee* and *California*, authorized to be constructed in the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, approved March 3, 1915, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed $10,500,000 each; said battleships to be constructed within 24 months from the date of signing contract.

Mr. Chairman, I for one think that the amendment is one of the most important amendments to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, naval preparedness is either entirely unnecessary or it is of paramount necessity. The question for this Congress to decide is whether we need a real and effective Navy or whether no such necessity exists, and if the decision is in the affirmative, then in all reason let us bring forth a law that will achieve its object.

The bill we have before us takes a middle ground; it does not frankly admit that the majority side of the Naval Affairs Committee believe there exists no necessity for an increase in America's first line of defense, nor does it meet the very conservative recommendations of the Secretary of the Navy and the General Board of the Navy. It is neither fish nor flesh.

Mr. Chairman, the stand for a large and effective Navy is not a new one for me, as my votes in committee and in the House have shown, but after four weary months of the closest

study in continuous daily sessions of the Naval Affairs Committee, where we heard at length from our greatest naval experts, from scientists, from pronavy and from antinavy advocates, I am more than unwilling to even appear to approve of the bill before us, the provisions of which fall so far short of what I conceive to be the dire need of the Nation.

Rear Admiral Knight, president of the Naval War College, sounded a timely warning when he said that the ocean, unless its waters be blocked by a fleet strong enough to command them, is a highway, broad, spacious, and convenient beyond any military road the Romans ever built. Let us realize in time that the ocean instead of affording the protection of a blockade is in reality exactly the reverse unless adequately policed.

The battleship, the fighting instrument of the Navy, is conspicuous by its absence from this bill. The General Board on July 30, 1915, recommended the construction of four dreadnaughts for this year's program. The Secretary of the Navy, in his five-year program, recommended two dreadnaughts for this year. All of the admirals who appeared before our committee voiced the opinion that battleships are essential. The concensus of opinion of those to whom we must look for expert and valuable advice is undoubtedly in favor of augmenting the number of our fighting dreadnaughts, the big fellows that give and take the hard knocks, and I believe we should authorize at least two at this time. Personally, I would go further and authorize four, as recommended by the General Board. Our thousands of miles of coast line are mutely appealing to us for a degree of protection that will render them safe from attack. Our people from ocean to ocean are looking to us to keep them out of war and to defend them against any possible invading foe. Let us take the action that will best promote the safety of our country and the welfare of our people by building a Navy that will place us second in the navies of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I trust this important amendment will prevail. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall, in the main, support the bill as reported by the committee, but shall vote, if the opportunity is offered, to reduce the number of battle cruisers provided for by one. I shall vote to increase the number of submarines and provide the necessary men to fully man the fleet.

Mr. Chairman, during the 12 years immediately preceding the outbreak of the European war, to wit, 1901 to 1912, inclusive, the leading naval nations of the earth expended, according to the best figures I am able to secure, the following sums for all naval purposes:

Great Britain	$1,999,209,088
United States	1,331,721,206
Germany	854,055,078
France	791,244,187

There is always some difference of opinion as to the relative strength of two navies which in tonnage, number, and character of ships are anywhere near equal, and while at the time practically all of those who were demanding a large naval program in 1912 insisted that our Navy was then inferior to that of Germany, it is now, I think, generally recognized that at that time we had from the standpoint of efficiency and effectiveness the second navy in the world. The same class of people who in 1912 were insisting that our Navy was third or even fourth among the navies of the world are now insisting that our Navy occupies the fourth place among the navies of the world. The best expert opinion of the day, however, accords us the third place, though, except for our lack of battle cruisers, of which we have none, and from the standpoint of the main battle line of dreadnaughts, our Navy is equal, if not superior, to that of Germany, barring some mythical ships which some imagine Germany may have built during the progress of the present war.

Since the year 1912 our naval expenditures have been as follows:

1913	$141,050,643
1914	145,503,963
1915	149,763,563

The bill before us carries appropriations amounting to $241,449,151, an increase of $91,787,287 over the bill of last year. The building program proposed in the bill is as follows:

Five battle cruisers, to cost $20,433,531 each.
Four scout cruisers, to cost $5,571,900 each.
Ten destroyers, to cost $1,325,314 each.
Three 800-ton submarines, to cost $1,206,302 each.
Seventeen smaller submarines, to cost $731,302 each.
One fuel ship, to cost $1,363,272.
One ammunition ship, to cost $2,714,650.
One hospital ship, to cost $2,250,000.

The total cost of these ships is estimated at $160,087,357, and of this total cost the amount carried in the bill is $59,244,326, leaving in round numbers $101,000,000 to be paid for in future bills. The bill also carries appropriations of upwards of $11,000,000 for ammunition for these new ships.

If we are to assume that as large a building program is to be carried next year as the one proposed in this bill, and that next year's bill will carry as much for that program as the present bill for this year's program in addition to paying for one-half the remainder of this year's program, and the increased expenditures resulting from the bringing into commission of new ships which will be completed during the year, next year's naval bill will exceed the present bill by at least $75,000,000, and the continuation of such a program for five years would give us a naval bill at the end of that period in the neighborhood of half a billion dollars annually.

It is devoutly to be hoped that no condition shall arise or exist that will necessitate any such outlay. Short of the absolute certainty that such an outlay is essential for the preservation of the country, the American people will not approve such a program.

In addition to the sums carried in the bill amendments will be offered by the minority of the Naval Committee increasing the building program by adding 2 first-class battleships, 1 battle cruiser, 2 scout cruisers, 18 destroyers, 30 large and 30 small submarines, and 1 fuel-oil ship; 1 transport, to cost $2,450,000; 1 supply ship, to cost $2,230,000; 1 destroyer tender, to cost $1,950,000; 1 repair ship, to cost $2,600,000.

The minority also proposes an increase of $52,000,000, in round numbers, in the appropriation for construction, and a very considerable number of other increases.

I shall support in part the amendments offered by the minority for increase of submarines and auxiliary ships. I shall also vote for their amendment for the enlistment of sufficient men to man the ships and for speeding up the building program. On the other hand, while supporting in the main the bill as reported by the committee, I shall, if an opportunity is offered, vote to decrease the number of battle cruisers by one.

I believe the amount carried in the bill is all and even more than can be justified at this time for naval expenditures, and while I believe we should increase the number of submarines provided for, I would pay for that increased number by saving the cost of a battle cruiser. Thirty defense submarines could be provided for the cost of one battle cruiser and in less than a third of the time.

In a speech which I made in the House on the 17th of December, I expressed myself in favor of proper and reasonable preparedness, but against extravagant and unnecessary expenditures for great and permanent Military and Naval Establishments. At that time I expressed the opinion that a proper program of preparedness would not include, at this time, any dreadnaughts in addition to the 9 of the first line and the 25 of the second line already in commission, the 6 superdreadnaughts under construction, 2 of which are now practically completed, and the 2—the *Tennessee* and the *California*—authorized a year ago and not yet laid down.

