SENATE.

THURSDAY, *July 13, 1916.*

(Legislative day of Friday, July 7, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. 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	Dillingham	Nelson	Smoot
Beckham	Gronna	Norris	Swanson
Brandegee	Hollis	Overman	Thompson
Broussard	Husting	Owen	Tillman
Bryan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Underwood
Catron	Jones	Pomerene	Vardaman
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Chilton	Kern	Sheppard	Williams
Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Simmons	Works
Culberson	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	
Curtis	McCumber	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. TAGGART]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE]. This announcement will stand for the day.

Mr. HOLLIS. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] is detained from the Chamber by illness. This announcement will stand for the day.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. HARDING], and I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to announce for the day that my colleague [Mr. LANE] is detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. SWANSON. I suggest that the Secretary call the names of the absentees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. TOWNSEND and Mr. WALSH answered to their names when called.

Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, Mr. STERLING, Mr. LEE of Maryland, Mr. OLIVER, and Mr. JAMES entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Chair lays before the Senate House bill 15947, the unfinished business.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the 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.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, before we proceed with the consideration of this bill I wish to make a brief statement, and also to make an appeal to my brother Senators.

It is readily seen by those who have examined the bill that the Senate Naval Committee has added very largely to the building program and also, imitating the House, has incorporated much legislation of a general character. The welfare of the Navy seems to vitally demand certain reforms in the personnel, and most of the suggested changes in the general law regarding personnel have been urgently pressed on the committee by the Navy Department itself. The letters of the Secretary of the Navy will explain the department's point of view and the reasons for the increases, promotions, and changes in the personnel; and my friend the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] who has charge of the bill for me will take pleasure in explaining more fully any point that is raised by anyone.

I want to ask this of Senators. My health, as everyone knows, is much better than it has been for a long while, but I have been here since December and I am tired out and want to go home and rest. I therefore appeal to you, Senators, to discuss the bill as fully as you please but let us be prompt and pass it in the Senate, because it will take a good while, I expect, for the conferees of the two bodies to come to an agreement. We may have to send it back to the respective bodies for instructions. I anticipate this on some points; but let us not consume any more time in discussing it than is absolutely necessary to elucidate obscure points or make necessary explanations.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a short address in behalf of the bill. I ask to be permitted to conclude my remarks without interruption, and then I will be glad to answer any question any Senator may suggest.

Mr. President, to my mind the most important question before this Congress is an adequate increase of our Navy. I believe this of more vital importance and of more far-reaching consequences to this Nation than any other matter pending. A mistake made in this matter now would be most difficult to correct in the future, would be fraught with great danger, and might in the coming years culminate in great national disaster. Our future safety, progress, and prosperity may be determined by the deliberations of this Congress. Our decision upon this matter may determine far in the future whether our pathway shall be one of peace and power or fraught with turmoil, wars, difficulties, defeats, and humiliations. I deeply feel that the fate of this Republic, the preservation of our institutions and the maintenance of our well-defined foreign policies are dependent upon the strength and success of our Navy. America and her Navy, for weal or for woe, are united in indissoluble wedlock.

The history of the world teaches one sure lesson—that naval supremacy ultimately means national preeminence and triumph. More than ever before sea power is the best and strongest military power. The rise and fall of nations and empires teach the same lesson—that national safety and national success are inseparable from naval strength and power. The destruction of the Spanish Armada in the English Channel was the first and controlling cause in the bloody drama which ended a few years ago when the flag of crimson and gold was banished from the Western World and Spain closed her glittering career. Waterloo was but the aftermath of Trafalgar.

All the vast power, the amazing genius and energy of Napoleon could not escape the doom inflicted by Lord Nelson's fleet. The heroic valor, the superb military genius, the splendid victories of the Confederacy during the late Civil War all faded before Federal naval supremacy. The shadows of southern doom rose slowly but surely from the pitiless sea. The stupendous superstructure of Russian power and military strength all crumbled at the triumph of Admiral Togo's fleet. Dewey's guns at Manila proclaimed alike the liberation of the Philippines, Cuba, and Porto Rico. The Italian Navy was the strong hand which seized Tripoli from the grasp of Turkey. It has been the great navy of Britain that has enabled her to carry her rule, civilization, and commerce to every continent, in every clime, and among every people. It enabled her to wrest from France the territory of Canada, with vast possessions stretching to the North Pole. It has given her colonies in the far waters of the Pacific exceeding in territory and richness any domain ever ruled by the Cæsars. It enabled her to conquer and rule the mighty empire of India, which had resisted the arms and thwarted the triumphs of Alexander. It has given her Egypt, the most ancient of nations, and brought to her the greater part of Africa, with its immense territory and vast riches. The naval supremacy of Great Britain has given her one-sixth of the habitable globe, which receives as law her will. The great war now raging in Europe is further emphasizing the advantages accruing to Great Britain from her naval power. It has enabled her to conquer all the colonial possessions of Germany. She has driven from the seas all the trade and commerce of Germany, Austria, and Turkey, while hers and that of her allies proceed practically uninterrupted, as in times of peace.

The iron grasp of the British Navy consigns the central powers and their allies to starvation and submission unless their internal resources are sufficient to stand the heavy exactions and tremendous burdens of this war. It has enabled Great Britain to transport millions of troops from her possessions, scattered all over the world, safely to the various scenes of conflict. Britain's Navy enabled Russia to transport troops to France and make more secure there important lines of defense. It has enabled her and France to carry troops to Greece and the Balkans to prevent complete military disaster in that section. It has exposed Turkey to such dangers as to make it impossible for her to render any substantial assistance to her allies. It has enabled Britain and her allies to receive military supplies from all parts of the world, and thus be able to withstand the terrific assaults and great military strength of the central powers. Britain naval supremacy enabled Russia to obtain military equipment for her shattered and defeated armies of last year, thus making it possible for her to succeed in her recent aggressive and successful campaign. British naval supremacy constitutes the chief dependence of the allies for their success over the central powers. The defeat of Great Britain on the seas would be the severest blow the allies could receive. The uncertainties of war are such that there is no capital on the continent of Europe safe now. Paris may fall, Berlin may fall, Petrograd may fall, Rome may fall, Vienna and Constantinople may fall, but London, protected by the great British fleet, is safe and secure. Entirely surrounded by water, with a fleet sufficient to maintain supremacy on the seas, Britain, serene and safe at home, is a menace and a dangerous antagonist to anyone who

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

dares challenge her power. This great world war emphasizes more than anything else the importance of sea power.

We are far more fortunately situated than England to depend upon a Navy for national defense. England is not many miles from the continent of Europe, where there has existed for years a dangerous and the most effective military system the world has ever devised. More than 3,000 miles of ocean separate us from any enemy that can seriously threaten or attack us. In a few hours, if conditions permitted, troops could be landed in England. Many days of travel and peril are required before troops could be landed upon our shores. Thus, if naval power is effective for offensive and defensive warfare by England, it would be doubly more effective if possessed by us. Surprises on account of the short distances to England's coast may bring her disaster, but if we had a sufficient and efficient Navy and aircraft no surprises can bring to us defeat. England has safely and securely builded on her naval power. The United States can with greater safety and security build on this power. Our Navy should constitute our first and chief line of defense. Our Navy should be such that no enemy's shells should ever fall on America's shores.

Mr. President, the best defense we can have for our immense lines of coast is a Navy. It is impossible to build forts and fortifications that can give adequate protection to our great stretches of coast. Forts can only give protection to a very limited area. Besides, forts and fortifications are stationary and must await the attack of an enemy, and if they are strong the enemy never approaches them. Forts and fortifications have never yet been decisive in warfare. A battleship as effective in destructive power as a fort can be carried where needed. It seeks and does not await the enemy. It goes where defense and protection are needed. America's safety from attack lies far more in an adequate Navy than in fortifications.

Mr. President, the necessity for an adequate Navy for us is greater to-day than ever before in our history. The time has passed in the history of the world when any nation can successfully lead an isolated life. All parts of the habitable globe in times of peace are closely connected by fast steamers. These exchange the product of one country with another. Even in remote villages in times of peace can now be obtained the products of almost all foreign countries. The development and prosperity of every nation is largely dependent upon its foreign commerce. For any civilized nation to be denied access to the seas for the sale and purchase of commodities would mean its financial bankruptcy and ruin. Especially is this true of the United States, whose exports exceed those of any nation. Our great crops of tobacco, cotton, wheat, and corn would find no profitable sale unless we had access to the seas to sell them in foreign markets. Our vast meat products would spoil on our hands but for foreign trade. Our immense manufacturing and mining industries would languish except for the great outlet found in foreign countries for our surplus. Thus the prosperity of mine, farm, forest, and factory is inseparably interwoven with our foreign commerce. The cessation of our foreign commerce for many months occasioned by the world-wide war, followed by frightful business stagnation, taught us more clearly than ever that our national prosperity is dependent upon our foreign trade. The revival of our foreign commerce on account of the world-wide demand for our goods immediately brought us an amazing business revival and prosperity. With a foreign commerce far exceeding that of any other nation, we, above all other nations, need an adequate Navy to give this proper protection. There is not a citizen in this Republic whose material prosperity is not more or less dependent upon our Navy.

The unjust restrictions that Great Britain has imposed upon our commerce during the progress of this war further emphasizes to us the necessity of having a Navy large enough to demand and enforce our rights. In modern commerce, with its varied trade complexities, the nation that is helpless upon the seas is the prey of all marauders and has its future destiny directed by others. The American people demand of us that we shall give them a navy sufficiently large that the vast products of their various industries and enterprises shall have access to the seas for sale in all the markets of the world as a matter of right and not as a favor conceded by others.

This great war vastly increased our foreign trade and reviving our home industries, has given us wealth almost unspeakable. When this war is concluded this Nation will be rich beyond the wildest dream of avarice. If we have naval and military strength we will be able to hold our wealth, power, and prestige. If we are weak in this respect the day of our despoilment will inevitably come. The Nation and individual weak and rich have ever been the prey of the strong. When this great war in Europe is concluded the nations will seek somewhere to recover the great losses they have sustained. The Western Hemisphere, where peace reigns and wealth grows, offers a profitable field for such plundering adventurers. Only here can wealth be garnered, and wisdom demands that we should be strong enough to successfully resist such attempts. When peace is made in Europe among the conflicting nations, many of the existing enmities and jealousies will subside, and we, as the richest Nation in the world, will become the subject of their jealousy and be the object of their aggression. The leading powers of Europe were able to keep peace for years, as long as they had something to divide among themselves.

A few years prior to this recent war the first-class powers of Europe had partitioned among themselves all the continent of Africa except the petty nations of Liberia and Abyssinia; all the rest of Africa had become subject to European domination. Never before in the history of the world had such a vast continent been so rapidly and ruthlessly seized and divided. Nearly all the islands of the seas were put under European dominion. All of Asia except Japan had been placed under the control of the European powers. Japan has maintained her independence and her wishes are respected on account of her naval and military strength. The few years preceding this great war marked the most tremendous territorial aggressions by the first-class powers of Europe that have ever occurred in the history of the world. The Central and South American States have not been the subject of spoliation by European powers only because the United States has maintained as its declared foreign policy the great Monroe doctrine, which protects these from European aggression, and because the United States at that time, in comparison with existing naval conditions, and on account of the mutual mistrust of other nations, had naval power sufficient to enforce this doctrine if challenged. Before the shadows of this impending war arose our Navy was safely the second in the world, and we were respected and feared. Are we foolish enough to suppose that this aggressive spirit of the European powers has been satiated and will cease at the termination of this war? This war was occasioned by this spirit of aggression and territorial ambition. With increased armies, armament, and navies these powers will seek new fields of despoilment when favorable opportunity offers. Is there anything in the past history of any of these nations to justify us in believing, if they have the power and opportunity, they will restrain their lust for dominion and commerce and use their power unselfishly for the betterment of the world?

Are we foolish enough to believe that this Nation, which, with its vast wealth and unsurpassed possibilities—the object of envy and jealousy of other nations—can be safe if we permit ourselves to become a fourth or fifth rate naval power? Are we simple-minded enough to risk our national safety to the chances of their mutual jealousies and enmities? Could this restrain each of them when the destruction of our Navy would mean the overthrow of the Monroe doctrine and the opening up to them of Central and South America for the purpose of exploitation and spoliation? Has not one of these nations disputed the Monroe doctrine, and only needed a sufficient navy to challenge it? Have we not an aggressive eastern neighbor who looks with covetous eyes upon our Philippine possessions? Are we weak-minded enough to imagine that we can control the Panama Canal for our own advantage and profit unless we have a Navy sufficient to fully protect it? Are we going to permit the $300,000,000 we expended in this great enterprise to be appropriated by other nations with superior naval strength?

Mr. President, there are those among us to-day who are foolish enough to trust all of this Nation's rights, our national safety and independence to treaties and arbitrational tribunals. Recent history has clearly shown that nations when self-interest demands treat treaties as simple paper parchment to be disregarded. The ink was scarcely dry which fixed the signature of Russia and Japan to The Hague arbitration treaty before they were in a terrific war to see which should be the successful despoiler of large Provinces belonging to the Chinese Empire. Italy was not restrained by her solemn pledge of peace and arbitration made to Turkey from seeking to enrich herself by the acquisition of Tripoli. No pledge made by Russia and Great Britain to Persia in this treaty, restrained them from dividing among themselves this helpless nation.

Germany had pledged to Belgium by treaty integrity of territory and neutrality, but this did not save her from flagrant invasion. The allied powers had guaranteed to Greece neutrality, but this did not prevent them, when military advantages demanded, to seize her territory and use it for their military activities. Treaties and justice have ceased to be barriers against military aggression and ambition. I hope the day will come when peace will dominate the world and na-

tional disputes will be determined by principles of equity and justice, promulgated by a properly constituted tribunal. But, sir, that day is far distant.

Mr. President, we had as well realize that all of our rights, the preservation of our institutions, the possession of our wealth, and the enjoyment of our foreign commerce, and the continuation of the Monroe doctrine, and the ownership of the Panama Canal are dependent upon our own strong arm, manifested and exercised through our Navy. The future of this mighty Republic lies upon the seas. Failure there means national decadence and disgrace. Success there means national supremacy, power, and progress. The best guaranty we have for peace and the peace of the world is a strong American Navy. It is the best insurance we can provide against future loss and disaster. For this great Nation, rich in all material wealth and far richer in future possibilities, to risk all to the hazards of wars and to become the prey of weaker nations merely for the lack of a sufficient naval strength is to my mind the supreme of national folly.

Mr. President, our best and most effective defense against those nations which have great military establishments, with compulsory military service, is not to raise, like these nations, standing armies of millions of men and impose heavy financial burdens on our industries and threaten our institutions, but to create a Navy so much superior that their military power will be absolutely powerless to hurt us. This is far safer, far cheaper. Hence I have consistently advocated that the United States should be the second naval power in the world. We have no occasion to apprehend danger from Great Britain as from other nations. Before the recent war Great Britain had no compulsory military service with a large standing army. While she had a navy that could greatly injure our commerce, she possessed no army that could threaten or dare attempt an invasion of our country under any circumstances. With twice the population and greater wealth we could raise and equip a larger standing army, and more quickly, than she could. Hence, having no army which could ever be a menace to us, the necessity of having a Navy superior to her is not as great as it would be with those nations who possess large standing armies. If at the conclusion of this war England should abandon this policy and establish a large standing army, in order to save ourselves we would have to have a standing army equally as large or have a Navy equal to hers. I believe that England will adhere to her past policy and rely for national defense and military power, as formerly, upon her navy. Besides, Great Britain has on this continent hostages, which would prevent her from making any aggression here. In addition, ties of blood and the still stronger ties of self-interest involved in mutual profitable trade and commerce almost insure the future peace of this Nation and Great Britain.

Mr. President, I believe we are safe under present conditions of the world's affairs if we will become and remain without question the world's second naval power. Our national honor, prestige, and safety will not permit of less. If those nations who are competing with us for this position increase their navies, we must equally increase ours. With our vast and varied interests, with our great responsibilities, with the present political complications in the world, we can not with safety afford to be less than the world's second naval power. If we remain less than this, our vast foreign commercial interests, inseparable from our prosperity, will be jeopardized. Our Philippine possessions will be the prey of superior naval power. Our foreign policies and intercourse will necessarily become timid and vacillating. The great affairs of the world affecting our interests will be regulated without consultation with us. We will then become suppliants, pleading for rights instead of boldly and courageously demanding them. It will mean the surrender of our great prestige. It will mean a distinct loss to the world of the great power possessed by this Nation for peace, justice, and liberty. The Monroe doctrine would be challenged and our control of the Panama Canal disputed. It would mean that this mighty young Republic has retreated and has ceased to advance along the pathway that was leading her to a higher and nobler destiny.

Mr. President, several years ago when this Nation was the acknowledged second naval power in the world, in a speech addressed to the Senate when the naval bill was pending, I urged the necessity of increasing our naval program in order to retain this desirable position. Much I say to-day is a repetition of what I then stated. I then pointed out that unless we did this, in 1914 Germany would pass us and take our position as the second naval power. This occured earlier than I predicted. Realizing the vital importance of this Nation occupying the position of second naval power, the committee has prepared this bill and recommends its passage. We believe if the policy of increase herein proposed is adopted that the day is not far distant when this Nation will regain its position as the second naval power. It is conceded that this is the best and most progressive naval bill ever presented to Congress in the history of this Nation. The Naval Committee have examined the immediate and pressing needs of the Navy and have sought to properly provide for them. This bill contains the conclusions reached by the committee after consultation with the President, the Secretary of the Navy, and capable and experienced naval officers and after a thorough examination conducted by its members. It is presented to the Senate with practically the unanimous approval of the Naval Committee.

The first problem confronting us was to reach a decision as to what increase in naval ships we should recommend. The General Board at the request of the Secretary of the Navy had prepared a five-year program for naval construction to cost on an average of $100,000,000 a year. This program had been prepared with the utmost care by the General Board, which is composed of the most experienced officers in the Navy. It took into consideration the entire needs of the Navy for every type of ship.

The General Board proposed to give us at the completion of the program a well-balanced and efficient Navy in every respect. After the most careful consideration and thought, the committee reached the conclusion that it could not do better than follow the recommendations of the General Board in the construction of the various types of ships. This General Board had investigated the matter most thoroughly and made their recommendations most carefully. Higher authority on naval matters than the General Board does not exist in this country. We have taken their five-year program and shortened it, making it a three-year program, practically adhering to the various types of ships recommended. The yearly construction of this three-year program has been divided and arranged by the most experienced and efficient naval officers to satisfy the needs of the fleet. We believed that the necessity for an increase of the Navy was so immediate and urgent that we could not afford to wait longer than three years for the completion of the program. We did not feel, with the grave responsibility imposed upon us, that we would be safe in recommending a delay greater than three years. We also thought it wise to construct during the first year as many of the ships recommended as could be reasonably accomplished. The President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy had recommended to Congress an annual building program of five years. The conventions of the three political parties in this country had indorsed an annual building program extending for several years. This policy gives us a safe, well-balanced, and progressive increase of the Navy.

Another great need of our Navy is aircraft for scouting and other purposes. We are sadly and dangerously deficient in this respect. A fleet without sufficient aircraft is liable at any time to be surprised and encounter disaster. To-day a fleet without aircraft is almost as helpless as a man without eyes. Both may have great strength which they can not use intelligently and effectively. The bill carries ample appropriation to provide suitable aircraft. It also carries an appropriation for the further development of aeronautics.

Realizing that ships are helpless unless they are well equipped with guns and have an abundance of ammunition, the bill materially increases the appropriation for this purpose. The great war raging in Europe has emphasized most strongly the necessity of a nation having at the beginning of a war a large supply of ammunition and an abundance of large guns. Danger confronts any fleet or nation that is deficient in these. In order to provide for sufficient large guns for our Navy the bill makes an appropriation to greatly enlarge our gun factory located at the Washington Navy Yard, where our best and largest guns are made. An appropriation is also made for a projectile factory where the Government can manufacture better projectiles and more cheaply than those now obtained. We thought that in as vital a matter as projectiles the Government should not be absolutely dependent upon outside manufacturers.

The bill appropriates $11,000,000, which the Senate had previously passed, for the erection or purchase of an armor-plate plant. This will save the Government from the excessive exactions of the notorious armor-plate monopoly.

The Navy Department has made a most careful survey of our merchant marine to ascertain which of these vessels can in time of war be utilized as a part of our Navy. This survey indicates what alterations are necessary for each vessel and the batteries required to properly equip them for naval uses. The navy yards where these alterations can be promptly made have also been designated, and the yards furnished with the details of the alterations required. So, in case of war, these vessels can without delay be altered and made an efficient part of our

Navy. We believe that prudence demands we should at once manufacture the batteries needed for these auxiliaries and an appropriation is contained in the bill for this purpose. It would be fatal to delay manufacturing these batteries until the need for them should arise. Thus, in increase of ships and aircraft, in supplying ordnance, guns, armament, and ammunition, the bill presents careful and efficient plans and makes proper appropriations. We believe if this is approved by Congress that this Nation will have in a reasonable time an adequate and efficient fleet, capable of asserting our rights and defending us against aggression. We also direct that the ships appropriated for in this bill shall be commenced within six months after the approval of the bill. This insures prompt and early construction. Also, in order to hasten construction we authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay an increase not to exceed 20 per cent of the appropriations contained in the bill to accomplish this purpose. We believe that an early Navy is as important as a strong one. The great amount of work in the shipyards of the country and the various industries that supply materials for ships necessitates this provision.

Mr. President, after creating an adequate fleet and properly equipping it, the next question confronting the committee was to make proper and ample provision for the personnel. A fleet is but a dead mass of wood and metal unless efficiently and fully manned. It is the officers and enlisted men that give a fleet life and soul and make possible its tremendous power. The present law authorizes about 54,000 enlisted men for our fleet. This is not sufficient to keep many of our battleships and battle cruisers in commission. Besides, it leaves too small a complement of men for the ships that are in reserve. The General Board recommended that the enlisted men of our fleet should be increased to about 74,000. We adopted this recommendation and include in the bill legislation and appropriations to accomplish this purpose. This increase of enlisted men will immediately enable us to put many of our battleships and armored cruisers in commission with a full complement of men and allow 50 per cent of the full complement for those in reserve. This is considered sufficient at this time for our Navy on a peace basis. The bill also contains a provision authorizing the President in case of an emergency or war to increase the enlisted men of the Navy to about 87,000, which will furnish a full complement of men for all of our naval vessels. We earnestly believe the power should be given the President, if occasion should arise, to put our Navy on a war basis.

The Marine Corps is one of the most efficient parts of our Navy. It can, when occasion demands, act equally with the Army or Navy. Its services in the past have been most splendid and its record is one of great achievement. This Government has heretofore followed the policy of having the enlisted men in the Marine Corps number 20 per cent of those in the Navy. This has been a wise policy, and it is continued in this bill. We have increased the Marine Corps 20 per cent of the increase made in the enlisted men of the Navy. Thus, the bill contains ample provision for the efficient manning of our fleet.

Mr. President, having furnished sufficient enlisted men for our present Navy, the next question for the committee to determine in order to have an efficient fleet was to provide sufficient commissioned officers to direct and command the fleet. An increase in the number of enlisted men necessarily requires an increase in the various ranks of commissioned officers. To the committee it appeared logical that the number of officers required should be based on the number of enlisted men—in other words, bear a certain percentage to the number of enlisted men. This percentage can readily be determined from the experience of past years in manning the ships of the Navy, and once fixed will work automatically under the direct control of Congress. In reaching a conclusion as to what this percentage should be, it is well to take the average that has existed for the last 20 years. Twenty years ago the percentage of commissioned officers to enlisted men was 5.3 per cent. During that time the percentage has gradually fallen below that number, owing to the fact that the increase of enlisted men for the new ships has been proportionately greater than the increase of officers.

At present the percentage of commissioned officers is 3.85. It is acknowledged that the Navy is very short of officers. The average for the last 20-year period has been 4.75. The committee has included in this bill an amendment providing that the commissioned officers of the Navy should be 4 per cent of the enlisted men. This is less than the average has been for the last 20 years, and appears to be most conservative. The number of officers thus provided for is fairly and justly distributed by certain percentage between the line and various staff corps. It is also justly and fairly divided by certain percentage between the higher and lower ranks so as to create a well-balanced and efficient corps of officers. The enactment of this legislation is of the utmost importance in order to give us capable officers to command our fleet. The amendment provides that promotions in the line of the Navy above the grade of commander shall be made by selection and not, as heretofore, by seniority; the appointment of captain and all higher grades to be made upon the recommendation of nine flag officers of the line of the Navy and to be based upon the fitness of the officer for sea command in the grade to which the promotion is to be made. The committee believed that this method of promotion would secure the best and most capable officers for the command of our ships and the control of our fleet. The method of selection is such that it can be controlled neither by favoritism nor partisan politics. This method will keep in places of grave responsibility the most capable and efficient officers.

In the future high command will come to officers not on account of age but on account of merit. It will stimulate officers and make them worthy of high rank. High rank, when thus possessed, will carry with it indisputable testimony of great merit. Genius is given an opportunity to advance over mediocrity. We consider this one of the most important provisions contained in the bill. The Marine Corps is given the same percentage of officers to enlisted men and also has given it a fair distribution of high and low ranks. This increase of officers is much needed, and will give younger men greater opportunities for advancement in the Navy and prevent the numerous resignations now occurring. It furnishes a continuous plan of promotions, which is absolutely necessary in the Navy in order to have young and capable men in high command. We will, if this provision becomes law, have rear admirals to command the fleets for years, and not be promoted to this high rank and then promptly retired. The bill also gives long-delayed relief and proper promotions to warrant and other petty officers. It also provides that 25 enlisted men, after examination, can be appointed to the Naval Academy. This will give us a higher grade of enlisted men, because every enlisted man will be given an opportunity through work and merit to become rear admirals if found worthy. Thus, Mr. President, is recommended legislation covering the entire personnel of the Navy, which we believe, if enacted into law, will be one of the most potential factors in increasing the efficiency of our Navy.

Having amply provided for the active personnel of the Navy, the next question presented to us was to recommend legislation that would give us a good and sufficient naval reserve. The naval powers of the world in time of peace keep many of their ships in reserve. It is too expensive to keep all of them in commission and on a war basis. If a nation has an ample and efficient naval reserve, it can safely keep a large part of its fleet in reserve with a small complement of men. England at the beginning of the present war had a percentage of trained naval-reserve men to active men of 43 per cent, Germany 104 per cent, and Japan 55 per cent. This number of trained naval-reserve men enabled these nations in a few days after the declaration of war to have their fleets fully equipped on a war basis and ready for immediate action. The rapidity with which this was done by each nation was most astounding and emphasizes the importance of having a large and well-trained naval reserve. To-day our naval reserve, including our Naval Militia, is about 11 per cent of our active enlisted men. One of the greatest needs of our Navy is a trained naval reserve. It will be impossible for us to ever have a well-equipped and efficient Navy that can promptly respond to all the demands made upon it until we have such a reserve. The bill contains well-considered legislation, which we firmly believe if passed will give us such a reserve. The legislation is sufficient to induce trained men of the Navy when they are retired to enter this reserve so they can be called upon whenever needed for naval purposes. We have also recommended legislation which extends to the Naval Militia the same privileges in each of the ranks that the recent Army legislation gave the National Guards. We believe that this is necessary in order to increase our Naval Militia. Under this amendment we require the Naval Militia to drill and prepare themselves equally as the National Guards. When needed they can be called out immediately by the President and be made a part of our Naval Establishment.

The bill also creates a naval flying corps, which will train for us capable officers and efficient men for our aircraft. As the Coast Guards and the Lighthouse Service has been made in time of emergency or war a part of our Navy, we present amendments to provide that these promptly become a part of our Naval Establishment when this contingency arises.

Mr. President, having provided for our fleet afloat the next question for us to consider was the equipment of our navy yards so that the fleet could be promptly supplied and repaired. With-

out efficient navy yards the fleet will quickly deteriorate and ultimately become helpless. Our various navy yards have been much neglected and many of them allowed to greatly deteriorate. Our docking facilities for large ships is deplorably deficient. Our shop equipment for good and economical work is most defective. Few of our yards are equipped for naval construction; only two of them for the construction of capital battleships. This bill makes appropriations to supply these great needs and give us navy yards that can properly take care of our fleet. We consider the navy-yard matters contained in the bill as of as much vital importance as any other of its provisions.

Mr. President, this is a short summary of the most important matters contained in this bill. We believe its enactment will give new life, new vigor to every part of our Naval Establishment. We have sought to give the Navy as a whole greater strength, greater efficiency. We believe the passage of this bill will mark a new era in the history of the American Navy.

Sirs, the American Navy has ever been the pride of our people. They have ever felt that it was their surest and safest defense. We gratefully remember how many difficulties and disasters we have averted in the past by our naval successes. Our debt of national gratitude to the Navy is great and lasting. In times of peace it surveys and charts the trackless sea; discovers and marks the dangers in the routes of commerce; makes researches for science and learning; stands as sentinels on the outposts of civilization; opens up for commerce new and hostile countries; and in every part of the world, by its activity and courage, it redresses American wrongs and asserts American rights. It is the best guardian of the interests of this great commercial people. In every country, in every clime, amid the frozen fields and ices of the North, under the blazing suns of the Tropics, naval officers and men have served and many died, unselfishly contributing to the prestige of this Nation and the glory and renown of its flag. In America's galaxy of greatness no names shine with more sparkling splendor than those of her naval heroes. It can be rightly said that the history of our Navy from the beginning has been "one blaze of glory without a single blot of shame." Sirs, if this Nation is to attain the summit of her possible usefulness and greatness, it must come through her Navy—its power, its triumph, and its success. Prudence and wisdom demand that this Nation should have a great Navy properly to perform its responsible duties and successfully to achieve its great work. I rejoice at this Nation's proud and glorious past, but I rejoice still more at the cloudless future which beckons us on to a still greater greatness and a richer and deeper glory. With strong arms and brave hearts let us fearlessly face our great and responsible future. Let us not be deterred from our duty and destiny by those of our brethren who are frightened by our own prodigious shadow projecting in the world's affairs, and who hesitate and shudder "through craven fear of being great."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, for me to attempt to describe the vital importance of sea power and the needs of the American Navy after the admirable exposition made by the Senator from Virginia would be a work of supererogation, but as I had some share in framing the bill there are one or two points which I desire briefly to emphasize.

I may say what everyone understands, I am sure, that in making this bill there was no party line drawn anywhere. The bill in its important provisions comes with the unanimous support both of the subcommittee and the full committee. It is to my mind a bill of the greatest value and the greatest importance. If this bill in its essential features is carried out as it is proposed to the Senate and passes into law in that form, as it ought, it will be of more value to our peace than all the diplomatic notes that can ever be written.

Mr. President, if there be any nations, either in the west or in the east, which have hostile feelings toward this country or cherish, as I hope they do not, sinister designs, they will take notice of the authorizations contained in this bill, of the program for three years herein adopted, and I think the law containing them will have a more soothing effect and do more to promote kindly feeling on the part of those nations than the most lavish employment of the resources of the English language.

I am aware that it is a large bill. I am aware that the total amount appropriated is very large. Mr. President, money spent on the American Navy, in my opinion, is the most economical expenditure which will be made by this Congress. The American people may very well resent some of the expenditures cast with liberal hand about the country for the promotion of local interests, but I do not believe there is an American of any party who grudges sufficient money to build up and maintain the American Navy. It can not be cheaply done. To attempt to do it cheaply would be the falsest kind of economy.

We have in fact a very great task before us in order to make the American Navy what it should be. This bill goes far to make up for some stinted and ill-balanced appropriations and authorizations from which we have suffered in the last five or six years. The authorizations here are well balanced as they come from your committee.

But it is well to remember that the problem before us is to create a Navy, which is our first and most essential line of defense, as we lie between two oceans, strong enough to protect the country, both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts. We can not rely upon the canal to transfer the Navy from one ocean to another. I do not mean by that that we are in danger of landslides, but the fact that the canal in its very nature is vulnerable. No matter how you fortify or guard it, one desperate man, one intelligent spy, who can make his way within the Canal Zone and put a bomb in the right place at one of the locks will clog your canal for weeks, and it may be for months. In other words, we must make up our minds to have one fleet for the Pacific and another fleet for the Atlantic.

Now, the first steps toward making the Navy what it should be and giving this country the naval defense which it ought to have have been taken in this bill. We have made an increase of men, raising the House provision from 68,000 to 74,000, with power to the President to increase it to 87,000 in time of national emergency. Germany had 79,000 men at the outbreak of the present war, according to the official returns, which gives some idea of what this proposed increase means, and it is far from excessive. By getting those 74,000 men at once, we can bring into commission a large number of vessels, not perhaps of the latest type but valuable fighting ships, battleships and dreadnaughts which are now lying useless at the wharves in the navy yards. We have not enough men to man them, and we ought to have every ship capable of taking a place in the first line at sea, with a full complement of men. A ship is injured by being tied up, and the organization of the crew, of the body of men necessary to make the ship an efficient engine of war, ought to be always prepared.

Therefore from the proposed increase of men we shall get an immediate addition to our Navy in being, and as we add new ships and the oldest ships are laid aside we have the men trained and ready for the new vessels as they come into service.

The authorizations of the Senate committee bill are for 8 capital ships, as they are called, and 58 other vessels—torpedo destroyers, submarines, scout cruisers, fuel and oil ships, and so forth, of different types—making in all 66 vessels to be built at once under the authorizations of this act.

The House provided for five battle cruisers. The need of battle cruisers in the American Navy is a crying one. We ought to have authorized them long ago, but I am sorry to say that authorizations for the Navy as made by Congress, though occasionally generous and frequently the reverse, have almost always been made haphazard and without any regard to proportion in the various branches of the fleet.

It is essential not only to have a large Navy but a well-proportioned Navy. We absolutely need battle cruisers. The House provided for five, a large authorization, but they provided for no dreadnaughts, and the result was an ill-proportioned, one-sided authorization.

Very recently in the present war it has been demonstrated that the theory upon which all nations have acted, that the dreadnaught, the heavy armored fighting ship, is the backbone of the Navy, is sound, and that whatever we do in adding to our Navy we must keep the great central fighting force always up to the highest level which we seek to attain.

Therefore the Senate committee cut down the House authorization of battle cruisers by one, leaving four battle cruisers, which constitute a squadron, and added four dreadnaughts or superdreadnaughts, which balances and proportions the capital ships. It is a large authorization, but we have lost time to make up and it is absolutely needed. I hope that the committee will here receive the solid and undivided support of the Senate in standing by that part of the authorization which will give us eight capital ships.

Mr. President, in addition we have made a program. We took the program of the General Board of the Navy, of which Admiral Dewey is the head, one which they made for five years under the limitations imposed by the department when asking for a program of $100,000,000 a year to be spent annually for a period of five successive years. For a period of five years that program is far too small if we wish to put the Navy, as I believe we do, in the position which it must occupy if our safety is to be consulted and our peace maintained.

But the program which was too small for five years is adequate for three years, and the committee has changed the period of the General Board's program to three years, adopting the various ships and the proportion of ships proposed by the General Board, which is, of course, the highest authority. I think that the program is second only in value to the authorization. Moreover, the reduction of time makes the proportions of the program accord with the authorizations of this year.

There are very many other features of the bill which have been entirely covered by the Senator from Virginia which are of great importance and which, I am sure, will receive the support of the Senate. I will advert to only one or two.

The House put in the bill provisions for a naval reserve, which are substantially the same as the bill for a naval reserve reported unanimously from your committee and now, I believe, on the calendar. With some trifling verbal amendments the committee have adopted the House provision, but they have added to it, as constituting part of the naval reserve of the country, provisions for the Naval Militia, following the bill which has been reported from the House committee and which places the Naval Militia on the same footing as the National Guard.

There is also one other comparatively small item in the bill which the Senate committee has added. I do not recall whether or not the Senator from Virginia mentioned it, but I desire to allude to it, because it seems to me to show the foresight which, I think, characterizes this measure. We have provisions for auxiliary ships in the naval reserve. We know that in any event we shall requisition merchant ships if, unfortunately, we should be forced into a naval war; but we have hitherto had no provision for arming such ships. This bill carries an appropriation of $1,650,000 to provide batteries for auxiliary ships when they are requisitioned. That is half of what is needed.

The next bill will carry the balance, making in all $3,300,000. By that simple and not very expensive provision we are going to put ourselves in such a condition that if war should come we can take the merchant vessels, which we can make useful as auxiliaries, and arm them at once so that there will be no delay.

Mr. President, I have nothing but praise for all the main features of this bill; but there are certain defects in our naval situation which ought not to be overlooked, which it is not in the power of Congress to cure. Our ships are deficient in speed. Congress demands in all these bills the highest practicable speed, and there is no reason in the world that I can see why, with our liberal appropriations, we should not get as high speed in our battleships—I am not speaking of battle cruisers, for we have built none—but in our battleships, as do other nations. I have here in the Navy Year Book a statement as to our two last ships, the *Oklahoma*, of 27,500 tons, with a speed of 20.5 knots; the *Pennsylvania*, which is 31,400 tons, with a maximum speed of 21.5 knots.

Mr. SWANSON. From what page of the Navy Year Book is the Senator from Massachusetts reading?

Mr. LODGE. I take these figures from pages 504 and 505 of the Navy Year Book.

The maximum average speed of the *Nevada* is, in round numbers, 20½ knots; of the *Oklahoma*, 20.5; and of the *Pennsylvania*, 21.5. Those are the actual averages of maximum speed. The last authorization of English dreadnaughts, including the series of vessels which are all in active service now and which comprise the *Queen Elizabeth*, the *Warspite*, the *Barham*, the *Valiant*, and the *Malaya*, the largest of which are 27,500-ton ships, as against the *Pennsylvania* with 31,400 tons. They have, however, a speed of 25 knots, being 4 knots more per hour than the speed of the *Pennsylvania*.

I can not see why we should not get equal speed in the same type of ship. The *Pennsylvania* is larger. I can only speak of what was known before the war; I can not tell what ships have been built since; but the *Pennsylvania* when built was larger than any ship in any other navy. She is powerfully armed. Ships of the same type, which will undoubtedly be built under the authorization of this bill, will carry, probably, guns of 16-inch caliber. There is nothing left to be desired in the power, the strength, or the armor in those ships; and yet they are 4 knots slower than the English ships.

The highest speed of the last three German ships of the dreadnaught type, which do not register 28,000 tons, is 23 knots—2 knots faster than the *Pennsylvania*.

This, Mr. President, is something which Congress can not cure by legislation. It rests with our constructors.

Here, in Ship Data of United States Naval Vessels, January 1, 1916, are stated the trial speeds of all our most recent ships. The highest speed reached was 22 knots by the *Florida* on her trial. None of the others got substantially beyond 21 knots.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts, if he knows, give us the explanation or excuse which the naval constructors or officers responsible for that deficiency in our Navy make for that defect in our ships?

Mr. LODGE. I have never been able to get an explanation. What I can not comprehend is why we have gone behind in speed. We can build as well as other nations; we have as good engines as they can possibly build; and yet we fall short in speed.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does it cost more to give a ship additional speed?

Mr. LODGE. Speed is very expensive; indeed, it is the most expensive thing in the ship. That is the reason why the battle cruiser, which is a lightly armored battleship, is so much more expensive than is the heavily armored dreadnaught. It is speed which constitutes the additional expense.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, in talking with naval constructors I have ascertained that in order to get speed additional machinery must be put in, and that can only be done at the sacrifice of the number of guns carried. A vessel can only carry so much weight. It is also true that the effort is to keep the speed of the various units of a fleet as nearly alike as possible, because unless the whole fleet, or a large portion of it, can travel at the same rate of speed it loses in effectiveness, and to secure speed at the expense of guns would not be a wise solution of the matter.

Mr. VARDAMAN. How does the armament of the English ships and the German ships with greater speed than ours compare with the armament on American naval vessels?

Mr. LODGE. I think they have about the same weight of guns.

Mr. SWANSON. I say that, as a general proposition, in order to obtain speed you have to sacrifice guns to machinery; you have to lessen the number of guns or other weight that the ship has to carry.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator from Massachusetts says that the foreign ships and our ships carry about the same number of guns.

Mr. LODGE. The English ships of which I spoke, the 25-knot ships, are 4,000 tons smaller than the *Pennsylvania*, and they carry eight 15-inch guns as against, I think, twelve 14-inch guns by the *Pennsylvania*. I suppose the weight does not differ materially. I merely mention this, because I hope our builders and constructors will address themselves to this matter. The Congress will not begrudge the money for the necessary speed; and it is incomprehensible to me that we should not be able to get it.

Now I come to another point, Mr. President, concerning which I wish to say a few words, and to remedy which I think the committee in this bill has done something. We have suffered very much from slowness of construction. I went myself over the list of vessels under construction or authorized, and ascertained the date of authorization and the percentage of completion on June 1, 1916. I will call attention to the battleships: The *Arizona*, which was authorized on March 4, 1913, on the 1st of June last was 91 per cent completed—that is over three years; the *Idaho*, which was authorized on the 30th of June, 1914, two years ago, is 60 per cent completed; the *New Mexico*, which was authorized on the same date, is 30 per cent completed; the *Mississippi*, authorized on the same date, June 30, 1914, is 45 per cent completed; and the *Oklahoma*, which was completed on May 2, 1916, was authorized on the 4th of March, 1911.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Five years ago.

Mr. LODGE. Five years ago.

Mr. VARDAMAN. How then does the committee expect to complete the program which they have authorized in this bill in three years?

Mr. LODGE. I am coming to what the committee has done. I think we have done something in that direction. The *Pennsylvania* was authorized on the 22d of August, 1912, and was completed on the 12th of June, 1916, practically four years. I will not go over the others in detail, but I will ask permission to print the table as a part of my remarks. It covers every submarine and all other vessel authorized for the Navy. I will not weary the Senate by going over them, but it is hard to see why a submarine authorized on the 13th of May, 1908, is not yet completed.

Mr. LIPPITT. What year?

Mr. LODGE. In 1908. The *G–2* was authorized on May 13, 1908, and was 92 per cent completed on the 1st of June, 1916. The *G–3* was authorized March 3, 1909, and is 89 per cent completed. I ask permission at this point to insert in the RECORD the table to which I have referred.

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

Vessels under construction or authorized.

	Date of authorization.	Per cent of completion June 1, 1916.
BATTLESHIPS.		
Arizona	Mar. 4, 1913	91.6
Idaho	June 30, 1914	60.6
New Mexico	do	30.8
Mississippi	do	45.7
Oklahoma	Mar. 4, 1911	(1)
Pennsylvania	Aug. 22, 1912	(2)
Tennessee (No. 43)	Mar. 3, 1915	.0
California (No. 44)	do	.0
DESTROYERS.		
Allen	June 30, 1914	81.0
Gwin	Mar. 3, 1915	5.3
Conner	do	5.6
Stockton	do	5.6
Davis	June 30, 1914	82.1
Rowan	do	86.3
Sampson	do	94.7
Shaw	do	33.5
Wilkes	do	68.4
Manley	Mar. 3, 1915	10.5
Caldwell	do	.0
Craven	do	.0
SUBMARINES.		
G-2	May 13, 1908	92.0
G-3	Mar. 3, 1909	89.5
L-2	Aug. 22, 1912	99.1
L-5	do	87.0
L-6	do	82.4
L-7	do	81.3
L-8	Mar. 4, 1913	87.0
L-9	do	96.0
L-10	do	96.0
L-11	do	91.8
M-1	Aug. 22, 1912	96.0
Schley	June 30, 1914	16.8
N-1	do	57.1
N-2	do	57.1
N-3	do	57.1
N-4	do	65.2
N-5	do	64.1
N-6	do	63.1
N-7	do	63.1
O-1	Mar. 3, 1915	0.0
O-2	do	0.0
O-3	do	4.2
O-4	do	4.2
O-5	do	4.2
O-6	do	4.2
O-7	do	4.2
O-8	do	4.2
O-9	do	4.2
O-10	do	4.2
O-11	do	17.1
O-12	do	16.8
O-13	do	16.5
O-14	do	11.9
O-15	do	11.7
O-16	do	10.8
No. 60	do	0.0
No. 61	do	0.0
FUEL SHIPS.		
Maumee	Aug. 22, 1912	[3]99.7
Cuyama	Mar. 3, 1915	63.0
TRANSPORT.		
Henderson	Mar. 4, 1913	63.3
SUPPLY SHIP.		
Bridge	do	66.0

[1] Completed May 2, 1916. [2] Completed June 12, 1916. [3] Lacks engines.

Mr. LODGE. The time is not lost in the actual building so far as I can make out, although it may be in some cases. The English build a battleship in from two years and two months to two years and a half, or a little over. We come pretty near that in the actual building. Our actual building is not slow, but undoubtedly it can be expedited. There is, however, an amount of time wasted in getting ready to build, which causes our ships to lag behind. On the 3d of March, 1915, we authorized the *Tennessee* and the *California*, known as No. 43 and No. 44. That was a year and nearly six months ago, and not one stroke of work has been done on either. The Secretary——

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the reason why nothing was done was because it was impossible to get bids from contractors within the appropriation.

Mr. LODGE. I am going to explain how it happened. The Secretary, unwilling to accept, very probably for good reasons, the bids of the contractors, put those two ships into the Mare Island and the New York Navy Yards, the only navy yards we have to-day with ways on which we can build a battleship, and those ways were occupied by other ships, and those other ships will not be off the ways before September at the earliest.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, does he not think it is proper to state that the Secretary tried to get contractors to undertake the building of those ships for the amounts authorized by Congress, but they would not do so? The bids were in excess of the amount which Congress authorized for those ships, and consequently the Secretary could not accept them.

Mr. LODGE. I was not criticizing what was done. I have no doubt that it was unavoidable. I am pointing out the trouble. The trouble was that when we could not get the contractors to undertake the work, the Secretary had no navy yard in which to build the ships.

I have here a letter from Admiral Dewey, written last September and addressed to Mr. GARDNER, in the House of Representatives. Admiral Dewey's letter is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ADMIRAL OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 24, 1915.

Mr. A. P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives, City.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 22d instant, requesting a reply to the following questions:

"1. How many ways capable of being occupied by battleships and battle cruisers are now available in all our shipbuilding yards, public and private?"

Including the building slips now occupied by vessels in the course of construction, the following are at present available capable of being occupied by battleships and battle cruisers:

New York Navy Yard	1
Mare Island Navy Yard	1
Cramp's Shipbuilding Co	2
Newport News Shipbuilding Co	2
New York Shipbuilding Co	2
Fore River Shipbuilding Co	2
Total	10

"2. How many additional ways could be constructed and how long would it take to construct them?"

The shipbuilding industry of the country would be capable of expansion to meet almost any demand that might reasonably be made upon it. It would be impossible to state the total number of slips that could be made ready in a short time, but additional slips could at least be installed at the following places:

Union Iron Works, San Francisco.
Maryland Steel Co.
New York Navy Yard.
Philadelphia Navy Yard.
Norfolk Navy Yard.
Puget Sound (Bremerton) Navy Yard.

Sincerely, yours, GEORGE DEWEY.

Thus it will be seen that we now could build 10 battleships; but with little trouble, adding Boston to the list, could build 16 at once.

One fertile cause of delay has been the lack of ways and slips in our own navy yards; and this bill, Mr. President, provides for that. That is what I meant, in part, when I said that this bill dealt, so far as Congress could deal, with the promotion of greater quickness of construction. We provide a lump-sum appropriation of $6,000,000, which is to be used for putting in ways for building capital ships at, I think, Boston, Norfolk, Philadelphia, and Puget Sound, and ways for smaller ships at Charleston and New Orleans. I think that is all. This is very important, and it will prevent the recurrence of the situation, for which I blame nobody, but which exists, for we shall have waited over 18 months before beginning the battleships authorized last year, because we had no slips in our own navy yards on which we could put them.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator if that involves the purchase of more land at the navy yards?

Mr. LODGE. No; it does not involve the purchase of a foot of land; it simply is to put in ways.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, does the Senator object to having me ask him a question?

Mr. LODGE. Not in the least. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator was speaking a few moments ago about the difficulty of getting speed.

Mr. LODGE. Would the Senator object to my completing what I have to say in regard to slowness of construction? Then I shall be very glad to have him interrupt me.

Mr. LIPPITT. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the committee has done something else to remedy slowness of construction, and I think it is one of the wisest things in the bill, and it met with the approval of the entire committee. It was framed by Admiral Taylor, the head of the Bureau of Construction, who said it was entirely practicable to comply with it. The clause provides that every ship authorized—not the ships of the program, of course, but every ship authorized under this law—shall be contracted for or be begun in a navy yard prior to January 1, 1917. The

officer in the department charged with construction says that can be done, and all he asked of the committee was that they should give him an ample force of draftsmen, so as to make the plans as rapidly as possible, and, of course, the committee have done that. It is a comparatively small expense.

Mr. President, I think that to remedy these two defects—and there is no use in blinking at the defects which exist—to remedy the defects of insufficient speed, which is a matter that must lie wholly with the Navy Department, and the other defect of slowness in construction, are things to which both the Navy Department and the Congress must address themselves. I think it is one of the merits of this bill that we have gone as far as it is possible for law to go to remedy the great difficulty of slowness of construction.

I now yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. I was only going to ask the Senator, in reference to the lack of speed, whether any of that difficulty was due to the method in which the appropriations were made for these vessels? I notice, on page 170 of the bill, that 10 first-class battleships are authorized, carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessels of their class, and to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, but at a cost not to exceed $11,500,000 each. Now, I do not know how the committee arrives at the cost that has been allowed for these vessels, but the Senator of course knows that there is nothing in shipbuilding that is so expensive as speed.

Mr. LODGE. I know that.

Mr. LIPPITT. The great passenger steamers like the *Mauretania* and the *Lusitania* ran into an enormous cost largely on account of the great speed which was provided for those vessels. The Senator rather intimated that there was some cause that he had not been able to discover that prevented these ships from having the desired speed. It is a matter that has come into my thought a great many times, whether or not this method of appropriating money for battleships and specifying a limit of cost for each vessel was not in itself a matter that so hampered the men who finally had the execution of the provision that they were obliged to sacrifice something.

May I add that I think our method of appropriating for the Navy is not followed by any other nation, if I am correctly informed in regard to the matter.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the language used—"the highest practicable speed," and so on—is the language which has been used in all the appropriation acts. Where Congress has tried to fix a speed it has usually fixed it so far above any possibility of being reached that the ship has not been built.

Mr. TILLMAN. That language has not been changed since I have been in the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. No; it is always the same language; but once or twice we have tried it. We tried it on getting speed for a submarine, and we put it so far beyond anything that any submarine has ever reached, or apparently could reach, that the submarine, of course, remained unbuilt and we had to repeal the provision. I do not think that Congress can undertake to fix speed in the appropriation.

Now, as to the amount, I have not heard it suggested from the department that it was insufficient in any way. We have taken the figures which they gave us. We have not attempted to estimate what a battleship of the highest practicable speed would cost. "Highest practicable speed" means, of course, the highest speed any battleship or dreadnaught of the same type has reached at the very least.

Mr. LIPPITT. It would also mean——

Mr. LODGE. And it might mean more. Now, never has there been—and I think the Senator from Virginia will bear me out in that statement—any suggestion which I have heard, from any of the experts or builders of the department, that we did not give them enough. We have taken their own figures. We have added a million and a half to each battleship in this bill; and $11,500,000 is the cost of the ship without her equipment.

Mr. LIPPITT. I am glad to hear that statement on the part of the Senator, that there has been a million and a half dollars added to the estimated cost of each of these vessels—I suppose as a matter of leeway in the construction. Of course, the Senator remembers there were two ships—two battleships, I think—which were not begun by the present Secretary of the Navy, because he stated that the bids made for them by private contractors exceeded the authorized limit.

Mr. LODGE. I have just been stating that case.

Mr. LIPPITT. So that in that particular case, certainly celerity was sacrificed. Whether anything else was or not, on account of the limit of cost, I do not know.

Mr. LODGE. In that case, as I understand it, the contractors bid more than the amount appropriated by Congress, and the Secretary had no choice. He had to put them into the yards where they could be built within the amount. At least, so it is stated; but they were put into navy yards where there were no ways on which to build them.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to his colleague?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. WEEKS. It seems to me that the Senator from Rhode Island, with his usual good business judgment, has put his finger on one of the great weaknesses in our method of making appropriations for the matériel of the Navy. I have always felt, and I have not seen any reason to change my judgment, that Congress is not competent to determine what particular craft should be built or what particular type should be built. The reason for this extraordinary bill which the Senate is now considering is because the judgment of the General Board of the Navy has not been followed in the past.

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator realizes that there is not a ship in this bill that does not come from the General Board.

Mr. WEEKS. I am not criticizing this bill; I commend the bill; but I am saying that the reason why it is so large is because the judgment of the General Board has not been followed.

Mr. LODGE. That is perfectly true.

Mr. WEEKS. And if Congress, in its wisdom, could adjust its policy so that it would make a lump appropriation for the building of new craft and leave to the General Board or to the Navy the disposition of that appropriation, we would have a more homogeneous and in every way a better Navy than we have to-day or will have if we follow the present practice.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if the method he suggests is not substantially the method that is adopted by all the other great navy-building nations of the world—by England, Germany, Japan, and France? I think it is almost exactly the policy of other nations.

Mr. LODGE. The ships authorized in this bill are every one of them ships recommended by the General Board. There is not a single recommendation there that does not come from experts. There is not a thing put in by the committee itself; not one thing. The money, the price, the number of each class of ships is all from the board of experts. I have always fought for this system, and I believe in it.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I commend this bill in that respect. I think, with perhaps one exception, it is the first Navy bill that has ever been presented to Congress which does carry out the recommendations of the General Board. So that the general criticism which I am just making does not apply to this bill at all, but does apply to what I think should be a general policy.

Mr. LODGE. I quite agree with what my colleague says, only I did not want it to be understood that it applied to this bill, for I do not think it does. It applies to building bills in the past. I have already said, when I began to speak, that this bill went some distance in remedying the haphazard, ill-balanced, often stinted, and ill-proportioned recommendations of Congress, made by committees and compromises, and all that, without any system.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, so long as the thread of the discussion of my colleague has been broken——

Mr. LODGE. I have finished.

Mr. WEEKS. I want to make one inquiry on the subject to which he has just alluded, relating to the building of ways in navy yards, so that battleships may be constructed in other yards. I understand that this bill, as I recall it, provides for the construction of ways in three additional navy yards.

Mr. LODGE. No; five.

Mr. WEEKS. Five additional navy yards?

Mr. LODGE. Well, for battleships in four, and for vessels of smaller tonnage in two.

Mr. WEEKS. I want to say, Mr. President, that in my judgment the committee is taking exactly the wrong course in doing what it is doing in that respect. We are going to have a great construction department in every navy yard, very much of which will be idle most of the time. The only real reason why the Government should construct its own ships is to prevent the possibility of collusion among outside builders, and the charging of a higher price for the building of ships than the facts warrant. The Government should be in position to build one or two ships annually, if necessary, in order to prevent this collusion; but for the Government to establish great construction departments for the building of battleships in seven navy yards is, in my judgment, a mistaken policy. It will tie up a great amount of money in those plants, and it will necessarily mean that in order to keep them employed, instead

of giving construction to private builders in future, it will very largely, if not entirely, be done at the navy yards.

I do not know anyone who has given this subject serious consideration who believes that a ship can be constructed as cheaply in a navy yard as it can be constructed under contract. My judgment is that the additional cost is not very far from 10 per cent in every case; and while I agree that we ought to be in position to prevent the Government being imposed upon, I do think it is a distinctly wrong policy to establish these great construction departments in all of our navy yards.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am entirely at one with my colleague on that matter. I think the private yards ought to and will build most of our ships, and will build them faster, and will build them in the long run cheaper.

Mr. CLAPP. And better.

Mr. LODGE. No; not better. The work is no better; but they will build them cheaper, and they will build them faster. I know that navy yards are slow. But there is no escape apparently from the fact that when the private yards found that there *was not* a Government yard with unoccupied ways they put on prices which went beyond the appropriations authorized by Congress, and they lost the ships and the country lost the time, which is far more important. It is not all on one side.

