Washington for the inauguration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the United Hatters of North America, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of legislation for the reduction of tariff on hats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Waterville (N. Y.) school, favoring the passage of the McLean bill granting Federal protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of citizens of New York, favoring the passage of the McLean bill for granting Federal aid to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *February 22, 1913.*

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the Providence which brings us to this day of holy and patriotic memory. In the light of the great example of him whom Thou wast pleased to make the father or our country, we here, with grateful and adoring hearts, consecrate ourselves anew to the service of this Thy people. Receive our offering, we pray Thee, and grant that by Thy grace this may be that happy Nation whose God is the Lord.

O God, who dost commit unto us the swift and solemn charge of life, we thank Thee for the life, the character, and the public service of him whom our lips shall this day name. We can not forget him who labored by our side, who shared our counsels, and who brake with us the bread of life. We honor ourselves, our Father, in honoring him who honored Thee. Despite our loneliness, we are the richer because such have lived. Though his body is buried in peace, his name liveth, and his memory is henceforth safely enshrined in our hearts.

We pray Thee, our heavenly Father, to comfort those to whom this sorrow is most bitter and to whom this loss is most sore. Grant, we humbly pray Thee, that their hearts may evermore be in unbroken communion with his emancipated spirit. Quiet their restless and yearning hearts, until the day of the fuller life shall break and the shadows of our earthly sorrows shall flee away.

In the name of Him who abolished death and brought life and immortality to light, hear Thou our prayer. Amen.

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

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. GALLINGER). Pursuant to the order heretofore made by the Senate that upon this day Washington's Farewell Address shall be read to the Senate, and in accordance with the designation made by the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BRANDEGEE, will now execute the order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE read the address, as follows:

To the people of the United States.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country, and that in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness, but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this previous to the last election had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you, but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety, and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed toward the organization and administration of the Government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself, and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country for the many honors it has conferred upon me, still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me, and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which, not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts and a guaranty of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which can not end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger natural to that solicitude urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation and to recommend to your frequent review some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies wil be most constantly

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

and actively, though often covertly and insidiously, directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it, accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity, watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety, discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint counsels and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The North in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The South in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the North, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the North it finds its particular navigation invigorated, and while it contributes in different ways to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength to which itself is unequally adapted. The East in a like intercourse with the West already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water will more and more find, a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad or manufactures at home. The West derives from the East supplies requisite to its growth and comfort, and, what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one nation. Any other tenure by which the West can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While, then, every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined can not fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations, and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government, which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations—northern and southern, Atlantic and western—whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You can not shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heartburnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the Executive and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the General Government and in the Atlantic States unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties—that with Great Britain and that with Spain—which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, toward confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This Government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government; but the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established Government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the Nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Toward the preservation of your Government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what can not be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited,

remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the State, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight), the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the Government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This, within certain limits, is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest, instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments, ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation, for, though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that toward the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object, which is always a choice of difficulties, ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations, cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas, is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by

pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils. Such an attachment of a small or weak toward a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence—I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens—the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

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

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

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

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world—so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it—for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But, in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

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

Harmony and a liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences, consulting the natural course of things, diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the Government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will control the usual current of the passions or prevent our Nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations—but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good, that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism, this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself the assurance of my own conscience is that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your Representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take and was bound in duty and interest to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity toward other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence, and that, after 45 years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things and actuated by that fervent love toward it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize,

without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking in the midst of my fellow citizens the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES, *17th September, 1796.*

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 1101).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the War Department, for the fiscal year 1914, for barracks and quarters, roads, walks, wharves, and drainage, water and sewers at military posts, $780,428, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN NATIONAL BANKS (S. DOC. NO. 1103).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 11th instant, information relative to the order directing certain changes in the method of handling receipts and disbursements of the Government. The communication and accompanying papers will be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and the communication will be ordered printed in the RECORD.

The communication is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 21, 1913.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: By direction of the President, I have the honor to make reply to the inquiry contained in the resolution of the Senate agreed to February 11, 1913, concerning the order which went into effect on February 1, directing certain changes in the methods of handling the receipts and disbursements of the Government.

Before the establishment of the national banking system in 1863, the Government's fiscal machinery consisted principally of the Treasury and the Subtreasuries. A predominating feature of this system, still in part prevailing, is that it requires the use of money as distinguished from checks in the daily fiscal operations of the Government; that is to say, an Assistant Treasurer can only issue certificates of deposit to collection officers upon the receipt of currency—can only accept their collections in actual money; and checks drawn on the Subtreasuries are paid in actual money.

The national bank act (sec. 5153, Rev. Stat.) provided that all national banks, when designated as depositaries by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be the financial agents of the Government; and in them may be deposited the revenues "except receipts from customs." So that since 1863 all revenues except from customs could be and mainly have been deposited in banks like the funds of private persons, and those of State, municipal, and other governments. Congress removed the restriction as to customs by an act approved March 4, 1907, entitled "An act to amend the national bank act and for other purposes" and thus abolished an exception that had ceased to have any use and had become a mere survival. Under the above provision of the national bank act it has been the practice for many years to have the banks receive internal-revenue taxes and transmit them to the subtreasuries. In the year 1870—in order to meet the public convenience and to conform to general business customs—collectors of internal revenue began to take checks in payment of internal revenue; but did so at their personal risk. When, at the request of the Treasury Department, this form of payment was made legal by the act of March 2, 1911, the practice had already become universal as to internal revenue. Up to that time, however, customs payments were still made in currency—though some practical mitigations of this cumbersome practice had in the course of the years been introduced. Since the passage of the act of 1911, both customs and internal revenue are paid by check. But, as stated, notwithstanding the present legal practice of receiving checks in payment of customs and internal revenue, these checks must be cashed before the proceeds can be deposited in the Subtreasuries. In all Subtreasury cities except Cincinnati and Philadelphia this is done through the agency of the clearing house.

As the daily payments of the Government are practically equal to its daily income, the desirability of a method whereby the receipts and payments shall clear each other is apparent; and the method to be complete should bring about this clearing before the point is reached of converting the checks into currency in the Subtreasuries. The new plan, regarding which the Senate has made inquiry, is designed to accomplish this result, and will accomplish it as a matter of course.

Its operation can not result in an automatic accumulation of Government funds in national-bank depositories, for there are the restrictive regulations which are applied under section 5153 of the Revised Statutes to national banks holding Government funds. Under these restrictions every national-bank depositary is required to have on deposit with the Treasurer of the United States security in the form of bonds to the full amount of the authorized balance the Government has with the bank. I say authorized balance, because the limit of the deposits in each bank is fixed by the Treasury Department and usually continues at one amount for a considerable time; and under the new plan these strictly limited amounts, secured by bonds, will be dependent upon the amount of the daily business done by the bank for the Government. With special exceptions these bonds have been either Government bonds or bonds for which the Government is financially responsible. The bank is permitted to hold the amount of its authorized deposit with which to transact the Government's business, but must transfer immediately all amounts in excess of this authorized balance from whatever source received. The department directs these transfers under standing instructions to the points where funds are needed for payments. Under this system the depositary banks have for years handled the entire income from internal revenue without any accumulation of funds in the banks in excess of their authorized balances. Last year internal-revenue receipts exceeded the income from customs, amounting to $321,612,199.

Under the new plan customs receipts are to be handled in the same manner as the internal revenues—under the excellent and progressive law of March 4, 1907; and, of course, with the restrictions and limitations on the banks unchanged.

Moreover, in times like the present, when the Government's income and outgo practically offset each other, it is hardly necessary to take seriously the fear that the deposits in New York banks will be increased by hundreds of millions. Before you can deposits hundreds of millions you must have the money.

Why this law of 1907 was not availed of at once I do not know. I authorized the preparation of plans to put it into effect as soon as I heard of it, which was about September 1 of last year.

Instead of the authorized balances held by banks being more or less inactive as they have been in the past, a feature of the new plan provides that the banks shall pay the checks of disbursing officers which are now drawn on the Treasurer of the United States instead of on the banks or Subtreasuries and charge the same to the account of the Treasurer, in whose name the funds in the bank are deposited. Section 3593 of the Revised Statutes provides that "All public moneys paid into any depositary shall be subject to the draft of the Treasurer of the United States, drawn agreeably to appropriations made by law." Section 3620 of the Revised Statutes authorizes disbursing officers to keep their accounts with the Treasurer of the United States and with Assistant Treasurers. The accounts or credits of all disbursing officers have accordingly now been placed with the Treasurer of the United States, as authorized. No balances are held in any banks to the credit of disbursing officers; but all Government moneys in the banks are to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States. This feature of the new plan makes it possible for the first time for the Treasury to have a far more exact daily knowledge of the financial accounts of the Government; for against the credit given each disbursing officer with the Treasurer of the United States is charged the checks drawn by the disbursing officer and paid by the depositary banks and Subtreasuries and sent daily to the Treasury. The banks making these payments for the Government out of their authorized balance are furnished daily with Government deposits sufficient to restore the balance to its fixed amount. In this way, as previously stated, the daily income will in the banks meet and clear the daily expenses of the Government, and only the excess of income over disbursements will be deposited in currency with the Subtreasuries.

Another advantage of the new plan which is of peculiar importance is the added convenience to the creditors of the Government. Checks drawn on the Treasurer of the United States are now good at par wherever they may be presented, since any depositary will pay them. Particularly will this benefit pensioners. Heretofore in a great many cases exchange has been charged pensioners by banks in cashing their checks because they were payable only at Subtreasuries or the Treasury. The new plan for pension payments, approved by Congress August 17, 1912, became effective February 1, and was the controlling reason for fixing that date for making the entire change.

The purpose, therefore, of the new system is to so handle the Government's income as to meet its payments with the same convenience to its creditors and with the same par values that are customary in the best regulated private business, and so that only the excess of Government receipts shall find its way into the Treasury or Subtreasuries.

One of the necessary requirements of the plan is the distribution of the revenues to the banks in just the proper amounts to keep their authorized balances filled. Another requirement of the plan is to make those authorized balances suited to the amount and character of the business done; that is to say, to give them funds just in proportion to the payments they make for the Government. Up to the present time, under the new system, the bank balances have still been replenished by transfers direct from the Subtreasuries. The feature of depositing customs receipts direct with the banks—which has not yet been begun in the Subtreasury cities, and is therefore not yet in full operation—will obviate much of the necessity for these transfers. These deposits, however, will not exceed the payments made by the banks.

It may be stated that in the brief trial the new plan has had it is working satisfactorily. The department has found itself able to handle the accounts and take care of all of the disbursements throughout the country without serious hitch. Of course, in making such a comprehensive change, it must be expected that there will be details to adjust, all of which require a little time. Meanwhile the banks throughout the country have cooperated cordially.

The necessity under the new plan of having additional depositary banks in the subtreasury cities made necessary an adjustment of the bank accounts in general. This resulted in net increased deposits being made amounting to a total of $363,000. While no depositaries were discontinued, there has been ordered withdrawn from existing depositaries a total of $6,090,000; there has been added in new depositaries $6,453,000, making, as stated, a total increase in banks of $363,000. Of this sum $4,963,000 has been placed in the nine Subtreasury cities. The total amount in banks is approximately $50,000,000; but as the reductions ordered are to take place on March 1 this amount will be cut down to approximately $46,000,000 at that time. Security has been required to the full amount of the deposits, consisting of United States bonds, District of Columbia, Porto Rico, Hawaiian, Philippine, Philippine Railway, and Manila Railway bonds. No interest is or ever has been charged on these deposits, as they constitute the active accounts of the Government upon which no interest charge is contemplated by law.

In making new depositaries it has been specified to each that the balances would be adjusted from time to time to meet the Government needs.

The total payments made by the Subtreasuries during the last fiscal year, which indicates also the amount of disbursing officers' accounts during that time, is as follows:

Baltimore	$14, 781, 760. 03
Boston	32, 636, 655. 40
Chicago	49, 946, 150. 02
Cincinnati	18, 923, 771. 38
New Orleans	16, 841, 291. 95
New York	276, 038, 159. 92
Philadelphia	34, 702, 796. 95
San Francisco	43, 436, 595. 97
St. Louis	33, 890, 565. 62
Washington	81, 854, 121. 97
Total	603, 051, 869. 21

There is transmitted a list of the depositary banks with their balances on December 31: a list of the depositaries added on account of the new system, and the amount of their balances; and a list of the banks holding inactive accounts upon which interest is paid to the Government. The postal savings funds are handled by the Post Office Department, and that feature of the resolution has been referred to the Postmaster General.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN MACVEAGH,
Secretary.

MRS. MARY MACARTHUR.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the secretary of state of the State of Wisconsin, transmitting a certified copy of a resolution adopted by the legislature of that State memorializing Congress to grant a life pension to the widow of the late Lieut. Gen. Arthur MacArthur.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that the communication and the resolution of the legislature may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Madison, Wis., February 20, 1913.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with the provisions of joint resolution No. 21, senate, I am transmitting herewith a copy of same.

Very truly, yours,

J. S. DONALD, *Secretary of State,*
Per COBBAN.

Senate joint resolution 21.

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to testify its appreciation of the great and distinguished services of the late Lieut. Gen. Arthur MacArthur throughout his life by voting to his widow a pension of $2,500 per year, as has been done in the cases of other officers of his rank.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senate of the United States and to the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from this State.

HOWARD TEASDALE,
President of the Senate.
MERLIN HULL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
F. M. WYLIE,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication and the resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin will be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, transmitting a certified copy of resolutions adopted by the General Court of that Commonwealth, petitioning for the submission of an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress power to regulate the hours of labor in the United States, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1913.

Resolutions relative to an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress power to regulate the hours of labor.

Resolved, That the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, believing that there is injustice both to industries and labor by reason of the lack of uniformity in the laws of the several States respecting hours of labor, respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States that Congress propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress power to regulate the hours of labor and to make the same uniform throughout the United States.

Resolved, That certified copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

In house of representatives, adopted, January 30, 1913.
In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 4, 1913.
A true copy. Attest:

FRANK J. DONOHUE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20102) relating to proof of signatures and handwritings.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the second committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 26680) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 28775) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 143) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for use at the meeting of the Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine to be held at Dallas, Tex., in May, 1913, 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. SLAYDEN, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. KAHN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 8178) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, 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. RUSSELL, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. FULLER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 8274) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, 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. RUSSELL, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. FULLER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 8275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, 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. RICHARDSON, Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WOOD of New Jersey managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 8314) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two House thereon, and had appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. FULLER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 22526) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ADAMSON, Mr. COVINGTON, and Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 28607) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, Mr. GARNER, and Mr. MCKINLEY managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 365) to permit Col. William C. Gorgas and certain other officers of the Medical Corps and certain officers of the Engineer Corps of the Army to accept service under the Republic of Ecuador, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SLAYDEN, Mr. DENT, and Mr. PRINCE managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Isaac Thompson;

H. R. 17260. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish in the Department of the Interior a Bureau of Mines," approved May 16, 1910;

H. R. 21220. An act to extend the power of the Commissioner General of Immigration, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor;

H. R. 22293. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Colorado Springs and of the town of Manitou, Colo.;

H. R. 23648. An act for the relief of David Crowther;

H. R. 26812. An act to provide for selection by the State of Idaho of phosphate and oil lands;

H. R. 27837. An act to authorize the Buckhannon & Northern Railroad Co. to construct and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River in the State of West Virginia; and

H. R. 28187. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across and over the Great Kanawha River, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented resolutions adopted by the board of aldermen of New York City, N. Y., favoring the construction of battleships at the New York Navy Yard, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Martinsburg, W. Va., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRISTOW presented memorials of sundry citizens of Herndon and Nekoma, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wakeeney, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the Government to loan money to farmers at a certain per cent, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GRONNA presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Stutsman County, N. Dak., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. I present resolutions adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring the submission of an amendment to the Constitution giving to Congress the power to regulate the hours of labor in the United States, which I ask be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

These resolutions have been already presented by the Chair and they were ordered printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WARREN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming indorsing and recommending the passage of House bill 27012, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, Frank L. Houx, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached copy of enrolled joint memorial No. 4, House of Representatives State of Wyoming, has been carefully compared with the original, filed in this office on the 18th day of February, A. D. 1913, and is a full, true, and correct copy of the same and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 18th day of February, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] FRANK L. HOUX,
Secretary of State,
By F. H. WESCOTT,
Deputy.

Original house joint memorial No. 5, Twelfth Legislature of the State of Wyoming.

Enrolled joint memorial 4, House of Representatives State of Wyoming.

Memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States relative to the expenditure of 25 per cent of the receipts from the national forests for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails within the national forests from the States in which such proceeds are derived.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

Whereas there was introduced in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States in the third session of the Sixty-second Congress, being House roll 27012, a bill providing for the expenditure of 25 per cent of the receipts from the national forests for road and trail construction; and

Whereas said bill provides for the expenditure of 25 per cent of all moneys received from the national forests for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails within the national forests in the States from which such proceeds are derived; and

Whereas we believe that a portion of such proceeds should be expended upon the development and advancement of the States within the boundaries of which are the resources which produced the revenue: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That we indorse and recommend passage of said bill.

MARTIN L. PRATT,
Speaker of the House.
BIRNEY H. SAGE,
President of the Senate.

Approved February 17, 1913, at 4.45 p. m.

JOSEPH M. CAREY, *Governor.*

Mr. PAGE presented memorials of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Enosburg, and of sundry citizens of Woodstock, Hartland, and Taftsville, all in the State of Vermont, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. STONE presented petitions of Hamilton Fish, Junior, Camp, No. 1, and Nelson Cole Camp, No. 2, of St. Louis, and of James Rush Lincoln Camp, No. 12, of Hannibal, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Illinois, and of sundry citizens of St. Louis, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and minor children of soldiers who served in the Spanish-American War, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Springfield, Mo., and a petition of the Federation of Labor of Sedalia, Mo., praying that an investigation be made into the methods of enforcing the Federal laws relating to the inspection of locomotives and railway safety appliances, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of members of the Home Culture Club, of Bonne Terre, Mo., remonstrating against the transfer of the control of the national forests to the several States, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Ozark, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation permitting the coloring of oleomargarine in imitation of butter, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Hannibal, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of the proposed new battleships in Government navy yards of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Local Division No. 141, Order of Railway Conductors, of St. Joseph, Mo., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called workmen's compensation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of members of the Stationers' Club of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to patents, which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Springfield, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation regulating injunctions and the punishment for contempt of court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Board of Trade of Kansas City, the Commercial Club of Kansas City, and of the State Association of Master Plumbers, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the adoption of a 1-cent postage on all first-class mail matter, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Clinton, Chitwood, Nevada, and Carthage, all in the State of Missouri, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

FIFTH-THIRD NATIONAL BANK OF CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Mr. KERN. From the Committee on Finance I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 26279) granting the Fifth-Third National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio, the right to use original charter No. 20, and I submit a report (No. 1284) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It authorizes the Comptroller of the Currency to issue to the Fifth-Third National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio, charter No. 20 in lieu of their present charter, No. 2798, said charter No. 20 being the original charter number of the Third National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio, which bank was merged and consolidated with the Fifth National Bank of Cincinnati,

Ohio, in the year 1908, under the name of the Fifth-Third National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio, said consolidated bank having succeeded to all the assets, good will, rights, privileges, and emoluments of the Third National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 8573) granting an increase of pension to George M. Trickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 8574) providing for the erection of a monument to commemorate the site of old Fort Morgan, Colo. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Library.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $250 to pay Edward T. Clark for extra services in connection with the preparation of the immigration bill, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that the time within which claims may be presented for refunding of sums illegally withheld from owners of private dies under section 3425 of the Revised Statutes be extended to December 31, 1913, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment fixing the limit of cost of the appraisers' stores building at Boston, Mass., to $1,250,000, intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus public buildings bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment providing that in all cases hereafter certified the accounting officers shall in stating balances follow the decisions of the United States Supreme Court or of the Court of Claims of the United States after the time for appeal has expired, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $150,000 for a United States post-office building at Roseburg, Oreg., intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus public buildings bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to determine and provide for payment out of the reclamation fund on account of any damage to property not liquidated in advance that has heretofore or may hereafter arise under an implied contract for reimbursement and which may be due to the operation and management of work constructed under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $150,000 for the construction and enlargement of military posts, of which amount $10,000 shall be available for the construction of a building for instruction purposes at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $100,000 for an international joint commission, United States and Great Britain, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROOT submitted an amendment authorizing the President to appoint a commission of seven members, to be known as the Peace Centennial Commission, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LEA submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $10,000 for the construction and maintenance of a lodge at the entrance of the national park for the keeper of said park at Lookout Mountain, Tenn., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment proposing to amend the act approved February 4, 1913, by inserting, after the words "loan associations," in the title of the act and also in section 10 thereof, the word "pawnbrokers," intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STONE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $47,550 for one additional mail lift and one combination freight and passenger elevator and for additions to mail apparatus and other improvements, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WETMORE submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to cause the necessary repairs and preservation of the U. S. S. *Constellation*, *Portsmouth*, and *Olympia*, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next the Senate will take up Order of Business No. 856, House bill 22913, for consideration immediately after the routine morning business, and that we shall vote upon the bill, together with the amendments, not later than 3 o'clock on that day. It is what is known as the Department of Labor bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I shall have to object to that unless the agreement provides that it shall not interfere with appropriation bills or conference reports.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, the Senator can exercise his privilege to object. I will only say that it is not my purpose to interfere with those bills, but I prefer not to insert that in the unanimous-consent agreement. We can take care of that matter when it comes up. If we make that exception, it may be utilized for the purpose of interfering with this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no desire at all to prevent a vote upon the bill, but at this stage of the session I do not believe a unanimous-consent agreement ought to be made unless it provides that it shall not interfere with appropriation bills and conference reports.

Mr. BORAH. I will insert that exception, then, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous-consent agreement asked for will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. It is agreed, by unanimous consent, that on Tuesday, February 25, 1913, immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 22913) to create a Department of Labor, and that at not later than 3 o'clock p. m. on that day the Senate will proceed——

Mr. BORAH. Permit me to state there that I will insert the calendar day instead of an hour.

The SECRETARY. And that on that day the Senate will proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendments that may be offered, and upon the bill—through the regular parliamentary stages—to its final disposition; such consideration, however, not to interfere with the consideration of appropriation bills or conference reports.

Mr. SMOOT. Does not the Senator think the legislative day would be better than the calendar day at this time of the session?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no. I should have to object to any legislative-day agreement, Mr. President.

Mr. BORAH. I think the calendar day would be better.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 28775. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SAMUEL H. FISHER.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask unanimous consent that as in executive session the nomination of Samuel H. Fisher, of Connecticut, to be United States district judge for the district of Connecticut, which has been lying on the table for several days, may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. There is a vacancy in the office. The committee meets on Monday, and I should like to get the nomination there, so that it may be considered by the committee.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that as in executive session the

nomination of the district judge named may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It is merely a reference to the committee.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 28180, the river and harbor bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 28180) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment, on page 19 of the bill, at the end of line 2, to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That not exceeding $2,000 thereof may be used for providing a channel to and from quarantine station, with a depth of water equal to project and depth of main river channel.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will suggest to the Senator that that amendment is not now in order. The committee amendments must first be disposed of. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like, out of order, to ask unanimous consent that it may be offered at this time. It is a very small matter, and does not ask for any additional appropriation. It simply takes $2,000 of the appropriation to make a channel for the quarantine station in the river.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that his amendment may be offered at this time. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, at the end of line 2, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That not exceeding $2,000 thereof may be used for providing a channel to and from quarantine station with a depth of water equal to project and depth of main river channel.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending amendment is on page 52 of the bill, commencing at line 14.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, for the sake of securing harmony—and I understand this will be satisfactory to all interests—I offer the following amendment to the amendment of the committee:

To strike out all after the word "examination," in line 22, page 52, and insert in place thereof the following:

"And for the building of such levees between said points upon the river in aid of navigation, as may be found necessary or desirable by the commission and approved by the Chief of Engineers, the sum of $200,000 is hereby appropriated."

That is to be a substitute for all in the committee amendment after the word "examination," in line 22.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the words proposed to be inserted by the committee, on page 52, line 22, after the word "examination," strike out the words "the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated," and in lieu insert:

And for the building of such levees between said points upon the river in aid of navigation, as may be found necessary or desirable by the commission and approved by the Chief of Engineers, the sum of $200,000 is hereby appropriated.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I hope that amendment will be adopted, because by its adoption and the acceptance of the amendment as amended it will fix a policy against which the Senators and Representatives from the lower Mississippi district can have no possible objection. It has never been their purpose to interfere with national aid to a river in any section of the country. We have not denied that appropriations could be properly made and that they were desirable in the upper Mississippi. Our contention has never gone to the extent of having it understood or committing ourselves otherwise to any policy that pretended that the lower Mississippi Valley was the only part of the United States where appropriations could be made in aid of the construction of levees for the various purposes for which levees are deemed desirable.

The principle of this amendment is that Congress in the exercise of its judgment has determined that the time has arrived when the levee interests of the upper Mississippi were to be looked to as an independent proposition and distinct from the lower Mississippi. The lower Mississippi has problems of its own, and they are not like the situation which exists anywhere else in this country. Their treatment has been a matter of growth. A great many experimental efforts have been made; a great many dollars have been invested from which no good results have followed. Finally a comprehensive and connected system has been evolved from past experience and past failures until we have entered upon a policy which will ultimately redeem that great valley from overflow.

So far from exhibiting a desire to oppose any amendment to provide for any other section similarly afflicted, each has imposed upon us a burden that can only be discharged by cooperating in every legitimate way with the representatives of other sections of the country, and we do so cheerfully.

Now that the objectionable principle involved in the provision incorporated by the House has been eliminated in a way that respects the rights of the upper Mississippi Valley without prejudice to the rights of the lower valley, we are not only willing to vote for it, but do so with some cheerfulness.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to have a vote upon this amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is upon the amendment as amended.

Mr. NELSON. That is to strike out and insert the amendment as amended.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to make an inquiry. A certain number of reaches are proposed to be stricken out. Is that the amendment we are now voting on?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on striking out and inserting the amendment as amended.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like the whole amendment to be inserted read, so that we may see what it is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment as amended will now be read, at the request of the Senator from Illinois.

The SECRETARY. On page 52, beginning with line 5, strike out to line 13, inclusive, and in lieu insert:

The Mississippi River Commission shall make an examination of the Mississippi River from Cape Girardeau, Mo., to Rock Island, Ill., with a view to such improvements as will at the same time promote navigation, develop water power, and protect property adjacent to said river from damage by floods; and in making such examination consideration shall be given and recommendations made as to plans for cooperation by the localities affected; and for the purpose of such examination and for the building of such levees between said points upon the river in aid of navigation as may be found necessary or desirable by the commission and approved by the Chief of Engineers the sum of $200,000 is hereby appropriated.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to say that so far as I am concerned the committee amendment as amended is satisfactory.

Mr. CULLOM. It is satisfactory to me.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, after consulting different Senators respecting the differences that have arisen between us and having in view the main object of those cooperating with me, I am willing to say to the Senate that while not entirely satisfactory it is acceptable, and I shall vote for the amendment as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next reserved amendment will be stated.

Mr. STONE. Before——

Mr. NELSON. The next amendment is on page 55, striking out certain words. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri about that matter that the committee had no information as to what was needed in regard to it in the way of bank revetments. We struck it out for the purpose of getting it into conference, and if it appears in conference that a bank revetment is needed we shall certainly agree to it. I wish the Senator would leave that paragraph of the bill stand as proposed by the committee.

Mr. STONE. Before we take that up I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question, and that means that we shall go back to the Mississippi River item.

Mr. NELSON. No; the Mississippi River item has been disposed of.

Mr. STONE. Yes; we have agreed to that amendment. I wish to ask the Senator whether he would object to an amendment to the Mississippi River Commission item increasing the salaries of the commissioners from $3,000 to $6,000.