I did not express that opinion as an expert, for I do not claim to be one, but from the impression which I in common with most of our people had received as to the lessons of the European war as indicating that the type and character of the future dreadnaught was in question and that of big ships the battle cruiser had proved its value as an essential factor of a naval establishment.

The almost unanimous opinion of the men in active command, as expressed before the Naval Committee, was in favor of the battle cruiser as the first essential to round out our Navy and fit it to cope with the navies of other powers having these big, fast ships, and I think the action of the committee in providing for battle cruisers rather than battleships was fully justified. Of course, if we were to build more than the number of capital ships proposed, it might be well to include some dreadnaughts, but I do not believe that is justified at this time. In fact, as I have stated, I believe the program proposed by the committee of capital ships is, if anything, too large. It would be better to spend more for submarines, destroyers, and auxiliaries. If there were no other reason for opposition to so large or a larger number of capital ships, the fact that they can not be laid down and their construction started within a year, is quite sufficient reason for not authorizing them. The fact is that the program proposed in the bill would tax the capacity of the shipyards of

the country capable of handling big ships beyond their resources and facilities. On the other hand, there are numerous yards in which submarines could be built.

Mr. Chairman, amid present conditions of world-wide war, the natural tendency is to emphasize the necessity or advisability for great military establishments and to minimize the strength and effectiveness of the defenses which we possess. Men who believe in the military idea, who would establish on our shores the military establishments, the existence of which have brought on and are perpetuating the horrors of the European war, take advantage of the situation to preach and argue for the military systems they approve. Such people, some of them, I regret to say, are in our military establishments; some of them familiar with things military through their interest in warlike invention and munition manufacture, have not scrupled to indulge in the most fantastic flights of imagination, to baldly misstate facts, and to attempt to incite terror through literature and utterances, treasonable in their exaggeration, their misstatement, and their adroit and unprincipled appeals to fear, cupidity, and prejudice. The most unprincipled, untruthful, and selfishlessly interested of this class of people have the most persistently and continuously veiled their true purposes under the guise and pretense of patriotism.

The fact is, that in all human probability we are less likely to attack by a powerful opponent now or any time in the near future than we have been for years. It is true that several of the belligerent powers have ruthlessly disregarded the rights of our people, and in a manner and to an extent that would have justified greater vigor than our administration has exhibited in its diplomatic correspondence. But it is also true that these powers will not be effected in their attitude by any authorization at this time of battleships and battle cruisers for completion three or four years hence. As to certain of these powers, we have an infinitely more effective weapon against their encroachment on the rights of our citizens in our power to curtail needed supplies than we would have with the most powerful Naval Establishment.

Nevertheless, we should be reasonably and properly prepared. We now have, according to the testimony of the best experts, harbor defenses superior to those of any other nation. Our Navy, while far from the largest, is ship for ship, according to the best expert testimony equal to that of any navy afloat, and in officers and men we do not believe it is equaled anywhere. Our mine material for harbor defense is first class in quality and will soon be abundantly sufficient in quantity. This bill and the fortifications bill soon to be passed will largely strengthen our defenses in quantity and extent, certainly all that can be justified.

My hope is that before all of the expenditures proposed by this bill are made, the return of peace in Europe, possibly the limitation of armaments there, may justify the curtailment of some of these expenditures, the abandonment of some of the program. In any event, I have an enduring hope that the world's condition will in the near future warrant the checking of the program of expansion, at the rate of approximately a hundred million dollars a year, contemplated by this bill, and that we may see our way clear to save for the people of the Union, or to provide for its expenditure in ways of peace and improvement and development, a portion, at least, of the vast sums which are now proposed to be expended for the engines and the agencies of destruction.

I can not close without again reverting to a thought that is ever present in my mind—that as our standing as a nation and our usefulness to the world as a people has in the past resulted from our devotion to peace, our adherence to the principles of liberty and justice, so in the future our contributions to the uplift and welfare and inspiration of mankind shall be based on our devotion to these principles. Even in the unhappy event of international misunderstanding, threatening to a breach of peaceful relations, our ability to enforce our just demands does and will depend infinitely more on our potential strength as a nation and the justice of our cause than on our armed power. In the event of threatened or actual war the outcome will depend infinitely more on our reserves of millions of virile patriotic citizens and our limitless resources for arming and equipping them than on any permanent war establishments we may maintain.

I do not agree with the gentleman who spoke a moment ago that the world is no better than it was 3,000 years ago. If men have not grown better, they have at least grown wiser, and the mighty struggle going on in Europe now is the best object lesson the world has ever had in all of the tides of time of the futility of great military and naval establishments in enabling any people to dominate the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, this subject is so vast that I can touch only upon one or two points. I congratulate the National Security League upon its success. I extend congratulations to the Steel Trust and to the manufacturers of munitions; a plentiful harvest awaits them. They have triumphed. They have aroused a state of hysteria which has proven irresistible. Congress has yielded, and my voice of protest is a voice in the wilderness. When you analyze the present campaign, you will find it is preparedness, profit, and politics. The Democrats were afraid of the Republicans. They were afraid if they would not give five battle cruisers at $20,000,000 apiece that the Republicans might succeed in getting 10 battle cruisers at $20,000,000 apiece. It is purely a question of politics on the part of the Democrats. Were I in their place, I would have courageously defied the imperialist, the munition maker, the Steel Trust, the war contractor. I would have squarely raised the issue of genuine democracy against imperialism. I would have trusted to the verdict of the American people. Instead of doing the brave thing, the Democrats have surrendered. I am sorry for them. When people are scared you can not expect them to be wise. When men get up on the floor of this House and repeat, parrotlike, the phrase that war is a part of human nature I lose patience. War is no more a part of human nature than religious war was human nature. Catholics murdered Protestants and Protestants slaughtered Catholics because both were stupid and barbarous. Increased knowledge and increased intelligence have made religious wars impossible. If people will but understand the cause of modern wars, war will be made impossible. Wars that we have to-day are economic wars, wars for economic advantages, for aggrandizement, for acquisition of territory, for increase of imperial domain. Are you out to increase your imperial domain? Do you want additional colonies? Do you want an additional fleet to obtain additional markets? Or is there anybody fool enough to believe that some European power or combination of powers would attempt to conquer the United States in order to acquire a new colony?

I was never so firmly convinced of the insincerity of the preparedness agitation as when I saw the vote on the Philippine question. The Philippine Islands are the weakest part of the political organism of the United States. Thousands of miles away, you can not keep those islands unless you have near them a fleet stronger than the fleet of Japan. But you voted to keep the Philippine Islands. Just as a designing lawyer for self-aggrandizement advises his client to litigate instead of settling a case. The imperialist and the munition maker and the politician have advised you to retain the Philippine Islands so that they may come out and argue that you want more battleships, more cruisers, a greater fleet on the Pacific Ocean, because the present fleet on the Pacific can be destroyed by one warship.