I believe it is just as important to encourage the shipbuilding industry of this country in the private yards as it is to have sufficient navy yards; but I also think that the shipbuilders should show a readiness to come forward on the Government work and meet us at least halfway. If, as is stated, they had not taken advantage of a situation where the only ways the Government had were shut up—which has resulted, as I say, in delaying two of our ships 18 months—if they had not come forward in that situation with bids in excess of anything the Secretary could accept, as I understand it, under the law, there would not have been an appropriation here to fit other yards with ways. If that appropriation is made to fit these other yards with ways, the shipbuilders have brought it on themselves. They are able business men, but apparently they brought it on themselves.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, he has referred to the fact that this program is to be completed within three years, as I understand.

Mr. LODGE. The program is for three years.

Mr. LIPPITT. What assurances are there that it will be completed in three years? When the Senator says it is to be completed in three years, does that mean that there is some place in the bill where it says that it shall be completed in three years, or is there any forfeiture if it is not completed in three years? How is that to be accomplished?

Mr. LODGE. The bill provides a program which Congress is to carry out, and Congress can carry it out or not, as it pleases. The program simply means that Congress in the next three years will authorize 16 capital ships. That is all that the program means.

Mr. LIPPITT. That they will authorize them—not that those, or any part of them, will necessarily be completed in that time?

Mr. LODGE. Well, it is the intention of the Government, of course, to build them. It is the intention of Congress to have them built. We appropriate the money. We compel all authorized this year to be begun before the 1st of January, 1917. We have abundant slips in this country. We can build 10 battleships at once to-day without adding to the Government navy yards at all.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, the Senator only a minute ago was reading a list of vessels which had taken three, four, five, and in some cases eight years to build.

Mr. LODGE. Yes, Mr. President; and some of those were in these private yards.

Mr. LIPPITT. I am not responsible for what yards they are in. I was only wondering and trying to obtain from the Senator for my own information a knowledge of what security or guaranty, or what probability, if I may put it that way, there was of the completion of some part of this program within this definite date. Of course I understand what the Senator says about Congress appropriating money. I understand that Congress can dictate the date at which any enterprise shall be begun; but what I was really trying to arrive at was what the probabilities were as to the date of its being completed.

Mr. LODGE. I will answer that as well as I can. I will take the authorization of this year, which, if the Senate committee's program for this year prevails, as I hope and believe it will, will require the construction of 8 capital ships—I will confine myself to them—and 58 other ships. We have appropriated the money. The money is all there. We have also provided that the ships shall all be contracted for or be begun in the navy yards before the 1st of January, 1917, and I have no doubt they will be.

Of course it is beyond the power of Congress—it is beyond the power of any human being—to say whether all those contracts will be fulfilled or that no accidents will occur. I think that we have done all that any reasonable men of common sense can do. We can not build them ourselves with our own hands; we have got to contract for them or build them in our yards, and that we have provided for.

Mr. LIPPITT. Does the Senator think that with reasonable diligence it is possible to complete them within that time? I am asking for information.

Mr. LODGE. I believe it is. We authorize 66 ships this year, and they can be completed within three years. I am speaking of capital ships. I believe they can be perfectly completed and afloat in three years. I think there is no reason in the world why they should not be. If, as required by this bill, they are contracted for and the construction begun before January 1, 1917, they can be built inside of three years. There is no lack of speed either in our navy yards or in private yards when they get started.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask, for my own information, whether in the Senator's opinion there is any way of accelerating the construction of these vessels, either by working with two shifts or by offering a bonus for speed, as is sometimes done?

Mr. LODGE. We have provided in the bill for all that matter of bonuses and premiums.

Mr. LIPPITT. For additional speed?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. LIPPITT. That only applies, I suppose, to private yards?

Mr. LODGE. It would only apply to private yards.

Mr. LIPPITT. So there is no premium for speed in Government yards?

Mr. LODGE. Of course in a Government yard we can double or treble the shifts at any time.

Mr. LIPPITT. I suppose the theory is that the vessels will be constructed with one shift, and that is eight hours' work, and not with two shifts.

Mr. LODGE. You mean on the basis of three vessels inside of three years?

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. That is on the eight-hour basis.

Mr. LIPPITT. Has the Senator looked into the question whether it would be possible to work two shifts?

Mr. LODGE. That is perfectly possible.

Mr. LIPPITT. And if so what would be the additional cost?

Mr. LODGE. Of course that would add to the expenditure?

Mr. LIPPITT. About what is the shortest time in which a vessel could be delivered?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know how much it would reduce it. That has not been considered.

Mr. LIPPITT. Does the Senator know how much would be the increased cost?

Mr. LODGE. That has not been considered. We have gone on the basis of an eight-hour day.

Mr. OVERMAN. How are we going to get the armor? We are going to build an armor plant.

Mr. LODGE. That is provided for.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does the Senator think that we could do it in three years?

Mr. LODGE. We shall get the armor. There are armor-plate plants now that are going to supply us with every pound of armor we need. There is no trouble about that.

Mr. OVERMAN. We can not get it from our own armor factory.

Mr. LODGE. No armor-plate factory can be constructed in the three years.

Mr. OVERMAN. It will take three years to complete it.

Mr. LODGE. Fully.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then we shall have to buy it by contract?

Mr. LODGE. We shall have to buy it from private contractors. I regard the armor plant as a pure waste of money. I have no more to say about that.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator understands that we can buy armor, the best in the world, at the lowest market price?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; now, at the lowest price in the world.

Mr. WEEKS. So there is no need for anxiety.

Mr. LODGE. We can get plenty of armor. The delay will not come there.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I was called out during a portion of the address by the Senator from Massachusetts. I have also been absent for nearly two months from the Senate, and during that time there has been considerable discussion concerning this bill. I have not had the benefit of that discussion nor of what has been written concerning it while it

was being considered by the two committees. However, I notice that the House provided for no battleships whatever, and that the bill as reported provides for 10 battleships, 4 of which are to be begun as soon as practicable.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, if the Senator will allow me, so as to get it straight, the House adopted no program at all, so that column in the program has no bearing on the bill as it passed the House because they adopted no program. There is nothing to compare with it. All you can compare is their authorization with our authorization. We propose to authorize four dreadnaughts and they authorized none.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is, we authorized four dreadnaughts at the present time and they authorized none at the present time, and we provide for 10 in due time. To the average person it would seem rather peculiar that great committees such as the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House and the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate should disagree to such an extent that one committee receiving its information from the same source should provide for no battleships and the other committee of Congress should provide for 10, to be constructed in the near future. I should like to secure such information as I may, and I know the Senator can give it to me as well as anyone, as to the reason for this great divergence of views with reference to the necessity of battleships.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I can not possibly explain what was operating in the mind of the House committee and of the House in authorizing five battle cruisers and nothing else. It was not in conformity with the recommendation of any board or of the Navy Department or of anybody who is best fitted to speak on the subject. Why they did it I do not know. It resembles many of our past bills which have been made without any regard, as I have said and as my colleague has said, to the recommendations of the experts and of the General Board of the Navy Department, in a perfectly haphazard way by the committees here. Why the committee of the House did it I can not understand. Our authorization is based on the recommendation of the General Board, which is supported by the Navy Department in every branch, and I can not help thinking that it is the correct balance. I have no doubt whatever myself that it is.

Mr. McCUMBER. We have been following for years a program of two battleships of the dreadnaught type each year. It is something strange to me that we should suddenly drop them entirely from a program in a bill that passed the House. I have not read the arguments; I have not read the reasons. I assume that some reasons were given in the House why we should not build any more dreadnaughts, and whatever those reasons were, whether they were valid or otherwise, it would be very agreeable to me if I could find out from any member of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. I wish I could, but, I am sorry to say, I can not inform the Senator of the reasons of the House committee. I can think of none myself. There ought to be some sound reason, but what their reasons were I do not know.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the greatest disgrace of the present century is that war between civilized nations is still a possibility. That such a barbarous condition should exist in the civilized world is painful to every lover of humanity and to every believer in the great brotherhood of man.

Every civilized country of the world requires its subjects to submit their differences and disputes to tribunals and courts that have been organized under the forms of law for their settlement, and yet these same nations violate the principle of the law which they compel their subjects to obey. The citizen must maintain his rights and settle his grievances before tribunals organized according to law upon principles of justice and of right. Kings and rulers settle their disputes upon the field of battle without regard to right, without regard to justice, and upon the erroneous and barbarous theory that might makes right. It is to be regretted that the great advance that has been made from barbarism by the different nations of the world by which the disputes and controversies arising within each nation are settled according to forms of law and upon the principles of justice and equality has not extended to the settlement of disputes between the nations themselves. Why is it that rulers who are able to settle all controversies within the countries they control are not able to settle controversies between those countries?

A sentiment for a universal peace has been growing rapidly for many years. This is because the great common people of the world who have been compelled to fight the battles of the kings and rulers have realized from their own experience and their own observation the unreasonableness and criminal folly of going to war. The citizen who bears the burden and endures the suffering is the one who has finally awakened, and he will eventually make his voice heard all over the civilized world. This sentiment has grown gradually, but steadily and firmly. Instead of coming down from the throne it has come up from the common people to the ruling classes. The rulers of the world have been the last to really grasp and understand the situation. The public sentiment of the civilized world is crying for international arbitration and a world's peace.

In every civilized Government public sentiment is the great moving force that will ultimately and finally be victorious. Statesmen do not always know it, rulers do not always recognize it, but in the end it will always prevail. It is more powerful in its influence than the combined armies and navies of the world. Before its silent tread the relics of barbarism and oppression must disappear and vanish in the retreating mists of an ignorant and superstitious past. This sentiment that comes up from the common people will finally reach the rulers and make its influence felt upon thrones. It will not cease in its onward march until all the rulers and lawmakers of the earth recognize and realize that the same principle which settles disputes between individuals will with equal justice settle all the controversies that can arise between nations.

The great world struggle now going on has been a sad disappointment to all of the participants. They all see even now that whatever the outcome may be the burden and the suffering can not be shifted from one to the other. They all realize now that military preparation is not a safeguard of peace, and when exhaustion takes place, as soon it must, and the end comes, as come it will, there can be no shout of victory from any source. They know now that ruin, desolation, suffering, and bankruptcy will enshroud the world like a pall. The entire civilized world will know then, as it is beginning to see now, that might does not make right; that war is not only wrong and useless, but that it brings misery to the victor as well as to the vanquished. It is a practical demonstration to all the world of the uselessness of armies and navies in any effort to maintain international peace and the absolute necessity of some international agreement between the civilized nations of the world to maintain a peace that can not be maintained by armament, and is not only desirable but necessary for the future happiness and preservation of the human race. The greatest war of history has followed close upon the world's greatest military expansion, professedly done in every case for the preservation of peace. From untold numbers of ruined firesides, from the broken hearts of millions of widows, from the sufferings of unnumbered thousands of fatherless children, from hundreds of battlefields strewn with dead and dying, writhing in human blood, surrounded by dismembered bodies of innocent human beings that once were fathers and sons in pleasant homes; from every honest, loving heart all over the civilized world goes up a wailing, despondent cry demanding peace.

The time has come when all the people from the peasant to the king are in favor of international peace. The difficult question is to agree upon some practical method for its attainment. Modern inventions for the transportation of people, property, and intelligence have made the world much smaller. Whether we wish it or not the fact remains that the modern commercial business world has brought the people of every country into close and intimate relations with the people of every other country. Business and commerce pay but little heed to national boundaries, and nations, wherever located, are next-door neighbors. International communication is now not only of daily occurrence, but of daily necessity. Upon closer acquaintance civilized man is found to be about the same regardless of his geographical location or his nationality. Closer intercourse dissolves the jealousies that were barriers in the distance. The fundamental principles of equity and justice which form the foundation of all civilized Governments are the same the world over. When we are brought into this close relationship the scales fall from the eyes, prejudice flees from the heart, and we realize that humanity is the same everywhere.

The love, the hate, and the passions of men are the same on both sides of the great Atlantic. When by war's cruel hand the husband, the father, and the protector of the home and the fireside is taken away, the suffering and the misery which follow is not measured by nationality. The human heart is the same, whether it is carried in the breast of an Englishman, a Frenchman, a German, or an American. Humanity is broader than nationality and embraces within its scope the entire world. The measure of human happiness will not be full, the heights of national glory will not be reached until we can look over the world and in the words of the Scripture, truthfully say of every citizen of every civilized nation, "Is he not, after all, my brother?"

Why, then, should there be war? I know that it can truthfully be claimed that this cruel and heartless demon has settled

many questions of world-wide importance, but it never settled one on any principle of equity, morality, or justice. In modern times its decree has been more often right than wrong, because the great spirit of public sentiment when once aroused has not only furnished money and men for the right, but it has thoroughly imbued the hearts of its soldiers with a determination and a bravery that has done much to place the victory where it properly belonged. But what a sacrifice of human life and treasure. I do not want to be understood as claiming that all the wars of history were wrong or could have been avoided. Some of them were carried on for liberty, some were waged for mercy, and some were fought for humanity. The soldier, not only of our own land, but of other countries as well, is entitled to all the consideration and all the honor and glory that humanity can give or bestow. I am, however, proclaiming against the conditions existing in modern civilization that make war not only sometimes necessary, but at any time possible.

But the question recurs again, What is a practical way to solve the difficulty? We have advanced to such a state that all civilized countries of the world are in favor of peace. Who shall take the first step? Who can take the first step with the assurance that beneficial results will follow? What nation to-day occupies such a unique position in civilization that it can step out into the open and say to all the civilized world, "We are willing to submit to peaceful arbitration every international dispute, every international controversy, not only of the present but of the future as well"? What nation, in assuming this position, can command not only the respect and belief of other nations in the integrity and the honesty of its purpose, but can also receive the respect and approval of humanity's peace-loving sentiment that will go far toward impelling the balance of the civilized world to accept the proffered hand of universal brotherhood?

If we study the history of European nations, we will find a trace, at least, of jealousy between them that has come down from the days of barbarism. In ancient times the king, who was then supposed to possess, and is still suspicioned to have, some attributes of Divinity, ruled only over such territory as he was able to hold in subjection. He broke no law of nations if, without notice, cause, or provocation, he made war upon his neighbor in an attempt to conquer and subdue additional territory. He violated no principle of government if in carrying out his purpose he resorted to trickery, chicanery, and dishonesty. The result was that every ruler was suspicious of every other ruler. This suspicion and lack of confidence anciently existing between kings, and permeating the framework of every European nation, has, in a lessening and decreasing degree, come down to the present day. It exists now—unconsciously perhaps—but exists nevertheless, and must be taken into consideration whenever any European nation makes a proposition to other European nations for the settlement of any great international question. This condition was well paraphrased by a great European statesman in comparing European conditions with those of America, when he referred to it as "American boldness and European suspiciousness."

In the New World, where our Government's leadership and controlling influence are recognized and acknowledged by all the world, these conditions do not obtain. Here the divine right of kings has never been recognized. We have not only disclaimed the right of conquest ourselves, but we have refused to recognize it in others. We have not only refused to recognize this right in the strong nation, but we have protected the weak nation against it. Moreover, we have shown to the world our unselfish devotion to that principle to the extent of sacrificing life and treasure in the defense of the weak against the strong—the protection of the downtrodden and oppressed against oppression. Our entire national life has been emblematic of an unselfish respect for the right of other nations and is not tainted with that suspiciousness which has come down to others from ancient times. Our position among the nations of the world in this respect was well illustrated by what happened in the recent war between Russia and Japan. When these great nations had each other by the throats and were struggling in mortal combat the entire world was aroused to admiration by the action of America's great President. Neither one of the warring nations had expressed any desire for peace. Neither one had shown any disposition to cease the conflict. Neither one had asked for any intercession, and yet, in the midst of the bloody conflict, when America's voice was heard, they both halted, they both ceased, they both followed, they both obeyed. It was because they knew—all the world knew—that in the voice which called them from the battle field to reason's court there was no taint of selfishness; that in that call there was no suspicion of an ulterior or dishonorable motive, but that in the heart of that great statesman, whose voice they heeded, there was only the purity of a humane effort to bring about the welfare of all. From the very nature of the development of other nations from the barbarism of ancient times it is quite apparent that no other ruler of the civilized world could have made that proposition with the same successful results. In response to the friendly intervention of the American Government Russia and Japan appointed commissioners to agree upon terms of peace.

While these commissioners were in session on American soil a notable assemblage for the advancement of international arbitration was in session at Brussels, the capital of Belgium. At this meeting of the Interparliamentary Union there were representatives from practically every civilized country in the world except Russia and Japan. We watched with hopeful anxiety the reports which the cable brought us of the progress that was being made by these peace commissioners at Portsmouth. In that assemblage, composed of representatives from two continents, there was a unanimous wish, a united hope, a fervent prayer that America's intervention would prove successful. As a fitting close of that great international conference, the representatives of Belgium invited all the delegates to a reception held in that historic building where the cohorts of Napoleon were assembled in revelry on the eve of Waterloo. The rooms were decorated with the colors of all nations.

The finest band in Belgium was playing her national air. In the midst of it the music suddenly ceased. All eyes were turned to the rostrum. We saw the leader of the band seize from the decorations of the hall the American flag, and using it as a baton, he waved it over the heads of the musicians, and in answer to his action, there burst forth the rapturous strains of the Star-Spangled Banner. For a moment, and a moment only, there was silence, and then there burst forth a roar of applause which clearly indicated that every one there understood that beneath the fathomless deep the electric spark had brought the welcome news that on the shores of America an agreement for peace had been signed. On the occasion of nearly 100 years before the revelry was interrupted by the booming of cannon, but on this occasion it was the joyous message that under the leadership of America the peace of the world had been established. That was an occasion, my countrymen, when it was greater to be an American citizen than to wear a crown.

Students of history will not find it difficult to see that there is but one Government in the world which occupies such a position among the nations that without arousing any suspicion or jealously, can take the step—can make the move that will make war practically an impossibility in the future, and bring about the establishment in its stead of international arbitration. The world is anxious for permanent peace. At the close of the present struggle, Europe will be ready for it. All civilization and humanity are praying for it and the eternal hand of Fate is beckoning for America to take the lead. At the close of the present war, our President, having been duly authorized by Congress, should propose to the belligerent nations that we desire to enter with them into the treaty of peace, and that we are anxious to provide in such treaty for the settlement of all future international disputes and controversies through the establishment of a permanent court of arbitration. We should also propose that the treaty of peace shall provide for the limitation of armaments both on land and sea, with a provision for the establishment and maintenance of an international navy.

Civilization is ready for this step. The present great contest is a demonstration that the method of the past of settling disputes between nations is a failure. Instead of justice, it brings misery and suffering, not only to one belligerent, but to all. It demonstrates that militarism will neither preserve international peace nor settle any international dispute with justice. Even before its termination, while the result is not yet known, all honest men agree that the peace and happiness of mankind would be safeguarded if by an agreement between nations, war could be made impossible. Our Government occupies a position that will enable it to take this great step for the benefit of humanity. Even though we may not believe we can obtain all that is desirable in such a treaty, there is no reason why we should not at least make the effort. Even if we feel that such an effort would be a failure, we ought not permit an opportunity such as this to pass by without making the effort. But, Mr. President, we will not fail. If in good faith we make this effort, there is every reason to believe that all of the belligerent nations will welcome our suggestion and will be willing to provide in the treaty of peace as nearly as possible against any contingency that will bring war in the future. If we make this effort, good will result from it. In my judgment, the nations will receive such a proposition with joy. They will welcome any honest attempt to better the conditions of the past. It is perfectly evident to all men that all the belligerent nations are wearied of the present contest

and that they will all realize when exhaustion brings the end there can be gain for none, but that the sufferings brought on by the war must be shared by all.

No money payment can compensate for the suffering it has entailed and even if it were possible to demand an indemnity there will be no nation financially able to pay it. The time will then be ripe for an international peace, and the American Government is the one nation in all the world that can take the first step to bring it about.

But in making this proposition we must be free from any hidden purpose to gain an advantage. We must make it clear that we have no selfish interest to be gained. We must express a willingness to bring to this arbitration court every international controversy that the unknown future has in store. With clean hands, a pure heart, and a clear conscience must we approach the great altar of international justice.

Will there not be reason to question our motive if while we are negotiating with the balance of the civilized world to take this important step for a permanent peace we are at the same time engaged in the greatest military expansion program that we have undertaken in our history? The present bill appropriates more money for the expansion of our Navy than has ever been appropriated by any nation in the history of the world in time of peace. Can it be said that we are acting in good faith when we extend one hand in brotherly love to the balance of the civilized world while with the other we are building up a bigger Navy and a larger Army than we have ever maintained in time of peace? If we desire a world's peace and are willing to make the attempt to get it and desire to impress the balance of the world with our sincerity and honesty, will it not be better that we give to the world an illustration of our sincerity by staying the hand of military preparation at least until we have made an honest attempt to perpetuate peace? If we ourselves are engaged in a mad race to build up the biggest Navy and organize the largest Army of the world, can we expect other nations to place full confidence in our professions when we are asking that the building of huge monsters of human destruction should cease? Can we even satisfy ourselves that we are doing all that can be done to bring about international arbitration when in time of profound peace we are making the greatest preparation for war that has ever been made in the history of the world? Would it not be said to us that we ought to first take the beam out of our own eye in order that we may see clearly to take the mote out of our brother's eye? Can we not at least wait until the present struggle shall end before we embark on this enormous military building program?

With the exception of the American Government, all the leading nations of the world are engaged in the present conflict. No one doubts but a treaty such as I have outlined, signed by our Government and these belligerent nations, would bring about the abolishment of war between the nations. In fact, such a treaty, signed by nations that can be numbered on the fingers of one hand, would insure the lasting and permanent peace of the entire world. My own idea is that if such a treaty were entered into, even the international navy would soon become unnecessary. I doubt very much whether such a navy would ever be called upon to enforce the decree of the permanent international court. While it would perhaps be wise to provide for such a navy, it would, in my judgment, soon become evident that we could trust to the honor of the nations and to the enlightened public sentiment of the civilized world for the honest enforcement in good faith, of every judgment and decree. This has been frequently demonstrated in the past. In all the history of the world there has never been an instance where an offending nation has failed to carry out in good faith the judgment of an international court.

Heretofore one of the greatest obstacles to the peaceful settlement of international difficulties and to the submission of such controversies to arbitration has been that the offense has been committed or the controversy has arisen before any rule for its settlement has been provided or any tribunal for its determination has been selected. This ex post facto machinery for the settlement of differences is not only unreasonable and illogical, but it has been guarded against by all the civilized nations of the earth in the regulation and management of their own internal affairs. When disagreeing nations are aroused to anger by the excitement and the prejudice of the people on account of real or imaginary wrong, it is a poor time, indeed, to attempt to agree upon a fair method of settlement or to exercise that calm deliberation which should be invoked in the selection of the arbitrators.

The treaty of arbitration should be general and apply to all disputes. It should be negotiated in time of profound peace and not with reference to any particular controversy. Its judges should be selected in time of peace and their terms of office should be permanent. In order that they might be removed from and uninfluenced by any bias or prejudice they should be appointed for a long term of years, and while holding this great international commission they should be prohibited from accepting or holding any other office or emolument from any government.

It would not be necessary that all of these arbitrators so selected should sit in judgment upon every case brought before the court. In case of any dispute between nations that could not be settled by diplomacy the contending parties would ordinarily have no difficulty in selecting a tribunal from this list of the international court; but in case of any such dispute, it would be easy to provide that members of this court should themselves select the arbitrators to pass upon the contention.

This would give us an international court that would command the absolute respect of all mankind and the confidence of all civilization. Its judges would be free from any bias, prejudice, or excitement that might exist in either one or both contending nations. Instead of representing one government as against the other they would, in fact, represent without partiality and with equal justice both of the contending parties. Their life work would be the study of international questions. They would become learned—yea, experts—in international law and the administration of international justice. The world would have a list—a school—of international jurists devoting their time, their energies, and their lives to the study of international questions and the settlement of international disputes. In the hands of these men the peace of the civilized world would be safe and secure. The judges of this court occupying this dignified, exalted, and unparalleled position before the world, would be further removed from bias and prejudice than any court that has ever been instituted in the history of mankind. Its decisions would become precedents for future action. It would not be long until we would have a line of decisions that would eliminate the uncertainty of international law which has existed in the past. A question once determined by this great court would be accepted by the world as the law for the future, and the result would be that we would not only have an international tribunal for the peaceful settlement and determination of all international questions, but that their decisions would become the beacon lights of peace for future generations, whose rays of wisdom and of reason would light up the dark waters of international jurisprudence, mark out the course of safety for every ship of state, and warn her mariners of the shoals of disaster.

The size of an army and navy to be maintained by any nation in time of peace is always a relative one. It always depends to a great extent upon the size of the army and navy of other nations, particularly of those other nations located in close proximity. If Canada were building forts along our northern boundary and filling them with armed men, it would perhaps be necessary for us to likewise build forts on our side of the line and to increase our standing Army. The building of huge forts by both France and Germany along their common boundary illustrates this principle. Every time one of these nations built a fort the other nation felt bound to duplicate it on her side of the line. Men and corporations, lured by the desire of financial gain, have often exaggerated the building of forts and battleships and the increasing of armament. There was reliable evidence to show that prior to the present war a great firm engaged in the manufacture of arms procured the publication of a false news item in a Paris paper announcing the purchase by France of a large number of guns of a certain type. This item was reproduced as a matter of news in Germany. It resulted in the German Government purchasing a large additional supply of arms, and when this fact was published in the papers it meant another order placed with this same firm by the French Government. And so, starting with nothing, they succeeded in having two great Governments purchase a large supply of the goods which they had manufactured. It is idle for us to suppose that we can announce a naval program by which in a certain number of years we shall have the largest or the second largest navy in the world. For every battleship which we build, for every military expansion program that we announce, there will be an added stimulus for military expansion on the part of the balance of the world. When we announce that we are about to enter a mad race to build up a huge military program of expansion we must not forget that it is a race in which all other nations can enter as well as we. We must not forget that by our very action we are compelling other nations to enter the same race. With such an announcement on our lips, we can not consistently ask the balance of the world to disarm or to agree upon the settlement of international disputes by arbitration, unless we couple with our proposition the willingness on our part not only to cease in our program of military expansion but that we will disband the increase of our Army

and agree to turn the proposed addition to our Navy over to an international tribunal to be used for the preservation of a world's peace and for the enforcement of the decrees of an international court.

The world has for a few years been witnessing the spectacle, which would be humorous if it were not so expensive and serious, of seeing the leading nations of the world in a mad race to see which could build the largest battleship. The world is startled by the announcement that one great nation is building a monster of destruction that will outclass and outshine anything that the world has ever seen. The excitement has hardly quieted before the next nation has made arrangements to duplicate this mistress of the seas. The third nation begins the task of building a pair of them. The fourth, not to be outdone, lays the plans for one larger than any of the others, and so on around the circle. And when we have reached the point of the beginning it is found that the first ship, supreme and invincible in her day, is outclassed, out of date, fit only for the scrap pile or for a target for other vessels to play with. If this race keeps up, it will not be long until the nations will have to begin to remodel and deepen their harbors to make a landing place for their battleships.

Ever since the beginning of the present war there has been the most wonderful propaganda in our country for increased armament that our civilization has ever seen. Under the cry of "preparedness" there has been an organized effort from one end of the country to the other demanding the increase of our Army and Navy. Newspapers everywhere have been filled with accounts of the impending dangers of attacks from foreign foes and the conquest and subjugation of our country by foreign enemies. From the rostrum, from the theater, from moving-picture films, from editorial columns of great newspapers, from magazine articles, from fascinating books published upon the subject, even from the pulpit, and also from ex-Presidents and from the present occupant of the White House have come gloomy prophecies, forebodings, and warnings that in a day or an hour we may be overridden, subjected to conquest, and made the subjects and vassals of some conquering military host. Most of these dire prophecies are coupled with the most lurid descriptions of the helplessness and the incompetency of our own Army and Navy. In some way these alarmists feel that at the close of the terrible, gigantic struggle the wounded cripples of surviving armies, backed up by bankrupt nations, are going to cross the great Atlantic, and perhaps the Pacific, and trample our flag in the dust, destroy our cities, ruin our homes, and make us all the unwilling slaves of hard-hearted and cruel monarchs. Just how much this organized effort to create public sentiment in favor of military expansion has been influenced and created by men and corporations who have already made billions out of profits from the manufacture of war materials, and who fear that at the close of the present war they will find themselves, like Othello, without occupation, may be a question of honest dispute, but that material assistance has been given to this propaganda by these interests will not, I think, be denied. It is one of the noticeable features of this great campaign that most of the men and corporations who are backing it up look with holy horror upon any proposition that will eliminate private profit from the manufacture of war materials, and they are therefore, with some notable exceptions, opposed to Government instrumentality in this line of business. We ought to take private profit out of "preparedness," and if this could be done there would be a change come over the spirit of the dreams of many of our friends who are advocating this great preparation for human slaughter.

I know the size of an army and navy is a question upon which honest citizens may honestly differ, and by no means do I desire to charge a lack of wisdom or a lack of patriotism against any man or set of men because they believe in great military expansion. I know that millions of our people are perfectly honest in this belief. To judge from the display and the noise made one would think that they were nearly unanimous. What I do believe is that this great propaganda, 90 per cent of which, in my judgment, is founded upon fallacy, has, nevertheless, been instrumental in misleading not only thousands of ordinary citizens but some of our greatest leaders and statesmen. We are confronted now with the greatest naval program that has ever been presented to Congress in our history. Every thinking man must realize that there must come an end to this military expansion, otherwise we will bankrupt ourselves even though war never comes. The danger is that when we are thus prepared and feel that we are invincible the perfectly natural thing will happen, and that is that we will become boastful of our supremacy and be lead into a war that we otherwise would have avoided. A program of "preparedness" carried to extremes will ruin us whether war comes or not. It eventually means exhaustion. In either case it means the enrichment of the few and the pauperizing of the many.

The wasting of our sustenance for things that can bring no economic return, whether in time of war or in time of peace, will, if carried to the extreme, eventually bankrupt and ruin any nation that is engaged in it. War and the preparation for war in time of peace always means the increase of the cost of living. This will not perceptibly affect the man of immense income, but it is a serious proposition to be faced by the poor man who is already taxed to his utmost to support himself and family. The increase of the cost of living falls upon the poor as well as the rich. War and the preparation for war makes the rich richer and the poor poorer, and when this increased cost is added to the burden of the man whose meager income is already scarcely sufficient to feed and clothe those dependent upon him, it means for this class an economic slavery that will not long be tolerated by the American citizen. I want to warn my countrymen that if this unreasonable program for "preparedness" is continued and carried on the civilization of our age will not be able to bear the burden, and revolution will be the inevitable end.

The power of taxation is a necessary attribute of government. Government sometimes uses this power to tax out of existence some evil thing or ruinous product injurious to life and health, but we ought to be reminded that this same power can be used to tax the poor out of their homes; to tax the ordinary citizen and commercial enterprise into bankruptcy. And when our citizens realize that for every dollar that is raised by the Federal Government by taxation the largest portion of it is demanded as a tribute to the bloodthirsty demon of war, there will come a revulsion on the part of the citizenship that will make its influence felt throughout the country. When the people realize that the present bill is such a terrible increase over the enormous appropriations of the past and that this bill is only a step toward higher and greater appropriations, we will find that the cry for international arbitration is coming not only from those who are moved by the idea of philanthropy, mercy, and humanity, but that these ranks are joined by and intermingled with all of the ordinary commercial interests and moderate taxpayers of the country. The people of the civilized world are taxing themselves to death in order that the survivors may kill each other according to the most modern methods of warfare, with the most modern weapons of human destruction.

As startling as the financial conditions are, they do not tell one-half the story. Human life can not be measured in dollars and cents; broken hearts can not be healed by the appropriation of money; human suffering and misery can not be alleviated by financial consideration; and humanity stands helpless in the face of death and destruction. At the fireside of practically every home in Christendom there is a vacant chair, made so by war. For every vacant chair there is a ruined hearthstone; for every hearthstone there is a sorrowing widow; and for every widow there is a fatherless child. For every penny spent for war there is a sigh of grief; for every shilling there is a tear of sorrow; and for every dollar there is a broken heart. The amount expended on this account in the civilized world in one year would give a shelter to every pauper, a home to every unfortunate, and an education to every child. At the present rate of increasing expense it will not be long until this great chain will break of its own weight; until every nation will become bankrupt and every moderate taxpayer will become a pauper. As this time approaches the forces of international peace will become more numerous and more powerful. Humanity will shake off the shackles of barbarism and defy the god of war upon his throne. In this battle of reason, that tyrant of oppression, that ruler of ignorance, that demon of superstition, in whose decree there is no mercy, in whose judgment there is no justice, will be driven from his throne and relegated beyond the portals of a universal peace, to be remembered only as a horrible nightmare of an unholy and unrighteous past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POINDEXTER in the chair). The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, under the subhead "Pay, miscellaneous," on page 2, line 21, after the words "religious books," to strike out "expenses of purchasing paymasters' offices, including clerks, furniture, fuel, stationery, and incidental expenses," and on page 3, line 8, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$50,000," so as to read:

For commissions and interests; transportation of funds; exchange; mileage to officers while traveling under orders in the United States, and for actual personal expenses of officers while traveling abroad under orders, and for traveling expenses of civilian employees, and for actual and necessary traveling expenses of midshipmen while proceeding from their homes to the Naval Academy for examination and appointment as

midshipmen; for actual traveling expenses of female nurses; actual expenses of officers while on shore patrol duty; hire of launches or other small boats in Asiatic waters; for rent of buildings and offices not in navy yards, including the rental of offices in the District of Columbia; expenses of courts-martial, prisoners and prisons, and courts of inquiry, boards of inspection, examining boards, with clerks' and witnesses' fees, and traveling expenses and costs; expenses of naval defense districts; stationery and recording; religious books; newspapers and periodicals for the naval service; all advertising for the Navy Department and its bureaus (except advertising for recruits for the Bureau of Navigation); copying; ferriage; tolls; costs of suits; commissions, warrants, diplomas, and discharges; relief of vessels in distress; recovery of valuables from shipwrecks; quarantine expenses; reports; professional investigation; cost of special instruction at home and abroad, including maintenance of students and attachés; information from abroad and at home, not exceeding $50,000, and the collection and classification thereof; all charges pertaining to the Navy Department and its bureaus for ice for the cooling of drinking water on shore (except at naval hospitals), telephone rentals and tolls, telegrams, cablegrams, and postage, foreign and domestic, and post-office box rentals; and other necessary and incidental expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 19, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$310,000" and insert "$190,000, and for necessary expenses for the interned persons and prisoners of war under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, including funeral expenses for such interned persons or prisoners of war as may die while under such jurisdiction," and on page 4, line 1, after the words "in all," to strike out "$1,050,000" and insert "$915,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That the sum to be paid out of the appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and purchasing pay offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, shall not exceed $190,000, and for necessary expenses for the interned persons and prisoners of war under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, including funeral expenses for such interned persons or prisoners of war as may die while under such jurisdiction; in all, $915,000: *Provided*, That hereafter expenditures from the appropriation for obtaining information from abroad and at home shall be accounted for specifically if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, they may be made public, and he shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditures as he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 22, to insert:

For the purpose of expediting the transaction of the necessary departmental business in connection with the construction of new vessels herein and heretofore authorized and the increases in personnel, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to employ, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service act of January 16, 1883 (22 Stats. L., p. 403), during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, such civilian civil-service employees, in addition to those authorized in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved May 10, 1916, as may be necessary to carry on the work of the Navy Department and its various bureaus and offices, and the sum of $250,000 is hereby appropriated for the pay of such additional employees, the total of such expenditures not to exceed for: Office of the Secretary, $10,000; Office of Chief of Naval Operations, $5,000; Office of Solicitor, $4,000; Office of Judge Advocate General, $6,000; Bureau of Navigation, including one chief of division, at $2,250, $18,000; Office of Naval Intelligence, $5,000; Bureau of Steam Engineering, $31,000; Bureau of Construction and Repair, $41,000; Bureau of Ordnance, $10,000; Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $30,000; Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, $10,000; Bureau of Yards and Docks, $75,000; and Office of Naval Militia, $5,000: *Provided*, That a report shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session showing in detail the number of persons so employed, their duties, and the compensation paid to each: *And provided further*, That the sum of $25,000 is hereby appropriated for the purchase of such stationery, drawing materials, and furniture as may be required by the various bureaus and offices of the Navy Department to carry out the duties imposed upon them.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry before the committee amendment, beginning with line 23, on page 4, and extending over to line 8, on page 6, is acted upon, which is, as I gather from the reading, an increase over the House appropriation of some $250,000.

Mr. SWANSON. It is not an increase, if the Senator will permit me. We have increased the personnel of the Navy by some 20,000 men and also the personnel of the Marine Corps. We have likewise increased the authorizations for construction. The legislative bill, which was passed long before the pending bill was reported, did not make any provision for the additional positions required in connection with drafting and other things. Heretofore a lump sum has been allowed for these purposes out of the amount appropriated for construction; but there is no specified limit as to what the department might do; they could spend a million dollars or one million and a half dollars or $300,000. We thought it was wiser to specify what they should have. Therefore we have changed the general appropriation usually carried, to meet the increased expenditure, on account of the additional construction provided for, and have specified where the additional assistance shall be available. We thought that was the better plan.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Am I to understand the Senator to mean by his explanation that the $250,000 provided here is simply to meet expenses or obligations already incurred under legislative acts already passed?

Mr. SWANSON. No; not already passed, but such as will occur on the passage of this bill; for instance, increased construction.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Ah, yes. For instance, if the increases in this bill recommended by the committee are adopted by the Senate and become a law, then this is necessary?

Mr. SWANSON. This is absolutely necessary. If the House provisions were retained——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am going to ask, then, that this amendment be passed over until the amendments are considered which, if adopted, will make necessary this expenditure.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the House provisions for five battle cruisers, and for the increase of the personnel by 15,061 men, and for the increase in the Marine Corps, and other increases, would necessitate a large increase—possibly three-fourths of this. It is limited simply to 1917. There is no clerk hire provided for longer than the fiscal year 1917. It is all for immediate work.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand that at least a portion of the appropriation which it is proposed that the Senate shall now adopt as in Committee in the Whole is contingent upon whether amendments which have not yet been considered by the Senate are adopted.

Mr. SWANSON. I will say to the Senator that if those amendments are not adopted I will recur to this one and give an opportunity to have the action on it reconsidered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Why would it not be just as well, I will ask the Senator, to pass over this amendment until those have been acted upon?

Mr. SWANSON. I would prefer acting on this one now. It would take too much time to go back and recur to matters like this. It seems to me better to dispose of them as we go along.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not believe it will expedite matters to proceed in that way.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator insists on it, I will ask that it be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over, without objection.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 8, to insert:

Hereafter interned persons and prisoners of war, under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, who are or may become insane, shall be entitled to admission for treatment to the Government Hospital for the Insane.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 18, after the word "allowances," to strike out: "All orders issued by the Chief of Naval Operations in performing the duties assigned him shall be performed under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and his orders shall be considered as emanating from the Secretary, and shall have full force and effect as such," and on page 7, line 2, after the words "Marine Corps," to insert:

Provided, That hereafter the Chief of Naval Operations shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, be charged with the operations of the fleet with the preparation and readiness of plans for its use in war. This shall include the direction of the Naval War College, the Office of Naval Intelligence, the office of Target Practice and Engineering Competitions, the operation of the Radio Service and of other systems of communication, the operations of the Aeronautic Service, of Mines and Mining, of the naval-defense districts, Naval Militia, and of the Coast Guard when operating with the Navy; the direction of all strategic and tactical matters, organization, maneuvers, target practice, drills and exercises, and of the training of the fleet for war; and the preparation, revision, and enforcement of all tactics, drill books, signal codes, and cipher codes. The orders issued by the Chief of Naval Operations in the performance of the duties enumerated in this paragraph shall be considered as emanating from the Secretary of the Navy when authorized or countersigned by him, and shall have full force and effest as such. The Chief of Naval Operations shall be charged with the preparation, revision, and record of Regulations for the Government of the Navy, Naval Instructions, and General Orders. He shall advise the Secretary concerning the movements and operations of vessels of the Navy and prepare all orders issued by the Secretary in regard thereto, and shall keep the records of service of all fleets, squadrons, and ships. He shall advise the Secretary in regard to the military features of all new ships and as to any proposed extensive alterations of a ship which will affect her military value, and all features which affect the military value of dry docks, including their location; also as to matters pertaining to fuel reservations and depots, the location of radio stations, reserves of ordnance and ammunition, fuel, stores, and other supplies of whatsoever nature, with a view to meeting effectively the demands of the fleet. In preparing and maintaining in readiness plans for the use of the fleet in war he shall freely consult with and have the advice and assistance of the various bureaus, boards, and offices of the department, including the Marine Corps headquarters, in matters coming under their cognizance. After the approval of any given war plans by the Secretary it shall be the duty of the Chief of Naval Operations to assign to the bureaus, boards, and offices such parts thereof as may be needed for the intelligent carrying out of their respective duties in regard to such plans. The Chief of Naval Operations shall from time to time witness the operations of the fleet as an observer. He shall ex officio be a member of the General Board.

So as to make the clause read:

Hereafter the Chief of Naval Operations, while so serving as such Chief of Naval Operations, shall have the rank and title of admiral, to take rank next after the Admiral of the Navy, and shall, while so serving as Chief of Naval Operations, receive the pay of $10,000 per annum and no allowances. To assist the Chief of Naval Operations in performing the duties of his office there shall be assigned for this exclusive duty not less than 15 officers of and above the rank of lieutenant commander of the Navy or major of the Marine Corps: *Provided*, That hereafter the Chief of Naval Operations shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, be charged with the operations of the fleet with the preparation and readiness of plans for its use in war. This shall include the direction of the Naval War College, the Office of Naval Intelligence, the Office of Target Practice and Engineering Competitions, the operation of the Radio Service and of other systems of communication, the operations of the Aeronautic Service, of Mines and Mining, of the Naval Defense Districts, Naval Militia, and of the Coast Guard when operating with the Navy; the direction of all strategic and tactical matters, organization, maneuvers, target practice, drills and exercises, and of the training of the fleet for war; and the preparation, revision, and enforcement of all tactics, drill books, signal codes, and cipher codes. The orders issued by the Chief of Naval Operations in the performance of the duties enumerated in this paragraph shall be considered as emanating from the Secretary of the Navy when authorized or countersigned by him, and shall have full force and effect as such. The Chief of Naval Operations shall be charged with the preparation, revision, and record of Regulations for the Government of the Navy, Naval Instructions, and General Orders. He shall advise the Secretary concerning the movements and operations of vessels of the Navy and prepare all orders issued by the Secretary in regard thereto, and shall keep the records of service of all fleets, squadrons, and ships. He shall advise the Secretary in regard to the military features of all new ships and as to any proposed extensive alterations of a ship which will affect her military value, and all features which affect the military value of dry docks, including their location; also as to matters pertaining to fuel reservations and depots, the location of radio stations, reserves of ordnance and ammunition, fuel, stores, and other supplies of whatsoever nature, with a view to meeting effectively the demands of the fleet. In preparing and maintaining in readiness plans for the use of the fleet in war he shall freely consult with and have the advice and assistance of the various bureaus, boards, and offices of the department, including the Marine Corps headquarters, in matters coming under their cognizance. After the approval of any given war plans by the Secretary it shall be the duty of the Chief of Naval Operations to assign to the bureaus, boards, and offices such parts thereof as may be needed for the intelligent carrying out of their respective duties in regard to such plans. The Chief of Naval Operations shall from time to time witness the operations of the fleet as an observer. He shall ex officio be a member of the General Board: *Provided further*, That if an officer of the grade of captain be appointed Chief of Naval Operations he shall have the rank and title of admiral, as above provided, while holding that position: *Provided further*, That should an officer, while serving as Chief of Naval Operations, be retired from active service he shall be retired with the lineal rank and the retired pay to which he would be entitled had he not been serving as Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not rise in any spirit of hostility to this amendment at all. Will the Senator from Virginia state, by way of explanation, what the relations of the Chief of Operations will be to the General Board of the Navy under this very much enlarged control, practically as deputy commander in chief, as it were, of the Navy?

Mr. SWANSON. This is not an enlargement at all. This is simply putting in the form of law the present regulations in connection with the Chief of Operations. These regulations have been promulgated, and we want to make the Chief of Operations stronger, more efficient, and more permanent, and so the regulations at present existing in the Navy have been put into law.

Mr. LODGE. There is nothing new in it at all.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is already in the regulations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 9, to insert:

An officer of the Corps of Civil Engineers may be detailed as assistant to the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks and an officer of the Corps of Naval Constructors as assistant to the Chief of Bureau of Construction and Repair; and, in case of death, resignation, absence, or sickness of the chief of bureau, shall, unless otherwise directed by the President, as provided by section 179 of the Revised Statutes, perform the duties of such chief until his successor is appointed or such absence or sickness shall cease.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 19, to insert:

That hereafter such amount may be expended annually for pay of drafting, technical, and inspection force, from the several lump-sum appropriations in which the specific authority for such expenditure is given, as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary; and the Secretary of the Navy shall each year, in the annual estimates, report to Congress the number of persons so employed, their duties, and the amount paid to each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 11, to insert:

Fuel oil: For an investigation of fuel oil and gasoline adapted to naval requirements, including the question of supply and storage, and for the purchase of necessary instruments and appliances and the extension of the naval fuel-oil equipment plant at the navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa., and the employment of civilian fuel-oil experts and assistants, $60,000.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator whether the committee made any investigation on its own account of this oil proposition?

Mr. SWANSON. I will say to the Senator that since 1908 all of our destroyers have used oil, and since 1911 all of our battleships have used oil. Unless we can get a good low-grade oil that can be utilized and that is efficient it is very expensive. This is to make an experiment in our own navy yard at Philadelphia for the purpose of ascertaining the cheapest and most efficient low-grade oil we can get. By experiments and discoveries we can save a great deal of money in this way.

Mr. NORRIS. What kind of oil do these vessels use now? Can they use crude oil in their engines?

Mr. SWANSON. They use crude oil—the lowest grades of oil.

Mr. NORRIS. Where is the supply secured?

Mr. SWANSON. They get some of it from Oklahoma, some of it from California, and some from other places, wherever it is offered by the lowest bidder.

Mr. NORRIS. Has the Navy Department undertaken to develop any oil wells?

Mr. SWANSON. We have a fight now in the Senate in connection with some oil lands that have been set aside for the naval reserve, which they are trying to take from us, and we are opposing that course.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator refers to a bill pending before the Public Lands Committee; but the particular information I wanted to get, if I could, from the Senator, was whether or not the Navy Department has so far actually drilled any oil wells.

Mr. SWANSON. It has not. Some money was appropriated last year to make some experiments, but what the results have been I do not know. But we have not been able to use the lands that have been set aside, because we have not the pipe lines, and the title to them is involved; and until that is fixed up nothing can be done.

Mr. NORRIS. The title is only involved in part. It is conceded that these lands set aside, according to a law passed by Congress, as a reserve for a supply of oil for the Navy belong to the United States; but there are other people, private parties, who claim title to a large number of tracts within the reserve.

Mr. SWANSON. At the last session of Congress the Naval Affairs Committee recommended and Congress made an appropriation to make experiments and investigations in connection with these oil lands, and to employ counsel to defend the title, which is being done; and this is simply to make some experiments as to the kind of fuel which can be best used in the Navy economically and efficiently.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the intention of the Navy Department in regard to that proposition? Is it the intention that the Navy Department will drill oil wells in these reserves and supply itself from the oil fields belonging to the Government?

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, this $60,000 does not appertain to that at all. This $60,000 appropriation is to make experiments to ascertain the best grades of fuel oil to use; to get experts to ascertain what kind of fuel oil, whether bought or used out of our own oil wells, is best adapted to our purposes. There is a very long letter here from the Secretary of the Navy showing the urgent necessity of that in order to find the most economical use of oil for these ships.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator that I am not moved to ask my question by any opposition to this amendment. I am not opposed to the amendment; I am in favor of it.

Mr. SWANSON. I think the purpose of the Navy is to do all it can to get possession of these oil lands that have been set aside as a naval reserve.

Mr. LODGE. That is not covered by this appropriation at all. This appropriation has nothing whatever to do with the oil lands.

Mr. NORRIS. I should think it might be used for that purpose. It says:

For an investigation of fuel oil and gasoline adapted to naval requirements, including the question of supply and storage.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, it will take some time, but I will read the reasons for this appropriation. I mean, we have a most elaborate statement of it. It was not projected into the bill in ignorance. I have the full statement here.

Mr. NORRIS. I will not ask the Senator to read that unless he wants to do so——

Mr. LODGE. It is a page of fine print.

Mr. NORRIS. Because I am in favor of this amendment. I want it done. The Senator from Massachusetts, and also the Senator from Virginia, seem to be laboring under the impression that I am opposed to it. I wanted to find out—and I thought this amendment was a good place to find out—if the Senator knew just exactly what the intention of the department was and what success it had had in regard to the supply of fuel oil.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the Secretary of the Navy has written to the chairman of the committee asking him to do everything he can, to me asking me to do all that I can, and also to Senator LODGE, asking him to do all that he can, to protect and take care of the naval reserves that have been set aside for the Navy. We will soon require about 5,000,000 barrels of oil a year to take care of our Navy.

Mr. BORAH. You are not trying to do that in this bill?

Mr. SWANSON. No; it is not in this bill.

Mr. BORAH. It will take some time to do that.

Mr. LODGE. It is not touched in this bill.

Mr. NORRIS. I heard the Secretary of the Navy on the stand before the Committee on Public Lands; and I agreed with him, and do agree with him, in the main, on that point. I want to help him accomplish what he is trying to do. It was the Secretary's idea that this naval reserve was itself to be used as a great storage supply of oil for the Navy, unless the Government loses the suits in which the title to quite a large number of tracts included within this reservation is involved. In that case the private parties, by sinking wells on their land, might perhaps drain the public land. I thought an investigation of that question would be included in this item, because it says, "including the question of supply."

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska possibly has in mind the action of the Attorney General in prosecuting the suits in naval reserve No. 2 in California. An appropriation of $50,000 was made by the last Congress for the prosecution of those suits, which was again repeated this year. While the Assistant Attorney General was on the stand before the Public Lands Committee I asked if, in the prosecution of those suits, any money was used which had been set aside for the Navy, such as this item for the investigation of oil lands. I must confess that I did not receive a satisfactory answer, and I believe the intimation was very clear that the money appropriated in the naval bill for the purpose of investigating the sources of oil supply, storage, etc., was diverted for the purpose of paying counsel and other expenses of the prosecution of litigation.

I judge that in the Senator's mind there is that confusion—what part of the money is used for litigation and what part of the money is used legitimately for the investigation of the subject, so that the Navy Department may be informed on this subject. That department is indeed in need of information because it has recently raised a hue and cry that the oil resources of the United States were being appropriated by private parties to the detriment of the Navy, whereas the facts are that the only matter in dispute between the Navy and the oil operators relates to naval reserve No. 2 in California, consisting of 30,000 acres, 20,000 acres of which, two-thirds, are patented lands, or lands clear listed for patent; and there is only a matter, with other deductions, according to the estimates, of from four to seven thousand acres of land that is capable of any further diversion from private ownership. Hence this naval-oil reserve, this so-called naval reserve No. 2, which is involved in so much controversy, is owned to the extent of two-thirds of its area by private operators, acquired under then existing law, held by unassailable title.

Hence, the Navy Department was not justified in misleading many good people into believing that the oil operators in California were without warrant either disposed or in a position to interfere in any way with the use of oil by the Navy.

They are simply taking care of their own oil, and the oil is available for the Navy just as soon as the Navy is ready to pay for it. There is no way of dispossessing those two-thirds owners, held of unassailable title, except by compensation. Not certainly by confiscation. The litigation which is now being prosecuted, while no doubt zealously conducted, has in many cases been conducted in a spirit of hostility to men who may be likened to the pioneers of this country, who went into the hard and difficult places, as the western Senators understand, and who have, by their enterprise and industry, developed natural resources which otherwise never would have been known.

It has been asked by the Senator from Nebraska if it is the intention of the Navy Department to drill wells. The Government has never drilled a well. The Government, as such, has never done anything to develop the land, because it has been the policy of this Government from the beginning to offer inducements and encouragement to the pioneer to develop its mineral resources; and that this is to-day a country rich in minerals is due simply to the wisdom of the policy of the law, and not because the Government itself has done any pioneering, any work of development.

I may say, in this connection, that had the Government spent out of the Federal Treasury, as is so frequently done now, large sums of money for the purposes of development, the cost would have exceeded the value of the output, because we all know in the West that the pioneer has, in the greater number of instances, failed in his enterprise, and it is only the few who have succeeded. They, in the minds of men, are the most conspicuous, however, until the impression has gone abroad that private individuals have profited by the neglect of the Government in developing, on its own account, mineral lands; whereas it is a fact that were the mineral lands developed by the Government, the Government would have been, in a money sense, the loser, and the great West possibly would not have been opened by an enterprising and intelligent population of men and women, who are the glory of their common country.

I do not wish to delay in any way the proper discussion of this measure; but I must say here and now that the Navy Department has created a false impression as to interference in any way by the men of California and the West with the oil supply, so called, of the Navy. It is well to remind the Senate at this time that the presidential withdrawal of these lands in September, 1909, was in the nature of an exercise of usurped power. The Constitution provides that only Congress, having exclusive jurisdiction, shall dispose of the public lands; and the President, in spite of that provision of the Constitution, withdrew these lands in California. The Supreme Court has decided by a divided court that because Congress has not disaffirmed the unauthorized act of the President, it has, by some unknown principle or process of jurisprudence, become a valid act. Because Congress failed to disaffirm an unauthorized act of the Executive, it became a valid act!

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. PHELAN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I think the Supreme Court in that case decided that power usurped becomes legitimate if frequently exercised.

Mr. PHELAN. I am very glad that the Senator from Colorado, so eminent an attorney, reinforces and affirms my understanding of that decision. There was a very able dissenting opinion in that case, which, in the estimation of many lawyers, is regarded as a very sound interpretation of the law. But what we are doing in the contemplated legislation is an appeal from the law to the lawmaker. Hence it is not necessary to criticize the opinion of the court, except in some measure to justify those men who went in after the presidential withdrawal and whose lands I do not refer to. But I say that two-thirds of that area in California is held by unassailable title by the men who went in before the presidential withdrawal, and that others, having been advised by learned counsel that the presidential withdrawal was unauthorized, and who established rights prior to the act of Congress of June, 1910, which did authorize subsequent withdrawals, were safe in making their investment and employing their labor. These men, victims of a questionable interpretation of the law, now ask preferential treatment in leasing on a one-eighth royalty the lands on which they have spent their time and money. This is the essence of the matter which so alarmed the Navy.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the remarks of the Senator from California, because, clear and explicit as they are, they tend to clear up a situation that has been greatly misunderstood over the country, not only in regard to oil but in regard to our other natural resources. I want to say, however, that I am very glad indeed that the committee has seen fit to insert this amendment in the bill providing for a real investigation of the oil supply and of the danger that threatens it, if there be any, because it seems that from direct governmental action we can get no unity of opinion.

At the present time, in regard to the California situation and in regard to the oil situation in other States of the West, on the one hand, a drastic course is demanded by one department of the Government, upon the theory and upon the avowed statement that unless such a course is taken we might as well quit building battleships that shall use oil as fuel. In other words, it is asserted that the whole idea of oil as a fuel for the Navy is threatened unless the Government at once goes in and takes possession of all these oil fields. On the other hand, the head of the department which has these matters directly in charge says, in private and in statements in the newspapers, that there is no danger to the oil situation of the country so far as the Navy is concerned.

I for one will be glad to have some commission or some committee that will act in an unbiased way and report to Congress

what is the exact situation in regard to our oil supply, because I am satisfied that if an unbiased report is made there will at once go out an invitation to people all over this country to go and make proper use of these supplies which the good Lord has put underground in the United States and to use them for the benefit of the whole country.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Certainly.

Mr. PHELAN. For the purpose of the RECORD, it may be stated that whereas the Senator from Virginia stated that 5,000,000 barrels of oil were necessary for the Navy annually, as a matter of fact only about 600,000 barrels of oil are being consumed to-day, but that the increase of the Navy in the course of five, six, or seven years will probably require the amount of 5,000,000 barrels annually. Now, in the 3,000,000 acres of Government oil land there is estimated to be 175,000,000 barrels of oil, as against a yearly consumption to-day of 600,000 barrels. So the experts are of the opinion that the Navy is not justified, as the Senator has said, in informing the country that the oil supply is about to be depleted, and that oil-burning ships will have to be abandoned unless some remedy is given on the part of the Government.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It is exactly the same cry that has been made year after year whenever the natural resources of this country have been sought to be touched and made available. Less than five years ago it was asserted by the head of a scientific bureau of the Government that unless steps were taken to stop the indiscriminate mining of coal and to acquire coal lands we had not more than enough coal to last this country 50 years, when, as a matter of fact, everybody who has investigated the subject knows that we have enough to last this country 50,000 years at the present rate of consumption, and the rate of consumption is annually decreasing every year by the use of additional fuels.