Mr. NELSON. That ought not to be in this bill. The matter of increasing salaries ought to be in another bill. I do not think it is proper to put that into this bill, and I have no au-

thority on behalf of the committee to agree to it. I trust the Senator will not complicate the matter.

Mr. STONE. I am not going to do it without the consent of the Senator from Minnesota. I suppose a point of order would lie against it.

Mr. NELSON. It certainly would, and I should feel it to be my duty to make the point of order.

Mr. STONE. I am not going to put the Senator to the necessity of making a point of order, but I do desire to say at this juncture that I am clear in the opinion that the members of the Mississippi River Commission, who are now receiving $3,000, are not adequately compensated. The members of other commissions performing like service and requiring no more of their time and attention are receiving $6,000 per annum. Of course I shall not press the matter beyond making this statement, but in the next bill which comes before Congress I hope that this manifest injustice will be rectified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paragraph of the bill on page 55, commencing in line 9, has not been dealt with.

Mr. STONE. Now, as to the Missouri River item, I am always disposed to follow——

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me, I stated a moment ago—I do not know whether the Senator heard me or not—that the committee had no information as to whether any revetment work there was needed, so we struck it out for the purpose of having it put into conference. If the House conferees show that it is a case as meritorious as the one below, we would certainly agree to it. I wish the Senator would let it go as it is to conference.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the House of Representatives put in the item proposed to be stricken out by the Committee on Commerce. The item is in this language. After appropriating $150,000 for the improvement of the Missouri River from Kansas City to Sioux City, this item follows:

Of which amount at least $75,000 may be expended for such bank revetment as, in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers, may be in the interests of navigation.

Why the committee struck it out is, in a measure, conjectural.

Mr. NELSON. I was trying to explain that to the Senator. I am afraid he did not understand me.

Mr. STONE. I understood what the Senator from Minnesota said.

Mr. NELSON. I said the committee had no information as to whether anything was needed for revetment there. Objection was made to it, and the committee agreed to strike it out for the purpose of putting it in conference. After we get the matter into conference, if there is necessity for the appropriation, we will restore it. The Senator can rely upon it that the committee will do what is just and fair in the premises.

Mr. STONE. Yes; I suppose I ought to have faith; indeed, there is no reason, I presume, from my experience here, why I should not have utmost faith in what the committee of conference will do.

But, Mr. President, there have been two surveys made of the river between Kansas City and Sioux City, made in pursuance of provisions inserted in river and harbor bills at the instance of the Committee on Commerce. There was great danger of the river breaking in at one point south of St. Joseph through what is known as Lake Contrary. The river banks have eroded until the river is within a short distance of this lake, and if the river should flow into that lake and pour on down through a long chain of lakes it would change the bed of the river; at least it would divide the waters of the river and result in very great injury to the people living there.

Now, that is one item. Then there is an island above St. Joseph, some distance just north of the island—I can not at the moment call the name of the island—on the Kansas side, where a like difficulty and danger appear.

When I was upon the Committee on Commerce I asked that some part of the money appropriated for the improvement of the river north of Kansas City might be set apart for revetting and protecting the banks on the Missouri side and on the Kansas side. I was then told that under the rules of the Commerce Committee, which had been a long time before adopted and rigidly adhered to, when appropriations were made for these rivers, a particular sum would not be set apart for expenditure at a given point. Now, that rule has been departed from. It has been departed from on the Mississippi River. My distinguished friend from Arkansas, the senior Senator [Mr. CLARKE], has wisely used his great influence upon the Committee on Commerce to induce that committee to set apart $100,000 of the appropriations made for the Mississippi River for expenditure at or near Helena, Ark.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas rose.

Mr. STONE. The Senator need not get up, because I entirely approve of what he did and I congratulate him and his constituents.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Approval and congratulation will not supply the fact. I have not been a member of the Committee on Commerce for some years. The only thing that commended that amendment to the favor of the committee and the Senate was its merits. The appropriation was not diverted from any purpose designed by Congress in making the appropriation; it was simply provided that in the choice of projects which would come under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission, they should give it preference because of the urgent character of the improvement.

Mr. STONE. The Senator knows that was a departure from the long-established practice of the committee.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I think not. It was in entire accordance with the practice of directing how an appropriation should be actually expended as between a number of projects for all of which it was intended. It was no departure from the procedure of the committee and no straining whatever of any rule that governed that committee in its deliberations.

Mr. STONE. We have agreed to that item setting apart $100,000 for expenditure at and near Helena. But the President pro tempore, long a member of the Committee on Commerce, knows, and every member of that committee knows——

[Mr. NELSON held a whispered conversation with Mr. STONE.]

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I am unable to understand the debate that is going on at this time. May we not have order, so that we can hear the conversation between the Senators.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I yield.

[Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order, and the occupants of the galleries will likewise be in order. The next amendment passed over will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 55, line 10, after "$150,000," strike out the words:

Of which amount at least $75,000 may be expended for such bank revetment as in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers may be in the interests of navigation.

Improving Missouri River: For improvement and maintenance from Kansas City to Sioux City, $150,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 16, after the word "session," to strike out "$150,000; in all, $300,000," and insert "$175,000, of which amount, because of present emergency, an amount not exceeding $75,000 may be expended for such bank revetment above Elk Point as in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers may be necessary to extend and protect existing revetments and regulate channel flow in the interest of navigation; in all, $325,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON. That disposes of the committee amendments. I understand that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WEBB] has an amendment to offer, and also the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS].

Mr. WEBB. I desire to offer an amendment to the pending bill. I send it to the desk, and ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee offers an amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 52, after line 23, insert:

That the sum of $200,000 is hereby appropriated, to be expended by the Mississippi River Commission, for revetting, leveeing, and otherwise improving the left bank of the Mississippi River at and near Memphis, Tenn., in cooperation with the municipal authorities at Memphis, for the purpose of preventing damage by floods and promoting the interests of navigation.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I feel compelled to renew the point of order against that amendment, which was made to a similar one on a former occasion and for the same reason. It proposes to add a new item to the appropriation bill without having been referred to the committee or having been included in any estimate.

Mr. LEA. If the Senator from Arkansas will yield for a moment. I hope he will not make that point of order. The entire trouble at Memphis is caused by the appropriations which have been made for doing work on the lower and upper Mississippi River. If it were not for those very generous appropriations, to which we have not objected and with which we have cooperated, there would be no trouble at Memphis. Every dollar that is expended on the lower Mississippi is causing a condition at Memphis that necessitates revetting and levee work, which would result in great damage to the city of Mem-

phis if it were not done, and it is not fair to ask the city of Memphis alone, the only point on the Mississippi River affected, to pay the damages that are caused by protecting other sections. I hope, therefore, the Senator from Arkansas will not insist on the point of order.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I made the point of order with the perfect understanding of what it meant. I am not averse to contributions by the Government to better conditions at Memphis, whether they arise from the construction of levees elsewhere or not. In the first place, I do not agree with the Senator that the construction of levees anywhere has had anything to do with conditions at Memphis. I am entirely friendly to the interests of Memphis, and would be glad to help them at any time when it could be done without seriously complicating greater interests elsewhere.

This matter has been considered elsewhere and has not met with favor. It can only have the effect of loading this bill with unpopular provisions at this time. When we have a better opportunity to give it the consideration that it deserves and to work out all the equities that inhere in it, I shall not only not object to it, but I shall be very glad to cooperate with the representatives from the State of Tennessee. At this time, however, I think it inopportune, in view of the history of the provision and the necessity for keeping this bill as free as possible from provisions that not only may delay its passage but may ultimately defeat it. I therefore renew the point of order.

Mr. WEBB rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I wish to say that the construction of levees to protect the lowland of Arkansas reduced the channel of the river to less than one-fifth of its original width at flood tide. That brought a flood upon the city of Memphis that put out the lights, cut off the water, choked the sewers, and produced typhoid fever. This is an additional appropriation, and I hope the Senator from Arkansas will withdraw his point of order against it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I should very much question whether this item is subject to a point of order. Here we have an existing appropriation providing for the narrowing of the flood area of the Mississippi River opposite Memphis through the construction of levees upon the Arkansas side, which are designed partly to promote navigation and partly to protect large cultivable areas. The city of Memphis is situated on the bluff side, and the Arkansas side is the swamp side of the river. The result of the contraction of the river by those levees has been to force the flood of the river against the bluff side at Memphis in such a way as to seriously injure the public works there and to seriously imperil the health of the people. The work that has been inaugurated, recollect, is the work of narrowing the river, and this amendment is simply intended to carry out the existing work in such a way as to make it innocuous to the city and to its inhabitants.

It seems to me that the amendment is entirely in order, it being to provide for a part of an existing work; and it seems to me that it would be a very wise exercise of the judgment of Congress in providing now for the cooperation of the Mississippi River Commission with the municipal authorities of Memphis, through teamwork that will result in continuing the operation of narrowing the river without injury to the adjoining country.

Mr. LEA. Mr. President, as this point of order is different from the point of order which was ruled on by the Chair the other day, I ask that it be submitted to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The rule is very explicit in this matter. First, as the Chair understands, the proposed appropriation has not been estimated for, and, next, the rule states that amendments proposing new items of appropriation to a river and harbor bill shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Commerce, which in this instance has not been done. Therefore, the Chair reluctantly sustains the point of order.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I very reluctantly made the point of order.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada offers an amendment, which will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the amendment, which was, on page 65, after line 10, to insert a new section.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Nevada, as we are a little pressed for time, if he would consent to dispense with the reading and explain in a few words his amendment? I think the amendment can probably be better understood by Senators by an explanation than by a reading of it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, pursuant to the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina, I ask that the amendment which I have offered be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be inserted in full in the RECORD? The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

The proposed amendment is to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 3. That for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end for the storage of flood waters in the watershed of such navigable rivers, including the beneficial use and control of such flood waters, in the maintenance so far as practicable of a standard flow for navigation, the reclamation of arid and swamp lands, and the development of water power; and for the protection of watersheds from denudation, erosion, and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies in plans and works having in view such river regulation and control, the sum of $5,000,000 annually for each of the years following the 1st day of July, 1913, and up to the date of the completion and opening to commerce of the Panama Canal, and thereafter the sum of $50,000,000 annually for each of the 10 years following the completion of the Panama Canal, is hereby reserved, set aside, and appropriated and made available until expended, out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, as a special fund in the Treasury to be known as the river-regulation fund.

That of the said river-regulation fund, until otherwise directed by law, one-tenth thereof shall be apportioned to the rivers on the Atlantic coast, one-tenth thereof to the rivers on the Gulf coast outside of the Mississippi River, one-fifth thereof to the Mississippi River from St. Louis to the Gulf, one-tenth thereof to the Missouri River and its tributaries, one-tenth thereof to the Ohio River and its tributaries, one-tenth thereof to the upper Mississippi River above St. Louis and its tributaries, one-tenth thereof to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries in California, one-tenth thereof to the Columbia and Snake Rivers and their tributaries in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and one-tenth thereof in the connection of the Great Lakes with the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

That a board is hereby created, to be known as the Board of River Regulation, consisting of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, the chairman of the Panama Commission, the chairman of the Board of Review of the Engineer Corps of the Army, the chairman of the Mississippi River Commission, the Director of the United States Geological Survey, the Chief of the Weather Bureau, the Forester of the Department of Agriculture, the Director of the Reclamation Service, the Chief of the Drainage Division of the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, one hydraulic engineer, one sanitary engineer, and one electrical engineer; the last three to be appointed by the President and to hold office at his pleasure, and each to receive an annual compensation of $7,500, payable out of the river-regulation fund.

The Chief of Engineers shall be the chairman of such board, and the secretary shall be annually elected by the board from its members.

That the functions of said board shall be to investigate and obtain full information concerning all matters involved in or specifically related to the objects set forth in this section, and for such purpose is authorized to expend a suitable and necessary proportion of the moneys therein appropriated; but said board shall not expend or incur liability for the expenditure of any money for the construction or execution of plans or projects without the specific approval of Congress, as hereinafter set forth; that said board is hereby authorized and directed to enlist through the President the services of any Federal department or bureau the statutory authority of which may involve investigations or constructive work that is necessary or desirable in the comprehensive performance of the objects set forth in this section, and to bring into cooperation and to harmonize and unify the work of said departments or bureaus as may be necessary to provide against duplication or unwarranted or incomplete work with respect to the objects herein provided; and that said board is authorized to defray the expenses of such investigations or assistance to the extent of the ultimate cost thereof to said departments or bureaus through a transfer of equivalent proportions of the appropriation herein provided.

That the board shall develop, formulate, and prepare plans for the accomplishment of the purposes herein provided, and shall report the same to Congress annually and at such other times as may be required; and whenever the recommendations or any parts thereof in said report shall receive the approval of Congress the said board shall proceed to construct and execute the same in accordance with the plans so approved: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall be so administered as in no way to supersede or conflict with any specific provisions which Congress shall from time to time make by way of appropriations other than such as are made by this act for work and improvements to be performed or maintained by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, but that all work prescribed under this section shall be supplemental to and coordinated with the work as specifically prescribed by Congress in other acts.

That the board shall in all cases where possible and practicable encourage, promote, and endeavor to secure the cooperation of State and local government bodies, public and quasi public corporations, private associations, and persons in carrying out the purposes and objects of this act, including the securing of the financial cooperation of said parties; that it shall negotiate and arrange plans for the apportionment of work, costs, and benefits, and to secure the agreement and consent of said parties, contingent upon the final approval of same by Congress as herein provided, which approval and consent may include the acceptance and use of any funds or property donated or subscribed or in any way provided for cooperative work; but no moneys shall be expended under any arrangement for cooperation approved by Congress until the funds to be provided by the parties to such arrangement shall have been made available for disbursement.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered is a condensation of a bill which I have presented in different phases during the last six or seven years for the

regulation of rivers by the creation of a board of river regulation, which shall bring into coordination the various scientific services of the Government whose duties in any way relate to the conservation or the use of water, such as the Reclamation Service, the Forestry Service, the Geological Survey, the Engineer Corps of the Army, the drainage service, and other scientific services of that kind. It provides for a river regulation fund, to which is appropriated until the completion of the Panama Canal only $5,000,000 annually, and after that time the sum of $50,000,000 annually for a period of 10 years, thus providing a sum of a little over $500,000,000, which will be expended in the regulation of our rivers during the next 10 or 12 years and which will insure continuous work upon all the watersheds of the country, that work embracing not only the cooperation of the services that relate to water, but the cooperation of the Nation with the States, so that the plans can be mutually prepared by the river regulation board and organizations effected by the States in such a way that the works contemplated by the respective sovereignties will dovetail into each other without conflict of jurisdiction and without the intrusion of any sovereign upon the jurisdiction of the other. It will insure teamwork that will secure the complete regulation of rivers, not only for the purposes of navigation, but for the purpose of storage for irrigation, storage for water-power development, control for swampland regulation, and all other uses to which the waters of rivers can be put, the idea being that every river is to be regarded as a unit composed of the main river, its lateral tributaries and source streams, and that the river should be developed by the exercise of all the powers and functions of the sovereigns and parties interested in the river in such a way as to secure its highest and best use for every purpose, the works to be constructed in such a way as to apportion the costs and the benefits to the relative jurisdictions.

The history of this proposed policy is as follows: In 1907 President Roosevelt appointed an Inland Waterways Commission, composed of two Senators, two Representatives, and five chiefs of the various services of the Government interested in water development—the Chief of Engineers of the Army, the Chief of the Forestry Service, the Chief of the Reclamation Service, the Chief of the Bureau of Corporations, and a representative of the Bureau of Soils. The duty assigned to that board by the executive department was to make an investigation as to the best method of regulating our rivers in such a way as to secure their highest use. That commission traveled all over the country. They made a report, in which they recommended practically everything contained in this amendment, with the exception that there was a difference of opinion as to whether a large fund should be created or whether the reports of the river board should come to Congress and appropriations be made based upon their reports, as now is the custom with reference to the river and harbor bill. To that report, in which I concurred as a member, I added an addendum, which is brief and the wisdom of which I think has been demonstrated by subsequent history. My statement was as follows:

I concur in the report of the commission, but desire to emphasize my belief that it is of the highest importance that in dealing with subjects relating to the respective powers, rights, and interests of the Nation, States, municipalities, corporations, and individuals, large powers and a comparatively free hand should be given to an administrative body of experts in the full development of projects, lest the complexity of the transactions, the time necessary to secure congressional approval, and difference of view as to purpose or method, may result in indecision and delay, the worst enemies of effective development.

An ample fund should be provided, to be reenforced from time to time either by legislative appropriation or by bond issue, and the administrative board, or commission, should be given the power not only to investigate projects, but also, when determined to be feasible, to enter, with the approval of the President, upon their immediate execution; but the power should be limited so as to prevent such administrative body from entering into any contract unless there are sufficient unappropriated moneys in the fund to meet the cost thereof.

Unless some method of construction and development insuring prompt decision and execution and continuous and consecutive work by a body of experts is adopted, I fear that the best of projects may be wrecked in the shoals and quicksands of legislation.

Mr. President, prior to the report of the Inland Waterways Commission I had introduced a bill covering this subject. That bill went to the Committee on Commerce, and was referred by the committee to the Inland Waterways Commission and to the Secretary of War for their opinion as to its merits. I wish to quote briefly from the report of the Inland Waterways Commission:

1. Several of the leading provisions of the bill are in accord with the recommendations of the commission in a report submitted on February 3 last and transmitted to the Congress by the President on February 26. Among these are (a) the provision for coordination of navigation with related uses of the waters; (b) the provision for cooperation between the Federal Government, States, municipalities, communities, corporations, and individuals; (c) the provision for correlating existing agencies in the Departments of War, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce and Labor in such manner as to secure effective administration; and (d) the provisions looking toward the control of running waters in such manner as to protect and promote navigation. In so far as these provisions are concerned, the bill has the unqualified approbation of the commission.

* * * * * * *

3. The general purpose of the bill is in harmony with the comprehensive plan for improving and developing the waterways of the country framed by the commission and approved by the President in his message of February 26 last.

The Secretary of War, Mr. Taft, also made a report upon this bill, quotations from which I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD. In that report the Secretary of War approved the bill. I shall not delay the Senate in the consideration of this bill by quoting freely from the report, but shall content myself with placing the extracts in the RECORD. I will simply say that he most emphatically indorsed the principle of coordinating the various Federal agencies and scientific bureaus in this work, and that he approved the method provided by the bill for bringing the Nation and the States into cooperation.

Shortly after that a conference of the governors was held at the White House, May 13, 1908. I shall ask to insert in the RECORD a statement from their resolutions, in which they unanimously indorsed the principle of cooperation in this work between the scientific services of the Government, cooperation of the Nation with the States, and the study and development of all our rivers in such a way as to promote every civilized use.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave will be granted as requested by the Senator.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Extracts from the letter of Secretary of War William H. Taft to the Senate Committee on Commerce, dated Apr. 17, 1908, on the same subject.]

"(c) The bill provides for correlating the existing agencies in the Departments of War, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce and Labor through certain powers vested in the President. The need for some such plan is sufficiently shown by the fact that while this country is better endowed with waterways than any other our streams are less used for navigation and other public purposes than those of other countries. Since this provision touches duties placed on the War Department by law, it has received careful consideration. It does not appear that the measure would interfere with the functions of the War Department, or with the continuation and extension of the engineering work now performed there, but it is believed that the provision for administration would tend to promote the general welfare. Accordingly this feature meets the approbation of the War Department.

* * * * * * *

"(e) The bill provides also for the initiation of projects by a board of experts. These provisions affect the work of the War Department and have had careful consideration. Suitable provisions for expert initiation and prompt execution are essential to the proper development of any system of river improvement. The chief defect in the methods hitherto pursued lies in the absence of executive authority for originating comprehensive plans covering the country or natural divisions thereof. The creation of an inland waterways commission for the purpose of initiating plans for the improvement of waterways seems to me a more effective way of a general plan for the improvement of all the waterways in the country than under the present provisions of law. This would not dispense with the admirable machinery furnished by the War Department for the improvement of waterways when the plan has been determined upon and is to be executed. But it supplies what does not exist in the law now—a tribunal other than Congress charged with the duty of originating and developing a satisfactory plan."

Secretary Taft adds:

"3. In its present form the bill might be construed to curtail indirectly certain functions of the War Department, which is now charged with large discretion in waterway affairs. Possible ambiguity on this point should be removed."

Mr. Taft goes on and gives the history of the Engineer Corps of the Army and shows how it drifted into the control of our waterways.

"Under the same long-standing arrangement"—

Mr. Taft says—

"it is the policy of the War Department to maintain a trained body of military engineers with a view to the national defense, and to keep these engineers in training in time of peace by detail to civil duty allied to their professional duty in time of war or military preparation; and it was in carrying out this policy that the functions of the War Department pertaining to waterways have been more and more largely intrusted to the Engineers of the Army during the 110 years since the Army and Navy were separated in distinct departments. This policy has long been sustained by the Congress, although the military engineers have been prohibited from initiating projects or originating plans for meeting the growing needs of commerce. It is desirable to continue the policy of keeping the military engineers in training and at the same time rendering their skilled service available in work on waterways, although it is not necessary to vest them with the power of initiative, which they have not exercised in the past and which is, perhaps, inconsistent with their primary duty in connection with the military establishment of which they form a part. A provision that the Chief of Engineers of the Army shall be a member of the commission proposed to be created, and a further provision specifically covering the detail of military engineers to the service of the commission whenever such detail shall be consistent with their military duties, would remove any possible ambiguity and would be in accord with the custom and policy of the War Department."

—

[Extracts from the conference of governors, held at the White House, May 13–15, 1908.]

We declare our firm conviction that this conservation of our natural resources is a subject of transcendent importance, which should engage unremittingly the attention of the Nation, the States, and the people in earnest cooperation. These natural resources include the land on

which we live and which yields our food; the living waters which fertilize the soil, supply power, and form great avenues of commerce; the forests which yield the materials for our homes, prevent erosion of the soil, and conserve the navigation and other uses of the streams; and the minerals which form the basis of our industrial life, and supply us with heat, light, and power.

We agree that the land should be so used that erosion and soil wash shall cease; and that there should be reclamation of arid and semiarid regions by means of irrigation, and of swamp and overflowed regions by means of drainage; that the waters should be so conserved and used as to promote navigation, to enable the arid regions to be reclaimed by irrigation, and to develop power in the interests of the people; that the forests which regulate our rivers, support our industries, and promote the fertility and productiveness of the soil should be preserved and perpetuated; that the minerals found so abundantly beneath the surface should be so used as to prolong their utility; that the beauty, healthfulness, and habitability of our country should be preserved and increased; that the sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the people, and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated.

We commend the wise forethought of the President in sounding the note of warning as to the waste and exhaustion of the natural resources of the country, and signify our high appreciation of his action in calling this conference to consider the same and to seek remedies therefor through cooperation of the Nation and the States.

We agree that this cooperation should find expression in suitable action by the Congress within the limits of and coextensive with the national jurisdiction of the subject, and, complementary thereto, by the legislatures of the several States within the limits of and coextensive with their jurisdiction.

We declare the conviction that in the use of the national resources our independent States are interdependent and bound together by ties of mutual benefits, responsibilities, and duties.

* * * * * * *

We recognize in our waters a most valuable asset of the people of the United States, and we recommend the enactment of laws looking to the conservation of water resources for irrigation, water supply, power, and navigation, to the end that navigable and source streams may be brought under complete control and fully utilized for every purpose. We especially urge on the Federal Congress the immediate adoption of a wise, active, and thorough waterway policy, providing for the prompt improvement of our streams and the conservation of their watersheds required for the uses of commerce and the protection of the interests of our people.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will quote just one sentence:

We recognize in our waters a most valuable asset of the people of the United States, and we recommend the enactment of laws looking to the conservation of water resources for irrigation, water supply, power, and navigation, to the end that navigable and source streams may be brought under complete control and fully utilized for every purpose. We especially urge on the Federal Congress the immediate adoption of a wise, active, and thorough waterway policy, providing for the prompt improvement of our streams and the conservation of their watersheds required for the uses of commerce and the protection of the interests of our people.

Later on the political parties, in 1908, took action upon this subject. With the permission of the Senate, I will insert in the RECORD quotations from the platforms of 1908 and 1912, from which it will be seen that all of these parties recognized and indorsed the policy embraced in the river regulation bill which I have offered, and in this amendment, which is a condensation of that bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Declarations of the platforms of the Democratic and Republican Parties in 1908 relative to the improvement of the waterways.]

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM 1908—WATERWAYS.

Water furnishes the cheaper means of transportations, and the National Government, having the control of navigable waters, should improve them to their fullest capacity. We earnestly favor the immediate adoption of a liberal and comprehensive plan for improving every water course in the Union which is justified by the needs of commerce; and, to secure that end, we favor, when practicable, the connection of the Great Lakes with the navigable rivers and with the Gulf through the Mississippi River, and the navigable rivers with each other, by artificial canals, with a view of perfecting a system of inland waterways to be navigated by vessels of standard draft.

We favor the coordination of the various services of the Government connected with waterways in one service, for the purpose of aiding in the completion of such a system of inland waterways; and we favor the creation of a fund ample for continuous work, which shall be conducted under the direction of a commission of experts to be authorized by law.

—

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM 1908—CONSERVATION.

We indorse the movement inaugurated by the administration for the conservation of the natural resources. * * * in the line of this splendid undertaking is the future day, equally, imperative, to enter upon a systematic improvement upon a large and comprehensive plan, just to all persons of the country, of the waterways, harbors, and Great Lakes, whose natural adaptability to the increasing traffic of the land is one of the greatest gifts of benign Providence.

NATURAL RESOURCES.

We repeat the demand for internal development and for the conservation of our natural resources contained in previous platforms, the enforcement of which Mr. Roosevelt has vainly sought from a reluctant party; and to that end we insist upon the preservation, protection, and replacement of needed forests, the preservation of the public domain of home seekers, the protection of the national resources in timber, coal, iron, and oil against monopolistic control, the development of our waterways for navigation and every other useful purpose, including the irrigation of arid lands, the reclamation of swamp lands, the clarification of streams, the development of water power, and the preservation of electric power generated by this natural force, from the control of monopoly; and to such end we urge the exercise of all powers, National, State, and municipal, both separately and in cooperation.

—

[Declarations of the platforms of the Democratic, Republican, and Progressive Parties in 1912 relative to the improvement of the waterways.]

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

We renew the declaration of our last platform relating to the conservation of our national resources and the development of our waterways. The present devastation of the lower Mississippi Valley accentuates the movement for the regulation of river flow by additional levee and bank protection below, and the diversion, storage, and control of the flood waters above, and their utilization for beneficial purposes in the reclamation of arid and swamp lands and the development of water power, instead of permitting the floods to continue, as heretofore, agents of destruction. We hold that the control of the Mississippi River is a national problem. The preservation of the depth of its water for the purpose of navigation, the building of levees to maintain the integrity of its channel and the prevention of the overflow of the land, and its consequent devastation, resulting in the interruption of interstate commerce, the disorganization of the mail service, and the enormous loss of life and property, impose an obligation which alone can be discharged by the General Government.

To maintain an adequate depth of water the entire year and thereby encourage water transportation is a consummation worthy of legislative attention and presents an issue national in its character. It calls for prompt action on the part of Congress, and the Democratic Party pledges itself to the enactment of legislation leading to that end.

We favor the cooperation of the United States and the respective States in plans for the comprehensive treatment of all waterways with a view of coordinating plans for channel improvement with plans for drainage of swamp and overflowed lands, and to this end we favor the appropriation by the Federal Government of sufficient funds to make surveys of such lands, to develop plans for draining the same, and to supervise the work of construction.

We favor the adoption of a liberal and comprehensive plan for the development and improvement of our inland waterways with economy and efficiency, so as to permit their navigation by vessels of standard draft.

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.

The Mississippi River is the Nation's drainage ditch. Its flood waters, gathered from 31 States and the Dominion of Canada, constitute an overpowering force which breaks the levees and pours its torrents over many million acres of the richest land in the Union, stopping mails, impeding commerce, and causing great loss of life and property. These floods are national in scope, and the disasters they produce seriously affect the general welfare. The States unaided can not cope with this giant problem; hence we believe the Federal Government should assume a fair proportion of the burden of its control, so as to prevent the disasters from recurring floods.