There is another thing that I will touch upon if you will permit me. You talk about the need of a first-class navy, of a navy as big as the biggest. I heard the leader of the Democratic Party speaking with pride of having a navy second in rank. He is again a victim of phrases. What does a first-class navy mean, or a second-class navy, or a third-class navy?

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

Mr. LONDON. I would like to have just one minute more.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. LONDON. A first-class navy is a navy that is best adapted for the purposes of the country which owns that navy. It is entirely immaterial whether it consists of half a dozen ships, of two ships, or of one. The question is, Is it suitable for the purposes of the country? The true criterion should be, To what extent can that navy help in carrying out the policy of the country? If your policy is to maintain and defend this Republic against attack, your present fleet is strong enough. This country is invulnerable against attack, and it is sheer madness to fear invasion. If it is a policy of aggression, a policy of imperialism, a policy of competing with European powers in acquiring new

markets, new colonies, and domains, and in extending your commerce by the sword, then your fleet is surely not big enough, and you had better vote with the Republicans to treble and quadruple your present fleet.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman of the minority if he has anyone who desires to speak now?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he would generously agree that the time to-morrow be equally divided, and then we will entertain him with some good speeches now.

Mr. PADGETT. I was willing to do that before, but I want half the time to-morrow morning.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman accedes to the gentleman's request he will still have time to-morrow.

Mr. BUTLER. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee to consume four minutes more, and then we will have another speech of five minutes on this side.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman can use such time as he may desire.

Mr. BUTLER. I know; but that will be charged against us to-morrow. I am tender about that. The gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. LONDON] might be willing to speak again.

Mr. PADGETT. Have you any speakers there?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; we have them here. I want to be perfectly candid. Two or three of my colleagues have something they want to say. I say to the gentleman, be generous, and to-morrow we will go in with the speechmaking and save you much embarrassment. Will you divide with us to-morrow equally?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I will divide with you half and half in the morning, and we will go on this afternoon.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is there any desire to have this bill passed quickly?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know.

Mr. BRITTEN. I see this Alphonse and Gaston act has been passing on here for five minutes. I wanted to know if it was the desire to pass this bill soon, or to dally along as we have been doing in committee for the last six months?

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, no. We were just conferring about the distribution of time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I have in the past been classed, I suppose, with those who have been termed "small Navy men." I have sometimes voted for one battleship. I have sometimes voted for two battleships. I have no apologies to make for the position that I have taken, nor shall I have any apology at any time in the future for the position that I propose to take now.

Some say that we ought to have a Navy equal to that of any other country in the world. More say that our Navy ought to be the second in the world. Now, Mr. Chairman, whether our Navy should be first or whether our Navy should be second, it seems to me, has depended, depends now, and will depend in the future to a very large degree on the balance of power in Europe.

Now, I lay no claim to having any technical knowledge of this subject. As to how the Navy should be balanced, I shall be glad to follow the Navy experts and the Committee on Naval Affairs; but as to the source from which we may expect trouble in the future, a Member of Congress ought to be just as competent to decide that question as any naval expert in the world.

Now, in the past I have been for a small Navy, because up to the beginning of this European war neither the power that had the first nor the power that had the second navy was in such a position that there was any possibility of our expecting trouble from them. It was not even a remote possibility so long as each was watching the other and had to reckon upon the other's aggression upon it if there was trouble with us. This European war has changed that situation. We can not now tell what the condition will be with reference to the balance of power in Europe when this war is over. If either side crushes the other and absolutely dominates the situation, then we may need a Navy that is equal to the best in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield now. So long as that possibility exists I believe it is our duty to make the utmost preparation possible at this time, not as a naval policy for the future, for we are not in any position to fix our future naval policy now until we know what conditions are abroad, but we should take every precaution possible to prepare for the conditions that may flow from this European war, and that is to build such dreadnaughts and battle cruisers as it is possible to build with our present yards and facilities, and to build them just as quickly as possible. [Applause on the Republican side.]

For that reason I am for this amendment. I am willing to vote now for six battle cruisers. I am willing to vote now for two dreadnaughts. [Applause.] I would rather vote for eight capital ships now than to vote for four now and four next year, because if we need to use them at all, we will need them at the earliest moment that we can secure them. I would rather vote for eight now and none next year than four now and four next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to make it plain that voting for this very large increase now does not mean that I am committed to any increase next year or when this European war shall be over. I may vote against any increase at that time. That will depend entirely upon conditions which then prevail. I believe it is the duty of every Member of Congress to meet this situation as it now exists, not to frame a definite policy for the future, but to take care to the utmost extent possible of the conditions that now confront us. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] five minutes.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, during all the discussion on this bill one of the main and most important amendments presented has been that of the speeding-up policy, the haste with which these ships shall be built. Yet in this bill now before us there is not one single item that provides for the equipping of the navy yards of the United States for the building of these battleships, cruisers, and torpedo boats. I believe there is one thing that we owe to ourselves in this Congress, and one thing that we owe to the people of the country, and that is to see that the property now owned by the Government—the navy yards of the United States—shall be equipped, and once for all to put down the story that we are trying to build battleships in order to enable the rich shipbuilding and armor-plate manufacturers to procure more of the money of the Nation. The place for us to do this work of building our ships is in the navy yards of the United States, and the navy yards to-day are unable and unfit to accommodate even two or three of the ships now specified in this bill. There are only two navy yards in the country equipped to build dreadnaughts. There are only two navy yards in the country equipped to build a battle cruiser. Yet we ask for speed, when every shipyard in the Nation is going at top speed and running three shifts at the present time. Why, Mr. Chairman, the deplorable condition of the navy yard in Boston is a lesson for any man who will sit and reason for himself as to what the conditions are. Just imagine, when we need ships so badly and there is such a pressing need for equipping the navy yards of the United States, on Saturday night last the ship fitters and riveters in the Boston Navy Yard were notified that their services for the present were no longer required in the service of the Government, because the Boston Navy Yard was not equipped, because there was no work for them to do, because there was no money appropriated for it.

Mr. Chairman, we hear so much to-day about what has been accomplished in the past. I think it is a disgrace to the former Secretary of the Navy that the navy yards of this country are in the deplorable condition that they are at the present time. With millions of dollars of United States property tied up, with enough millions of dollars' worth of property to equal the amount in this bill rotting away in the navy yards of the Nation, it is a disgrace to former administrations. Mr. Chairman, I was surprised to-day to pick up a Boston paper and read an interview with a former Secretary of the Navy who is now attempting to make presidential nominations, former Secretary of the Navy George von L. Meyer, of my State:

[From the Boston American, Sunday, May 28, 1916.]

NAVY USELESS IN EMERGENCY, SAYS MEYER—FLEET UNBALANCED AND SHIPS UNDERMANNED, DECLARES FORMER SECRETARY—PERIL TO MONROE DOCTRINE.