Mr. PHELAN. I hope it will not be understood from what I have said that I oppose this item. I am heartily in favor of it; indeed I would be in favor of increasing it on the theory that the Navy is entitled to information which it does not now possess.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I wish to supplement what has been said on this matter by remarking that I learned with very great regret from the statement of the Senator having charge of the bill that this item bears no relation whatever to the matter of deposits of oil within the naval reserve. Were we not so advised from so authoritative a source I would say that it must of necessity refer to that source of supply. The expenditure is to be made for the purpose of investigating among other things the question of supply and storage of fuel oil for the use of the Navy. It would seem to me that that language is not only sufficiently comprehensive to embrace an inquiry of that character, but it could hardly be given any other interpretation.

The Senator advises us that he, as well as the distinguished ranking Republican member of the committee, have been requested by the Navy Department to do everything that they can to preserve intact these naval reserves. I should be glad to lend whatever feeble support I may be able to contribute to that policy if upon an investigation of the matter it seems economically desirable to do so, having in mind the necessities and the requirements of the Navy.

But, Mr. President, I am perfectly satisfied that neither of the distinguished members of the Naval Committee nor the Navy Department itself is in possession of any information of such a character as ought to govern and influence this body or the coordinate branch in reference to legislation upon this subject. Among other things, for instance, here is a very considerable tract of land set apart as a naval reserve—tens of thousands of acres. That looks as if it were a great body of land available as oil land, but the truth about the matter is that a very considerable area of that reserve has passed out of the hands of the Government and is now owned by private individuals whose title is not open to question and whose title has not been questioned by anyone. That eliminates so much from the reserve. Then title to another very considerable portion of the reserve has passed out of the hands of the Government. The right of the party to whom it has gone is challenged by the Government and suits are now in progress to reinvest the Government with the title to the lands with which it has thus parted. Just exactly how much land is thus involved in those lawsuits and what the prospects are of recovering in those lawsuits is a matter concerning which the information that has been given to us is not particularly definite or satisfying. We shall not be able to know much, if anything, about the extent of our resources here until we have some information along that line.

But more important than that, Mr. President, are two other considerations. It is insisted quite strenuously and apparently with much persuasive force that the lands thus held in private ownership are interspersed among the entire body of lands included within the naval reserve, and that the owners of the private lands are entitled to sink their wells and pump dry the whole pool beneath the lands held by the public as well as those held in private ownership, and that unless the Government goes to work and pumps as well as the private owners the private owners will soon exhaust the entire pool or, at least, will exhaust the pool in the course of time. On the other hand, it is disputed that the geological conditions are such as to permit the depletion of the lands in that way. Of course, if that contention is sound, it would be the height of folly to preserve these lands as a part of a naval reserve unless the Government goes to work at once to prospect the lands which it owns and engages in the work of exhausting the pool in competition with the private interests, and if that is sound we must then either abandon the naval reserve or we must immediately make provision for pumping the lands held in public ownership and storing the product for future use.

Then, Mr. President, that involves another consideration. These reserves are far inland. The California reserve is away off in the desert, in the southeastern part of the State. The reserve in the State of Wyoming is something over a thousand, possibly fifteen hundred miles from the seaboard. If we are going to utilize them, evidently transportation facilities must be provided so that the product of the operations, if the Government is going to carry on any mining operations, may be transported to the seaboard, where it may be utilized for fuel purposes. Consequently the question addresses itself as to the advisability and the economy of constructing transportation systems for the purpose of making this supply available.

Then, Mr. President, beyond all that, of course anybody who knows anything about this business recognizes that it is not profitable, that it is not economical, to take oil out of the ground which contains valuable gasoline and other high-priced products of that character and use it for fuel purposes, and that in order to handle this thing economically gasoline and other high-priced products must be extracted and the refuse used for fuel purposes only. In other words, there is a refining proposition that is included in the general matter of the utilization of these naval reserves.

Bear in mind I do not mean to assert that it is not a wise policy for the Government to reserve these great deposits of oil for the use of the Navy; but, Mr. President, the question whether they ought to be reserved as is proposed or ought to be allowed to be appropriated by legitimate laws applicable to the case, as has been done in the past, is a question of the most profound importance, and with respect to many features of which we have not the information that we need in order to guide us to a proper conclusion as to what ought to be done with these reserves.

Now, I have very great respect for the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Virginia who has charge of this bill, but I do not think that he has any more definite information on this matter than I have. I should hesitate a long time to say that it is a good thing to let these reserves stay just exactly as they are, and I should hesitate a very long time to say that they ought to be turned over the same as all other public lands for exploitation by private individuals.

Accordingly, Mr. President, if the language of the amendment is not broad enough to authorize a thorough investigation by the Navy Department into the advisability of preserving those naval reserves and to investigate how available they are or may be made for the purpose of supplying the needs of the Navy, I shall tender an amendment to enlarge the scope of the amendment. My judgment about it is that the language is ample, but in view of the statement made by the Senator in charge of the bill, if the parliamentary situation will permit, I will offer the following: After the word "storage," in line 14, on page 10, I move to insert:

And the availability, economically and otherwise, of such supply as may be afforded by the naval reserves on the public domain.

Mr. SWANSON. I accept that amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I offer an amendment to the pending bill, which I ask may lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 22, after the word "aircraft," to insert "including dirigibles," so as to make the clause read:

Aviation: For aviation, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for procuring, producing, constructing, operating, preserving, storing, and handling aircraft, including dirigibles, and appurtenances, maintenance of aircraft stations and experimental work in development of aviation for naval purposes, $3,500,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for drafting, clerical, inspection, and messenger service for aircraft stations shall not exceed $25,000.

Mr. SWANSON. I move, in line 22, to insert the word "rigid" before "dirigibles."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 2, to strike out "Advisory committee for aeronautics: For traveling expenses of members and employees, $2,000; 2 technical assistants, at $2,500 each; 1 clerk, at $1,500; 1 clerk, at $1,000; 1 draftsman, at $2,000; 1 draftsman, at $1,000; 2 laborers, at $660 each; 3 mechanics, at $1,200 each; rent of office, $1,200; supplies, $7,800; special reports, $5,000; movable combination field office, machine shop, dynamometer shed, hangar, and power plant, $15,000; dynamometer carriage and truck, $18,000; aeroplane, including motor, $10,000; transmission dynamometer, $1,000; ripograph, $1,000; stabilizer, $1,500; anemometers, barographs, inclinometers, incidence indicators, $1,500; miscellaneous supplies, spare parts for operation of field plant, $5,580; in all, $85,000"; and insert:

Advisory committee for aeronautics: For traveling expenses of members and employees; 2 technical assistants, 2 clerks, 2 draftsmen, 2 laborers, 3 mechanics; rent of office in the District of Columbia, and rent of a site for shop, hangar, and experimental work under direction of the committee; supplies; special reports; movable combination field office, machine shop, dynamometer shed, hangar, and power plant; dynamometer carriage and truck; aeroplane, including motor; transmission dynamometer, ripograph, stabilizer; anemometers, barographs, inclinometers, incidence indicators; miscellaneous supplies, spare parts for operation of field plant; in all, $85,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this amendment provides "for traveling expenses of members and employees; two technical assistants, two clerks, two draftsmen, two laborers, three mechanics; rent of office in the District of Columbia," and so forth. There is no other appropriation bill that I know of which passes Congress without some limitation as to what you are going to pay draftsmen, laborers, mechanics, and so forth. As to the clerks, it does not state of what grade they are to be. Under this provision they can pay clerks $1,800; they may all be classed as fourth-class clerks. They may be classed as clerks of class 1, at $1,200. No definite rate of pay is provided in the amendment, but it appropriates a lump sum. There is no limitation as to the amount that shall be paid to laborers, clerks, and so forth.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, if he will read the House provision for which this is offered as a substitute, it is there definitely stated——

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator——

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the Smithsonian Institution, through a member of its advisory committee, stated that it was impossible for them to state definitely at what rate they could get experts. They did not ask to increase the appropriation at all, but to give some latitude until the clerks could be obtained and the difference in cost ascertained between the pay of a clerk and an expert. It requires some experts. They wrote us a letter stating that it would be better to have the same appropriation but to give them in the organization some latitude as to the salaries to be paid this year. After that is done they expect to have it fixed definitely. They are to organize this office with $85,000, and we thought we could fix some specific sums for experts, but they did not know at what amount they could get the persons they especially desired.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that there is not a head of a department who would not prefer a lump-sum appropriation. They then can use it in any way they wish; they could pay to any employee any salary they wish. If the salary is fixed by this advisory committee I will promise the Senator that it will be a very hard matter to change the salary fixed when we come to provide for the salaries in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. SWANSON. I fully agree with the Senator as to the necessity of having salaries fixed by Congress, but this department is being organized, they have no idea what they will have to pay, some of those employed will be ex-scientific experts, and they thought it was much better to give them this latitude at the time of the organization.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I happen to be one of the Regents of the Smithsonian. This advisory committee on aeronautics was formed at the Smithsonian and was provided for by Congress. It is composed entirely of scientific men. The one who will have the expenditure of the sum is Dr. Walcott, the Secretary of the Smithsonian. He is not trying to load clerks on the Government, but it is impossible for him to tell about the cost of these scientific persons, and he has to have latitude. He does not want to pay the men highly. But if I were the Senator in charge of the bill, I would withdraw this amendment rather than waste time on it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not asked the Senator to withdraw the amendment, but I would very much prefer to have the amendment withdrawn than to have clerks, draftsmen, laborers, and mechanics paid from a lump sum, with no amount specified, as Congress appropriates millions of dollars for the payment of the same kind of laborers and clerks, draftsmen, and mechanics, and if the salary at which these may be employed by the advisory committee on aeronautics is different from the salary paid in all the other departments, then the next year there will be a demand made from every department of the Government for increases, if the positions named in the proposed amendment is an increase over the regular salaries paid for the same positions in other departments.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, one of the objects they desire to accomplish in investigating this matter is to get a good aeroplane. They are anxious to have a lump-sum appropriation, not an increased appropriation. They want to get the best experts they can to standardize our motors and our aircraft. They thought it was better to have this done without increasing the appropriation, but if the Senator from Utah wants me to do so to save time, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not asking that the amendment be withdrawn.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 19, after the words "Secretary of the Navy," to strike out "$387,737.73" and insert "and for retainer pay of officers and enlisted men, and traveling and other necessary expenses of the Naval Militia and National Naval Volunteers herein authorized, $1,270,737.73," so as to make the clause read:

Arming and equipping Naval Militia: For the pay, subsistence, and transportation of such portion of the Naval Militia as shall engage in actual service or instruction afloat or on shore, and for pay, transportation, and subsistence of any part of the Naval Militia as shall participate in any cruise, maneuvers, field instruction, or encampment of any part of the Regular Navy afloat or on shore; for prizes, trophies, and badges for excellence in gunnery exercises and target practice of the Naval Militia; for the purpose of providing for issue to the Naval Militia any stores and supplies or publications which are supplied to the Navy by any department for the actual and necessary traveling expenses, together with a per diem not to exceed $10 to be established by the Secretary of the Navy, of the Naval Militia Board appointed by the Secretary of the Navy; and for the necessary clerical and office expenses of the Division of Naval Militia Affairs in the office of the Secretary of the Navy, and for retainer pay of officers and enlisted men and traveling and other necessary expenses of the Naval Militia and national naval volunteers herein authorized, $1,270,737.73.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 24, after the words "Naval Militia of Illinois," to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$125,000"; in line 26, after the word "Minnesota," to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$165,000"; and, in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$290,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase, repair, and alteration of a ship for the Naval Militia of Illinois, $125,000; for the repair of the U. S. S. *Topeka* for the Naval Militia of Minnesota, $165,000; in all, $290,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 13, to insert:

Lease of naval lands: That authority be, and is hereby, given to the Secretary of the Navy, when in his discretion it will be for the public good, to lease for a period not exceeding five years, and revocable at any time, such property of the United States under his control as may not for the time being be required for public use and for the leasing of which there is no authority under existing law, and such leases shall be reported annually to Congress: *Provided*, That the authority herein granted shall not be held to apply to oil, mineral, or phosphate lands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Navigation," on page 14, line 11, after the word "transportation," to strike out "$882,940" and insert "$1,010,524," so as to make the clause read:

Transportation: For travel allowance of enlisted men discharged on account of expiration of enlistment; transportation of enlisted men and apprentice seamen and applicants for enlistment at home and abroad, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation to their homes, if residents of the United States, of enlisted men and apprentice seamen discharged on medical survey, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation of sick or insane enlisted men and apprentice seamen to hospitals, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu

thereof; apprehension and delivery of deserters and stragglers, and for railway guides and other expenses incident to transportation, $1,010,524.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 16, after the word "parties," to strike out "$184,477" and insert "$244,228.84"; in line 18, after the word "Navy," to insert "or Marine Corps"; and, on page 15, line 1, after the word "enlistment," to insert "*And provided further*, That the President is authorized in his discretion to utilize the services of postmasters of the second, third, and fourth classes in procuring the enlistment of recruits for the Navy and the Marine Corps, and for each recruit accepted for enlistment in the Navy or the Marine Corps the postmaster procuring his enlistment shall receive the sum of $5," so as to make the clause read:

Recruiting: Expenses of recruiting for the naval service; rent of rendezvous and expenses of maintaining the same; advertising for and obtaining men and apprentice seamen; actual and necessary expenses in lieu of mileage to officers on duty with traveling recruiting parties, $244,228.84: *Provided*, That any person who may hereafter enlist in the Navy or Marine Corps for the first time shall, in time of peace, if he so elects, receive discharge therefrom without cost to himself during the month of June or December, respectively, following the completion of one year's service at sea. An honorable discharge may be granted under this provision; but when so granted shall not entitle the holder, in case of reenlistment, to the benefits of an honorable discharge granted upon completion of an enlistment: *And provided further*, That the President is authorized in his discretion to utilize the services of postmasters of the second, third, and fourth classes in procuring the enlistment of recruits for the Navy and the Marine Corps, and for each recruit accepted for enlistment in the Navy or the Marine Corps, the postmaster procuring his enlistment shall receive the sum of $5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 17, to strike out:

Gunnery exercises: Prizes, trophies, and badges for excellence in gunnery exercises and target practice; for the establishment and maintenance of shooting galleries, target houses, targets, and ranges; for hiring established ranges, and for transportation of civilian assistants and equipment to and from ranges, $132,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 23, to strike out:

Steaming exercises: Prizes, trophies, and badges for excellence in steaming exercises, to be awarded to the ships in commission for general efficiency and for economy in coal consumption, under such rules as the Secretary of the Navy may formulate, and for the purpose of classifying, compiling, and publishing the results of the competition, $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 4, to insert:

Gunnery and engineering exercises: Prizes, trophies, and badges for excellence in gunnery and engineering exercises, to be awarded to ships in commission, under such rules as the Secretary of the Navy may formulate; for the purpose of printing, recording, classifying, compiling, and publishing the rules and results; for the establishment and maintenance of shooting galleries, target houses, targets, and ranges; for hiring established ranges, and for transporting civilian assistants and equipment to and from ranges, $135,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 17, after the word "each," to strike out "$1,428,000" and insert "$2,065,920," so as to make the clause read:

Outfits on first enlistment: Outfits for all enlisted men and apprentice seamen of the Navy on first enlistment, at not to exceed $60 each, $2,065,920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 22, after the word "appropriations," to strike out "$950,000" and insert "$1,069,460," so as to make the clause read:

Maintenance of naval auxiliaries: Pay, transportation, shipping, and subsistence of civilian officers and crews of naval auxiliaries, and all expenses connected with naval auxiliaries employed in emergencies which can not be paid from other appropriations, $1,069,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 13, after the word "materials," to strike out "$270,000" and insert "$350,000," so as to make the clause read:

Instruments and supplies: Supplies for seamen's quarters; and for the purchase of all other articles of equipage at home and abroad; and for the payment of labor in equipping vessels therewith and manufacture of such articles in the several navy yards; all pilotage and towage of ships of war; canal tolls, wharfage, dock and port charges, and other necessary incidental expenses of a similar nature; services and materials in repairing, correcting, adjusting, and testing compasses on shore and on board ship; nautical and astronomical instruments and repairs to same; libraries for ships of war, professional books, schoolbooks, and papers; compasses, compass fittings, including binnacles, tripods, and other appendages of ship's compasses; logs and other appliances for measuring the ship's way, and leads and other appliances for sounding; photographs, photographic instruments and materials, printing outfit and materials, $350,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 19, after the word "four," to insert "from the active list," so as to make the clause read:

Ocean and lake surveys: Hydrographic surveys, including the pay of the necessary hydrographic surveyors, cartographic draftsmen and recorders, and for the purchase and printing of nautical books, charts, and sailing directions, $105,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to detail such naval officers not exceeding four from the active list as may be necessary to the Hydrographic Office.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 7, page 20.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, on page 20 I move to amend line 7, where the words "eighty thousand dollars" occur, by inserting "one hundred thousand dollars" in the item for the "Naval Training Station, Great Lakes."

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to the Senator's amendment, but the committee amendments are to be first considered.

Mr. LEWIS. I beg pardon; I misunderstood what the bill was being read for.

Mr. LODGE. The committee amendments are to be first disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Illinois that the bill is being read for action upon the amendments of the committee.

Mr. LEWIS. Very well.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Ordnance," on page 23, line 8, before the word "clerical," to strike out "chemists," and in the same line, after the word "clerical," to strike out "drafting, inspection," and in line 11, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$505,000" and insert "$220,000," so as to make the clause read:

Ordnance and ordnance stores: For procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material; for the armament of ships; for fuel, material, and labor to be used in the general work of the Ordnance Department; for furniture at naval magazines, torpedo stations, and proving grounds; for maintenance of the proving ground and powder factory and for target practice; for the maintenance, repair, or operation of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes at naval magazines, the naval proving ground, Indianhead, Md., and naval torpedo stations; and for pay of chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and naval magazines: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, watchman, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and naval magazines for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, shall not exceed $220,000; in all, $6,402,485.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 10, before the words "The Secretary of the Navy," to insert as a side heading, "Armor plant."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 25, after line 7, to insert:

Batteries for merchant auxiliaries: For batteries for merchant auxiliaries (to cost not exceeding $3,300,000), to be available until expended, $1,650,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 13, after the word "ships," to insert "together with the necessary tools, cranes, and construction of ordnance storehouses," so as to make the clause read:

Ammunition for ships of the Navy: For procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ammunition for issue to ships, together with the necessary tools, cranes, and construction of ordnance storehouses, $13,720,000, to be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 6, after the word "factory," to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$189,000, to be available until expended," so as to make the clause read:

For new and improved machinery and tools for torpedo factory, $189,000, to be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 17, to insert:

Contingent building fund: For minor extensions and improvements of public works under the cognizance of the Bureau of Ordnance, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 27, line 20, after the word "pay," to insert "of technical, drafting, and inspection force and"; in line 23, after the word "clerical," to strike out "inspection, drafting"; in line 24, after the word "and," to strike out "other classified work" and insert "watchmen"; and on page 28, line 1, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$399,000" and insert "$250,000," so as to make the clause read:

Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks: For general maintenance of yards and docks, namely: For books, maps, models, and drawings; purchase and repair of fire engines; fire apparatus and plants; machinery; operation or repair, purchase, maintenance of horses and driving teams; carts, timber wheels, and all vehicles, including motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes, and including motor-propelled vehicles for freight-

carrying purposes only for use in the navy yards; tools and repair of the same; stationary; furniture for Government houses and offices in navy yards and naval stations; coal and other fuel; candles, oil, and gas; attendance on light and power plants; cleaning and clearing up yards and care of buildings; attendance on fires, lights, fire engines, and fire apparatus and plants; incidental labor at navy yards; water tax, tolls, and ferriage; pay of watchmen in navy yards; awnings and packing boxes; and for pay of technical, drafting, and inspection force and of employees on leave, $1,774,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, messenger, and watchmen in the navy yards and naval stations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, shall not exceed $250,000: *Provided further*, That hereafter worn-out motor-propelled vehicles for the Naval Establishment may be exchanged as a part of the purchase price of new ones.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 28, line 10, after "$3,000," to insert "remodeling the old machine shop, building No. 18, for use as the main machine shop of the yard, not exceeding $300,000; in all, $303,000," so as to make the clause read:

Navy yard, Portsmouth, N. H.: Toilet and locker facilities, $3,000; remodeling the old machine shop, building No. 18, for use as the main machine shop of the yard, not exceeding $300,000; in all, $303,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 20, after "$7,000," to insert "improvements to heating system, $8,000; improvements to brass foundry, $7,900," and in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "$93,000" and insert "$108,900," so as to make the clause read:

Navy yard, New York, N. Y.: Dredging, to continue, $50,000; general distributing systems, $15,000; paving to continue, $10,000; ventilating system, $11,000; toilet and locker facilities, $7,000; improvements to heating system, $8,000; improvements to brass foundry, $7,900; in all, $108,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I ask the indulgence of my colleague on the committee at this time to consider an amendment which I propose, and which has the approval of the committee. The amendment is now at the desk. It goes in at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the situation the amendment would hardly be in order now except it were offered by the committee.

Mr. O'GORMAN. There is no objection, I understand, to the consideration of the amendment at this time, as it has the approval of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 28, after line 22, insert the following:

For improvement of East River, N. Y., with a view to providing a channel 35 feet deep from Long Island Sound to the navy yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., in accordance with so much of the report contained and published in House Document No. 188, Sixty-third Congress, first session, as applies to the channel through Hell Gate, $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 4, before the words "gun shop," to strike out "Addition to" and insert "Additional," and in the same line, after the word "cost," in parentheses, to insert "exclusive of equipment," so as to make the clause read:

Navy yard, Washington, D. C.: Additional gun shop (to cost exclusive of equipment not exceeding $600,000), $200,000; fireproof model storage, $65,000; fuel-oil storage, $18,000; toilet and locker facilities, $2,000; in all, $285,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 7, to insert:

For the acquisition by purchase or condemnation of such lands in the vicinity of the navy yard, Washington, D. C., as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy it shall be deemed necessary or expedient to acquire for additions to said navy yard, $331,000, and in addition to said sum the unexpended balances of the appropriation in the act of March 3, 1907 (34 Stats., p. 1187), for a railroad bridge and track at the Washington Navy Yard, and of the appropriation in the act of June 24, 1910 (36 Stats., pp. 615–616), authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to enter into an agreement with the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. for the construction of a track connection to the Washington Navy Yard, and the acquisition of land or property necessary in connection therewith, are hereby reappropriated and made available for the acquisition of such additional lands, and the several provisions of said act of June 24, 1910, so authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to enter into said agreement, are hereby amended to read as follows: "The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. for a sufficient and satisfactory track connection from a suitable point on the running tracks of said Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to a suitable point on the track system of the Washington Navy Yard as said system is now or may be hereafter established: *Provided*, That said track connection, so far as the same may project or extend beyond the right of way or property now owned or occupied by the said railroad company, shall be constructed wholly upon a suitable and satisfactory right of way to be provided for such purpose by the United States, the title to which shall at all times remain in the United States: *Provided further*, That so far as may be consistent with the public interests said track connection, with its appurtenant turnouts and sidings, shall be located and constructed in, upon, over, and through public grounds, space and streets of the United States as the same are now or may be hereafter ascertained and established: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire any part of the land or property necessary for said right of way by purchase or condemnation and to construct the connections, side tracks, turnouts, and switches necessary to the proper operation of the yard system in connection with the said branch track, and for the purpose of acquiring said right of way such part of the sums herein appropriated for additions to said navy yard as may be necessary are hereby made available: *Provided further*, That pending the completion of the track connection hereinbefore authorized and provided for the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. is hereby authorized to maintain its track connection with the said navy yard as at present existing and to continue the operation thereof under such rules and regulations as may be established by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the governance thereof: *Provided*, That within 30 days after the completion of the new track connection with the said navy yard hereinbefore authorized and provided for said Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. shall, at its own expense, remove said existing track connection and restore and make the surface of the streets over and through which the same is laid satisfactory to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act: *Provided further*, That in the event that the Secretary of the Navy shall be unable to acquire the land or lands, or any parcel or parcels thereof, necessary or expedient in his judgment for the purposes aforesaid at a price deemed by him to be reasonable, then and in that event he is hereby authorized and directed to acquire the same by condemnation proceedings in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, to be instituted upon his request by the Attorney General of the United States, and to be conducted in substantial accord with the provisions of the act of Congress approved August 23, 1890 (26 Stats., pp. 412–413), providing a site for the enlargement of the Government Printing Office, which provisions are hereby made applicable to the proceedings for this purpose, and jurisdiction to hear and determine the same is hereby conferred upon the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the power and authority to acquire by purchase or condemnation, as the case may be, lands for the purposes aforesaid shall include the power and authority to purchase, condemn, or compensate for any wharves, bulkheads, structures, or other improvements upon any land, as well as any outstanding privately owned interests in the same, in the vicinity of the said navy yard deemed expedient for said additions within the area designated by the Secretary of the Navy that, though owned or claimed by the United States, is in the occupancy of private individuals, and the sums herein appropriated for are hereby made available for such purposes: *Provided further*, That upon the acquisition of the additional lands hereby authorized to be acquired all portions of public streets on which any squares acquired so abut and lying between the same, and all public alleys within said squares, together with such portions of streets and public alleys as lie between the present navy yard and the lands, or any part thereof, so acquired, are hereby abandoned and closed, and said portions of said streets and public alleys, together with the Government-owned land lying south of the north line of Potomac Avenue between the west boundary of the navy yard and the east line of Second Street east prolonged in a southerly direction, and such other Government-owned land along the water front of the Anacostia River lying between the east line of the said navy yard and the west line of Eleventh Street east prolonged in a southerly direction, shall be regarded as set apart and reserved for naval purposes: *Provided further*, That any balance not expended in said purchase or condemnation may be used toward improving the lands so added to the said navy yard and toward the extending of the railroad-track system thereof and connections thereto.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I notice that this amendment makes an appropriation of $331,000—

For the acquisition by purchase or condemnation of such lands in the vicinity of the navy yard, Washington, D. C., as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy it shall be deemed necessary or expedient to acquire for additions to said navy yard.

That is in addition to unexpended balances that are now in the Treasury, I suppose, and representing unexpended amounts of previous appropriations. Provision is then made by the amendment for purchasing a right of way for the building of a railroad track by the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to connect with the track system of the navy yard.

Then, on page 31 this amendment makes another disposition of this appropriation by permitting its use to purchase the right of way in addition to the original purpose for which it was appropriated. My understanding, in other words, of the amendment up to the point where I made the interruption is that it is proposed to appropriate moneys for the specific purpose of securing land, but it is also provided that the money may be expended, if necessary, for the purpose of purchasing a right of way to be occupied by the tracks of a railroad company. Apart from the apparent contradiction of the purposes for which the appropriation is to be used, I should like to inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill what amounts of unexpended balances are available under the provisions of the amendment and why it is necessary to make an appropriation of $331,000 to purchase lands necessary for naval uses, and at the same time to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to use it for the purpose of purchasing a right of way for a railroad?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will permit me, I desire to say that this amendment has been strongly urged by the Navy Department; and I have this morning received a letter from the department asking for an amendment of the amendment. The sum of $173,000 was appropriated for the purpose of getting land for a right of way, as I understand, and constructing a track for the railroad. That, however, has never been done. The department is now anxious to get about 20 acres, I believe, down there to answer the purposes of the navy yard for all time to come, and they are urging it.

Mr. THOMAS. That is to be a permanent acquisition?

Mr. SWANSON. It is to be a permanent acquisition. As I understand, the department has to buy some land to get the railroad track to the navy yard, and this appropriation is for that purpose. The tracks, as I understand, will be owned and used entirely by the navy yard. The department has insisted that it would take $331,000 to accomplish all this.

My attention has to-day been called—though I have not had an opportunity to carefully examine the amendment—to the fact that we already have an agreement with the Pennsylvania Railroad to construct a track. If that is true, there is no reason why the railroad should be released from that agreement. I have sent for the appropriation act, and I desire that this amendment go over, after it has been amended as the Secretary of the Navy has requested, in order that we may see whether the amendment which has been sent to me from the department accomplishes what I think ought to be accomplished.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado permit me to ask a question of the Senator in charge of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. As I understand, it is proposed that the navy yard shall own the track from the yard to the point where it joins the track of the railroad? I assume the Senator proposes, although there may now be but one railroad in that section of the city, that the track built up to that point shall be open to any railroad?

Mr. SWANSON. The amendment which the Secretary of the Navy desires shall be included in the pending amendment allows any railroad to use it. The Secretary desires to have the power to contract with any railroad, and he desires to have an amendment adopted to that effect.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to say to the Senator from Virginia that the language should be so worded as to accomplish that end. That has been the rule heretofore as to Army posts.

Mr. SWANSON. I have here an amendment to that effect which was prepared by the Navy Department and was sent to us by the solicitor. These objections were out, and yesterday he sent me a provision which he desires to have offered as a substitute for the pending provision. After his proposed amendment is read, I desire to offer it as an amendment, and I should then like to have it go over until I can further look into the provision in relation to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Mr. THOMAS. I think, Mr. President, that it is proper that I should add at this juncture, before taking my seat, that it would be better to make a specific appropriation for the purpose of purchasing as much of this right of way as may be necessary, and to make a distinct appropriation for the purpose of acquiring this additional acreage which the navy yard needs. I do not think it is good policy to make an appropriation of a given amount for a certain purpose, and then to invest the authorities with the power to expend that money for some other purpose if, in their judgment, any portion of it is necessary for such purpose.

Mr. SWANSON. It is simply a question as to how much will be needed. The money is already appropriated to get the right of way for the railroad tracks, and so forth.

Mr. THOMAS. If that is the case, then there is no need of diverting any part of this $331,000 for that purpose.

Mr. SWANSON. A portion of it may be needed to get the land; it will take $500,000, as the Navy Department states, to get what they need for the purposes of the navy yard.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not objecting to that.

Mr. SWANSON. They have $173,000 which has already been appropriated and which it is not necessary to reappropriate. They simply want $331,000 additional, making a half million dollars in all.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no objection to that at all. From the Senator's statement it is entirely plain that the entire amount appropriated is needed to obtain this additional land; and consequently I do not think that any of it should be expended or that any authority should be given to expend it for any other purpose. If an additional sum is necessary to secure the needed right of way or to perfect it, that should be arranged for by specific appropriation.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to have adopted the amendment which has been suggested by the Secretary of the Navy, so as to carry out the suggestion made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]; and then I should like to have the matter go over until I can look into the act appropriating $173,000, to see to what extent that act relieves the railroad from any obligation which it now has in connection with aiding in constructing the track.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

The SECRETARY. On page 30, line 3, beginning with the words "The Secretary of the Navy," strike out the remainder of the page; on page 31 strike out all of lines 1, 2, and 3 and the following words in line 4: "are hereby made available," and insert in lieu of the matter stricken out the following:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with such railroad company as he may deem proper for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, and operating a sufficient and satisfactory track connection with the railroad track system of the Washington Navy Yard as said system is now or may be hereafter established: *Provided*, That so much of said track connection as can not be constructed over any right of way or property now or hereafter owned or occupied by said railroad company shall be constructed wholly upon a suitable and satisfactory right of way to be provided by the United States, the title to which shall at all times remain in the United States: *Provided further*, That, so far as may be consistent with the public interests, said track connection, with its appurtenant turnouts and sidings, may be located and constructed in, upon, over, and through public grounds, space, and streets of the United States as the same are now or may be hereafter ascertained and established: *Provided further* That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire any part of the land or property necessary for said right of way by purchase or condemnation and to secure the construction of the connections, sidetracks, turnouts, switches, etc., necessary to the proper operation of the yard system in connection with the said track connection; and for the purpose of acquiring said right of way such part of the sums herein appropriated for additions to said navy yard as may be necessary are hereby made available: *Provided further*, That authority is hereby granted to the railroad company, and its successors and assigns, entering into the agreement aforesaid to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto for such track connection across the Anacostia River, D. C., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, to an available point within or in the vicinity of the said navy yard, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

In line 20 on page 31 insert after the colon following the word "act" double quotation marks.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment to the amendment which I have sent to the desk adopted, and then I desire that the matter may go over until I can look into the act of 1911, which, I understand, put an obligation on some of the railroad companies to construct some of these tracks. I want to see whether or not this amendment to the amendment releases that obligation.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator does not ask that the amendment be now voted on?

Mr. SWANSON. No; I simply ask that the committee amendment be pending. I do not care to have it now voted on; but I thought possibly the amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Navy would make it clearer, because, as I understand, it simply allows him to contract with any railroad to have access to the navy yard, so that it be not limited to one railroad.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the entire amendment had better go over without being adopted at the present time.

Mr. NORRIS. I should not like to see any part of the amendment adopted now.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. SWANSON] to another matter. This amendment provides:

For the acquisition, by purchase or condemnation, of such lands in the vicinity of the navy yard, Washington, D. C., as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy it shall be deemed necessary or expedient to acquire for additions to said navy yard, $331,000; and, in addition to said sum, the unexpended balances of the appropriation in the act of March 3, 1907—

That was an act for a railroad bridge and track at the Washington Navy Yard—

and of the appropriation in the act of June 24, 1910—

That was virtually for the same purposes, but perhaps involved a more extended operation. Now, I want to ask the Senator if he knows whether the appropriations mentioned in these two specific acts were continuing appropriations?

Mr. SWANSON. I understood they were continuing appropriations, aggregating about $173,000, which would make half a million dollars for the purchase of this land.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator understand that the unexpended balance is $173,000?

Mr. SWANSON. I have not looked at it definitely, but the Navy Department informed me that there was about $173,000 available for this purpose. If we had appropriated $500,000, with the amount unexpended and available the total would be $673,000 instead of $331,000 appropriated in this provision plus the $173,000 which is available. As I have said, I have not myself looked definitely into this matter, but the information furnished me is that the unexpended balance is $173,000, and that it is a continuing appropriation and available for this purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose the appropriation originally, then, was made as an appropriation until expended.

Mr. SWANSON. I think so. I do not know what items were covered by the amount. I have not had an opportunity to investigate it personally.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not know but that the Senator had looked it up.

Mr. SWANSON. No; I have not done so.

Mr. SMOOT. We can look it up in a moment and find out whether the other appropriation is a continuing appropriation.

Mr. SWANSON. The reason I would like to have the amendment go over is that I desire to make a personal investigation of it, which I have not had time to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire the amendment which he has offered to the amendment to go over?

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to have the entire amendment, including the amendment I have offered, to be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, together with the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia, will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 33, after line 14, to insert:

Naval Observatory: For purchase of the remainder of the tract of private land formerly known as "Normanstone," comprising 3,848.57 square feet lying within Naval Observatory Circle, which the Secretary of the Navy has authority to purchase under joint resolution approved August 1, 1894, $4,040.70.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 34, to insert:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to lease for a period not to exceed three years storage facilities in the vicinity of the navy yard, Norfolk, at an annual rental of not exceeding $16,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 6, to strike out:

Marine recruiting station, Port Royal, S. C.: For enlarging and improving hospital and for necessary equipment, $15,000.

And insert:

Marine recruiting station, Port Royal, S. C.: For a new building for the naval hospital and for necessary changes in existing buildings and equipment, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 15, after "$8,000," to insert "to enlarge dry dock (limit of cost $1,085,000), $750,000; foundry and forge shop, $200,000," and in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$970,000," so as to make the clause read:

Navy yard, Charleston, S. C.: Dredging, to continue, $12,000; toilet and locker facilities, $8,000; to enlarge dry dock (limit of cost, $1,085,000), $750,000; foundry and forge shop, $200,000; in all, $970,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 1, after the word "reconstruction," to insert "extending wharf 1,650 feet, $100,000; in all, $250,000," so as to make the clause read:

Naval station, New Orleans, La.: To repair and reconstruct, where necessary, public works damaged in September, 1915, by hurricane, $150,000, and the accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized to transfer from this appropriation to the appropriation "Naval station, New Orleans, La.," made by joint resolution approved April 25, 1914, the amount heretofore expended therefrom for such repairs and reconstruction; extending wharf 1,650 feet, $100,000; in all, $250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 6, after "$9,000," to insert "floating crane, revolving type (to cost not exceeding $600,000), $300,000"; and in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "$84,000" and insert "$384,000," so as to make the clause read:

Navy yard, Mare Island, Cal.: Maintenance of dikes and dredging, $50,000; erecting shop, $25,000; toilet and locker facilities, $9,000; floating crane, revolving type (to cost not exceeding $600,000), $300,000; in all, $384,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 8, before the word "estate," to strike out "Li" and insert "Il"; in line 11, after the word "from," to strike out "'ford numbered five' (ford numbered five" and insert "'Ford No. 5' (Ford No. 5"; in line 17, after the word "feet," to strike out "west" and insert "east"; and in line 18, after the word "Territorial," to strike out "triangulation" and insert "trigonometric," so as to make the clause read:

Beginning at a point marked by a concrete monument at the southeast corner of the land acquired by the United States from the John II estate through condemnation proceedings, which point has the coordinates 230.1 feet south and 87.2 feet west from "Ford No. 5" (Ford No. 5 being marked by a galvanized pipe in a concrete monument stamped "U. S. 1911," established by the United States district engineer office, and having coordinates 8,570.99 feet south and 10,087.64 feet east from the Ewa Territorial trigonometric station); thence north 23° 12′ east 177 feet, more or less; thence north 16° 0′ east 66 feet, more or less, to a point on the shore line at high-water mark; thence southerly along high-water mark to a point marked by a concrete monument that is, with reference to the point of beginning, south 51° 0′ east 70 feet, more or less, the southwesterly boundary of the said tract being formed by the line joining said last-mentioned point on the high-water line with the point of beginning: *Provided*, That this transfer is in no manner to interfere with the right of the Navy Department to make such use of the shoals and islets extending in a northeasterly direction from Fords Island as the needs of the Naval Service may require: *Provided further*, That there may be established over said military reservation, at such place as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, a right of way for the use of the Navy from the remaining portion of the naval reservation on Fords Island to the said shoals and islets.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 23, after "25,000," to insert "*Provided*, That the said bridge shall be so constructed as not to interfere with the navigation of the said creek; fence around powder factory, $28,000;" and in line 25, after the words "in all," to strike out "$78,000" and insert "$106,000," so as to make the clause read:

Naval Proving Ground, Indianhead, Md.: Three powder dry houses, $15,000; fire protection, $38,000; for the construction of a foot-passenger bridge over Mattawoman Creek, Charles County, Md., for the exclusive use of the Government of the United States under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, $25,000: *Provided*, That the said bridge shall be so constructed as not to interfere with the navigation of the said creek; fence around powder factory, $28,000; in all, $106,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 6, after "$10,000," to insert "fire and boundary wall, $5,000; in all, $15,000," so as to make the clause read:

Naval magazine, Lake Denmark, N. J.: Quarters for guards, $10,000; fire and boundary wall, $5,000; in all, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 17, after "$105,000," to insert "sea wall and filling, $36,000; in all, $141,000," so as to make the clause read:

Naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I.: Seaman gunners' quarters, $105,000; sea wall and filling, $36,000; in all, $141,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 21, after "$3,500," to insert "purchase of additional land, $90,000"; and in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "$18,000" and insert "$108,000," so as to make the clause read:

Naval magazine, St. Juliens Creek, Va.: Filling house, $2,000; railroad system, $12,500; locomotive house, $3,500; purchase of additional land, $90,000; in all, $108,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it might be barely possible that it would be wise for us to know what some of these items are, the appropriations for which we are increasing. I will inquire where the Secretary is now reading?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Page 41, line 8.

Mr. BORAH. In reference to the item on page 40, in line 21, appropriating $90,000 for the purchase of additional land, I should like to inquire what is that additional land to be purchased for?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I have a letter from the Secretary of the Navy explaining the matter. The Government has a very large magazine at St. Juliens Creek, near Norfolk. The amount of land they now have is rather limited, and they are anxious to increase the Government's holdings in order that they may make the magazine larger and also save it from danger.

Mr. BORAH. The amendment says, "For the purchase of additional land." How much additional land is going to be purchased? Ninety thousand dollars would purchase considerable land in Virginia, I apprehend.

Mr. SWANSON. Here is the basis on which this amendment was recommended. I read the following letter from the Secretary of the Navy, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 5, 1916.

Hon. B. R. TILLMAN, United States Senator,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I respectfully recommend the following insertion before the words "in all," in line 21, page 27, of the naval bill as it passed the House of Representatives, viz:

"For the purchase of additional land, $90,000."

This is for enlarging the magazine reservation on St. Juliens Creek, Norfolk, Va., which at present covers about 71 acres. The present site is becoming crowded and it is certain that expansion will shortly have to be provided for. It is, therefore, very desirable that land which has been offered for sale to the Government adjacent to the present magazine for about $90,000 be purchased.

This item was not included in the estimates submitted to the House, but in view of the unusually large appropriations for ammunition in prospect, there will be a tremendous increase in activity at all the naval magazines, and it is considered urgently necessary that the additional land here in question be purchased at the present time.

The land it is proposed to purchase comprises about 88 acres.

Very sincerely,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, do I understand that it is proposed to pay $90,000 for 88 acres of land?

Mr. SWANSON. The item provides for the purchase of land. I presume it may be condemned. I do not know anything about the value of the land except what the Secretary of the Navy has written. I know that he was very insistent that this item should be included, as was Admiral Strauss, who was Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance.

Mr. BORAH. Is that land near the city?

Mr. SWANSON. It is near Norfolk; I do not know the exact distance.

Mr. BORAH. Well, of course, we are utterly in the dark in regard to it. It does seem that $1,000 an acre is rather an extraordinary price for land so situated.

Mr. SWANSON. From what I have been told, I do not think it is an exorbitant price. The Government usually acquires land under such circumstances by condemnation; it is very rarely that it purchases.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia a little further in regard to the same item. Is there a general statute by virtue of which the Secretary would have the right to go into court and condemn this land, or is the only authority he has to purchase it contained in this bill?

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to include the words "or condemnation," so as to make it clear. I think the acquisition of land should be made by condemnation unless it can be obtained at a satisfactory price. I think there is a statute which authorizes condemnation; but if not, I should like to have the language of the amendment include such authorization.

Mr. NORRIS. I know that, as a rule, when we are appropriating for a purpose of this kind we provide in the appropriation for acquiring the land by condemnation.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to have the amendment read "purchase or condemnation." I think provision for condemnation ought to be made in all cases where land is to be obtained.

Mr. BORAH. It is pretty safe to assume that if the Government is going to pay a thousand dollars an acre the matter will not have to go into court.

Mr. NORRIS. That depends altogether on the circumstances. If the Secretary——

Mr. SWANSON. I offer an amendment to insert the words "or condemnation."

Mr. NORRIS. If the Secretary of the Navy should offer the owners of the land the full amount of the appropriation, he probably would not have to go into court; but if the Secretary of the Navy were of the opinion that the land was not worth the amount of the appropriation he would probably have to go into court.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator in charge of the bill will notice that the item on page 32, in respect to the acquisition of property for the Washington Navy Yard, provides for purchase or condemnation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not yielded.

Mr. WARREN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from Wyoming desires to ask a question with regard to this item, I yield.

Mr. WARREN. I was going to say that quite often in items providing for the acquisition of land condemnation is provided for. On page 32 the manner of condemnation in connection with the acquisition of property for the Washington Navy Yard is provided for, it being there stated that the condemnation proceedings shall be conducted substantially in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress, approved August, 1890, "providing a site for the enlargement of the Government Printing Office," and so forth. That act seems to have provided a successful method of procedure and has been followed very often since then.

Mr. SWANSON. That is nearly always provided in the acquisition of property in the District of Columbia.

Mr. NORRIS. That is not a general statute that will apply to every case, is it?

Mr. GALLINGER. It applies to the District of Columbia alone.

Mr. NORRIS. It applies only to the District?

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

Mr. WARREN. But it is usual to insert such a provision where the acquisition of land is provided for, as in the case of the item on page 32.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, of course, if there were a general statute providing for the condemnation of property by the Government, and in such an item as this we simply authorized the property to be condemned according to law, that would be sufficient. I do not know whether there is such a general statute, though I am rather inclined to think there is.

Mr. SWANSON. There is one; and we usually put in the words "condemnation or purchase." They ought to be included in this instance.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, if condemnation proceedings become necessary, resort can be had to the general law, and the Government can begin the necessary proceedings in court.

Mr. SWANSON. I offer an amendment, on page 42, line 21, after the words "additional land, $90,000," to insert "to be obtained by purchase or condemnation, as the Secretary of the Navy may deem wise."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will suggest to the Senator that he make it "$90,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. SWANSON. I accept that amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. It will probably make no difference, but I nevertheless offer the suggestion.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to hear the suggestion made by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that, after the numerals "$90,000," there be included the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is a very proper amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to amend the amendment so that it will read "$90,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be obtained by purchase or condemnation, as the Secretary of the Navy may deem wise."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I know that there is sometimes a general opinion—and I think it is particularly applicable to the District of Columbia—that when an appropriation is made for the purchase of land, whether by condemnation proceedings or otherwise, it is necessary to use the entire appropriation before the matter is ended. I remember, several years ago, soon after I came to Congress, of being on a street car one day, after an appropriation had been made for the condemnation of some property and a Member of the House had made quite a determined speech in opposition to what he complained was the extravagant use of public funds. I heard two gentlemen talking it over—I do not know who they were, but they were apparently intelligent citizens of the District—and they concurred in the proposition that the Member of the House who had made the speech was wrong, because, as they said, when Congress provided for the purchase of real estate in the District of Columbia and made an appropriation for it, Congress had thereby placed a value upon the property, and that even though condemnation proceedings were resorted to the commissioners appointed to appraise the property had no other duty to perform than to divide the appropriation up between the owners of the property in proportion to the value of the property as they really thought those proportions were represented.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. May I give the Senator a concrete example? When it was proposed to erect the Senate Office Building, a provision was placed in an appropriation bill that $750,000 should be appropriated for the purchase of land and toward the construction of the building. I took occasion in the Committee on Appropriations to suggest to the chairman, who was the late lamented Senator Allison, of Iowa, that mighty little of that appropriation would go for the construction of the building.

He differed with me. The result was that the owners entered into a combination and forced condemnation proceedings. In this District the juries are made up largely of real-estate men, and when the matter was settled they took out of the $750,000 $748,500, leaving $1,500 for the construction of the building!

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is a fair illustration of what often happens.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to say a word further, if the Senator will permit me. I have been engaged in committee work, and will have to return immediately to the committee room, but I think there is a provision in this bill for the acquisition of land for the enlargement of the navy yard in the District of Columbia. The Government is never wise about matters of that kind. Somebody in the interest of the Government ought to have had an option on that land, but I happen to know that a citizen of the District has an option on that land, taken some time ago, in anticipation of this very appropriation; and we will pay all that it is worth, whether it is acquired by condemnation or not.

Mr. NORRIS. We will undoubtedly pay more than it is worth.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; more than it is worth.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask further of the Senator from Virginia how the sum of $90,000 came to be agreed upon?

Mr. SWANSON. If I mistake not, I wish to say to the Senator that I know what he is driving at. I knew nothing about this matter until a letter came to the committee urging the amendment. As I understand, this is the price at which the land is offered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if the Senator thinks I am driving at the proposition that he engineered this matter he is greatly mistaken. It is no reflection upon the Senator from Virginia at all, and I did not intend it in the slightest way as such. I beg the Senator's pardon. He must not draw that inference at all. What I thought, though, was that a proposition to buy land for the purpose proposed at the rate of a thousand dollars an acre was most interesting.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator can get land in the city of Norfolk, or near the city, on the water front for less than that, he would make a fortune very soon. The Senator knows that in Norfolk near the navy yard and in all that section, especially in the city, which is growing rapidly, land is held very high. As I understand, the owners have offered to let the navy yard have it at this price.

Mr. SMOOT. How many acres are there?

Mr. SWANSON. Eighty-eight acres. I will say to the Senator that I do not think it is an exorbitant price; but this amendment came up, and it was left to the clerk to include it. It ought to carry $90,000, if necessary, and provision ought to be made to acquire the land by purchase or condemnation. It ought to be included in that way.

I offer that amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state, for the information of the Senator from Virginia, that the amendment of the committee has already been agreed to, and there will have to be a reconsideration. Without objection, it will be reconsidered. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia to the amendment proposed by the committee, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 40, line 21, in lieu of the amendment proposed by the committee, after the numerals "$3,500" and the semicolon, it is proposed to insert:

Purchase of additional land, to be secured by purchase or condemnation or otherwise, as the Secretary of the Navy may direct, $90,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 7, to insert:

The appropriation contained in the naval appropriation act approved March 3, 1915, of $20,000 for the construction of a building for the storage of torpedoes at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., is hereby made available for expenditure for a like purpose at the naval coaling station, Melville, R. I.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 23, to strike out:

Experimental laboratory: For laboratory and research work, including the construction, equipment, and operation of a laboratory, to be expended at the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy (limit of cost not to exceed $1,500,000), $1,000,000.

And to insert:

Experimental and research laboratory: For laboratory and research work on the subject of gun erosion, torpedo motive power, the gyroscope, submarine guns, protection against submarine, torpedo, and mine attack, improvement in submarine attachments, improvement and development in submarine engines, storage batteries and propulsion, improvement in radio installations, and such other necessary work for the benefit of the Government service, including the construction, equipment, and operation of a laboratory, the employment of scientific civilian assistants as may become necessary, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, $2,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am going to ask the Senator to allow that amendment on page 42, beginning at line 4, to go over.

Mr. SWANSON. Until what time? Some time later in the evening?

Mr. SMOOT. I will try to get together the information I have by that time; but I want to say to the Senator that I am compelled to leave the Senate Chamber now to attend a meeting of the Appropriations Committee, and it may be after 4.30 before we get through with the District appropriation bill. Just as soon as I can get through there, however, I am going to get together the information which has been sent to me in connection with this item, and I shall be glad to take it up then.

Mr. SWANSON. Let the amendment be passed over.

Mr. SMOOT. While I am on my feet I should like to ask also that the amendment on page 132, beginning with line 5 and ending with line 9, may be passed over for the same reason in case I am not in the Chamber.

Mr. SWANSON. I will ask the Secretary to make a note of that.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, as I may not be in the Chamber when the amendment on page 42 is taken up, I should like to ask a few questions now in regard to it. How much of this appropriation of $2,000,000 is to be expended for the construction and equipment of a laboratory, and where is the laboratory to be located?

Mr. SWANSON. There is a letter from Mr. Edison and others in connection with this amendment, which makes a very detailed statement of the contemplated expenditure. As I understand, this is to construct a building and equip it with the machines and all the chemical apparatus needed to make investigations and experiments on the lines indicated in the amendment. If the Senator will note the amendment of the Senate, it broadens the investigations and the experiments included in the House provision.

Mr. WEEKS. Has the committee any information about how much of the $2,000,000 is to be expended for a laboratory?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Edison and others said that unless we appropriated that amount it would be useless to make a smaller appropriation; that the good that could be accomplished by the expenditure of less than $2,000,000 would be so little that it would be a waste of money; that if the Government is going to have a scientific laboratory to experiment on all these matters, to ascertain the latest and most scientific methods as outlined in this amendment, less than $2,000,000 would not be of any value.

Mr. WEEKS. But that does not answer my question at all. Two million dollars covers a great many things in this paragraph. How much of it is to be expended for a laboratory?

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, the entire amount is to be spent for building a laboratory and to equip it, both.

Mr. WEEKS. Oh, no. In the very line which I am talking about, line 12, it says, "the construction, equipment, and operation of a laboratory." How long is it proposed to operate it under this appropriation?

Mr. TILLMAN. I will say, for the benefit of the Senator, that Mr. Edison wrote to me, and the information I received was that it would take $1,500,000 to build and equip a laboratory, and then he needed $500,000 with which to conduct experiments.

Mr. WEEKS. How long will it take to construct the laboratory?

Mr. TILLMAN. It will be constructed as soon as possible.

Mr. WEEKS. I mean, it would take a year; would it not?

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not know.

Mr. CLAPP. That would depend upon how many men they put to work, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it might take more than a year. It would depend upon how quickly they could get the machinery.

Mr. WEEKS. What I am trying to find out is whether or not the laboratory is likely to be operated this year. If not, why should we appropriate the money for it this year?

Mr. TILLMAN. You can depend on it that Thomas A. Edison does not fool with things. When he gets busy he gets very, very busy.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to say that the details of the matter are to be found in a letter written by Mr. Edison. When the Government can get the valuable information, the genius and the scientific knowledge possessed by these men, free, and all they ask the Government to do is to furnish the laboratory and the expense of operating it, and their services are given free, and then the money is spent under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, who has to approve the expenditures, it seems to me that it is a combination of science and genius and practical knowledge in the Navy Department that would make it a very wise expenditure on the part of the Government.

Mr. WEEKS. Let me ask the Senator what right we have to accept the services of these gentlemen without compensation?

Mr. SWANSON. I do not know any reason why we should not, if they offer them.

Mr. WEEKS. Is it not contrary to law?

Mr. SWANSON. I know of no law to that effect.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is contrary to law.

Mr. SMOOT. But this amendment provides that they shall be paid.

Mr. BORAH. If we can get something for nothing, let us repeal the law.

Mr. SWANSON. They must have some employees. The employees are the only ones who will be paid. The members of the advisory board, these scientists, do not get anything. It

is a patriotic effort on their part to aid the Government. It is the minor employees, who are not included in this advisory board, who get some compensation.

Mr. WEEKS. One more question, Mr. President. Would the Senator object to an amendment requiring that these employees should be under the civil service?

Mr. TILLMAN. All of this expenditure is under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, and of course he is bound by all the laws they have in the Navy Department.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection.

Mr. WEEKS. Does the Senator think that it will be necessary for him to employ the people who are to work in this laboratory, unless there is a special provision for it, under the provisions of the civil-service act?

Mr. TILLMAN. I know it would.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I think the law is the other way. They are only exempted from the civil service by special enactment. We have, on several occasions, inserted provisions of that kind in different pieces of legislation, notably the banking act and the tariff act.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WEEKS. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I may be wrong, but, as I understand it, unless the law specifically exempts the employees from the classified service they would be put under the classified service under the general law.

Mr. WEEKS. I think the Senator is right.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I will have Mr. Edison's letter here, and we will let this amendment go over until it comes, and then we will have it read into the RECORD.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask whether any hearings were had, or is there anything besides Mr. Edison's letter?

Mr. TILLMAN. No.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, there were very full and voluminous hearings in the House.

Mr. BORAH. I had reference to the Senate committee.

Mr. SWANSON. Not in the Senate. The Senate had very few, if any, hearings. I do not suppose we spent half a day in hearings; but if the Senator will examine the hearings in the House he will find the matter very fully discussed, and, I think, the items of expediture, and so forth.

Mr. TILLMAN. The House only gave one million. Mr. Edison wrote and assured me that a million would be wasted.

Mr. SWANSON. As the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has asked that it should go over, suppose we let it go over until he returns to the Chamber. It is useless to discuss it two or three times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 24, after the words "public works," to strike out "$7,139,975" and insert "$10,335,915.70." so as to make the clause read:

Total public works, $10,335,915.70 and the amounts herein appropriated therefor, except for repairs and preservation at navy yards and stations, shall be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 2, after the word "officers," to strike out "on the active list of officers," so as to read:

The President is hereby authorized to appoint a commission of five officers of the Navy not below the rank of commander to investigate and report at the beginning of the next regular session of Congress if practicable, and if not, as soon thereafter as practicable, as to the necessity, desirability, and advisability of establishing an additional navy yard or naval station on the Pacific coast of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 22, to strike out:

Said commission shall also investigate and report upon the necessity, desirability, and advisability of establishing an additional navy yard or naval station on the Atlantic coast south of Cape Hatteras or on or near the United States coast of the Gulf of Mexico or in the Caribbean Sea of a character adequate for the proper naval defense of that portion of the country. Said report shall contain all the information of like character as directed in the preceding paragraph relating to the investigation and report as to the Pacific coast.