* * * * * * *

We favor a liberal and systematic policy for the improvement of our rivers and harbors. Such improvement has been made upon expert information and after a careful comparison of cost and prospective benefits.

PROGRESSIVE PARTY PLATFORM.

The rivers of the United States are the natural arteries of this continent. We demand that they shall be opened to traffic as indispensable parts of a great nation-wide system of transportation in which the Panama Canal will be the central link, thus enabling the whole interior of the United States to share with the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards in the benefit derived from the canals. It is a national obligation to develop our rivers, and especially the Mississippi and its tributaries, without delay under a comprehensive general plan covering each river system from its source to its mouth, designed to secure its highest usefulness for navigation, irrigation, domestic supply, water power, and the prevention of floods. We pledge our party to the immediate preparation of such a plan, which should be made and carried out in close and friendly cooperation between the Nation, the States, and the cities affected. Under such a plan the destructive floods of the Mississippi and other streams which represent a vast and needless loss to the Nation would be controlled by forest conservation and water storage at the headwaters and by levees below, land sufficient to support millions of people will be reclaimed from the deserts and the swamps, water power enough to transform the industrial standings of whole States would be developed, adequate water terminals would be provided, transportation by river would revive, and the railroads would be compelled to cooperate as freely with the boat lines as with each other. The equipment, organization, and experience acquired in constructing the Panama Canal soon will be available for the Lakes-to-the-Gulf deep waterways and other portions of this great work, and should be utilized by the Nation in cooperation with the various States at the lowest net cost to the people.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I shall not weary the Senate with the reading of these various platforms. It is sufficient to say that in 1908 the Republican Party indorsed this policy in general terms, and the Democratic Party indorsed it in express terms, specifically demanding what the pending amendment provides, namely, coordination of the services, cooperation with the States, an ample fund for continuous work, the dovetailing of plans so as to insure the construction and completion of works that would serve all the uses to which a river can be put, whether those uses are under national or under State jurisdiction, but providing for this teamwork and cooperative work in such a way as to preserve the integrity of the jurisdiction of each sovereign. The Democratic platform of 1912 indorsed and repeated its insistence upon the declaration of 1908, and added to it a declaration that the recent flood on the Mississippi River accentuated the demand for the development of this policy. The new party, the Progressive Party, added its demands to those of the Republican and Democratic Parties in favor of broad and com-

prehensive plans, ample funds, continuous work, and teamwork between the Nation and the States.

Mr. President, my impression is that at different sessions of Congress I have introduced three bills upon this subject, each of which I regard as an improvement upon the other. The first bill, which I introduced in 1907, was a bill entitled, if I recollect rightly, "A bill for the creation of an inland waterway commission." The pending bill provides for the creation of a river regulation board. It contains everything that is contained in the other bill and contains elaborations which I think will add to its efficiency.

The first bill, it will be recalled, was referred to the Secretary of War, Mr. Taft, and received his approval. The last bill was referred to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, the War Department, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the latter being for many years, as will be remembered, the Director of the Geological Survey—an experienced official and most capable administrator—who has been familiar with every phase of waterway development in this country for many years. I will ask that the communication from the Secretary of Agriculture may be read. It is addressed to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter will be read, as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 4, 1912.

Hon. KNUTE NELSON,
Chairman Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have received, by reference from the clerk to your committee, Senate bill 122, introduced by Mr. NEWLANDS, "to create a board of river regulation," etc. It is a comprehensive measure with regard to the control and utilization of flood waters. I have referred the bill for comment to three of the chiefs of bureaus in this department, and inclose herewith copies of their reports, in which they discuss the matter, I think, very intelligently.

I have been for some time impressed with the fact that sooner or later the Congress of the United States, probably in cooperation with the States, will be compelled to inquire carefully into the waters of the country that are now going to waste, with a view to their utilization in the production of maximum crops. Where we depend entirely upon rainfall we do not always get maximum crops, because there are long periods of drought that prevent. We had such droughts last year. I believe it will be necessary, eventually, for the Federal Government, or the Federal Government and the States, or in some cases each State individually, to work out a comprehensive system of saving flood waters—the surplus waters that run away in spring and winter and during flood times in summer. This can be done, as it has been done in other countries, by arranging for a system of reservoirs beginning near the head of streams and continuing the reservoirs down the streams until all the advantage is secured that can be had from confining the waters for use on the land in dry times. I think the entry upon the subject is timely and wise, and any cooperation this department can extend will be cheerfully given.

There is a line of work in this connection that must be done by the Weather Bureau in ascertaining the precipitation found on each of the streams, and this feature I think it would be well for the committee to look into, if it has not already been considered.

Very truly, yours,

JAMES WILSON, *Secretary.*

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, as the time is short I shall not have the other reports read, but shall ask that they be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 29, 1913.

The COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
United States Senate.

GENTLEMEN: I am in receipt of your request for such suggestions as I may deem proper touching the merits of Senate bill 122, "To create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for the beneficial use of flood waters and for water storage and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies."

This bill is based upon two principles which have not been hitherto generally recognized in the construction of public works for river improvement. These principles are, first, that a river from its source to mouth, with all of its tributaries, is a unit in all its most important physical and functional characteristics. It should therefore be dealt with as a whole and not piecemeal, and in dealing with it for any single use, such as navigation, we should not lose sight of the other uses to which it can be put, such as water supply, irrigation, power, drainage, etc. River improvement should harmonize these uses, treating the river system as a unit for this purpose, and should provide for the cooperation of the Nation, States, and individuals to that end. The same principle applies, only in less degree, to the unification of all river systems into one comprehensive whole.

The second principle is that this work of waterway improvement in its details should be guided and determined as an administrative and not as a legislative matter, and therefore that a large fund should be provided and replenished from time to time as may be necessary, this fund to be expended at the discretion of a competent administrative commission of experts without specific appropriations or limitations, except of a broad general character, by Congress. The proposed commission is to consist of the chiefs of the Federal bureaus whose duties are now concerned with specific phases of the problem, together with specially qualified experts to be appointed by the President.

I am heartily in accord with these principles and believe that legislation embodying them should be enacted. I have not attempted, however, to criticize the bill in detail.

Very respectfully,

WALTER L. FISHER, *Secretary.*

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 27, 1913.

MY DEAR SENATOR NEWLANDS: I have at last had an opportunity to read and consider the bill introduced by you in the first session of the present Congress (S. 122) to create a board of river regulation, and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers, etc. The bill relates to many bureaus and departments of the Government not within my jurisdiction, and it contains many administrative features, which will doubtless be the occasion of much discussion and probable difference of opinion. As to the details of these features, I can not, especially in the limited time which I have, express any opinion. But so far as my observation extends, the bill is the first attempt to treat in a comprehensive and constructive manner the national problem afforded by our rivers and waterways. It is only of late years that we are beginning to obtain an adequate idea of the extent of this problem. It is only of late that the effect of forestration upon stream flow and erosion has been studied and appreciated, and that it has been learned how the navigable character of our long rivers may in part depend upon conditions at their headwaters. It is only of late years that the science of engineering has suggested conserving and standardizing the flow of our navigable rivers by systems of reservoirs at their heads. It is only within comparatively recent years that our engineers have developed the method of making navigable our long and shallow streams by canalization or the slack-water method. And it is even later yet that our people have begun to realize the necessity of saving and utilizing in this development, for the purpose of reducing its expenses, the valuable incidental water powers which may be created in the development itself.

Our conception, therefore, of what constitutes a navigable river and our appreciation of the various elements which enter into its development have been greatly widening. We see now that the problem of developing and preserving its navigability is no longer necessarily confined to removing obstructions in that part of the river in which navigation exists, but may extend to countless remote branches and sources of supply. We also see how the improvement of the river may be intimately connected with and dependent upon another development—that of water power—which formerly we may have regarded as a thing quite separate and apart.

This growth of knowledge in respect to the problem necessarily postulates a similar broadening in our treatment of it. To the Federal Government has been confided the care of our navigable streams. The Federal Government is also the proprietor of vast tracts of public and forest land, upon the protection of which the stream flow ultimately depends. It is also the proprietor of other semiarid lands, whose future use depends upon irrigation taken from navigable waters or their sources of supply. One of its departments has also direct relations with the development of our farming lands and the preservation of our forests. All of these activities of the Government impinge upon each other, and they also at the same time impinge at many points upon the jurisdiction, the property, and the powers of the several States.

Under these circumstances it is manifest that the problem of our navigable rivers can no longer be treated as a mere problem of dredging and deepening, of removing snags and obstructions, of confining our work to those stretches of river where commerce is actually plying, but must extend to those vital sources of supply upon which the very existence of the river depends. And it is equally manifest that in exercising this widening responsibility the Government must avail itself of all proper and possible means to economize the inevitable expense. If the general taxpayers of the country are to be called upon, for example, to protect the dwellers along the lower Mississippi Valley against the floods of that river, by taking over the expense of caring for its levee system, they must be permitted to reduce this enormous burden by availing themselves of all the by-products of water power which can be developed in the improvement not only of that river, but of all our other navigable streams.

Under our present system there is no such coordination of effort. Government action which may affect a single river is distributed among different bureaus and different departments, which have at present no necessity and practically no opportunity even for common discussion. This leads not only to lack of cooperation and action, but it often perpetuates conflicting scientific theories under circumstances where the conflict might be removed by mutual discussion and comparison of work. Instances have come under my personal observation, for example, where the views held by members of the Corps of Engineers as to the effect of forestration upon stream flow were radically different from those held by the Geological Survey and by the Forest Service.

It is manifest that such conditions work against effectiveness and in the direction of waste and expense. Such lack of cooperation would not be permitted in any private organization possessing the functions of our Federal Government. The various agents entrusted with responsibility over the various parts of the problem would be brought into mutual relations where they would be obliged to discuss and coordinate the mutually interdependent features, and a system would be arranged by which a consistent view of the whole problem could be obtained and by which it could be attacked intelligently in all its parts.

I understand that this is the purpose of your bill, and such a purpose must appeal to any one who has considered the problem. As I said in the beginning, I can not undertake to discuss the administrative methods by which you undertake to solve the problem. I may say, however, that my own inclination would be to lay primary emphasis upon the creation of a board whose duty it would be to discuss and harmonize and recommend rather than to actually appropriate funds. The latter function may meet objection, which would not exist in the case of the former. And it seems to me that the former functions are the most pressing and important in our present situation.

I may also observe that my experience indicates that our executive and bureau officers are already weighed down with about as much labor and as many functions as can be wisely performed. There is not a little danger of loading down our administrative machinery to inefficiency. In conferring such extensive powers as your bill contemplates upon a board largely composed of existing officials, we should be on our

guard lest we impair the existing enforcement of the law by entrusting it entirely to men who are already overworked. Such details, however, are doubtless under observation by yourself, and the suggested criticism, if held well founded, could be met by amendment.

Very respectfully,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Hon. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,
United States Senate.

[United States National Museum; International Exchanges; Bureau of American Ethnology; National Zoological Park; Astrophysical Observatory; International Catalogue of Scientific Literature.]

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, U. S. A., February 7, 1912.

To Hon. KNUTE NELSON,
Chairman Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In reply to your request of January 5, 1912, that the Committee on Commerce be furnished with suggestions touching upon the merits of Senate bill No. 122 and the propriety of its passage, I beg to state that the bill has been duly examined.

GENERAL FEATURES OF BILL.

I am in full accord with the general features of the bill, and think that if they are carried into effect it would be of great advantage and value not only to the citizens of the United States but as an example to the various civilized nations of the world. The comprehensive scheme outlined calls for a coordination of many effective forces now at the service of the Government that can not fail to give practical results of a constructive nature and great value and to stimulate the action of individual States and municipalities.

The problems involved are of such a character and concern such vast interests that it is only by taking them up in the broadest possible manner that successful and permanent results can be obtained. This will involve the expenditure of a large amount of money, energy, and time, but with wise planning and effective administration the results can not fail to be of the greatest value and service as long as the civilized people exist on the North American Continent.

The administration and execution of a work of such magnitude might properly hereafter involve a redistribution of some of the bureaus concerned so as to bring a majority of them into one of the existing departments that might become equivalent to a department of public works and conservation.

WORK OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The bill provides in section 11:

"That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution to give especially attention to the acquisition from foreign countries and from all sources of all obtainable knowledge concerning the problems involved in the work of the board and to diffuse and disseminate the same, and to establish and maintain a museum of conservation in which such knowledge shall be placed before the people, with object lessons illustrating the disastrous consequences that have resulted from the failure of such conservation and particularly the failure to conserve the forest and water resources in other countries of the world, and to utilize the resources of the institution under his charge, which may be available for that purpose, to aid in the education of the public in the elements of knowledge which lead to the successful regulation of water and of the flow of rivers and the use of water in connection with agriculture and the intensive cultivation of land and in connection with other industries."

It is my belief that a museum of conservation, such as is contemplated in this bill, can be satisfactorily established and maintained in connection with the National Museum system if adequate means are supplied for the purpose. Such a museum, which would consist largely of models, charts, maps, diagrams, and photographs, would ultimately require a considerable amount of space for its installation. In the beginning provision might be made for its accommodation in the buildings now under the control of the institution, but additional room would be called for in the near future if its rate of growth were commensurate with the scope and importance of the subject.

The preparation of the models and other exhibits, which must be accurate in detail, would require time and necessitate the employment of skilled modelers and other workmen. In the beginning it would be necessary to secure measurements, charts, photographs, etc., of typical areas in various parts of the world showing the methods and effects of conservation and reclamation and of others showing the results of neglect of such activities; also of the forms of engineering works best adapted to the purposes of conservation and of other objects and scenes illustrating the subject under consideration. In this manner an adequate basis could be obtained for accurate educational models suitable for the museum.

As regards the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge relative to the conservation of natural resources and allied topics, the Smithsonian Institution could doubtless accomplish much of what is desired through an extension of its exchange service and its system of correspondence. It would, however, in my judgment, be necessary in this connection also to send experts and agents to obtain information at first hand. It is taken for granted that much new information would be desired regarding conservation operations, etc., which could only be obtained by studies made in the places in which these operations are carried on. It would be important also in connection with the subject of forestry, mentioned in this bill, to have studies made of forests which are still in an undisturbed natural condition, especially the forests of Central and South America, which are extensive and diversified and have been but little affected by human activities. The natural relations existing between forests, water supply, and soils could be studied there to better advantage perhaps than in any other part of the world.

I would call your attention to a certain inconsistency in the bill as regards the dissemination of information procured under the direction of the board. In section 11 it is made the duty of the Smithsonian Institution to disseminate this knowledge, and in section 6 the board is directed to "print, publish, and disseminate" the "information, data, and facts collected and obtained by the various bureaus or offices of the Government."

Having had a somewhat varied experience in connection with the administration of the Geological Survey, which included hydrographic work and the Reclamation Service, the early development of the Forest Service and policy, and the past five years as Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, I am submitting as appendices some general statements combining my own and experts' views on the following different points:

1. Conservation of water resources.
2. Conservation of water resources in respect to irrigation.
3. Conservation of forest resources.

Very respectfully, yours,

CHARLES D. WALCOTT, *Secretary.*

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will read a sentence or two from each of them to indicate how thoroughly they approve the principle of this bill.

Secretary Fisher says:

This bill is based upon two principles which have not been hitherto generally recognized in the construction of public works for river improvement. These principles are: First, that a river from its source to its mouth with all of its tributaries is a unit in all its most important physical and functional characteristics. It should, therefore, be dealt with as a whole and not piecemeal, and in dealing with it for any single use, such as navigation, we should not lose sight of the other uses to which it can be put, such as water supply, irrigation, power, drainage, etc.

He then declares the second principle to be that this work of waterway improvements, in its details, should be guided and determined as an administrative and not a legislative matter, and therefore that a large fund should be provided, and so forth.

The Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, by mistake addressed his letter to me personally instead of to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce; but it is a report upon the pending bill. It is a report prepared with great care, and contains a most valuable vindication of the policy to which I have referred. He emphatically approves the system proposed, of coordination of bureaus and services, cooperation with States, an ample fund, continuous work, and the contemporaneous development of every use to which a river can be put by the exercise of the joint powers and functions of the Nation and the States.

The letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, Mr. Walcott, formerly the Director of the Geological Survey, also indorses every essential principle of this bill, as a result of the long experience of that gentleman in the scientific work of the Geological Survey, which first undertook a general study of the waters of the United States, and under whose jurisdiction the Reclamation Service was developed most efficiently.

Mr. President, I have here also numerous resolutions and comments of a public character upon this bill, which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD without reading. They include the indorsement of this bill by the Legislatures of California, Louisiana, and South Dakota, the indorsements of numerous waterway associations, chambers of commerce, and boards of trade.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Joint resolution concurred in by Senate and House, Louisiana Legislature, June 6, 1912, at the request of the Louisiana Reclamation Club.

Whereas the great flood of 1912 has demonstrated that the National Government only can obviate a recurrence of such overflow disasters in the future by a national policy under which an adequate levee system will be built and maintained as national fortifications against invasion and destruction by the forces of nature; and

Whereas the steadily increasing volume of the floods in the lower Mississippi Valley has been largely caused by the changed condition of the watershed in the States comprising the drainage basin of the Ohio, upper Mississippi, and Missouri Rivers; and

Whereas these causes and conditions are beyond the control of the States bordering the Mississippi from Cairo to the Gulf, and can only be controlled by the National Government. Now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana (the Senate concurring therein), That the National Government should immediately extend such temporary relief as may be necessary to repair the broken levees and to maintain them in future, and to control the river in its channel by revetments and bank protective works which will safeguard against the destruction of levees by caving banks and shifting channels.

Resolved further, That in working out plans for flood prevention and the protection of the lowlands of the Mississippi Valley from overflow, the Mississippi River and all its tributaries and source streams should be treated as a unit, and a comprehensive and adequate levee system, to be permanently maintained by the National Government, should be supplemented by a system of reservoirs on the headwaters of the Ohio and its tributaries, and also on the upper Mississippi, and by a system of flood-water canals and storage reservoirs in the Missouri River Valley by means of which the flood plane at Cairo would at all times be so reduced that no combination of high water in the three upper rivers would ever create a great flood in the lower Mississippi Valley, and at the same time prevent overflow and damage by floods in the valleys of the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, and Missouri Rivers.

Resolved further, That the Nation can not longer afford to permit its resources of soil, of power, of water, and of navigation to be carried as a wasteful and destructive flood to the sea, and that since the States themselves can not, in the general interest, prevent this waste, the Federal Government should conserve such floods at their sources and subject the now wasted waters to beneficial use.

Resolution of the Assembly of the State of California.

The following resolution was offered by Mr. Guiberson:

"Whereas a bill has been introduced in the Senate of the United States by Hon. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, of Nevada, which, according to its title, proposes 'to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection, and for the beneficial use of flood waters and for water storage, and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion, and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies'; and

"Whereas it has been proposed by the leading supporters of said bill that it be amended so as to provide for an appropriation of $5,000,000 annually for 10 years for the control of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries, and for a like appropriation for the control of the Colorado River; and

"Whereas this legislature is in hearty accord with the principles embodied in said bill, and believes that the money proposed to be expended under it and the cooperation provided for in it will promote the general welfare; and

"Whereas the vastness and variety of the interests that will be benefited by the expenditures contemplated in the proposed amendments fully justify such participation by the National Government in the work of making the navigable streams of California as useful as possible to the public. Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States be, and both branches of said body hereby are, requested to pass said bill, with the amendments aforesaid, and that the Representatives of California in the Senate and the House of Representatives be requested to use their best efforts to that end. And be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be, and he hereby is, directed to send a copy of this resolution to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State, to Hon. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, to the Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives."

Adopted this 4th day of February, 1913.

L. B. MALLORY,
Chief Clerk.

Joint resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota.

A joint resolution and memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to pass the Newlands bill, relating to river regulation.

Be it enacted by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring):

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact during the present session the Newlands bill, providing for the creation of a board of river regulation and for the control and beneficial use of flood waters, and we urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress to employ their best efforts to accomplish this end.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota, ss.:*

I, Frank Glasner, secretary of state of the State of South Dakota, do hereby certify that the annexed bill, to wit, senate joint resolution No. 14, was duly passed by the 1913 session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota and is now in full force and effect.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota this 4th day of February, A. D. 1913.

FRANK GLASNER,
Secretary of State.
By J. T. NELSON,
Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The President elect, Mr. Wilson, has also declared himself on this subject in a telegram addressed to me, as president of the recent irrigation congress, as follows:

SEA GIRT, N. J., *September 30, 1912.*

Hon. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,
President National Irrigation Congress, Salt Lake, Utah:

Please express to the National Irrigation Congress my hearty approval of the policy it is met to promote, and especially of the policy of supplementing bank and levee protection by storage of flood waters above for irrigation and water power, turning floods from a menace into a blessing and at the same time abundantly feeding navigable waters.

WOODROW WILSON.

(C. A. Woolsey Paint & Color Co., manufacturers and importers of paints and varnishes.)

JERSEY CITY, N. J., *December 26, 1912.*

Hon. FRANK O. BRIGGS,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Communications have been received by us from a number of our customers located in the South, who have been affected by the overflowing of the Mississippi River in the recent and past floods which have occurred in that section, and earnestly request our cooperation for the immediate enactment of the Newlands river regulation bill, S. 10900, Sixty-first Congress, third session, introduced in the Senate by Senator NEWLANDS on March 1, 1911, entitled:

"A bill to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end, and to provide for flood prevention and protection and for the beneficial use of flood waters and for water storage and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and local agencies."

For the further purpose of uniting forces for an organized demand on the Congress at Washington our friends of the South have issued a call requesting friends of the movement to attend the National River Regulation and Flood Prevention Congress to be held in New Orleans, January 6 and 7, 1913.

We are naturally interested in the growth, progress, and upbuilding of the South, both from a business standpoint and a feeling that the lives and property of those living in such places should be looked after to a certain extent by our Government, and we therefore respectfully refer the matter to you for your consideration, hoping that you may see your way clear to support the proposed legislation, as we believe that they are justified in looking to the country at large to help them in this matter.

Very truly, yours,

C. A. WOOLSEY PAINT & COLOR CO.
F. WOOLSEY, *President.*

LIST OF SOME OF THE ORGANIZATIONS WHICH HAVE INDORSED THE NEWLANDS RIVER REGULATION BILL, SPECIFICALLY OR IN PRINCIPLE, WITH COPIES OF SOME OF THEIR RESOLUTIONS.

The bill has been indorsed, among others, by the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, the Nineteenth National Irrigation Congress, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress (in principle), the National Drainage Congress, the New Orleans Progressive Union, the Louisiana Reclamation Club, the Louisiana Bankers' Association, the Illinois Association of Drainage and Levee Districts, St. Louis Merchants' Exchange, City Club of Memphis, and by the following organizations in California:

California section of the National Irrigation Association; boards of supervisors of the counties of Madera, Merced, and San Joaquin; the chambers of commerce of the cities of San Francisco, Madera, Merced, Ceres, Modesto, Lodi, and Fresno, and of Stanislaus County; the La Grande Board of Trade; the Los Angeles Clearing House Association; the cities of Madera, Turlock, and Modesto; the Women's Improvement Clubs of Madera, Merced, Modesto, Livingston, Escalon, Salida, and Raymond; and the River Regulation Commission of Stockton.

LOS ANGELES CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATION.

Resolutions indorsing and advocating the enactment by the Congress of the Newlands river regulation bill (Senate bill 122, introduced Apr. 6, 1911, by Senator FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS), entitled "A bill to create a board of river regulation, and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection, and for the beneficial use of flood waters and for water storage, and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other, and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies":

"Whereas reports made by Maj. J. W. Powell, first Director of the United States Geological Survey; Gen. Hiram M. Chittenden, of the Engineer Corps of the United States War Department; United States Engineer Ullert, and others; also through surveys and investigations made by the Pittsburgh Flood Commission, have shown the practicability of the storage of the flood waters of the rivers of the whole country to the end that destructive floods may be controlled and the waters heretofore wasted may be conserved for the use of navigation and irrigation where required; also the necessity of the drainage of the swamp and overflowed lands; and

"Whereas a condition which now causes wide devastation it is shown may be controlled and transformed into a great natural resource, reclaiming millions of acres of land now uncultivable, thus benefiting and enriching every section of the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific; and

"Whereas the Newlands river regulation bill embodies the provisions requisite for the carrying into effective operation of the beneficial objects desired to be accomplished: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Los Angeles Clearing House Association hereby indorses said Newlands river regulation bill and requests the Senators and Congressmen from this State to urge its passage by the Congress."

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution passed at a special meeting of the Los Angeles Clearing House Association held yesterday afternoon.

JAMES B. GIST, *Secretary.*

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF PITTSBURGH.

Resolution adopted April 13, 1911.

Whereas a bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator NEWLANDS on March 1, 1911, entitled "A bill to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for the beneficial use of flood waters and for water storage, and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies"; and

Whereas the primary purpose of said bill is to bring into conference and cooperation the National Government with the States, municipalities, counties, and local districts for the construction of the works necessary for the regulation of the flow of rivers and for flood prevention and protection, and provides a fund of $50,000,000 annually for 10 years for said purpose; and

Whereas the passage of said bill by Congress would result in the relief not only of Pittsburgh but of all cities and communities on the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi Rivers from destructive floods and increase the flow of the rivers in the low-water season for navigation: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh hereby indorses said Newlands river-regulation bill and requests the Senators and Congressmen from this State to urge its passage by Congress; and

Resolved further, That the secretary be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to all boards of trade and chambers of commerce in cities on the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi Rivers, and urge their active support for this measure.

The Nineteenth National Irrigation Congress on December 9, 1911, at Chicago, adopted the following as one of its resolutions:

"We indorse and recommend the Newlands bill (S. 122) to create a board of river regulation, and urge every delegate to this congress to cooperate in all possible ways to aid in securing its enactment by the Federal Congress during the present session."

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress at Washington, D. C., on December 8, 1911, adopted the following as its first declaration:

"We urge the adoption by the Government of a broad, liberal, comprehensive, systematic, and continuous policy of waterway development, a policy which has heretofore been unanimously pledged by the great political parties of the country in convention assembled, which pledges have not as yet been redeemed."

National Drainage Congress, Chicago, Ill., December 9, 1911:

"*Resolved*, That * * * we do especially recommend the creation of a national commission to make the necessary surveys and estimates of cost and to work out a comprehensive plan of national reclamation in connection with the several States, designed to coordinate the mutual interests of the various States in a practical State and Federal system of consistent and progressive drainage, reclamation, and development; and that sufficient funds be appropriated by the National Government to carry on the work of the commission."

—

SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Resolution adopted at meeting of board of directors, January 5, 1912.

Whereas a bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator NEWLANDS on March 1, 1911, entitled "A bill to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and, as a means to that end, to provide for flood prevention and protection, and for the beneficial use of flood waters, and for water storage, and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion, and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies"; and

Whereas the primary purpose of said bill is to bring into conference and cooperation the National Government with the States, municipalities, counties, and local districts for the construction of the works necessary for the regulation of the flow of rivers and for flood prevention and protection, and provides a fund of $50,000,000 annually for 10 years for said purposes; and

Whereas the passage of said bill by Congress would result in the relief, not only of Pittsburgh, but of all cities and communities on the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi Rivers from destructive floods, and increase the flow of the rivers in the low-water season for navigation: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce hereby indorses said Newlands river-regulation bill and requests the Senators and Congressmen from this State to urge its passage by Congress.

SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
M. H. ROBBINS, Jr., *President*.
A. B. C. DOHRMANN, *Secretary*.

—

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 15, 1912*.

Hon. JOSEPH E. RANSDELL,
President National Rivers and Harbors Congress,
Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the directors of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress immediately following the last annual meeting of the congress it was suggested that this organization should advocate a policy not only having for its purpose the improvement of waterways for navigation but for all the beneficial uses to which the water could be put. The suggestion was advanced:

First. Because the proponents believed that in no other way could an orderly and continuous development of waterway improvements be possible.