Former Secretary of the Navy George von L. Meyer calls attention to the "unpreparedness" of the United States Navy in the following article:

[By George von L. Meyer, Secretary of the Navy during the Taft administration.]

"The United States Navy at the present time is inadequate. Either we must have an adequate Navy or we must give up the Monroe doctrine, which is no stronger than the Navy.

"A navy is of little service unless it is prepared for sudden emergency.

"England's navy was of incalculable value because it was prepared. Had it not been prepared its vast expenditures would have been of little service.

"Our enormous expenditures for the past 15 years are of little service to the country because our fleet is unbalanced, our personnel is deficient, and our ships consequently undermanned.

BLAMES CONGRESS.

"Our fleet is unbalanced because Congress has failed to listen to the counsel of naval experts, and our money has, in addition, been frittered away on useless navy yards that have no strategic value.

"To make our Navy efficient we must, in the first place, have an up-to-date organization to run the Navy with a continuity of policy taking military necessities into consideration.

"To meet these exigencies, we should have a general staff and a national council of defense.

"Business men thoroughly realize that a great combination that has not an up-to-date organization can not compete with another organization especially well equipped in that direction.

"So also our Navy, not equipped with a military organization, can not compete with a navy of another country that has an efficient military organization for the conduct of naval affairs.

"Furthermore, after increasing the Navy personnel to the extent of 20,000 men, we should have a naval reserve of 50,000 men, and in order to meet the present military requirements we should reduce the age limit of our captains and our admirals.

CRITICIZES WILSON.

"The Wilson administration has particularly failed during the past 18 months to make the necessary effort to strengthen the strong right arm of the Government, which is the Navy, and in which direction public sentiment has been thoroughly aroused and prepared to support the President as never before.

"Had the President arisen to the occasion, much might have been accomplished immediately after the breaking out of war by mobilizing the fleet and demanding of Congress necessary preparations in order that the Navy should be put on an adequate basis of defense and preparedness.

"It is not necessary that our Navy should be the first in the world, but it is necessary and possible to be the second."

He was Secretary of the Navy, and what did he do for the navy yards of Massachusetts or the other yards in this country. Yet he comes out in the face of preparedness and says to the people of the country that the Navy of the United States is useless in an emergency. That is from a former Secretary of the Navy, who is as much responsible as any other man in the country for the present condition of the Navy of the United States.

Why, Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago in an address before an audience in Boston this same distinguished genfleman, this gentleman who to-day is all preparedness, told the people of the country that if France lost in this war inside of six years the United States of America would be a monarchy.

What is the condition all over the country? Every shipyard is running day and night. In our State shipbuilding companies run with three shifts a day, and working on the battleships of the United States which we should be building in our own navy yards.

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

Mr. PADGETT. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any provision in the bill to equip navy yards with larger dry docks.

Mr. TAGUE. No; there is not; there is not a dollar appropriated in this bill, so far as I know, for the building or extension of ways or the equipping of the yards.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will pardon me, there is a provision in the bill for a large dry dock in Norfolk and one at League Island, Philadelphia.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That would not apply to other great navy yards where they are just as essential.

Mr. TAGUE. Our State has taken time by the forelock. They are building to-day, and it will be completed soon, the largest dry dock in the United States, at an expense of $3,000,000, and the provision is that the ships of the United States Government shall have preference over any other ship in the use of it. Our State had in mind that at some time the Government of the United States would see to it that our navy yard lying almost idle would be equipped sufficiently to take care of the wants of the Navy.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman tell the committee why the Boston Navy Yard is idle?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes; I will tell the committee, because it has never been equipped to do the work. The provision for equipping it was given in the last Congress under the present Secretary of the Navy, when he got Congress to appropriate $148,000 for the building of ways that are only large enough to accommodate a small supply ship. We have asked of this committee an appropriation large enough to equip the navy yard for building a battleship. We have the finest harbor, with one or two exceptions, that there is in the United States. We have 35 feet of water at low tide. The Government property there is valued at about $20,000,000, and all that is being done there is to manufacture rope for the Government and chains used on the battleships, with the exception of minor repairs that are being done on ships for the Government.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I want to ask, for information purely, is it not a fact that the change of patterns for dreadnaughts is the thing that puts a yard out of commission to do the work—that you do not keep up with the changes of the patterns?

Mr. TAGUE. No; the navy yard, in order to build dreadnaughts, has to be equipped with ways that are large enough. You must have ways, you must have machine shops, you must have chain shops. We have the machine shops, we have the chain shops, and we have the water in the harbor, and we have the protection of the forts at the mouth of the harbor, but we have not the ways for the building of the ships.

Mr. FESS. There are only two navy yards, are there, equipped for building battleships?

Mr. TAGUE. There are but two.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. New York and Mare Island.

Mr. TAGUE. With that condition, I think it is the duty of this Congress to appropriate for these navy yards, so that they can do their own work and build our own battleships. We are building better battleships than any private concern in the country, notwithstanding to-day that we are being told that we are unable to build a ship except by an enormous expenditure over and above other private shipyards.

The gentleman forgot to state that the men employed by the Government are taken from work on the battleship in order to perform the work necessary for the repairs of ships when lying and waiting to go into the service of the Government.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman understands that the Secretary of the Navy has the power to build submarines at the Boston Navy Yard, does he not?

Mr. TAGUE. If we give him the money.

Mr. BRITTEN. The money was authorized last year and the year before.

Mr. TAGUE. I do not know that the Secretary is authorized to do it.

Mr. BRITTEN. The Secretary has the money authorized in the last Congress, and he has taken no steps to build submarines there, notwithstanding the fact that right in your own bay you built 20 for England last year in 12 months.

Mr. TAGUE. I believe that there are over 20 to-day tied up there, the property of the British Government, built by the Fore River Co.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is merely another evidence of the inefficiency of the present Navy Department.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. TAGUE. I will take issue with the gentleman upon the efficiency of the present Secretary of the Navy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I said this morning that I had been around the navy yard in my district during my life, and I have seen the work they do. We have had three Secretaries of the Navy from Massachusetts. We have had Moody, we have had Long, and we have had Von L. Meyer, and Meyer recommended that we close the Boston Navy Yard and other navy yards of the country and build at a tremendous expense a navy yard at Narragansett, R. I.—to satisfy selfish land speculators, and during his régime the navy yard at Boston was practically closed, and the other navy yards were closed, and for that reason the repairs which were so important on the ships that should have been done was neglected.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not mean to say that Secretary Meyer advocated the closing of all navy yards. He was for the efficient management of navy yards, by concentrating the work in those best suited for the benefit of the Navy.

Mr. TAGUE. It is a question whether he was right or wrong, and we take issue with him and say that he was wrong.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, he advocated the closing of all on the Atlantic except one, and to establish another one at Narragansett.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did he ever advocate the closing of the League Island Navy Yard?