And to insert:

Said commission shall also investigate and report as to the necessity, desirability, and advisability of establishing submarine and aviation bases on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and other possessions of the United States, and as to the cost and location thereof.

Said commission shall also report on the advisability of establishing one or more naval academies on the Pacific coast or in the region of the Great Lakes and where the same should be located and the probable cost thereof.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator having the bill in charge, referring to the amendment on page 44, whether or not he understands that "the Atlantic" includes the Gulf of Mexico. If there is any question about it, I think that ought to be corrected. I would suggest, as an amendment, after the word "Atlantic," on page 44, line 8, to insert the words "Gulf of Mexico," so that it would read "on the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, and Pacific coasts."

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to that being inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I move to strike out the paragraph commencing on line 11 with the words "Said commission" and ending on line 14 with the words "cost thereof."

I presume it would not do any harm to have a commission traveling about to consider the question of establishing more naval academies, provided they reported that it was inadvisable to do so; but it seems to me that it is a piece of folly and nonsense to talk about establishing another naval academy or another military academy. The men that we propose to educate for the Navy can be educated to so much greater advantage in one place and so much less expense to the Government, wherever that naval academy is located, that to think of establishing other naval academies and constructing great plants, as would naturally follow any such course, seems to me the height of folly. I think the whole thing ought to go out of the bill.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, there are Senators on the Naval Committee who are very insistent that there should be another naval academy, located either on the Great Lakes or on the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. WEEKS. Let me say to the Senator that I have no doubt that there are 40 Senators who would like to have naval academies established in their States.

Mr. SWANSON. And motions were offered to provide for them. We thought it would be better to have a commission to report on the matter before any action was taken pro or con. I hope the Senator will not object to this commission being organized. It is not a new commission. It is a commission that has work already. Let the commission make a report.

Mr. TILLMAN. Let the commission report, and then make the fight.

Mr. SWANSON. I concur with the Senator. I think one academy each for the Army and the Navy is sufficient; but I have no objection to having the matter investigated by this commission. I hope the Senator will not insist upon eliminating that provision, but that it may be included in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WEEKS. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I was going to suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that this is the appropriate time to consider the matter if it is to be considered at all, because if this commission should make a report recommending one or more academies, those who are interested in the places selected will then strenuously exert themselves to secure the enactment of legislation establishing them; and once we begin to multiply or even duplicate these institutions we are going to have them all over the country.

Personally I am of the opinion that one additional academy, military as well as naval, for the West or for the Pacific coast might be a good thing for the country; but the difficulty is that the precedent once established is bound to produce a brood of academies, both naval and military, all over the country. My State will want one.

Mr. WEEKS. It would be natural for a great coastwise State like Colorado to want one.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator's constituents will want one; and, as a consequence, we will have an omnibus bill providing for these institutions all over the country. Now is the time, I think, to determine the matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WEEKS. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was only going to say that I quite concur in the views of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Colorado, and I believe that now is the time to raise this objection. I think we can not do better than to retain the academy where it is.

Mr. TILLMAN. If Senators will look at the top of page 43 and see who constitutes this commission, I think they will get some light and understand that this is no cheap-John excur-

sion running around just to spend money, but that it will be composed of naval officers who are supposed to know the good of the Navy and the needs of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withhold his motion until the return of the junior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], who made a very elaborate argument before the committee, and I think the Senate ought to have the benefit of that argument before acting on this matter.

Mr. SWANSON. I am very much opposed to establishing any academy anywhere else, either for the Army or for the Navy.

Mr. TILLMAN. No one is more opposed to it than am I.

Mr. SWANSON. But this matter will have to be determined at some time. They are very insistent on it, and it seems to me that the report of a board on it could not do any harm.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I think the Senator will save himself and the Government trouble to let this matter come to a vote now and knock the whole thing out of the bill. I want to do the courteous thing by the junior Senator from California; but he is a member of the committee, and it seems he should be here while this bill is under consideration. I am either going to renew this motion later on or I am willing to defer it now if the Senator in charge of the bill would like to have it passed over temporarily.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to have the Senator from California here when this matter is disposed of. It would not be proper to pass on it in his absence, it seems to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Virginia desires to have the whole amendment passed over.

Mr. SWANSON. Let the amendment be passed over until the Senator from California comes in. We will recur to it as soon as he returns.

Mr. FLETCHER. I take it that the motion to strike out applies only to lines 11 to 14, inclusive, and not to the whole amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be necessary to have the whole amendment passed over.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. PHELAN entered the Chamber.

Mr. SWANSON. The junior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] is in his seat, and we can dispose of the amendment. I will state that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] has moved to strike out the provision directing a commission to make a report—

on the advisability of establishing one or more naval academies on the Pacific coast or in the region of the Great Lakes, and where the same should be located and the probable cost thereof.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I understand that a motion has been made to strike out the provision referred to by the Senator from Virginia. The object of the provision in the bill is to meet the absolute necessities of the Navy to-day in providing adequate means for the education of Naval officers. The Annapolis school has reached its capacity, and the Congress has increased the number of midshipmen. I am informed by the Secretary of the Navy that it is impracticable to enlarge the Annapolis Academy on account of inadequate ground, and it is not desirable to educate at any one place more than 1,200 midshipmen, and that is the capacity of the Annapolis Academy to-day.

England has two academies—a small, tight little island. The United States is an extensive country, with a population constantly growing. The western part of the country has recently come into well-deserved prominence. I have been informed that midshipmen are reluctant to come from the Far West to Annapolis on account of its remoteness from their homes, and western Senators have informed me—the Senator from Nevada did so the other day—that men have refused to go, on the advice of their parents, because they would be so remote from the influence of their parents. Therefore, the Navy is denied a class of midshipmen that would doubtless greatly increase the efficiency of the Navy, by introducing a desirable class of young men, hardened by the frontier, in the arduous service of war in behalf of their country when that time must come.

I do not know why the eastern part of the country should make any objection to the addition of another school; and, granting that other schools should be established, why they should not, not only in justice to the West but generously, accord that privilege to that part of the country, the Pacific coast, where the Navy is to-day most needed, where familiarity with its waters is most desirable, because I am not alone in believing that the next great naval engagement in which this country shall be involved will be rather in Pacific waters—the term "Pacific" being a misnomer—than in Atlantic waters. There the expansion is going on. There we read, no later than to-day, of treaties between Asiatic countries and European countries for the purpose of controlling the trade. There, according to William H. Seward, will be the future theater of the great events of the world; and he so stated it with prophetic vision at the time he, as Secretary of State, acquired the Territory of Alaska.

We have islands, Senators, in the Pacific. Whether we are to defend our frontier or not is a matter for future discussion. There is a disposition to give up some of these hazardous possessions of the United States; but, needless to say, we have them, and we are interested in the development of the Pacific trade, and there the future conflict will come.

I mention that merely to say that this country is larger than Maryland or New York or Massachusetts; that the Pacific Ocean, strategically, is of great importance to this country, and should be known and understood. I am told that there are men in the naval service of this Government to-day who have no knowledge whatever of Pacific waters. If some of them were educated on the shores of the Pacific, they would have special qualifications.

We have there the great ocean; we have still waters; we have navy yards. There is every facility for the education of the man not only in navigation on still waters and in the deep sea but in the construction of war vessels. It is only fair, in the establishment of a new school, if such a school is to be established, that it be established on the Pacific coast, and that the Members of this body should be informed as to the most desirable location, as to the probable cost, and as to every other fact which will guide them in determining their action.

I submit that this matter does not settle the question whether there shall be two schools, but merely puts the Senate in possession of the information necessary upon which to base a sound judgment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it is true that this amendment does not technically settle the question as to whether or not we shall have another school, but it is the first step in that direction. If it is necessary that we should have another school like Annapolis, I should not be one to oppose its establishment; but before we take any steps let us determine whether or not it is necessary to establish another school. If there should be another one established, it probably would be established on the Pacific coast. I would just as lief it should be on the Pacific coast as on any other coast. But, Mr. President, if we are going to expand the Navy to such an extent that the school already established is too small, and we have not enough land there on which to build more buildings and to expand, then let us buy some more land there. If we establish one on the Pacific coast we will have to buy the land upon which it is established.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, will the Senator submit to an interruption?

Mr. NORRIS. I will.

Mr. PHELAN. Congressman KENT, of California, has made a tender of a thousand acres of land on the Bay of San Francisco; so I judge other points on the coast would be just as ready to make a donation, if that is a moving consideration with the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator that it has not much influence with me whether it is donated or not; but there is not any proposition here that anybody is going to donate the land. I presume we could advertise for donations and establish these schools all over and get the land donated.

Why, Mr. President, if the other argument is good, that the young men from the West refuse to go to Annapolis because they will be so far away from the influence of their fathers and their mothers, if that is an argument for the establishment of more military and naval academies, then let us establish them in every county in the United States.

Why, Mr. President, how far do they have to go now from my part of the country? I have not heard that any of them objected to going to Annapolis because they would be out from under the influence of parental care. But, Mr. President, if the sons of Nevada do not want to go to Annapolis, and therefore we are deprived of the valuable services of those young men; if they will not go there because they will be so far away from father and mother, how much better would it be if they went to San Francisco? They could not go home every Saturday night there. And what would happen to those valuable midshipmen if they were graduated from the academy, and the order came that they should go to South Africa, or to Japan, or to China, still farther away from their fathers and their mothers? I presume they would resign from the Navy.

Mr. KENYON. Their fathers might go along.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Iowa suggests that their fathers might go along. That might be; but, Mr. President——

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. PHELAN. I may have been misunderstood. I was merely describing the attitude of mind of the parents, not the disposition of the boy; and hence we lose that class of boy, on account of the mental attitude of the parents toward sending the boy to so remote a point. The boy himself is always willing to leave the parent nest.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from California assure us that these fathers and mothers of Nevada would not likewise object if their sons went to San Francisco? Would not that be just a little too far away from the control of parental influence?

When I mention San Francisco Bay as a center, it covers a very considerable area, easily accessible to points in Idaho, and in Nevada, and in Utah, and in Arizona, and in all the pioneer States. The Senator probably has reference to Nebraska. That is still more remote.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I had reference to Nevada because the Senator mentioned the State of Nevada.

Mr. PHELAN. It is one night's journey from San Francisco.

Mr. NORRIS. But the parents whose sons go to Annapolis would probably likewise object to their sons going to San Francisco, even though it took only two or three days to go and return.

Mr. PHELAN. To those people who are working hard for their living the consideration of the item of transportation—the cost is not so great for the smaller distance—means very much.

Mr. NORRIS. But the Senator will have to have some new regulations for this specific academy, because, even though parents living in Baltimore have sons in the Annapolis Academy, the young men could not go home to see their fathers without permission, and they would not get permission under the rules and regulations more than once or twice a year. They will get that permission if they live in Nevada, and the Government will pay the expense of the young men going there and back.

It seems to me it reduces itself down to this, that we are going to make a commercial proposition. If academies are going to be established for the benefit of the communities in which they are located rather than for the benefit of the Government, then we must go into the business, and we ought to have them everywhere. I could guarantee to you, Mr. President, that if you will establish a naval academy on the Missouri River we can have donated a thousand acres of land available for that purpose without any expense to the Government, and probably build a plant and turn over some boats that the Senator from Iowa has put out of commission by his opposition to the river and harbor bill.

Mr. KENYON. On the Platte River?

Mr. NORRIS. On the Platte and the Missouri Rivers.

Mr. KENYON. I do not know that there are any boats on the Platte River.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes, there are boats on the Platte. But that does not make any difference. If you are going to establish these military academies for the benefit of the communities, then you ought to establish them where there is no water, because it will cost that much more money to get water there; and you can dig a channel up the Mississippi and its tributaries and do more good to the community by spending the Government funds than if you simply established a military academy along the ocean. Why should not the cities on rivers have them as well as the ocean cities?

It all reduces itself, it seems to me, to the proposition whether we need another academy. No good argument, as far as I have been able to hear, has been offered or even suggested that another academy is necessary. I think, if we had another one, it would probably go to the Pacific coast by general consent, but I do not believe we ought to go into the business of establishing academies for the benefit of communities. If we do, then we ought to establish another military academy for the Army. This is for the Navy.

If we must have two naval academies, then why not have two military academies? It is a stepping stone. It means the establishment of a naval academy on the Pacific coast, one on the Great Lakes, and one on the Gulf; and then the military academies, and they will not be confined to the coast, will go all over the country, because you can train your soldiers inland just as well as you can on the water. The one already established is on a river, and every river in the country will be demanding a military academy. After all, the great naval program of expansion is one more for the benefit of the community and individuals than it is for the benefit of the country. It may not be out of place to provide for the establishment of a dozen of them, because that will take public money and give it to somebody just as well as if we built two or three dozen useless battleships and let somebody get that money.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I am slightly interested in this provision. It will be noted that the provision calls for an investigation as to the places likely to be available for this new academy. One of the places is the Great Lakes. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] says, "For Chicago." It is true, my home is in the imperial and unparalleled city of Chicago, which sits in queenly magnificence upon the great Lake Michigan. It feels that it is the most appropriate place where an academy could be located upon the Lakes if one is to be located in that vicinity. I confess a personal interest in that undertaking, and I was instrumental, together with the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], both being members of the Naval Committee, in having this provision written in the phraseology that it now presents.

Mr. President, there is only one inquiry here. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] puts it very well and, I think, disposes of it and makes the issue absolute. If it is necessary for the Government to have academies for the education of students in the matters of naval warfare and naval commerce, then the Government should have them in number sufficient and at places appropriate to serve the object and to completely serve the full object of the Government. If, on the other hand, we have reached a point where the wisdom of the legislative body is that they are unnecessary further, that they should not be increased, that there should be no enlargement, then this provision should be defeated upon the ground that the policy is not for the welfare of the Government.

If, on the other hand, it has been discovered through past events or present existing circumstances that we should enlarge the Navy, enlarge its officers, prepare a larger field for the education of the men who shall serve in the Navy, then the question is, Where can that best be done?

I beg to say to the Senate that I think the able Senator from Nebraska has failed to catch the spirit which is the one which I think justifies this investigation. I tender it in detail, and if the one I offer is not sufficiently justified then I do not think that the mere question of accommodation of localities for the mere purpose of locality or appropriation for their profit or their pleasure would be sufficient.

This Government, Mr. President, extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific. If we shall ever have a conflict, such as I fear, it will come either from the Atlantic, Europe, from the Pacific, the Orient, or from the South. It is not generally conceded that we are likely to have trouble from the North. As to the latter I do not altogether agree. It is well known that I do not agree in this enjoyed security, but I do not intend to enter now upon that phase. It is enough to say that I have always harbored the fear that if this country should ever become involved in difficulty with any European nation it will find one of its greatest difficulties to solve at the north border.

But, Mr. President, the theory of an academy upon the Pacific coast is that those waters shall become learned to the seamen, shall become learned to the sailors, so that the ability to struggle in those waters and to contest in those waters may be known to men trained upon those waters.

Second, sir, that the Pacific coast and that part of the West shall feel akin and close to the Government. That it shall feel in participating in the Government it has been permitted to enjoy the benefit of the Government.

It is too well known, I am sure Senators will not regard this as an exaggeration, that there is a part of our country which has always felt that it has been divorced from the benefit of the Republic, and that the Atlantic has always enjoyed all the privileges so that every benefit conferred is to some degree sooner or later conferred there; that through favored privileges the Atlantic coast has enjoyed for nearly a hundred years a monopoly of benefits.

The Pacific coast should have one academy if it shall be first conceded that there shall be an increase in the opportunities and an increase in the number of the Navy. Two things that I feel result. One is, it is nearer to the citizens; they do not travel so far; they train at their doorways; they are acquainted with the water in which they may serve.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. LEWIS. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to suggest to the Senator this thought in answer to his argument, that one of the reasons why an additional academy should be located on the Pacific is to

familiarize the future men of the Navy with the Pacific waters. I may be wrong in it, but I believe the fact is that the men who are at Annapolis to-day get as much experience and drill and practice on the Pacific coast as they do on the Atlantic Ocean, and that, outside of the little boating in the immediate vicinity of the school where they would learn to handle boats, and so forth, they get as much absolute practice on one side of the country as they do on the other. I think that exists now, and while I agree with the Senator if it is decided that another academy shall be built it ought to be on the Pacific Ocean, yet the fact that a young man goes through a school there does not equip him any better in knowledge of the Pacific Ocean than though he went through a school on the Atlantic Ocean. When he is put in charge, as he eventually will be, of a battleship or any vessel of the Navy he is just as liable, if graduated from the Pacific coast school, to be sent to the Atlantic Ocean as he would be to be retained on the Pacific.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I desire in reply to say to the able Senator that he indulges in a state of facts that investigation will assure him are not well grounded. It is not until after the student has graduated that he is put upon a ship. Then, of course, he may train after that in waters anywhere; but pending the time of his graduation he is, I assure the Senator, by the regulations largely limited to the field upon the Atlantic coast.

But I wish to say to my able friend, this has another point of consideration that impresses me. I am now speaking about the coast. I am satisfied that while we live, if Providence shall be so generous as to allow us to live the Divine statute of limitations, the whole present policy of the Navy will be abandoned; that our country, extending so far, from the Pacific to the Atlantic, and our interests becoming constantly involved and in many cases so threatened, there will next arise the necessity for an Atlantic Squadron wholly controlled from the Atlantic coast for purposes of Atlantic defense; then there will be one on the Pacific coast, wholly existing upon the Pacific, trained on the Pacific, suited for Pacific necessities. The Panama Canal will make the channel through which these will join when necessary; yet, sir, under ordinary circumstances all life on each will be separate from each other for the purposes of the defense of the Republic against those things which many of us assume are inevitable in the future, from either coast, or both.

If I am right in that, surely then it is most appropriate that on the Pacific coast there should be the opportunity of a training station. Senators will see that the provision only calls for an examination. The objection made by the Senator from Nebraska, which is as well put and as forcibly as can be from any other source, if well taken, will clearly appear to those who will investigate the subject under this provision, and then that investigation which entails no expense will reveal such fact of just opposition. If, on the other hand, the investigation should reveal the necessity which the Senator says if revealed he would yield, as to the locating of some academy, then we will have the opportunity of the location.

This much I say for the Pacific coast. The only other place where I feel there will be the necessity for naval education is upon the Great Lakes. Let it not be forgotten that one of the great struggles of the Republic for the maintenance of itself was on the Great Lakes; and as I see it, Senators, not wanting to strike a note of alarm here to-day, the Great Lakes again will be a field of a very severe naval encounter in this Republic.

It might not be while we live—we all pray it shall not be ever—but it is inevitable if there should be an encounter anywhere that we should be involved with those nations which have possessions on the American continent now located upon the Great Lakes. For that reason I feel that the Great Lakes should have two stations. One should be for the shipyard. In that we are very much embarrassed by a treaty a hundred years old between the United States and Great Britain, which exists yet, which seems to forbid the construction of ships for naval uses or of ships at all upon the Great Lakes. Whether that treaty shall be abrogated or not I do not know, and why our Government continues to allow that obstruction to remain as it now exists against a shipyard on the Lakes, in view of the necessity for commerce, I do not understand.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume the Senator is better posted on that than I am, and I am asking entirely for information. Would the provisions of that treaty prohibit the use by the students of an academy, if one should be located on the Great Lakes, of naval vessels for the purpose of practice?

Mr. LEWIS. I will say to my able friend that there was indulged before certain members of the committee their views on that subject, and I must say to the Senator there is some apprehension. There is a feeling on the part of very able men and thoughtful men in this body who have given the subject attention before, that the same objection which would prevail against the ships being built for naval purposes might be equally addressed to a naval academy if Britain sought to enforce the provisions of the treaty.

The hope is indulged that it will be waived by Great Britain as it has never been urged under certain conditions past where it might have been urged. But in reply directly to the Senator I say the subject is filled with very grave doubt. It is urged that the examination shall extend to the consideration of the Great Lakes in order that we may ascertain whether that part of the Middle West, which has felt at times that it has not been treated by this Government as an integral part. That it has often been ignored, and that it has been too often discriminated against. I feel that there upon the Great Lakes, a body of water foreign to both the Atlantic and the Pacific, calling for a different form of training, it would be most appropriate and justifiable to establish some form of academy where the young men could be trained for the uses of the water to the naval demands if these academies are necessary at all anywhere and if the increase of the Navy is essential and if further expansion of it is justified.

I respectfully call to the attention of the Senate that the provision merely asks to have the question investigated. If the investigation shall develop a report calling for their construction, then I think the objections urged by the able Senator could be probably addressed in more detail, but until the recommendation discloses their necessity these objections need not be entertained. If it should be disclosed that they are necessary, then I am sure the objections will be addressed to the mere matter of their cost, their propriety, and the appropriateness of their location, for none of us would defeat the project if the necessities of the Government called for it.

I join with the Senator from California in asking the Senate to allow the provision to remain.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am opposed to this bill and I expect to give the reasons for my opposition a little later on. But the Senator from Massachusetts makes a motion to strike out this provision of the bill. I am a little surprised that under the circumstances he should object to this provision. It seems to me to be quite ungrateful of him. It may be because he was educated at Annapolis and entertains the thought that no one can be well educated anywhere else.

This provision does not establish a naval academy on the Pacific coast. It only provides for a proper investigation of that subject in order to determine whether it should be so established or not.

I do not very well see how an advocate of the passage of this bill could object consistently to such a reasonable provision as that.

We all know, Mr. President, this bill is going to pass eventually and become a law, however unfortunate that may seem to me, and these different provisions in the bill must be judged upon that basis. If we are going to provide for an enormous Navy, which I think ought not to be established in a free country like this, there is certainly nothing unreasonable in providing that there may be two naval academies 3,000 miles apart. Why should the boys on the Pacific coast and nearby be compelled to come 3,000 miles to be educated under the Government when a school could be established nearer home?

I must say, Mr. President, that whatever my views may be of the bill itself as a whole, I can see no reason why this provision in the bill should be stricken out.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, it seems to me that this amendment is an exceedingly reasonable proposal. As I understand, it is merely that this commission shall inquire into the advisability of establishing a naval school on the western coast.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, in our military and naval preparation for the future, I think that we ought to give great attention to the education and training of officers, both for the Army and the Navy. The estimate is that in our Army each man costs about a thousand dollars per annum, except in the Philippine Islands or in other foreign service, where the cost is higher. The average cost of an officer annually does not exceed $2,500; and yet a good officer has an expansive quality of one to one-hundredth, for a good officer can train 100 men. We have, therefore, by training officers, this element of elasticity in our naval and military preparation that we have always on hand, whether they are actually in the service or not, a body of men who are trained to arms and who are capable of training others. Thus, the very presence of that large body of men facilitates elasticity in our military preparations in case of emergency.

One of the great difficulties in England in training the enormous armies which they have recently produced has been a lack of officers, for in the preliminary stages of the war in Belgium

the officers of the British Army acted with their usual bravery and recklessness, leading their men instead of following and being protected by them, and they were swept away. Consequently England was at the greatest disadvantage, a disadvantage arising from the lack of having trained men who could train others.

I have been in hopes of seeing our Military Establishment enlarged in such a way as to provide military schools for training officers all over the country, making use of the original purposes of the land-grant college law, which provided not only for the advancement of agriculture and the mechanic arts, but for military training as well, the very purpose being to train for the Republic men who had some knowledge of military discipline and military tactics and military sanitation, and who would be able to take care of others. In every war that we have had the chief difficulty at the very start has been one of sanitation; one of inability to meet the ordinary requirements of sanitation, so that disease and pestilence have swept away more of our men than has war itself.

If we are going to have a larger Military Establishment and a larger Naval Establishment, are we to content ourselves with one naval school at Annapolis, Md.—the naval school at Newport being one, I believe, of advanced training—or are we to have others? Has not the Pacific coast its problems just as the Atlantic coast has its problems, and are we going to require that that enormous territory in the western region should send all of those whom we desire to train in the art of war, so far as it relates to our Navy, 3,000 miles away for that training? I believe that we should have such training as near as possible to the people themselves whose interests are affected, and that we should have as many of such schools as will be necessary to have on hand always, either in active or in retired service, a body of men who will be able to meet any emergency, whatever it may be.

I do not suppose for a moment that the Senate will reject this reasonable amendment, which has been inserted by the Committee on Naval Affairs, having knowledge of the exigencies of the situation regarding this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS].

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I desire to have the amendment again stated. I was temporarily absent from the Chamber when it was offered.

The SECRETARY. On page 44, after line 10, it is proposed to strike out:

> Said commission shall also report on the advisability of establishing one or more naval academies on the Pacific coast or in the region of the Great Lakes and where the same should be located and the probable cost thereof.

Mr. WEEKS. 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:

Bankhead	Fletcher	Nelson	Smoot
Borah	Gallinger	Newlands	Swanson
Brady	Gronna	Norris	Taggart
Brandegee	Hardwick	Oliver	Thomas
Bryan	Hitchcock	Overman	Thompson
Catron	James	Phelan	Tillman
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Townsend
Chilton	Jones	Poindexter	Underwood
Clapp	Kenyon	Pomerene	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Shafroth	Walsh
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Warren
Curtis	Lewis	Smith, Ariz.	Weeks
Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Md.	Williams
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Smith, S. C.	Works

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS].

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, just a moment to explain why I have made the motion which is now pending. One Naval Academy has been established for the construction and maintenance of which the Government has expended a great many millions of dollars. That institution is adequate for all the purposes to which it is likely to be devoted. I am surprised to hear Senators making an argument in favor of more naval academies because some other section of the country will be benefited. It does not make any difference to me whether the Naval Academy is on the Atlantic coast, the Pacific coast, or on the Gulf coast. It happens to be located on the Atlantic coast. I would feel exactly the same if it were located elsewhere.

No argument can be made that it will add to the efficiency of such an establishment or to the value of the product of that establishment if there are two institutions instead of one, or three instead of two. The same argument can be made in favor of the establishment of such an institution on the Great Lakes as can be made in favor of its establishment on the Pacific coast or in one of the Gulf States. It is one of those matters which ought not to be considered at all from the standpoint of location. It is a great national institution.

I do not think that a board of officers could be found who would report in favor of the establishment of an additional Naval Academy. I would feel it just as wise to put into the sundry civil bill a provision that a board should make an investigation to determine whether there should be another capital or not, or how many capitals there should be, and I am confident that there would be Senators—quite a number of them—if that were to be done, who would advance good arguments from their standpoint why a capital should be created in their own States. I hope that this important institution will not be trifled with, even to the extent of appointing a commission, and that that provision will be stricken from the bill.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I wish to detain the Senate just long enough to give my very hearty approval to what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] has said. I was impressed with the argument advanced by the honorable Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], that the Pacific coast has its problems and that it is necessary to establish a naval academy there in order that a peculiar science of naval warfare may be taught on the western coast of this country. I think, instead of founding another institution to teach men military sanitation, as suggested by the able Senator from Nevada, that we ought to offer a reward to somebody to discover an antitoxin that would kill the military germ that seems to be poisoning the blood of the American people and firing their brains to acts of indiscretion. Congress seems almost to have gone crazy on the subject of expending money for preparedness, which means, God knows what; but any proposition to spend any amount of money for anything on earth, if you just attach to it the name of "preparedness," would find supporters in this body. I sincerely hope that the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts will be adopted.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senators who were absent during the preliminary discussion, I simply desire to say that the committee report embraced a provision authorizing the President to appoint five naval officers, not lower in rank than that of commander, to report on various subjects—naval bases, aviation grounds, submarine bases, and, among other things, the advisability of providing for the growing needs of the Navy another naval academy, either on the Pacific coast or on the Great Lakes, and to report the location and probable cost thereof. They are simply charged with the duty of reporting on the advisability of it as well as the location and the cost—information necessary for the Senate to determine, with expert evidence on their part, the necessity for such action.

The Senator from Massachusetts has stated just now that Annapolis provides ample means. I desire to challenge that statement. The Congress has already increased the number of midshipmen by one-third, if I recall aright; and the Navy Department—the Secretary himself—has stated that the capacity of Annapolis is 1,200, and that that capacity is about being reached now. As we are aware, there are hundreds of young men constantly rejected for one reason or another, and that is the only reason why the pressure has not been greater upon the Congress to provide additional accommodations. So it remains undisputed that either Annapolis has to be enlarged or a new academy established elsewhere; and it is against sound economic considerations and also against military educational considerations to attempt, I am informed by the Secretary of the Navy in conversation, the education of a larger number of men than 1,200 at any one place. England has two naval academies, and England has led the way in the progress of naval development and construction.

If that be true, it is not a matter of sectional consideration. It is not a matter of geography. It is a matter of necessity that greater accommodations should be provided. The Pacific coast is looming up in importance. It is to be the theater of the great events of the world's future. Upon its waters possibly the next naval engagement shall be fought, and very few of the men educated at Annapolis have that intimate knowledge of that ocean and the neighboring waters, the bays, and the rivers and the harbors that qualifies them fully for service there. I am informed, on the other hand, that men who have served on the Pacific, when transferred to the Atlantic, have but an inadequate and imperfect knowledge of the waters where they command great fleets. So there will ultimately be, probably sooner than we expect, an absolute necessity for having both a Pacific Fleet and an Atlantic Fleet; and an admiral testified before the

House committee the other day that our so-called Pacific Fleet could be routed by one enemy warship, and that the only hope in the world for the Pacific Fleet as it is constituted to-day, guarding that great coast, would be the precipitation of a fog at the "psychological moment," under cover of which it might escape!

So the Pacific Ocean must be borne in mind, not only in the location of our fighting craft, but in the education of our youth. The great West is turning out men all the time of the right sort for fighting, not pampered by influences which prevail to a great extent in the luxurious cities of the East—hardy youths, brought up on the farm. I demonstrated here, on testimony of western Senators, that the mental attitude of the parents toward a college so remote from their homes that they never could afford to get to see their boy during the period of his education, four years, has actually deterred young men from seeking careers in the Navy, and they have refused proffered appointments as midshipmen to the Annapolis institution. So, in order to develop the Navy, not to develop the West, I claim that it would be exceedingly desirable now to secure merely a report from competent authority as to the advisability of doing this.

Possibly I need as much information as other Senators, but I will not accept the word of an alumnus of Annapolis, making the defense here of his alma mater, wishing to confer upon it exclusive benefits, as any reason whatever why another naval academy should not be established in some other part of the country. I have great respect for his filial love, but it should not stand in the way of legislation by the Senate of the United States. I recall that it is the spirit of emulation that develops the best in men and in institutions.

In the State of California a few years ago Leland Stanford, some time Senator to the United States in this body, having lost his son, decided to give his great wealth to the establishment of a university. The men who supported by taxation and by their loyal Californian spirit the University of California looked with fear, with a sense of apprehension, upon this vastly endowed institution entering the educational ranks for competition. What was the result? We have, instead of competitive institutions, rival institutions; and I believe the enrollment in the University of California, which thought it was threatened, ranks only second to Yale and Harvard; and Stanford, with equal pace, has gone forward until it is one of the great universities of the land. So the one that was threatened—the University of California—became the greatest of them all, stimulated by the presence of a rival educational institution.

Certainly when the Senator says he would just as soon vote for having two capitals in this country, one east and one west, he does not, I am sure, seriously attempt to make a comparison between, or establish as anything analogous, the development of universities and the establishment of capitals. I myself believe in one capital and one flag and one country. The capital is the emblem of the unity of the Nation. If the Senator were consistent in that statement, he would discourage all other educational institutions except a national university; and I do not believe, although his logic would lead him there, that he would give us that as his conclusion, after a careful survey of the field.

They say that in England once there was one lawyer in a town who was starving to death until another came, when they both grew rich.

It is the spirit of emulation, the spirit of competition, of doing better than the other man can possibly do, whether in scholarship or in oarsmanship or in swimming or in athletics or in seamanship or in construction, that will bring us the very highest development in the men who are in the future to defend the country in its battles upon the sea.

I may say, in conclusion, without appearing in the least to be sectional, that in the far western land we have a climate which enables men to work in comfort, which you appreciate to-day, the year around. Hence, it is due to that fact that there has been a greater proficiency shown by the men educated, say, in the sports, in that part of the country. I read but to-day that in that form of athletics where men are made alert and hardy, in the tournaments, the men from the West excel the men from the East, and it is stated that it is due entirely to the fact, not that they are better in spirit and in thought and in aspiration, but that on every day of the year they can in comfort develop their muscles and promote their skill in the open air. And so in aviation, which in the future will mean much in determining the battles of the country. There aviation fields and aviators—a part necessarily of naval education—will find clear skies and congenial environment.

Senators, inasmuch as this is merely an ordinary and desirable means of securing information, and not in the least committing this body to the policy of even two naval academies, I request, on behalf of those who are interested, not so much in the western part of this country, but who are interested very deeply and sincerely in the development of the Navy and the skill and proficiency of its men, that this motion to reject the amendment be voted down.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I agree entirely with the Senator from Massachusetts that if a second Naval Academy is not necessary, the question of locating it on the Pacific coast should receive no consideration whatever. I am one of those who believe that favors of this kind should not be distributed in any such way. But the matter to be submitted to this investigating commission is not merely whether it should be located on the Pacific coast or not, but whether or not there should be a second naval school at all.

It may be that the officers who will be called upon to investigate the matter may not agree with the Senator from Massachusetts as to the importance of maintaining the one academy at which he was educated. He may be a little bit prejudiced in that respect; but I see no reason why that matter should not be committed fairly to the naval officers who will be called upon to determine that question, as they will determine it, without any reference to the wishes or the desires of the people of the Pacific coast, so far as I represent those people. But if it should be determined that it is advisable that a second one should be established, then I think it is fair to consider the other question as to where it should be located. We have one at the far eastern side of the country, and I think it should be considered fairly whether the other one ought not to be established on the Pacific coast, after first determining that there should be a second one, and not before.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very sorry that I can not agree with the argument presented by my friend the junior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] in behalf of this amendment. I stated somewhat briefly, when the Senator from Massachusetts yielded for a question, why I thought the matter should be disposed of now; and I would not undertake to repeat what I said at that time if it were not for the fact that there are a good many Senators present now who were not present in the Chamber then.

The proposed amendment is as follows:

> Said commission shall also report on the advisability of establishing one or more naval academies on the Pacific coast or in the region of the Great Lakes and where the same should be located and the probable cost thereof.

Evidently the commission, if this amendment is incorporated into the law, will be required to visit various localities and to report upon the advisability, not of one, not of two, perhaps, but of an indefinite number of naval academies on the Pacific coast or in the region of the Great Lakes.

If it is necessary that the Government should establish one or more naval academies in addition to that which it now has, I see no reason why this commission should be confined in its examination to the Pacific coast and to the Great Lakes. There are other sections of the country which perhaps might possess facilities or advantages equal, if not superior, to those possessed by the two sections of the country specified in the amendment. There is the Gulf coast, for example.

Mr. BORAH. That has already been included.

Mr. THOMAS. There is the great interior body of salt water at Salt Lake City.

Mr. SMOOT. The best place in the world.

Mr. THOMAS. And there is also the argument, which is by no means a fallacious one, that naval academies might be desired and in fact might be superior, from some standpoints, if they were located away from any body of water at all. In any event, other sections of the Union will clamor—and if this amendment should be adopted, I shall be one of them—for an extension of this investigation so as to comprise the great Rocky Mountain region, which is interested in the Navy to some extent, perhaps, as other localities are, for local reasons.

Mr. President, when this commission goes to the Pacific coast for the purpose of making this investigation, and to the Great Lakes, its members will be feasted and wined and dined, and they will have great difficulty in resisting the genial and bounteous hospitality of my very dear friend the junior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], when he has an opportunity to entertain them and acquaint them with the magnificent resources and the splendid people and the wonderful atmosphere of that land of sunshine and gold and flowers. They will receive similar entertainment from my equally distinguished and hospitable friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], who, I understand, is also interested in this investigation. And if they should, perchance, come to the city of Denver, there is no question but that it will maintain its own reputation for hospitality and for entertainment. I do not know of any commission, even

with Mr. Edison at its head, that will be able to resist all of the blandishments, all of the entreaties, all of the persuasions, and all of the representations that will necessarily and very properly be made concerning the necessity, first, of another academy, and second, the necessity of its location at the particular place which is at the time the immediate subject of inquiry and investigation.

This, Mr. President, will be followed by a similar amendment to our military bill—which, I think, is equally appropriate, if this is appropriate—providing for a similar commission which shall report upon the advisability of establishing one or more military academies in addition to the one which we possess. That commission will also be subjected to the same representations and the same persuasive influences which it is difficult, perhaps, to resist, and which, whether resisted or not, will necessitate a report here which, if favorable, will be acted upon, and if unfavorable will in all probability be followed by the institution of another and yet another commission until we can get one which will make the right kind of a report.

Mr. President, assuming that a report favorable to some locality shall be made without regard to the question of its necessity, experience teaches us that those who represent the section of the country favored by the report will be besieged—indeed, they will be beleaguered—by their constituency until they secure the establishment of the institution and the appropriation necessary for its adequate operation. The precedent having been set every State in the Union, one after the other, will be clamoring here for the institution of similar establishments within their geographical boundaries. Indeed, I perhaps might go further and say that every city of any great importance and every congressional district will ultimately desire schools of this kind. If we may judge from the manner in which similar precedents have multiplied into appropriations for similar purposes, certainly the prediction which I make in this matter is not an extravagant one.

So I think that this project of increasing the number of these schools, which I do not believe necessary, should be met at the threshold, and instead of having the subject investigated we should first determine whether the investigation is necessary.

Mr. President, if we have not room enough at Annapolis to house and graduate a sufficient number of students to officer our Navy, we should increase the capacity of that school. If we have not enough room and accommodations and facilities at West Point to turn out the requisite number of officers for our Military Establishment, then that school should be amplified so that it can meet the new demands made upon it.

But do not let us begin the work of duplicating, because it means the subsequent multiplication of these institutions; and, of course, that means the added expense necessary for their maintenance.

We must remember, Mr. President, that this bill carries the enormous appropriation of $319,000,000, and that if it becomes a law for the purpose of carrying out its provisions there must be raised in the next two or three years an added sum of $488,000,000, in round numbers. More than three-quarters of a billion dollars are involved in this bill, and, while the amendment here does not affect the amount of the appropriation at all, we can easily perceive how this report may be followed by the consequences to which I have called attention.

I think that we should leave it here and that the motion to strike out as proposed should prevail.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, we will shortly pass a bill here carrying the appropriation of a tremendous sum of money, and it seems to me that in view of the burden that must necessarily apparently be placed upon the taxpayers of the country we ought to be exceedingly thoughtful with regard to those matters which are not essential at this time.

Naturally I should be very much in favor of anything which would look to the aggrandizement or the honoring of the Pacific coast or anything which would inure to its benefit or to its recognition or anything that would tend to place the country west of the Mississippi upon the political map of the United States. But I must say I disagree with my able friend from California and others as to the necessity at this time or as to the wisdom of including this provision in the bill.

This is a peculiar amendment, Mr. President, and speaks for itself. It does not provide, as I read it, that this commission shall report upon the advisability of establishing another naval academy, but it is to report alone upon the question as to the advisability of establishing one or more naval academies on the Pacific coast or in the region of the Great Lakes. The thing upon which they are called to pass is whether or not it is advisable to establish it in that particular region or country.

Mr. President, for many years we know that our Army appropriations have been filled up with large amounts for the purpose of maintaining forts in different parts of the country which ought long ago to have been abandoned. There have been a great number of forts established, some of them necessarily in the early days, but afterwards becoming wholly useless. Others were established out of the same spirit and enterprise which characterize this movement. All of them have been a drain upon the Treasury without any real benefit or value to the Army or to the protection of our country. Those forts, many of them, ought long ago to have been abandoned. It is almost impossible to secure their abandonment, but, to use perhaps a not wholly inapt and yet a rough phrase, they are in sense "pork" in the Army bill, and they are constantly sustained. We have had also the same thing with reference to some of our naval bases.

This is not with the intention of making it so, but, actuated by the same spirit, will result in the same way the establishing of some things which it seems to me are not necessarily connected with a thorough preparedness for the country.

If there is any reason why this academy should be established upon the Pacific coast, it can be better determined, in my judgment, in after years, after the spirit which now pervades the country shall have disappeared.

You could establish almost anything in any part of the country at this time which would have the name or pass under the cover of preparedness, and which might in after years serve no other purpose than that of simply a drain upon the Treasury.

It seems to me that there are other things which we need very much more for the Pacific coast. One of them was mentioned by the able Senator from California. We need a more real protection, more warships upon the Pacific coast, more of those things which will really be of service and which we may need immediately, and we had better address our attention in the line of securing those things rather than to speculate upon this matter, which to my mind is not necessary at this time, and may result in a great drain upon the Treasury without any real benefit to the country.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, whether or not the provision which the Senator from Massachusetts seeks to strike out is in the form in which it should be placed or not I am not quite certain. I believe there should be some inquiry into this subject. I do not think that in the form it appears in the bill it covers the situation. Some months ago, when the movement was on foot to increase the number of cadets at the Military Academy and the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy, an officer of the Navy came to me with this suggestion. He believed it was necessary to increase the membership in both institutions, but he felt that there were not sufficient accommodations at either of those institutions for the increased number of cadets or midshipmen, and he suggested that it might be well to provide a third institution for the first-year men, so that the cadets who were appointed to West Point and the midshipmen hereafter to be appointed to the Naval Academy could attend this third institution during the first year. His reason was, in brief, that the course of study at the two institutions during the first year is substantially the same, and that it might be of very great benefit to the graduates of both institutions if they were brought somewhat more closely together during the first part of their course of study.

Having in mind his suggestion, some time afterwards I introduced in the Senate Senate bill 4711. This bill was referred to the Military Committee. I think perhaps it has had some slight consideration, but it has not been taken up for final action I understand. My thought is that if this commission is to be appointed it would be well to authorize the commission to inquire into the advisability of establishing this third institution and also as to the wisdom or unwisdom of having the cadets and midshipmen together during the first year of their course of study.

I do not believe that we should attempt now to locate an institution, whether it is of the kind suggested by the Senator from California or the one suggested by the Senator from Illinois or the one suggested in the bill which I myself presented. I think that can be done later if we determine that it is necessary.

Mr. PHELAN. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. POMERENE. Certainly.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator expressed a doubt as to the wisdom of one course or another. Where the provision merely requires information to be sought by experts, he certainly would not object to the receipt of that information prepared by experts.

Mr. POMERENE. No; except I do object to this, that it is attempted by the provision of the bill to limit the judgment of the experts to particular localities. I am quite sure that, notwithstanding the fact that the distinguished Senator from Colorado overlooked Ohio, if this commission would get to

work they would not go farther west than Ohio for either of the institutions.

Mr. PHELAN. In answer to that, I simply desire to say that the existing institution is upon the Atlantic coast, and no good purpose would be served, in my judgment, in bringing in the greater population of the West by establishing another institution on the eastern coast. While I concede there is a necessity for it, there must be another institution, no matter where it is located, because it is the judgment of the Navy Department, I suppose properly advised, that 1,200 is the capacity of the existing institution, and that not more than 1,200 men should be educated in one place. I take that as a basis. If we do establish another institution, it must be far from the eastern seaboard in order to make a new demand. It is immaterial to me, for the purpose of this discussion, where it is, provided it is beyond the Atlantic seaboard and far enough west to bring within its scope that new population that seeks to serve the country and which is deterred by the remoteness of the Annapolis institution from their home.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from California a question. The Senator makes the statement that it is not advisable that Annapolis should have at any time more than 1,200 students. On what authority does the Senator make that statement?

Mr. PHELAN. In my previous remarks I said I made the statement on the authority of the Secretary of the Navy in a private conversation. The ground there is limited, and additional ground can not be acquired without very considerable cost because it adjoins the city. The plant is of a size and adequate only to meet the demands of 1,200 midshipmen, and therefore it is impracticable to increase that plant to educate a larger number of men. As I recollect, that was his judgment at that time.

Mr. SMOOT. I have talked with a good many naval officers, and the information that they give me is that Annapolis could just as well have 2,400 or 3,000 as the present number.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Utah permit me?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Utah is aware of the fact that we have just constructed a high-school building in the city of Washington for the accommodation of 2,500 school pupils?

Mr. SMOOT. The new Central High School?

Mr. GALLINGER. The new Central High School.

Mr. PHELAN. Do I understand the Senator to say that without any additional buildings it would accommodate 2,400?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not say that. I was going to tell the Senator what naval officers had told me. They claimed that a great deal of the overhead expenses and much of the expense of maintaining the institution would be the same with 1,200 as with 2,400 students.

I never heard the question as to whether there was room sufficient discussed, but I take it for granted that additional land could be purchased. No matter where a school was established, there would have to be land acquired. The building of the central or administrative building for a new naval academy would be very expensive, while with very little expense, I am informed, the administrative buildings at Annapolis could be made ample for all purposes, even if the attendance was increased to 2,000.

I wish to say that if there is to be another naval academy established, if the policy is to increase the number, then, of course, I think myself there ought to be one located in the far West, not necessarily in California, for I think the Senator from Colorado designated the very best place in the United States for a military or naval academy, and that was Salt Lake City.

I believe that if the amendment is going to be favorably considered, the Senator ought to ask that it be broadened and that the investigation be made by the commission first as to whether it is advisable to establish another naval academy, and, next, if it is advisable to do so let the commission say where it should be located—not in the Great Lakes country or California alone, but anywhere in the United States, I care not where. I think that would be the proper thing to do if we are going to undertake it at all. However, I have no doubt in my mind but what, if there is another academy established, it is going to cost the Government of the United States not one million dollars but many million dollars, and it will be a constant drain upon the Treasury every year.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me it would be ill-advised to adopt the amendment, even if amended as I suggested.

Mr. PHELAN. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. PHELAN. If the Senator from Utah were a member of the proposed commission to determine the advisability of establishing a naval academy either on the Pacific coast or the Great Lakes, in considering the advisability, would he not discuss the preferential plan advocated by many of enlarging Annapolis?

Mr. SMOOT. I would; and I want to say frankly——

Mr. PHELAN. Therefore we will elicit the information, which none of us seems to have in detail, from authentic sources.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say frankly to the Senator that I have not now sufficient knowledge at my command, nor have I been able to secure the information that I would consider absolutely necessary to decide that question, particularly the question as to the advisability; but I have had experience enough in trying to establish branch schools in connection with the main school to know that every time it is done it is an expensive undertaking. I take it for granted that this would be an expensive undertaking, though I am not prepared to say that the advantages that might accrue from it would not offset the expense. As to that question, I have not information sufficient at my command to decide; but I do know that it would cost the Government of the United States millions of dollars to undertake it. I further know that there are naval officers who have told me that it would be no advantage whatever to have a divided school.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. JONES. Will the Senator from Utah state whether or not the Navy Department, or any official representing it, has officially stated or suggested to Congress that an additional naval academy was needed?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know of any public statement which has been made to that effect, and I doubt whether there has ever been one. I do not think that any official of the Navy Department has ever publicly recommended that such a course be followed; but the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] has stated that in a private conversation with the Secretary of the Navy the Secretary told him that he thought 1,200 students were all that could be successfully taught at Annapolis.

Mr. JONES. What I desired to find out was whether or not the Secretary of the Navy, in an official way, or whether anybody representing the Navy Department, has ever suggested or recommended to Congress that any separate academy or divided academy should be established.

Mr. SMOOT. I think I am perfectly safe in saying that no one has made such recommendation.

Mr. JONES. If such officials thought it very necessary, they certainly would make such a recommendation.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the fact remains that there is a necessity for the increase of accommodations at the Naval Academy. When I introduced a bill last winter appropriating a sum of money for the purpose of constructing a naval academy on the Pacific coast there was a report from the Secretary of the Navy—for which I have sent—and in a conversation with me at that time the Secretary said he believed in the establishment of another naval academy; but he was not prepared, without an investigation by competent persons, to recommend it. I acquiesced in that view, and we have waited all these months without bothering Congress for the purpose of having a commission appointed to report, among other things, on that subject. This merely provides for a commission to make a report. A refusal to vote for the amendment would be a refusal to accept, with open-mind, information, which in no way determines the main question.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I am very much in favor of the creation of this commission. I think the information that they would get and the report that they would make to us would be very valuable and instructive, but I do not see any particular reason why they should be confined to particular sections of the country if they think other sections are better for such location. For myself I would be perfectly satisfied to accept the recommendation of trained men in that line of business; in fact, I think I should prefer their recommendation; I know I would prefer it to my own. I was going to suggest, however, to the chairman of the committee whether or not the purpose could not be served if we struck out the words "on the Pacific coast or in the region of the Great Lakes" and inserted words so that the amendment might read in this way:

Said commission shall also report on the advisability of establishing one or more additional naval academies and where the same should be located and the probable cost thereof, and whether the present academy should be enlarged.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, this amendment was inserted at the request and in consequence of the earnest efforts of the junior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], all of whom are members of the committee. If it is agreeable to those Senators to accept the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, it is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The only object I have is that the commission, being a commission of experts and naval officers, might have a free hand to suggest to Congress what they really thought was the best thing to do. We shall always have the right in the end to determine what is the best thing to do if we disagree with them.

Mr. LEWIS. I am perfectly willing that any form of investigation shall be made.

Mr. SWANSON. With the concurrence of the Senators previously named by me, I accept the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, let the amendment be again stated.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have not formally prepared it, but I have interlined the amendment in the bill which I hold in my hand. The reporter, of course, has taken the amendment down as I read it; but I will repeat it for the information of the Senate.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will excuse me, if he is going to offer that amendment to the amendment, would it not serve all of his purposes if, after the word "academies," he simply struck out the words "on the Pacific coast or in the region of the Great Lakes"?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did propose to strike out those words and to add something at the end of the amendment. If the Senator will permit me, I will once more read the amendment as it would read if my suggestion were accepted. I really do not care whether it is accepted or not. As I propose to amend the amendment it would read:

Said commission shall also report on the advisability of establishing one or more additional naval academies, and where the same should be located, and the probable cost thereof and whether the present academy should be enlarged.

Mr. SWANSON. I accept the amendment.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, it is possible that the amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] may improve the original proposition, which was evidently purely sectional in its intent; but it does not improve the fundamental condition which is proposed to be effected by this proposition.

We do not need another naval academy. We have the facilities, possibly barring suitable dormitory rooms, at the Naval Academy for a greatly increased number of midshipmen. It would be a waste of the Government's money, in my judgment, to establish another naval academy.

Some Senator, in speaking to-day, has referred very truly to the course which is followed when a fort or any other Government establishment is once fixed. We go on year after year appropriating money for additions, for improvements, for repairs, and for maintenance, whether they are needed or desirable or whether they are not. Here is a case where, in my judgment, there is no necessity for the establishment of an additional naval academy. In fact I believe the product which would go to the Navy from two institutions would be less homogeneous, that it would be less adapted to our needs than if they went from one institution. I can not see any argument in favor of the proposition, and I sincerely hope that the entire amendment will be voted out of the bill.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I think, if the proposed commission should be appointed, they ought not to be limited to reporting on the advisability of establishing particular academies. It seems to me that they ought also to have authority to report, if any additional school at all is to be established, whether or not it should be a preparatory school. I know that there are a great many authorities in the Navy Department who favor the establishment of a preparatory school, where young boys may be prepared for entrance to the Naval Academy and also for entrance to the Military Academy. So, I move to amend this paragraph by inserting after the word "academies" the words "or schools preparatory for the United States Naval and Military Academies"; so that that may be included in the scope of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that accepted by the committee?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I can not agree with the Senator that preparatory schools should be included in the scope of this provision. The only excuse I have ever heard from the naval officers with whom I have talked for the establishment of a second academy was to constitute purely a post-graduate school for, say, a one year's course, after a man had been graduated from the Naval Academy. Some have thought that possibly a second academy of that kind should be established, which could be a part of the academy at Annapolis and which would include post-graduate courses of one year, or some such period as that. As to preparatory academies all over the country, I think it would be a great mistake if we entered upon that system.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, let me call the attention of the Senator to the fact that we have such an institution in the War College, which affords substantially a post-graduate course.

Mr. SWANSON. As I have said, the only excuse that I have ever heard and that ever has made any impression on me for the establishment of second academies was that there should be afforded a post-graduate course after the regular course at Annapolis had been completed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The inquiry of the Chair was directed to the chairman of the committee for the purpose of keeping the record straight. The Senator from Washington can not, without the consent of the chairman of the committee, at the present time amend this portion of the amendment, because there is a motion pending to strike it out; and it is only when modified by the consent of the chairman of the committee that it can be modified before the motion to strike out is put.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The rule provides that the portion to be stricken out may be first perfected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is nothing to be inserted here; that is the difficulty about it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Question!

Mr. SHEPPARD. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the adoption of the committee amendments at this time preclude the offering of amendments to those amendments at a later time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If they are adopted now, it precludes that until the bill reaches the Senate, unless there is a motion to reconsider the vote whereby they have been adopted.

Mr. GALLINGER. I assume that in considering a committee amendment an amendment to amend the committee amendment would be in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no doubt about that, but that was not the inquiry of the Senator from Texas. The inquiry was directed to a case where the committee amendment had been adopted.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We were unable to hear the observation of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. My observation was that pending the consideration of a committee amendment a motion to amend that amendment would be in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

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

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JONES. Let us have the amendment read now as amended by the Senator from Connecticut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment as modified.

The SECRETARY. On page 44, line 11, it is proposed to strike out the committee amendment as modified, as follows:

Said commission shall also report on the advisability of establishing one or more additional naval academies and where the same should be located and the probable cost thereof and whether the present academy should be enlarged.

Mr. PHELAN. That is the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it is an amendment accepted by the committee. The Chair is trying to rule that on a motion to strike out amendments can not be submitted to the text unless they are modifications accepted by the committee.

Mr. WEEKS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was unable to hear just what the Chair ruled. Does the Chair hold that we can not amend the committee amendment now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; there is a motion to strike out a committee amendment, and the Chair is ruling that a Senator can not on motion amend the part to be stricken out; that it must be done by the consent of the committee. If it is not stricken out, it can be amended, or if it is stricken out another amendment can be proposed.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts to strike out.

Mr. WEEKS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). In the absence of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], with whom I am paired, I withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote "nay."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and vote "nay."

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. He is absent on important business. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask whether the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a general pair with that Senator, and will withhold my vote. If privileged to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. GRONNA. I have a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If privileged to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CATRON. I inquire if the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. CATRON. I have a pair with him, and therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan], who is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the remainder of the day.

Mr. WALSH. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. MYERS] on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. LANE] on account of illness.

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

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

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]; and

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays, 32, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Borah	Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Sterling
Bryan	Hitchcock	Nelson	Thomas
Culberson	Kenyon	Norris	Townsend
Cummins	La Follette	Oliver	Vardaman
Curtis	Lippitt	Smith, Ga.	Warren
Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Md.	Weeks
du Pont	McCumber	Smoot	

NAYS—32.

Ashurst	Hardwick	Phelan	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	James	Pittman	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poindexter	Swanson
Brady	Jones	Pomerene	Thompson
Brandegee	Kern	Ransdell	Tillman
Broussard	Lewis	Shafroth	Walsh
Chamberlain	Newlands	Sheppard	Williams
Chilton	Overman	Simmons	Works

NOT VOTING—36.

Catron	Gronna	McLean	Saulsbury
Clapp	Harding	Martine, N. J.	Sherman
Clark, Wyo.	Hollis	Myers	Shields
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Colt	Husting	Owen	Stone
Fall	Johnson, Me.	Page	Sutherland
Gallinger	Lane	Penrose	Taggart
Goff	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Underwood
Gore	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Wadsworth

So the motion of Mr. WEEKS to strike out was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. POMERENE. I move to amend the amendment by inserting the matter which I send to the desk.