Second. Improvement and development of other beneficial uses would be in aid of and not in conflict with improvement for navigation.

Third. An enormous saving in public funds and direct and lasting benefits to the public would ensue.

Fourth. It would unite in a common cause a large number of people and organizations interested in various phases of water use and control who are now advocating and exploiting the particular use only in which they are more directly concerned.

Fifth. The result would be that an irresistible public sentiment would be created to which Congress would be compelled to respond and which would be in harmony with the declarations of the platforms of the great political parties demanding the carrying out of a policy having for its purpose the conservation and utilization of the waterway for all beneficial purposes from its source to its mouth.

No direct action was taken, but a committee was appointed charged with the duty of reporting to the directors upon the question, with the object of giving full opportunity and time for its consideration before the next annual meeting of the organization. The undersigned were appointed as such committee and beg leave to report as follows:

I. There are a number of governmental scientific agencies having in charge and under their control various national public resources. Generally speaking, these agencies are fairly equipped to carry on their work and are in charge of competent men. The Engineer Corps of the Army, the Reclamation Service, the Geological Survey, the Forest Service, and other branches of the Agricultural and Interior Departments are illustrative. These agencies in the public interest should be in the closest cooperation and coordination, but such is not the case.

II. The various departments are frequently dealing with the same agency or public resource in its application to some particular service, giving but little, if any, consideration to coordination with other available services or uses to which such agency or public resource might be put. This is not the fault of the departments, but the failure of Congress to make provisions therefor. It is the opinion of the committee that the best results can only be secured and the public interest promoted through cooperation and unity of purpose and action.

III. There is scarcely a river worthy of improvement for navigation but what has other beneficial uses to which it could be put and other conditions which require treatment and consideration, all of which bear directly upon the navigability of such river or add to the productiveness of adjacent territory or further development of such territory. We refer to forest protection, prevention of damage from flood, soil erosion, drainage, irrigation, and water-power development. It would therefore seem in the public interest that the improvement of a waterway for navigation could well contemplate the conservation and utilization of such manifestly beneficial uses at the same time.

IV. It is generally conceded that the improvement of rivers for navigation is a necessity and that this improvement should be based on a comprehensive scheme under some general plan of related projects, the work to be carried on continuously until completed.

V. At the present time there are a large number of organizations and vast numbers of people interested in various phases of water use and development which, it would seem, could be united in common purpose for a common use. Transportation is a tax that touches all, and producer and consumer alike are interested in securing cheap and efficient means of transportation. Therefore those who create tonnage are directly interested in its reaching the markets at the lowest possible cost, and those who propose to engage in water transportation are certainly interested in the development of tonnage tributary to the waterways.

The foregoing facts are well known. The committee do not feel it incumbent upon them to enter into an extended argument to show that coordination of service and cooperation of effort between the various governmental agencies and the sovereignties, national and State, are not only desirable, but necessary, if real efficiency and the best results are to be secured. On the contrary, we feel that those who oppose such a seemingly natural, logical, and businesslike policy should show wherein the cause of the improvement of rivers for navigation would be detrimentally affected by its adoption.

In time both organizations and individuals are likely to become too conservative. In other words, the tendency is to follow rather than to lead, and we believe this organization should lead public opinion, not follow it.

We would hesitate to suggest for adoption anything of a novel character, but we are convinced that this organization must take advanced ground upon all questions respecting the improvement of our waterways and should cooperate with every individual and organization willing to work to this end.

We therefore recommend that this organization should advocate a comprehensive scheme of waterway development of related projects;

That this scheme should involve and consider all the beneficial uses which the waterway may serve or to which it may be put;

That the work of the various scientific services of the Government should be coordinated;

That the several States and the Nation should cooperate and act in harmony in all matters of common interest; and

That funds should be provided so that work on all approved projects can be carried continuously to completion.

The committee submits the foregoing suggestions for your consideration.

JOSEPH N. TEAL,
JAMES E. SMITH,
FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,
Committee.

—

River regulation, in the words of George H. Maxwell, must become the campaign cry of the people of the Mississippi Valley, no matter what their party politics, if their fertile fields are to be made safe from overflow and their country is to be freed from the adverse opinion of the remainder of the world.

"The flood waters of the Mississippi River and its tributaries can be regulated, and such regulation, in conjunction with a good levee system, will forever safeguard the valleys from overflows," said Mr. Maxwell, who is an ardent supporter of the Newlands river-regulation bill, to-day. "The entire country will back up the demand of the people of the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Missouri Valleys for constructive legislation of this character."

In proof of his assertion he exhibited the following telegram from the far West:

STOCKTON, CAL., *April 8-9, 1912*.

Mr. GEORGE H. MAXWELL,
Executive Chairman Board of Control,
National Drainage Congress, St. Charles Hotel, New Orleans.

DEAR SIR: We extend our heartful sympathy to the sufferers from the present floods in the East and the South. Our sympathy is tinctured with shame, as we know that the appalling loss of life and property could and ought to have been prevented. As a people we have the intelligence and the money to do the required work that will control forever the flood area of our country, whether in the East, the South, or the West. We know how to change the awful destructive flood forces into constructive and beneficial powers. With these forces we can improve and make permanently navigable our inland waterways, generate enormous quantities of electric power, make safe the investments and increase the improvements in our great valleys, and while doing so shall remove the danger of drought or fear of it. The time is opportune for an immediate start on this great work. The Panama Canal is now nearly finished. Even now the services of a part of the splendid working army is being dispensed with and part of the equipment is being sold. These trained men should be kept together, and the equipment that can be used in the South and East or in the West should be at once put in order for the work that must be done to save the lives and property of our people by properly conserving the natural forces and resources of our country. There can be no excuse for another hour's delay. The sinking of the *Maine* with so large a part of her gallant crew in Habana aroused our people to war. What can we say to a watching world if we refuse to act as promptly and as energetically when the lives of our people are being taken by floods that we can control or droughts that we can prevent? To the loss of life we must add the destruction of property so vast that its value, if wisely used, would prevent forever such losses. Under such conditions can we still say that we have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, to enable us, a people, to claim without shame that we so govern ourselves? We pray that you will take such action at New Orleans and immediately thereafter at Washington that the Newlands bill may be enacted into law and the good work of conservation and control be started without further delay.

Yours, truly,
THE RIVER REGULATION COMMISSION OF STOCKTON, CAL.,
By J. L. CRAIG, *Chairman*.

—

Resolutions of Southern Commercial Congress.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *April 9, 1912*.

We urge the immediate adoption by Congress of a broader, more aggressive, comprehensive, systematic, and continuous policy of waterway improvement, thereby carrying out the wish of people of the country as expressed in the platforms of both the great political parties in the national conventions of 1908, to the fulfillment of which both parties pledged themselves, but which pledges have not been redeemed.

We favor the adoption of a law by Congress granting the use of the Panama Canal to American ships engaged in coasting commerce free of tolls, and the prevention of the use of the canal by any steamship line owned or controlled by a railroad or any monopolistic interest.

We favor such legislation as is necessary to induce the construction of a merchant marine for the United States and the carrying of American commerce in American ships made under the American flag.

EXTENSION OF POWERS.

We recommend that the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission be extended over shipment by water, so as to oblige proper division of rates by railroads and connections, and fix minimum as well as maximum rates for water-borne traffic.

Properly equipped terminals being as essential as channels to the successful use of waterways, we urge that such terminals be provided

under public ownership or control, so that they may be open to all comers on equal and reasonable terms.

We favor liberal annual appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors, and disapprove the policy of delay and interruption in work begun and of practicing economy at the expense of the construction work of the Government.

We urge upon Congress the adoption of such laws as will compel coordination and cooperation between railways and waterways in the interchange of traffic, and that will remove destructive competition of railways against waterways.

—

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF PITTSBURGH,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

Resolution adopted April 13, 1911.

Whereas a bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator NEWLANDS, on March 1, 1911, entitled "A bill to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce," and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection, and for the beneficial use of flood waters, and for water storage, and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies; and

Whereas the primary purpose of said bill is to bring into conference and cooperation the National Government with the States, municipalities, counties, and local districts for the construction of the works necessary for the regulation of the flow of rivers and for flood prevention and protection, and provides a fund of $50,000,000 annually for 10 years for said purposes; and

Whereas the passage of said bill by Congress would result in the relief not only of Pittsburgh, but of all cities and communities on the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi Rivers, from destructive floods and increase the flow of the rivers in the low-water season for navigation: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh hereby indorses said Newlands river regulation bill and requests the Senators and Congressmen from this State to urge its passage by Congress; and

Resolved further, That the secretary be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to all boards of trade and chambers of commerce in cities on the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi Rivers and urge their active support for this measure.

—

[From the Fresno Republican, Apr. 10, 1912.]

CHAMBER INDORSES NEWLANDS BILL FOR RIVERS.

The board of directors of the Fresno Chamber of Commerce yesterday passed a resolution, presented by John Fairweather, vice president of the National Irrigation Congress, in which it indorsed the Newlands river regulation bill, now before Congress. Copies of the resolution will be forwarded to the California Representatives at Washington. The resolution is as follows:

"Whereas a bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator NEWLANDS on March 1, 1911, entitled 'A bill to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers, in aid of interstate commerce," and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for the beneficial use of flood waters, protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion, and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies; and

"Whereas the primary purpose of said bill is to bring into conference and cooperation the National Government with the States, municipalities, counties, and local districts for the construction of the works necessary for the regulation of the flow of rivers and for flood prevention and protection, and provides a fund of $50,000,000 annually for 10 years for said purposes; and

"Whereas the passage of said bill by Congress would result in the relief not only of Pittsburgh, but of all cities and communities on the Ohio, Missouri, Mississippi, Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kings Rivers, from destructive floods and increase the flow of the rivers in the low-water season for navigation and irrigation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Fresno County Chamber of Commerce hereby indorses said Newlands river regulation bill and requests the Senators and Congressmen from this State to urge its passage by Congress."

The supervisors followed yesterday the example of the directors of the chamber of commerce, and on the showing made by John Fairweather, vice president of the National Irrigation Congress, indorsed the Newlands river regulation bill in Congress as a measure of relief against destructive floods, while also one for increasing the flow of rivers in low-water season for navigation and irrigation.

—

[From the Madera (Cal.) Tribune, Apr. 15, 1912.]

RESOLUTIONS FAVORING FLOOD-WATER CANAL.

The following resolutions were adopted at the District Federation of Women's Clubs in Fresno at their recent session:

Resolutions indorsing the Newlands bill and the resolutions of the California Legislature requesting the Federal Government to construct a flood-water canal and reservoir from the San Joaquin River, near Pollasky.

Be it resolved, That the California Federation of Women's Clubs for the San Joaquin district, in convention assembled in the city of Fresno, indorse the Newlands bill in Congress (S. 122) and the resolutions of the California Legislature requesting the Federal Government to construct a flood-water canal and reservoir from the San Joaquin River; and be it further

Resolved, That our Senators, Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS and Hon. JOHN D. WORKS, and our Representatives, Hon. J. C. NEEDHAM, Hon. JOHN E. RAKER, Hon. WILLIAM D. STEPHENS, Hon. S. C. SMITH, Hon. E. A. HAYES, Hon. JULIUS KAHN, Hon. JOSEPH R. KNOWLAND, and Hon. WILLIAM KENT, be, and they are, requested to use all honorable means at the present session of Congress to secure the legislation requested in said resolutions; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this convention be, and she is hereby, directed to mail forthwith to each of our said Senators and Representatives a copy of these resolutions.

LOUISIANA BANKERS' ASSOCIATION.

Resolution adopted at annual meeting, Covington, La., April 27, 1912.

Whereas a bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator NEWLANDS on March 1, 1911, entitled "A bill to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for the beneficial use of flood waters and for water storage, and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies"; and

Whereas the primary purpose of said bill is to bring into conference and cooperation the National Government with the States, municipalities, counties, and local districts for the construction of the works necessary for the regulation of the flow of rivers and for flood prevention and protection, and provide a fund of $50,000,000 annually for 10 years for said purposes; and

Whereas the passage of said bill by Congress would result in the relief not only of Pittsburgh but of all cities and communities on the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi Rivers from destructive floods and increase the flow of the rivers in the low-water season for navigation: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Louisiana Bankers' Association hereby indorses said Newlands river-regulation bill and requests the Senators and Congressmen from this State to urge its passage by Congress.

LOUISIANA BANKERS' ASSOCIATION.

—

STOCKTON, CAL., *April —, 1912.*

Mr. GEO. H. MAXWELL,
Executive Chairman Board of Control,
National Drainage Congress,
St. Charles Hotel, New Orleans, La.

DEAR SIR: We extend our heartfelt sympathy to the sufferers from the present floods in the East and the South. Our sympathy is tinctured with shame, as we know that the appalling loss of life and property could and ought to have been prevented. As a people we have the intelligence and the money to do the required work that will control forever the flood area of our country, whether in the East, the South, or the West. We know how to change the awful destructive flood forces into constructive and beneficial powers. With these forces we can improve and make permanently navigable our inland waterways, generate enormous quantities of electric power, make safe the investments, and increase the improvements in our great valleys, and while doing so we shall remove the danger of drought, or fear of it. The time is opportune for an immediate start on this great work. The Panama Canal is nearly finished. Even now the services of a part of the splendid working army is being dispensed with and part of the equipment is being sold. These trained men should be kept together, and the equipment that can be used in the South and East or in the West should be at once put in order for the work that must be done to save the lives and property of our people by properly conserving the natural forces and resources of our country. There can be no excuse for another hour's delay. The sinking of the *Maine* with so large a part of her gallant crew in Habana aroused our people to war. What can we say to a watching world if we refuse to act as promptly and as energetically when the lives of our people are being taken by floods that we can control or droughts that we can prevent? To the loss of life we must add the destruction of property so vast that its value if wisely used would prevent forever such losses. Under such conditions can we still say that we have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people? To enable us, a people, to claim without shame that we so govern ourselves we pray that you will take such action at New Orleans and immediately thereafter at Washington that the Newlands bill may be enacted into law and the good work of conservation and control be started without further delay.

Yours, truly,
THE RIVER REGULATION COMMISSION OF STOCKTON, CAL.,
By J. L. CRAIG.

—

NEW ORLEANS PROGRESSIVE UNION.

Resolution adopted at meeting of board of directors May 2, 1912.

Whereas a bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator NEWLANDS on March 1, 1911, entitled "A bill to create a board of river regulations and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for the beneficial use of flood waters and for water storage, and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies"; and

Whereas the primary purpose of said bill is to bring into conference and cooperation the National Government with the States, municipalities, counties, and local districts for the construction of the works necessary for the regulation of the flow of rivers and for flood prevention and protection, and provides a fund of $50,000,000 annually for 10 years for said purposes; and

Whereas the passage of said bill by Congress would result in the relief not only of Pittsburgh, but of all cities and communities on the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi Rivers, from destructive floods and increase the flow of the rivers in the low-water season for navigation: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Orleans Progressive Union hereby indorses said Newlands river-regulation bill and requests the Senators and Congressmen from this State to urge its passage by Congress.

NEW ORLEANS PROGRESSIVE UNION,
JAMES W. PORCH, *President.*
M. B. TREZEVANT,
Secretary-Manager.

—

LOUISIANA RECLAMATION CLUB.

Resolution adopted at meeting held Tuesday, May 14, 1912.

Whereas throughout a wide extent of country that is comprised within the trade territory of New Orleans the great flood of 1912 in the Mississippi Valley has made thousands homeless, ruined crops, drowned live stock, destroyed buildings and improvements, and will seriously retard the advancement and development of that territory; and

Whereas every business man and property owner in New Orleans will feel the loss from this great disaster in a decreased volume of business, deferred collections, reduced property values, stagnation of trade, and lessened demand for real estate; and

Whereas the danger of a recurrence of such disasters is a menace to the prosperity, growth, and development of New Orleans, and such danger can only be permanently removed through the adoption by the Congress of the United States of a broad national policy under which the Federal Government will in future guarantee protection against overflow by taking over and maintaining the levee systems as national fortifications against invasion by the destroying forces of nature, just as it now maintains military and naval forces and builds fortifications as defenses against foreign invasion; and

Whereas the construction of the great engineering works and reservoirs that would store the floods of the Ohio River and thereby aid in affording protection from overflow in the lower Mississippi Valley is warranted by the benefits therefrom to the Ohio Valley alone in flood prevention, incidental power development, and navigation, and a similar policy is likewise justified in the Missouri Valley for the same reasons, and also because the water there may be used for the irrigation of millions of acres of arid lands; and

Whereas in no possible way can the construction of such works for headwater control of the floods in the territory of their origin do otherwise than benefit the lower Mississippi Valley by regulating the flow of the river, and thereby improving it for navigation and giving additional security and protection against floods; and

Whereas the steadily increasing volume and rising flood plane of the flood in the lower Mississippi Valley have been largely caused by the changed conditions of the watershed in the States comprising the drainage basin of the Ohio, upper Mississippi, and Missouri Rivers, and those conditions and causes are beyond the control of the States bordering the Mississippi River from Cairo to the Gulf, and can only be controlled by the Federal Government: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government should immediately extend such temporary relief as may be necessary to repair the broken levees and to maintain them in future, and to control the river in its channel by revetments and bank protective works which will safeguard against the destruction of levees by caving banks and shifting channels; and

Resolved further, That in working out plans for flood prevention and the protection of the lowlands of the Mississippi Valley from overflow the Mississippi River and all its tributaries and source streams should be treated as a unit, and a comprehensive and adequate levee system to be permanently maintained by the National Government should be supplemented by a system of reservoirs on the headwaters of the Ohio and its tributaries, and also on the upper Mississippi, and by a system of flood-water canals and storage reservoirs in the Missouri River Valley, by means of which the flood plane at Cairo would be at all times so reduced that no combination of high water in the three upper rivers would ever create a great flood in the lower Mississippi Valley, and at the same time prevent overflow and damage by floods in the valleys of the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, and the Missouri Rivers; and

Resolved further, That the Nation can not longer afford to permit its resources of soil, of power, of water, and of navigation to be carried as a wasteful and destructive flood to the sea, and that since the States themselves can not, in the general interest, prevent this waste, the Federal Government should conserve such floods at their sources and subject the now wasted waters to beneficial use; and

Resolved further, That the Louisiana Reclamation Club hereby indorses and approves the resolution of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce adopted on April 13, 1911, indorsing the Newlands river-regulation bill, and urging its passage by Congress; and

Resolved further, That the business men and property owners of New Orleans be, and they are hereby, urged to extend their hearty personal cooperation and financial support to the Louisiana Reclamation Club in its work for the organization of a national campaign, through the National Reclamation Association, to accomplish the early passage of the Newlands river-regulation bill by Congress.

—

[Night letter.]

WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH CO.,
Stockton, Cal., May 23, 1912.

Mr. GEORGE H. MAXWELL,
New Orleans, La.:

We on the coast believe this is the opportune moment to force passage of the NEWLANDS bill. The present disaster in the Mississippi Valley should of itself be sufficient reason to prompt its passage. If existing conditions in Mississippi Valley do not change the inertia of Congress, we can not conceive what would be impressive enough to cause them to perform their duty. Keep us informed on any important movement at any point.

THE RIVER REGULATION COMMISSION OF STOCKTON, CAL.,
J. L. CRAIG, *President.*

—

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Los Angeles, Cal., June 13, 1912.

Resolution indorsing and advocating the enactment by the Congress of the Newlands river regulation bill (S. 122), introduced April 6, 1911, by Senator FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, entitled: "A bill to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for the beneficial use of flood waters and for water storage, and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies." * * *

Whereas reports made by Maj. J. W. Powell, first Director of the United States Geological Survey, and later surveys, investigations, and reports of the Geological Survey; also reports by Gen. Hiram M. Chittenden, of the Engineer Corps of the United States War Department, Engineer Charles Eliet, jr., and others; also surveys and investigations made by the Pittsburgh flood commission have shown the practicability of the storage of the flood waters of the rivers of the whole country to the end that destructive floods may be controlled and the waters heretofore wasted may be conserved for the use of navigation and irrigation where required; also the necessity of the drainage of the swamp and overflowed lands;

Whereas a condition which now causes wide devastation it is shown may be controlled and transformed into a great natural resource, reclaiming millions of acres of land now uncultivatable, thus benefiting and enriching every section of the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific; and

Whereas the Newlands river regulation bill embodies the provisions requisite for the carrying into effective operation of the beneficial objects desired to be accomplished: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce hereby indorses the said Newlands river regulation bill and requests the Senators and Congressmen from this State to urge its passage by the Congress, and approves the resolution of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce indorsing said bill, adopted by that body on April 13, 1912; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Irrigation Association and National Reclamation Association be, and are hereby, urged to at once put forth all their efforts toward inaugurating and carrying on a campaign directed toward the furtherance of the purpose of the foregoing resolution.

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce at their regular meeting held June 12, 1912.

H. Z. OSBORNE, *President.*

Attest:

H. B. GURLEY, *Assistant Secretary.*

—

Resolution of the Twentieth Irrigation Congress, at Salt Lake City, October 3, 1912.

We renew our indorsement of the Newlands river-regulation bill and urge its enactment by the Federal Congress during the coming session. The bill provides for the complete control of the flood waters of our rivers in such a way as to promote irrigation and drainage, the development of power, the extension of navigation, and the protection of the lowlands from destructive floods.

—

PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF TRADE,
Philadelphia.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

This memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade respectfully represents:

That, through its committee on inland transportation, it has examined the provisions of Senate bill No. 122, introduced by Senator NEWLANDS, having for its purpose the creation of a board of river regulation with the view of securing the maintenance by the Federal Government of an adequate levee and bank revetment system in the low States bordering the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers and for the ultimate adoption of a policy of stream control which shall check and minimize the formation of floods, which have proved so disastrous in the loss of life and property.

That the yearly damage caused by preventable floods in the drainage basin of the Ohio River, and the damage caused by the great flood of 1912 in the Mississippi Valley, certainly justify the most liberal appropriations and the most careful study for their causes, with the view of securing remedial measures for their prevention.

That Philadelphia, while far removed from the territory affected by these floods, sympathizes with the sufferers therefrom and believes that in the last analysis the great losses affect unfavorably every business interest and the General Government is called upon to aid by legislation in securing for the afflicted sections of the country immunity from the recurrence of these devastating floods: Therefore

Your memorialist, the Philadelphia Board of Trade, petitions your honorable bodies to favorably consider and pass Senate bill No. 122, known as the "Newlands river-regulation bill."

And your memorialist will ever pray.

[SEAL.]

WM. M. COATES,
President Philadelphia Board of Trade.

Attest:

W. R. TUCKER, *Secretary.*

—

Resolutions of the National Flood Prevention and River Regulation Conference at New Orleans. Unanimously adopted January 7, 1913.

Whereas the great flood of 1912 in the lower Mississippi Valley demonstrated the necessity for the complete national regulation of our rivers from source to mouth, including their tributaries, in such a way as to restrain the floods, not only by levee construction, revetments, and bank protection in the lower river valleys, but also by source-stream control of the flood waters, so far as possible, in the territory of their origin, by all adequate and practicable means of water conservation, including flood-water canals and reservoirs, in aid of navigation, reclamation, and power development, thus transforming the floods from agencies of destruction into agencies of production and saving for beneficial use the enormous national wealth that now goes to waste in floods and maintaining a sustained and well-regulated flow for navigation; and

Whereas the policy approved and urged by President Elect Woodrow Wilson, in his telegram to Hon. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, of September 29, 1912, which has been read to this conference, of supplementing bank and levee protection by the storage of flood waters above for irrigation and water power, thereby turning floods from a menace into a blessing and at the same time abundantly feeding navigable waters, can be best carried into practical effect and operation by concentrating constructive effort upon the greater river systems of the country and treating each of such systems as a unit from source to mouth and completing, with all possible expedition, adequate levees and bank-protective works in the lower valleys as national defenses against the destroying forces of nature, supplementing such works of defense by the simultaneous construction of all effective and practicable works for source-stream control; and

Whereas in order that this may be done it is necessary that an appropriation should be made sufficient for the entire work of construction, without interruption or delay, in the same continuous way in which the work on the Panama Canal has been so rapidly pushed forward to completion: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That as rapidly as the works on the Isthmus are completed so as to dispense with them there that the trained force of engineers and skilled workmen and such machinery as may be available for and adapted to this new work shall be forthwith transferred to the Missis-

sippi Valley and there set to work under the same competent leadership which has directed their work on the Panama Canal, to the end not only that all destructive floods in the "Sugar Bowl of the Continent" in the valley of the Mississippi River, as well as its tributaries, shall be forever safeguarded against and the shadow of their menace lifted forever from the pathway of its future progress and development, but also that the great Isthmian waterway now approaching completion shall be supplemented by the most complete system of inland waterways existing in any nation of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That the Newlands-Bartholdt river-regulation bill, in order that it may more fully and completely accomplish the great objects above set forth, shall specifically appropriate not less than $10,000,000 annually, $100,000,000 in all, for work on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, other than the Ohio, from St. Louis to the Gulf; and $10,000,000 annually for 10 years, $100,000,000 in all, for work in the drainage basin of the Missouri River; and $10,000,000 annually for 10 years, $100,000,000 in all, for work in the Ohio River drainage basin; and $5,000,000 annually for 10 years, $50,000,000 in all, for work in the drainage basin of the Colorado River; and $5,000,000 annually for 10 years, $50,000,000 in all, for work in the drainage basin of the rivers of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys in California; and be it further

Resolved, That the annual appropriation for 10 years to the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall be increased in said bill from $24,000,000 to $29,000,000, $290,000,000 in all, to be expended for levees, revetments, and other works for river regulation and control, as now specified in said bill, and also for building bank-protective works to prevent erosion and cutting of the banks and consequent caving and destruction of the levees and to control the river and hold it in a permanently fixed and established channel; and be it further

Resolved, That the said bill be further amended so as to specify more particularly in its title and in the first section of the bill its purpose and object of preventing silt and sedimentary material from being carried into and deposited in navigable rivers, channels, and harbors, and for the conservation of the water resources of the United States, and that in subsequent sections of the bill its purpose of promoting river regulation by land reclamation should be, wherever provided for, made to include drainage to an equal extent with irrigation in order that the flow of rivers shall be regulated and controlled in aid of navigation, not only by the use of flood waters for irrigation on the upper tributaries but also by controlling them in fixed and established channels in the lower valleys, thereby aiding navigation and at the same time promoting land reclamation by both irrigation and drainage; and be it further

Resolved, That the specific appropriation in said bill for the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture shall be reduced from two to one million dollars annually for 10 years, and that the appropriation for the Forestry Service for the acquisition of lands under the Appalachian Act shall be reduced from five to one million dollars annually for 10 years, the total amount of said reductions to be added to the appropriation for the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army for work under said bill as hereinbefore provided; and be it further

Resolved, That on international rivers or streams the board of river regulation may cooperate with other nations and the representatives thereof in the same manner and to the same extent that they are now directed by said bill to cooperate with the States of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the Mississippi River Commission shall be a member of the board of river regulation created by said bill; and be it further

Resolved, That, in the judgment of this conference, the passage by Congress of the Newlands-Bartholdt river-regulation bill can be accomplished by a great educational campaign similar to that which resulted in the passage of the national irrigation act and the Appalachian Act, and that to facilitate and expedite the conduct of such a campaign the National Irrigation Association and the National Reclamation Association should be merged into one great national organization under the broader name of the National Reclamation Association, more particularly as the national irrigation act is officially known as the United States reclamation act and the Government service created by that act and through which it is administered is known as the United States Reclamation Service.

NEWSPAPER COMMENTS AND EDITORIALS FAVORABLE TO THE NEWLANDS RIVER REGULATION BILL.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Item.]

RIVER NAVIGATION AND FLOODS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *March 13, 1911.*

Senator FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, of Nevada, is one of the best-informed men on the subject of river navigation in the United States. In his recent speech in the Senate on this subject he gave the Nation an amount of practical information, which, so far as we know, is unmatched in the same space to be found anywhere. We can touch on a few points only here.