Mr. PADGETT. I said on the Atlantic.

Mr. GALLAGHER. He has not dared to—it is in Pennsylvania. [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. All along the Atlantic coast, except the Norfolk yard.

Mr. STAFFORD. The League Island?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. If my memory serves me right, he never advocated the closing of League Island.

Mr. PADGETT. He did, and he wanted to establish one at Narragansett, and even close the New York yard.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate my friend from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] upon his knowledge of geography.

Mr. GALLAGHER. But the gentleman from Illinois can not congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Mare Island Navy Yard is the only one provided for in this bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman mean with building slips?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It is not equipped with building slips in this bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Dry docks.

Mr. PADGETT. We have not any building slips in this bill for any yard.

Mr. GALLAGHER. A dry dock will be a slip when it is done.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I have never permitted myself to say that we have no Navy. Ship for ship, man for man, gun for gun, I have always believed the American Navy was the equal of any other navy. I do, however, sincerely believe that we need some more ships. I do not agree with the gentleman who said that these new battle cruisers will not add any strength to the Navy. It seems to me very obvious that a ship that costs $20,000,000 and carries 14-inch guns will add strength to the Navy. Of course it will.

For a moment or two I want to address myself to what I consider really a basic matter here, and that is the question as to whether we are discharging the responsibility that lies upon us as men. My colleague from the twelfth New York district [Mr. LONDON] said that there was no such thing inherent in the race as a fighting spirit. I absolutely disagree with him. From time immemorial it has been the burden of the man to discharge the responsibility of protecting and defending the clan, the tribe, or the country, and if he will look at his own Hebrew psalms, in the eighty-ninth, he will find that when the psalmist desired to describe a man whom the Lord had deserted he described a man the edge of whose sword had been turned, and who could no longer stand in battle; and that has been history always. The duty and responsibility of defense has been upon man. The woman has had her place and, in the main, has discharged her duty better than the man has discharged his.

It is not my purpose now to discuss the duty of woman, but I do rise to discuss the duty of man, and ask whether after these centuries, because of education, because of luxury, because of trade, because of commerce, because of business, we have forgotten that the responsibility is upon us to provide the measure of sure defense? Why, gentlemen talk about cost. It is expensive. As I have figured roughly, it will lay a tax on the people of the United States amounting to something like $4 per capita per year; but in the old times the tax that was laid upon the clan or the tribe or the people was everything they possessed over the amount of the bare means of subsistence. We have progressed unquestionably. We devote the greater part now of our earnings, of our surplus over the bare means of existence to progress; but have we reached the time when we, who have been distinguished by our districts each as a preeminent man, scruple to spend that portion of the money that is necessary for the national defense? That raises the question whether we are not only false to our country but to humanity and to our manhood, for the duty has always been discharged faithfully by the man to provide the sure defense; and here and to-day, upon our consciences and responsibilities, we are to decide whether in this twentieth century, because of the fact we have had ease and opportunity, we have ceased to be virile and become epicene. [Applause.]

For one, I propose to do a man's duty and to vote to give my country a sure defense. I shall vote for all the new construction in this bill, for two battleships, for additional submarines, and aeroplanes, and, generally, for the Naval Board's program.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the time, and although I did not expect it, however, I am willing to speak extemporaneously if the committee will bear with me.

One of the questions before the committee to-day is whether we are going to add two battleships to the naval bill, and an additional battle cruiser. I, for one, am very glad the committee saw fit to bring out five battle cruisers, and I am going to support the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make it six battle cruisers.

A few moments ago the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] stated that the time when we would need these boats would be within the next few years and not within the next decade, if we were going to need them at all. I trust that the time will never be when we will have to use them in actual combat; but in the face of the situation that has been forced on other nations of the world we should provide these ships now. Throughout all the world the brunt of combat has been borne by the battleship. If it was the battleship of the War of 1812, like the *Constitution*, the brunt of combat fell on it. If it was in the Civil War with the heavy line ship, that was the battleship of that day. In the Spanish War we all know very well it was the battleship at Santiago that won the day. To be sure, they were only fighting so-called armor crusers; but at that time Spain possessed the highest type of armored cruisers represented in the four ships at Santiago. And in the war between Japan and Russia it was the Japanese battleships that won the battle of the Tsu Shima Straits, where the Russian fleet came all the way from the Baltic and were annihilated off the coast of Japan. And so on down. It is the English battleship fleet to-day that causes her to hold the seas, and although she lost a few at the Dardanelles, no one can deny that if it were not for her home battle fleet the German ships of battle would not have remained so securely in the Kiel Canal, but would have ventured forth more often. To-day we are told that it is the battle cruisers that have been doing the fighting on the other side; but the battle cruiser is in reality a battleship except that it has not the armor of a battleship, although it has practically the same gun power. It sacrifices armor for speed. Therefore we should have ample capital ships, be they battleships or additional battle cruisers.

I heard the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] say to-day that he was going to answer the accusation made by certain men on the Republican side whom he accused of bringing politics into the discussion on this bill, and he quoted figures from this bill to show it was a larger bill in money appropriated for capital ships than any heretofore passed under Republican administrations. Certainly it is, because battleships and capital ships cost more now than they did in former administrations. That is no criterion to go by, because the cost of these ships is increasing annually as they get larger. The old *Oregon* cost one-fourth as much as a dreadnaught of to-day. He did not call attention to the fact that the average number of battleships provided per year under the Republican administrations was two ships a year, nor did he call attention to the fact that since the Sixty-second Congress in 1911, when this country first elected a Democratic House, there was provided an average of only one battleship a year until last year, when two were authorized. I will qualify that by saying that the year before last—1914—we had three battleships, because we sold the old *Idaho* and *Mississippi* to Greece, and in place thereof substituted one dreadnaught——

Mr. BUTLER. Two.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Two dreadnaughts. I do not like to refer to a gentleman's statement when he is not present on the floor, and I did not interrupt him this morning, because I knew he had only a limited time, and I thought I might have a chance a little later on to put in the RECORD an answer to his statement. I expect to vote for two battle ships, and I expect to follow the minority members of the Committee on Naval Affairs in their recommendation, not because I happen to be on their side, but because I agree with what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] said, that the Navy is the first line of defense that will have to meet the enemy when it comes. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the few remarks I have made.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I can not at this time attempt to describe the ships of all of the great navies, but I wish to make some comparisons that may be useful in voting upon the amendments before the House. For this purpose I shall speak first of the navy of Germany, which now is generally

considered to occupy the second place in rank among the navies of the world. The English Navy is so much superior to ours that I shall not now consider it.