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

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the amendment, the following words:

Said commission shall also report on the advisability of establishing a school for the accommodation, instruction, and training of military cadets and midshipmen, at which school all cadets and midshipmen shall attend for the first year after their appointment, and the place where it should be located, and the probable cost thereof.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All in favor of the amendment to the amendment will rise. [A pause.] Those opposed will rise. [A pause.] There is no doubt that the amendment to the amendment is rejected. The question now recurs on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Medicine and Surgery," on page 44, line 27, after the word "stores," to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$921,740," so as to make the clause read:

Medical Department: For surgeons' necessaries for vessels in commission, navy yards, naval stations, Marine Corps, and for the civil establishment at the several naval hospitals, navy yards, naval medical supply depots, Naval Medical School, Washington, and Naval Academy, and toward the accumulation of a reserve supply of medical stores, $921,740.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 3, after the words "in all," to strike out "$167,000" and insert "$241,080," and in line 5, after the words "dairy herd," to insert "land for pasturage, and erection of necessary buildings," so as to make the clause read:

Contingent, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery: For tolls and ferriages; care, transportation, and burial of the dead; purchase of books and stationery, binding of medical records, unbound books, and pamphlets; hygienic and sanitary investigation and illustration; sanitary and hygienic instruction; purchase and repairs of nonpassenger-carrying wagons, automobile ambulances, and harness; purchase of and feed for horses and cows; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of two passenger-carrying motor vehicles for naval dispensary, Washington, D. C., to be used only for official purposes; trees, plants, care of grounds, garden tools, and seeds; incidental articles for the Naval Medical School and naval dispensary, Washington; naval medical supply depots, sick quarters at Naval Academy and marine barracks; washing for medical department at Naval Medical School and naval dispensary, Washington; naval medical supply depots, sick quarters at Naval Academy and marine barracks, dispensaries at navy yards and naval stations, and ships; and for minor repairs on buildings and grounds of the United States Naval Medical School and naval medical supply depots; rent of rooms for naval dispensary, Washington, D. C., not to exceed $1,200; for the care, maintenance, and treatment of the insane of the Navy and Marine Corps on the Pacific coast, including supernumeraries held for transfer to the Government Hospital for the Insane; for dental outfits and dental material, not to exceed $38,000, and all other necessary contingent expenses; in all, $241,080: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, may expend $25,000 of said appropriation for the purchase of a dairy herd, land for pasturage, and erection of necessary buildings for the naval hospital at Las Animas, Colo.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 15, after the words "United States," to strike out "$17,500" and insert "$24,908," so as to read:

Transportation of remains: To enable the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to cause to be transferred to their homes the remains of officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps who die or are killed in action ashore or afloat, and also to enable the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to cause to be transported to their homes the remains of civilian employees who die outside of the continental limits of the United States, $24,908.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 1, after the word "Surgery," to strike out "$884,500" and insert "$1,187,728," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, $1,187,728.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 22, to insert:

NAVAL DENTAL CORPS.

That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to appoint and commission, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, dental surgeons in the Navy at the rate of 1 for each 1,000 of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps, who shall constitute the Naval Dental Corps, and shall be a part of the Medical Department of the Navy. Original appointments to the Naval Dental Corps shall be probationary for a period of two years and may be revoked at any time during the probationary period by the President: *Provided*, That the rank of such officers of the same date of appointment among themselves at the end of said probationary period shall be determined by the recommendations of an examining board appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, which board shall conduct a competitive examination, based upon both service record and professional attainments, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy; and the rank of such officers

so determined shall be as of date of original appointment with reference to other appointments to the naval service: *Provided further*, That all appointees to the grade of dental surgeon shall be citizens of the United States between 24 and 30 years of age, and shall be graduates of standard medical or dental colleges and trained in the several branches of dentistry, and who shall before appointment have successfully passed moral, physical, and professional examinations before medical and professional examining boards appointed by the Secretary of the Navy and have been recommended for appointment by such boards.

Dental surgeons shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenants (junior grade) until they shall have completed five years' service. Dental surgeons of more than 5 but less than 20 years' service shall, subject to such examinations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, have the rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant. Dental surgeons of more than 20 years' service shall, subject to such examinations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, have the rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant commander: *Provided*, That the total number of dental surgeons with the rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant commander shall not at any time exceed 10.

All officers now in the Dental Corps, appointed under the provisions of the act of August 22, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," including the officers appointed for temporary service, shall be appointed dental surgeons without further examination and without regard to the age qualifications herein prescribed: *Provided*, That the officers so appointed shall not be subject to the provisions herein prescribed for probationary service for a period of two years: *Provided further*, That such officers shall, after appointment as herein prescribed, rank from date of commission and take seniority among themselves in the order of their original appointment by the Secretary of the Navy as shown on the Navy list on the date of approval of this act: *And provided further*, That no dental surgeon appointed in accordance with the provisions of this act who on original appointment to the Dental Corps was over 40 years of age shall be eligible for retirement before he has reached the age of 70 years, except for physical disability incurred in the line of duty.

Dental surgeons who shall have lost numbers on the Navy list by sentence of court-martial or by failure upon examination for promotion shall be considered to have lost service accordingly for purposes of advancement in rank with increased pay and allowances.

DENTAL RESERVE CORPS.

That a Navy Dental Reserve Corps is hereby authorized to be organized and operated under the provisions of the act approved August 22, 1912, providing for the organization and operation of a Navy Medical Reserve Corps, and differing therefrom in no respect (except as may be necessary to adapt the said provisions to the Navy) other than that the qualification requirements of the appointees shall be dental surgeons and graduates of reputable schools of medicine or dentistry instead of "reputable schools of medicine," and so many of said appointees may be ordered to temporary active service as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary to the health and efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, provided the whole number of both Naval Dental Corps and Naval Dental Reserve Corps officers in active service shall not exceed in time of peace 1 to 1,000 of the officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps: *Provided*, That all officers now in the Navy Medical Corps and the Navy Dental Reserve Corps shall be recommissioned, respectively, in the Navy Medical Reserve Corps as established under the provisions of the act of August 22, 1912, and in the Navy Dental Reserve Corps provided in this act, in the order of their original appointment in said corps, and hereafter when ordered to active duty they shall receive promotion in rank in the respective reserve corps under the same relative conditions and provisions of active service as is provided in this act for the Naval Dental Corps.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that be passed over, Mr. President.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New York desire to be heard on this amendment.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from North Carolina desires to have it passed over for the present. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment beginning at the foot of page 49 and going to line 18 on page 53 will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," on page 53, line 21, after the word "duty," to strike out "$12,925,135.36" and insert "$12,927,735.36," and in line 24, before the word "commutation," to strike out "dental surgeon at Naval Academy, $2,400," so as to read:

Pay of the Navy: Pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, $12,927,735.36; officers on waiting orders, $175,000; officers on the retired list, $3,124,527; commutation of quarters for officers on shore not occupying public quarters, including boatswains, etc.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Virginia why the provision for this dental surgeon is stricken out here?

Mr. SWANSON. This dental surgeon is really entitled to $2,600 by the length of his service at the academy. Having this provision there limits him to less than he is entitled to under the law. Therefore it is cut out at that point and included on the other side in the proper amount—$2,600.

Mr. LODGE. It is provided for under another item.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I wanted to ascertain.

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; it was a mistake.

Mr. NORRIS. Is there only one dental surgeon there?

Mr. LODGE. There is only one at the academy. He has been long in the service there, and there has only been one there.

Mr. NORRIS. It seemed to me that it would really be necessary to have more than one.

Mr. LODGE. When the Naval Dental Corps probably is established there undoubtedly will be a detail made there of an assistant.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for "Pay of the Navy," on page 54, line 19, after the words "Fish Commission," to strike out "61,500 men" and insert "68,700 men, and the President is hereafter authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy to 87,000 men."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not care to debate this amendment particularly; but it is quite an important one, and it seems to me there ought at least to be an explanation on the part of the committee as to why it is put in. As I understand, it increases the Navy from 61,500 men to 68,700 men, or possibly to 87,000 men.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will note, the House increased the personnel of the Navy of enlisted men to 61,500 men, and we increased it to 68,700 men. At present a great many of our battleships are in reserve, not in commission, and a great many of them in reserve have not a complement of men sufficient to have them well manned. We have not any reserve like the other nations. Our Naval Reserve only amounts to 400 men. We have a Naval Militia of several thousand. One of the great complaints about the Navy being that we do not have enough enlisted men, the General Board recommended that our force of enlisted men should be increased to 74,700 men—that is, 68,700 enlisted men and 6,000 apprentice seamen. We have adopted the recommendation of the General Board and increased the men to that extent, and we are satisfied that it is needed. It is needed to use the ships we already possess. This will take care of our best battleships and battle cruisers, and it will give a complement of 50 per cent of men on the ships that are in reserve; and that is what the General Board recommends.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, it is absolutely necessary if we are to man our ships.

Mr. SWANSON. Absolutely so. The Secretary recommended it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Is this for the ships already constructed or for the ships to be constructed under this bill?

Mr. LODGE. Ships already constructed are out of commission and insufficiently manned; and some of the destroyers are at this moment short of men in order to make up the complement of battleships.

Mr. SWANSON. We make no appropriation or authorization for enlisted men until the ship is ready. This is simply to take care of the present needs.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 54, in line 24, after the words "Hospital Corps," to strike out "$857,405.75"; in line 25, after the words "Naval Militia," to strike out "$28,421,394.25" and insert "$30,655,704.29"; on page 55, line 6, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three" and insert "six"; in line 7, before the word "apprentice," to strike out "five hundred"; in line 9, after the word "law," to strike out "$740,880" and insert "$999,630"; in line 10 after the words "in all," to strike out "$46,876,246.86" and insert "$50,226,912.65"; and in line 15, after the word "fund," to insert "*Provided*, That the enlisted strength of the Navy authorized in this act shall be deemed to include all enlistments heretofore made during this calendar year which may have been in excess of the number authorized by law at the time," so as to read:

Pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineers' force and men detailed for duty with the Fish Commission, 68,700 men, and the President is hereafter authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy to 87,000 men; and pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps and for the pay of enlisted men detailed for duty with the Naval Militia, $30,655,704.29; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court-martial, $225,000, and hereafter the number of enlisted men of the Navy shall be exclusive of those sentenced by court-martial to discharge; and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; and 6,000 apprentice seamen under training at training stations and on board training ships, at the pay prescribed by law, $999,630; pay of the Nurse Corps, $119,182; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps, $15,000; in all, $50,226,912.65; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay of the Navy" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law as "Pay of the Navy," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That the enlisted strength of the Navy authorized in this act shall be deemed to include all enlistments heretofore made during this calendar year which may have been in excess of the number authorized by law at the time.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 8, to insert:

Hereafter in addition to the appointment of midshipmen to the United States Naval Academy, as now prescribed by law, the President is hereby allowed 15 appointments annually instead of 10, as now prescribed by law, and the Secretary of the Navy is allowed 25 appointments annually instead of 15, as now prescribed by law, the latter to be appointed from the enlisted men of the Navy who are citizens of the United States, and not more than 20 years of age on the date of entrance to the Naval Academy, and who shall have served not less than one year as enlisted men on the date of entrance: *Provided*, That such appointments shall be made in the order of merit from candidates who have in competition with each other passed the mental examination now or hereafter required by law for entrance to the Naval Academy and who passed the physical examinations required before entrance under existing laws.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in the examination this year of the enlisted men, 23 of the candidates qualified. Under the existing provisions of law it was possible to appoint but 15 of them. I should like to inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill whether the bill contains any provision for the admission of the additional eight men who passed the examination?

Mr. LODGE. They are covered by this amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. The amendment allows the Secretary of the Navy to appoint 25 men.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that; but my inquiry is whether, under this provision, these eight men will be admitted?

Mr. SWANSON. It is understood from the Secretary that he will be able to take care of these eight men under it.

Mr. LODGE. They are covered by the language of this amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 57, to insert:

That hereafter the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to permit not exceeding four Filipinos, to be designated, one for each class, by the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md.: *Provided*, That the Filipinos undergoing instruction, as herein authorized, shall receive the same pay, allowances, and emoluments, to be paid out of the same appropriations, and shall be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation as are authorized by law and regulation for midshipmen appointed from the United States, but the Filipino midshipmen herein authorized shall not be entitled to appointment to any commissioned office in the United States Navy by reason of their graduation from the Naval Academy.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it seems to me that this amendment of the committee presents a rather unusual phase as a piece of legislation. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, under this amendment, to admit four Filipinos to the Naval Academy, to educate them at the expense of the Government of the United States, and the amendment then proceeds to deny to those Filipinos the right to serve as officers in the United States Navy.

It seems to me that it is at least a doubtful policy to educate these Filipinos as naval officers and then refuse by statute to make use of ther services. It can not be contended by the friends of this amendment that we are educating Filipinos to serve in a Filipino navy at some time in the future, for I do not think any Senator will contend that the Filipinos, if granted their independence at sometime in the future, really will possess a navy which will sail the seas.

Mr. SWANSON. This amendment makes exactly the same provision for the Naval Academy that the present law makes for the Military Academy.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I suggest that that is a very different proposition? The United States Government supports in the Philippines now a military force composed of Filipinos, the Filipino Scouts; and I assume, without having accurate information on the subject, that one of the purposes of admitting Filipinos to the Military Academy at West Point is perhaps to educate some of those Filipinos to be commissioned officers of the land force maintained in the Philippines. But this is for the education of naval officers, and I do not think it can be contended that the Filipinos are going to maintain a navy. Yet this provision forbids their being employed in the United States Navy; and I think educating Filipinos to be naval officers will result in educating Filipinos to be naval officers in some other navy than our own.

Mr. SWANSON. The Philippine legislature also requested that this privilege should be extended to them and it was transmitted through our Governor General, and the Secretary of the Navy recommended that the request of the Philippine Legislature be complied with. He thought it would be very beneficial.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not want to create the impression that anything I said in regard to this amendment arose from an unfriendly or ungenerous feeling toward the Philippine people. I think it is a very commendable project to educate Filipinos in the United States, but if the United States Government is to embark upon the policy of education for Filipinos in the United States at Government expense it should be done in the universities of the country and not in the naval schools and at the same time forbid the Filipinos from taking advantage of that education as naval officers. It is apparent of course there is good reason for forbidding the enrollment of these Filipino midshipmen as officers of the Navy. It seems to me if the Government wants to spend money on educating Filipinos it is a very commendable project and should be done in the universities of the country instead of the Naval Academy.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I can understand why the education of Filipinos at West Point might be of advantage to the United States so long as it is the purpose of the United States Government to hold the Philippine Islands, but I do not believe that any man should be an officer of the United States Navy except an American white man. I put it on that ground. I am afraid that some of us are not quite as mindful of the magnitude of the problem involved, and as cautious as prudence would dictate we should be in dealing with the question of race. In my judgment the race question is the most difficult problem which the American people are called upon to solve. And the danger which I see in the situation is the unmindfulness on the part of the leaders of public thought of the gravity of the question.

Mr. SWANSON. The amendment provides that he shall not be an officer.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I understand. Then if he is not to be an officer you do not want to educate him as the able Senator from New York has said for some other navy, because he is going to use his education or the knowledge which he acquires at the academy for some purpose that will be of benefit to him. He is not going to be a mere private in the Navy of the United States. If he can not get employment in the American Navy as an officer he will join some other navy. It is quite natural for this man to seek the field of employment wherein he may find the goal of his ambition and realize his hopes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. May I ask the Senator in charge of the bill what object the committee had in mind in inserting this provision?

Mr. SWANSON. The legislative body in the Philippines requested us to grant this privilege. It was transmitted through our Governor General, and the Secretary of the Navy requested it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What reason did they give for giving their men an education they could not use?

Mr. SWANSON. They had an idea that if they became independent in the case of any ships they might possess it might be of value, and if they did not become independent they might serve this Government.

Mr. TOWNSEND. They have no right to serve this Government.

Mr. SWANSON. But as an officer of a ship there, a man educated at the academy becomes a good seaman in all directions.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to direct a question to the Senator in charge of the bill in view of what he last said in regard to the request of the Philippine Legislature in this regard. Are the Philippine Legislature or the Filipino people satisfied with the amendment as it is proposed? In other words, are they satisfied with a provision that will exclude Filipino students or graduates of the Naval Academy from being commissioned as officers?

Mr. SWANSON. I have no information on that subject. This amendment was drawn and reported as requested by the department. It was transmitted at the request of the Philippine Legislature.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in relation to the matter. I think it is very important for this Government that we should have the most friendly relations with the Philippine people, no matter what may be the outcome of their desire for independence, and for that reason it seems to me that any manifestation on our part of good feeling or of favor at this time would evidently have a tendency to draw them to us in the way of assistance and in every way in the administration of the government over there.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that inasmuch as this same provision is practically in the Army bill for the Military Academy, and inasmuch as the scouts over there are in the United States service and are making good in every particular, performing whenever they are called out excellent service, and they are in every way desirous of aiding and assisting the United States Government, it is a recognition of their standing that is bound to make toward the good feeling that now exists between the Filipinos and the American Government. Whether or not we

sever relations between the Government and the Filipinos, this provision, it seems to me, would have a wholesome effect.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to ask the Senator whether he does not think if it is desirable for us to show our friendly feeling to the Filipinos by educating some of their young men it would be wise for us to educate them in a way so they would be useful to themselves and to their people and to our Government? Turning to the Army Register I find that there have been several Filipinos graduated at the Military Academy and they are serving in the Philippine Scouts as officers. Undoubtedly they are performing good service. If it is desirable to show our friendship, why would it not be well for us to increase the number at the Military Academy rather than to educate them at the Naval Academy, when they would be of no service to us or to their own country by being given that education?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I can say with regard to where these people should be educated that I understand there is now a law on the statute books of the Philippine Islands which provides a fund for the education in American universities of Filipinos out of their revenues, and 100 Filipinos are being educated continuously in the United States at universities and schools. They are doing their part. They are trying to get a knowledge of our institutions and of our language, and their good intent is shown by the fact that they make that appropriation for the education of these people.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to my friend from Colorado that it is possible that it would be a very sore disappointment to the bright Filipino boy who goes to the Naval Academy and equips himself for that work in life and shows his fitness and aptitude to be denied the privileges after he has gone through the academy, of using the knowledge he had acquired there. I can not imagine a more unfortunate plight for a proud, ambitious man to find himself in than that. You cultivate the mind, fire the ambition, and then shut the door of hope in his face. Now, I think, for the good of the American white people the door of hope should be shut in his face, if it must be done; but I prefer not firing the ambition and generating the hope when we know beforehand that the door must be shut.

If, as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, you educate him at the Military Academy at West Point, he can go to his native country and there engage in the service of the United States by serving in the Army, but under the terms of this bill if we educate him, if we graduate him from the Naval Academy, he is denied the privilege of using the knowledge he acquires there in the service of the United States in the Navy, and it may be a sad disappointment to him.

The Senator can very readily understand why we do not want to have a man of that race as an officer in the United States Navy.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, it may be that there are objections to the phraseology that is here employed; but if the Philippine people are to have their independence they ought to have some people there who are capable of conducting whatever vessels they may have for themselves in any armament or navy that they may acquire.

Inasmuch as we are trying to put them upon a basis of independence so that they can handle their own affairs, I do not believe they would take it as an affront or as anything against them if they are not accorded the right of becoming officers in the United States Army.

This is a proposition of education, and, inasmuch as the Naval Academy gives such an excellent education, it is natural that there should be people from that country who would desire to come here.

Mr. President, I understand that we admit foreigners into the Naval Academy. The President has a right to designate a certain number from any country who may acquire an education at our Naval Academy. They pay a proportionate charge. The proportion that the cost of maintaining the academy bears to the number of cadets in the academy fixes the price at which the Government permits entrance into the academy from foreign countries, which has been estimated, I think, at $13,500 for the four-year term. Those people do not enter our Navy. They want to get the knowledge that is given there.

Mr. President, it seems to me in view of our relations with those people and the desire to assist them in every way we can, whether they become independent or whether they do not become independent, this is a wise provision.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to ask the Senator if he recalls any cases where young men from any other country than Japan were admitted to the Naval Academy?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know, but I have understood that the President has the power to admit them into the academy. I have been so told.

Mr. WEEKS. Thirty or forty years ago we did educate some Japanese students in the Naval Academy, but I do not recall any other instance.

Mr. THOMAS. I think they have been admitted to West Point.

Mr. WEEKS. That is a very different matter.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I desire to make a suggestion in respect to this matter. I can conceive where these officers can be very useful in the Philippine Islands without being officers in our Regular Navy. We have a peace establishment—the Filipino Scouts—to keep the peace, and the officers that we have educated at the Military Academy become officers of it. With the great number of islands and the water surrounding them, we need something to aid the Government in patrolling the sea to prevent smuggling and to take care of the shipping. We have a Coast-Guard Service there that used to be called the Revenue-Cutter Service. I can not see why it would not be very possible to have little vessels armed as patrol vessels commanded by these Filipino officers, with crews entirely of Filipinos.

In the Philippines the Moro population especially have been great navigators in their day. I can remember when I was a boy seeing pictures of Moros sailing in their peculiar ships. They are considered great navigators.

To me it seems that these officers educated at the Naval Academy would be useful for two purposes. They would be useful in forming a part of the water patrol necessary to prevent smuggling. They need not command any but sailors of their own blood, and I am sure there could be no objection to that, and they could become very efficient. Besides that, they would become good, useful officers to command merchantmen. They have local shipping over there—vessels navigated by their own people, plying between the islands—and these men could become useful commanders of them.

So I think, on the whole, we ought to manifest toward the Filipino people a little friendliness, and I do not think it would jeopardize our own service in the least. By excluding them from the Navy you do not cut them off from their usefulness in their own bailiwick, in their own islands. They can become useful there in the patrol service, as I have indicated, and also in the local merchant service.

Therefore I trust that this little amendment may be left in as a matter of encouragement to the Filipino people.

Mr. SWANSON. In addition to that, I should like to say that this request was formally presented to this Government. The resolution was passed by the Philippine Legislature, and the legislature, through the Governor General, transmitted it, and I think it would be an evidence of ill will to reject the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 15, to insert:

COMMISSIONED PERSONNEL.

Hereafter the total number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall be 4 per cent of the total enlisted strength of the active list authorized by law: *Provided*, That the total number of commissioned line officers on the active list at any one time, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall be distributed in the proportion of 1½ in the grade of rear admiral to 4 in the grade of captain, to 8 in the grade of commander, to 14 in the grade of lieutenant commander, to 32½ in the grade of lieutenant, to 40 in the grades of lieutenant (junior grade) and ensign, inclusive.

And that the total number of commissioned officers of the active list of the following-mentioned staff corps at any one time, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall be distributed in the various grades of the respective corps as follows:

Medical Corps: One and one-half deputy surgeons general with the rank of rear admiral, to 4 medical directors with the rank of captain, to 8 medical inspectors, to 18 surgeons, to 68½ in the grades below surgeon: *Provided*, That hereafter appointees to the grade of assistant surgeon shall be between the ages of 24 and 32 at the time of appointment.

Pay Corps: One and one-half deputy paymasters general with the rank of rear admiral, to 4 pay directors with the rank of captain, to 8 pay inspectors, to 86½ in the grades below pay inspector.

Construction Corps: One and one-half naval constructors with the rank of rear admiral, to 5½ naval constructors with the rank of captain to 14 naval constructors with the rank of commander, to 79 naval constructors and assistant naval constructors with rank below commander: *Provided*, That vacancies in the Construction Corps shall be filled in the manner now prescribed by law, at such annual rate as the Secretary of Navy may prescribe.

Corps of Civil Engineers: One and one-half civil engineers with the rank of rear admiral to 5½ civil engineers with the rank of captain, to 14 with the rank of commander, to 79 civil engineers and assistant civil engineers with rank below commander: *Provided*, That the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the following staff corps, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall be based on percentages of the total number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy as follows: Pay Corps, 12 per cent; Construction Corps, 5 per cent; Corps of Civil Engineers, 2 per

cent; and that the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the Medical Corps shall be sixty-five hundredths of 1 per cent of the total number of the officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; and that officers in the lower grades of the Pay Corps, the Construction Corps, and the Corps of Civil Engineers shall be advanced in rank up to and including the rank of lieutenant commander with the officers of the line with whom or next after whom they take precedence under existing law.

Chaplains: One and one-half chaplains with rank of rear admiral to 5½ with rank of captain, to 14 with rank of commander, to 79 chaplains and acting chaplains with rank below commander.

Provided, That for the purpose of determining the authorized number of officers in any grade or rank of the line or of the staff corps, there shall be excluded from consideration those officers carried by law as additional numbers, including staff officers heretofore permanently commissioned with the rank of rear admiral, and that nothing contained herein shall be held to reduce below that heretofore authorized by law the number of officers in any grade or rank in the line or staff corps.

Provided, That hereafter the pay and allowances of officers in the upper half of the grade or rank of rear admiral in each corps and chiefs of bureaus shall be that now allowed by law for the first nine rear admirals, and the pay and allowances of officers in the lower half of the grade or rank of rear admiral in each corps shall be that now allowed by law for the second nine rear admirals.

Provided further, That when there is an odd number of officers in the grade or rank of rear admiral in each corps, the lower division thereof shall include the excess in number, except when there is but one.

Whenever a final fraction occurs in computing the authorized number of any corps, grade, or rank in the naval service, the nearest whole number shall be regarded as the authorized number: *Provided*, That at least one officer shall be allowed in each grade or rank herein established.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I inquire if that is the conclusion of the amendment?

Mr. LODGE. That is the conclusion of that amendment. The next amendment, I will say to the Senator from Montana, relates to warrant officers.

Mr. WALSH. I observe some provisions toward the close of what follows, page 63, evidently applying to all officers.

Mr. LODGE. We have not yet reached that. This amendment stops at the top of page 61. It relates only to the increase of grades made necessary by the increase in the number of enlisted men.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I suppose probably this may be denominated as general legislation. I want to inquire of the Chair just exactly what the action of the Senate was on yesterday touching the right to insist upon a point of order in the Senate upon a matter considered as in Committee of the Whole?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate then decided that the point of order might be made in the Senate as well as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WALSH. I regret that. I was quite well satisfied that matter adopted in Committee of the Whole would not be subject to a point of order in the Senate unless reserved.

I have an amendment to offer to this amendment proposed by the committee, which was tendered some time ago by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], the chairman of the committee. I do not see him here. I offer it as an amendment to the committee amendment, and ask that it be inserted after the end of the amendment on page 61.

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

The SECRETARY. On page 61, after line 5, it is proposed to insert:

Hereafter every officer of the Navy shall be officially addressed by the title of his rank without any distinction or discrimination whatever, except that in written communications the corps to which any such officer belongs shall be stated next after his name.

Mr. WALSH. I hope the committee will find no objection to that amendment.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Montana just what the purpose of that amendment is?

Mr. WALSH. It is a very simple matter. The earlier provisions of the bill give to various staff officers in the Navy a certain rank, as the Senator from Colorado will have noted. The Medical Corps, for instance, is to consist of "one and one-half deputy surgeons general with the rank of rear admiral to four medical directors with the rank of captain." So the Pay Corps is to consist of "one and one-half deputy paymasters general with the rank of rear admiral," and so forth. My amendment to the committee amendment simply provides that in communications to them they shall be addressed by the rank which they have.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, what would happen to me, for instance, if I were to address one of these gentlemen without addressing him by his rank?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Colorado would be guilty of a gross breach of etiquette of the service.

Mr. THOMAS. I want to find out and understand exactly what may be accomplished by the amendment. Seriously, I was struck somewhat with the unusual phraseology of the Senator's amendment, as I know the Senator is always very careful in preparing his amendments.

Mr. WALSH. I think that there should be no difficulty at all about understanding the matter. The staff officers in the Navy have rank as is provided in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. That is perfectly right.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly; but, unlike the staff officers in the Army, they are not entitled to be addressed in official communications by the title appropriate to their rank. For instance, the head of the Medical Corps in the Navy, a man like Surg. Gen. Blue, has the rank of admiral, but he is not to be addressed as admiral. The man who is at the head of the Medical Corps in the Army is Gen. Gorgas. He is to be addressed by the title accompanying his rank. He has the rank of a major general, and he is Gen. Gorgas; but the other gentleman is not Admiral Blue.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does the Senator from Montana think that the title of "general" has added anything to the great standing of Dr. Gorgas? Is he not bigger as Dr. Gorgas than he is as Gen. Gorgas?

Mr. WALSH. Of course I do not want to set up my judgment about that. There is, however, the most invidious and unjustifiable kind of distinction raised in these cases. These officers are given this rank by law, and yet they are not to be addressed by the title which goes with that rank. A short time ago, for instance, when we had the Army reorganization bill under consideration, a Dental Corps was created, and a very strenuous effort was made—and a successful effort—to give to the officers in the Dental Corps rank in accordance with the length of the time they served, and that amendment was adopted. Even veterinary surgeons in the Army were given rank. Automatically they are addressed in the Army by the title which goes with the rank, but the officers who in the Navy now enjoy the right thus to be addressed find some reason for objecting to having their associates of the staff addressed by the title which goes with the rank. My amendment to the amendment is offered simply to accord them that right.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator really thinks the amendment is necessary, I shall not object to it, although it seems to me it is largely punctilio.

Mr. WALSH. It is.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I do not think the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana ought to be adopted. As succinctly as I can I desire to explain the effect of it. To fix the pay of staff officers in the Navy they are given certain rank. The officers of the different staff corps rank so and so with the pay of that rank. This is an effort to bring about a condition under which a chaplain, for instance, will not be called "chaplain," but will be called captain, commander, or admiral. I have never seen a preacher yet who has requested to be called admiral or captain or by any military title.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, does the Senator say that the title fixes the pay? Then in that instance "the rank is but the guinea stamp."

Mr. SWANSON. No; not the title but the rank. The law provides, for instance, that a chaplain shall have the rank of captain. That means that his pay shall be the same as that of a captain; but he is still called a chaplain. A doctor of medicine, a member of the Medical Corps, is called doctor, but he receives the pay of the rank which he holds. Some of them have the rank of lieutenant, some have the rank of commander, some have the rank of captain, but doctors in the Navy are not called captains.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The only interest, then, that they have is that their title be given them by the paymaster.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not think, as a general thing, they are interested in having a military title. Shall we call a preacher "admiral"? If a preacher goes abroad on a battleship, shall he be introduced as Admiral So-and-so or Captain So-and-so or Lieutenant So-and-so or Commander So-and-so?

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SWANSON. I will.

Mr. WALSH. We ought to be fair about this. Chaplains can not possibly attain the rank of admiral under the bill.

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, yes; they can if they serve a sufficient length of time.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, it makes no difference whether a staff officer is a chaplain or a doctor or a dentist

or a paymaster, this is an effort to give him a title which does not represent his duties. The duties of an admiral are perfectly well known. He is a flag officer and he commands a fleet. The duties of a captain are represented by his title; he commands a ship. This amendment proposes to give titles to men who do not perform duties corresponding with the titles.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will permit me, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question, because this is a revelation to me. Did I properly understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that in the Navy a physician or a dental surgeon can obtain the rank of admiral?

Mr. LODGE. The dental surgeon can not.

Mr. GALLINGER. Who can—all the other staff officers?

Mr. LODGE. All of them.

Mr. GALLINGER. Veterinarians in the Army can reach high rank, can they not?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know how it may be in the Army, but I think they can. The Senator from Oregon will know as to that. However, in the Army I think veterinarians can reach the rank of major.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I understand that is so under the Army bill.

Mr. LODGE. The fact that such a practice exists in the Army does not weigh with me.

Mr. GALLINGER. As to chaplains, how high can they go?

Mr. LODGE. They can go as high as admiral.

Mr. GALLINGER. As high as admiral?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; after they serve a sufficient length of time.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not suppose that was possible; and I am glad to get the information.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Virginia, I will say that, as I understand, the object of the amendment of the Senator from Montana is to require a seaman when he addresses a chaplain to call him "captain" instead of "chaplain."

Mr. SWANSON. "Captain" or "commander" or "admiral."

Mr. NELSON. And if a seaman addresses a dental surgeon he must call him either "lieutenant" or "captain" instead of "Mr. Surgeon." Is not that the object?

Mr. SWANSON. That is the object and purpose of the amendment.

Mr. NELSON. And when he addresses a paymaster he must call him "lieutenant" or "captain," or whatever his rank may be, instead of "Mr. Paymaster." Is not that confusing all ranks and titles?

Mr. SWANSON. Absolutely, Mr. President. In the Army officers are given brevet rank of general or lieutenant or colonel, but they do not get the pay of such rank. In the Army, however, an officer gets the title of the rank which he actually holds.

Now, our Navy ranges over the entire world. Its officers are brought in contact with the officers of other navies, and there is not a navy in the world in which staff officers are given title as proposed in the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

I have here information as to what is the practice in connection with staff officers in other navies. In England paymasters have the title of paymaster in chief, fleet paymaster, full paymaster, assistant paymaster, and so forth. So it is in the case of doctors. Now, it would be a curious thing in London to introduce a preacher as "admiral" or "captain."

I think there are only a few members of the staff who are in favor of such an amendment as this. I have not seen a single physician in the Medical Corps who has requested it. The Surgeon General says he would rather be known as a doctor than as a commander or an admiral; and I have not seen a member of the Medical Corps who has taken a different position, although there are some paymasters and members of other staff corps who favor such a provision as this. If a man is ashamed of being a chaplain, he ought not to be in the Navy; if he is ashamed of being a doctor, he ought to abandon the practice of medicine and not try to hide it by getting another title. So, if a man is a paymaster, that title is an honorable title and has been an honorable title for a long time, and he should not be ashamed of it. Why should he try to have the title of captain or admiral or any other title that does not appertain to the calling in which he is engaged?

When you speak of an admiral, necessarily there is brought up in your mind an officer who commands a fleet. No one would think of a chaplain or of a doctor in that connection. When you think of a captain you think of a man who commands a ship, and you would not think of a man who was a mere paymaster or a mere physician or a mere chaplain. When you think of a commander you think of a man who commands a smaller ship than one of the large ships. Thus the title indicates the vocation. This is so of every navy in the world, and I think a majority of the officers of the American Navy with whom I have talked—paymasters, doctors, and chaplains—are satisfied, and the desire voiced in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana does not come from any large number of them.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I want to say another word or two about this matter. However absurd it may seem to some Senators who are not affected, this subject is by no means a small matter to the staff officers who are thus discriminated against. Of course it might or might not seem ridiculous to address a chaplain as admiral, but if a man devoted his whole life in the Navy to the betterment and uplifting of the moral character of the enlisted men and the officers of the Navy, and by long and faithful and devoted service attained actually to the rank of admiral and was entitled to the pay of an admiral, I do not think that it would be regarded as a matter for risibility at all that he should be spoken of as Admiral So-and-so; indeed, I should imagine very likely he would esteem it as a very much to be coveted distinction. So with the members of the Medical Corps. I have no doubt in the world that they are all proud of the profession to which they belong, but, at the same time, the distinction of being called an admiral, if a surgeon may aspire to so high a distinction as that, I have no doubt is very much coveted.

But, Mr. President, whatever may be said about it, by way of comparison, the system does obtain in the Army. It has been of such value to the staff officers of the Army that the law has interposed and declared that they shall be entitled to be addressed by the title which goes with their rank.

Now, Mr. President, you will bear in mind that these officers are noncombatant officers. The staff officer in the Army runs no risk of his life at all, so far as the general accidents of military service are concerned. He does not go upon the firing line. But the staff officer in the Navy, Mr. President, has to go with his ship. He has to risk his life in battle just the same as any officer in the line. If there were any reason for making a distinction in the matter at all, it ought to be made in favor of the staff officers in the Navy rather than in favor of the staff officers of the Army.

But, Mr. President, that this is not regarded by any means as a trifling matter by those who are affected by it and by those who have given some study to the matter is known to everybody who has followed this controversy, which is by no means a new one. A very distinguished officer of the Navy—Rear Admiral Fiske, lately retired—contributed an article upon this subject to the Army and Navy Journal of January 26, 1907, strongly urging—bear in mind, a line officer—that this invidious distinction now existing in the Navy be wiped out for the good of the naval service. His letter upon the subject is so pertinent to the present discussion that I trespass upon the patience of the Senate to read it. It is not very lengthy. He says:

> The staff officers of the Navy wish the same titles in their respective corps as the line officers have in their corps. They give as their reasons:
>
> 1. The fact that officers holding corresponding positions in our sister service, the Army, have such titles.
>
> 2. The fact that titles like "assistant surgeon" give a false impression among people outside the Navy as to the position of the holders of the title, and that such titles as "pay director" and "medical inspector" are foolish.
>
> 3. The fact that their present titles tend to belittle them among the people they meet in civil life, and that it is harmful to them and to the Navy in general to have any of its officers belittled.
>
> They disclaim any wish to pretend to belong to any corps except their own, and they disclaim any dissatisfaction with their present titles, so far as the Navy itself is concerned, feeling that their titles are correctly understood by the people in the Navy.
>
> Many line officers oppose their being given the titles they desire. Unless I am misinformed, these line officers do not state as their reason any belief that the practical efficiency of the Navy would be impaired. The only reason I have heard is the oft-repeated statement that the title is the only thing most line officers ever get, and that they ought not to be compelled to share their titles with other people.
>
> Now, it is an admitted principle that every man will do his work better if he is contented than if he is not contented; so that it is better to give every man what he wants, so far as it can be done, and provided that it can be done without working harm to some thing or some person. Therefore it would be better to give staff officers the titles they wish unless it would do harm to some thing or some person.
>
> As no claim has been made that the giving of those titles would do harm to anything, not even to the practical efficiency of the Navy, all reasonable opposition can be based only on the theory that it would do harm to some persons—the only possible persons being the line officers.

Now, would it do them any harm? If so, what harm? The only possible harm would be by robbing the line officers of some fraction of the honor which their titles may be supposed to confer on them.

But their titles do not confer on them whatever. Titles do not confer honor; titles can not confer honor. Honor is too sacred a thing to be conferrable by title. Honor is not conferrable even by position, except in so far as the position gives its holder an opportunity to do honorable service and receive proper credit for it.

This being true, no man who possesses a title, given him from any cause, can possibly be harmed if some other man be given the same title from some other cause. The President of the United States is not harmed by sharing the title of "President" with thousands of presidents of small affairs. Elihu Root is not harmed by sharing the title of "Secretary" with thousands of secretaries. A captain of the line of the Navy is not harmed by sharing the title of "captain" with thousands of tugboat captains, police captains, and captains of militia; and if all the medical directors, medical inspectors, pay directors, and pay inspectors were given the title of "captain," the only result would be that instead of sharing his title with, say, 10,000 captains in the United States, he would share it with 10,060 captains. The fact that no harm is done to any man by titles being given to other men may be proved by the two instances following:

1. Secretary Stanton made a great many brevet brigadier generals in order, it has been said, to belittle Gen. Sherman by making the title of "general" common. But the scheme did not succeed, and Sherman's glory was not dimmed.

2. There was once an officer blessed with a handsome person, an erect carriage, an unusually rich voice, and a certain peculiarity of the chest, which combined to give him the appearance of a pomposity entirely foreign to his nature, which was essentially modest. His subordinates nicknamed him "God"; yet his brother officers were not in the least wounded by his being given this title, though it was much higher than theirs.

I want to conclude this, Mr. President, by reading from the RECORD the remarks of some of the distinguished Senators who are now opposing this amendment when the provision of the Army reorganization bill relating to dental surgeons was under consideration by the Senate. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who seems quite earnestly opposed to the simple little amendment which I have here offered, had something to say on that occasion. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] had introduced an amendment to the bill the purpose of which was to give rank and to give accompanying title to dental surgeons in the Army, a distinction which, apparently, they had not theretofore enjoyed. He said at that time:

Nearly every man who enters the Dental Corps, if he were simply seeking the financial emoluments connected with the office, could do better in his private practice; but he will be attracted by the fact that he may be entitled to some official rank. Some men may not regard that as of very much importance, but others do. The question of rank seems to be a matter of very great importance to the medical profession; and I would not be understood for one moment as attempting to decry the merits of that profession; but the dental profession is entitled to some recognition as well. We are interested in having the Dental Corps so attractive that it will bring to it the best of the young men in that profession; and if we are going to deny to them the right of rank, certainly we are going to detract from the service itself. Let us encourage rather than discourage the young men of the great dental profession.

And then the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said as follows—I read from page 6126 of the proceedings of April 14:

Mr. President, I shall not consume all of my time. The bill, as it stands, gives dental surgeons the pay and allowances of first lieutenants until they have accomplished 10 years' service; after 10 years' service and up to 25 years' service they receive the pay and allowances of captain; and after more than 25 years' service they receive the pay and allowances of major. The proposition of the Senator from Ohio, as I understand, is simply to give them the rank.

Then he continues:

Mr. President, during the many years which I have been here the question between staff and line has been frequently before both bodies and before committees on which I have served. I was never a friend in those days of giving high rank to the various divisions of the staff; but Congress always seemed to differ from me in that respect, and seemed always to have a great feeling of favor for the staff, and the question now seems to be well settled.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, there is the broadest possible distinction between the rank and the title.

Mr. WALSH. There is no doubt about that; but the Senator from Massachusetts will agree with me that, under the law, when you give these dental surgeons rank in the Army they get title.

Mr. LODGE. I beg the Senator's pardon. There is not one word about title here.

Mr. WALSH. Why, that is the general statute.

Mr. LODGE. What I advocated was giving them rank; nothing else. I never advocated giving them title. In the Army I know that the titles are given to the Staff Corps, and I think it is thoroughly wrong; and I do not think it is any argument for introducing a bad system into the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. I am simply calling attention to the fact that the Senator was quite willing to introduce that system into the Army and make it applicable to dental surgeons in the Army. Of course, he could have prevented it from being introduced into the Army by resisting at that time the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LODGE. I thought they ought to have the rank. I think so still; but I never advocated their having titles, either in the Army or in the Navy..

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, those of us who advocated it in the Army were in this position: The doctors already had the title and the rank, and we felt that there should not be a discrimination against the dentists. It was there; there was no chance to escape it, and we simply extended it and made it uniform.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly. Now, I want the Senator to follow his views to their logical conclusion. The Medical Corps in the Army had the rank and had the title. The dental surgeons did not have the rank. The Senator from Georgia did not want any invidious distinction between the members of the Medical Corps and the members of the Dental Corps; exactly; and I do not want an invidious distinction here between the staff officers in the Army and the staff officers in the Navy.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will pardon me, I do not think there is any. The doctor and the dentist stand side by side there without an official title. I should be glad to vote the title out for the doctors and the dentists, both, in the Army.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has not any opportunity to do that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No. There is no discrimination between the two classes. In the Navy the title has not been introduced as to either. As I said before, if I were Gen. Gorgas I would vastly prefer to be called "Dr. Gorgas" than "Gen. Gorgas." I do not think it is any reflection on him to call him "doctor." I think a great doctor is fully as great a man as a great soldier.

Mr. WALSH. I am perfectly satisfied that the Senator from Georgia, in saluting Gen. Gorgas, would feel that he had committed a horrible faux pas if he did not address him as "general."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. On the contrary, Mr. President, I think Gen. Gorgas enjoys being called "Dr. Gorgas" fully as much as he does "Gen. Gorgas."

Mr. WALSH. That may be, but I am very sure that the Senator would not act upon that impression.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And I have accosted him in that way, and I thought he seemed pleased.

Mr. WALSH. Jocularly, I dare say.

Mr. President, I will conclude what I have to say by remarking that you are conferring no rank upon these officers at all by this amendment. The rank goes. The law provides that the Surgeon General shall have the rank of rear admiral. He has the pay of a rear admiral. He has everything that goes with a rear admiral except that you must not call him that.

Mr. LODGE. Except the title and the duties. He has none of the duties of a rear admiral.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, well, duties——

Mr. LODGE. Yes; he has none of the duties. He can not command a fleet, and he is not a flag officer.

Mr. WALSH. On the contrary, he is given the rank of an admiral and charged with the duties of surgeon general.

Mr. LODGE. He has no duties as a rear admiral. It is an attempt to give him a title that misrepresents his office.

Mr. WALSH. I suppose, then, that the Senator would likewise contend that Gen. Gorgas has none of the duties of a major general.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think he has.

Mr. WALSH. Did the Senator from Massachusetts vote to confer that title on him?

Mr. LODGE. Why, it is the law. I could not help voting for it.

Mr. WALSH. Why, certainly. We passed a special act here, did we not?

Mr. LODGE. But he has the title anyway, under the Army law.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly; he has. And what reason is there why the same title should not be accorded to the staff officers of the Navy?

Mr. LODGE. Why, the reason is, to my mind, perfectly simple, Mr. President. It is giving a man a title which does not describe him. It is giving him a title to which he has no title. The name "admiral" implies certain duties. The name "captan" in the Navy implies certain duties. Those duties are not performed by doctors and paymasters, and can not be.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana what reason there is for bestowing titles in the Navy, as he proposes, which really have no significance,

any more than there would be in the Senate of the United States to bestow upon our excellent chaplain, who daily conducts religious services in the Senate, the title of United States Senator? It would be just as appropriate in one case as in another. To call these men admirals and captains does not make them so, any more than to call the tail of a sheep a leg makes it so.

The Senator refers to the practice in the Army. I am sure the Senator also knows how it came about that these civilians attached to the Army secured their titles. He knows that they were secured by lobbying in the Congress of the United States. He knows that they were not bestowed for the good of the Army, but that they were bestowed to satisfy the demands of the medical profession, the demands of the veterinarians, the demands of the dental profession. I think it is time to call a halt, and not to permit our Navy to be infected by this same vice that already extends so far in the Army.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am not sufficiently informed about the matter to either affirm or deny the statement made by the Senator that concessions to staff officers of the Army are secured by lobbying rather than as a result of the solid judgment of the Congress of the United States concerning what was best for the service. The Senator, however, rose to address a question to me, and I want to answer his question.

The difference between the case that he put to me, that of a Chaplain of the Senate, and the one before us is certainly obvious. We have given these officers the rank. It may be quite inappropriate, I do not undertake to say that it is not quite inappropriate, to give a chaplain or a surgeon or a naval constructor or the head of the Pay Corps, for instance, the title of admiral. Of course few of them reach such a distinction under any circumstances; it is cut off with lieutenant commander in most instances. A chaplain, however, may rise to the rank of an admiral, contrary to what I said awhile ago. But we have given that rank; we have created these officers.

Mr. President, if the Constitution of the United States provided for the office of chaplain and said that he was to have the rank of a Senator why should you not call him a Senator? We do not call him a Senator simply because he has not any such rank as a Senator. But you are giving the rank to these men, and yet you are denying to them the name which goes with the rank. If the chaplain were indeed a Senator, why should you not call him so instead of calling him Dr. Prettyman?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, just a word. We have followed in the Navy the practice that has obtained in every navy in the world since there were navies in this respect. This is not a new contention; it is a very old one. Ever since the beginning of time as far as I know there have been some staff officers who have desired that they be given a title to which they were not entitled. A title indicates a man's profession, or his trade, or his occupation; and we can not make a man something other than what he is fitted to do.

It is no argument in favor of this contention that titles are given to officers in the Army who are staff officers. I believe on the whole that that practice is not approved of by most of the people in the Army, but in any case it is a bad practice for us to adopt something which has been discountenanced and discredited in all the navies of the world and which the larger part of the officers in our Navy do not believe in.

I think there is no very strong contention in favor of this legislation from most of the staff corps of the Navy, but there are a few uneasy beings who are always seeking something to which they are not entitled, and that is the result of this movement at this time. I think it would bring about confusion in the service. I think it would in a sense have to do with inefficiency rather than efficiency. I do not think it would mean anything more than gratifying the pride of some man in having a title to which he had no claim and which he is not fitted for. Therefore, for every reason I think it would be unwise to adopt this practice in the Navy.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, as the amendment we are discussing is the one I gave notice I would offer, I think I ought to explain how it came into the Senate now. I myself decided it was not wise to offer it, or try to bring it to a vote at all at this session, and requested the Senator from Montana not to present it at all. I am very sorry he has done so, because it precipitated a fight which was unnecessary and it will do more harm to the Navy than good. I would be glad to have him withdraw it.

I believe there is merit in this amendment and the reform which it is intended to bring about; and I give notice now that next winter, when we have more time, I expect to have a hearing before the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs on this question of titles and rank, and the rivalry between line and staff officers, and give both sides a chance to present their side, if the Naval Committee will sustain me in bringing about the hearing.

The chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department are now called admirals. Why, I do not know. But it has been so for a long while, and there must have been a good reason for starting the custom in the past. The line and staff in all other branches of the public service, Army, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and the Revenue-Cutter Service, have no distinction, and I do not think there ought to be one in the Navy. It is producing friction now and has been producing friction for years, and it ought to be ended if it is possible to do it.

However, I will not discuss the matter any further this evening.

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to print in the RECORD so that Senators may see it what is the title given in all the navies of the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Numbers and titles of staff corps of principal foreign navies.

[Office of Naval Intelligence, Navy Department, Feb. 27, 1912.]

MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Line titles.	England.	Number.	France.	Number.	Germany.	Number.
Vice admiral	Director general of the medical department.	1	Surgeon general, first class	1	Staff surgeon general (personal as vice admiral.	1
Rear admiral	Surgeon general	5	Surgeon general, second class	6		
Captain	Deputy surgeon general	134	Chief surgeon, first class	14	Surgeon general	5
Commander	Fleet surgeon	147	Chief surgeon, second class	15	Chief surgeon general	68
Lieutenant commander	Staff surgeon	186	Principal surgeon	65	Chief staff surgeon	
Lieutenant	Surgeon	178	Surgeon, first class	140	Staff surgeon	94
Junior lieutenant			Surgeon, second class	100	Chief assistant surgeon	118
Ensign			Surgeon, third class	(1)	Assistant surgeon	
Total		651		341		286

Line titles.	Japan.	Number.	Italy.	Number.	Austria.	Number.	Russia.	Number.
Vice admiral								
Rear admiral	Surgeon general	7	Major general	1	Staff surgeon general	1		
Captain	Inspector	14	Colonel	8	Chief staff surgeon, first class.	2		
Commander	Fleet surgeon	40	Lieutenant colonel	12	Chief staff surgeon, second class.	4	Hold civil rank of the Russian general service; are not officers.	304
Lieutenant commander	Staff surgeon	68	Major	31	Staff surgeon	9		
Lieutenant	Surgeon	114	Captain	107	Battleship surgeon	46		
Junior lieutenant	Assistant surgeon, first class.	56	Lieutenant	83	Frigate surgeon	20		
Ensign	Assistant surgeon, second class.	35						
Total		334		242		82		304

[1] As required.

Numbers and titles of staff corps of principal foreign navies—Continued.

PAY OFFICERS.

Line titles.	England.	Number.	France.	Number.	Germany.	Number.
Vice admiral			Paymaster general, first class	1		
Rear admiral			Paymaster general, second class	4		
Captain	Paymaster in chief	12	Paymaster chief, first class	12		
Commander	Fleet paymaster	160	Paymaster chief, second class	12	Staff paymaster	46
Lieutenant commander	Staff paymaster	72	Principal paymaster	37	Chief paymaster	179
	Paymaster	36				
Lieutenant	Assistant paymaster, 4 years' seniority.	332	Paymaster, first class	100	Paymaster	
Junior lieutenant			Paymaster, second class	40		
Ensign	Assistant paymaster, 4 years' seniority.		Paymaster, third class	(1)		
Total		612		+206		225

Line titles.	Japan.	Number.	Italy.	Number.	Austria.	Number.	Russia.	Number.
Vice admiral								
Rear admiral	Paymaster general	4	Major general	1	Paymaster general	1		
Captain	Inspector	19	Colonel	6	Chief paymaster, first class	5		
Commander	Fleet paymaster	48	Lieutenant colonel	17	Chief paymaster, second class	6		
Lieutenant commander	Staff paymaster	79	Major	28	Chief paymaster, third class	16	Line officers perform pay corps duties.	
Lieutenant	Paymaster	79	Captain	107	Paymaster, first class	86		
Junior lieutenant	Assistant paymaster, first class.	62	Lieutenant	80	Paymaster, second class	37		
Ensign	Assistant paymaster, second class.	33	Sub lieutenant					
Total		324		239		151		

CONSTRUCTORS.

Line titles.	England.	Number.	France.	Number.	Germany.	Number.
Vice admiral	Constructors belong to civil branch of the navy. They have no military rank; but assistant constructors, while serving at sea, are given rank of engineer lieutenant. Titles are as follows:		Inspector general of naval construction	1	(Constructors are a civil corps; the titles are not translatable.)	
Rear admiral			Director of naval construction	10		
Captain			Engineer in chief, first class	18	Schiffbau-direktor	7
					Schiffbau-betriebs-direktor	24
Commander	Director of naval construction	1	Engineer in chief, second class	18	....do	4
Lieutenant commander	Director of dockyards and works	1	Principal engineers	18	Baural fur schiffbau	41
Lieutenant	Chief constructor	14	Engineer, first class	62	Schiffbaumeister	84
Junior lieutenant	Constructor	28	Engineer, second class	20		
Ensign	Assistant constructor	75	Engineer, third class	(1)		
Total		119		147		160

Line titles.	Japan.	Number.	Italy.	Number.	Austria.	Number.	Russia.	Number.
Vice admiral			Lieutenant general	1				
Rear admiral	Inspector general	5	Major general	3	General constructor	1		
Captain	Inspector general	6	Colonel	8	Colonel constructor	5		
Commander	Chief constructor, first class	6	Lieutenant colonel	10	Chief constructor, first class	4		
Lieutenant commander	Chief constructor, second class.	24	Major	15	Chief constructor, second class.	4	No authentic information	
Lieutenant	Constructors	25	Captain	55	Chief constructor, third class.	5		
Junior lieutenant	Assistant constructors	8	Lieutenant	18	Constructor, first class	3		
Ensign					Constructor, second class	1		
Total		74		110		23		

[1] As required.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will withdraw it.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 61, after line 5, to insert:

Chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief machinists, chief carpenters, chief sailmakers, chief pharmacists, and chief pay clerks shall, after six years from date of commission, receive the pay and allowances that are now or may hereafter be allowed a lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy: *Provided*, That chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief machinists, chief carpenters, chief sailmakers, chief pharmacists, and chief pay clerks shall, after 12 years from date of commission, receive the pay and allowances that are now or may hereafter be allowed a lieutenant, United States Navy.

That warrant officers shall receive the same allowances of heat and light as are now or may hereafter be allowed an ensign, United States Navy: *Provided*, That any commissioned warrant officer of the active list who shall have had six years' service as a commissioned warrant officer may be commissioned with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the corps to which he belongs upon satisfactorily passing such examination as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, and upon recommendation of the examining board composed of three officers not below the rank of lieutenant commander.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 4, to insert:

Provided, That hereafter promotion to the grades of captain and rear admiral shall be by selection from the next lower respective grade: *Provided further*, That no officer shall be eligible for promotion by selection to either the grade of rear admiral or the grade of captain until he shall have been recommended for appointment to such grade by a board of nine flag officers of the line of the Navy, which board will base its recommendations upon the comparative probable fitness for command afloat in the respective grades into which promotion is to be made of all captains or commanders, respectively, of the line of the Navy who shall at the time the recommendation is made have had not less than three years' service in the grade in which they are then serving, except that the recommendation of the board in the case of officers of the former Engineer Corps who are restricted by law to the performance of shore duty only, and in that of officers who may hereafter be assigned to engineering duty only, shall be based upon their comparative fitness for the duties prescribed for them by law, and that upon promotion they shall be carried as additional numbers in grade: *Provided further*, That no officer shall be recommended for such promotion unless he shall have received the recommendation of not less than seven members of said board: *And provided further*, That any officers so selected shall, prior to promotion, be subject in all respects to the examinations prescribed by law for officers promoted by seniority, and in case of failure for any reason to pass such examination such officer shall lose his then existing opportunity for promotion and such examination shall not be considered in event of subsequent retirement to entitle such officer to the rank of the next higher grade.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Virginia if he will not allow that amendment to go over until

to-morrow? I failed to notice in the reading of it a provision prescribing the manner in which the board for the selection of officers for promotion may be appointed. It is a matter of a great deal of importance aside from that, and I should like the Senator to let it go over.

Mr. SWANSON. If there is objection to it, I will be glad to let it go over.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Washington—and I intend to make comment on that particular phase of the amendment—if the provision for a board of nine senior admirals would not cover his suggestion?