He said we must realize that the country needs and demands legislation from Congress that will include regulation, improvement, and development of all the waterways of the United States under broad and comprehensive plans.

Regarding irrigation works, with only eight years' work we have to-day 23 projects, some completed, and all well along toward completion.

So far these newly irrigated lands have become the most valuable, or as valuable, per acre of any producing lands in the United States, lands which a decade ago could not even be given away, so worthless in their desert aspects did they appear to the farmer.

Methods can and will be devised for the Nation to cooperate with the States to provide a proper apportionment of costs and benefits, so instead of wasting time on question of jurisdiction we could unite all powers and create a common benefit for all the people.

The development of our waterways as efficient machines for transportation requires primarily the regulation of river flow. For if the flow of the rivers be regulated in such a way as to avoid the extreme of floods and the opposite extreme of low water, we will always have in the rivers a navigable stage of water to transport boats for passengers and freight.

We must first prevent floods. We can make use of the natural reservoirs which nature has provided for the absorption of the rains, and we can create artificial reservoirs for the storage of flood waters, as we are now doing on the Panama Canal.

The natural reservoirs are the forests and the agricultural lands, which absorb the rainfall and the melting snows. Our aim should be to everywhere increase the porosity and absorbent properties of the soil and thus prevent the run-offs which swell our streams into great floods, which now aggregate a damage upon property of the stupendous sum of nearly two hundred millions a year in the United States.

Aside from the question of whether or not the denudation of our forests will diminish rainfall, there can be no doubt whatever that the destruction of forest growth will diminish the absorption of falling waters on the soil.

The reports of the Geological Survey show clearly that wherever there has been a destruction of forest growth there follows immediately a hardening of the surface, the erosion of the soil, and the rapid run-off which carries the soil and silt and the material from the mountains and hillsides down into the channels of the rivers, choking navigation. Therefore the preservation of the forests upon these great watersheds, which are the sources of water supply, is an essential element in the control of floods which affect the channels of navigable rivers.

The next thing to consider is the increase of the absorbent properties of the soil itself wherever it is farmed or cultivated. Plowing and cultivation, and of terraced and irrigated fields systematically practiced, facilitate the absorption of moisture. By such and like scientific means the soil is prevented from being washed into the creeks and streams and finally into the navigable rivers; they arrest this constant flow of vast areas of alluvial soil down into the Ohio, the Missouri, and the Mississippi Rivers, and also from the Appalachian Mountains, and the White Mountains, and the Allegheny Mountains down the rivers that flow into all the channels emptying into the bays and sounds on the Atlantic seaboard.

In that manner, adds Mr. NEWLANDS, we will not only perform the work of facilitating the storage of water in the soil by intelligent methods of cultivation and thereby aid in regulating the river flow, but we will also prevent the enormous waste of soil of the country, which is robbing the cultivated areas of vast amounts of fertile, cultivable soil and depositing it in rivers, bays, sounds, and gulfs, where it is not wanted.

The next thing to be considered is artificial reservoirs. The people of Pittsburgh have recently caused to be made a survey of the watersheds of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers, and they have found there many large sites that can be utilized for storage purposes. They are seriously studying the question of constructing these reservoirs with a view to avoiding the destructive floods which at present inflict an annual injury upon Pittsburgh, and the year of the great flood of 1907 caused damage in that city alone amounting to from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000.

So it is everywhere. Localities are considering the question of flood destruction and are working at the problem, not only in its local aspects but in its national aspects. The States at the lower ends of rivers are calling upon the Nation to see to it that they are not damaged by the run-offs from States above them.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post, Mar. 16, 1911.]

FOR FLOOD PROTECTION.

The declaration by George H. Maxwell that the enactment of the Newlands bill by Congress will add fifty to a hundred millions to the value of property in the Pittsburgh industrial district has aroused an increased interest on the subject of flood protection. The Newlands bill was introduced in the United States Senate by Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, and it provides for an annual appropriation of $50,000,000 for 10 years to regulate and control the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce and as a means to provide for flood protection.

This act, Mr. Maxwell declares, will afford Pittsburgh the protection desired, and by proving a guaranty of safety would result in a tremendous enhancement of values. Mr. Maxwell, as the executive director of the flood commission, has made a thorough study of conditions, and his statement must be accepted as wholly devoid of extravagance. It serves to show what the flood menace inflicts in the way of business losses and depreciation in the value of affected real estate.

The flood commission has made commendable progress in the preparation of plans, but it is stated both State and national aid will be required. The Newlands bill, owing to the broadness of its scope, is recognized as the best legislation that has been advanced. It covers every State in the Union. A bill is also pending in the legislature which authorizes county commissioners to expend moneys for flood protection.

Naturally, the citizens of Pittsburgh will await with keen interest for the development of this all-important matter. I means much to them both as to business and comfort. With the positive claims that the danger can be overcome there will be an increased demand for a condition that would be of such incalculable benefit to the city and all its business interests.

[From the Lockport (N. Y.) Sun, Dec. 12, 1911.]

ONE MILLION ACRES IN NEW YORK.

The immediate drainage of the 80,000,000 acres of swamp and overflow land in the United States, the immediate regulation and control of the flood waters of every river in the country, the immediate development of a national policy for the control of the entire drainage-water question as a unit, are the aims of the National Drainage Reclamation Association, just formed in Chicago of men from the South, Southeast, East, Southwest, Middle West, and far West.

To this end the new association will get behind the bill introduced in the Senate by Senator NEWLANDS providing for the regulation and control of all rivers and streams, storing their flood waters, and distributing them in times of low water.

James R. Garfield, former Secretary of the Interior, and Gifford Pinchot, former Chief Forester and at present the president of the National Conservation Association, were present at the organization meeting. Each spoke at length upon the magnitude of the work the association was about to undertake, and each spoke of the necessity for a strong organization built upon the policy of national patriotism.

As the name of the association indicates, its primary work will be to compel the Federal Government to take immediate steps to reclaim the 80,000,000 acres of swamp and overflow lands that are scattered all over the country. At the same time it will give its aid and support to every other conservative movement—to forestry, irrigation, river regulation. The word "reclamation" in the name indicates the comprehensiveness of the aims of the association.

"We want to reclaim these 80,000,000 acres of swamp lands," said Edmund T. Perkins, of Chicago, who called the meeting. "We want to add to the permanent wealth of the country five or eight billion dollars

worth of land and hundreds of millions of dollars to the value of the annual crops from our lands. We want Uncle Sam to do this for the sake of all this people—to provide more homes for his nephews and nieces, to increase the prosperity of the land, to decrease the high cost of living.

"Because every section of the land has swamp acres this is not and can not be a sectional movement. There are nearly 14,000,000 swamp acres in the States immediately surrounding Chicago—in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. There are more than a million such acres in New York and New Jersey; there are nearly 3,000,000 such acres in California and Oregon; there are 25,000,000, approximately, along the Atlantic coast; and there are more than 30,000,000 in the Mississippi and Ohio and Missouri Valleys."

—

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal, Jan. 19, 1912.]

The Newlands reclamation bill is one of the most comprehensive conservation measures ever placed before Congress. It contemplates devoting $50,000,000 a year for a period of 10 years to the general subject of water control in the United States. It is proposed to unite all of the hydrographic activities of the Government into one harmonious plan. The idea is to impound and store the flood waters of the upper reaches of the rivers for irrigation; to provide channels as the rivers near the sea large enough to carry away floods without damage, and at the same time serve as waterways for commerce. With the plan goes the reclamation of the swamps and the reforestation of the mountains to prevent erosion and check sudden freshets. It is easy to figure a return on this investment running up into the billions of dollars. In general, the plan is workable. Of the financial benefits to be derived from it there can be but little question. The main point to guard against is the enhancement of the value of private lands at the expense of all the people. The national irrigation act provided for the return of all the money expended to the Treasury as a result of the enhancement in the value of the lands served by the Government ditches. It would be only just to arrange for the same policy with reference to vast areas of property directly benefited by the Newlands program.

—

[From the Pueblo (Colo.) Journal, Jan. 19, 1911.]

WATERWAY IMPROVEMENT.

The proposal of Senator NEWLANDS to make a thorough investigation of the inland waterways of the country has merit which ought to insure its passage by Congress. Under his plan every use to which water can be put will be considered; the rivers will be examined as to their possibilities for freight carrying and power purposes; practical plans will be formed for improvements and estimates of the cost made. It is a big undertaking, which will require the expenditure of considerable money for the preliminary work, but the expense will be small in comparison to the good to be accomplished. Accurate facts will be secured and the Government enabled to go about the work of waterway improvement in a systematic manner, and not in the haphazard way which is of so frequent occurrence. Under the "pork-barrel" methods which have existed immense sums have been voted in the past for "improvements" which were of no account, the only good thing about them being that employment was furnished.

A feature about the Newlands measure which can be objected to is that for the appointment of a special board to consider the matter of improvements. A salary is provided for the members, and as their task will take a number of years, the expenditure on this item alone would be considerable. There must be some supervising board to direct the work, but one could be secured without any additional salary expense. The Government has plenty of engineers and experts in its employ, and these could be detailed to make the investigation. The Army engineers and the experts connected with the Interior Department are well fitted for the task, and with substituting a board composed of such the Newlands bill would be the ideal method for getting at a businesslike handling of the waterway problem.

—

[From the Woman's National Daily, St. Louis, Mo., Jan. 27, 1911.]

ESCHEWING PORK.

Senator NEWLANDS has offered an amendment to the river and harbor bill providing for the appointment of a board to consider all questions of inland waterways, irrigation, swamp-land drainage, and forest preservation in its relation to the streams. This is not a general conservation commission, but one charged with the consideration of all the phases of inland navigation. It would be the province of this board to study all the projects, harmonize and coordinate them, and make recommendations to Congress for specific action. This is something the friends of waterways have long demanded. It is the proper way to cut the "pork barrel" from appropriation bills, and therefore should receive the approval of the President. It is the way to harmonize the various projects and get all their friends to pulling together for such of them as the board considers desirable and practicable.

Having expended half a billion on the Panama Canal, as we shall have done by the time it is put into operation, particularly if we erect elaborate fortifications, and then add largely to the Navy to protect the fortifications, as we should be compelled to do, we could well afford to expend a like sum upon a properly devised system of waterways for the development of internal transportation. We have expended hundreds of millions in the past with comparatively little to show for it. We shall continue to waste money in the same way, pork or no pork, unless we systematize the work as Senator NEWLANDS provides for in this bill, or in some other way involving the same general principle. This amendment will probably not carry in the brief time Congress has yet to consider it. Indeed, it may be the means, by delay caused by its discussion, of preventing the bill itself from passing, and thus adding one more to the calls for a special session. But, soon or later, it will be passed, because it appeals to the business sense of the people.

—

[From the Gulf States Farmer, New Orleans, March, 1912.]

COOPERATION IS THE WATCHWORD OF THE NATIONAL DRAINAGE CONGRESS.

The object of the Second National Drainage Congress, to be held in New Orleans on April 10–13, 1912, will be to work out a national policy for river regulation and control, for protection from overflow, for flood prevention, and for land reclamation by the irrigation of arid lands and the drainage of swamp and overflow lands, that will harmonize and unite every section of the United States in a great campaign for its adoption by the National Government.

This national policy must be one that will bring into complete cooperation and harmony the National Government, the States, and all local districts and municipalities in actual constructive work.

It must be a policy that will clearly recognize the constitutional limitations of the National Government, and require of the National Government that it shall do only such things as are clearly within those constitutional limitations and for which precedents already exist in legislation heretofore enacted.

It must be a policy which will unite in its support the Ohio River Valley, which requires flood prevention, as well as navigation; the upper Mississippi River Valley, which requires a sufficient enlargement of the reservoir system on the headwaters of the Mississippi River to regulate the river flow for navigation and for water-power development; and the Missouri River Valley, which requires storage reservoirs and flood-water canals for irrigation, navigation, protection from overflow, flood prevention, and water-power development.

The precedents already exist for the doing of all these things by the National Government, but its work through the different bureaus, services, and departments lacks cooperation, and is for that reason inadequate and wasteful.

In the lower Mississippi Valley, if the National Government will protect the banks, prevent caving and the destruction in that way of existing levees, preserve and maintain the navigable channels, construct adequate outlets and controlling works, and build the large canals necessary for navigation and as part of a comprehensive drainage system, the rest of the work of the reclamation of the swamp and overflow lands will be accomplished through State, district, and local action.

In the State of Louisiana the recent decision of the State supreme court sustaining the constitutionality and validity of drainage bonds issued under State statutes provides the way for securing the capital necessary for the local drainage work, and it is neither desirable nor necessary that this work should be undertaken by the National Government, even though it were within its constitutional power.

It will thus be seen that the object of the National Drainage Congress will not be to strike out any new and radical national policy, but its slogan will be "Cooperation and harmony." It will aim to bring into cooperation, coordination, and harmonious and united constructive work all the agencies which are now at work in an inadequate and disconnected way.

It is in this work of bringing order out of chaos, eliminating controversy, and perfecting a broad working plan which will unite territorially the entire Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, with the Ohio River Valley on the east and the Missouri River Valley on the west—a vast region embracing more than one-third of the entire area of the United States—that the National Drainage Congress so much needs the cooperation by attendance as a delegate at its meeting in New Orleans on April 10–13 of every one who would be benefited by the development of the Mississippi Valley.

Those who contribute to the success of this great movement for uniting so many heretofore divergent ideas and plans in one great workable whole that will solve the problem of navigation, drainage, protection from overflow, and flood prevention in the lower Mississippi Valley, and at the same time apply to similar conditions anywhere in the United States, will help to do the country a service as great as any which can be rendered to it in any way in this generation. The problem is so vast and far-reaching in its importance and magnitude that it overshadows every other public question. It dwarfs into comparative unimportance even the Panama Canal.

In the State of Louisiana alone there are 10,000,000 acres of land that can be reclaimed for agriculture by drainage, protection from overflow, and flood prevention. Louisiana is larger by 10,000 square miles than the combined area of Belgium, Holland, and Denmark, has greater latent agricultural resources, and will sustain a larger population than those countries. Their combined population is now 16,000,000, while that of Louisiana is only 1,600,000. The annual agricultural production of Louisiana to-day is $85,000,000. If its 10,000,000 acres of reclaimable land were drained and cultivated, it would increase the agricultural production of the State over a billion dollars—more than twice the entire gold production of the world. And these stupendous figures show the possibility of development by river regulation and land reclamation in only one State.

If the western boundary line of Mississippi were extended south to the Gulf of Mexico, that part of Louisiana lying to the east of that line would embrace an area as large as Belgium. If the unreclaimed lands in that territory which are now an uninhabited waste, were drained and intensively cultivated, as are the lands of Belgium, by a densely settled rural people, there would be within a radius of 100 miles of New Orleans a population as large as that of Belgium. The population of Belgium is 7,200,000. What would that mean to New Orleans? It would mean that it would rival Antwerp, the third great seaport of the world, in its commercial prestige and world trade; while Baton Rouge would grow to be as great and beautiful a city as Brussels.

Every smaller city, town, village, and hamlet in the whole Mississippi Valley and Gulf States would grow and develop proportionately in population. Every merchant, wholesale or retail—every manufacturer—every professional man, engineer, lawyer, doctor, or dentist—every real estate owner—every planter, farmer, fruit grower, or truck gardener, would be correspondingly benefited. All would share in the enormous prosperity that would be created by this stupendous development of wealth from natural resources.

—

[From the Gulf States Farmer, April, 1912.]

THE NATION-WIDE NEWLANDS PLAN—SENATOR NEWLANDS'S BILL BEFORE CONGRESS TO AID DRAINAGE—ITS WIDE SCOPE.

[From our Washington correspondent.]

Four billion dollars more in farm products each year; this sum added annually to the wealth in the United States for the prosperity of its farmers, merchants, manufacturers, railroads, and bankers and their employees; this is the result of a national business investment under consideration in this Congress. It is proposed in the bill for river regulation drawn by Senator NEWLANDS and known as the Newlands bill.

Four billion dollars per annum in perpetuity from the investment by Uncle Sam of $50,000,000 a year for 10 years—$500,000,000.

The Newlands bill has a scope big enough to perform as a harmonious whole the big tasks to which the Government has set its hand.

The bill is considered one of the broadest and most comprehensive conservation measures ever drafted. By coupling all the work proposed by it with the idea of promoting interstate commerce by means of navigable rivers it brings within the constitutional limitations of the Federal Government such tasks as the drainage and reclamation of swamp lands, the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands, the protection of forests, the elimination of dangers from floods, etc.

The Newlands bill has received the enthusiastic indorsement of many public men and associations. It was indorsed unqualifiedly at the

nineteenth meeting of the National Irrigation Congress held recently in Chicago. It is being earnestly supported by the Pittsburgh flood commission. It has just been indorsed by Edmund Perkins, president, and Isham Randolph, vice president, of the American Reclamation Federation, at the annual meeting in Chicago. It has the support of most of the members of the National Drainage Congress, organized in Chicago last month, and probably will be officially indorsed by that organization at its second meeting, in New Orleans, April 10 to 13.

* * * * * * *

DECLARED CONSTITUTIONAL.

Many expert constitutional lawyers have pronounced the bill constitutional. They say this is about the only way in which the National Government can undertake such work as drainage and reclamation of swamp lands, irrigation works, forest preservation.

* * * * * * *

Edmund T. Perkins, of Chicago, vice president and acting president of the National Drainage Congress, who was the engineer of the Reclamation Service for several years, is an ardent supporter of the Newlands bill. "It is such a splendid constructive measure, and with such far-reaching beneficial effects to the entire country, that it ought to be passed immediately," he said. "It is all that the irrigation advocates could want, all that the drainage enthusiasts could wish for, all that the forest men could desire; it provides for the conservation of the water, forest, and soil resources of the whole country."

George H. Maxwell, director of the Pittsburgh flood commission, is more enthusiastic even than Mr. Perkins. Mr. Maxwell is a member of the executive committee from Pennsylvania of the National Drainage Congress. "The Newlands bill," says Mr. Maxwell, "unites every aspect of conservation in a comprehensive plan that can be carried out by the Federal Government for the benefit of the whole Nation; and does it in what I consider the only constitutional way such a work can be done—under the policy of aiding interstate navigation and controlling, regulating, and standardizing the flow of navigable rivers."

* * * * * * *

[From the Spectator, Pittsburgh, Friday, Apr. 7, 1911.]

FLOOD COMMISSION'S GREAT WORK.

Mr. George H. Maxwell, executive director of the flood commission of Pittsburgh, writes as follows to the Spectator:

"Is not $100,000,000 added to the value of property in the Pittsburgh industrial district a proposition large enough to merit the active and vigorous cooperation of every business man in the district? The figure I give is the conservative estimate of the benefits that would immediately result if the Pittsburgh industrial district were safeguarded against floods. That would be done, beyond all question or peradventure of doubt, if the Newlands river-regulation bill were enacted into a law by Congress."

The bill which Senator NEWLANDS has before the Senate at Washington has attracted a great deal of favorable attention and provides for the construction by the Federal Government of storage reservoirs and irrigation works wherever necessary to furnish water not only for irrigation purposes but for the prevention of devastating floods.

It is this latter purpose that is specially applicable to the Pittsburgh district, for with the Newlands bill made a law the work of constructing great reservoirs at the headwaters of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers could be carried on, with the splendid and profitable result of ending the costly ravages to Pittsburgh and suburbs by great floods.

Such a proposition should receive the prompt, hearty, and generous support of business men and all other citizens of Pittsburgh. Certainly the adding of $100,000,000 to the value of property in our industrial district is a grand thing, and yet to attain it nothing is really needed but the support of the people.

In this great work the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce is taking an active, aggressive, and splendidly efficient part. Let its work be backed up by the influence and the financial support of business men and all people of the Pittsburgh district. The chamber of commerce flood commission was originally organized with 34 business and professional men, and is now being enlarged to include representation of the various industrial, commercial, and manufacturing interests.

[From the Fresno Morning Republican, Sunday, Apr. 7, 1912.]

CONTROL OF FLOOD WATERS.

EDITOR REPUBLICAN: We have noticed very recently accounts of the old and often-repeated story that Pittsburgh is flooded again; and this week the old, old story comes again that the Missouri, La Platte, and the Mississippi Rivers are raging torrents and doing millions of dollars of damage to the people in their vicinity. We may not this year have such reports of the Kings, San Joaquin, and Sacramento Rivers, but under usual conditions we shall hear of such things in future years; we had it last year and will again. Because of these ever-recurring floods Pittsburgh some time ago raised $100,000 to make surveys and estimates to store the flood waters that do so much damage (we might say annually to their city), and out of a large number of sites for reservoirs we understand they have selected 17 of the most favored ones, and that if these are built the flooding of Pittsburgh will be a thing of the past, and the flood waters that do so much damage will be made a useful servant of the people. And Pittsburgh is preparing, if in the event they can not get the Government to aid them in this work, to go on and do it alone. As Pittsburgh in the past has been one of the most favored cities in the country to receive benefits through the Government's protective policy, they have good grounds to continue to plead for aid from their point of view on this matter. One of their Congressmen has a bill now before Congress for a large appropriation to help in this work. Of course, if it became a law it would be a local matter, yet of great benefit to a large section of country. But if Congress would pass Senator NEWLAND'S river-regulation bill, known as S. 122, which appropriates $50,000,000 a year for 10 years, it would become a national affair, and as this bill provides for cooperation with States, counties, and even small districts, for the benefit of the people all over, wherever they take enough interest in such work to do something to help themselves. This great constructive measure should become a law at the earliest possible moment.

Some people say it is all well enough to appropriate the money, but where is it to come from without more taxation of the people? We answer, let the Government stop building battleships costing about $15,000,000 each before they are ready to leave our shores on a peaceful mission, for we have no wars on our lands and not the slightest prospect of one; yet some of the "chair warmers" at Washington want to-day to spend $20,000,000 on a single battleship, and they want one or two of this kind every year. These "chair warmers" are men on duty keeping their seats warm and imagining all kinds of disasters are going to come upon us as a nation if we do not keep building these engines of destruction. Congress now being in session, we hear from these infant industrial "chair warmers" that we are in danger again of the Japanese invading us, which is all "bosh and rot" to many of our great and notable men. It is time the people waked up to the enormous expenditure that our Government is spending every year preparing to kill people and only giving a paltry few dollars in helping the "mainstay" of the Government, to wit, agriculture. It is well to remember that 70 cents out of every dollar collected by the Government every year is spent in paying for past wars and preparing for future ones that will never come. This leaves 30 cents for all the rest of the work. We constantly hear of the high cost of living, and if the same policy is carried on as in the past we will hear more of it.

We need more land under cultivation, and we have it here at home if the Government only turns its attention to it. We have 80,000,000 acres of swamp and overflow land made so by these ever-recurring floods, and nearly every acre of these lands could be made a garden spot for our people to live on in peace and plenty. It must be reclaimed, and it will be as soon as our people wake up to its advantages and its great possibilities.

The great national drainage congress that will be held in New Orleans the coming week will be one of the largest congresses ever held in this country, and we have no doubt it will speak in no uncertain words a demand that our Government does take notice that in this great work a substantial start shall be made and that at once in the work to reclaim these vast areas of the richest lands on the face of the globe. In a short space of time our Government will have an abundance of material and machinery on hand when the Panama Canal is completed, and this could be brought home and put to good use in this reclamation work in preparing these lands for homes, and it must be done.

We are glad that Mr. Frank Short is going to that drainage congress, sent by the Panama fair commission; by this we know that our State will be heard from. The writer of this communication holds credentials from the head officers of the drainage congress, but it takes more than credentials to go so far to attend, no matter what the great object of the gathering may be. We are positive, knowing some of the leading men of this congress, that Senator NEWLAND'S bill, S. 122, will be strongly indorsed by that congress, and this we know every county board of supervisors and every chamber of commerce, board of trade—in fact, every organization of every description in this State and other States—should pass strong resolutions indorsing the Newlands river-regulation bill, and every resolution should be sent to every Congressman and every Senator at Washington and a private note that this measure must be passed and become a law this session of the Congress. If this were done we could be in line for assistance, not only of drainage but of irrigation—what our west side so much needs.

JOHN FAIRWEATHER.

[From the Courier Journal, Louisville, Ky., Apr. 7, 1912.]

CONTROL OF FLOODS.

It is evident that the levee system along the Mississippi River, while a great protection in the case of ordinary high water, is a source of no small danger in times of extraordinary floods.

Many years ago, when an engineer of some note suggested a system of storage reservoirs for controlling floods and also for increasing river stages at seasons of low water, he was almost laughed out of court. His plan was regarded as visionary and impractical, and nobody gave it very serious attention. The engineer long ago passed to his last account, but the idea has survived, and there is pending in the United States Senate a bill, offered by Senator NEWLANDS, which bears the following title:

"A bill to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for the beneficial use of flood waters and for water storage, and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies."

A few years ago the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh organized a flood commission to investigate the question of flood control and make a report thereon. The commission delved deeply into the subject, and finally recommended storage reservoirs as a means of flood prevention. As reasons for indorsing the reservoir plan it cited the following:

"The flood relief would be extended over hundreds of miles of tributaries and of the main rivers, including the Ohio, for many miles below Pittsburgh.

"The impounded flood water, with proper manipulation of the reservoir system, would considerably increase the low-water flow of the tributaries and of the main rivers.

"This increased low-water flow would greatly aid navigation and interstate commerce.

"The increased low-water flow would notably improve the quality of the water for domestic and industrial purposes.

"The sewerage problem of Pittsburgh and of many other communities along the rivers would be simplified.

"The public health would be protected against the dangers arising from the insanitary conditions caused by overflow and by extreme low water.

"A considerable amount of water power would be incidentally developed."

The commission found that there were many available sites for reservoirs in the vicinity of Pittsburgh. In fact, it selected 43 such sites, and had most of them surveyed. The opinion was expressed that adequate flood reduction at Pittsburgh could be obtained with 17 reservoirs, and the estimate was made that these reservoirs could be constructed at a cost of $20,000,000. In 10 years the flood damage at Pittsburgh has aggregated more than half this amount. The area affected by floods in the city includes real estate of the assessed valuation of $160,000,000. If relieved from the flood menace, it is believed this property would be increased in value at least $50,000,000, or more than twice the cost of a system of reservoirs. The commission believes it would be the part of wisdom for the city to build the reservoirs.

The National Drainage Congress is to meet in New Orleans April 10 to 13. Considering present conditions along the Mississippi River, the congress is likely to devote considerable attention to the question of flood prevention. A discussion of the reservoir plan which seems to be so strongly favored by Senator NEWLANDS and the Pittsburgh flood commission would add much to the interest of the convention.

[From the Chronicle Telegraph, Pittsburgh, Pa., Apr. 8, 1912.]

FLOOD PREVENTION.

Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, in taking up the cudgels in behalf of the Pittsburgh flood commission's plan of flood prevention, directs attention to the inadequacy of unrelated improvement projects, such as channel dredging and levee protection. If we are to prevent disastrous floods and make the rivers serve their proper function of waterway navigation, he contends each river must be treated as a unit from source to mouth and treated in a scientific and orderly manner. This is the view enunciated by President Taft in his speeches and recommendations relative to river improvement, and it is in accordance with this view that the President has advised the taking up of the improvement of the Ohio as a starter and the prosecution of this work in a logical way until the problem of securing all-the-year-round navigation has been solved. To the idea so advanced in its general aspect no serious objection is raised in any quarter. The vital difficulty is to interest Congress in operations requiring so large an expenditure as the proposed improvement entails. While the present economy spasm lasts the prospects are not encouraging. Sooner or later, however, Congress must concede the public necessity that exists and provide the means of meeting it, in so far as Federal obligation goes.

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune, Apr. 8, 1912.]

ANNUAL WASTE.

Annual and semiannual repetitions of floods such as are devastating the Mississippi, Ohio, and Missouri Valleys, causing the loss of many lives and damage to property that will probably total more than $50,000,000, would be prevented by the passage of Senator NEWLANDS's "river-regulation" bill now pending in Congress. This is the statement of Frank B. Knight, member for Illinois of the executive committee of the National Drainage Congress.