Taking the Naval Yearbook that has been issued by the Senate and considering the first five battleships which are listed in the German Navy, we find what are called the *Kaiser Friedrich* class. Of these ships Mr. Archibald Hurd, the English naval expert, says:

In their original form each ship carried eighteen 5.9-inch guns, but all, excepting the *Kaiser Karl der Grosse*, underwent complete reconstruction six or seven years ago, when four 5.9-inch guns and much of the clumsy top-hamper were removed. This reduction in weight brought the lower edge of the armor belt dangerously near the surface, with the result that when the ships are rolling the belt comes out of the water, and the lower hull is thus exposed to the smallest projectile.

Owing to this grave defect the ships were withdrawn from active service and have been in reserve ever since they were reconstructed.

So we find some other nations have some ships in reserve as well as our own. These vessels in fact are very much inferior to the *Indiana* and *Massachusetts*, which we no longer include in our list, but which carried very much heavier armor and four 13-inch guns 35 caliber, while the German ships carried 9.4-inch guns 35 caliber as the very largest.

Then we pass to the next five battleships, completed in 1902 and 1903, called the *Wittelsbach* class. Of these ships, Mr. Hurd says:

In service they have been found defective in sea-keeping qualities, and the high freehold and lofty superstructure offer an inviting target to hostile guns.

Normally these ships form part of the reserve fleet. Proposals to reconstruct and modernize them two years ago were rejected on the ground of their insignificant fighting value.

These ships also carried no big guns, the armament being practically the same as the first five mentioned, while we continued to build ships in which the main battery was 13-inch guns 35 caliber, and with much larger guns in the secondary batteries than the German ships.

In planning the next five ships the Germans corrected the error of making the main battery only 9.4-inch guns, and the five ships of the *Braunschweig* class were provided with 11-inch guns. They are much smaller, however, than our vessels built at the same time which carry four 12-inch guns with a heavier secondary battery and heavier armor. The Germans had also increased the range of their guns by making them 40 caliber in the main battery, but we had done better in our *New Jersey* class by not only making the main battery 40 caliber, but the secondary battery 45 and 50 caliber, with heavier projectiles.

The next five battleships of the German Navy, being the *Deutschland* class, completed in 1906 and 1908, are the last of their predreadnaughts. They are a little larger than the *Braunschweig* class and have a little heavier armor belt, but their size, 13,000 tons, is small compared to those battleships of the *Connecticut* class in our own Navy, built at the same time, which have 16,000 tons, and the German ships have four 11-inch guns in the main battery as against four 12-inch guns on our ships, which also carry a heavy secondary battery and heavy armor.

Coming now to the dreadnaughts of the German Navy, the first four belong to what is called the *Nassau* class, completed in 1909 and 1910. Of these ships, Mr. Hurd says:

For their size they have an extremely powerful armament, but too much was obviously attempted on the displacement, and they are admittedly failures.

It is held by experts that these ships would be quickly put out of action if subjected to heavy fire, and it is considered doubtful whether they would be able to stand for long the concussion of their own numerous heavy guns.

I would not, myself, class these ships as failures. They are extremely steady boats and some of the best shooting in the German Navy has been done from them. Their armament comprises twelve 11-inch 45-caliber guns, but owing to the fact that four of the turrets are placed on the broadside, only eight of the big guns can be used on one broadside—the same number as on the first dreadnaught of the English Navy. This has an important bearing on their fighting value. The horizontal deviation in long-range gunfire is much less than the vertical deviation. All naval experts agree that future naval fleet actions will be fought at long range and in broadside, as in this way the ships are less likely to be hit. Inability to use guns in broadside fire has thus become a very serious defect. Our *Michigan* and *South Carolina* are not classed as dreadnaughts in the Naval Yearbook, although as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] said yesterday, they should be.

Mr. KELLEY. I think the *Michigan* ought to be so considered. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Both, as the gentleman said yesterday, and quite properly. They are better fighting ships than the first four German dreadnaughts, which in broadside fighting could only oppose eight 11-inch guns to eight 12-inch guns of the *Michigan* or *South Carolina*, while the latter carry about as heavy armor. I know these two ships are a little slower than the *Nassau*, but the difference is not great enough to affect their fighting value. They roll heavily, but with modern appliances fine records for shooting have been made from them.

The next four dreadnaughts of the German Navy, the *Helgoland* class, were completed in 1911 and 1912. They carry twelve 12-inch guns, but the same mistake was made in their plans by which four of the turrets were placed on the broadside and only two on the center line fore and aft, a disposition which allows only eight guns to be trained on either beam. In other words, only 66 per cent of the heavy armament is available on the broadside. This error has been avoided in all of our construction. Our constructors started out with the principle that the proper place for the big-gun turrets was on the median line; that none should be placed where their broadside fire would be cut off or restricted by the superstructure of the ship, and all other nations now follow this plan.

The next five dreadnaughts of the German Navy are of the *Kaiser* class, completed in 1912–13. Smaller than our *Arkansas* and *Wyoming*, completed in 1912, our ships being of 26,000 tons and the German ships of 24,300 tons, they carry only ten 12-inch guns against the twelve of the same kind carried by our ships, but have a very strong armor belt of 13¾ inches. This is heavier than our ships last named carry, notwithstanding they are larger. There is, however, in the German ships the same defect, only to a lesser extent, in the arrangement of the big-gun turrets, the broadside fire of which is somewhat restricted. These vessels are excellent sea boats, are fitted with turbine engines, and are undoubtedly very powerful fighting ships.

The five German dreadnaughts of the *König* class, completed in 1914–15, are considered by German experts to be very successful ships. The main armament has ten 12-inch 50-caliber guns, so mounted that all ten can be fired on their broadside and four ahead or astern. They are heavily armored, having a belt 13¾ inches thick amidships, but their armament of ten 12-inch guns is much lighter than that of our *Texas* and *New York*, which carry ten 14-inch guns. Our ships are larger, being of 27,000 tons against the 25,500 tons of this class of German vessels. Our *Nevada* and *Oklahoma*, recently built, and sometimes called superdreadnaughts, are a little larger still, being of 27,500 tons. They also carry ten 14-inch guns, with very heavy armor—13½ inches on the belt. In the *Idaho*, *Mississippi*, and *California*—superdreadnaughts—the thickness in the armor belt is expected to be raised to 14 inches amidships, but as the last two are not started, the details of the plans are uncertain. No details are known concerning the latest class of the German dreadnaughts, except that it is understood that they will carry 15-inch guns. If so, the number of guns must be reduced, and experts differ as to whether our new ships should carry larger guns.

In the latest fighting machines—the dreadnaught and battle cruiser—we are outnumbered by the Germans. The most powerful armored cruiser ever built lacks the speed to escape from the battle cruiser and the guns and armor to fight it.