Mr. POINDEXTER. If there is to be a board vested with these very great powers, it seems to me that some such provision as that suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts would be very worthy of consideration. The merit of this proposition, of course, depends absolutely on the administration of the powers. If the board administers the vast power which it has over the careers of their fellow officers efficiently, undoubtedly it would be a good system, but it could be made a very obnoxious system by poor administration.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, the amendment goes over until to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 63, after line 10, to insert:

For purposes of retirement all officers now in the Navy or Marine Corps shall be credited with service from the dates they take precedence in accordance with law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 13, to insert:

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to reduce the pay or other benefits of any officer of the Navy or Marine Corps as now provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Officers for engineering duty only," on page 63, line 18, after the word "Navy," to insert "not below the grade of lieutenant commander," and on page 64, line 16, before the word "ensigns," to strike out "acting," so as to make the clause read:

Officers of the line of the Navy not below the grade of lieutenant commander may, upon application, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, be assigned to engineering duty only, and that when so assigned and until they reach the grade of commander they shall perform duty as prescribed in section 4 of the personnel act approved March 3, 1899, and thereafter shore duty only as now prescribed for officers transferred to the line from the former engineer corps, except that commanders may be assigned to duty as fleet and squadron engineers: *Provided*, That when so assigned they shall retain their place with respect to other line officers in the grades they now or may hereafter occupy, and also the right to succession to command on shore in accordance with their seniority, and shall be promoted as vacancies occur, subject to physical examination and to such examination in engineering as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe: *And provided further*, That the number of officers so assigned in any one year shall be in accordance with the requirements of the service as determined by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to appoint annually in the line of the Navy for a period of 10 years following the passage of this act, in the order of merit determined by such competitive examination as he may prescribe, 30 ensigns for the performance of engineering duties only.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 3, before the word "ensigns," to strike out "acting"; in line 7, before the word "commissioned," to insert "regularly"; and in line 9, after the word "examination," to insert "to qualify for the general duties of the line," so as to make the clause read:

Such ensigns shall, upon the completion of the probationary period of three years, of which two years shall have been spent on board cruising vessels and one year pursuing a course of instruction at the Naval Academy prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, be regularly commissioned in the grade of lieutenant of the junior grade after satisfactorily passing such examination to qualify for the general duties of the line as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, and having been recommended for promotion by the examining board and found physically qualified by a board of medical officers of the Navy.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, after line 13, to strike out:

Such officers shall thereafter be required to perform engineering duties only, and shall be eligible for advancement to the higher grades in the manner herein provided for line officers assigned to engineering duty only.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 21, after the word "liquors," to strike out "or other misconduct," and, on page 66, line 4, after the word "liquors," to strike out "or other misconduct," so as to make the clause read:

Hereafter no officer or enlisted man in the Navy or Marine Corps in active service who shall be absent from duty on account of sickness or disease resulting from his own intemperate use of drugs or alcoholic liquors shall receive pay for the period of such absence, the time so absent and the cause thereof to be ascertained under such procedure and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That an enlistment shall not be regarded as complete until the enlisted man shall have made good any time in excess of one day lost on account of sickness or disease resulting from his own intemperate use of drugs or alcoholic liquors.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I desire to recur to the committee amendment striking out lines 14, 15, 16, and 17, on page 65, which read:

Such officers shall thereafter be required to perform engineering duties only, and shall be eligible for advancement to the higher grades in the manner herein provided for line officers assigned for engineering duty only.

I ask that that amendment go over until to-morrow, because I have some data which I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate. I shall oppose the committee amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. I shall not object to the amendment going over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has been agreed to. However, without objection, the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered and the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the chairman and members of the committee to the injustice of the proviso beginning at the foot of page 65, which reads:

Provided, That an enlistment shall not be regarded as complete until the enlisted man shall have made good any time in excess of one day lost on account of sickness or disease resulting from his own intemperate use of drugs or alcoholic liquors.

Is not that a discrimination between the enlisted men and the officers? In the case of the officer we simply provide that he shall not receive pay, but in the case of the enlisted man he is required to serve the full time lost. That is not putting the officers and enlisted men on a fair footing of equality. It seems to me the enlisted man should receive the same favors as does an officer. The provision preceding the proviso reads:

Hereafter no officer or enlisted man in the Navy or Marine Corps in active service who shall be absent from duty on account of sickness or disease resulting from his own intemperate use of drugs or alcoholic liquors shall receive pay for the period of such absence, the time so absent and the cause thereof to be ascertained under such procedure and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, an enlistment is for a definite period.

Mr. NELSON. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. And an officer's service, of course, is not definite.

Mr. NELSON. But he can retire at a given age.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; he can retire for age, but I mean he has a life service, and you can not apply the word "enlistment" to a commissioned officer.

Mr. NELSON. If an enlisted man in the Navy is unfortunate enough to be sick for, say, six months or more, he is required to serve six additional months.

Mr. LODGE. Only if his sickness is caused by drugs or alcohol.

Mr. NELSON. The provision concerning drugs and alcohol applies to officers, too.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. If the same rule were applied to enlisted men as is applied to officers, it would be just to say that the enlisted man should not receive pay for that time. That would be applying the same rule.

Mr. LODGE. That is provided for in the first part.

Mr. NELSON. It is provided as to officers that they shall not receive pay for the period of absence. If the same provision were made as to the enlisted man, it would be putting them on a parity. The bill simply says as to officers that for the period of their sickness they shall not be entitled to pay; but as to the enlisted men, it is provided that they shall also serve an additional time in the Navy.

Mr. SWANSON. But they are paid when they serve the additional time. If the Senator will allow me, I will endeavor to explain it. If an enlisted man gets drunk for five days, he loses his pay, as does the officer in a similar case; but the enlisted man, to complete his term of enlistment and to be entitled to a discharge, if he has been absent from duty for more than one day, must serve out a time equal to the period of his absence in order to complete his enlistment. He is simply kept in the Navy longer, but he is paid for the additional service.

Mr. NELSON. Does he lose his pay during his sickness?

Mr. SWANSON. He loses his pay if he is sick on account of being drunk, say.

Mr. NELSON. Well, there is a discrimination.

Mr. SWANSON. Wait a moment. Under this provision the officer also loses his pay. If an officer were drunk for five days, he would lose his pay. When it comes to counting the service of the enlisted man, at the end of three years he is entitled to his

discharge; but if he has been sick in excess of one day on account of drunkenness his enlistment is extended, as I understand, to cover the period during which he was absent from duty, but he gets pay for the additional period.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, if the provision simply deprived the enlisted man of pay during that period, as is done in the case of the officer, it would put them on an equal footing, but the enlisted man is not only deprived of his pay for that time, but he is required to serve an additional time.

Mr. SWANSON. For which he is paid.

Mr. NELSON. That is the result of this bill. It is a top-heavy officers' bill, and it does not properly recognize the rights of the enlisted man.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the warrant officer and enlisted man, I think, are treated as fairly as the officers. The enlisted man has contracted to serve the Government for three years, for which the Government agrees to pay him so much money. Now, during one month of his service he was absent on account of being drunk, so that at the end of his term of enlistment he has not given three years' service. As I understand, under this provision, if an officer is absent because of drunkenness he loses his pay, as the enlisted man loses his pay, but before the enlisted man can complete his contract of enlistment he must serve another month, because he has agreed to serve three years, and he lacks one month of doing so. He is, however, paid for the additional month.

Mr. NELSON. What about the officer who loses time by being drunk?

Mr. SWANSON. He can not get out of the service at all, unless he resigns, and his resignation is accepted.

Mr. NELSON. He can retire when the retiring age comes.

Mr. SWANSON. He can retire at 62. If the Senator will look at the provision, he will see that there is no discrimination. Of course, if an officer only served for a specified time, as an enlisted man does, he could be required to serve an additional time, but the officer does not have that kind of a service.

Mr. NELSON. It looks to me as though you are inflicting a double penalty on the enlisted man. First you deprive him of pay when he is laid up, and in the next place you require him to serve the additional time to make up for it. That is leaving him not on the footing of the officer. It is a discrimination between the enlisted man and the officer.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I think if the contention of the Senator from Minnesota should be carried to its logical conclusion it would simply result in allowing the officer that gets drunk and is out of the service for, say, a month, to have the privilege of serving a month additional beyond the age limit, and it seems to me to be a temptation to them to go off on a spree once in a while.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 67, to insert:

That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be paid to Mrs. Eliza Orr, mother of the late William Orr, fireman, United States Navy, an amount equal to six months' pay at the rate received by him at the date of his death.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to know why that personal claim is added here.

Mr. SWANSON. The Secretary urgently requested it. As I understand the case—I will get the letter in a minute—an enlisted man usually designates a person who shall receive his pay in case of his death, and in this case I think the enlisted man failed to designate his mother, and under the law she could not get it. I think this is to correct his failure to designate the person whom he wanted to get this six months' pay. I think that is the case; but, if it is not, I will correct the statement when I find the letter.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 13, after the word "retirement," to insert:

Provided, That hereafter any retired officer of the naval service who shall be detailed on active duty shall, while so serving, receive the active duty pay and allowances of the grade, not above that of lieutenant commander in the Navy or of major in the Marine Corps, that he would have attained in due course of promotion if he had remained on the active list for a period beyond the date of his retirement equal to the total amount of time during which he has been detailed on active duty since his retirement: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to reduce the pay of any retired officer on active duty whose retired pay exceeds the active duty pay and allowances for the grade of lieutenant commander.

So as to make the clause read:

No officer who, after having commanded a fleet in active commission, has been retired for age and whom, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, the public interests make it necessary to retain for a time after said retirement and who is performing active duty as chairman of the executive committee of the General Board, shall, for the period so retained, suffer any reduction in the emoluments he was receiving at the time of his retirement: *Provided*, That hereafter any retired officer of the naval service who shall be detailed on active duty shall, while so serving, receive the active duty pay and allowances of the grade, not above that of lieutenant commander in the Navy or of major in the Marine Corps, that he would have attained in due course of promotion if he had remained on the active list for a period beyond the date of his retirement equal to the total amount of time during which he has been detailed on active duty since his retirement: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to reduce the pay of any retired officer on active duty whose retired pay exceeds the active duty pay and allowances for the grade of lieutenant commander.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I move to amend, in line 16, page 67, by striking out the words "lieutenant commander" and inserting "commander."

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

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the word "lieutenant," before the word "commander," so that it will read "not above that of commander."

Mr. WEEKS. The reason I propose that, Mr. President, is because it seems to me that the retired officer in the admiral's list, and possibly in the commander's list, would receive less pay as a lieutenant commander on the active list than he would as a retired officer in the grade at which he was retired.

It is rather difficult to determine what the pay is. Of course, the base pay is given in the register, but the number of fogies affects it so that I can not tell just what the pay of any particular man would be. An admiral's base pay is $6,000. His retired-list pay would be $4,500, based on that. That would be more pay than he would receive on the active list as lieutenant commander, even if he were given pay for the highest grade, 64 years, after the date of his commission, with all the bonus added.

Mr. LODGE. The proviso protects him in that.

Mr. WEEKS. That is quite true; but a large percentage of the officers who are retired are admirals, commodores, and captains. I do not see any particular reason why the pay of those men should not be at least the pay of a commander, if they are going to perform the duties which they naturally would—the duties of their grade.

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

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. Assuming that one of these retired officers is put to work and given this pay, would his retired pay continue? Would he get both?

Mr. WEEKS. Oh, no.

Mr. NELSON. There is nothing in this paragraph to say that he will not.

Mr. WEEKS. There is a provision of law that no officer of the Government shall receive pay for two services under any circumstances.

Mr. NELSON. He would be deprived of his retired pay?

Mr. WEEKS. For instance, the Senator from Minnesota could not receive the pay of United States Senator and the pay of a major general in the Army, even if he were serving as major general.

Mr. NELSON. Oh, no; but——

Mr. POINDEXTER. He could receive the pay of United States Senator and the pay of judge of a Federal court.

Mr. WEEKS. That is because a judge has a retired pay, and——

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, this amendment is in conformity with the Army amendment. Under the present law a retired naval officer can not receive pay in excess of the pay of a lieutenant; and very frequently they get less pay for working than they do if they are not working.

Mr. WEEKS. I approve of this amendment. I think it is a very just one.

Mr. SWANSON. The Army has it up to the pay of major. We thought we ought to make the provision as to retired naval and Army officers conform in the law.

If you get a contest between the two, you will soon have retired officers receiving as much pay as active officers. We think that in the case of a man who has retired at the age of 62, or retired on account of physical disabilities, the pay of a lieutenant commander is sufficient pay for him. If he has been retired when he did not have the physical disability, he has been unworthily retired. Now, after he attains the age of 62 years, we reached the conclusion that for active service in the Navy the pay of a lieutenant commander is sufficient. The Army decided that a major's pay was sufficient.

I do hope the Senator will not insist on this amendment. This is quite a good advance in the pay of retired officers, making it conform with the Army; and it seems to me we have gone

as far as we can go in paying retired naval officers up to the pay of lieutenant commander.

In reference to the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, I will say that they can not get two pays. The situation is this: If the retired pay exceeds the pay of a lieutenant commander, the officer gets the retired pay but gets no active pay. If the retired pay of one of the younger officers is less, he gets the pay of a lieutenant commander if he would have reached that position if he had continued in the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to inquire whether there is to be a recess or an adjournment. The Chair will adjourn the Senate at 6.30 o'clock under the order heretofore made.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand there has been an agreement to adjourn this evening, so there can be a morning hour tomorrow. I will therefore make that motion.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2845) authorizing the sale of the marine-hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 5425) to standardize lime barrels, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. REAVIS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15316) to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, 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 (H. R. 16911) making appropriation for the relief and transportation of destitute American citizens in Mexico, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. BRYAN, from the Committee on Claims, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 228), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 6616) granting an increase of pension to James W. Higgins (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 6617) to correct the military record of James H. Painter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 6618) granting a pension to William E. Puett;

A bill (S. 6619) granting an increase of pension to Reuben H. Chapel (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6620) granting an increase of pension to John S. Stearns (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6621) granting a pension to Frederick Besancon (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6622) granting a pension to Marcia R. Ainsworth (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6623) granting an increase of pension to Samiria H. M. Bryant (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 6624) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment providing that Brazos Island and Point Isabel, Tex., be added to the list of cities for specific plans for improvements of harbors and connecting channels, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 15947), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $350,000 to repair and reconstruct when necessary public works damaged in July, 1916, by hurricanes at the navy yard and station, Pensacola, Fla., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 15947), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have in my hand some newspaper editorials and resolutions relating to the so-called Shields water-power bill. I do not desire to take up the time of the Senate in reading them, but I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian, May 24, 1916.]

TIDE TURNS AGAINST PINCHOT.

The administration forces in Congress now evince a decided reluctance to press water-power legislation at this session. The Ferris bill, relating to water power on public land, has passed the House, and Senator MYERS has reported a substitute, which has been made the unfinished business but has been displaced by other business, and the Senate has failed to agree on a time when it shall again be taken up, the steering committee refusing to push it forward. The Shields bill, relating to water power on navigable streams, has passed the Senate, and the Adamson substitute has been reported to the House, but the Rules Committee has sidetracked it in favor of the Army and Navy bills, appropriation bills, and the shipping bill, and there is no prospect of its being taken up until after the national conventions. There is so wide a divergence between the House and Senate bills on important points of policy that long debates in conference committees would likely delay agreement.

Although President Wilson and Secretary Lane have several times expressed a desire for final action at this session, administration leaders in Congress show a sudden lack of interest in the subject. One reason may be the growth of public sentiment against the proposed invasion of the rights of the States. A remarkable evidence of this fact is the adoption by the Conservation Congress of resolutions favoring the Shields and Myers bills by a vote of 116 to 39, against the opposition of Gifford Pinchot and James R. Garfield. This proof that the tide is turning against Pinchotism may have given the Democratic leaders pause. Another cause for delay is the fact that the main points in controversy are before the Supreme Court for decision, in the case of the Beaver River Power Co., appealed from Utah, which is to be argued in the fall and which may be decided before a new Congress meets. The six States which intervened have made so strong a case against the usurpation advocated by Mr. Pinchot that the leaders in Congress may not be willing to waste time in passing a law which may be annulled by judicial decision before it can come into operation.

Greatly as Oregon desires that its water power be unlocked, it would rather see laws passed which rest on a firm foundation of constitutionality, such as will be laid by the decision in the Utah case, than see laws passed which, as the Oregonian believes, will be made dead letter by that decision.

—

[From the Newport (Wash.) Miner.]

WHO WILL DO THE MOST GOOD?

Gifford Pinchot complains that the Shields bill, which has been passed by the Senate as a substitute for the Ferris bill passed by the House, proposes to give away the water powers of the country without compensation.

What Mr. Pinchot calls compensation is a question. The minute any water power is developed by a private company it immediately begins to pay taxes to the State, city, and county; special corporation taxes; in many instances gross-earning taxes; and many other forms of licenses, fees, etc., to both State and National Governments.

To an ordinary citizen this would look like compensation for the use of water power. It is an unquestionable fact that if additional fees and licenses are to be asked by the Government it will increase the cost of operation and naturally the price to the consumer. From an industrial standpoint it will tend to discourage development of power enterprises in the Pacific coast States, where we have so much need of any kind of development that furnishes pay rolls.

If there were any chance of power companies getting hold of our water powers and making arbitrary rates there would be cause for alarm; but there is no such chance, as the rates these companies are allowed to charge are already under the control and supervision of State and interstate commerce commissions, and the rights of the public are fully protected.

What the Western States want is development. They do not care whether it is under the Shields bill or some other bill.

The Shields bill, however, as passed by the Senate, seems to fully protect "future generations," whom the supporters of the Ferris bill worry so about, and at the same time allows the present generation to develop and enjoy its water-power resources instead of letting them run to waste in the ocean.

Who will do our State the most good—Gifford Pinchot sitting in a soft-bottomed chair in Washington, D. C., working for a bunch of faddists, or a hard-headed engineer developing one of our water powers and employing 500 to 1,000 men, especially when we already have laws fully protecting the rights of the public against excessive rates, etc.? (Pacific Coast Manufacturer.)

—

[From the Williston (N. Dak.) Graphic, May 11, 1916.]

THROWING PINCHOTISM OVERBOARD.

The National Conservation Congress has, by a decisive vote, indorsed the Shields bill for the development of water powers in navigable streams. Despite the pleadings and the threatenings of the Gifford Pinchot idealists, who want the Government to retain its ownership of the powers forever and ever, the congress has thus declared for a sound and practical plan of permitting private interests to develop them under careful Government regulation, safeguarding the public's interests.

The Pinchot conception of conservation is that natural resources must be kept locked up in Government possession, where private interests can not get at them for development. There is no end of water power going to waste in this country. The Government will not develop it, and, if Mr. Pinchot had his way, no one else would be permitted to do so.

It's the same way with the coal in Alaska. Coal lands there must be leased and not sold outright. But coal lands are useless without railroads, and railroads are not permitted to lease coal lands except for their own use. So before there can be coal leasers there must be Government-built railroads. Accordingly the Government begins a 500-mile railroad to reach the most distant of the coal fields, while it neglects to build a 30-mile stretch into the most accessible field. Thus Alaska must wait three years for coal that might be had in six months. That is conservation of coal!

But the National Conservation Congress is weary of Pinchotism and ready for practical water-power development—and that is some progress! (Minneapolis Journal.)

—

[From the Newark (N. J.) Evening Star, June 5, 1916.]

WEALTH IN THE AIR.

A good example of the value of intensive farming is given by a Cumberland County truck farmer, who produces 625 bushels of potatoes and 10,000 quarts of strawberries to the acre. People familiar with agriculture need not be told that these yields are about three times the normal. He does it by an arrangement of overhead sprinklers covering 160 acres, and by lavish fertilizing.

The average European farmer uses 200 pounds of fertilizer to the acre, the average American farmer 28 pounds. And at that the farmers of the United States spend $170,000,000 a year for fertilizers, and get crop returns lower than those of Europe by half.

Above each square mile of the earth's surface there are 20,000,000 tons of nitrogen. We are spending yearly on Chilean nitrates $21,000,000, at $75 a ton. Chile's nitrate beds will be exhausted about seven years from now. Then we shall be compelled to get our nitrogen supply from the air. Why not begin now?

In Europe 1,200,000 hydrohorsepower is used every year to extract nitrogen from the air. England is about to establish a nitrogen plant in Iceland. We have the water power and the air. We need the enterprise and foresight.

There is a military side to it also. If we should be drawn into war now and lose control of the sea, we could get no nitrates from Chile, our powder would soon give out and we could make no more until we harnessed our streams to draw nitrogen from the air.

—

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1916.]

THE WATER-POWER BILL.

The report that President Wilson may veto the water-power bill is not very encouraging to those who had hoped that the day of antagonism to honest enterprise had passed. It would be strange, indeed, if the President should disapprove the water-power bill in the face of the approval given to the appropriation of $20,000,000 for a Government nitrate plant. If the bill had been enacted months ago there would now be under way a considerable development of water power, and instead of one Government nitrate factory there would be a number of large interests investing in this new process for manufacturing fertilizers and the essential ingredient of powder for war purposes.

The water-power bill would not cost the United States a single dollar.

All that it would do would be to permit the Secretary of War to issue permits for water-power development upon some definite plan or system. The measure was passed by the Senate by a two to one vote after all the arguments against it had been analyzed and disposed of. It may be assumed that the differences of opinion with regard to the merits of this bill are honest differences. The chief dispute is over the recapture clause, which provides that after capitalists have invested their money in the erection of dams and the building of power plants, the Government, at the end of 50 years, by paying the cost of the property, may take it over for Government operation. The opponents of the bill say that the recapture claue is so phrased as to enable investors to defeat the purpose of the law by technicalities. If this be true, it is hard to understand why the ablest lawyers in the Senate, men who are honest and patriotic, voted for the measure. There were the same differences of opinion over the Sherman antitrust law many years ago when it was before the Senate; yet the law has worked very well. It should be assumed now that since the measure passed the Senate by a large majority, it is a good working program for the development of water power.

There are in the bill a great many provisions for regulation by State commissions as well as the National Government, and at any time these regulations can be made stronger if the need for restriction appears. The main thing is to get development under way, and if the present measure is to be vetoed, a definite substitute should be suggested for it without delay.

—

[From the Ishpeming (Mich.) Record, May 26, 1916.]

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

At a recent meeting of the National Conservation Congress held in Washington, D. C., the indorsement of the principle of private industrial development of the great waterway resources of the United States was put through after a stormy session in which Gifford Pinchot and his followers were turned down and their principles were repudiated. The action as the result of the stormy debates is taken by the members to mean that the big conservation body has grown tired of seeing the vast resources of the country tied up and was anxious to put itself on record before the whole country as favoring legislative measures for private development of our water resources.

The development of water power, which conservationists recognize as the greatest natural resource the country has, has been brought almost to stagnation by the failure of legislation looking to its development. Business men with capital have stood ready to start on the hazardous undertaking of harnessing great rivers in order to provide cheaper power and light, as well as cheaper fertilizers for the farmer and a greater supply of explosives for our Army and Navy, through the new process of taking nitrogen from the air by means of water power. They have been met with the cry of "trust" and "monopoly," until, as business men, they were almost ready to abandon their efforts. The action of the Conservation Congress, however, in placing its stamp of approval on a plan to permit private industry to go ahead and develop water powers, under a limited franchise and carefully governed restrictions, is regarded as the most important step to water-power conservation that has been made in recent years.

Such men as Hugh L. Cooper, the engineer of international reputation who built the Keokuk Dam as well as big water-power plants at Niagara and on the Susquehanna River, have been prominent in the power fight. The President and members of his Cabinet and Members of Congress, without regard to political affiliations, have been advocating strongly the necessity of legislative action that will put an end to a stagnation in the development of this wonderful resource. Almost every other nation of any size, it has been pointed out, is ahead of America in the use of water power. This fact, it is said, coupled with the growing demand of the people of the United States that something be done so that the country can utilize as well as conserve this vast resource, is regarded as the basis of the decisive action by the Conservation Congress.

—

[From the Electrical World, May 6, 1916.]

THE CONSERVATION OF WATER POWERS.

Convinced of the necessity for water-power development in the interests of conservation and of national preparedness, the National Conservation Congress in convention assembled this week indorsed in principle two water-power bills now pending before the Legislature at Washington. Following close on the heels of the water-power conferences of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers and of the American Electrochemical Society in the same city last week, the action of the Conservation Congress is ominous. While there may be some question of the propriety of a national body approving or disapproving any particular form of legislation, there can be absolutely no doubt that the conservationists were impressed with the vital need of quick and definite action, and adopted the surest means of making their desires known. The high character and wide range of subjects discussed and the patriotic enthusiasm of the speakers and of the convention as a whole were sufficient to remove this action of the Conservation Congress from taint of suspicion. Now that light and understanding have been freely imparted on the situation, action should no longer be deferred.

—

[From the Leavenworth Times, May 1, 1916.]

FAVORS SHIELDS BILL.

The Rotary Club has passed a resolution indorsing the Shields bill, which has been introduced into the House of Representatives after having passed the Senate. This bill provides for the issuing of 50-year permits for the development of water-power sites on navigable streams anywhere in the United States. The bill anticipates the prevention of waste of such immense quantities of power as is now taking place.

—

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Herald, May 17, 1916.]

THE SHIELDS WATER-POWER BILL.

The discussion on the best bill for Congress to adopt in bringing into action the dormant water power going to waste goes on with unabated zeal, with the tendency to favor the Shields bill in preference to all others. Because of the wide publicity of the Pinchot plan a good deal of attention was given to his views at first until the gentleman began to get a little peevish and fretful on account of the preference for the Shields bill. Now he has almost eliminated himself from attention. The big bugaboo Mr. Pinchot found in the Shields bill doesn't exist at all—that is, in the leases amounting to in perpetuity. On the contrary, ownership ceases absolutely at the expiration of the 50 years. Tennessee will be greatly benefited by this bill, as this State is fortunately blessed with water-power streams, and as the esteemed Chattanooga Times says, millions of money is waiting to be invested in Tennessee as soon as the bill becomes a law.

The Times says:

"The strongest argument for the passage of the Shields or a similar bill to the same purpose is that millions of dollars are ready for investment in plants having for their purpose the development of electrical power through the use of inland waters of the country. Senator SHIELDS has said that if this bill should become law, the development along the Tennessee River would within the next few years add immeasurably to the wealth of the country and become a most powerful agency in promoting the industrial development of the States through which it passes. As it is, few men of wealth are willing to undertake such development hedged about as they would be under present rules and regulations governing running streams under control of the Government."

We should say that, while conserving agencies for the benefit of coming generations is a duty upon the present Government, something is due those who are now on the scene of activity and whose energies and activities are being directed to the projection of enterprises and the development of resources the full benefits of which will extend long beyond the time of their natural lives and which will therefore become rich heritages for those who shall come after them.

—

[From the San Jose (Cal.) Herald, May 25, 1916.]

KEEPING CAPITAL AT HOME.

If American capital, seeking opportunities for investment in water-power development, is to be kept at home, American laws governing water-power development must be made quite as attractive as the laws of Canada or of the Canadian Provinces. That Canada welcomes the investment of American capital has been amply demonstrated.

The present Dominion water-power law of Canada, enacted five years ago, has failed to lure American dollars, and is to be remedied; but the law of Quebec—a Province where water-power development does not come under Dominion control and regulation—is far more liberal in its provisions, and far more alluring in its terms, than any bill now before the American Congress. Add to this the fact that Quebec has the most attractive water powers undeveloped in all North America, where the cost of installation is relatively cheap, where leases run from 75 to 99 years, where terms are moderate, and where tidewater transportation is at hand and big markets within easy reach, and it will be realized that this much of Canadian competition is a factor which can not be ignored in working out the water problem in the United States.

Within recent months American capital of vast extent, discouraged by the repeated failure of the American Congress to adopt a water-power policy, turned toward Quebec, intending to make an initial investment of $10,000,000 in a development that ultimately would reach 600,000 horsepower, the largest single enterprise of the kind on this continent. That the investment has not yet been made is due solely to a conflict of private interests owning the power site. When that obstacle is overcome, ten, twenty, perhaps thirty millions of American

capital, that first sought investment in the United States, will follow into Canada the American millions that went to the Canadian side of Niagara Falls to build and operate the only hydroelectric plant on this continent that to-day produces commercial atmospheric nitrogen for the manufacture of fertilizers and explosives.

So liberal have been the Quebec officials in the administration of their water-power policy that American capital to-day has less fear of the Quebec Government than of the Government of the United States. Moreover, the Canadian Province which threatens to become the most active competitor of the United States in the hydroelectric field is already offering definite terms, while in the United States there is nothing but uncertainty—an uncertainty that grows greater as the prospect for water-power legislation grow dimmer.

—

[From the Engineering Record, New York, Feb. 12, 1916.]

CONCENTRATION OF WATER-POWER CONTROL.

The bugaboo of a water-power trust has been raised again by the publication of the report, submitted to the Senate by the Secretary of Agriculture, showing the relations of the companies owning water power in the United States. The report was briefly abstracted in the last issue of the Engineering Record, page 192. From various quarters have come expressions of fear that the people of the United States either now or later are to be at the mercy of the octopus. Granting that 18 corporations control more than one-half of the total water power used in public-service operations in this country, and that 6 corporations control more than one-quarter, what need is there for alarm so long as the State utility commissions have control over the rates? In other words, no matter how extensive the monopoly, the return to it from the ownership of the water powers remains in control of the people. Such is not the case, of course, where the entire power produced at a particular point is used by a single corporation for industrial purposes. Yet it is not these powers that are discussed in the report in question.

That the report itself recognizes the advantage of monopoly is apparent from the following passage:

"Monopolization of the supply in any given territory makes possible, through interconnections of stations and through diversification of load, economies of operation that would not be possible for isolated independent stations. Interruptions to service may be lessened, the needs of the customer may be better served, and rates may be lower with a single power system than with several. No better service is given and no lower rates charged than in California, where, notwithstanding the considerable municipal developments, 90 per cent of the total primary power is used by public-service corporations, or in Montana, where 89 per cent is owned by two affiliated corporations. Having the ability to give the better service and the lower rate, it only remains for the proper public agency to require it."

It is right here that the case of the agitators who hold up the water-power-trust bugaboo falls to pieces, because the proper public agency to require reasonable rates is already provided in the various public-service commissions which now regulate electric utilities in all but 15 States.

—

[From the Utica (N. Y.) Observer, June 5, 1916.]

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

The Shields water-power bill, if it becomes a law, will throw open to development a large amount of water power. Its sponsor declared that the amount that would be developed is upward of 15,000,000 horsepower, or the equal of 100,000,000 tons of coal consumption per year.

The bill places a large responsibility in the hands of the Secretary of War. He is authorized to grant permits for dams and power plants where he believes that such dams will improve the navigability of streams. It is manifest that in this clause there is a large restriction, for there are many power-producing streams which are not navigable, and the dams would make them so only for rowboats. It is not clear why mountainous streams were not included in the bill.

The dams are to be constructed by private capital, which shall provide locks, gates, etc. Business within the State shall be regulated by the State and interstate business by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It appears that through this provision any corporation is under close control as to its prices. The plans for the dams, morever, must be approved by the War Department in order that the best improvement of navigation and the fullest development of waterpower may be obtained.

The corporation must pay a rental for public lands and a charge for the rights and privileges in the use of water. These rentals and charges are to be fixed by the Secretary of War. The money thus received is to be placed into a special fund for use in further improvement of waterways.

A corporation is prevented from delaying in its work by a provision which requires that it shall begin work within two years after the granting of the permit. The Secretary shall prescribe that the work shall be completed within a reasonable time, fixed by him. If the works are not completed as directed, or if the provisions are violated, the corporation is subject to penalties or revocation of the grant.

At the end of the 50-year period, for which the permits are granted, the Government may extend the lease, make a new grant, or upon one year's notice take over the property upon payment of its value. This value shall be determined by agreement, or by the Federal courts. No rights granted by the Government shall be allowed in arriving at this value and such rights shall not be included in fixing the rates to consumers.

Municipally owned dams and power plants for irrigation, or for supplying power for municipal purposes, are given preferences for surplus water. The bill does not apply to small streams.

The measure contains an antimonopoly clause providing that no dams shall be controlled by any unlawful monopoly, or shall form any unlawful constraint to limit the output of electrical energy, or in restraint of trade. This seems to be a superfluous provision, for existing laws should take care of that.

The Senate talked about this bill for weeks, and passed it by a good majority, which indicates that the Senate is fairly well satisfied with it. It is a measure which gives private enterprise much inducement to develop various water powers, and at the same time it does not give these valuable rights away, as public property has been given away heretofore. It is to be noted, however, that at the end of the 50-year lease, the Government shall pay the value of the plant. The Government could do the same with the railroads. On the other hand, 50 years hence they may fix values differently, so that the unearned increment piled up by the public will not be included in the price.

[From the Boston Commercial, Feb. 19, 1916.]

DEVELOPMENT REAL CONSERVATION—THE FOLLY OF WITHHOLDING WATER POWER FROM PUBLIC USE—AMPLE COMPENSATION IN SERVICE AND TAXES.

Gifford Pinchot, who came prominently into the public eye several years ago as one of the foremost advocates of conservation, apparently has not awakened to the fact that the American people have debated that question in their minds until they are satisfied that it is simply the crazy idea of an illogical dreamer. He is now writing personal letters to editors, asking the press to help him "defeat a most serious attack upon our public resources." He says the Shields bill, now before the Senate, gives to the "power interests" without compensation the use of water power on navigable streams; that the amount of power these streams will supply is larger by far than all the power of every kind now in use in the United States; and then he rambles on about provisions which should "enable the people to take back their own property at the end of 50 years."

Mr. Pinchot is a socialist, though he probably does not know it, and it is altogether improbable that the socialists would accept him as such. His idea, reduced to its final analysis, is that the whole people should own everything and that the lazy and improvident, through the mere mistake of birth, should inherit a share of the accumulations of the creative, the industrious, and the thrifty; it seems to be his opinion that one method to bring about his desired distribution of wealth would be to hold up those who finance and develop industries and make them pay the Government for the privilege of doing business. John Ruskin objected to steam-railroad building in England because, in his opinion, it would deface the scenery. Gifford Pinchot is afraid some one might develop water power in "the Grand Canyon, the greatest natural wonder on this continent." Therefore Pinchot is in no sense original.

If the savings of thrifty people had not been put into corporations to build up the railroads probably no one would now take as a gift either the water powers or the great agricultural areas of the interior of this country, there would not be taxable property enough in the United States to pay the salaries of the little group of muckrakers who still hold public office, and the relatively small area from which food products could be moved to seaboard would not support one-half of the present population. Everybody knows, possibly excepting Pinchot, that the development of the country's water powers will result in the creation of property values and that the taxes the holders of such properties will pay will compensate the Government handsomely. They also know that by the use of this power the productive capacity of the country will be immensely increased, giving remunerative employment to labor and exerting an influence to reduce the cost of living. It is common knowledge also that the entire material progress of humanity has been due to the development and use of natural resources by the people who save, invest, and work, and who do not permit themselves to be restrained from doing so by impracticable theories.

If this country is to go ahead industrially, an immense amount of mechanical power must be developed. Is it better that the coal deposits or the waterfalls should be conserved? One or the other must furnish the power.

Mr. Pinchot thought the coal of Alaska should be conserved, also the forests, and now the water powers. The rest of us in the United States do not agree with him fully, and therefore it would seem to be up to him to remove his place of residence to the interior of South America or Africa, where everything is being conserved.

If there is anyone left who has the courage to invest his capital in the development and equipment of a water power in the United States after the way the Government has treated investors during the past eight or nine years, he should be given the privilege of doing so and he should also be awarded a medal for bravery.

That water powers or anything else should be operated at cost for the alleged "benefit of the people" is a figment of the imagination. Profits are just as essential to industrial and material progress as food is to a growing child.

If the full product of the industry were divided equally among those who take part in its production, there would be no fund with which to build for the future. Until there is a sufficient accumulation to pay for clearing the land, providing the seed, and cultivating the plants, there can be no harvest, and a part of each crop must be saved for seed and to feed the workers until harvest time the following year.

Undoubtedly a few editors will fall for Mr. Pinchot's argument, but it is believed that a vast majority of them know better. The population of the United States is increasing, and the only way to provide the growing numbers of people with food, raiment, and shelter is by the development of the country's natural resources, the extension of its industries, and the continuing increase of its production.

A relatively small portion of the profits of industry is wasted by the rich on luxuries and extravagances, but more than three-quarters of all net earnings are reinvested and the profits thereon reinvested in such a way that the public gets the full benefit to the last dollar.

Fortunately, approximately all of the profits so far made in this country have been invested at home. After they begin to be invested abroad the people of other countries will get the benefit of them. If Gifford Pinchot's dreams are permitted to come true, American capital will go abroad in shiploads.

The old song says, "The mill will never grind again with the waters that are past." The only way to conserve water power is by developing and using it. By this method the millions of horsepower now running to waste every day should be conserved, Mr. Pinchot to the contrary notwithstanding.

—

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES, INDORSING THE SHIELDS NAVIGABLE-STREAM WATER-POWER BILL (S. 331).

BY THE RALEIGH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, RALEIGH, N. C.

Whereas 60,000,000 undeveloped horsepower in the rivers and streams of the United States now go to waste because their development is financially impossible under our present laws; and

Whereas cheap electrical power for the irrigation of our desert lands; for the treatment of our limestone, phosphate, and mineral resources; for the operation of light, heat, and power plants in areas now closed to electrical competition; for the electrification of divisions of our railroads; for the manufacture of nitrogen from the air on a scale to lessen the cost of our farm fertilizers, and to assure us an adequate ammunition supply in time of war; and for reducing the cost of power in manufacturing of every description, now waits upon a change in our present laws; and

Whereas water-power development under vigilant regulations by National and State authorities, insuring absolute freedom from monopoly or restraint of trade, and forfeiture in event of failure to develop, and termination of the Government franchise at the end of 50 years, and the payment of compensation to the Government for any use of Government property and land, is fully secured in the Shields bill, recently passed by the Senate of the United States and now pending in the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Raleigh Chamber of Commerce, of Raleigh, N. C., an association representing the commercial and agricultural interests of Raleigh and Wake County, upon whose welfare depends the livelihood of many employees and the prosperity and comfort of a population of 70,000, now comprised within the commercial and agricultural districts of Raleigh and Wake County, hereby indorses the Shields bill as passed by the Senate, free from impractical provisions that so disastrously have prevented water-power development in recent years, and hereby respectfully urge upon the House of Representatives the immediate passage of this bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the secretary of this association to every Senator and Congressman from the State of North Carolina, and to every commercial and agricultural association with whom this association is in correspondence or affiliation.

—

BY THE COMMERCIAL CLUB OF SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

At the regular meeting of the board of governors on April 24, 1916, the following resolutions in regard to the Shields bill now pending in Congress were adopted:

"Whereas 60,000,000 undeveloped horsepower in the rivers and streams of the United States now go to waste because their development is financially impossible under our present laws; and

"Whereas cheap electrical power for the irrigation of our desert lands, for the treatment of our limestone, phosphate, and mineral resources, for the operation of light, heat, and power plants in areas now closed to electrical competition, for the electrification of divisions of our railroads, for the manufacture of nitrogen from the air on a scale to lessen the cost of our farm fertilizers and to insure us an adequate ammunition supply in time of war, and for reducing the cost of power in manufacturing of every description now waits upon a change in our present laws; and

"Whereas water-power development, under vigilant regulation by national and State authorities, insuring absolute freedom from monopoly or restraint of trade and forfeiture in event of failure to develop, and termination of the Government franchise at the end of 50 years, and the payment of compensation to the Government for any use of Government property and land is fully secured in the Shields bill, recently passed by the Senate of the United States and now pending in the House of Representatives: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Commercial Club of Salt Lake City, an association representing the commercial and agricultural interests of Salt Lake, upon whose welfare depends the prosperity and comfort of a population of approximately 130,000, now comprised within this district, hereby indorses the Shields bill as passed by the Senate, free from impractical provisions that so disastrously have prevented water-power development in recent years, and hereby respectfully urges upon the House of Representatives the immediate passage of this bill; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the secretary of this association to every Senator and Congressman from the State of Utah."

—

BY THE CARBONDALE BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION, CARBONDALE, PA.

Whereas 60,000,000 undeveloped horsepower in the rivers and streams of the United States now go to waste, because their development is financially impossible under our present laws; and

Whereas cheap electrical power, for the irrigation of our desert lands; for the treatment of our limestone, phosphate, and mineral resources; for the operatioa of light, heat, and power plants in areas now closed to electrical competition; for the electrification of divisions of our railroads; for the manufacture of nitrogen from the air on a scale to lessen the costs of our farm fertilizers and to insure us an adequate ammunition supply in time of war; and for reducing the cost of power in manufacturing of every description, now waits upon a change in our present laws; and

Whereas water-power development, under vigilant regulation by national and State authorities, insuring absolute freedom from monopoly or restraint of trade and forfeiture in event of failure to develop and termination of the Government franchise at the end of 50 years, and the payment of compensation to the Government for any use of Government property and land, is fully secured in the Shields bill, recently passed by the Senate of the United States and now pending in the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Carbondale Business Men's Association, of Carbondale, Pa., an association representing the commercial, agricultural, and mining interest of the community, upon which depends the livelihood, prosperity, and comfort of a population of 35,000 now comprised within the commercial, agricultural, and mining district in and around the city if Carbondale, Pa., hereby indorses the Shields bill as passed by the Senate, free from impractical provisions that so disastrously have prevented water-power development in recent years, and hereby respectfully urges upon the House of Representatives the immediate passage of this bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the secretary of this association to the Congressman representing this district and to the Senators from the State of Pennsylvania.

—

BY THE EL PASO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, EL PASO, TEX.

Whereas 60,000,000 undeveloped horsepower in the rivers and streams of the United States now go to waste because their development is financially impossible under our present laws; and

Whereas cheap electrical power for the irrigation of our desert lands; for the treatment of our limestone, phosphate, and mineral resources; for the operation of light, heat, and power plants in areas now closed to electrical competition; for the electrification of divisions of our railroads; for the manufacture of nitrogen from the air on a scale to lessen the cost of our farm fertilizers and to insure us an adequate ammunition supply in time of war; and for reducing the cost for power in manufacturing of every description now waits upon a change in our present laws; and

Whereas water-power development under vigilant regulation by National and State authorities, insuring absolute freedom from monopoly for restraint of trade and forfeiture in event of failure to develop, and termination of the Government franchise at the end of 50 years, and the payment of compensation to the Government for any use of Government property and land is fully secured in the Shields bill recently passed by the Senate of the United States and now pending in the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That El Paso Chamber of Commerce, of El Paso, Tex., an association representing the commercial and agricultural interests of El Paso, Tex., upon whose welfare depends the livelihood of El Paso employees and the prosperity and comfort of a population of 100,000 now comprised within the commercial and agricultural districts of El Paso, hereby indorses the Shields bill as passed by the Senate, free from impractical provisions that so disastrously have prevented water-power development in recent years, and hereby respectfully urges upon the House of Representatives the immediate passage of this bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the secretary of this association to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Texas.

—

BY THE ENGINEERS' AND ARCHITECTS' CLUB OF LOUISVILLE, KY.

Be it resolved by those members of the Engineers' and Architects' Club of Louisville present at a meeting May 2, 1916, That the development of the enormous water powers of the United States would add greatly to the wealth, the comfort, and the business opportunities of the people of the United States.

Resolved further, That in the opinion of the members of this club such development is impossible unless the persons who propose to develop the various water powers can do so under reasonable and certain laws, which laws should provide for such tenure of the water-power rights and land necessary for the development of such rights as will enable investors either to enjoy in perpetuity the fruits of their investment or to be reimbursed for their expenditures in case the Government should see fit to take over these rights.

Resolved further, That the plan of requiring a separate act of Congress for the development of each water power is entirely impracticable, as business men can not afford to subscribe money to an enterprise when the legal right to carry on the enterprise is not already secured, and probably can not be secured without incurring considerable expense, and waiting for an indefinite period—possibly four or more years.

Resolved further, That Senate bill No. 3331, known as the Shields bill, having been read and discussed by this meeting, it is the sense of the meeting that it fully protects the interests of the public and will promote the speedy development of our water powers.

Resolved further, That the Secretary be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each Senator and Representative from the State of Kentucky; also that a copy be sent to the Louisville Board of Trade, and that the Louisville Board of Trade be requested to memorialize Congress on this subject, and lend its influence toward securing the passage of a bill which will enable the water powers of the country to be harnessed for use under terms which will be fair to the investors and fair to the public.

—

BY THE HARTFORD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, HARTFORD, CONN.

Whereas the State of Connecticut has a large number of undeveloped water powers which are situated to a large extent on navigable rivers, and it is now generally admitted that the laws now on the statute books of the United States are such as to prevent the adequate development and utilization of these water powers and the improvement of navigation in connection therewith, so that such water-power development and improvement of navigation is now and has been for many years at a standstill; and

Whereas cheap electrical power for the operation of light, heat, and power plants; for the electrification of railroads; for the manufacture of nitrogen from the atmosphere for use as farm fertilizers; to insure an adequate supply of ammunition in time of war; and for the treatment of our limestone, phosphate, and mineral resources; and for supplying low-cost power for manufacturing of every description is now prevented by the present laws; and

Whereas new legislation must be enacted by the Congress of the United States so that water-power developments can be permitted and encouraged upon terms under which the necessary capital can be obtained for such development and improvement of navigation; and

Whereas a bill known as the Shields bill has been passed by the United States Senate, under the terms of which the development of water power is permitted and encouraged under proper regulation by National and State authorities, with provision for the termination of the Government franchise at the end of 50 years and the payment of compensation to the Government for any use of Government property and land, with adequate provisions for the protection of the interests of the consumers of power, and with proper safeguard for the investment of capital, and for the improvement of navigation upon navigable streams, which said Shields bill is now pending in the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Hartford Chamber of Commerce, an association representing the commercial, business, manufacturing, and agricultural interests of the city of Hartford and surrounding territory, hereby indorses the Shields bill as passed by the Senate and hereby respectfully urges upon the House of Representatives the immediate passage of this bill; and

That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the secretary of this chamber to every Senator and Congressman from the State of Connecticut and to other chambers of commerce in the United States.

—

BY THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, DALLAS, TEX.

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Association, representing the commercial and agricultural interests of Dallas, hereby indorse the Shields bill as passed by the Senate, free from impractical provisions that so disastrously have prevented water-power development in recent years, and hereby respectfully urges upon the House of Representatives the immediate passage of this bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the Secretary of this association to every Senator and Congressman from the State of Texas.

BY THE GADSDEN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, GADSDEN, ALA.

Whereas 60,000,000 undeveloped horsepower in the rivers and streams of the United States now go to waste because their development is financially impossible under our present laws; and

Whereas cheap electrical power for the treatment of our limestone, phosphate, and mineral resources; for the operation of light, heat, and power plants in areas now closed to electrical competition; for the manufacture of nitrogen from the air on a scale to lessen the cost of our farm fertilizers and to insure us an adequate ammunition supply in time of war, and for reducing the cost of power in manufacturing of every description, now waits upon a change in our present laws; and

Whereas water-power development, under vigilant regulation by National and State authorities, insuring absolute freedom from monopoly or restraint of trade, and forfeiture in event of failure to develop, and termination of the Government franchise at the end of 50 years, and the payment of compensation to the Government for any use of Government property and land, is fully secured in the Shields bill, recently passed by the Senate of the United States and now pending in the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Gadsden, an association representing the commercial and agricultural interests of Gadsden, upon whose welfare depends the livelihood of many thousands of employees, and the prosperity and comfort of a population of some 50,000 now comprised within the commercial and agricultural districts of Etowah County, hereby indorses the Shields bill as passed by the Senate, free from impractical provisions that so disastrously have prevented water-power development in recent years, and hereby respectfully urges upon the House of Representatives the immediate passage of this bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the Secretary of this association to every Senator and Congressman from the State of Alabama and to every commercial and agricultural association with whom this association is in correspondence or affiliation.

GADSDEN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

MAY 8, 1916.

BY THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Whereas the present governmental system makes it practically impossible to develop the great water power now dormant in the State of Alabama, thereby retarding the material progress of 2,000,000 people; and

Whereas the manufacture of electricity through the cheaper process of water power has become a necessity for the development of our mineral resources and the making of nitrogen from the air for fertilizers and ammunition in the event of war; and

Whereas complete protection is guaranteed the people from oppression by corporations in the so-called Shields general dam bill passed by the United States Senate and now pending in the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Montgomery, representing the commercial, industrial, and agricultural interests of the capital city of Alabama, That we urge upon the House of Representatives the speedy passage of the Shields bill, in order that the material development of our State may not be hindered.

Resolved further, That copies of these resolutions shall be transmitted to Members of Congress and commercial organizations throughout the country with a request that they join with us in a demand for this needed legislation.

Certified as a true copy.

BRUCE KENNEDY,
General Secretary.

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *April 25, 1916.*

BY THE ROME CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ROME, GA.

Whereas 60,000,000 undeveloped horsepower in the rivers and streams of the United States now go to waste because their development is financially impossible under our present laws; and

Whereas cheap electrical power for the treatment of our limestone, phosphate, and mineral resources, for the operation of light, heat, and power plants in areas now closed to electrical competition, for the manufacture of nitrogen from the air on a scale to lessen the cost of our farm fertilizers and to insure us an adequate ammunition supply in time of war, and for reducing the cost of power in manufacturing of every description, now waits upon a change in our present laws: and

Whereas water-power development, under vigilant regulation by National and State authorities, insuring absolute freedom from monopoly or restraint of trade, and forfeiture in event of failure to develop and termination of the Government franchise at the end of 50 years, and the payment of compensation to the Government for any use of Government property and land, is fully secured in the Shields bill, recently passed by the Senate of the United States and now pending in the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Rome, an association representing the commercial and agricultural interests of Rome, upon whose welfare depends the livelihood of many thousands of employees and the prosperity and comfort of a population of some 100,000, now comprised within the commercial and agricultural districts of Floyd County, hereby indorses the Shields bill as passed by the Senate, free from impractical provisions that so disastrously have prevented water-power development in recent years, and hereby respectfully urges upon the House of Representatives the immediate passage of this bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the secretary of this association to every Senator and Congressman from the State of Alabama and to every commercial and agricultural association with which this association is in correspondence or affiliation.

ERADICATION OF THE CATTLE TICK.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting communication from the Acting Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, on the subject of the cattle tick, a matter we had under consideration on yesterday. The communication reached me too late to have it placed in the RECORD then, and I ask to complete the record on the cattle tick by having this letter printed.

Mr. SMOOT. The subject of the communication is a past issue. Why should it go in the RECORD?

Mr. RANSDELL. Because it contains very valuable information, and it is also very short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1916.

HON. JOSEPH E. RANSDELL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR RANSDELL: As a result of 10 years' experience in tick eradication the Federal officials in charge of this campaign are convinced that the hearty cooperation of the people themselves is absolutely essential to success. The Department of Agriculture's representatives in the field, therefore, have been warned of the danger of beginning systematic work in any county before public opinion is ready to lend vigorous support to the enterprise. It frequently happens that a few of the more progressive farmers are earnest advocates of tick eradication, while the rest of the community may be either indifferent or actually hostile. In a number of instances in the past when tick eradication has been begun under these circumstances it has been found necessary after two or three years for the Federal Government to withdraw its men, because the results in their work were, to a great extent, nullified by popular indifference. To make a success of eradication, all cattle in the county must be dipped regularly. In practice this is only possible when the great majority of the people are so strongly in favor of the work that they will insist upon the enforcement of the necessary regulations.

Recent instructions sent out from Washington to the men in charge in the infested regions directed them to procure a list of the voters in any county in which there was manifestation of local interest in tick eradication. Circular letters and pamphlets explaining the evil of the tick and the possibility of its elimination could then be sent to this list.

The next step is to arrange for practical demonstrations of dipping. Since the Federal department has no funds at its disposal for the purpose, the construction of demonstration vats must be undertaken either by the local authorities or by one or more public-spirited and progressive stock owners. The cost of building a vat is comparatively small, not exceeding $50, exclusive of labor provided by farmers, and it has been found that these practical demonstrations are by far the most effective method of convincing farmers that the tick can be eradicated without any injury whatsoever to live stock. As soon as the vats are built a number of demonstrations are held in order to give all the people of the county an opportunity to see for themselves that dipping does no injury to cattle. There is a widespread belief among the less informed stock owners in the tick-infested regions that the arsenic in the dipping vats poisons cattle and dries up milch cows. This erroneous notion may be easily dispelled if arrangements are made for holding the dipping vat on exhibition for a few days.

After a series of such demonstrations meetings of farmers are held and the benefits of tick eradication explained clearly and forcibly. Ordinarily these meetings lead to the organization of county live-stock associations, which have been found very influential factors in promoting eradication. It is customary for these associations to apply to the county board for the materials for the vats and for the chemicals used in the baths. Until satisfactory arrangements have been made in this or some similar way for the construction of sufficient vats to accommodate all the cattle in the county without driving them long distances the time is not ripe to undertake active eradication work. In most instances the law requires that before such work is undertaken the county should vote for it in a special election. Even where no such election is actually required, the moral effect of the expression of the people's will is greatly to be desired.

Systematic eradication work means the dipping of all cattle in the county every 14 days in a standard arsenical solution. If this regulation is rigidly enforced, one season should see the elimination of the ticks and the freeing of the country from quarantine. Every dipping, however, should be supervised by regularly appointed inspectors, and the arsenical solution should be tested and made of standard strength before each time that the vat is used. Furthermore, care should be taken to account for each cow in the territory in which the vat is located. A few neglected cattle will afford a refuge for the tick and in time undo all that was accomplished by the dipping of the others.

This necessarily involves some inconvenience to cattle owners. As has already been said, therefore, before active work is undertaken, it is essential that public sentiment be brought to a point where this inconvenience is cheerfully accepted. In general, one to two years' preliminary work is sufficient for this purpose. The free use of demonstration vats will do much toward shortening the period and increasing enthusiasm for the active work that is to follow.

As large areas were freed from cattle ticks each year, more and more people became convinced that ticks could be eradicated at a reasonable cost. Furthermore, they discovered that as soon as ticks which kill susceptible cattle were gone, better cattle were at once brought into the country and year-old calves produced that would weigh more than cattle at two years of age raised under tick conditions. These plain every-day facts gave impetus to the work, and tick eradication increased and developed in nearly all the States where cattle ticks flourished, until up to the present time there has been freed from ticks an area of approximately 285,000 square miles, an area nearly as large as that of the combined States of Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, and North Carolina. This means that practically 40 per cent of the area formerly under quarantine for cattle ticks has been released as being free from ticks. (See inclosed statement of "Progress in Tick Eradication, July 1, 1906, to March 10, 1916.")

The possibility of eradicating ticks is no longer doubted by the farmer. The question now is, How soon can the last tick be eliminated from the United States?

Congress and the State legislatures are each year appropriating larger sums of money to the end that the work may be increased. In many cases where State legislatures failed to appropriate sufficient funds to meet the demands for tick eradication, the county courts have come to the rescue. In other cases farmers have formed local live-stock associations and provided funds to build cattle-dipping vats, to buy dipping materials, and receive the cooperation and assistance of the United States Department of Agriculture in carrying on systematic work.

The cost of tick eradication varies according to conditions and the personal efforts put forth by the farmers themselves. In some States the cost runs as high as $11.80 per square mile; in others as low as

$6.70 per square mile. But when we realize that the same class of farm lands in a tick-free county will sell for $5 to $10 more per acre than the same class of land in tick-infested areas, there can be no question as to whether tick eradication is profitable to the farmer and to the State.

In connection with the above it may be stated that subsequent to the time the Secretary submitted estimates for tick-eradication work during the fiscal year 1917 the interest in tick eradication has increased tremendously. In Texas, where the work usually included two or three counties at a time, there are now 20 counties which have decided to take up the work, and it is to meet this general increasing demand for tick eradication that additional funds have been requested, for the purpose of conducting the work along the old lines in countries which have not thus far been reached. The department is prohibited by act of Congress from expending funds for the construction of cattle-dipping vats and for the purchase of materials for the preparation of dips except for experimental purposes. During the last fiscal year less than $300 was expended for such work. The vats and dipping materials required for use in the eradication of ticks have been provided, therefore, by either States, counties, or individuals. The various States in the tick-infested territory are expecting to expend during the next fiscal year a total of $975,730 for tick eradication, as follows: In Alabama, the State is expecting to appropriate $25,000 and the counties $120,000; Arkansas, the State $34,000, other sources $50,000; Florida, the State $15,000; Georgia, the State $29,000, the counties $69,000; Louisiana, the State $18,000, counties $90,000; Mississippi, the counties $108,230; Missouri has been released from quarantine; North Carolina, the State $8,000, counties $5,500; Oklahoma, the State $35,000, counties $110,000, other sources $20,000; South Carolina, $30,000; Tennessee has been released; Texas, the State $40,000, counties $160,000; Virginia, the State $2,000, counties $7,000; making a total for the States directly of $236,000, the counties $669,730, and other sources $70,000.