The Newlands bill would place the task of regulating the navigable waters—treating them all as parts of a unified, comprehensive system—in the hands of a commission. It provides for the storage of the flood waters in natural and artificial reservoirs, to hold them back until times of drought, when they can be let loose and maintain the navigable rivers at a proper depth. The reforestation of the watersheds is only one of the methods contemplated by the bill for checking the floods. Others are the construction of artificial reservoirs where these are possible and practicable, and the full utilization of natural reservoirs. It provides for carrying the surplus waters out over the arid and semiarid districts, in irrigating operations, to let it seep back gradually through the soil. It provides for the digging of drainage channels to carry off the surplus waters from the lower reaches of the river, to help keep the navigable channels at a standard depth and prevent them from being shifting; also to utilize these drainage channels as additional waterways.

It provides also for the construction of dikes and levees. The levee system is a good thing and has accomplished a great deal to protect people and property and to reclaim overflowed lands. But this work has been done by piecemeal; the various sections are unrelated. In times of unusual conditions, as at present, the entire levee system is endangered because the work of controlling the rivers has not been started at the headwaters and among the tributaries.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post, Apr. 9, 1912.]

THE MISSISSIPPI FLOOD.

The flood in the Mississippi River must be regarded as a national calamity. More than 30,000 persons have been driven from their homes, a number not yet fully calculated drowned, while the monetary loss will exceed $10,000,000. Inasmuch as the end is not yet, these figures will probably be greatly exceeded, as many communities heretofore prosperous are in danger of being wiped out of existence.

These floods, with their attendant disasters, will continue just as long as scientific means are not adopted for keeping them under control. The present disaster proves the inadequacy of the levee system.

Senator NEWLANDS, who is to address the Pittsburgh flood commission next week, favors a system of river government that will not be piecemeal. He believes that each river must be treated as a unit from source to mouth in order to guarantee the perfection of the precautions taken for the safety of the people. It is evident, however, that if the Mississippi Valley is to be spared repetitions of these disasters a form of levee must be developed that will not break. This would involve a tremendous cost, but it would be warranted when we take into consideration the millions that are swept away by the floods, the loss to business, and the suffering imposed on the people. It is a problem that calls for the most careful scientific research.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Apr. 9, 1912.]

DEEP WATERWAYS.

Senator NEWLANDS, one of the distinguished men the Commercial Congress has brought to Nashville, is interested in the improvement of waterways and points out that the present floods emphasize the necessity for that great work. He was quoted in the Banner's news columns yesterday as saying:

"In order to accomplish anything in this direction, we must undertake the work in a big way—just as we did the Panama Canal and the irrigation works. We must appropriate at least $50,000,000 annually for 10 years and tell our engineers and constructors to 'plan big.'"

Senator NEWLANDS, though now representing one of the States in the far West, is a native of Mississippi. He therefore knows something of the great river, whose unruly waters are now devastating the adjacent lands, and of the possibilities that would come of its control.

Senator NEWLANDS is right in placing waterway improvement on a parity of importance with such great public works undertaken by the Government as the Panama Canal and the irrigation of arid lands. The work should be undertaken on a big scale with a view to great accomplishment.

The improvement of the Mississippi River and its tributaries will be made the more pressing by the completion of the Panama Canal. All the vast valley will need the deep waterway to send its exports to the nearest port of shipment.

Deep waterway is a matter in which the South—that portion west of the Blue Ridge Mountains at least—has a vital interest. Senator NEWLANDS should have the strong support of this region in what he proposes. And it is not a matter for the South alone, but for the whole Mississippi Valley, and that is a very considerable portion of the country.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News, Apr. 10, 1912.]

THE RIVER PROBLEM.

The great flood in the Mississippi and its affluents is attracting public attention to one of the greatest problems confronting the American people. The Mississippi drains the central part of the United States, a region of wonderful fertility, already densely inhabited and destined to support a much larger population in the near future. The recurring floods bring danger to life and destruction to property throughout the great Mississippi Valley. It is estimated that the present overflow has cost the lives of 30 persons and destroyed property to the value of $10,000,000. How can such disasters be averted? How can the mighty river be controlled? That is the problem that the people of this country must endeavor to solve. It is a problem of greater magnitude than the construction of the Panama Canal, and its solution may involve a greater outlay. The people of Holland have protected their country against the North Sea by the construction of dikes. The original cost was enormous, and many thousands of dollars are expended every year in protecting and repairing the dikes on which the salvation of the country depends. The floods of the Mississippi are even more unmanageable than the waves of the North Sea. The best engineering skill of the age will be taxed to the utmost to devise means for restraining the angry waters. The sediment brought down by the floods has already raised the bed of the river above the level of the adjacent land. Whenever a break occurs in the levee the waters rush through and cover an immense area of fertile land. The Egyptians thousands of years ago attempted to control the Nile by constructing great reservoirs or lakes to hold back a part of the flood. The British are doing something of the same kind now by building the Aswan Dam. These examples may give a hint to our engineers. This subject came under discussion on Monday in the Southern Commercial Congress. Senator NEWLANDS made some very wise suggestions, which were published in this paper on yesterday, but their importance justifies their reproduction here.

Senator NEWLANDS advocated the appropriation of at least $50,000,000 a year for 10 years by the General Government to dam the great rivers and store their flood waters in such a manner as to prevent freshets and afford a constant flow of water throughout the year.

"The Mississippi flood," he said, "accentuates the agitation for big action regarding our waterways. The full regulation of our rivers can never be secured by mere channel dredging and levee protection. The whole river must be treated from source to mouth, including all its tributaries, by preventing swift run-off of the storm waters through storage and diversion of flood waters, both natural and artificial.

"We must undertake the work in a big way—just as we did the Panama Canal and the irrigation works."

Senator NEWLANDS is on the right road. Of course, his plan means the outlay of an enormous amount of money, but the object to be attained justifies the outlay. No nation was ever before called on to undertake a work of such magnitude. But this Republic is to-day the richest country in the world and it can afford the outlay. Then, too, it must be remembered that the benefits of the work, if properly done, will not be confined to the present generation, but will continue to bless those who come after us indefinitely, and it must not be forgotten that the saving of the loss of $10,000,000 a year, to say nothing of the loss of life as a human sacrifice, will furnish a motive for Government liberality in this matter which must command the general approval of the American people.

[From the Evening Star, Newark, N. J., Apr. 11, 1912.]

A NATIONAL PLAN OF FLOOD PREVENTION.

There is an object lesson for the National Drainage Congress at New Orleans on the need of an intelligent national waterways policy in this week's tremendous flood in the Mississippi Valley. Local devices to confine the mighty torrents have proven their feebleness. Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, shows that each river, with its sources and tributaries, must be treated as a unit, so that the surplus water can be held back in storage and used to irrigate arid lands and furnish power. Thus we shall harness one of the mighty forces of nature and make it man's profitable servant instead of his destructive foe. Senator NEWLANDS goes so far as to place this problem above the construction of the Panama Canal, and he argues that if it costs the Nation $50,000,000 a year for the next decade the money will be wisely and profitably spent. He urges that the scientific skill of the Nation and the States be enlisted in comprehensive plans of storage, irrigation, drainage, and flood prevention, embracing the 15 arid and the 15 swamp-land States.

[From the Trenton (N. J.) True American, Apr. 11, 1912.]

TO PREVENT FLOODS.

Flood devastation along the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Valleys has been greater in some localities than ever before, but when it is known that the damage annually from floods throughout the country totals $100,000,000 the news of the present rampages will not create surprise. While Senator NEWLANDS's river-regulation bill, now pending in Congress, aims to prevent this great damage annually, the cost of the reform would reach sums that would appear almost prohibitive. Senator NEWLANDS would put a commission in charge of the rivers, construct reservoirs for the storing of the water, establish a system of reforestation, build levees, dig drainage canals, and in other ways endeavor to prevent the great overflows that bring distress and death. Expense should not be a deterrent when it provides a remedy for an evil as great as this. Taking into consideration the loss of life, the damage to property, the deprivations of those who inhabit the valleys, and the soil erosion, the proposition of Senator NEWLANDS might in the end prove an economy.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, Apr. 11, 1912.]

TO CONTROL THE FLOODS.

Senator NEWLANDS believes in checking the floods of spring, and, besides having a practical plan, has the courage to advocate for this purpose the expenditure of $500,000,000—$50,000,000 bonds a year for a decade. It has been amply demonstrated, he declares, that channel improvement alone is a failure, that dikes can not be built high enough or strong enough to confine the waters to their natural channel. It is time to turn to something else, and that is, he believes, the construction of reservoirs into which the surplus water may be turned and from which it may be taken for the purpose of irrigating the dry lands and for making power, a universal need in the industry of the country.

Anticipating the objection that there is not money for this enterprise, the Senator holds up to ridicule the nation that has not money enough for its necessary constructive work, and suggests the taxation

of wealth by inheritance, corporation, employment, and other similar taxes. Whatever the result of this propaganda, it is timely, for there is even now before the country the spectacle of the destruction of property and life by the floods in the great rivers. That it is not only a tremendous loss of property and business activity, but also an enormous waste of energy, needs no demonstration. The only possible argument is as to the course to be adopted to prevent the loss and to conserve and employ the energy. The Senator's estimate that the control of the floods overshadows in importance the construction of the Panama Canal invites credence.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Apr. 12, 1912.]

RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

Senator NEWLANDS's idea that appropriations for river improvement should be a lump sum and the work directed in systematic manner in lieu of the present "pork-barrel" process, with local specifications, is one that deserves attention.

A great deal of money has been spent in river improvements that is of ony partial benefit, because other parts of the river are left unimproved. According to the Newlands idea the Government should complete the improvement of all rivers throughout their navigable length. That is a commendable idea and suggests a plan that would be a great improvement on the piecemeal, patchwork plan of river improvement that has been so long ineffectively pursued.

The waterways of the country are of great value to internal commerce, and ought to be improved to the highest possible point, making unobstructed navigation possible. Under the present system of river improvement everything is left to the enterprise of interested localities in securing special appropriations. The work is done in spots and without any connected system. Years are spent before anything substantial is accomplished, and then the lack of continuous improvement throughout the whole length of the stream renders local improvements of little avail. Some sort of reform in the method of river improvement is sorely needed, and the Newlands idea seems to be a good one.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Times, Apr. 12, 1912.]

PLEDGES NOT FULFILLED.

Senator NEWLANDS hails from the arid West and therefore is not immediately concerned about the floods in the Mississippi Valley or about waterways and how they should be treated in order to make them serve the country's welfare. Nevertheless Senator NEWLANDS has ideas on the subject, and he has not been slow to express them. He makes the charge that both political parties have failed to keep their pledges with respect to waterway improvement.

Senator NEWLANDS left Washington last Sunday on a speech-making trip to agitate the adoption of a constructive policy for the development of waterways. He spoke before the Southern Commercial Congress at Nashville Monday and was scheduled to address the National Drainage Congress yesterday in New Orleans. From New Orleans he will go to Pittsburgh to speak at a dinner given by the Pittsburgh Flood Commission.

"The present floods demonstrate forcibly the substantial foundation for the agitation for large action as to our waterways," said Senator NEWLANDS before leaving Washington. "Our rivers can never be regulated properly by unrelated projects for their improvement, such as by channel dredging and levee protection. If we are ever to prevent these disastrous floods and make the rivers serve their proper function of waterway navigation, each river must be treated as a unit from source to mouth and developed in a scientific manner. I shall urge the different associations which I address to appear immediately at Washington and demand from both political parties the performance of their platform pledges with respect to waterways. These platforms called for the cooperation of the scientific services of the Government, for cooperation between the Nation and the States, and for big continuing appropriations for the development of our waterways under comprehensive plans."

This idea has been indorsed in its essential principles by President Taft, when Secretary of War, and it is under legislation of this character that the Panama Canal and the national irrigation works have been so successfully prosecuted.

[From the Goldfield (Nev.) Tribune, Apr. 12, 1912.]

NEWLANDS'S PLAN APPROVED.

Out in this arid country reports from the flooded districts of the South have scarcely more than passing interest. Nevertheless a Nevada man is at the head of the waterways commission which has had under advisement for years plans for ameliorating conditions along the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries during the annually recurring floods.

Senator FRANCIS NEWLANDS has a bill pending in Congress which has been approved by the National Drainage Congress now in session at New Orleans. It is estimated that the damage from these floods during normal seasons amounts to at least $100,000,000 annually. This year the loss will be infinitely greater and the destruction of life and property will mark an epoch in national history. The Newlands proposed legislation bill provides for an outlay of $50,000,000 a year for a period of 10 years. This would be employed in the construction of levees, retaining walls, and reservoirs to impound surplus flood waters for use later in the year when the waterways are almost useless for want of a supply to keep their sluggish channels clear of obstructions. The Chicago Post, in treating the subject, outlines the plan as follows: It is proposed to treat the navigable streams as units from their sources to their mouths. Under the constitutional clause giving the United States Government exclusive jurisdiction over navigable waters Congress has the right to control, regulate, and standardize the streams. Under the public-health clause the Government is compelled to protect its citizens from floods and disease resulting from floods. The Newlands bill provides for carrying the surplus waters out over the arid and semiarid districts, in irrigation projects, to let it seep back gradually through the soil. It provides also for a uniform system of levees which has heretofore been done piecemeal without any correlation of effort or design. At present the entire levee system is endangered, because the work of controlling the rivers has not been started at the headwaters and among the tributaries. The Newlands bill has been indorsed all over the country, including the Irrigation Congress, the Pittsburgh Flood Commission, and numerous boards of trade and chambers of commerce.

[From the Providence Tribune, Apr. 13, 1912.]

THE RIVER FLOOD PROBLEM.

At the meeting of the National Drainage Congress in New Orleans the other day Senator NEWLANDS very truly said that the most vital function of that body is to bring order out of chaos, reconcile differences, eliminate controversies, and perfect a working plan broad enough to unite the entire Mississippi Valley. It has been demonstrated that the attempt to regulate rivers by channel improvement alone is a mistake; the proper way is to decrease the flood and raise the ebb and thus secure a stable flow of water. To do this it is necessary to treat each river as a unit, including its source and tributaries, with a view to storing and holding back the floods and utilizing the flood waters in the irrigation of arid lands and the development of water power, coupled with the construction of canals for drainage.

This work is not incomparable in importance with the construction of the Panama Canal. It would be tremendously expensive, but if it were done under comprehensive plans and with cooperation between the Federal and the State Governments the development of each use for the surface water would lessen the cost of maintaining a channel for navigation and would help to make practicable improvements the cost of which would otherwise be prohibitory. In the State of Louisiana alone it is said that there are 10,000,000 acres of rich agricultural land that can be reclaimed by drainage, protection from overflow, and flood prevention.

Every section of the Mississippi Valley is interested in some feature of the problem, and the object desired is to combine all elements into harmonious, concerted effort for the common good. To that end the skill of the various scientific services of the Nation and States should be united. Comprehensive plans should be prepared under their direction, embracing the 15 arid States and the 15 swamp-land States. The work might be organized under the supervision of the Engineer Corps of the Army in much the same way as the Panama Canal service.

"Let us candidly admit," said Senator NEWLANDS, "that during the next 10 years the work will cost $500,000,000, and provide a continuous appropriation of $50,000,000 annually in the firm faith that the money will be well invested. Once we unite in the support of such a policy the Ohio River Valley, with its need of flood protection; the upper Mississippi Valley, which requires the construction of reservoirs for the storage of water for navigation and for the control of floods; the Missouri River Valley, with similar needs; and the lower Mississippi Valley, with its need of drainage and flood protection; then it will be found that the National Congress will respond to the demand as it never has and never will respond to the demand for fitful and ineffective work by projects."

The pledges of both parties in 1908 as to waterway development have not been fulfilled, and the disastrous occurrences of the last two weeks should induce the people to express to Congress their emphatic opinion that it is time for both parties to redeem these pledges, instead of merely renewing them two months hence for campaign purposes. The excuse that the revenues do not warrant the expenditure can no longer be accepted. If the Government has not enough money to provide for this great construction work, then there must be created more revenue by additional taxes levied on the wealth of the country in the form of inheritance taxes, corporation taxes, or occupation taxes, based on income. It would be an outrage, of course, to increase the taxes on consumption, from which nearly the entire revenue of the Fedcral Government is now derived; but there is no reason why the wealth of the country should not respond in some form to the obligations of the Government to exercise fully the power conferred upon it in the interest of the whole people.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Journal, Apr. 15, 1912.]

PROGRESSING.

It is one of the inexplicable things of nature that while one section of the country is flooded and damaged in the millions by too much water another is suffering to the same extent for lack of water. Possibly it is not entirely a natural phenomenon so far as floods are concerned, for these seem to have a pretty close relation to the cutting off of the timber resources of this country; but whether it is natural or artificial it is appareat that the conditions may be greatly mitigated and ameliorated by both public and private action.

Senator NEWLANDS's address in Nashville is peculiarly timely in the present flood emergency. His remarks appear to have a value and application not before so clearly seen. His theories are not mere academic ones, but have a practical import that can be readily brought down to that great measure of dollars and cents.

The Nevada Senator has persisted in the ideas of irrigation and reclamation for many years. He has had little encouragement from parties engaged in the perpetual bickering and puttering of partisan politics, but it is some comfort to know that the time is approaching when the country may expect to realize the practical results of his work.

[From the Santa Ana (Cal.) Blade, Apr. 16, 1912.]

TO PREVENT FLOODS.

Annual and semiannual repetitions of floods such as are devastating the Mississippi, Ohio, and Missouri Valleys, causing the loss of many lives and damage to property that will probably total more than $50,000,000, would be prevented by the passage of Senator FRANCIS NEWLANDS's river regulation bill, now pending in Congress. This is the statement of Frank B. Knight, consulting engineer, of Chicago, member for Illinois of the executive committee of the National Drainage Congress. Before leaving for New Orleans to attend the second meeting of that organization, April 10 to 13, Mr. Knight declared that the United States Government will be in the position of neglecting a plain duty until it protects its citizens from such destructive internal foes as floods and the disease that results from them.

"The damage to property from floods amounts to at least $100,000,000 a year," he said. "The Newlands river regulation bill provides a method of preventing floods at a cost of but $50,000,000 a year for 10 years. An editorial in the Chicago Post on the present situation says: 'Aside from the old question of saving the trees on the watershed so that the spring floods will be slower in running off, the only thing to be done is to keep on in the present course. More levees and higher levees will have to be built until the Mississippi is thoroughly harnessed.'

"The Newlands bill provides for an additional method. It proposes to treat the navigable streams of the country as units from their sources to their mouths. Under the constitutional clause giving the United States Government exclusive jurisdiction over navigable waters, Congress has the right to control, regulate, and standardize the streams. Under the public-health clause of the Constitution it is the duty of the Government to protect its citizens from these internal foes, floods, and diseases resulting from floods.

"The Newlands bill would place the task of regulating the navigable waters—treating them all as parts of a unified, comprehensive system—in the hands of a commission. It provides for the storage of the flood

waters in natural and artificial reservoirs, to hold them back until times of drought, when they can be let loose and maintain the navigable rivers at a proper depth. The reforestation of the watersheds is only one of the methods contemplated by the bill for checking the floods. Others are the construction of artificial reservoirs where these are possible and practicable, and the full utilization of natural reservoirs. It provides for carrying the surplus waters out over the arid and semi-arid districts, in irrigation operation, to let it seep back gradually through the soil. It provides for the digging of drainage channels to carry off the surplus waters from the lower reaches of the river, to help keep the navigable channels at a standard depth and prevent them from being shifting, also to utilize these drainage channels as additional waterways.

"It provides, also, for the construction of dikes and levees. The levee system is a good thing and has accomplished a great deal to protect people and property and to reclaim overflowed lands. But this work has been done by piecemeal; the various sections are unrelated. In time of unusual conditions, as at present, the entire levee system is endangered, because the work of controlling the rivers has not been started at the headwaters and among the tributaries.

"These floods occur and recur year after year. We can expect them to continue. We have the means, the ability, and the power to stop them. And it would be economy to do so. It would be economy even without considering the enormous waste of soil fertility caused by each flood.

"The people of Illinois, as well as those of the other Central States, are awake to the necessity of controlling the rivers. The existence of some 600 drainage and levee districts in Illinois shows that. But all flood prevention and drainage work needs to be brought under one comprehensive system."

The Newlands bill has been indorsed by a number of organizations all over the country, including the National Irrigation Congress, the Illinois Association of Drainage and Levee Districts, the Pittsburgh Flood Commission, and many boards of trade and chambers of commerce.

It will probably be indorsed by the National Drainage Congress at New Orleans.

—

[From the Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal, Apr. 16, 1912.]

CHECK THE FLOODS.

Day after day the public has been reading of the destructive floods in the Mississippi Valley until to nearly everyone has occurred the question whether something could not be done to prevent their recurrence year after year as has been the experience in the past.

Reforestation, of course, is the first suggestion for checking the enormous damage that is done by the high water. There is no denying that planting trees in the headwaters of the Mississippi would do a great deal to hold back the water.

Deepening the channel of the river is another suggestion that would help some, but the relief that it affords is only temporary as the stream gradually carries back as much as is taken out. Dredging if kept up, of course, will materially help to improve the situation. But neither of these methods would be sufficient.

What is needed is a series of dams in connection with an improved system of levees together with the two foregoing suggestions. That would solve the problem and put an end to the frightful annual loss of life and property.

Storage dams would not only hold back the water in times of flood, but they could be used in connection with a system of irrigation that would make them a profitable investment. In the rivers that flow into the Mississippi no doubt they could be made to develop light and power.

Senator NEWLANDS, in an address before the National Drainage Congress at New Orleans last week, declared that the problem of preventing the floods in the Mississippi Valley overshadowed in importance the construction of the Panama Canal; and so it does.

It would be tremendously expensive, yet if there were cooperation between the Federal Government and the various States affected the work could be carried to a successful completion. In the State of Louisiana alone there are 10,000,000 acres of rich agricultural land that could be reclaimed in connection with a proper system of handling the Mississippi's waters.

—

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Chronicle Telegraph, Apr. 17, 1912.]

WATERWAY LEGISLATION.

Speaking at the banquet of the chamber of commerce and the flood commission last night Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, extended assurances of ultimate cooperation by Congress in the work of flood prevention which are full of encouragement. Mr. NEWLANDS admits that as it is Congress lags behind in this respect, public opinion in regard to the need of a logical system of flood prevention and river improvement being far in advance of congressional action. He holds, however, that it rests only with the public bodies interested in the solution of the problems in question to inspire adequate action at Washington. This, in his judgment, may be brought about by uniting upon some cooperative measure, full and comprehensive in its nature, as a substitute for the piecemeal system at present prevailing. Should a measure of this character be prepared and urged with due earnestness, Congress would be certain to respond. There is sound sense in the counsel thus given, and it is to be commended accordingly to the notice of the various river and harbor associations, waterway associations, and flood-prevention associations that are working, each on its own lines, in the various regions affected.

—

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Thursday, Apr. 18, 1912.]

LEVEES AND THE FLOODS.

As one of the Representatives in Congress of the State of Louisiana, JOSEPH E. RANSDELL has for years been among the foremost and ablest advocates of waterway improvements in the Mississippi Valley. As United States Senator elect from the same State it may reasonably be expected that after March 4 next his devotion to the cause for which he has so long and so faithfully contended will be continued and his usefulness to it increased. The other day in the National Drainage Congress at New Orleans he made an eloquent plea in behalf of the levee system of the lower Mississippi. According to one of the local newspapers, he directed attention to the vast benefit the levee system had been to the protection of fertile lands from overflow, and urged that the congress should insist upon stronger and higher levees and the greatest possible energy in improving and protecting those embankments.

Nobody even in the most superficial way acquainted with conditions along the lower Mississippi and its immediate tributaries will undertake to controvert Mr. RANSDELL'S testimonial to the service rendered by the levees in the past, but in the light of conditions that are even now present throughout a large section of the low country and in the Delta, is it not opportune to question the value of these barriers? Have they not failed repeatedly in times of emergency? Are they not failing now as safeguards of the plantation and reclaimed areas?

Owing to the topography of the country through which they flow, the lower Mississippi and its immediate tributaries must always be held within levees or artificial banks. This goes without saying. But would it not be a much wiser plan for the States subject to river floods and inundations to give hereafter less attention to effect and more to cause?

The levees would not need to be so strong or so high; they would not need to be constructed with regard to so much power of resistance if the strain upon them was diminished. Under ordinary pressure the levees should and would stand for years with little repair. Subject, as they are now, to the full force of the flood tide, crevasses are common, and the losses resulting from levee destruction alone, to say nothing of consequential damages, are enormous.

It is to be sincerely hoped that Senator Elect RANSDELL and his southern colleagues will unite with the middle western and northwestern delegations in Congress in a comprehensive movement for the storage of flood waters and the prevention of floods. Floods can be prevented at the headwaters and along the courses of the Mississippi and its tributaries by diversion of the surplus flow of the spring freshets into reservoirs much more effectually than by attempting to confine the vast cumulative volume after it has entered the main artery. How futile are the levee embankments has been all too apparent during the last two weeks. Has not the time come when men like Senator Elect RANSDELL should look to remedying the trouble at the root rather than in the branch?

—

[From the Courier Journal, Louisville, Ky., Apr. 19, 1912.]

THE FLOW OF THE OHIO.

Senator NEWLANDS'S bill to create a board of river regulation, with a view to flood prevention, has as one of its objects the building of storage reservoirs. The Newlands bill is a measure which provides for the cooperation of the National Government with States, municipalities, counties, and districts in flood protection, drainage, reclamation, forest preservation, and a multitude of other things. It would appropriate $50,000,000 a year for 10 years for these purposes. As it is receiving some indorsements from influential sources, the opinion of the Geological Survey as to the feasibility of reservoirs along the Ohio is worthy of note.

—

[From the Ogden (Utah) Examiner, Apr. 19, 1912.]

PEACE AND THE TREASURY.

In a recent address delivered by Senator NEWLANDS before the National Drainage Congress at New Orleans the frank statement was made that the one solution of the problem of big rivers was to appropriate $500,000,000 at once, and then a continuing provision of fifty millions a year indefinitely.

It looks like a tremendous amount of money. Possibly the Nation would gasp at such a mighty appropriation.

But the United States is less startled at a like expenditure for war. Of course, it is wise to be prepared against the possible attack of a foreign power. But out of the resources provided by the people there certainly should be an expenditure sufficient to prevent a recurrence of such flood horrors as this year has known.

The Treasury ought to be regarded as available for the uses of peace quite as much as for the demands of war. It is a bad commentary on the wisdom of the lawmakers if a preventable flood can waste millions of dollars in property and scores of lives. It is an equally bad commentary when the desert waits to bloom because there is no money left after providing for the Army and Navy—and that for a cultivated nation and in a time of peace.

—

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Apr. 22, 1912.]

TO CURB THE FLOODS.

In view of the destructive floods in the Mississippi River and its great tributaries, the present is considered by Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, as an opportune time to inquire into the feasibility of controlling the surplus waters of the Mississippi Valley by way of storing them at their height and releasing them later on when the water is low, in order to help navigation. Accordingly he has introduced a bill to provide a board and a fund "for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection, and for the beneficial use of flood waters, and for water storage and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies."

He has also introduced another bill making an appropriation of $8,000,000 for the relief of the present sufferers by the floods along the Mississippi and its tributaries.

Referring to the matter of controlling the flood waters of the Mississippi Valley, the task is generally referred to in the eastern papers as one not impossible, but impracticable by reason of its assumed great cost. And yet the losses every year by the floods amount to millions of dollars. How many years would it take to have these losses aggregate as much as the cost of the work of flood prevention? We do not believe that it would be necessary to take very many years in order to make the accounts balance.