The German battle cruisers, which up to the time of the war were four in number, including the *Goeben*, which was subsequently sold to Turkey, are fine fast ships of high speed, carrying heavy guns, but with comparatively light armor. Four other battle cruisers of the *Derfflinger* class were then building, of 28,000 tons, to carry eight 12-inch guns and have a speed of 27 knots. Some and possibly all of these vessels have now been completed. We have never built anything in this class and in their line have nothing to oppose them. If, however, we carry out the plans of this bill, it is understood that the battle cruisers provided for therein will be larger, faster, and carry a heavier battery. We will be late, but we will have better designed and more powerful vessels.

My study of these matters leads me to conclude that, ship for ship, the American Navy is superior to any in the world. Our early ships, of course, are defective in many respects, but the defects are not so serious in comparison. We have built later than the other powers, and thus have been able to take advantage of their mistakes. Our plan has been to build larger vessels, with heavier batteries and heavier armor than those which could oppose them. In fast vessels we are deficient, but that will be remedied by the provisions of this bill. The battle cruiser, of course, can not stand in the fighting line as against the dreadnaught, but its value for other purposes is very apparent. It has made the armored cruiser, which is a vessel inferior in speed, armor, and armament, a thing of the past. No naval power will build any more of them, and we are fortunate in that we have not very many. Our Navy is often compared to that of France, and it is said that it is inferior in tonnage. It may be, but when we consider that in 1914 over 200,000 tons in the French Navy, out of 665,000 tons, consisted of armored

cruisers whose day has passed, while we have only 140,000 tons of these almost obsolete vessels, it will be seen that such a comparison is very unfair to our Navy.

I do not have time to compare our ships with those of France. Notwithstanding the frequent statements to the contrary, I consider that a comparison, not only of the ships but of the actual fighting strength, would be greatly in our favor. At the outbreak of the war France only had four dreadnaughts completed, while we had eight. It is true that she then had eight under construction or authorized, and may since have taken over one that was being constructed for another power. I do not believe, however, that she has been able as yet to complete the construction of all of these vessels, and consider the present rank of the American Navy is third; but I hope to see it raised to second place among the navies of the world as fast as can reasonably be done.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] five minutes, which he will occupy to-morrow, so that I will not stand in the way of the committee rising now.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman has nothing further now?

Mr. BUTLER. No.

Mr. PADGETT. 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. FITZGERALD, 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. 15947) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by Gov. A. O. Stanley, of Kentucky, at the Democratic State convention last Wednesday; also a speech by Senator OLLIE M. JAMES on the same occasion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROUSE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by Gov. Stanley, of Kentucky, at the Democratic State convention recently, and a speech delivered by Senator JAMES on the same occasion. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSE. The speech of Gov. Stanley will appear elsewhere in the RECORD of to-day's proceedings, and the speech of Senator JAMES will appear later.

The SPEAKER. What was the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. To extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman if we can have some understanding about printing the speeches to be made in the two national conventions?

Mr. MANN. I suppose we have started in to print all the speeches made at all the State, county, and village conventions, and that the others will follow.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well the gentleman has not said anything lately, and I will not object. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. FOSS. And I make the same request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] and to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. And I make the same request, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House and had appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. TOWNSEND as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ROCK CREEK AND POTOMAC PARKWAY COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the report of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission, with a request from the Committee on Appropriations that the order to print be so modified as to include three illustrative maps. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, let us know about it. Does this come from the Committee on Appropriations?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Has there been an order to print?

The SPEAKER. There has been an order to print the words, but not the maps.

Mr. MANN. Does this print all the maps?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Only the maps, not all the illustrations; the maps that are necessary to make the document intelligible.

Mr. MANN. I want to print all the maps that are there.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There are only three maps.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FAIRCHILD, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 30, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report on preliminary examination of White Oak River, N. C., from its mouth to the head of navigation at or near Maysville (H. Doc. No. 1169), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. RAKER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15096) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States providing for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated," and to authorize an exchange of lands between the United States and the several States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 779), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SHALLENBERGER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9856) granting to the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co. and to the Anheuser-Busch Brewing Association, and to the Manufacturers' Railway Co. permission to transfer certain rights of easement for railway purposes heretofore granted by the United States to the St. Louis & Iron Mountain Railroad Co. and to the Anheuser-Busch Brewing Association, respectively, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 780), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 16093) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the payment of drainage assessments on Indian lands in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 16094) for purchasing a site for the erection of a public building at Columbus, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 16095) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Freeport, Stephenson County, Ill., two bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 16096) authorizing the Secretary of War to sell certain magazine rifles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 16097) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Missouri River near Kansas City, Mo., authorized by an act approved June 17, 1914; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 16098) providing for a site and public building for a post office at Ludington, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAKES: A bill (H. R. 16099) granting a pension to Margaret Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16100) granting a pension to Martha Hynes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 16101) to authorize the reinstatement of entry and issuance of patent to certain lands in Alabama to William J. Whitworth; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: A bill (H. R. 16102) granting an increase of pension to Richard Burge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 16103) granting an increase of pension to Dick Ransom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 16104) granting a pension to Missouri L. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 16105) granting a pension to Maria Schmidt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 16106) granting an increase of pension to Fred W. Porter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 16107) for the relief of Oscar Smith; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 16108) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16109) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. English; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 16110) granting a pension to James O. Singleton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 16111) granting a pension to Bryant Libby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 16112) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mamie M. Carter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 16113) granting an increase of pension to John Robinson Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 16114) granting a pension to Charles F. Updegraff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OGLESBY (by request): A bill (H. R. 16115) for the relief of the Union Trust Co., of the District of Columbia, trustee for Bessie J. Kibbey, owner of lot 75, square 628, Washington, D. C., with regard to assessment and payment of damages on account of changes of grade due to construction of the Union Station, District of Columbia; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTEN: A bill (H. R. 16116) for the relief of the widow of Robert M. Gibbs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 16117) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Catherine Shotwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 16118) granting an increase of pension to Alfred E. Neal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16119) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 16120) granting an increase of pension to Harriet N. Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 16121) granting an increase of pension to James W. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 16122) to amend the acts of July 1, 1862, and July 2, 1864, and June 24, 1912, relating to the construction of a railroad from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, the legalizing of certain conveyances heretofore made by the Union Pacific Railroad Co., and more perfectly disposing of the excess portions of the company's right of way; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 16123) granting a pension to Mrs. Julia McFarland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 16124) for the relief of John Curtis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16125) granting an increase of pension to Ahi S. Loudermilk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16126) granting an increase of pension to James A. Duncanson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 16127) granting a pension to David S. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16128) granting a pension to Arthur Culbertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

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): Memorial of Federal Watchman's Union, Local No. 14964, American Federation of Labor, favoring passage of the Nolan bill, House bill 11876; to the Committee on Labor.