The Legislatures of Mississippi and Louisiana have both recently passed laws requiring all counties in the States where tick infestation exists to take up the work of eradication on request by the State live-stock sanitary officials. In Alabama the work has been greatly increased, and in Florida funds have been pledged by landowners, transportation companies, and other interested persons which will provide an additional fund of $60,000 each year for three years.

Very truly, yours,

J. K. MOHLER,
Acting Chief of Bureau.

Progress in tick eradication July 1, 1906, to Mar. 10, 1916.

State.	Counties.					Area.			
	Infected.			Released.		Infected.		Released.	Per cent released.
	July 1, 1906.	Mar. 10, 1916.		Whole.	Part.	July 1, 1906.	Mar. 10, 1916.		
		Whole.	Part.						
	No.	*No.*	*No.*	*No.*	*No.*	*Sq. mi.*	*Sq. mi.*	*Sq. mi.*	*P. ct.*
Alabama	67	54	4	9	4	51,279	41,972	9,307	18
Arkansas	75	50	7	18	7	52,525	37,566	14,959	29
California	15	.....	1	14	1	79,924	720	79,204	99
Florida	47	44	1	2	1	54,861	51,061	3,800	7
Georgia	143	100	1	42	1	57,438	45,690	11,748	20
Kentucky	2	.....	.....	2	.....	841	.....	841	100
Louisiana	60	56	1	3	1	45,409	43,142	2,267	5
Mississippi	78	38	2	38	2	46,340	21,215	25,125	54
Missouri	4	.....	.....	4	.....	1,386	.....	1,386	100
North Carolina	75	24	1	50	1	37,365	12,351	25,014	67
Oklahoma	[1]61	29	7	20	12	47,8 0	27,924	19,966	42
South Carolina	44	15	.....	29	.....	30,495	12,428	18,067	58
Tennessee	42	.....	.....	42	.....	16,987	.....	16,987	100
Texas	190	110	2	78	2	191,885	148,177	43,708	22
Virginia	30	3	1	26	1	13,918	1,776	12,142	87
Total	933	522	28	378	33	728,543	444,022	284,521	39

[1] Only portions of five of the 61 counties were quarantined.

MARINE HOSPITAL RESERVATION, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2845) authorizing the sale of the marine-hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio, which were, on page 2, line 3, after "appraisements," to insert "and at not less than the appraised value," and, on page 2, to strike out lines 8 to 22, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the proceeds of the sale of so much of said reservation and the improvements thereon as is sold under the foregoing authorization are hereby appropriated and made immediately available for the provision of a new marine hospital at Cleveland, Ohio, including furnishing and the acquisition of a suitable site therefore, within a limit of cost of $400,000; and the balance of the proceeds of the sale shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

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

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 6.30 o'clock having arrived, the Chair declares the Senate of the United States adjourned until to-morrow at 10 o'clock a. m.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., Thursday, July 13, 1916) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, July 14, 1916, at 10 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *July 13, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father who art in heaven, we thank Thee that down deep in our hearts we recognize and fully appreciate the beauty, potency, and truth of the great principles enunciated by the Master, but we realize that we fall short of those principles in our daily duties; hence we pray for strength, that we may assimilate them and make them dominant in all the transactions of life, that we may hasten the coming of Thy kingdom upon the earth. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

WATER-POWER BILL.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 3331, the water-power bill, with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] in the chair.

The House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 3331, the water-power bill, with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I believe we were considering section 20 when the consideration of this bill was suspended the other day.

Mr. ADAMSON. Section 10.

The CHAIRMAN. There was an amendment pending to section 10.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I desire to offer an amendment to section 20.

The CHAIRMAN. It can be offered only by unanimous consent, inasmuch as section 20 has already been disposed of. The Clerk will report the amendment which is pending before the committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. I would like to dispose of it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment was offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] and amended.

The question was taken, and the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House. No; I withdraw the motion. There are two gentlemen who wish to speak.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I desire to ask unanimous consent to return to section 20. I desire to offer an amendment to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, what is the amendment?

Mr. ADAMSON. Until I can find out what it is, I shall reserve the right to object.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It is a substitute embodying section 14 of the Shields bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] will send his amendment to the desk.

Mr. ADAMSON. I understand it is a section of the Shields bill. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to section 20 proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD], to which objection is made. It will be reported for information.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, we are not considering the Shields bill at all, and the gentleman stated to me privately that he wanted to amend a section of the Shields bill.

Mr. MANN. No; the gentleman is mistaken. The gentleman wanted to amend section 20, and to that end offers an amendment from the Shields bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the section by substituting the following: "That the term 'navigable waters' as used in this act"——

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I see what it is. It is to substitute section 14 of the Shields bill, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia objects.

Mr. MANN. Under a special order of the committee, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH] is entitled to address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And also under that arrangement the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] is to be recognized for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the special order the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH] will be recognized for 10 minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] will be recognized for 5 minutes. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH] is now recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, if the mysterious forces of electric energy are placed within the easy reach of all the people by the agency of the Government, their burdens will be immeasurably lightened and their comforts greatly increased. On the contrary, if the Government fails and neglects to control this well-nigh "universal future source of industrial power," and permits it, unregulated and uncontrolled, to remain in selfish and unsympathetic private hands, it is certain to become the controlling force of the most despotic combination ever created to control the commercial, industrial, and domestic affairs of a people. Even the very Government itself, if not already under the influence of this combination, will sooner or later be corrupted by the evil influences bound to emanate from so vast and unrestrained twentieth century organization of natural and artificial forces.

The proposition we are now considering is a measure providing for the development and use of this electrical power generated by water power from dams to be erected in navigable streams. The principal feature of this legislation is the regulation of the development and "use of electric current," so that the great benefits accruing from the discovery of electrical transmission will contribute to the comfort and happiness of all the people instead of a few.

On a proposition so complicated and far-reaching as this it is not surprising that a variety of theories are put forth to solve the problem. However, by the processes of elimination and agreement these schemes can be reduced to a single theory as soon as a common understanding of the fundamental principles involved is reached, but until the fundamental principles are discovered and understood no reconciliation of the contending theories is possible.

Since we adopted the amendment directing the Secretary of War to make a charge for the use of the flow of water in the river a few of my colleagues have expressed themselves as being satisfied with this bill, as though the exercise of this taxing power were a fundamental feature of the legislation.

While I am convinced that the amendment is a proper one, such a feature is by no means fundamental or necessary to the accomplishment of the purpose of this legislation, to wit, to put within the reach of all the people hydroelectric power at the lowest cost that will be in keeping with sound finance.

Can it be said by anyone, except the Democratic Party, which has taxed everything in sight except babies, that the taxing of flowing water in our rivers will to any appreciable degree accomplish the thing we are seeking? If so, I would like to have him point it out. The water-power monopoly opposed the imposition of this tax most vehemently. Why? Not because it made any difference to them, for every dollar of tax the Government compels this monopoly to pay will be charged to the consumer; this is one of the benefits of being a monopoly. Then why should it oppose the tax? Because by so doing attention will be diverted from the fundamental principles of the bill, which in this case are acceptable to the hydroelectric people.

Has any representative of the Water Power Trust objected to the regulatory features of this or the Shields bill? Notwithstanding the regulatory sections of the bill provide for no regulation at all, but simply turn the whole subject of regulation over to the Secretary of War without limitation or restriction. If this bill or the Shields bill becomes a law in its present form any future candidate for the Presidency can have all the money he wants for campaign purposes from the trust if he will agree to let it suggest his Secretary of War.

Each succeeding Secretary of War will have the power to regulate this industry according to his own personal notions. He will be untrammeled by any law to either guide or restrain him.

Is it reasonable to suppose that the water-power interests would let such a provision remain in the bill unopposed if they were not cocksure that they would be on the inside in the matter of regulation?

Ah! but I hear some piping voice say that this industry will be regulated by State commissions, and therefore it is immaterial what kind of regulation is prescribed by Congress. The same could be said of our railroads with equal justification.

The conditions brought about through the agency of physical combination of plants and lines have made electric current interstate and have developed its interstate tendencies to such an extent that it is practically beyond State control.

Let me call your attention to what Hugh L. Cooper, one of the chief representatives of the Water Power Trust, had to say on this phase of the question before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives on March 11, 1914, when asked by Chairman ADAMSON:

> What is the reason this will not do? If it is entirely within the jurisdiction of the State, let the State do what it pleases.
>
> Mr. COOPER. I am afraid of any State. As far as I am personally concerned I would not put up $5 for some States to shoot at. I have heard such awful things stated in the halls of the various legislatures that I am very generally afraid of them. It is not a joke with me; I am afraid of it, but I am not afraid of Congress.

But in February, 1916, Mr. Cooper sings quite another song, as appears from an article in the Outlook over his signature, a marked copy of which publication was sent to Members of Congress during the discussion of the Shields bill in the Senate for the purpose of gaining their support for that bill. In this article Mr. Cooper says:

> The regulation of rates by any Cabinet officer is wrong in practice, except temporarily pending the establishment of commissions in a few States which still lack them. If the rates fixed by the State commissions are unfair to either power companies or consumers, either party can appeal to the people and eventually secure justice.

In view of what Mr. Cooper said on March 11, 1914, does anyone believe that he was sincere in February of 1916 when he said that he believed that State commissions should regulate the service, and so forth. The trusts are simply playing a little game of hide and seek with the Members of Congress and the public. What they want is what they have in the pending bills, to wit, no regulation at all, or such as it may be to be in the hands of the Secretary of War.

It must be manifest to everyone who has examined the pending measure that under its terms the Water Power Trust would be able to get a grant in perpetuity free from effective regulation. The very thing they should not be permitted to get, if we desire to retain a portion of the benefits of our water power for the public. However, it is contended by some that it is better to give the trust the kind of a grant they want so as to unlock this natural resource that is now running to waste. To this I have but to say that until the water-power monopoly develops and puts into operation the 61 water-power sites that it obtained from the Federal Government between 1905 and 1907 it comes with poor grace for it to cry, "locked up water-power sites."

Under the present conditions the enactment of a wise and beneficial water-power bill is not a Sunday-school picnic nor a protracted prayer meeting, as the distinguished chairman of the committee having charge of this matter would lead one to believe from his remarks. On the contrary, it is sizzling with more inate cussedness and fiendish selfishness than any other piece of legislation brought before Congress in a quarter of a century.

I deeply appreciate the difficulties of my colleagues who are combating the active and resourceful lobby in Washington, as well as a vile and mercenary press at home. We of the Central West are fortunate in having only one daily paper that is stabbing us in the back and espousing the cause of the Water Power Trust. The paper I have in mind is the Minneapolis Tribune, whose proprietor, W. J. Murphy, has made millions out of water-power grants. He bitterly bemoans the fact that he has been without a representative in Washington and has had to go elsewhere for aid in his plundering campaign of public property. The city of Minneapolis is to be congratulated that my predecessors, Messrs. Washburn, Fletcher, and Nye, never permitted themselves to be used for such an unholy purpose.

The substitute for the Shields bill offered by the House is made up from a great number of other bills, and is known as a composite bill, according to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON]. No one can claim its authorship. Figuratively speaking, it is a legislative pick-up. That can not be said of the Shields bill, because it looks so much like Rome G. Brown that he could not deny its authorship, even if he would. This is no reflection upon Mr. Brown, who is an honest, able, and conscientious lawyer, and who always looks out for the best interests of his clients. If he were employed by the Government to draw a bill, instead of by the Water Power Trust, you can rest assured that he would present a measure that would fully protect the interests of the public.

The sooner the secret influences that are at work to shape this measure so as to give the control of the vast water-power

resources of the country to the hydroelectric people free from efficient regulation come into the open the better for both sides to this controversy. The sooner you discover your enemy the quicker you can dispose of him.

If these propositions did not have such monopolistic possibilities, we would meet with but little opposition in enacting a law that would meet the situation.

In the early winter the water-power interests organized an association known as the Water Power Development Association, with headquarters at Washington and branch offices in other cities. Since the organization of this association its secretary has been Marcus A. Beeman, who was formerly secretary to the Cleveland and Buffalo Chambers of Commerce, and secretary to the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, and its principle publicity man is Mr. Walker, formerly principle publicity man in Secretary Lane's office.

One of the methods adopted by this association to deceive the public was to send free plate matter to country publishers and have them run in the daily papers as an expression of their own opinion, subsequently collecting these editorials and mailing them regularly to Members of Congress without any explanation, thus conveying the impression that the article presented the local opinion of the community in which the matter circulated.

The Democrat, of Mineral Point, Wis., of June 8, 1916, has this to say in reference to this boiler-plate method of publicity:

A TRICK THAT IS VAIN.

If the men who are behind the scheme to pervert the minds of the people on the water-power question by sending free plate matter to country publishers had been present at the meeting of the newspaper men in the senate chamber at Madison last Friday night, they would doubtless have come to the conclusion that tricks that are vain will hardly get them very far in the court of public opinion. When the matter was put up to Courtland Smith, president of the American Press Association, he confessed that in his opinion it was "rotten business," and the unanimous opinion of the gathering was that the publisher who would accept the plates and publish them, except as paid advertisements, plainly marked as such, would do himself and his profession dishonor.

The Daily Herald, of Quincy, Ill., of March 29, 1916, carries the following article, written by Gilson Gardner, which sets forth some of the activities that have been going on in Washington by the Water Power Development Association as well as the water-power lobby. For the benefit of the Members of the House, I will insert in the RECORD this article, as well as a list of names of some of the men who have been in Washington contributing to water-power legislation:

WATER BILL POWER GRAB—SHIELDS BILL HAS BIG LOBBY AT WASHINGTON—SHIELDS BILL IS BITTERLY FOUGHT BY CONSERVATIONISTS—SAID BY OPPONENTS TO BE WORST FORM OF GRAFT.

[By Gilson Gardner.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 29.*

Since February 7 the entire attention of the United States Senate has been devoted to a bill drafted by water-power grabbers and supported by a powerful water-power lobby—the Shields bill. The debate, although it has gone on for more than 20 days, is only just beginning.

The Shields bill is vicious in the extreme. The purpose of those behind it is to secure control of the remaining water-power sites on navigable streams, without compensation or Government supervision, nor any adequate provision for regulation of rates to consumers nor the recovery of the site at the end of the proposed 50-year franchise period.

The bill is supported in the Senate by its author, JOHN K. SHIELDS, of Tennessee; OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD and JOHN H. BANKHEAD, of Alabama; JOHN F. SHAFROTH, of Colorado; REED SMOOT, of Utah; KNUTE NELSON, of Minnesota; and WESLEY L. JONES, of Washington. It is being bitterly fought by Senators LA FOLLETTE and HUSTING, of Wisconsin; NORRIS and HITCHCOCK, of Nebraska; KENYON, of Iowa; LANE, of Oregon; POINDEXTER, of Washington; and WALSH, of Montana.

HAS BIG LOBBY.

In the Senate galleries a large number of lobbyists may be observed daily watching its progress and sending notes to Senators on the floor. Among those observed in the gallery and about the offices of Senators UNDERWOOD, SHIELDS, and JONES are Henry L. Peirce, of the General Electric Co.; Hugh S. Cooper, for Stone & Webster; M. O. Leighton, of the Utah Securities Co.; Frank H. Short, of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.; ex-Congressman Dennis O. Flynn, of the Electric Bonding interests; J. W. Worthington, of Alabama Power & Light; ex-Congressman George Washington Taylor, representing the Muscle Shoals (Ala.) Co.

The latest move in the fight has been the organization of what is called the Water Power Development Association. This is a publicity bureau, and starts its career by hiring the principal publicity man from Secretary Lane's office, a former newspaper correspondent. This new lobby concern takes the public into its confidence by admitting frankly that it has a special interest to serve in seeking the passage of the Shields bill, since it is made up of certain named builders of water wheels and electrical appliances and supplies of all kinds. Among them are the I. P. Morris Co., of Philadelphia; the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., of Milwaukee; Wellman-Seaver-Morgan Co., of Cleveland; R. Thomas & Sons Co., of East Liverpool, Ohio; Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., of Pittsburgh.

WORKING FOR BILL.

Mr. Marcus A. Beeman, secretary of the new association, has been assistant secretary of the Cleveland and Buffalo Chambers of Commerce and secretary of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce.

The water-power subject is displacing all matters in the Senate, and the friends of the Shields bill are getting impatient at the delay. Various efforts have been made to put a check on the debate, but those opposing the measure in the public interest are determined to continue their opposition if no business is done between now and fall.

The following is a list of names of some of the men who have been in Washington urging legislation of the kind outlined in the Shields' bill:

Josiah T. Newcomb—Stone & Webster.
L. L. Nunn—Utah Power Co.
H. J. Pierce, of Seattle, Wash.
John H. Finney—Aluminum Co. of America.
Ex-Congressman D. J. Flynn, of Oklahoma.
Calvert Townley—Westinghouse interests.
Henry L. Cooper—Du Pont interests.
Frank M. Washburn—American Cyanamide Co.
Ex-Congressman C. B. Landis—Du Pont interests.
Rome G. Brown, chief lecturer, draftsman, and attorney for the water-power interests.
S. Z. Mitchell—General Electric Cos.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SIMS. I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, a bill very similar to the one that is now about to pass the House was considered in the Sixty-third Congress by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported to the House, amended in various ways and passed by the House, and sent to the Senate, but was not acted on by that body. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House has been considering this subject very closely and seriously and conscientiously for a number of years. When the present Congress convened, or very shortly thereafter—I do not remember the exact day—our distinguished chairman, Hon. W. C. ADAMSON, introduced a bill, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce gave it conscientious, continuous, very earnest, and long consideration, and was doing its very best to get that bill reported to the House and passed as soon as possible, without any reference to any bill then pending in the Senate. In the Senate, on the legislative day of March 3, being calendar day of March 8, 1916, the Senate bill passed. It came to the House and was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on March 10. The House committee had practically finished consideration of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON], and on the 21st of March the committee directed a favorable report on the Adamson bill as a substitute for the said Senate bill. Some gentlemen seem to have reached the conclusion that because the Senate bill reached the House on March 10 and was on that day referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and was reported out by substitute on March 21, that the 11 days between those two dates was all the time that the House committee gave to the bill which it reported as a substitute. That is a very great mistake, because the House committee had been considering a bill almost the exact substance of which had been reported in a former Congress for three months of this session.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I am stating the facts when I say that, as far as it is possible to know anything of the matter from the expressions of the members of the committee, there was an honest, sincere, and conscientious purpose to try to report to this House and pass a bill which would be in the interest of the general public and not intended to conserve any existing monopoly, and not intended to have in it legislation under which a water-power monopoly might hereafter be formed.

Now, we may have made a mistake. Possibly the committee not possessing all wisdom could not foresee what some court in the future might hold. But our intention was to protect the public interest and at the same time report a bill which would not prevent water-power development in this country.

After the Senate bill had been reported I noticed quite a lot of criticism in the newspapers, similar to that which has just been read from the desk, and wanting to know what the highest authority on conservation had to say as to this substitute, on the 25th of May I wrote Hon. Gifford Pinchot asking him if he had considered and studied the House substitute for the Senate bill, and that I would be glad to have any suggestions from him as to any amendment that he though might be desirable to the House substitute for the Senate bill.

I was anxious to have his advice because, as I understand, he is chairman of the conservation association and in that way representing those who had been very anxious to protect the public from any monopolistic control of these water powers. I have not a copy of my letter to Mr. Pinchot, if I had I would

read it as part of my remarks. On May 29 I received the following letter from Mr. Pinchot:

MILFORD, PIKE COUNTY, PA., *May 29, 1916.*

Hon. THETUS W. SIMS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SIMS: Yours of May 25 has just been forwarded to me. Since I do not expect to be in Washington for some time, I have asked Mr. Harry Slattery, secretary of the Conservation Association, to submit to you such amendments as we think necessary to make the House substitute for the Shields bill acceptable to the conservationists. I am only sorry I can not get the opportunity to go over the matter with you in person.

With my best thanks for writing as you did, believe me,

Sincerely, yours,

GIFFORD PINCHOT.

Now, I have waited patiently and expectantly from the day I got that letter from Mr. Pinchot for Mr. Slattery's suggested amendments that the conservation association thought were necessary to the House substitute, or the original Adamson bill, and to this hour I have received no suggestion from Mr. Slattery or anyone else. I know that Mr. Pinchot is sincere; his letter shows it on its face, and I know that I was, and therefore I feel that I am warranted in saying that the bill as reported was so near what the conservation association would have it that they have suggested no amendments from the 25th of May to this day, the 13th day of July. I think I have a right to assume that the bill as reported was so near what the conservationists desire, as represented by the organization of which Mr. Pinchot is president, that they thought it was unnecessary to suggest any amendments. I must suppose that so important a measure as this is would not have been overlooked by Mr. Slattery.

Mr. KENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. KENT. I can tell the gentleman from Tennessee two things the conservationists objected to in the bill, namely, lack of certain compensation clause and a more definite system of termination. These things have been embodied now by amendment in the present bill. If they have any more objections, I do not know them.

Mr. SIMS. I was only drawing conclusions which, I think, are fully warranted, which are that the bill as reported was not seriously objectionable to the conservationists, and now as it has been amended by the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT], who has just made the statement, which shows that the bill as amended is wholly acceptable to the conservationists.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit me to ask in his time a question of the gentleman from California?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. Did not the amendment which the gentleman from California has just offered to the House have the concurrence of the ex-Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Fisher, one of the most strenuous conservationists?

Mr. KENT. He had one criticism to make of it. He found it difficult to define where the transmission line feature should cease. When I used the words "point of application" he said that that was difficult to construe, but he could not for the life of him find a better phrase.

And now with the permission of the gentleman from Tennessee I want to say that I did not mean to say that this was entirely satisfactory to the conservationists, but I have been close to Mr. Slattery and Mr. Pinchot, and I do not know of anything else that they want done to the bill.

Mr. SIMS. I was assuming, Mr. Chairman, that the bill was satisfactory. I have shown that the report was not gotten up hastily and dumped into the House, but was a matter of serious, faithful, and long consideration.

I do not want to be a party to a bill that carries a "joker" of any sort, if I know it. Speaking for myself and as a Member of the House and as a member of the committee, I was willing to amend section 10 by striking out the words "after the expiration of 50 years," so that it would read that at any time the United States may terminate the right herein granted upon giving two years' notice and by complying with the other provisions of section 10.

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

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. As I was about to say, that without waiting for the expiration of the 50 years I was willing to give the Government that power, for the reason that I sincerely and honestly believed that no capitalist will hesitate to invest his money in such enterprises when he knows that the United States, whenever it recaptures the property, will return to the investor every cent of his money. But there were other members of the committee, a majority, who did not take that view of it, and were afraid that such an amendment might prevent any further development of water powers by private capital.

Such an amendment would make it impossible to build up a water-power monopoly. But the House has retained the right to pass upon every application to build a dam for water-power development. Under this bill they will still have to come to Congress for permission, and with 435 vigilant members of this body, some Member will be certain to see any "joker" that may be proposed in any bill hereafter introduced and who can and will place any limitation upon it or restriction they see fit. Therefore I think under this bill, even without the amendments put on by the Committee of the Whole, it offers a perfectly sound and workable plan for safe water-power development, and the great fundamental controlling thing is to keep the whole question of water-power control within the grip of the 435 Members of this body, who can place upon the bill authorizing the building of a water-power dam any limitation it may see fit to prevent its going into the hands of any existing monopoly or one to be hereafter created. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I am not entirely satisfied with section 10 of this bill, even as it is amended by the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT]. Fifty years is a very long time; too long, as I view it, for these leases to run. If you will trace human ingenuity as applied to water power through the past 50 years, you will very likely go back to a gristmill to which your father and mine took their sacks of wheat to receive in exchange a specified amount of flour. The water power of a half century ago as compared with the water power of to-day was inconsequential in value, because the value of water power, as the value of everything else, is dependent entirely upon its utilization. Within the past 50 years—yes, within the past 25 years—human ingenuity has created inventions that make water power to-day vastly more valuable than it was formerly, and even the wildest imagination of this hour will not attempt to conceive the usages of water power 50 years hence. If you will go to Niagara Falls you will see the tremendous power of that awful cataract harnessed and carried along tiny wires for hundreds of miles beyond the brink of the gorge. It is no longer necessary to go to the scene of the power, for the power is now brought to you. In the city of Niagara Falls the houses and business places are lighted with that power, their manufactories derive their power from hydroelectric power generated by the Falls. If you will stand in the city of Detroit in the evening and look just across the river into the city of Windsor, Canada, you will see the factories of that place lighted by the power generated at Niagara Falls, more than 200 miles away. It is interesting to note that Canada has retained that tremendous asset for its own benefit, while we have granted our rights to private enterprise. The power that is applied to Windsor, 200 miles and more from the brink of the gorge, is sold, so I am informed, to that community for just one-third of what the patrons in the United States pay for it on the very brink of the cataract itself.

No one can look into the future and tell what the value of these water powers will be 50 years hence. In this bill as amended by the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] there is a provision that the United States must give six months' notice before these leases can be terminated and the property taken over and they may be taken over then only upon the United States making adequate compensation to the lessee for the value of his property. The payment is to precede the taking. That will lead to litigation concerning the payment that will tie up these leases for an interminable length of time so that the lessee will be in possession for a term much longer than 50 years. I would like to see incorporated in this bill a provision that at the end of the specified period nominated in the lease the United States may take this property over and make adequate compensation, to be thereafter ascertained. In that way there will be no holding on to the power for a term in excess of the lease. There is not a man on the floor of this House in the heat of this afternoon who will be on the scene of action when these leases expire. There is not a single lessee who will take a lease under the provisions of this bill who in human probability will live until the expiration of his lease. It is a responsibility to legislate for the present, but it is a tremendous responsibility to foreclose the future for 50 years and more. You and I are legislating to-day for the second

generation, and we are legislating in a way that will permit the lessee under the provisions of this bill not only to hold the property for 50 years, but, by adding interminable litigation as to the value of the property to be turned over to the United States, will doubtless retain the property and this tremendous asset for a period long beyond the life of the lease. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I did not originally intend to say anything about section 10 and the recovery clause, but I have said privately and am perfectly willing to say it publicly that I do not regard the recovery clause in this bill as of any very great importance. The important section of the bill—in reference to that is the power to amend the bill so as to make the amendment apply to the existing water powers without any liability on the part of the Government for changing the arrangements. No man is wise enough to-day to tell the terms upon which the Government should recover the power 50 years hence. I can remember when the States or the Federal Government had no control over railroad rates, when such a thing as control by a municipality over public utility company rates was not dreamed of; and with the development of water power for years to come there will undoubtedly come with it a distinct line of policy which States will use for the control of that power. We have not reached the wisdom yet where we can settle that question, but it will be settled in the future.

I rose for the purpose of saying a word concerning the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and its distinguished chairman. I have not agreed in many essential features with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] and other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the water-power question. I did not agree with the majority of that committee, when I had the honor of being its chairman, but, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, able man, conscientious man, has given great study to this subject for many years.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in my opinion, is the most important legislative committee of this House. It does more work dealing with great questions than any other committee, and its membership has never been recreant to the will of the House. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] may not agree with the policy adopted by the House in some particulars, it is not necessary to say that he will never betray the House. [Applause.] I commend him and thank him and his committee for the splendid work they have done on this bill as well as upon other bills. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I desire only to direct attention to the great importance of Members being here when the conference report shall come up for consideration. In this connection I ask especial attention to the fact that the pending bill came from the Senate to the House and was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the 10th of March, which committee reported it out by substitute on the 21st of March, but that the House has not been called upon to consider it until in this intense heat in the middle of July, at a time when Members are all anxious to have the session end that they may go home. And yet while we have been considering it we have been told two or three times during the discussion that after all the bill which is to become the law is to be written in conference.

Months have elapsed during any one of which the House could have taken up the measure and given it weeks of thorough consideration such as its vast importance demands.

But consideration is delayed until the middle of July, toward the end of a long session of Congress, with the mercury at 95 in the shade and with Members wishing to go to their homes, and then, I repeat, the House is informed that after all the real bill is to be written in conference. I presume that, as is usual in such circumstances, when the conference report is brought in gentlemen will say, "Oh, well, we must adopt it and adjourn." And yet it is in many respects the most important bill that has been before the House of Representatives in 25 years. As the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] remarked, a few years ago, a man who wanted work done at a mill had to go to the mill. All the power was at the dam site. But to-day the power is efficient 200 miles in every direction from the dam site, and that power can be connected in every direction with electric power generated at other dams. The possibilities in such combinations are tremendous. What will these be 25 years from now? And what will these be when 50 years, the term of the privileges granted under this bill, shall have passed away? No man can foresee. The methods of production, of insulation, and of distribution are constantly being improved. When I was at Niagara Falls a few years ago a stockholder in the American plant, replying to my question, said, "Why, machinery that six years ago was all right is obsolete now. Nobody can tell what combinations can be made 25 years hence." Said he, "I am a hard-headed business man; my imagination does not get the better of me, I think, and yet I believe that in 25 years from now a large percentage of all the manufacturing in the United States will be done by electrical power."

The coming conference report will be a document of tremendous importance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] for his generous remarks. He has always been appreciative, generous as able, and everybody knows his ability and knows of his distinguished service on our committee. As to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], the latter part of his statement is correct. I have repeatedly stated to this House during the past 10 years that this was the most important matter that has been before Congress, and I do not think the gentleman from Wisconsin intends for the country to understand the first part of his statement as he made it. Everybody in this House knows, and the gentleman himself will concede it on reflection, that it has been impossible to get this bill up for consideration in this House earlier at this session, although we have striven earnestly to do so. I put it on the Unanimous Consent Calendar as soon as it was reported. It remained there and was passed over several times without prejudice, until finally objection was made and it went off, but it remained on that calendar for several months. The Committee on Rules was consulted time and again, appeal after appeal was made to try to get consideration for it, but gentlemen here know what the state of public business has been during this session, with other matters pressing for consideration, and it has been postponed until this is the first opportunity we have ever had to get consideration for it. Its importance was recognized by me, for my speech went in the RECORD on the first day of the session. The committee went to work, and although the Senate bill remained in the committee but 11 days, the committee had prepared a bill ready to report when it came. We simply whipped it into shape and put it in as a substitute for the Senate bill. I do not think the gentleman ought to intimate that there has been any purpose to delay consideration.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. ADAMSON. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I did not impute any wrongful motive to the gentleman, or to any other Member of the House, but simply stated the fact that the bill has been here since March, while things of much less importance have been considered for days and days, when the House was simply eating up time, as everybody must know. And it is difficult to understand, if, as the gentleman says, this bill is the most important thing in the way of legislation proposed, as he says in 10 years—and I say in a generation—why it could not get before the House.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, no effort has been made to curtail anybody's opportunity in debate; and I wish time, at least, to say this, without any reflection on anybody—and I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will not so construe it, as it is not so intended—that whenever a bill has been reported and is on the calendar of this House five months I do not know any law to prevent any Member from studying that subject. On the other hand, it appears to me to be the duty of Members, when the most important bill for 25 years is on the calendar and persistent effort is made to get it up, to look into the subject and be prepared to discuss it when it does come up. I have made somewhat the same statement when men have said we have hurried about the consideration of some other bill. Mr. Chairman, I will not move that the committee rise, because I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] wishes to speak.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, the question of water power upon the public domain and the navigable streams, as Members who have been here for several years know, has been a very live question in each Congress. There have been divergent views upon this question here as well as outside of Congress as to what the franchise ought to contain and what requirements ought to be made, and the conditions under which they may be permitted to operate. As has been stated here before, I think that one of the great things to have in this bill is a provision that permits regulation of the water power so that the people can not be charged exorbitant prices. Another is that there should be a charge upon every permit that is given to operate. Another is that the franchises should have a definite ending. As has been stated here by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], who has taken a prominent part in this legislation and has rendered a valuable service to the whole country in this matter, and has offered the suggestion that meets the views of all of us who believe there should be proper regulation, there should also be no question as to the time when the permit should terminate. Fifty years is a long time, and the developments that are being made now in electricity are such that no man can tell what 50 years may bring about.

I remember a few years ago these water-power bills were upon the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and up to that time what bills had gone through had been passed by unanimous consent.

There were only a few of them up to that time, but there appeared, as I remember, at one session of Congress some 16 or 17 of them upon the calendar, but none of them has gone through from that time to this. And I think the temper of this House and the temper of the country is such that no legislation will ever get through this House, whether it is in the form of a conference report or a bill, that does not properly provide for regulation and a definite termination of the franchise. I do not know that this bill will come out of conference during this session. I doubt whether it does. I believe the gentleman from Georgia, though his views are not in accord with mine on many points of this bill, to be an honest man, and when he assures this House that he will not bring in a report that does not agree with the views of Members without giving them a chance to vote on it, I have confidence that he will do exactly what he says in the matter.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly obvious that this bill is passing the House, not with any expectation that it will become a law in this form, but in order that there may be a conference between the House and Senate upon it, and that then a satisfactory compromise may be agreed upon. My district is deeply interested in its fate. We are not insistent upon any particular form. Our vital interest is not in the economic and industrial results, although they may be prodigious for us. But as an incident to the construction of a great dam, to supply power to a region famous for its diversified industries, there will be opened to navigation a long stretch of the Connecticut River, which we hope will bring a new adjustment of freight rates to 250,000 people. For nearly 20 years I have been working zealously toward that end. Several times it has seemed that we were sure to win and then one of those unexpected obstacles, which are so common here, has arisen and dashed our hopes. I trust that this bill will at last become a law and in such form that capital will not be afraid to take advantage of it. In the past capital in Massachusetts has stood ready to organize under any fair bill and to construct a dam which would furnish much-needed power to the industries of the district, and which would also provide locks so that boats could come up from the Sound.

I trust that this project, which now appears so favorable, will not again be thwarted and that this time at last the present unendurable conditions may be remedied.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise and report the bill as amended to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration S. 3331, an act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce, and had directed him to report the same to the House with certain amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ADAMSON. Under the rule under which we are operating, the previous question is automatically ordered, and under the agreement of yesterday the vote goes over until to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. Only the final vote, I think.

Mr. ADAMSON. The final vote, but the rule automatically orders the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The final vote on this bill goes over until to-morrow morning.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] rise?

Mr. RAKER. I rise for the purpose of asking unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 15096, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of other business on the Speaker's table——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is to recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman from Illinois withhold that until I can make a statement for a minute?

Mr. RAKER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. Am I not permitted to put my unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. The House made a special order the other day that as soon as we got through with this bill, which we have just finished, the corrupt-practices bill should be privileged.

Mr. RAKER. I do not want to take its place.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] demands the regular order.

Mr. ADAMSON. He reserves it at my request, as I understand, for a minute.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] adhere to his point or not?

Mr. MANN. I demand the regular order.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15842.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman withhold that a minute for me to make a statement to the House?

Mr. RUCKER. I will, if I may do so.

Mr. ADAMSON. I call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to what is known as the bill-of-lading bill that there is a general demand for all over the country; and what I wanted to ask was it be given a privileged status.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, it is not fair to the gentleman to put the burden upon me to object to bills of this kind, which I am in favor of, when they know it is not the intention to consider them at this time.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not want to do anything unjust, and I will withdraw the request.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15842, and pending that motion it may be desirable to see if we can agree upon time for general debate. What time would the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] like to have?

Mr. MAPES. I think we can get along with one hour on this side.

Mr. RUCKER. I will say frankly that I have had no requests for time on this side, and I am quite sure will not use an hour, but I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for two hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I have no objection to limiting the general debate. We are going to have a meeting of the House to-morrow, necessarily. There is not a very large membership here to-day. Does the gentleman expect to get very far with the bill under the five-minute rule to-day?

Mr. RUCKER. I will say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, it is the hope that we finish it to-day.

Mr. MANN. There is no chance to do it. It ought not to be finished to-day in the absence of so many Members. I think it would be wise to let the five-minute end of the debate go over until to-morrow.

Mr. RUCKER. And not read the bill under the five-minute rule to-day at all?

Mr. MANN. No; finish the general debate only.

Mr. RUCKER. I want to be entirely acquiescent in every suggestion the gentleman makes.

Mr. MANN. I think we can finish the bill to-morrow, and that is all we will do anyway to-morrow.

Mr. BURNETT. It will only come in after the vote on the other bill, will it not?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. I will say to the gentleman that we will have no trouble about that.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow, if it is necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his motion?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the remarks I made this morning on the dam bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. What was the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, the request was that the debate be limited to two hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] asks unanimous consent that the debate be limited to two hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] and the other half by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15842, the campaign publicity bill, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15842) to revise, amend, and codify the laws relating to publicity of contributions and expenditures made for the purpose of influencing the nomination and election of candidates for the offices of Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States, extending the same to candidates for nomination and election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, limiting the amount which may be expended, providing for the publicity of campaign expenses, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to consume but a few minutes in presenting this bill to the committee.

Before I address myself to the bill I want to refer briefly to a little pleasantry that occurred here on the floor of the House a few minutes ago. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], having once been the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with still some affection for that committee, paid the committee a great compliment, which the chairman of the committee, my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON], admits to be merited. The criticism I have to make is that the gentleman from Illinois, who generally knows everything, knows so little about the personnel of some of the committees of the House, because when it comes to real earnest, hard working, patriotic, active, genial, affable, and handsome gentlemen, both Democrats and Republicans, I believe the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Members of Congress will take the prize. [Laughter and applause.]

It has been my good fortune to preside over that committee, and I want to say now that whatever of success has attended the results of my efforts has been very largely contributed to by the membership of the committee; I mean all the members of the committee. From the time we began the consideration of this bill, Democratic members and Republican members applied themselves to it studiously and patriotically, and we finally evolved a measure which we believe is the best bill on publicity every presented to Congress, and we present it with a unanimous report, without a dissenting voice on either side of the committee.

There is absolutely no partisanship in it. Each and every member, feeling the responsibility of his position, has striven to present a bill which would be acceptable first to the Congress and approved by the people of the United States, and I believe we have succeeded.

Let me say generally there is not a great difference between the bill now pending and the bill which passed this House during the second session of the Sixty-third Congress. Members of the committee who are present now will recall that at that time we had a more or less spirited contest over several provisions written into the bill which was then being considered, and the House in its wisdom inserted a good many amendments, striking out some language and inserting other language. This committee, which I have already told you in good faith is the best committee in the House, has proven its worth by showing its submission to the will of the House. The bill now presented for your consideration is in strict harmony with the will of the House, as expressed in the various votes taken while the measure was being considered in the other Congress.

It is true there are some changes in it. There are some changes by transposition and consolidation and division, changes in the position of certain sections in order to make the bill more harmonious and perfect. There are some changes which simply involve the incorporating of two sections into one or separating one section into two.

There is one change that I want particularly to call to your attention, which is an innovation or an enlargement of the scope of the bills of this character heretofore considered by Congress. Until this bill was reported I believe no bill was ever reported which sought to require publicity of the amount of expenditures in campaigns applying to the great offices of President and Vice President of the United States. This bill does that. This bill requires all candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency to make and publish statements, both before and after the nomination and before and after election, just as it requires candidates for the Senate and House to make reports, except that the time for filing those reports is somewhat different.

In fixing the amount which a candidate for President might legitimately expend under the provisions of this bill, the committee acted without precedent, and hence upon its own judgment. We wrote into the bill that a candidate for the Presidency of the United States could expend, if he saw fit to do so, not exceeding $50,000 for nomination and election, and a candidate for Vice President $25,000.

It will occur to Members here present, no doubt, at first blush, that this is a large sum; but when we consider the great questions which may confront the American people and the necessity of publicity, or of a campaign of education, and analyze it, it seems to me the amount is not excessive. Fifty thousand dollars would be on the average a fraction over $1,000 per State for educational purposes, and if candidates for the Presidency have to pay the same rates for expressing their views that some of the rest of us have to expend, they would not go very far even at that rate—a thousand dollars for a State. If there is any criticism to be made, it may be that the amount is too small. I propose, with the consent and patience of the House, to call attention very briefly to various sections of the bill.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield?

Mr. RUCKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP. Does the $50,000 mean that that is the only amount that can be expended by the candidate, or the committee outside of the amount that the candidate himself can expend?

Mr. RUCKER. I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question. The $50,000 is the amount that the candidate himself may expend. It may come from his own purse, or it may consist, in part, of contributions from friends in aid of his candidacy. But the $50,000 is all that he can expend in carrying on his campaign, either from his own purse or from money contributed to him. That does not affect the activities of committees. That is another proposition.

Mr. CRISP. That is the proposition I wanted to refer to, whether it confined the advocacy of his candidacy to $50,000.

Mr. RUCKER. No.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the language read that he shall not expend or cause to be expended over $50,000?

Mr. RUCKER. I think you are right.

Mr. WALSH. Would not that limit the amount that a committee could expend?

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman will read the section governing expenditures by the committee, I think he will reach a different conclusion. The committee is not spending it in the sense that this law seeks to regulate and control expenditure by the candidate. The committee is regulated and governed by a section of the bill which is independent of the section we are now discussing.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state how much the committee can expend?

Mr. RUCKER. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. In this bill there is no limitation on the amount that the committee may expend. There is a limitation upon the method of expenditure or the source of contribution. The only limitations, however, are those which spring from publicity. Right or wrong, I have a pronounced view on this question, and I realize that I run counter to the judgment of some very strong men in expressing the views I am going to express. Throughout this bill the effort has been rather to invite or to induce every man who wants to make contributions toward political campaigns to make those contributions to a committee, and then the committee, by the provisions of this bill, is required to make public the name of the person from whom the contribution came and for what purpose it was used. We fix no limitation on the amount the *committee* can expend. They can expend whatever they see fit to expend, along legitimate lines, of course.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If I correctly understand the bill, a candidate for President might expend in one State the entire amount to which he is limited, might he not?

Mr. RUCKER. I think he could do so if he wanted to, but it is not likely a candidate for President would do that.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RUCKER. I will yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. Did the committee consider the advisability of limiting the amount which the committee might expend for the election of President and Vice President? In other words, was that question up before the committee, and did the committee consider it?

Mr. RUCKER. I want to be entirely frank with the gentleman. The question was at different times discussed briefly. It was not pending in the form of an amendment before the committee.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then nobody offered an amendment before the committee.

Mr. RUCKER. No amendment of that sort was offered that I recall.

Mr. HASTINGS. And it was only informally considered.

Mr. RUCKER. Only informally considered. No amendment of that sort considered.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to take occasion now to say, in the gentleman's time, that I would favor that sort of an amendment and vote for it, limiting the amount that a committee might expend in the election of a President and Vice President.

Mr. RUCKER. One gentleman took that view, and I know there are gentlemen who uphold it, but I can not but think they look at the question from the wrong angle. I do not believe there should be any limitation whatever on any legitimate means to reach the judgment of American voters. Much of the money that is expended nowadays in campaigns, obviously is expended for educational purposes, literature, speeches; and I believe the more literature we have and the more speeches we send out, the more men express their views on great national and international questions, the better able the American voter will be to intelligently express his views through the ballot box. I may be wrong about it, but I have that conviction.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RUCKER. I will be glad to.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman has seen statements made in elections heretofore that many millions of dollars were said to have been expended by the two committees in the election of President and Vice President. Does not the gentleman think those amounts are exorbitant and that there ought to be some limitation in some way?

Mr. RUCKER. Unquestionably; but I believe we present here an antidote for that sort of wrong. We present a preventive for it. I recall very well the campaign to which the gentleman refers. The gentleman will bear in mind that at that time there was no publicity law, and Democratic committees and Republican committees alike got all the money they could get from every source on earth, from concerns that were interested in legislation, and in appointments, and so forth, who gave tremendous sums, almost enough from one man, if current reports may be relied upon, to finance a national committee. But to-day what political party would stand sponsor for the expenditure by its committee of these stupendous sums, contributed by the special interests which contributed to that campaign? The very fact, published to the world, that they received these stupendous donations from special interests of the country would ruin, in the eyes of the American people, any party, regardless of who its candidate might be, in my judgment. I believe in all sincerity that when we can require and secure publicity of the conduct of men we almost guarantee rghteous and correct action by men. It is when men may do things unknown to their neighbors that they do wrong. Why, you can not go upon the streets and find a petty thief who will steal with human eyes gazing upon him. Publicity scares men who have tendencies toward evil and protects the public from contamination and degradation, and will protect the ballot box from pollution, I hope and believe.

Mr. THOMPSON. What arrangement do you make for publicity?

Mr. RUCKER. We make the best arrangement that I have been able to get the House to agree to. A long time ago I had in mind a thought which I believed was even better than we here present, but I believe we have here that which will in most cases secure genuine publicity. Now, I am not going to claim, and no man here would respect the soundness of my judgment if I should claim, that this law is perfect or that this bill proposes a perfect scheme. It is not perfect, and no mortal man has ever yet been able to devise a law on any subject that all men would or have obeyed. Every statute, from homicide to common assault, is violated. This statute may be violated, although I want to say that this bill deals with a class of men who are not criminal, and whose status in life is such, enjoying, as they do, the confidence of the people, that every impulse will lead and help them to comply with the provisions of this bill and not to violate them. The gentleman asks what provision we make for publicity. My reply is that, beginning with the President and Vice President, Senators, and Representatives, we require each one to solemnly swear that the statement of expenditures made by him is true, and that the statement contains every item of money received and expended by him or by anyone for him with his knowledge and consent, from any source, in aid and support of his candidacy for nomination or election. That ought to get at the true condition of affairs. We require that statement to be made before nomination and after nomination, and a like statement to be made before and after election. Then this bill seeks to amend existing law in a very material way along that line. As it stands to-day—and the Members on both sides of the House know what I say to be true—there has been somewhat of carelessness on the part of some gentlemen, due to the fact that nobody has seen fit for obvious reasons to try to enforce this law seriously.

Let me suggest that if I was seeking a nomination against the gentleman from Oklahoma, who has just asked me a question, and he should know that I had violated the law, if he knew I had not filed my statement, if he knew I had filed a false statement, if he had defeated me, public sentiment would say, "Oh, you have had victory enough; do not prosecute the man." If I should defeat him and he had the same knowledge, then public sentiment would say, "Oh, take your defeat like a man; don't you become an informer; let some one else do it." Yielding to considerations of that kind of sentiment nobody informs.

Now, we fix it differently. We provide that each candidate for the Senate and for the House in his initial statement shall give the name and the home address and the Federal judicial district in which his opponent resides.

Mr. COX. That is new, is it not?

Mr. RUCKER. It is. He must give all that in the initial statement. Then in the proper section this bill proposes that the the Clerk of the House shall, within 30 days after the statement ought to have been filed by one whom he knows, from information obtained from the returns on file, has failed or refused to comply with this law, report to the district attorney in the district in which the delinquent resides the fact that such candidate has not complied with the publicity laws of the United States. In that way through officials, without involving any candidate, whether successful or defeated, we make it the official duty of the Clerk to communicate directly to the prosecutor for the United States in the district in which the defaulting candidate resides. The bill makes it the duty of the district attorney to investigate and prosecute if the facts warrant it. That, I believe, gentlemen, is an important change in the existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. What about the national committee that collects money and spends it for the election of President of the United States—what kind of a report is that committee required to make?

Mr. RUCKER. Not only the national committee, but every other committee, whether composed of one or a number of men, which receives or expends money in a campaign, as an individual

or as a committee, is bound to make a statement similar to the one I have described for Senators and Members of Congress. They must show from whence every dollar received or disbursed came and for what purpose it was used. In every case where bills paid exceed $10 they must have a voucher showing what it was actually expended for. The books must be kept open to inspection, so that the truth of the statement may be verified.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. COX. What was the general purpose in only requiring items reported of expenditure in excess of $10? In my country on both sides it is the $1 and $2 bills of which the banks are drained about two days previous to the election that does the work out there.

Mr. RUCKER. Well, I never lived in Indiana and never participated in politics there, and perhaps I do not understand it. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will look at the geography of his own State, down on the border line he may find the same state of affairs.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman from Indiana may have information along those lines which I disclaim. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. You cut down in this bill the maximum amount that can be expended by a Member of Congress.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman is wrong about that; the House cut it down, and we obeyed the mandate of the House. In the last Congress the committee reported a bill providing, as the existing law does, $5,000, but the House by a very pronounced vote said that was too much.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does that interfere with the expenditure of the committee?

Mr. RUCKER. No.

Mr. STEENERSON. In addition to that the committee can participate and extend——

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does not the bill expressly forbid it; that is to say, a committee is organized in behalf of a candidate for Congress and the limitation applies not only to what the Member of Congress spends but to what the committee has spent?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, unquestionably.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Missouri did not understand the question of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. RUCKER. No. The bill in as strong language as we can put it provides that no candidate shall expend through himself, his agent, or anybody else, exceeding $2,500.

Mr. STEENERSON. Suppose there is a volunteer committee outside of his contribution that spends something in addition to the $2,500.

Mr. RUCKER. The candidate is chargeable with every dollar expended by anybody from any source with his knowledge and consent.

Mr. STEENERSON. Whether he furnishes the money or not?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Suppose the candidate himself expends $2,500; that is all the money that can be expended in his behalf?

Mr. RUCKER. If any more is expended with his knowledge or consent he is chargeable with it. At this time I am suffering some discomfiture because that is the law.

Mr. STEENERSON. I simply wanted to understand whether this limit of $2,500 is upon the total amoupt to be expended, whether furnished by the candidate or his friends.

Mr. RUCKER. That is what the bill says expressly, and I would say that, judging from the attitude of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I evidently misunderstood the gentleman a moment ago, because I had no intention of making any conflicting statements.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman clearly did.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, in many States primaries have already been held under the existing law, which permits an expenditure of $5,000. It is barely possible that some candidates have already exceeded the limit in this bill. What would happen in a case of that kind?

Mr. RUCKER. I had an idea that possibly this might catch somebody here, and I have studiously tried to draft an amendment which I propose to offer which I think will protect them. In other words, I will say to the gentleman that it would be unfair, the limit now being $5,000 and in many cases the campaigns for nomination having been concluded, with a perfect right to spend up to $5,000, all for nomination, if need be, to change it to $2,500 now.

Mr. GORDON. It would also be unconstitutional, would it not?

Mr. RUCKER. And thus deny the candidate the right to spend anything for the election, or make him a criminal if he did. Before the bill passes we will see if we can not agree upon an amendment which leaves the existing law, so far as the amount to be expended is concerned, in operation during this year.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I notice that in section 7 supplemental statements are required to be filed, itemized, detailed statements every six days. Will the gentleman state how the committee arrived at the time within which those detailed statements should be filed—how they came to fix upon it as every sixth day?

Mr. RUCKER. This refers to statements made by committees?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. When the existing law was being enacted my recollection is that the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Cullop, offered an amendment requiring these supplemental reports to be made every sixth day, and the House adopted it and the Senate agreed to it.

Mr. WALSH. And that is the only reason it is in the bill?

Mr. RUCKER. It is existing law, and to that extent existing law is reproduced in this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand that itemized detailed statements such as are required in this bill are now required by law?

Mr. RUCKER. Absolutely. Those supplemental statements do not have to contain a full statement of all of the transactions of the committee, but transactions that have occurred since the last statement was made.

Mr. WALSH. They have to contain what is called for in section 8 of the bill.

Mr. RUCKER. Yes; what has transpired since the former statement was made, because the section provides that publicity does not have to be given in any supplemental statement of any item of which publicity has already been given.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, candidates for Congress who have campaigns on now will have expended $2,500 up to the time this becomes a law. Under the bill he could not expend any more money then. That would be unfair, would it not, when up to this time he has been operating under a law which permits him to expend up to $5,000? He would be handicapped for the balance of the campaign.

Mr. RUCKER. I desire to read to the gentleman an amendment which has been prepared with the approval of the committee, although the committee as a committee has taken no formal action upon it. At the end of the section, regarding the statements and fixing the amount of the expenditure, I propose to offer an amendment, to read as follows:

Amend by inserting at the end of line 26, page 14, the following: "*Provided further*, That the amount which may be expended by candidates for Senator and Representative in securing nomination and election in the year 1916 shall be the same as now prescribed by law."

Mr. WHEELER. Then, if that is adopted, this limitation in the bill will not apply to this year?

Mr. RUCKER. No; and it ought not to.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, how much can a candidate expend now under the present law?

Mr. RUCKER. He can not expend more than $5,000 under the Federal law, and not that much if his State law fixes a lower limit.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman give us an idea what constitutes the expenses of a candidate?

Mr. RUCKER. I am in the best position in the world to give the gentleman that information, because I am now in the midst of a campaign, and I have been thinking very seriously about it.

Mr. EMERSON. To give the gentleman an idea of what I mean, of course he knows that candidates are approached to give funds to churches and clubs and for advertising this or that magazine and something else. Is that a part of the campaign expenses?

Mr. RUCKER. I think if any Member of Congress is willing to admit that he gave the Methodist Church or the Baptist Church—I do not know to which the gentleman belongs—$25 in order to get the Baptist or the Methodist vote, he ought to account for it; but I do not believe that any Member of Congress would ever offend the church or stultify himself by giving the church one dollar for the purpose of securing the votes of the membership of the church.

Mr. EMERSON. I do not think any Member would, either.

Mr. RUCKER. I am a Methodist myself, although that may not be generally known, and I desire to state that I received a letter a few days ago from a good Methodist brother in which he told me that his church was in arrears on a piano which had been purchased for the church, and he wrote: "You are needing votes right now, and you have a good deal of opposi-

tion in this particular locality, and the Methodists are strong, and a good liberal contribution toward paying for that piano would be the best campaign that you could make in this locality." I wrote him back that I never yet had gotten low enough to attempt to buy the Methodist Church, and I would not do it. And if I give them $25 or $10 or some other sum I shall not charge myself with it, because I shall not give it for campaign purposes. I would give it just as quickly if I did not expect a vote.

Mr. WALSH. I see here that the forms for the statement required by this act shall be furnished by the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Does that include the ledger or record which is to be kept by the treasurer? Will the Clerk of the House furnish the ledger or record?

Mr. RUCKER. No; I do not think so.

Mr. WALSH. Why should not the Clerk of the House furnish the record which has to be kept by the committee, in order that it may be kept in a uniform manner?

Mr. RUCKER. Well, if they will keep the items and report the items, that is all the public is interested in. The gentleman can readily see that it would be a right tedious, as well as an expensive, task to undertake to furnish ledgers to all persons in the country who may handle campaign funds.

Mr. WALSH. He can send them out in separate sheets, the same as he sends out statements.

Mr. RUCKER. The ledger they keep must be a permanent book, so it may be preserved.

Mr. WALSH. It says here that the ledger or record may be kept on loose rough sheets.

Mr. RUCKER. The record.

Mr. WALSH. I know; but you are giving discretion here to the treasurer to keep either the ledger or the record. Why, he could keep it on a sheet of wrapping paper.

Mr. RUCKER. Let me say—and I take the criticism kindly—the gentleman is simply forcing me to again insist that the committee in presenting this, the best bill ever presented on this subject, did not expect absolute perfection.

Mr. WALSH. I understand. My only purpose was to suggest that, might not the Clerk of the House have some of these loose sheets for the use of treasurers of committees?

Mr. RUCKER. I think the gentleman will bear me out in this and will agree with me that in a heated campaign if the Clerk of the House would send out a lot of loose sheets like this, some clerk, officer, or treasurer who was not as careful in his methods as some other gentleman might lose the sheets and they never could be found. Now, if there was any trouble about it at all, I would rather amend the bill and provide that they should be required to keep permanent records, because the purpose is, and ought to be, to make the committee in good faith account for absolutely every dollar of money it receives or expends.

Mr. WALSH. In other words, the gentleman thinks he should be stricter with the committee than he is with the candidate?

Mr. RUCKER. You can not be as strict with a candidate as with the committee.

Mr. WALSH. One further question.

Mr. RUCKER. I suppose I make myself clear to the gentleman? You could not do that.

Mr. WALSH. With reference to the amount which the candidate may expend. Does the bill as proposed by the committee proceed upon the theory that States have the right to enact statutes fixing the limit which may be expended by the candidate for Senator or for a Member of the House at less than $2,500?

Mr. RUCKER. Unquestionably. I want to say in answer to the gentleman's question that as a constitutional question I very seriously doubt whether the State has any jurisdiction to prescribe how much money we may spend, or any other condition touching our qualifications, but the fact is some of the States have done so; and, yielding to the sentiment which it evidently had, the purpose being the purification of election in order that every vote might clearly represent the judgment of the voter, we recognized that right by writing into the bill that no candidate could expend a larger sum or a greater sum than he may lawfully expend under the law of the State in which he may reside.