Taking the Ohio River to begin with, the floods are heavy and destructive every year. Occasionally the destruction amounts to very large figures, and the computation of those who have studied this question is that the losses of one generation would fully provide means for protecting all coming generations from destruction by floods in that river. The valleys of the tributary streams of the Ohio are long, usually quite narrow, but in all of them are good sites for dams and space for large reservoirs. It would cost a good deal of money to do the work, nor should the task of controlling all of the river floods of the Mississippi Valley be begun at once, for so little would be done in any one place that it would hardly count for anything. But if the work should be begun on the headwaters of the Ohio River, and extended to the main tributaries of that river, there can be little done but that the whole flood situation there could be controlled at an expense that would not be extraordinary when compared with the annual losses that the floods inflict. Senator NEWLANDS'S bill to set on foot the preliminaries by way of inquiring into the feasibility of such control is a good one, and now is a good time to pass it.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer, Apr. 26, 1912.]

CONSTRUCTIVE LEGISLATION.

When a broad, well-considered, far-reaching, constructive measure is brought forward it is entitled to careful notice and consideration. It is well known that the methods of dealing with the great Mississippi floods have been spasmodic without sufficient general plan of continuity and wholly inadequate to control the constantly recurring disasters which they cause.

In order to meet the problem and at the same time to provide economically and scientifically for universal control and utilization of flood waters, Senator NEWLANDS introduced a bill for river regulation which has as yet received no consideration, but the principles of which have been approved in the platforms of both parties. Speaking to an amendment to the river and harbor bill, Senator NEWLANDS said:

"This question has been taken up in great detail by the Irrigation Congress, whose problems relate to the mountain regions above, tributary to the Mississippi River, and by the Drainage Congress, whose problems relate to the reclamation of swamp lands in the Mississippi Valley below; and they, in connection with the other waterway associations of the country interested in waterway development as a matter of navigation, have substantially agreed that the best way, the full and comprehensive way, of taking hold of the question of river development for purposes of navigation, to which the Federal jurisdiction attaches, is by regarding the river with all its tributaries as a unit; regarding the Mississippi River, with its tributaries of the Ohio, the Tennessee, and the Cumberland on the east, and with its tributaries of the Missouri, the Platte, and the Arkansas on the west, as a unit; requiring cooperative treatment upon the part of both the Nation and the State, the Nation being interested in developing these rivers for transportation, the States and the Nation both being interested in the development of the waste land of the country, whether it be the arid land above or the swamp land below, and also in the development of that great natural resource, the water power of the country, for the purpose of hydroelectric expansion.

"Suggestion is made that through a system of cooperation of the great scientific services of the country full and comprehensive plans can be made covering all these various forms of development, and also covering such an apportionment of costs and of benefits as will assign to the different sovereignties certain proportions of the cost, just as they receive certain proportions of the benefit."

That would be genuinely constructive legislation, with no politics in it, and of very great benefit to the whole country, and Congress, even though it be a campaign year, ought to spare the time to take it up and pass it. The country would appreciate attention to the real wants and interests of the people along such lines.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune, May 3, 1912.]

Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, has taken a comprehensive view of the destructive floods in the Mississippi River which have impelled the Government to send large measures of relief and to spend great sums of money in feeding the homeless and distressed. He has brought forward in the Senate a proposition to provide what is called "a river regulation fund" of $50,000,000 annually for a period of 10 years after the completion of the Panama Canal, and an annual expenditure of $5,000,000 in the intermediate years. This he proposes as an amendment to the river and harbor bill offered by himself. The plan contemplates the control at the headwaters as well as at the lower branches of the troubled rivers of the Mississippi Valley system. The Senator claims that his measure not only would prevent destructive floods in all of the great watersheds of the country, but would provide for the use of flood waters on arid lands, for swamp-land reclamation, and for the development of water power. One-fifth of the money appropriated is to be spent on the lower Mississippi and one-tenth each on Atlantic coast rivers, Gulf rivers, exclusive of the Mississippi, the upper Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Sacramento and San Joaquin, and the Columbia and Snake Rivers, and the remaining tenth in connecting the Great Lakes with the Ohio and Mississippi. The cooperation of the great hydraulic engineers of the country with the Engineer Corps of the Army is invoked, they to work under the supervision of the river regulation board, which is provided by the measure, and the cooperation of this board with States and municipalities is provided for.

The scheme is as broad as the country, and its great merit is that it will bring to bear upon the mighty question of handling the surplus waters of the United States the best scientific and practical knowledge in the country, as well as the unlimited resources of the National Treasury in the solution of the question. It is a vast proposition, comprehensive as to all the river systems, and as beneficial as it is inclusive.

There is no question about the practicability of the operations proposed by Senator NEWLANDS. The great deterrent is the vastness of the labor required; but since the engineering skill of the country is equal to the task, and since the resources of the National Treasury, applied as they would be generally throughout the country, are sufficient to meet the cost of solving the problem, there seems to be no reason to doubt the practicability of the Newlands program. The idea has been suggested by many heretofore, but there has been no concrete proposal in Congress to move for the solution of the great question in a practical way until now. Mr. NEWLANDS now comes forward with this practical proposition, involving a cost altogether of $500,000,000. We believe that this cost would go very far to settling the whole question; perhaps it would be ample for all the work.

The problem is to control the flood waters, store them at favorable locations in the valleys of the tributaries of the great streams, and release these stored waters later on when they would be beneficial to navigation. On the lower Mississippi River the great problem is to strengthen the banks and to prevent their being washed away. This can be done by proper piling and riprapping work, which the hydraulic engineers fully understand, and work which they have already said will be ample for the purpose.

The proposition of Senator NEWLANDS is both statesmanlike and eminently practical. It is, perhaps, too much to expect that the average Member of Congress will rise to the full comprehension and necessity of meeting the difficulties as Senator NEWLANDS proposes to meet them, but we can not doubt that eventually this matter will be taken up substantially on the lines marked out by him, and that the country will show that it is able to handle its river systems as well as the ancients in Egypt, Chaldea, and Assyria were able to handle the great rivers of their countries. To allow such vast destruction by floods and such impediments to navigation as annually intervene is a reproach to the skill and practical ability of the American people, and it can not be supposed that this reproach will be allowed to lie upon us forever.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Item, May 3, 1912.]

SOUTHERN VOTES WILL DO IT.

The Newlands bill provides the only radical and permanent remedy for such floods as now threaten so great an area of the Mississippi Valley and its tributaries or have already wreaked loss upon thousands of helpless people.

We are told, upon what we believe to be reliable authority, that the success of the Newlands bill in Congress now depends upon the southern vote. The West will support it. The Pittsburgh flood commission, representing important and influential interests near the headwaters of the Ohio, has indorsed it, and has already outlined for its own section a comprehensive plan for checking flood at its source. The southern vote is needed, and the southern vote, so we are told, will put this great measure through Congress.

New Orleans approves the Newlands bill. The Progressive Union indorsed it on Thursday. It is of vital importance, not only to Louisiana, not only to the Mississippi Valley, but to every State whose rivers flow into the Mississippi and to every State which has any large area in need of drainage or any large area in need of irrigation; for the bill provides for a general plan of Federal river protection, conservation, drainage, and irrigation, which should serve to check floods at their source, to hold the surplus water in great reservoirs to relieve the rivers and always offer a supply of water for dry lands, to deepen rivers for navigation, and to drain millions of acres of wet lands.

The present flood has demonstrated two things conclusively: First, that the river problem is a national problem; second, that the building of levees alone is not enough for real protection.

The Mississippi Valley is the drain vent of half the United States, and lower Louisiana is the outlet for the rest of the Mississippi Valley as well.

Other parts of the country, however, also suffer from flood, and the selfish interest of other States dictates a policy of cooperation with us in preventing floods.

But a higher duty calls them. They owe to us, who bear the brunt of the burden, their vigorous help in our demand that the Federal Government tackle the problem at its source, stop the deforestation which yearly permits greater floods to gather in mass, and hold back the swollen spring freshets until the lower rivers have worked off their own surplus and offer a safe channel to the sea.

To a great extent, however, our relief from the danger which annually threatens us lies in our own hands.

The Newlands bill offers the best plan thus far suggested, and southern votes can pass it.

Now is the time for the South to unite in solid support of it. The whole country is awake to the importance of the work, and the sympathy of all the people is with us.

Now is the time to mold a new national policy of river protection while public sentiment is softened to receive the impression.

[From Times-Democrat, May 5, 1912.]

FEDERAL CONTROL OF LEVEES.

The suggestion that the United States Government take charge of the levees of the Mississippi River, now being discussed in the press and by public men in Congress and elsewhere, is by no means a new proposition, says Mr. W. O. Hart, of the Louisiana Historical Society, for 30 years ago President Chester A. Arthur sent a message to Congress, giving it as his opinion that the action of the Federal Government in taking charge of the levees should no longer be delayed, no matter how much it would cost. Unfortunately, the country at that time was in the grasp of partisan politics, and the matter was not followed up, though the press at the time considered the matter of great benefit and importance to the people.

MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT ARTHUR.

The message of President Arthur is well worth reading at this time, and is as follows:

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *April 17, 1882.*

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a letter dated the 29th ultimo, from the Secretary of War, inclosing a communication from the Mississippi River Commission, in which the commission recommends that an appropriation may be made of $1,010,000 for "closing existing gaps in levees," in addition to the like sum for which an estimate has already been submitted.

The subject is one of such importance that I deem it proper to recommend early and favorable consideration of the recommendations of the commission. Having possession of and jurisdiction over the river, Congress, with a view of improving its navigation and protecting the people of the valley from floods, has for years caused surveys of the river to be made for the purpose of acquiring knowledge of the laws that control it and of its phenomena. By act approved June 28, 1879, the Mississippi River Commission was created, composed of able engineers. Section 4 of the act provides that—

"It shall be the duty of said commission to take into consideration and mature such plan or plans and estimates as will correct, permanently locate, and deepen the channel and protect the banks of the Mississippi River; improve and give safety and ease to the navigation thereof; prevent destructive floods; promote and facilitate commerce, trade, and the postal service."

The constitutionality of a law making appropriations in aid of these objects can not be questioned. While the report of the commission submitted and the plans proposed for the river's improvement seem justified as well on scientific principles as by experience and the approval of the people most interested, I desire to leave it to the judgment of Congress to decide upon the best plan for the permanent and complete improvement of the navigation of the river and for the protection of the valley.

SHOULD PROTECT MISSISSIPPI VALLEY.

The immense losses and widespread suffering of the people dwelling near the river induce me to urge upon Congress the propriety of not only making an appropriation to close the gaps of the levees occasioned by the recent floods, as recommended by the commission, but that Congress should inaugurate measures for the permanent improvement of the navigation of the river and security of the valley. It may be that such a system of improvement would as it progressed require the appropriation of twenty or thirty millions of dollars. Even such an expenditure, extending, as it must, over several years, can not be regarded as extravagant in view of the immense interest involved. The safe and convenient navigation of the Mississippi is a matter of concern to all sections of the country, but to the Northwest, with its immense harvests, needing cheap transportation to the sea, and to

the inhabitants of the river valley, whose lives and property depend upon the proper construction of the safeguards which protect them from the floods, it is of vital importance that a well-matured and comprehensive plan for improvement should be put into operation with as little delay as possible. The cotton product of the region subject to the devastating floods is a source of wealth to the Nation and of great importance in keeping the balances of the trade in our favor.

It may not be inopportune to mention that this Government has imposed and collected some $70,000,000 by a tax on cotton, in the production of which the population of the lower Mississippi is largely engaged, and it does not seem inequitable to return a portion of this tax to those who contributed it, particularly as such an action will also result in an important gain to the country at large, and especially so to the great and rich States of the Northwest and the Mississippi Valley.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

[From the Taunton (Mass.) News and Bay City (Mich.) Tribune, May 8, 1912.]

REGULATION OF THE BIG RIVER.

The needs of 200,000 persons, made homeless and destitute by floods, will be urged as ample reason for the preventive measure of Senator NEWLANDS in his recent amendment to the rivers and harbors bill, appropriating $5,000,000 a year for the control and regulation of the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and $50,000,000 a year after the completion of the Panama Canal. It is the contention of the advocates of this measure that if it is passed and put into effect the Mississippi and tributaries can be controlled, and the Government may not again be called upon to feed and care for thousands of victims of the action of the rivers as in the present case. This amendment is substantially the resolution adopted by the National Drainage Congress at New Orleans April 12. First Vice President Edmund T. Perkins, of Chicago, is cooperating with President David R. Francis, of St. Louis, of the congress; Vice President E. J. Watson, of Columbia, S. C.; Vice President Barnard Baker, of Maryland; and Vice President Edward Wisner, of New Orleans, in the work of getting a large and strong delegation from all parts of the country to urge the passage of this or similar legislation in the interests of humanity and to prevent the repetition of the appalling flood destruction of life and property of the last two months.

[From the New York Press, May 12, 1912.]

URGES RIVER REGULATION—LOUISIANA MAN SAYS FLOOD WATERS FROM OTHER STATES CAUSE TROUBLE.

That it is "the duty of the National Government, by a broad and sane system of conservation at the headwaters, such as is contemplated in the Newlands river-regulation bill," to protect Louisiana from the flood waters of 30 other States is contended in a telegram sent yesterday to the New York Chamber of Commerce by M. B. Trezevant, secretary of the New Orleans flood relief committee and the New Orleans Progressive Union.

The message points out that the floods at present sweeping parts of Louisiana come from almost two-thirds of the States of the Union, and asks why Louisiana should spend millions of dollars annually to guard herself from such trouble. Speaking for the citizens of New Orleans, the message says:

"We earnestly urge the citizens of the United States, and particularly the newspapers, to give us the only outside aid we ask—that is, discredence of false and alarming stories and support of the Newlands river-regulation bill, which will harness the floods and force them to serve instead of to destroy."

Louisiana, Trezevant says, has spent $50,000,000 out of the public treasury, and private individuals and railroads millions more, for levee protection since the Civil War. The city of New Orleans has been unaffected by the Mississippi Valley floods, and resentment is shown by the residents at reports that the city has been in danger. No levees in 100 miles of the city have broken, and engineers of the city, State and national, agree New Orleans is not menaced by the torrents.

[From the New York Sun, May 12, 1912.]

NO FEAR FOR NEW ORLEANS—BUT THE CITY WOULD LIKE AID IN PASSING THE NEWLANDS BILL.

The following dispatch from M. B. Trezevant, secretary of the New Orleans flood-relief committee and the New Orleans Progressive Union, was received yesterday by the chamber of commerce:

"The city of New Orleans is absolutely unaffected by the floods in the Mississippi Valley, though a number of parishes of the State of Louisiana have been inundated and the floods have therefore wrought great damage outside of the city. New Orleans is herself alleviating distress with contributions of money, clothing, and bedding, and the Government with rations, and the State militia aiding in rescue work. No levees within a hundred miles of New Orleans have been broken, and all stories that the city is under water are the wildest sort of irresponsible canards.

"The United States, the State, and city engineers agree that New Orleans will safely pass through the crisis and that the worst is now over. The greatest damage is the farmers' loss of opportunity to make crops, and we are now working out a plan to begin the reconstruction of our agricultural districts affected as soon as the waters recede.

"New Orleans, because of its peculiar defensive strength, is the safest city in the Mississippi, Ohio, or Missouri Valleys, despite the fact that Louisiana must protect herself from the flood waters of some 30 other States. This should be the duty of the National Government by a broad and sane system of conservation at the headwaters, such as is contemplated in the Newlands river-regulation bill.

"Why should Louisiana spend millions of dollars annually to protect herself from the waters which come from nearly two-thirds of the Union? Louisiana has spent $50,000,000 out of the public treasury and private individuals and railroads millions more for levee protection since the Civil War. We earnestly urge the citizens of the United States, and particularly the newspapers, to give us the only outside aid we ask; that is, discredence of false and alarmist stories and support of the Newlands river-regulation bill, which will harness the floods and force them to serve instead of to destroy."

[From the New Orleans (La.) Picayune, May 17, 1912.]

CYPRESS MEN FAVOR GOVERNMENT LEVEE BUILDING, INDORSING NEWLANDS BILL.

The Southern Cypress Manufacturers' Association adopted the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the Federal Government should immediately extend such temporary relief as may be necessary to repair the broken levees; and, further, should absolutely take over the work of constructing future levees, including revetments, and otherwise protecting the lower Mississippi Valley from overflow.

"*Resolved further*, That the Southern Cypress Manufacturers' Association hereby indorses and approves the resolution of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, adopted April 13, 1911, indorsing Senator NEWLAND'S river-regulation bill, and urges its passage by Congress."

[From the News-Scimitar, Memphis, May 18, 1912.]

URGES SUPPORT OF NEWLANDS BILL.

George H. Maxwell, leading national authority on drainage and regulation work, addressed the City Club Saturday. He urged the club to support the Newlands bill, now pending in Congress, providing for a board of river regulation to control the flow of navigable rivers and to provide flood prevention and protection. Mr. Maxwell declared that he had no fight to make on the levee system, but insisted that the levees must be supplemented by headwater control of the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi Rivers by storage reservoir. He said no amount of levee building in itself will afford a guaranty against floods should the waters of the three great streams descend at once from Cairo to the Gulf.

The club, by resolution, went on record as favoring the Newlands bill, and a committee of five will be named to give publicity to the measure.

[From the Racine (Wis.) Times, May 18, 1912.]

MAKING WATERWAYS VALUABLE.

Senator FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS is earnestly advocating the organization of a national board of river regulation, in which shall be coordinated the Engineer Corps, Reclamation Service, Weather Bureau, and Forestry Service, for the purpose of formulating a sensible policy in regard to domestic commerce and the conservation of the national water supply.

The recent Mississippi floods have demonstrated the idiocy of permitting billions of gallons of water to run riot over the fertile lands of the Central West, ruining property and taking lives, and then dumping into the ocean. Three months later these same lands will need water to save the crops, and river steamboats will be lying on sand bars because of the shallowness of the channels.

If the Army engineers could take hold of this problem as they have taken hold of the Panama Canal construction, it would not take them long to evolve a plan for utilizing the tremendous water supply which goes to waste every spring in the United States. The river problem would seem to be open to solution. The rainfall for the year, if distributed fairly, would result in a standard flow of the river and its tributaries which would be safe for navigation and attended with no destructive results. But the melting of snows in the Rocky, Allegheny, and Appalachian Mountain systems, together with spring rains, all coming about the same time, create an enormous run-off from an area comprising nearly two-thirds of the United States, and this run-off is emptied into the Gulf through a very narrow space.

The Government must not only increase the annual appropriations for bank revetment and levee projection below, but must arrest the run-off by storage for irrigation and water power.

[From the Houston Chronicle, May 19, 1912.]

A SANE RIVER PLAN AT LAST.

Elsewhere in this day's Chronicle we publish portions of a debate that took place in the United States Senate on May 9, the subject being the need for a larger, more comprehensive, and more intelligent treatment of river control in this country.

Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, outlined the problem and urged action on his bill to create a river-control board, enlisting the cooperative efforts of all the national services which are directly or indirectly engaged in this or collateral work, but are not working together and to a common end, as they should be.

It is proposed in Senator NEWLANDS'S bill to appropriate $500,000,000, to be expended at the rate of $50,000,000 a year for 10 years, in building a system of reservoirs, dams, power plants, channel improvements, etc., which will put an end forever to this country's $250,000,000 annual loss by flood and will transform the cause of this vast loss into a permanent source of great profit.

His bill embodies a plan which has received the indorsement of the National Waterways Congress and of both the Republican and Democratic Parties in national convention. It is a sane plan. It is the first plan ever offered big enough to cover the needs of the situation.

As Senator WILLIAMS declared, the doing of this work at a cost of $500,000,000 would be worth ten times as much to the people of the United States as the construction of the Panama Canal at a cost of $400,000,000 will ever be.

All that stands in the way of the adoption of this plan by Congress, as Senator NEWLANDS stated very plainly, is the secret and subtle opposition of the railroads, which dread the competition of an effective system of navigable inland waterways, and the disposition of Members of Congress to scramble for the largest obtainable shares of the "pork" provided by the annual rivers and harbors bill.

The spoils system and the opposition of the private owners of the steam railroads of the country prevent action by Congress on sane lines and condemn the country to the continuance of a policy which wastes millions every year by spending relatively small sums piecemeal, instead of doing the whole job and doing it right in the shortest time required for the completion of the work.

The Chronicle assures the Texas Members of Congress that the people of this State will support them loyally, enthusiastically, in every bit of support that they may give to this great plan. Our sister States, Louisiana and Mississippi, are the chief losers through inaction. It is the Nation's problem and the South's sorrow. Surely it is the duty of every southern Representative in either branch of Congress to line up in support of this measure.

[Night letters.]

THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH CO.,
New York, April 11, 1912.

GEORGE H. MAXWELL,
National Drainage Congress, New Orleans, La.

A large portion of machinery necessary for Government to purchase for construction of Panama Canal, which is now rapidly becoming idle, is especially adapted for dredging and constructing levees, the character of work the Mississippi Valley needs, and which is now so

strongly impressed upon the minds of the public through great losses of property and life incurred through recent floods. This machinery, if sold secondhand, would not bring more than junk prices, but the machinery and organization which the Government now has would be of great benefit to all if utilized in protecting, through drainage and levees, the overflowed lands of Mississippi Valley. Through your knowledge of this subject, to which you have given particular attention, you know better than others that opening streams and removing obstructions so as to permit free flow of great volume of water greatly relieves the levees. With such machinery and forces now at command of Government ample dredging and adequate levee work can be done cheaper than ever before, and now is an opportune time to undertake it. Am very sorry, indeed, I could not attend this session of Drainage Congress, but it was absolutely impossible for me to get away.

B. F. YOAKUM.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 11, 1912.*

GEORGE H. MAXWELL,
St. Charles Hotel, New Orleans, La.

People of the upper valley who are prevented by floods from attending Drainage Congress, urge you, before adjournment, ask National Congress to transfer fast as possible all available engineers and machinery from Panama Canal to Mississippi River. Situation serious, and must be handled at once by men competent to deal with a big problem.

O. M. KILLOUGH,
President St. Francis Levee Board, Mississippi Valley Drainage Association.

[Republished from Gulf States Farmer, June, 1912.]

FLOOD PREVENTION IN THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY—THE LEVEE SYSTEM MUST BE SUPPLEMENTED BY SOURCE STREAM AND HEAD WATER CONTROL, AS PROVIDED FOR IN THE NEWLANDS RIVER REGULATION BILL.

The most important problem before the people of the United States to-day is that of protecting the lower Mississippi River Valley from overflow.

The question is not whether it shall be done; it must be done. The only question is "How shall it be done?"

Two plans are proposed, and the issue before the country is "Which plan shall be adopted?"

The first plan is the "levees only" policy, which proposes a system of stronger and higher levees from St. Louis or Cairo to the Gulf, with revetments and bank protection, but takes no account of the causes for the steadily rising flood plane, which goes higher and higher with each successive great flood, and takes no account of any policy of controlling any part of the floods in the territory of their origin.

The other plan is that embodied in the Newlands river regulation bill, which proposes a system of levees from St. Louis to the Gulf as high and strong as the advocates of the "levees only" policy contemplate, with every possible protection by revetments and bank protective works. But the advocates of the Newlands bill stand squarely upon the fact that no levee system can be built that will permanently protect the lower valley from overflow unless it be supplemented by an additional policy of harnessing and holding back as large a portion of the flood water as possible in the drainage basins of the streams where it originates.

There can be no doubt of the fact that the flood plane at Cairo can be lowered 10 feet on the Ohio River, and as much or more of a reduction made in the level of the floods of the upper Mississippi River and the Missouri River where they join to form the lower Mississippi.

If this had been done before the great flood of 1912, a volume of water equal to that which poured through the crevasses and made reservoirs for itself by overflowing millions of acres of fertile farm lands, would have been held back in the watershed of the tributaries of the Ohio, the upper Mississippi and the Missouri, and would never have reached the Mississippi River at all.

The result of this would have been such a lowering of the flood plane that the levees would have carried the entire volume of water that reached the Mississippi, the Reelfoot levee would not have been topped, no crevasses would have occurred, no damage would have been done, no lives would have been lost.

That is what would have happened if the Newlands river regulation bill had been passed 10 years ago. It would have prevented losses and damage caused by this great 1912 flood that are estimated to have amounted to over $100,000,000, and some estimates run as high as $250,000,000—one-half of the total amount appropriated by the Newlands bill.

Of course estimates of damage at this time are mere surmise, but there is no possible doubt whatever that the expenditure of the $50,000,000 a year for 10 years appropriated by the Newlands bill would save an annual property loss of more than that from floods alone without figuring on the benefits from regulating the flow of the rivers for the use of the water for navigation and for all industrial and beneficial uses.

The Newlands river regulation bill contains the following appropriation:

"For the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for building and maintaining revetments, dikes, walls, levees, embankments, gates, wasteways, by-passes, flood-water canals, restraining dams, impounding basins, and bank protective works for river regulation, and as a means to that end the building of works for reclamation, drainage and flood protection, and for building reservoirs and artificial lakes and basins for the storage of flood waters to prevent and protect against floods and overflows, erosion of river banks, and breaks in levees, and to regulate the flow of source streams and navigable rivers, and reenforce such flow during drought and low water periods, and for the operation and maintenance of the same, $24,000,000."

It is proposed to increase this amount to $30,000,000 and to apportion from the entire $50,000,000 annually appropriated by the bill the sum of $10,000,000 to the lower Mississippi River; $10,000,000 to the Missouri River drainage basin; $10,000,000 to the Ohio River drainage basin; $5,000,000 to the upper Mississippi River drainage basin; and $5,000,000 to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, as urged by the River Regulation Commission of Stockton, Cal.

The Newlands bill expressly provides that the appropriations made by it are to be supplemental to such appropriations as may be made by Congress through the river and harbor bills.

The advocates of the Newlands bill say: "Build levees, but do not stop there. Supplement that safeguard by protecting the watersheds from denudation and erosion; check the rapid run off and sudden floods caused thereby; harness the floods where they originate and make the levee system safe by reducing the flood volume to such an extent that the levees will always carry it without danger of crevasses or of the flood going over the levees. In other words, plan and build the reservoirs on the head waters instead of having the river break over the levees and make reservoirs for itself in the lower valley, as it has done.

[From the Agricultural Magazine, St. Anthonys Park, St. Paul, Minn.]

CONTROLLING THE GREAT RIVERS.

If organized effort, the union of heretofore conflicting interests, and an inspiring leadership can accomplish it, then the improvement of the great rivers of the Mississippi system along the lines of the broadest statesmanship, the greatest beneficence, and the truest economy seems now for the first time "within sight."

The organized effort is seen in the cooperative work now being done by commercial bodies in the great cities all the way up from New Orleans to Pittsburgh, Duluth, the Twin Cities, and Omaha. The union of diverse interests is illustrated in the fact that the irrigationists, the levee builders, and the men who are working mainly for the development of water transportation have now pooled their issues for a common object. The inspiring leadership is found in the person of George H. Maxwell, the author and chief promoter of the national irrigation act, the magnetic orator, and the apostle of the small farm as against the baronial estate. He kindles a flame of enthusiasm for the project wherever he speaks.

All the organizations, all the forces referred to, are to be represented in a grand "river regulation and flood prevention conference" to be held at New Orleans January 6 and 7, 1913, to voice what is fast becoming a "nation-wide" demand for the passage of the Newlands-Bartholdt river regulation bill.

This bill involves a frank recognition of the principle laid down many years ago by Gen. Haupt—one of the foremost of our Government engineering experts—that the place to begin the work of flood prevention and river improvement is at the headwaters, not on the lower stretches of the river. Hold back the floods by storing in great reservoirs along their higher reaches the extra feet of water constituting "the crest" of the floods, and not only will the rivers no longer overflow the country along the lower levels but the water thus held back will serve to maintain navigation in seasons of "low water." And not only this, but the stored-up water in the reservoirs can be made also to serve at innumerable points the purposes of irrigation and the creation of water powers. The cost of levee building will be much reduced. And thus the "water wealth" of our great valley becomes one of the grandest of our material assets, whereas now its waste makes it an annual liability.

Minnesota is one of the States which will share most largely in the benefits sure to flow from the passage of this bill, especially in the establishing of cheap water transportation for the products of the farm. It is an "American," not a partisan measure. It plans a vast expenditure—$50,000,000 a year or more. But in carrying forward the work it is proposed to employ the same engineers and the same "plant" now engaged on the Panama Canal. This is a guaranty of efficiency and economy; therefore it is to be hoped that the people of Minnesota will urge upon their Congressmen an energetic support of the bill.