Also (by request), petition of Grand Army of the Republic of the State of New York, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of Thomas Kerr, James W. Stephenson, H. A. Morris, Richard Scollon, John R. Musser, William McPherson, Louis Luxenberg, E. M. Binder, Hart Commons, Max Lipman, McMillen & Killins, J. J. Barnes, Sam Ratonsky, F. J. Pandracki, Robert Taylor, Max Freidman, H. A. Shruller, and Frank McAnulty, all of Barnesboro, Pa., favoring a tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union of America, favoring House bill 10318—employers' liability act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLEMAN: Petition of sundry organizations and citizens of Wilkinsburg and Turtle Creek, Pa., favoring amendment relative to polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of Young Men's Christian Association, of Concord, N. H., and Katharine H. Shaw, of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring passage of Owen-Hayden bill relative to probation system in United States courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Colonial Dames of America of New York City, favoring national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Pennsylvania Branch of the Congregational Union for Woman Suffrage and Women of the West, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARROW: Memorial of the Colonial Dames of America, favoring national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: Petition of John McCellan, of Houston, Tex., favoring the passage of Rainey bill, House bill 10585, for a nonpartisan tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Glenn W. Smith and commissioners of Mason County and Mason Business Men's Club, of Mason Tex., favoring passage of the Bankhead good-roads bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DILLON: Memorial of the Dakota Conference of the Evangelical Association, favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia and national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of the Colonial Dames of America, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of the Colonial Dames of America, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Petitions of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., and National Security League, favoring national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Woman's Home Missionary Society of Methodist Episcopal Church of Oakland, Cal., favoring bill to prohibit exportation of liquors to Africa; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Woman's Home Missionary Society of Methodist Episcopal Church of Oakland, Cal., favoring bill to prohibit sale of liquors in Philippine Islands and Porto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of the Colonial Dames of America, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: Petition of Samuel E. Vertreez, of Richmond, Ind., favoring legislation to prevent slaughter of young calves; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of citizens of Salem, Oreg., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES: Petitions of sundry citizens of Lake Linden, Mich., against any change in the parcel-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of Diamond Machine Co., of Providence, R. I.; Libermore & Knight Co., of Providence, R. I.; and the Master Printers' Association of Rhode Island, opposing passage of the Tavenner bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of Mixer & Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring House bill 651; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Rhode Island Chiropodists' Society, indorsing House bill 13717; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of 533 citizens of Illinois, favoring woman suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of 220 citizens of National City, Cal., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of Gadsden (Ala.) Chamber of Commerce in re water-power legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Mental Hygiene Societies of the United States, favoring establishing a division of mental hygiene in the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of J. B. Komdorfer, of Bensonhurst, N. Y., in favor of House bill 11539; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Mrs. S. H. Hough and 117 others, of Comstock, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also papers to accompany House bill 15910, for relief of George M. Woodard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Branch No. 5, Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America against the bill providing for the registration of designs; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Rhode Island Antituberculosis Association against Senate joint resolution 120; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of H. G. Ford and 54 others, of Highwood, Conn., against passage of House bill 13048, relative to juvenile courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of citizens of Worcester, Mass., against bills to amend the postal laws: to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *May 30, 1916.*

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

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

O God, our Father, we come to Thee with gratitude in our hearts and praise upon our lips for the spirit of patriotism which lives in the hearts of our people and will manifest itself to-day in memory of our sacred dead. Floral tributes will cover their graves and the emblem of liberty float over their ashes. We thank Thee that time not only assuages grief, but sweeps away the unhallowed passions of men, for to-day we would honor the Blue and the Gray, in memory of their valor, since each fought for the right as it was given him to see the right. We thank Thee that the sons of those who followed the Stars and Stripes and the sons of those who followed the Stars and Bars would rally round the old flag and bear it to the breeze in defense of the honor and integrity of our beloved country. Thus we would hallow this day and consecrate it to the soldiers living and the soldiers dead and teach in song and story the value of patriotism in peace no less than in war; that our Nation may continue to live and grow in all that makes it sacred to our hearts; and pæans of praise we will give to Thee, in the name of Him who taught us liberty, justice, mercy, love, peace. Amen.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 26, my colleague [Mr. SCULLY] was paired with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LOUD] on some of the measures that were being voted on at that time. There seems to have been an error in the way in which he was paired, and I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a statement made by Mr. SCULLY on that subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a statement by his colleague [Mr. SCULLY] as to a certain vote. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

"On the afternoon of Friday, May 26, 1916, Mr. SCULLY, by force of circumstances, was absent from the House during the consideration of the transfer of H. R. 6915 and H. R. 10130 from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

"Mr. SCULLY was paired with Mr. LOUD, of Michigan, on this vote, with Mr. SCULLY for the transfer and Mr. LOUD against. Through an error on the part of some one, the pair appears under the vote on the District of Columbia appropriation bill and not on the vote on the transfer of the Tague and Griffin bills.

"I talked with Mr. LOUD about asking for a correction of the RECORD, and after I explained what the transfer meant, he said he did not care to bother about it; that it made very little difference; and that if he had known about the bills and voted on them he would have probably voted as Mr. SCULLY did."

FOURTH-CLASS POST OFFICES.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I desire a few moments to correct a statement made by a Member of the House in the RECORD yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, when the bill in relation to the postal savings bank was before the House it was discussed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], myself, and others, and finally passed. I find in the RECORD yesterday an extension of remarks of Hon. HALVOR STEENERSON, in which he refers to the fact that he opposed the provision of the bill known as the nonaccounting office provision, by which the department would have been enabled to cover into the civil service some 56,000 postmasters of the United States. Mr. STEENERSON takes entire credit to himself in this matter—I think inadvertently, because he is a very correct and estimable gentleman, and I do not believe he would do a thing intentionally that reflected upon the other members of the Post Office Committee or the conferees. After referring to his remarks in the House on the 17th of March he quotes from some communications, newspaper clippings, which he had received and publishes them as a part of the extension of his remarks, headed:

STEENERSON saves the postmasters—Minnesotan defeats proposition to abolish all except 3,000 post offices.

And also—

STEENERSON SAVES POSTMASTERS' JOBS IN 56,000 TOWNS—MINNESOTA CONGRESSMAN DEFEATS PLAN TO ABOLISH FOURTH-CLASS OFFICES—REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS UPON TENDENCY TO INCREASE DEPARTMENT POWERS.

WASHINGTON, *May 15.*

Representative HALVOR STEENERSON won his fight to prevent the abolishment of fourth-class postmasterships throughout the country. At the instance of the Post Office Department the Senate placed in the bill to increase the limit of postal savings to $1,000 a provision authorizing the establishment of a central office in each county in the country, with the other post offices as branch stations.

Although the same provision had been submitted to the House Post Office Committee and rejected, the House Members generally were not informed upon it, and the Minnesota Member had to make his fight practically alone for a time, when he won over the Democratic House conferees.

When the conference report was before the House Thursday Representative STEENERSON made a short speech telling what the department was seeking to accomplish.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the statement that he won over the Democratic conferees on that proposition is clearly incorrect. There never was a time during the pendency of the bill when the two Democratic conferees favored the proposition which Mr. STEEN-