Mr. WALSH. So that the bill as proposed recognizes the State laws, and it may result in a man being allowed to expend $2,500 while across the line from my district, in a bordering State, my colleague could not expend but $1,500?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. It recognizes the inequality in the amount that can be expended by candidates?

Mr. RUCKER. It recognizes the fact that in the State of Missouri, one of the greatest States of this Union [applause], in one district a certain limit is the maximum that one may spend, and just across in an adjoining district the amount may be twice as much.

Mr. WALSH. In the same State?

Mr. RUCKER. In the same State.

Mr. WALSH. And that is fixed by State law?

Mr. RUCKER. That is fixed by State law. Let me say to the gentleman I do not desire to talk about personal matters, and I do not want to reveal too much——

Mr. WALSH. That was not my purpose in asking the question.

Mr. RUCKER. I will make this statement. In my own district I can not spend this year within $200 as much as I could in the last election, although I have occasion to spend four times as much——

Mr. WALSH. In other words, there is a descending relation——

Mr. RUCKER (continuing). Owing to the fact that I was so very satisfactory to my Republican friends they did not put up a Republican candidate and there was no Republican vote to base the amount upon.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me that is a good argument for this House making it a uniform law.

Mr. RUCKER. It is a good argument to induce the Legislature of Missouri to change its law.

Mr. WALSH. To comply with this act, for instance.

Mr. RUCKER. As a matter of fact, let me say, in answer to the gentleman's suggestion, that the hope of this committee—and if we ever realize that hope we will be amply well paid—it is the hope of this committee, with the aid of Members of the House and Senate, to make a publicity law along a line so perfect and satisfactory that every State of the Union will pattern after it and enact laws which will articulate with this Federal law, requiring publicity of statements of accounts in the States similar to what we are requiring here, and in that way begin and go all along through the great fabric of this Republic purifying the elections. I hope it can be done.

Mr. SIMS. If I understand your bill—and I have not read it at this time closely—you limit this amount of expense to those items of expense required to be reported only. In other words, expense items are not required to be reported under this bill?

Mr. RUCKER. Traveling expenses, for instance.

Mr. SIMS. Or postage.

Mr. RUCKER. Under the Federal law you do not have to account for postage, but under our State law you do.

Mr. SIMS. Under this law there is no limit of expenditures, provided they are of the kind not required to be reported, so far as Congress is concerned?

Mr. RUCKER. That argument is worthy of consideration and thought, but how can it be done? There is every conceivable expense, either forcing men to intentionally forget or else forcing a man to carry a bookkeeper along to keep account of every little item of expense. It can not be done.

A man is busy and rushing about transacting business, and he can not do it. Now, I only know one State of the Union where postage stamps have to be accounted for, and that is Missouri; and I want to say I can not write one letter to each name on my mailing list and put a 2-cent stamp on it without violating the law of my State.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can frank congressional matter without any violation of the law to all of his constituents, can he not?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes, sir. I believe so.

Mr. MANN. So that the gentleman has advantage over anybody running against him. The other man has to put a 2-cent stamp on his letter, and he can not do it without violating the law, but the gentleman can send a dozen pieces to one individual and does not violate the law. I do not say that the gentleman does.

Mr. RUCKER. I want to say I have never done that for the reason that I always feared it would likely do me more harm than good.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that some gentlemen may do it. The gentleman knows that every Member of the House——

Mr. WALSH. You can not send a political circular under a frank.

Mr. MANN. Practically a political circular. I know of one room in this building now where there are a lot of people employed sending out a campaign document printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. RUCKER. I think the gentleman is correct about that, but I think there are two of those rooms. I never have adopted that plan. I am not complaining about conditions.

Mr. SIMS. I wanted to get the answer of the gentleman. There is no attempt in this law to limit the expenditures that are not required to be reported upon the theory that those expenditures are not of the kind that are liable to corrupt the electorate like the writing of letters? In some States we have the election of county officers and State officers in August. We do it in Tennessee. Consequently, there are more candidates for office in the August election by far than there are in the fall election. Many counties are close. Suppose a candidate for Congress is requested by the committee of his party in those counties to contribute to the local party campaign fund for the August election. Now, does he have to report that under this law? As a matter of course he would not be called on if he was not a candidate, and he pays primarily because he expects to receive, directly or indirectly, a party benefit.

Mr. RUCKER. That is a question of mixed ethics of law that the gentleman is as well able to answer as I am. I will not attempt to answer it.

Mr. SIMS. What will he do?

Mr. RUCKER. I do not know. How much time have I consumed, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. About 50 minutes.

Mr. CRISP. Can I ask the gentleman a question? I had the honor and privilege of serving under my friend in the last Congress, and I know of his great efforts in this direction. You contemplate, then, amending the law to require the candidates to mail to their opponents a copy of the statement that they have?

Mr. RUCKER. No. The House knocked that out in the last Congress. The House did not think it wise. I thought it was.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RUCKER. I will be glad to answer the gentleman, but I have promised some time.

Mr. FESS. Does the bill contemplate the expense of sending a statement to the newspapers? Suppose you announce you can not go back home, and you have to take that method?

Mr. RUCKER. A paid item?

Mr. FESS. Naturally it would be a paid item.

Mr. RUCKER. It would have to be accounted for. The reason you send it back is to let them know you are not coming, and thus arouse friends to activity.

Mr. FESS. If you make a trip in your own automobile, which costs money, would that be included?

Mr. RUCKER. That is one of the inequities, as the gentleman can see very well.

Mr. FESS. I was asking for information.

Mr. DECKER. As I understand the law as you have it now, and as it will be after this bill is passed, a man must swear to his expenditures that have been made either with his knowledge, by himself, or with his knowledge and consent by others.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio spoke about the newspaper advertisements. I was wondering if there were advertisements in the newspapers of the district purporting to be under some committee supporting some man for Congress, we will say the "Jones for Congress Club," should those be accounted for by the candidate?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, I suggest this to the gentleman: To my mind it is inconceivable that such a club could run an advertisement for the benefit and in the interest of any candidate without his knowledge. If he knew of such effort being made in his behalf and acquiesced in it—that is, did not stop it—he ought and must charge himself with it or, in my judgment, violate the law as it now is and as it is proposed in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. Will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] use some time now?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, in view of what the distinguished chairman of our committee, Mr. RUCKER, has said, it may not be out of place for me at the outset, on behalf of the other Republican members of the committee and myself, to express our appreciation of the uniform courtesy and consideration which the chairman has always shown to the Republican members of the committee. In the consideration of this bill I think it is well within the truth to say that he consulted and worked with the Republican as much as with the Democratic members. [Applause.]

As the chairman of the committee has said, it is proposed by this bill to codify the laws now on the statute books requiring that an accounting be made of and publicity be given to campaign receipts and expenditures and to make some important amendments to such laws.

It may be of interest to know the history of recent Federal legislation on this subject. The first law enacted by Congress attempting to require publicity of campaign receipts and expenditures was approved June 25, 1910. It required an accounting after election only by campaign committees operating in two or more States; that is, the national campaign committees. As the bill passed the House of Representatives it required an accounting by the committees before as well as after the election, but the provision requiring an accounting before election was stricken out in the Senate.

At the next Congress a bill was introduced and passed the House of Representatives amending the law so as to require an accounting by the national committees before election, as the House bill provided in the previous session. The Senate at that session went further than the House of Representatives. It not only retained the provision requiring an accounting by such committees before the election, which it had stricken out of the House bill at the previous session, but incorporated a new provision, which went further than the House had proposed to go, requiring candidates for the nomination or election to the House of Representatives and the Senate, as well as committees, to give an accounting of their campaign receipts and expenditures both before and after the election, and limited the amount which such candidates could expend.

That act was approved August 19, 1911, and is the law at the present time. You are all familiar with that law. It is the law under which Members of Congress have had to file reports for the last four years.

In the last Congress the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] introduced a bill, somewhat similar to the present one, to codify and revise these acts. That bill passed the House of Representatives and was reported by the Senate committee, but was never taken up in the Senate.

Whenever this matter has been considered in Congress the right of Congress under the Constitution to enact legislation of the kind has been questioned by some, particularly in so far as it related to the nomination of candidates, but it is now generally conceded that Congress has the right to pass such legislation. The Supreme Court has recognized the right of Congress to regulate elections at which Members of Congress are elected in several cases. The nomination is such an essential part of the election, and in many districts is so nearly equivalent to an election, that it would be unreasonable and to no purpose to give Congress the power to regulate the one and not the other. Such a construction would render the power of Congress over the election of its own Members of no avail.

The present law does not define, nor is it proposed by this bill to define, the purposes for which money can be used in political campaigns. It only proposes to limit the amount of expenditures and require publicity thereof.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MAPES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Does not the gentleman think it would be better to limit the expenditure of money to certain purposes, rather than to limit the amount of money that is expended? Or, in other words, would it not be better, if we are going to omit the one, to omit the one as to the amount that we can expend, and incorporate the one that designates the purposes for which the money may be expended?

Mr. MAPES. I will say to the gentleman that, so far as I am personally concerned, I would favor a law which would both limit the amount of money that could be expended and define the purposes for which it could be spent. However, I think that if publicity is given of all expenditures, there will not be very much improper use of money in political campaigns.

Most of the States have laws defining the purposes for which money can be expended in political campaigns, and I do not believe any candidate for Congress is going to spend money for which he has to account, showing that he has violated those State laws.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. In that connection, does not the gentleman think the candidate needs some protection as well as the public?

Mr. MAPES. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. And that it would be well to limit the purposes for which the money can be expended, so as to avoid just the thing that the chairman of this committee called our attention to a moment ago?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. The candidate's time is very valuable. He has only a short time in which to reach his constituents, and he would be saved an immense amount of trouble if certain parties should know that it was unlawful to approach him to secure money or other favors at that time.

Mr. MAPES. What the gentleman from Minnesota says is undoubtedly true.

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

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman has given a lot of study to this proposition. I would like to ask him if he has given any thought to this view of the case: Suppose that a citizen, who may happen for the time being to be a candidate for a Federal office—Member of Congress or Senator or President—should think proper to make a contribution to the national committee of his party or to the State committee of his party or the county committee of his party, without respect to anything in connection with his own candidacy. Has the committee reached the conclusion that that is chargeable to his expenses as a candidate for the office he is running for?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to answer?

Mr. MAPES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER. Let me say this to the gentleman from Illinois: For four years I believe the law has plainly stated that any candidate might make contributions to political parties within the limits herein defined; in other words, not to exceed $5,000.

Mr. MADDEN. That does not answer my question at all.

Mr. MAPES. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that in Michigan candidates, when they contribute to the State or county committees, do account for those contributions in their statements.

Mr. MADDEN. That does not answer my question at all. What I want to know is whether the mere fact that a man is a candidate for an office over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction prohibits him as a citizen of the United States from contributing out of his own money to the success of the party with which he is affiliated, whether it is through the national committee or otherwise?

Mr. MAPES. If the committee has jurisdiction over the district in which he is a candidate, I should say he ought to account for it.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, say the national committee.

Mr. MAPES. If a candidate for Congress, in the State of Illinois, for instance, contributed to the local campaign of some man in California, perhaps it would not have to be accounted for; but if he contributed to the national committee, or to the State committee of Illinois, I think it ought to be accounted for.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think the national committee has any effect in the management of the campaign in any congressional district in the United States?

Mr. MAPES. It ought to disband, if it has not.

Mr. MADDEN. It has not. I have never been connected with a campaign yet where any committee, national committee or congressional committee, both of which committees are supposed to have control of the campaign, have either contributed their moral support or their financial support or in any other way supported the candidacy of any man who ran for the office of Member of Congress coming within my knowledge.

Mr. MAPES. They distribute literature and help the local campaign committees in other ways.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois not only that, but they have been a hindrance and a detriment from the fact that the word has gone abroad that they were helping you, and people call to see you, and when you refuse their demands and explain that they are not helping you, they believe you are lying to them. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAPES. That may be the practical effect, but that is not the purpose for which they are organized.

The theory of this legislation, as stated in the report of the committee of the Senate on the first bill, is "the belief that publicity of contributions and expenditures in a campaign for a public office will tend to lessen, if not wholly prevent, the improper use of money in public campaigns and so promote the purity and honesty of elections."

It is interesting to note the change of attitude of the Democratic Party in regard to this character of legislation. It is not many years ago that the members of that party generally declared legislation of this kind unconstitutional, and that the regulation of elections ought to be left to the States. In 1894, during the Cleveland administration, that party repealed the Federal election laws and the bribery statutes passed soon after the Civil War for the purpose of maintaining the purity of elections, against the protest and opposition of the Republican Members of Congress. To-day the Democratic Party makes the enactment of a measure somewhat similar a part of its legislative program.

Most of the States have corrupt-practices acts of a much more stringent nature than the present Federal law or than is proposed by this bill. The State laws, as a rule, provide not only for publicity and limit the amount that may be expended, but they define the purposes for which money can be expended as well. The next step in Federal legislation undoubtedly will be the enactment of a statute after the manner of the State laws defining the purposes for which money can be expended in campaigns in which Members of Congress are to be elected and restoring the bribery statutes that were repealed in 1894.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. MAPES. Just a brief question. I have already taken more time than I intended to take.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to ask the gentleman if the committee have given any consideration to the question whether a citizen of the United States has any rights that anybody is bound to respect if he becomes a candidate for office?

Mr. MAPES. I do not think this bill limits them in any way. Many believe that Federal legislation of this character would be more effective than the State laws upon the same subject, and that this legislation will not be complete until Congress enacts some such law. They believe that a Federal law upon the subject would command much more respect than the State laws do.

It is well to bear in mind, however, that this bill does not annul the corrupt-practice acts of the States. It is in addition to them. It aims to supplement the State laws rather than to supplant them. It expressly provides that the State laws shall not be annulled and that the candidates mentioned in it shall not be exempt from complying with such State laws.

The amount that can be expended under State laws differs greatly in the different States. In Missouri, for example, the home of the distinguished chairman of the committee, a candidate for Congress can expend $100 for the first 5,000 voters, $2 for each 100 voters over 5,000 and under 25,000, $1 for each 100 voters over 25,000 and under 50,000, and $0.50 for each 100 voters over 50,000. This would allow a candidate for election to the House of Representatives in a district where there were 50,000 voters, which is more than the average, to expend in his campaign for the nomination and election a total of $750.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman very accurately quoted the Missouri statute, but unfortunately, as I have had occasion to discover recently, the amounts that may be expended are not based on the voting strength of the district, but on the vote actually cast.

Mr. MAPES. I think that is correct.

Mr. SLOAN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MAPES. Very briefly.

Mr. SLOAN. In the State of Missouri, if a candidate for Congress spent more money than the statute of the State of Missouri provides, would he come under the penalty provided in this statute if it was under the maximum generally provided?

Mr. MAPES. The bill expressly states that he would.

Mr. SLOAN. That is, we are brought down to the Missouri basis.

Mr. MAPES. If we live in Missouri, we are.

West Virginia allows an expenditure of $75 only for each county in the district. The amount that can be expended varies in the different States, some States allowing 50 per cent of the first year's salary, or $3,750, to be expended by a candidate for Congress. This bill limits the amount that a candidate for the House of Representatives can spend for his nomination and election to $2,500 and a Senator to $5,000. These amounts are in addition to his expenditures for travel and subsistence, stationery and postage, writing or printing—other than in newspapers—and for telegraph and telephone service.

Some of the important changes in the pending bill over the present law are the following:

The bill for the first time limits the amount that can be expended by candidates for the office of President and Vice President of the United States and requires them to give publicity to their expenditures. The committee has limited the amount that can be expended by a candidate for President for the purpose of securing his nomination and election to $50,000 and to a candidate for Vice President to $25,000.

In this connection I will say that the committee struck out of the present law the provision which exempts candidates from accounting for expenditures for distributing posters, handbills, and letters.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. You struck that out?

Mr. MAPES. We struck it out of the present law. We felt that candidates ought to account for such expenditures.

The present law only requires campaign committees operating in two or more States to make a statement. The pending bill requires all committees that receive or expend any money for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the result of a primary or an election at which candidates for President,

Vice President, Senator, or Representative in Congress are to be nominated or elected to make a statement even though operating entirely with a State.

This provision of the bill is criticized because of the number of reports that will be required, but it seemed to the committee that the law would not be effective unless it required reports from all committees that take part in the campaign. The fact is that the congressional campaign committees and the county committees within the congressional districts are very important factors in the election, and a law which would leave them out of consideration would be incomplete. In recommending this provision the committee is only following out the action of the House of Representatives in the last Congress. The bill reported by the committee at that time did not contain such a provision, but an amendment covering the matter was voted into the bill in the House.

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

Mr. MAPES. Briefly.

Mr. MADDEN. Take the case of Cook County, Ill., where we have 10 congressional districts in one county. The county committee has jurisdiction over the whole campaign of the 10 congressional districts. They conduct a campaign for every man who runs for office of any kind, name, or nature in Cook County. How are they going to make a report as to just what they spend for a candidate for Congress, when his campaign is coupled up with all the other candidates? It can not be done.

Mr. MAPES. I think under the provisions of this bill, if they account once for the money they expend, that will cover it even though there are a number of candidates. They do not have to make any more statements than they would if there were only one candidate. The money is spent for the benefit of the ticket, and the candidates for Congress are on the ticket. The committee would undoubtedly have to account for all expenditures made in the campaign.

Under the provisions of the bill voluntary committees or associations of the friends of candidates or any individual who expends $50 or more for the purpose of helping to nominate or elect a candidate must make a report, unless he contributes the same to a committee.

The bill also provides that no committee shall expend in any one State more than is contributed or raised by citizens of that State. The purpose of this provision is to prevent the excessive use of money in a State which it may seem desirable or important to carry.

The bill also reduces the amount that may be expended by candidates for the House of Representatives from $5,000, in the present law, to $2,500, and for the Senate from $10,000 to $5,000. This is in addition to expenditures for printing, writing, stationery and postage, traveling expenses, and so forth, and is more than is allowed by the majority of the States having corrupt-practice acts.

Another new provision requires a candidate to file a copy of his statement with the clerk of the United States district court having jurisdiction over the Federal judicial district in which the candidate resides.

The bill also requires that anyone found to have violated its provisions shall not receive or retain the office to which he has been declared elected. The committee has some doubt as to the constitutionality of this provision in view of the right of each House to determine the qualifications of its own Members, but has put it into the bill for whatever moral effect it may have.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. What happens to a man who runs for Congress and is defeated? Does the law make provision that if he violates the law they can get after him as well as the sitting Member?

Mr. MAPES. Every man who violates the law comes under the jurisdiction of the law, and will be dealt with by the district attorney in the district in which he resides.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Will it be up to the district attorney, or will the successful candidate for Congress have to do it, in the same way that the defeated candidate would push it against the successful one?

Mr. MAPES. This bill provides that it is the duty of the Clerk of the House to call the attention of the district attorney to any violation of the law.

Mr. SLOAN. Under the existing law would it require the Cook County committee to report first to the Cook County authorities; second, to the secretary of state of the State of Illinois, as they do in our State——

Mr. MAPES. If the State law provides that.

Mr. SLOAN. And third, to the Clerk of the House?

Mr. MAPES. This law requires the committee to report to the Clerk of the House and to the clerk of the district court having jurisdiction.

Mr. TAGGART. There are many States that have statutes limiting expenditures for local and State officers, but which expressly omit to place any limitation on candidates for Senator or Representative in Congress or for President and Vice President. This act has no reference to any State statute, except those that place a limitation on candidates for Congress and national candidates, as I understand.

Mr. MAPES. That is it.

To state the purpose of the bill in one sentence, I think it can fairly be said that the bill aims to require publicity of all expenditures for the purpose of influencing the result of the nomination or election of a candidate for President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative in Congress, whether made by the candidate himself, by regularly organized political committees, voluntary associations of friends, or otherwise.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I notice that the forms for statements required in this act shall be furnished by the Clerk of the House. Does the Clerk of the House furnish forms for candidates to the Senate or for the election of President and Vice President?

Mr. MAPES. I think that has been the practice.

Mr. WALSH. It is intended to continue that practice, is it?

Mr. MAPES. It is. The bill is reported unanimously by the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. No one will claim for the bill that it will bring about a political millenium, but if enacted into law it will make it a little more difficult to use money in political campaigns improperly, or, as Gladstone is said to have answered the critics of certain reform legislation in England, it will make it a little harder to do wrong and a little more easy to do right. [Applause.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Missouri in charge of the bill about what hour will the general debate end?

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan inform me how many speeches he has on that side?

Mr. MAPES. We have three more speeches. I think our time will be all taken up.

GEORGIA WATERMELONS.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a matter of the highest privilege, and I ask the gentleman to yield to me a minute or so to talk about it.

Mr. RUCKER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMSON. The hour of closing debate does not suit me, so I will have to ask the loan of Members. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has a very important meeting at which they have a clinic and will dissect the bodies of a large number of Georgia watermelons that have come in from Troup County, Ga., in the district which I have the honor to represent. They will have as special witnesses the surviving Members of the Fifty-fifth Congress as special guests. Any Member present who is a friend of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or of the surviving Members of the Fifty-fifth Congress, is invited to come up and participate.

Mr. RUCKER. At what time does this meeting take place?

Mr. ADAMSON. At 3 o'clock, in the room of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. [Applause.]

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD].

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] in paying the highest possible compliment to the ability, capacity, and patience of our able chairman, through whose diligence we have been able here to present a bill that expresses at least the best judgment, regardless of partisan considerations, of the members of the committee with reference to publicity.

A few months ago there came from the White House a list describing in detail the specifications of the task set before Congress for this session. That list came directly from the President, as all Members of the House understood, and on that list there was included an item describing this bill, as I am now informed. It was called the corrupt-practice act. I have been on the committee all winter, but I did not recognize that this was a corrupt-practice act. I do not want to say that the President used "weasel words," because I assume that he may not have known exactly what was in the bill or exactly what a corrupt-practice act is.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he remembered whether in that list there was a presidential primary law.

Mr. SANFORD. I do not recall that there was. The point I am trying to make is that the bill before us is a publicity bill—nothing more. It is not designed to become in any real sense a corrupt-practice act. This bill, however, recognizes the existence of corrupt practices, the law to prevent which was repealed by the Democratic Party in 1894.

During the reconstruction period that followed the Civil War and between 1865 and 1870 several Federal statutes were enacted in exercise of the authority conferred on Congress by the Constitution to prevent corrupt practice at elections. There were provisions to protect the citizen in doing the things necessary to qualify himself to vote and penalties provided for wrongfully refusing to receive a vote, and for unlawfully hindering a person from voting. There was provision to keep the United States courts open to protect such rights. There was provision for the appointment of supervisors of election to attend at all times and places for holding elections of Representatives and Delegates in Congress, and such supervisors were required to scrutinize the counting of the ballots. There was provision for the summary punishment of persons offending against these laws. All of these provisions, constituting a complete system for the protection of the interests of the Federal Government at elections where Members of Congress and Senators were to be chosen, were embodied in title 26 of the Revised Statutes.

There were further laws for the punishment of crimes against the elective franchise providing for the punishment of persons who unlawfully hinder, delay, or prevent any citizen from voting and punishing persons for fraudulently voting or for using any force, threat, intimidation, or bribery; punishing fraudulent registration, punishing officers of election for violation of duty; punishing persons for being guilty of conspiracy to prevent the support of any candidate; punishing supervisors of election for neglecting their duties; punishing other persons for interfering with supervisors of election or for obstructing the verification of the registration list.

There was, in fact, a complete exercise of the authority given Congress to protect the purity of the ballot at elections at which Representatives in Congress were chosen.

But when the Democratic Party was in power in 1894 these laws were repealed on the theory that they were both unconstitutional and inexpedient.

It is interesting to quote a paragraph from the report of the committee that favored the repeal of these laws:

> But we regard these statutes as chiefly inimical to the best interests of the people because they are, in effect, a vote of lack of confidence in the States of the Union. The inference is irresistible that they were enacted because of a lack of confidence in the honesty if not in the ability of the States to conduct their own elections. With such an intention plainly on their face, with what consideration could they be met by the people for whom they were intended, except that of distrust and suspicion? Would the United States Government suffer less by the prevalence of fraud in elections than the States whose officers we sent to represent it in the Government of the United States? Is fraud in elections any less contemptible because it emanates from the people of the States without Federal interference, or is it any less dangerous to the people of the States because it lacks Federal supervision?
>
> Let every trace of the reconstruction measures be wiped from the statute books; let the States of this great Union understand that the elections are in their own hands, and if there be fraud, coercion, or force used, they will be the first to feel it.

The same party, again in power, admits the weakness of the theory on which it repealed these remedial laws and proposes to cover up its shortcomings with a publicity statute.

The burden of the argument, however, for the repeal of these statutes was on the ground that they were unconstitutional. Throughout the discussion of this subject it is very evident that the Democratic Party has been unwilling to recognize the authority of the Federal Government to pass such laws. The reason for this attitude of mind is almost self-evident, and can clearly be found in the following figures:

At the 1914 election of Members of Congress the total vote cast in certain districts was as follows:

	Total vote.
NORTH CAROLINA.	
First district	8,940
Second district	8,843
Sixth district	8,392
SOUTH CAROLINA.	
First district	3,053
Second district	4,688
Third district	4,521
VIRGINIA.	
First district	5,578
Fourth district	2,902
Sixth district	4,214
TEXAS.	
Seventh district	7,003
MISSISSIPPI.	
Seventh district	3,702
Third district	2,168
Eighth district	2,404

The population of the above districts is in almost every case approximately 200,000.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. Gladly.

Mr. FESS. I made a comparison of the seventh Ohio district with the State of Mississippi, and found that the seventh Ohio district cast one-third more votes than the eight districts of the State of Mississippi in 1914.

Mr. SANFORD. That is very interesting in a representative body.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman think that the fact that in a southern district where there is no opposition in a general election that it is a fair comparison to what the vote is in other districts?

Mr. SANFORD. I think it is fair to point out that in a congressional district in the United States, with a population of 200,000, there are only 2,000 or 3,000 interested American citizens ready to express in the only way possible for them their interest in the Government of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FOSTER. Now, without any politics in it, laying aside the politics——

Mr. SANFORD. I do not call it politics.

Mr. FOSTER. In a southern district in which there is no opposition, no other candidate running as a Member of Congress, does not that make some difference in the number of votes that may be cast? Has the gentleman compared the districts where there is opposition to see what the vote is?

Mr. SANFORD. I have found that where there is some competition—for instance, like the district I referred to in Texas, where there are 3 Republican votes—it does make some difference.

I have the honor to represent a district of approximately the same size in population as those mentioned above, and at the 1914 election there were polled in my district 52,362 votes. The voting strength of the districts represented by the gentlemen on the left of the aisle ranges from 30,000 to 50,000.

In this connection, also, it is interesting to note that the chairman of the great Agricultural Committee of this House, the gentleman from South Carolina, represents a district which polled a total vote of 5,501. The gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, represents a district that polled at the last election 4,214 votes. The chairman of the Committee on Education, the gentleman from Georgia, represents a district that polled 6,836 votes. The gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, that has reported such important bills to change the policy of this Government concerning its island possessions, represents a district that polled 4,578 votes. The gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, represents a district polling 4,754 votes. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Virginia, who has had charge of the most important bill that has come before this session of Congress, represents a district that polled 5,255 votes. The gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of Ways and Means and the leader of the House, represents a district that polled only 7,843 votes.

The total vote of all the districts combined represented by the chairmen of all these important committees is much less than the total vote of the district which I represent, but in the hands of these chairmen of committees is the control of most of the important legislation of Congress. I do not question the ability of any of these gentlemen, but merely desire to point out the character and extent of their representation.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. CALDWELL. Did the gentleman have a contest in the Republican primary at the time he was nominated?

Mr. SANFORD. Oh, we have no troubles in the Republican Party in my district. [Laughter.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Did the gentleman receive as many votes in his primary as he did in the general election?

Mr. SANFORD. I did not pay much attention to the primary.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does not the gentleman know that in the South the fight is all made in the primary, because all the decent people down there are Democrats? [Laughter.]

Mr. SANFORD. Yes; the primary is a family quarrel. But I think I have a right to comment on the election itself.

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

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman did not catch the import of the inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL], which was this, that the contest in the States about which the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD] just addressed the House, hinges always on the primary election and does not hinge on the general election at all.

Mr. SANFORD. I caught that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So that what applies in this particular instance would not apply after the candidate had gained the nomination?

Mr. SANFORD. Yes; I see that.

Mr. FOCHT. We all understand what underlies this whole business, and why they do not vote in the fall, but I would like to ask the gentleman, while he is on his feet, to state how he regards the action of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the other members representing the southern districts that poll only two or three thousand votes, in bringing in a revenue bill to tax the North untold millions of dollars when they pay very little of it themselves, and what will be the ultimate result of that? Are they not inviting something to be done and done very soon?

Mr. SANFORD. I understand that, and in this connection I want to say that I make no reflection and do not want to be understood as making any reflection on the ability or quality of mind of any of the chairmen of these committees, but I say what I do merely to call attention to the quality of representation, in order that some people may be able better to understand the vision of the men who helped in this great year to more clearly define Americanism in this country.

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

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. If it is constitutional to pass a bill of this kind would there be anything to prevent a Republican majority sometime from requiring that at least 30,000 votes should be cast for somebody in a congressional district before a man should be certified as elected to this great body?

Mr. SANFORD. I can answer the gentleman by saying that the Supreme Court of the United States has said that this body has almost unlimited power with reference to the supervision of the elections at which Members of Congress are chosen.

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

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think the passage of this bill is going to produce more votes in these districts to which he has referred; that there will be more votes cast at these elections?

Mr. SANFORD. Oh, no; nothing can do that.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman replies that nothing can do that.

Mr. SANFORD. Nothing; that is, that can be done at this session of Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, that is quite a different proposition.

Mr. SANFORD. I will come to that.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman come to that?

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

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

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

Mr. ADAIR. Has the gentleman taken notice of the fact that the State from which I come, the northern State of Indiana, is represented by 11 Democratic Congressmen, one of whom is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and that each one of these 11 was elected by probably as large a vote as the gentleman from New York received, and that one gentleman of those 11, who is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, figured in reporting to the House the revenue bill, as well as did the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

Mr. SANFORD. I am not discussing the revenue bill. I would rather not get into that. I was interrupted by a gentleman who brought it up, and the gentleman's remark can apply to his inquiry.

Mr. ADAIR. Then I shall apply it to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I find that I must refuse further to yield.

These figures quoted above clearly show why the party in power at the present time is perfectly willing to commit itself to a harmless publicity statute while it keeps off the statute books laws to prevent corrupt practices at elections.

I am in favor of the passage of this bill, although I believe it to be merely a halting step. I am in favor of voting for it because I am perfectly confident that no effective law on this subject could be passed in this Congress.

If we start consideration of this subject with the assumption that money is improperly used in political campaigns and with the assumption that elections are not honestly conducted throughout the different States of the Union, one may well question whether or not the power given to Congress by section 4 of Article I of the Constitution does not carry with it a duty that is coextensive with that power and an obligation that is definite. [Applause.]

The provision of the Constitution is as follows:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

The framers of the Constitution apparently clearly foresaw that the time might come that the States would fail in their duty in this matter of holding elections, and reserved to the Congress, it seems to me, the fullest power to make regulations affecting the manner of conducting elections. New conditions, however, not foreseen by the writers of the Constitution, have arisen which emphasize the obligation of Congress to cure the evil of corrupt practice at election if such evil in fact exists, and I for one believe that it does. The new conditions of which I speak are those that have grown out of the introduction of the direct primary. In a large number of congressional districts to-day the direct primary election is for all practical purposes the final election. In those districts the only real contest is the contest at the direct primary. The result of the primary election is final. Those are the districts in which one or the other political party is so strong that its candidates are either wholly unopposed or so weakly opposed that the final election may be said to be uncontested. It is in the conduct of the direct primary contest in such cases that money is spent. It is probably a fact that in many congressional districts fully as much money is spent by congressional candidates and their supporters in these days in seeking to be chosen at the primary election as is spent in the final election contest itself. The improper use of money to control the result of the direct primary is just as vicious and threatens just as seriously the stability of the Government as the improper use of money in the campaign for final election.

At each stage in the development of the law which the pending bill seeks to amend it has been strenuously objected, both in this House and in the Senate, that Congress has no authority to interfere with or in any manner to regulate direct primary elections. These objections, however, have been overridden, and Congress has assumed the authority to the extent to which these bills have gone to regulate the use of money at the primary election, as well as at the final election. If the Congress has operated within its constitutional authority in going to the extent to which it has already gone, it seems clear to my mind that it not only has authority but it must also recognize the obligation to do all within its power to regulate the manner of holding both primary and final elections to such an extent that it may be said that it has done its whole duty to promote the purity and honesty of elections.

The bill before us, without any partisan distinctions, has received the unanimous approval of the members of the committee. It probably represents the best that can be done at this time. It would, it seems to me, however, be unwise to claim that much good will be accomplished by this bill. Its influence to accomplish purity in elections is decidedly an indirect influence. I do not pretend to be able to accurately estimate the total number of reports that will be required by this bill. It is something like 20,000.

Reports are required of every candidate and of each candidate before and after the primary election, and before and after the final election. It requires also reports of all committees, associations, and organizations, whether political or not, of all their transactions with reference to money expended or promises given for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the result of any such elections. How many such committees there will be or how many candidates in the 435 congressional districts of the country I do not know, nor does anybody else.

Every detail is required to make complete paper record of financial transactions that may effect the result of the elections. I can not imagine how Congress can do any more than is being done under this bill to make publicity possible.

The point that I am trying to make is that it is easy to accomplish publicity, but that we are accomplishing very little toward promoting purity. Under the direct-primary system

it has been commonly and constantly claimed that the rich man has a distinct advantage and the poor man has no chance.

Without having any evidence to offer, I should be unwilling to say as a fact that the political committees and the candidates who have been making reports under this law have not truthfully and accurately reported their expenditures, although I may be permitted to say that from many conversations with many people I have gained the impression that it is generally understood that it is not a difficult thing to make a report as to campaign expenses. If this bill does no more than impress upon the mind of the candidate for Congress the fact that if he inaccurately and untruthfully reports as to his campaign expenses he is a criminal and unfit to take his seat it will perhaps have done much. The crime, however, of violating this act is one that is not easily detected. I can not find that anyone has been convicted of violating this act since its original passage in 1910. From that fact, however, I do not draw the conclusion that many persons have not violated it, and violated it willfully.

I do not know that anything can be done further than is being done to enforce honest obedience to the provisions of this law. But what I am trying to point out is the fact that the law does not, and probably can not, do much to embarrass those who are inclined to purchase public office, for a person so criminally inclined surely can not hesitate to falsely report the amount of his disbursements.

I have no doubt that the vast number of men who are or who have sought to be or who have sought to become Members of the Senate or House of Representatives feel themselves morally bound by the limitations of this law. As to such persons and as to all persons who are mentally honest the law would be sufficient if it merely fixed the limit of disbursement. One of the primary purposes of providing for publicity is to control the acts of those who desire to use more money than that limited, or who desire to use and do use money for corrupt purposes.

This committee has taken the position which is clearly described by its learned chairman in his report, where he says that—

> No attempt is here made, nor in any part of this bill, to limit the expenditure of money used in an effort to reach the judgment of electors. Appeal to the mind and judgment of men by political parties and candidates for political office is commendable and is encouraged by every section and provision of this bill.

The purpose of the bill, as the chairman points out, is to prevent the use of money "to demoralize, corrupt, and debauch the electorate." The root of the evil, therefore, at which this bill with its indirect influence is aiming is the purchased vote. The scheme of the bill by which it attempts to use this indirect influence is to require an accurate account of the collection and distribution of all money by candidates and committees in the hope that in this manner men will be prevented from using money for a corrupt purpose because of the fact that they are required to account for the money. I can not be very optimistic with reference to the curative value of this bill. A person who would use money to buy votes is a criminal. The bill simply requires, therefore, of the criminal who would debauch the electorate that he add to his crime the further and much easier crime of falsely reporting his act.

What I am saying, however, is not any criticism of this bill, which I sincerely hope will pass the House. I merely desire to point out how Congress has the clear duty to deal further with this matter of corrupt practices by reenacting the statute repealed in 1894.

There has grown up in this country a wholesome regard for the Federal criminal laws. Such laws are feared more than the statutes of any of the States. The long arm and the farseeing eye of the Federal Government under such a statute would now go a great way, in my judgment, to persuade men that it is a dangerous thing to attempt to demoralize, corrupt, and debauch the electorate. The repealed statutes were well within the supervisory power of Congress under that provision of the Constitution which I have cited, giving to Congress the right to make and alter regulations affecting the manner of holding elections. The Supreme Court of the United States, in Ex parte Seibold (100 U. S., p. 372), speaking on this subject, says:

> In making regulations for the election of Representatives it is not necessary that Congress should assume entire and exclusive control thereof. By virtue of that clause of the Constitution which declares that "the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators," Congress has a supervisory power over the subject and may either make entirely new regulations or add to, alter, or modify the regulations made by the State.
>
> In the exercise of such supervisory power Congress may impose new duties on the officers of election or additional penalties for breach of duty or for the perpetration of fraud or provide for the attendance of officers to prevent fraud and see that the elections are legally and fairly conducted.
>
> The exercise of such power can properly cause no collision of regulations or jurisdiction, because the authority of Congress over the subject is paramount, and any regulations it may make necessarily supersede inconsistent regulations of the State. This is involved in the power to "make or alter."

Mr. Chief Justice Bradley, in the opinion in that case, uses the following language appropriate to this discussion:

> It is the duty of the States to elect Representatives to Congress. The due and fair election of these Representatives is of vital importance to the United States. The Government of the United States is no less concerned in the transaction than the State government is. It certainly is not bound to stand by as a passive spectator when duties are violated and outrageous frauds are committed.

In Ex parte Yarbrough (110 U. S., 664) the Supreme Court used the following language with reference to the right of Congress to regulate elections at which Members of Congress are chosen:

> Will it be denied that it is in the power of that body to provide laws for the proper conduct of those elections; to provide, if necessary, the officers who shall conduct them and make return of the result, and especially to provide in an election held under its own authority for security of life and limb to the voter while in the exercise of this function? Can it be doubted that Congress can by law protect the act of voting, the place where it is done, and the man who votes from personal violence or intimidation and the election itself from corruption and fraud?
>
> If this be so—and it is not doubted—are such powers annulled because an election for State officers is held at the same time and place? Is it any less important that the election of Members of Congress should be the free choice of all the electors because State officers are to be elected at the same time?
>
> These questions answer themselves; and it is only because the Congress of the United States, through long habit and long years of forbearance, has in deference and respect to the States refrained from the exercise of these powers that they are now doubted.

In James *v.* Bowman (190 U. S., 127) the Supreme Court held section 5507, Revised Statutes, to be unconstitutional. This section was designed to punish persons who by means of bribery or certain threats should intimidate or prevent the exercise of the right of suffrage to persons protected by the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution. In this case the court, in holding this particular statute unconstitutional, used the following language:

> We are fully sensible of the great wrong which results from bribery at elections, and do not question the power of Congress to punish such offenses when committed in respect to the election of Federal officers.

The interest of the Government, therefore, being of such vital importance, the authority of Congress in the matter being so unquestioned, the existence of the evil of corrupt practice being recognized by the pendency of this bill, is it not a fact that the obligation is on Congress to recognize the evil, to again exercise its authority, and to meet its obligations? [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FLOOD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2845) authorizing the sale of the marine-hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6279. An act for the relief of William Harold Kehoe.

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. 6279. An act for the relief of William Harold Kehoe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLICITY OF CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of a uniform corrupt-practice act applied to all of the States in the election of Members of Congress. I think it is unfortunate that while we are dealing with this general subject we are proposing to do it in the wholly inadequate way proposed by this bill. Ordinarily Federal statutes dealing with matters which have formerly been under the jurisdiction of the State legislatures are passed with a view of securing uniformity of laws with respect to the general subject. There are now corrupt-practice acts in many of the States. These acts differ in many essential features. This law would create no uniformity with respect to these laws whatever. It only serves to increase the complications and discriminations which now exist. For instance, as has been stated, in the State of Missouri, represented by the

distinguished chairman of the committee that reports this bill, there is a limit of approximately $600 or $700 in the amount that he can legally expend. This law will in no way affect that, although in those States in which there is now no limitation whatever the candidate will be limited only by the amount specified in this bill. In my own State there is a requirement that a candidate shall report all of his expenditures, including expenditures which are specified in this bill and expenditures which are not specified in this bill.

Mr. COLEMAN. Does the gentleman not think that such a law is a good deal better than the one before us now?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do think so. I have no doubt of that whatever. That is one objection to this bill—it repeals State laws which are better than this bill. The law is in many respects wholly and utterly inadequate.

Mr. MAPES. How does it repeal any State law?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will answer that question. This bill contains on its face a recognition of its own inadequacy. It provides it shall only repeal or supersede State laws in those particulars in which it is in conflict with State laws. The same provision is carried in the existing law, but in the State which I have the honor to represent in part the Attorney General has held that, with respect to the limit and with respect to the statement to be filed under the State law, the present law repeals the State law. I do not know how much further his decision goes, but it goes that far.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman believe Congress can pass a measure——

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. Does not this bill expressly provide that the State laws shall be in force as far as they pertain to elections?

Mr. ANDERSON. It does, and so does the present law; but the gentleman is familiar, I think, with the rule of law that where the Federal Government undertakes to deal with a subject it enters that field exclusively, and so the Attorney General has held that it does repeal the sections of our law which requires a full report and which fixes a limit upon the expenditure.

Mr. WALSH. Is the gentleman of opinion that Congress can enact a law which will abrogate State laws pertaining to the election of Members of the House and the Senate?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have no doubt of it whatever.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will.

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman will look at section 16 of the bill he will find that it is expressly provided that—

> This act shall not be construed to annul or vitiate the laws of any State, not directly in conflict herewith, relating to the nomination or election of candidates for the offices herein named, or to exempt any such candidate from complying with such State laws.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. But it is in conflict with many of the best and most salutary provisions of existing State laws. It requires statements to be filed concerning certain disbursements of the candidate at certain times and in certain places, while the State laws require statements to be filed at other times and at other places, with respect to other and different disbursements of the candidate. It is in conflict with the State law wherever it differs from the State law in its requirements, but as the gentleman has said, because it does not specifically repeal the State law, the candidate, for his own protection, must comply with both, and in those States where statements are required to be filed at other times and places than are specified in this bill, and as to other disbursements, the candidate must keep two separate accounts, and file anywhere from 16 to 24 separate statements of his receipts and expenditures. This is no small task in the middle of a campaign. But I was addressing myself particularly to the fact that this bill does not create uniformity of law with respect to corrupt practices in elections, but, on the contrary, only perpetuates the discriminations which now exist between the different States, and complicates the difficulties of the candidate.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. EMERSON. As suggested by the chairman of the committee, it does not vitiate any State law, unless directly in conflict with it. Does that pertain to the amount expended? Suppose the amount the State allowed a candidate for Congress to expend was $1,000 or $2,000 and this allows $2,500; would that be construed as being in conflict?

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman does not state it correctly. The law as it stands now and the language in this bill is that no candidate for Senator or Representative may spend any larger or greater sum than he can lawfully spend under the laws of the State in which he resides, provided that the total amount that he may expend does not exceed $5,000. Now, then, if the State law limits the amount to $10,000, on the face of the law it would be in conflict, and it could be cut down to $5,000, but if the State puts a lower limit than $5,000, the law recognizes the validity of the act.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman from Missouri, of course, will recognize the fact that that is an injustice. There is no reason why a man should be permitted to spend $5,000 in one congressional district because he lives in the State of Minnesota and be limited to $600 because he lives in the State of Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER. I grant the gentleman is right, that there should be uniformity, but the States have acted, and the States have not thus far acted with uniformity. Now, we ought to fix the law so that we invite the States to legislate along the line of this bill and try to bring about a condition which will create uniformity.

Mr. ANDERSON. We have here the power to create uniformity. We are not obliged to wait for the States to conform to the statute we may pass here. We have the power here to create uniformity.

Mr. RUCKER. Well, the gentleman will appreciate this: If the law of my State or yours fixes a certain limitation and Congress puts a higher limitation, and the gentleman or I would say that we spent the money under the authority of a law of Congress, while in the final analysis we might not be amenable under the State law, we would be amenable to the criticism and animadversion of every man who indorses the State law, which would put a gentleman to great disadvantage.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that when Congress undertakes to deal with a general subject that it ought to deal with the general subject adequately, and if it assumes jurisdiction of a proposition, it ought to assume the jurisdiction to the exclusion of the State. It ought to create, so far as possible, a general uniformity in the law which will put all candidates for the same office on the same footing.

Mr. RUCKER. I want to qualify what I said a little while ago. I feel there should be uniformity just as far as practicable, but, if the gentleman will bear with me, I have heard Members on this floor say that in certain districts in the United States it would be harsh and unjust to put them on the $5,000 limitation for the reason of their having different nationalities in their district, many of whom could not understand the language which the Member speaks, and that he must have printing done in this language and have printing done in that language and printing in some other language in order to reach those people.

Mr. ANDERSON. You do that very thing in this bill. You limit every Member of Congress to $2,500 for the expenses which are specified under the bill. But the fellow who is limited by State laws to a less sum than that is still limited by that law.

Mr. RUCKER. The reason the congressional act put it at $2,500 is because Congress in its judgment thought $2,500 would be sufficient to meet the conditions in any district.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with that. This bill is inadequate in many respects. It contains no definition as to what are legal expenditures under the law. In other words, there is no section in this bill which defines the purposes for which a candidate may expend money. He may under this bill hire any number of persons to go out and exercise their influence throughout his district for the purpose of influencing the election without violating any provision of the bill whatever.

He may spend a million dollars for advertising, outside of the newspapers, without violating any section of this bill. He may spend a hundred thousand dollars on speakers and bands without incurring the slightest penalty under its provisions. He may send a telegram to every voter in the congressional district without incurring any penalty under this bill. He may do all of these things without making any account whatever of the expenditure, but if his State law prohibits expenditures for these purposes or limits such expenditures, he is subject to all of the penalties of the laws of the State. This law will not encourage the passage of corrupt practice acts in the States; it only exempts candidates in States which have no corrupt practice act from the penalties to which other candidates in States that have corrupt practice acts are subject. I again repeat, that while we are dealing with this subject we ought to deal with it adequately and in such a way as to put the candidates of all the parties and of all the States upon an equal footing before the law.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I had not intended to make a speech on this bill, and I am not going to speak on the merits of the bill, but inasmuch as a moment ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD] reviewed at some length the number of votes polled in some of the Southern States, and mentioned particularly the State which I have the honor in part to represent—the great State of Texas—I wish to say the gentleman is not familiar with the conditions in that section of the country. We have laws protecting the ballot there, but our great fight is in the primary election, and if he were to be in Texas a week from next Saturday he would find out whether or not the people of that great State take an interest in their public affairs; because they go to the ballot box almost as one man to express themselves on the issues before the people and on the candidates that are up for nomination. But the nomination in the primary election settles everything in that section of the country. We do not have an opposition ticket at the general election. My district has a population of something like 215,000 people, and polls about 25,000 votes in the primary election. In the general election I have no opposing candidate, and the governor, as a rule, has no opposing candidate, and in my district from 12,000 to 15,000 votes are polled at the general election. Everything is settled at the primary, and hence there is nothing that calls for a general turnout at the general election. And I want to make this suggestion: In the strong Republican districts in the North and the East, I dare say, where the Democratic opposition amounts to nothing, or scarcely nothing, in your primary election you have not a full representation of your citizenship.

Mr. EMERSON. Will you give some of us fellows from the North a few pointers as to how you keep this opposition at the election out?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I will tell you about it. When a Republican from the North comes South he finds such a fine bunch of people who are members of the Democratic Party that forthwith he becomes a Democrat.

Mr. MANN. Why do you not send some here?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. They send enough to take care of the interests of the country on the floor of this House.

I rise, Mr. Chairman, to put this feature of the elections in the South before the House. I say the general turnout is on the primary day and that the ballot boxes are protected by the laws of the various States. Every man has a right to go and has a right to be protected when he goes to the ballot box and casts his vote.

Mr. FOCHT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania——

Mr. FOCHT. Will you answer the question?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. When you say we tax the North, I want to say to you that if you will go into my State——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. I asked whether the gentleman will yield or not.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was trying to find out if the gentleman from Texas would yield. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. In a moment. If you go to my State, you will find that the steel bridges that cross the streams of my county come from the great State of Pennsylvania, and we pay for them out of the products that we grow in the South—the great cotton crop, that goes to your country to help bless and clothe the people of your section. It is one great country, and we have diverse interests, and we feel that all these interests should be taken care of alike.

Mr. FOCHT. Does that answer my question?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I was answering what the gentleman asked a moment ago.

Mr. FOCHT. You just stated a moment ago about how you were going to have those seats filled again with Democrats. May I ask you on the square, my brother and friend, how many Democrats you would have left over there if they were sent here on the basis of the number of votes cast instead of on the basis of population?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. There would not be a vacant seat on this side, sir.

Mr. FOCHT. Will you yield me a minute further?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. To ask a question. I am not yielding for a speech.

Mr. FOCHT. You are making a speech and I am asking you questions. I ask you how many Democrats now sit there in defiance, if not in violation, of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Not a single man, and the imputation is unworthy of the gentleman who makes it.

Mr. FOCHT. I refer you to the statistics read by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD] as my answer.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, while everybody is in a good humor I move that the committee do now rise. [Laughter.]

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15842) to revise, amend, and codify the laws relating to publicity of contributions and expenditures made for the purpose of influencing the nomination and election of candidates for the offices of Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States, extending the same to candidates for nomination and election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, limiting the amount which may be expended, providing for the publicity of campaign expenses, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. COOPER of Ohio, indefinitely, on account of illness, at the request of Mr. FESS.

To Mr. LINDBERGH, indefinitely, on account of the dangerous illness of his daughters.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 16911. An act making an appropriation for the relief and transportation of destitute American citizens in Mexico.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of aeronautics, by printing a brief memorandum prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Congressional Library.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a memorandum on aeronautics prepared by the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Congressional Library. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Considering that we are pretty much in the air, I shall not object. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks by printing the speech of the President of the United States before the Salesmen's Convention at Detroit.

The SPEAKER. What speech?

Mr. MANN. Just another campaign speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. BEAKES. The speech of the President before the Salesmen's Convention at Detroit.

The SPEAKER. By printing the speech of the President before the Salesmen's Convention at Detroit. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of "The birth of a nation."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on "The birth of a nation." Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a lecture delivered at Yale University by Mr. W. H. Phipps, of Ohio, late auditor general of the Philippine Islands.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, was this gentleman a Member of Congress?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No. He was auditor of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. FOSTER. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article written by Mr. STINESS, of Rhode Island, in regard to the condition of the country after the European war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an article written by Mr. STINESS in regard to the condition of the country after the European war. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 16911. An act making an appropriation for the relief and transportation of destitute American citizens in Mexico.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, July 14, 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 reexamination of harbor of refuge, Grand Marais, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 1286), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and a joint resolution were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. DICKINSON, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (S. 5645) for the establishment of Noyes, in the State of Minnesota, as a port of entry and delivery for immediate transportation without appraisement of dutiable merchandise, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 962), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16417) to provide for the exportation of gin in bond in other than original packages, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 963), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 386) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as the "Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 964), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 50) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the coal deposits in and under certain public lands to the Republic Coal Co., a corporation, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 965), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and a resolution were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr YOUNG of North Dakota, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 798) for the relief of Kate Canniff, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 954), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAPSTICK, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1963) for the relief of John E. Keys, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 955), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3533) for the relief of Mike G. Womack, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 956), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAPSTICK, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15797) for the relief of Charles L. Schroeder, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 957), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5020) for the reimbursement of Horace M. Blunt for the loss of a horse while hired by the United States Geological Survey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 958), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2205) for the relief of Robert T. Legge, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 959), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12240) for the relief of John Brodie, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 960), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2210) for the relief of James Diamond for horse lost while hired by the United States Forest Service, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 961), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SWIFT, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12204) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to audit and adjust certain claims of the city of New York to the Court of Claims, reported in lieu thereof H. Res. 305, accompanied by a report (No. 966), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. CAPSTICK, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13294) for the relief of Henry Hotchner, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 967), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. SWIFT, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8781) for the relief of William E. Horton, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 968), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9076) for the relief of Alfred Sjostrom, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 969), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9036) for the relief of Sidney G. Sherwood, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 970), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. CAPSTICK, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13017) for the relief of M. Elizabeth Rochford, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 971), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5040) for the relief of John M. Dimmick, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 972), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 16971) to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture, the trades, commerce, industries, and home economics; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers and supervisors of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 16972) to enlarge, extend, remodel, and improve the public building at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 16973) fixing the rate of pay of compositors and bookbinders in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SWIFT [from the Committee on Claims]: Resolution (H. Res. 305) referring the bill (H. R. 12204) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to audit and adjust certain claims of the city of New York to the Court of Claims; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 264) authorizing a joint committee to investigate certain representations relative to Roman Catholic organizations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 16974) for the relief of John L. Kelley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 16975) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Dolly Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRUKKER: A bill (H. R. 16976) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Post; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 16977) to authorize the President to reinstate Guy H. B. Smith, formerly captain, Fourth United States Infantry, in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 16978) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Kyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16979) granting a pension to Patrick H. Madigan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 16980) for the relief of Edward N. Carr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 16981) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16982) granting an increase of pension to Christian Lock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 16983) granting an increase of pension to Arvesta M. Conrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 16984) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16985) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Smiley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 16986) for the relief of the heirs of William E. Bradshaw; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16987) for the relief of the heirs of Elijah Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 16988) granting an increase of pension to Bentley Briant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of citizens of Lincoln County, Mo., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, (by request), petition of Delaware Branch of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, favoring amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of Admiral R. D. Evans Camp, No. 33, United States Spanish War Veterans, of Sacramento, Cal., favoring Nolan minimum-wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of William Fox, of New York City, against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Security League, relative to military training in public schools; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Delaware Branch of Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, relative to amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of William Fox, of New York City, against bill to tax theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Mrs. Caroline McDowell, of Providence, R. I., favoring amendment for woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Edward J. Rosenstein, Baltimore, Md., favoring bill for Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Evidence supporting House bill 16928, to grant a pension to Michael Levi; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Alfred G. Langley, Newport, R. I., relative to location of power plant in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Rhode Island Bankers' Association, relative to amendments of Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Providence Chamber of Commerce, favoring appropriation for aero coast-patrol system; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Protests of Francis Carr and Roscoe J. Anderson, of Redding, and California Producers' Association, of San Francisco, Cal., against further tax on copper and copper industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protests by Dudley V. Saeltzer and W. J. Harrington, chairman Democratic County Central Committee, of Redding, Cal., against further tax on copper and copper industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of sundry citizens of Colorado, against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *July 14, 1916.*

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

Almighty God, Thy name is above every name. We desire Thee above all the earth. Thou hast brought to us the rich and manifold ministries of Thy grace. Thou dost hold us in Thy hand. We desire Thy favor above all the favor of men. We would work into all the institutions of our land the will and the purpose of God. Every thought to usward has been a thought of love and of protection and of fatherly mercy. We bless Thee that to-day our lives are in Thy hands and the destiny of our great Nation is in Thy keeping.

We pray that this day Thou wilt guide us in the way of truth. Guard us from every evil thing. May the full expression of our lives be the going forth of the influence and power of Thy truth and Thy spirit in us that we may maintain the high ideals given to us by our fathers who received them as they supplicated the throne of the heavenly grace.

Guide us this day. Forgive our sins. For Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

On request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, July 7, 1916, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I note 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:

Brady	Gallinger	Overman	Taggart
Brandegee	Hollis	Owen	Thomas
Bryan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Shafroth	Tillman
Chamberlain	Jones	Sheppard	Underwood
Chilton	Kenyon	Simmons	Wadsworth
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Smith, Ga.	Warren
Culberson	La Follette	Smith, S. C.	Williams
Curtis	Lodge	Smoot	Works
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Sterling	
Fletcher	Oliver	Swanson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. ASHURST, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. RANSDELL, Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. TOWNSEND answered to their names when called.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. LANE] is detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and to state that he is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. NELSON, Mr. BORAH, Mr. MCCUMBER, Mr. HARDWICK, Mr. LEE of Maryland, Mr. VARDAMAN, and Mr. PITTMAN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.