[From San Francisco (Cal.) Call, June 24, 1912.]

TOUCHES CALIFORNIA IN THREE WAYS.

Among other declarations in the Republican platform, the one that most concerns California deals with provision for the prevention of floods. The plank is suggested by the recent devastation of the Mississippi region by overflow, but any plan for the protection of that territory will necessarily involve the provision of similar measures for the prevention of overflow by the rivers of California.

Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, has been the chief proponent of the general scheme of legislation for this purpose, and his plan includes provision for the California rivers in proportion to their needs.

This matter of flood prevention has assumed the importance of a great national question, as may be inferred from its inclusion in the Republican platform. Treatment of the whole subject on a comprehensive scale is being urged by organized effort, as may be gathered from the following statement issued on behalf of the Mississippi Valley bodies:

"Harness the source streams. Conserve the freshet waters for dry season navigation. Draw power from dams and reservoirs. Turn the floods of the upper Missouri out over the dry bench lands. Build strong levees from Cairo to the Gulf that will hold the partially controlled floods in the lower river. And what will be the result?

"The reservoirs will supplement the summer flow and thereby provide at all times an adequate supply of water for the system of locks and dams so that there will always be a navigable stage in the Ohio on which to float out to tidewater the coal, the iron, the steel, and the manufactured products of that portion of the country, while the power developed will go a long way toward increasing the economy of manufacture.

"In the upper Missouri River country hay will grow on millions of acres of land now devoted to grazing, and the production of cattle that will then thrive on that land will be increased tenfold. In addition, summer seepage will return enough water to the river to supply a navigable stage throughout the dry season."

The reasoning applies with equal force to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. It is not a question of flood prevention merely, but involves in an important way the promotion of irrigation and the conservation of navigation in the dry season.

In a word, the policy recommended in the platform touches California in three several important ways.

The Springfield (Ill.) News of July 4, 1912, says:

"The National Reclamation Association and its allied organizations will ask the Federal Congress in December to pass a bill providing for the construction of a complete system of levees from St. Louis to the Gulf as a first step in preventing the drainage of 30 States overflowing the farms of the Mississippi Valley. * * * It is estimated that the dense population of Louisiana alone will be capable of producing from two to three crops each year on 10,000,000 acres of alluvial prairie, aggregating a billion dollars annually of agricultural wealth, to say nothing of the vast resources that will be conserved by the protection of the millions of acres in the watershed of the Missouri, the Mississippi, and Ohio Rivers, that are to-day being devastated by overflows or impoverished by the erosion of tributary streams at the time of high water."

[From the Times-Democrat.]

NEWLANDS AND RANSDELL PLANS.

NEW ORLEANS, *June 30, 1912.*

To the Editor of the Times-Democrat:

While it is not generally known, it can very easily be learned by anyone reading such essays as those of Judge R. S. Taylor, of the Mississippi River Commission, entitled "The Subjugation of the Mississippi," "Levees, Outlets, and Reservoirs," "The Present Aspect of the Mississippi River Problem," and "An Emergency in the Life of a River," that the ultimate state of the Mississippi River from Cairo to the Gulf would be that of a practically clear-water stream, after its banks had been revetted throughout this stretch, and after its tributaries and upper reaches had been cared for under the operation of such a Nation-wide policy as that contemplated by the present Newlands bill.

Judge Taylor shows what I believe is generally conceded by all the engineers who have had practical experience on the river, that nearly all of the silt carried in suspension by its swift-moving waters comes from the caving of its banks, and not from the mountain side or the farm. He shows that just as soon as these banks are mattressed, which he estimates would cost about $30 a lineal foot, or about $100,000,000 for the Cairo-to-the-Gulf section, the sand bar, once put out of business by the dredge, would practically be a thing of the past, when not only 14 feet, but probably 20 feet, would represent the shallowest portions of this stretch. Judge Taylor, like Gen. Bixby, Maj. Dabney, and other eminent authorities, while he does not condemn the reservoir system as this may be applied to the headwaters of the Mississippi, assumes, I believe, that no such storage system can ever be practicable in the great watershed of the Ohio River Valley, notwithstanding the Chittenden investigations and those of the Cairo flood commission show that reservoirs on all the tributaries of the Ohio River would reduce that river's flood level at Cairo by at least one-fifth of its maximum.

These distinguished Army engineers seem to all agree that as long as the river carries the amount of silt it does to-day the "outlet" which so many contend would lower the flood level is also impracticable as a means of accomplishing that great desideratum.

But once remove this silt, which even the layman may understand would not only fill up the "outlet," but would gradually also fill up the main river itself, through the slackening of the current which would induce its precipitation, there can be no question but that we could then have all the outlets we would need in order to lower said level, and at every point at least, where a lake or bay or the sea itself could be reached, into which this surplus water could be diverted.

And if this grand transformation of conditions can be accomplished, should it not follow that the amount of its cost should only be measured by the magnitude of its obvious advantages, to say the least? In other words, should $100,000,000 or twice that amount, between Cairo and the Gulf, stop the consideration of such expenditure for such a purpose for a single minute?

The Newlands bill contemplates the expenditure of $500,000,000, which, if placed in the shape of bonds, when added to the present debt of a country whose wealth is said to be some $120,000,000,000, and whose present debt is only $200,000,000 more than that of the city of New York, could hardly be felt, particularly when the tremendously increased earning capacity of these improved highways of commerce is considered. The question therefore presents itself as to whether the vastly larger amount contemplated by the Newlands bill, which would be expended all over the country, on all of our rivers, would not more likely appeal to the people of the Nation who could probably see the incalculable advantages of connecting our rivers in one grand system than would the smaller sum suggested by Mr. RANSDELL, which would be spent mostly in this southern section on the lower Mississippi alone.

PETER S. LAWTON.

—

The Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of July 8, 1912, prints this editorial comment:

"Estimates of engineers made to the National Reclamation Association of the cost of adequate protection from Mississippi River floods is $500,000,000, and the association is to ask Congress to spend that sum in strengthening the levees and building dams to hold back freshets in the tributaries That is an enormous expenditure, more money, perhaps, than the Government can find for that purpose, but unless the work is undertaken on some such scale and planned for permanency, the Government will have spent, at the end of a generation, an even larger sum in making repairs and guarding against breaks in times of flood."

—

The Bangor (Me.) Commercial of July 8, 1912, says:

"The terrible losses of life and property resulting from the Mississippi floods having called the attention of the Nation to the need of steps to prevent or minimize the same, the request of the National Reclamation Association that Congress appropriate $500,000,000 to strengthen levees and build dams for regulating the freshets will not create the smiles that might have greeted such a request in times when the existent danger was not as fully appreciated. The task is no light one nor can it be done in a moment. But the investment is one that must ultimately be made, although the expenditure must, of necessity, be extended over a term of years."

—

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 12, 1912.]

The delegations in Congress of every Mississippi Valley State, from Pennsylvania to the Rockies, and from Minnesota to Mississippi, should insist that the problem of the Mississippi River system, including all the tributary systems of the Father of Waters, shall be attacked without delay.

Col. Roosevelt already has declared for this great task, and the necessity for a broad solution has never been more apparent than now in the wake of the devastation of 1912. Discussion is general on this topic and public opinion ready to be crystallized.

A compact statement of the situation and its possibilities, written by Mr. Walter Parker, of the Louisiana Reclamation Club, gives one of the best summaries.

"Four hundred million tons of silt, the surface soil, is washed from the lands of the Mississippi watershed into the Gulf of Mexico each and every year," writes Mr. Parker. "This is waste in so far as everybody now living is concerned, and the farmers and land owners of the Ohio and Missouri Valleys are paying the bill. Water enough passes down the Missouri when in flood stage to irrigate 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 acres of the dry plains or bench lands in the upper watershed of that river. More than enough water goes to waste down the Ohio River each flood season to supply dry season navigation and millions of electrical horsepower units. The same thing is true of the upper Mississippi River."

Here is conservation whose benefits are for the present generation.

"Harness the source streams," urges Mr. Parker. "Conserve the freshet waters for dry season navigation. Draw power from dams and reservoirs. Turn the floods of the upper Missouri out over the dry bench lands. Build strong levees from Cairo to the Gulf that will hold the partially controlled floods in the lower river. And what will be the result?

"The reservoirs will supplement the summer flow and thereby provide at all times an adequate supply of water for the system of locks and dams so that there will always be a navigable stage in the Ohio on which to float out to tidewater the coal, the iron, the steel, and the manufactured products of that portion of the country, while the power developed will go a long way toward increasing the economy of manufacture.

"In the upper Missouri River country hay will grow on millions of acres of land now devoted to grazing, and the production of cattle that will then thrive on that land will be increased tenfold. In addition, summer seepage will return enough water to the river to supply a navigable stage throughout the dry season.

"The upper Mississippi will enjoy all-the-year navigation and an abundance of power.

"From Cairo to the Gulf the floods will not then climb anywhere near so high as they have done in the spring of 1912, and with a complete and well-constructed levee system on both sides of the river the farmers and planters will no longer fear crevasses and overflows, and limit their investments for improvements accordingly.

"The silt waste will be checked because no adequate system of flood control can ignore soil erosion. Then the farms of the North and Middle West will not annually lose in fertility, and there will be fewer bars and mud lumps in the lower river to check the flow and obstruct navigation."

No nation has had a greater engineering problem than this, and the hopes of enthusiasts are to be discounted. Yet the problem should be attacked with breadth and foresight, and penny-wise caution or short-sighted fear of expenditure should not prevent careful expert consideration of the tremendous possibilities, to say nothing of the urgent necessities of the improvement.

—

The Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, of July 15, 1912, says:

"The Louisiana Reclamation Club, affiliated with the National Reclamation Association, advocates Federal action looking to the permanent prevention of floods. The Chronicle unhesitatingly indorses the broad principle of adequate Mississippi flood prevention, because it is necessary to national prosperity."

—

The Pittsburgh Chronicle-Telegraph of Saturday, July 20, 1912, says:

"The tremendous damage caused by recent floods in the Mississippi Valley has moved the Louisiana Reclamation Club to make a strenuous appeal for action by the Federal Government toward the execution of the plans advanced under successive administrations for the prevention of floods and the conversion to useful purposes of the huge surplus of water in the basins of the Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Ohio."

Speaking of the club, Mr. Walter Parker thus summarizes the work of conservation that is deemed possible: "Harness the source streams. Conserve the freshet waters for dry-season navigation. Draw power for dams and reservoirs. Turn the floods of the upper Missouri out over the dry bench lands. Build strong levees from Cairo to the Gulf that will hold the partially controlled floods in the lower river.

"Let these measures be taken," Mr. Parker goes on to say, "and the results will include a permanent navigable stage in the Ohio, the fertilization of millions of acres in the upper Missouri River country, all-the-year-round navigation, and abundance of power in the upper Mississippi region, abatement of floods from Cairo to the Gulf, stoppage of the waste of silt, and an ultimate addition to the value of landed investments that will afford manifold compensation for the outlay involved."

"These suggestions and deductions are not new, but they derive special force from the circumstances whereby they are prompted and whereby an ominous lesson has been given to the country. The conservation problem, in its relation to the rivers, is a pressing one, and it is clear that further postponement of action upon it will be a dereliction of national duty."

—

[From the Cairo Bulletin, Aug. 21, 1912.]

GET BUSY.

There is no city in the United States more vitally affected by floods than Cairo. With the Nation's two greatest rivers passing its doors, the city is doubly menaced every time the rivers rise, and that it has escaped inundation in the past doubtless could have been attributed to the fact that when the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers simultaneously reached the flood crest, relief was obtained through the breaking of levees above or below.

Cairo now plans to spend a half million and possibly more in raising and strengthening its levee system, while a movement is on foot to make the levees between the Ohio's mouth and New Orleans impregnable. What assurance has Cairo that posterity will be protected by the system of levees it is now planning to build?

G. H. Maxwell, executive chairman of the National Reclamation Association, which is fighting "tooth and nail" for the Newlands-Bartholdt river regulation bill, which provides for the expenditure of $500,000,000 in a period of 10 consecutive years for the building of source controls, addressed a joint meeting of the three local organizations Monday night. Less than two dozen members of the three organizations attended. Whether this was due to indifference or lack of knowledge of the importance of Mr. Maxwell's visit are matters of conjecture. However, Mr. Maxwell, who has been making a scientific study of the flood problem for a decade, and who is recognized as an authority, solicited an invitation to return to Cairo at a later date and address a larger meeting. The invitation was not extended Monday night, but it is to be hoped that no time will be lost in arranging for another meeting in the early future.

Men who have been studying the flood situation for years virtually agree that the building of an impregnable levee system would give only temporary relief, inasmuch, as the rivers flood, the channels would gradually fill up and necessitate the continual raising and strengthening of the levees until the time would arrive when every flood-menaced city in the Mississippi, Ohio, and Missouri Valleys would be surrounded by levees as high as mountains.

There are others, however, who pooh-pooh this idea, but strange as it may seem, they offer no explanation of the fact that the river beds

are ever filling, nor do they offer any solution for the correction of this condition. The main opposition to the reservoir system advanced by the advocates of impregnable levees, is the monstrous cost of construction. Five hundred millions of dollars is a vast sum, we will admit, but it is infinitesimal when compared to the vast losses in the past, and losses that must be borne by the people of the valleys in the future, unless some action is taken to control the floods at the river sources.

What is $500,000,000 to this great Nation of ours; the Nation that is building the Panama Canal; the Nation that can build $15,000,000 battleships? If the Government is to permit its rivers to overflow the valleys as it has in the past, it will not be long before the total losses will have passed to the $500,000,000 mark.

The Mississippi, Ohio, and Missouri Valleys are worth more to the United States than a dozen Panama Canals or a hundred $15,000,000 battleships, and a billion dollars would not be too much to spend to protect the lives and property of the people who live in these sections.

The Newlands-Bartholdt bill does not oppose any other river or levee improvement movements. The people of the valleys can continue to build their levees, and they may need them scores of times before the vast work contemplated in the measure is completed. What is needed for the future is a system of control, and if Cairo is possessed of a particle of good judgment, it will lend every effort to the successful passage of the measure.

There is no side-stepping the flood problem. We will have floods so long as man is powerless to prevent the falling of snow and rain. Man can not only control rain and snow after it falls if he will, but can turn it into the arid countries when it is most needed, and also release it at the river sources in such a manner that a navigable channel will be maintained at all seasons of the year.

We urge the local organizations to invite Mr. Maxwell to return to Cairo and deliver a second address. The cause he champions seems to be meritorious, and we desire to know more about it.

—

[From the Duluth News-Tribune, Sept. 19, 1912.]

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY.

The intertrade relations of Minnesota and the rest of the Mississippi Valley are such that the interest and well-being of every part of it are second only in importance to that within our own State limits. The floods of the lower Mississippi this last season caused a loss estimated at from $100,000,000 to $250,000,000. This means that the purchasing power, the investment power, the credit basis, and the property value of that section have been reduced by just that much.

There is that much less of all these forms of financial power and stability; the whole economic structure of the entire valley has been weakened to just that extent. Every part must feel the results of this. There will be that much less support for all the intertrade and commercial relations.

Minnesota wants waterway channels on the Minnesota and upper Mississippi Rivers that will give it connections with the lower valley. This State would have the Government make these channels and maintain them at very large expense.

Why? Because Minnesota believes that such channels would be of enough benefit to the people of this and the other valley States to warrant this expense; that the traffic between these sections is so large that the lower water carrying rates would justify the initial cost.

If this is true, or largely true; if it is warranted even by probable development rather than present conditions, it proves conclusively that the prosperity of the lower valley and of the upper valley are completely unified.

What is true of Minnesota is the fact as to every other State along the Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Ohio Rivers. All of this tremendous sweep of territory forms the Mississippi Valley, and a loss to one part is a loss to all, a gain to one part is a gain to all, and the interests of every part are woven together in an inseparable whole.

Outside of the motives of patriotism and humanity these are the concrete, the pocketbook reasons that Minnesota should stand with all this vast territory for any definite plan that will certainly prevent the recurrence of floods causing such enormous losses.

The upper and lower valleys have climatic differences that make each the other's market, both by season and by product. The loss of one is instantly the loss of the other; the lessening of the purchasing power of the one instantly acts on the other.

The upper valley can no more afford a $250,000,000 loss to the lower valley than can the lower valley itself. We prove this, as stated, by the very demand for greater and cheaper intertransportation facilities.

It is not, then, for the lower valley alone, but for the entire valley, to support a comprehensive and sufficient plan for flood prevention as a national project, as essentially national as is the preservation of the Great Lakes as a national highway.

—

[From the Agricultural Magazine, St. Anthony Park, St. Paul, Minn.]

CONTROLLING THE GREAT RIVERS.

If organized effort, the union of heretofore conflicting interests, and an inspiring leadership can accomplish it, then the improvements of the great rivers of the Mississippi systems along the lines of the broadest statesmanship, the greatest beneficence, and the truest economy seems now for the first time within sight.

The organized effort is seen in the cooperative work now being done by commercial bodies in the great cities, all the way up from New Orleans to Pittsburgh, Duluth, the Twin Cities, and Omaha. The union of diverse interests is illustrated in the fact that the irrigationists, the levee builders, and the men who are working mainly for the development of water transportation have now pooled their issues for a common object. The inspiring leadership is found in the person of George H. Maxwell, the author and chief promoter of the national irrigation act, the magnetic orator, and the apostle of the small farm as against the baronial estate. He kindled a flame of enthusiasm for the project wherever he speaks.

All the organizations, all the forces referred to, are to be represented in a grand river-regulation and flood-prevention conference, to be held at New Orleans January 6 and 7, 1913, to voice what is fast becoming a nation-wide demand for the passage of the Newlands-Bartholdt river-regulation bill.

This bill involves a frank recognition of the principle laid down many years ago by Gen. Haupt, one of the foremost of our Government engineering experts, that the place to begin the work of flood prevention and river improvement is at the headwaters, not on the lower stretches of the rivers. Hold back the floods by storing in great reservoirs along their higher reaches the extra feet of water constituting the crest of the floods and not only will the rivers no longer overflow the country along the lower levels, but the water thus held back will serve to maintain navigation in seasons of low water. And not only this, but the stored-up water in the reservoirs can be made also to serve at innumerable points the purposes of irrigation and the creation of water powers. The cost of levee building will be much reduced. And thus the water wealth of our great valley becomes one of the grandest of our material assets, whereas now its waste makes it an annual liability.

Minnesota is one of the States which will share most largely in the benefits sure to flow from the passage of this bill, especially in the establishing of cheap water transportation for the products of the farm. It is an American, not a partisan, measure. It plans a vast expenditure—$50,000,000 a year or more. But in carrying forward the work it is proposed to employ the same engineers and the same plant now engaged on the Panama Canal. This is a guaranty of efficiency and economy. Therefore it is to be hoped that the people of Minnesota will urge upon their Congressmen an energetic support of the bill.

—

[From the Reno (Nev.) Journal, Oct. 5, 1912.]

CURBING THE MISSISSIPPI.

The Democratic plan to harness the Mississippi is in response to a demand that has been made for years. It comes not alone from the people of the South, but the North and West as well. Every year disastrous floods sweep down through the channel, ruining crops worth millions of dollars, devastating the land, and inundating cities. Not infrequently the rush of waters claim a toll of human life.

The people who live on the lands that flank the great stream want the waters curbed.

The people of the West ask that the flood waters be impounded and held to irrigate their lands.

It is simply a question of the people of the South joining hands with those of the West and acting together, each to get what they want.

If the flood waters are held in great reservoirs they will be checked.

Woodrow Wilson's ideas meet with those of the people east and west. He is in accord with the progressive thought of the day. He is a man who responds to the wishes of the people. It is because he catches the drift of public sentiment that he is indorsed by men of all sections. He has enlisted in the movement long ago started by Senator NEWLANDS to save the water for those who need it and from those who do not.

This question of harnessing the waters of the Mississippi has been discussed for half a century. It has been dodged by men and candidates.

Now, after decades of agitation, it would seem that something shall be done by bringing together in a perfectly simple manner the people of the West and the South in an enterprise that will mean the saving of untold millions for each section of the country.

—

[From the Reno Gazette, Nov. 16, 1912.]

NEWLANDS DEVELOPMENT BILL.

The Newlands bill for the prevention of waste flood waters and the utilization of these surplus waters in the irrigation of millions of acres of highly productive land furnishes one of the most interesting proposals for national development ever suggested. It is practical. The assured beneficial results from it are such as to command widespread enthusiasm.

The resources of the United States are so vast and varied that thus far the country has prospered by gathering up what was lying about in profusion rather than through the thrifty development of less apparent sources of national wealth.

With millions of acres of the richest virgin soil awaiting the conservation of these waste waters, the duty of Congress is plain. We must have battleships for defense, but an even greater source of national security would be the cost of a few battleships applied to the development of lands capable under irrigation of supporting millions of prosperous Americans.

There are fully 10,000,000 acres of land right here in California that could be made productive through the conservation of waste water in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys alone. The harnessing of the Colorado would add other millions to the productive resources of the State and Nation. Ten million prosperous people added to the Nation's reserve beats the construction of battleships as a means of national power and defense. (Los Angeles Express.)

—

[From the Los Angeles (Cal.) Cultivator, Nov. 21, 1912.]

STORE THE FLOODS.

The Newlands bill has such vast possibilities that many people are almost staggered in contemplating it, but almost the entire West favors it, and the East will favor it more and more as its real worth is understood. The Cultivator gives much more space to it this week. The question, Will the Newlands bill favor California? is answered by Mr. George Maxwell known to irrigators the world over as one of the greatest flood conservation enthusiasts. For $5,000,000 per year can be put into the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys flood storage works and a like amount along the headwaters of the Colorado, and it will mean wonderful advancement in material things for this State.

Mr. Maxwell touches upon some of the benefits to California of the North. The Colorado River work is only incidentally referred to, but there are said to be over 5,000,000 acres of lands along the Colorado, a liberal portion of them being in Arizona, and some below the Mexican line which would be directly benefited by the operation of this bill. We need not be concerned with that below the line except that under existing treaties Mexico is now entitled to one-half the normal flow of the river. The Imperial Valley asserts that she is entitled to all the waters now flowing during the drier season in the Colorado River. The Chucawalla Valley, the Palo Verde Valley, and the lands in Arizona which can be supplied from the Colorado must go dry unless the floods are stored. The Government can invest its money no more profitably.

A great convention is to be held in Los Angeles this week to discuss this matter, and already vigorous action is being taken to arouse enthusiasm which will lead to action.

—

[From the Los Angeles Express, Nov. 22, 1912.]

SOUTHWEST'S OPPORTUNITY.

If the Newlands river-regulation bill is enacted into law in form to include the conservation of the waste storm waters of the Colorado, the Sacramento, San Joaquin, San Gabriel, and other streams, the multiplication of the productive resources of the Southwest would so far surpass anything heretofore experienced in land development as to be scarcely conceivable.

Any one who has seen the transformation worked through irrigation development in various parts of the country knows something of what it would mean to reclaim 10,000,000 acres of the richest virgin soil on the continent through the application of water under climatic conditions that are destined to convert a vast empire into a veritable paradise.

The plan is absolutely feasible. All that is needed is men of vision and business courage to take up the work of public education, money with which to carry forward an aggressive and successful campaign, and a public opinion that is alive to a great opportunity.

—

[From the Statesman, Austin, Tex.]

FOR FLOOD PREVENTION.

The cause of river regulation through source stream control, the use of now wasted flood waters, and the prevention of floods and overflows has been given great impetus through the consolidation of the National Irrigation Association and the National Reclamation Association, under the name of the latter, with C. B. Boothe, of Los Angeles, as president, and George H. Maxwell, of New Orleans, as executive director, and the announcement that a national conference will be held at New Orleans January 6 and 7, 1913, for the purpose of finally deciding upon the details of the campaign to secure the enactment of the Newlands-Bartholdt river regulation and flood prevention bill by the Federal Congress.

This conference will be held by the National Reclamation Association, under the auspices of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. The New Orleans Progressive Union, the Pittsburgh Flood Commission, the Louisiana Bankers' Association, the Stockton (Cal.) River Regulation Association, the Arizona and California River Regulation Commission, the Louisiana Reclamation Club, and other organizations and delegates representing the commercial organizations of every State in the Union are expected to attend.

The primary object of the conference will be the consideration of the Newlands-Bartholdt bill as it affects the interests and needs of the several sections of the country.

This bill provides a continuing appropriation of $50,000,000 annually for 10 years and the organization necessary to enable the Federal Government to harness the source streams of the great rivers in such manner as is necessary to permit the use for irrigation, for power and for dry weather navigation of the flood waters that now go to waste in destructive torrents, for the building and maintenance of necessary levees, and for other works of a protective nature. Its application is general, and all of the great rivers come within the scope of its operations.

—

[From the Republican, Phoenix, Ariz., Nov. 23, 1912.]

PROOF AGAINST HARD TIMES.

One of the assigned causes for the financial disturbance of 1907 was the San Francisco fire and earthquake. That was undoubtedly a contributory cause, for when such a vast volume of property is utterly annihilated, the loss of it must be felt in all parts of the country.

Yet, all the property destroyed at San Francisco was of small volume compared with the annual waste by floods in this country. This great loss does not disturb the country for the reason that it is regarded as a matter of fact, something that can not be avoided, an overhead expense, incident to carrying on our business.

But this annual loss, great as it is, is small in dollars and cents compared with what we lose by neglect, neglect to avail ourselves of the means of creating wealth, neglect to reclaim wealth-creating lands, neglect to conserve and make use of other natural resources.

No attention whatever had been given this matter until it began to be hammered upon the country by Mr. Roosevelt, but before we were fairly awake he passed out of office, since when we have been conserving things in a most leisurely and haphazard way, hardly at all.

A nice thing about a genuine thorough conservation policy is that when properly executed its benefits will be threefold. For the prevention of the great annual devastating floods (the first benefit), control must be established over the headwaters of our streams. Thus, we will have means for developing power and electrical energy and for the irrigation of arid lands, these results being grouped under the head of the second benefit.

With the waters thus controlled at all times, there will be preserved a steady flow in the lower rivers for navigation, but never enough for floods, thus lessening the swamp area of the country and making easier the drainage of swamps not directly caused by the floods. Here we have the group of the third benefit.

Now, if this country in all its breadth and length could be disastrously affected by such a loss as that caused by the San Francisco earthquake and fire, how would it be affected by the prevention of the waste by floods and how would it be affected if we were to make use of the great natural resources which we are neglecting?

Senator FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, to whom we of the West owe so much for what has been accomplished in the way of reclamation, has already taken up this still greater matter for the benefit of not only the West but the entire country. We wish him God speed in this new undertaking and hope that the same degree of success will crown his efforts as that which followed his movement for the reclamation of arid lands.

—

[From the Picayune, New Orleans, La., Dec. 26, 1912.]

THE CONVENTION FOR PROTECTION FROM FLOODS.

Early in January there will be held in this city a convention representing many States of the River Regulation and Flood Prevention Association.

This is a very important body, and while it will devote its energies to dealing with Mississippi River and its great tributaries it must not be confounded with the Deep Waterways Association that has held annual conventions in the cities along the river, several of which were in New Orleans.

The object of the first-named convention is to arrest and store up the flood water in the great tributaries of the Mississippi River, so as to prevent any and all floods in the lowlands of the southern tier of States, while the subject of river navigation is a secondary consideration, although not neglected. The object of the deep-waterway advocates is to provide first of all for the uses of navigation, while the measures necessary to obtain deep water in the channel are considerations of chief importance, while protection from floods is to follow as a necessary consequence.

The regulation of the river as the main factor in flood prevention is urged in the interest of the draining and reclamation of the lowlands of Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, and other States, while the deep-water advocates are working in the interest of such river improvements as will clear out and maintain a channel for a great river commerce, and as a necessary consequence keep the river within its banks and thereby put an end to floods. It is necessary to distinguish between the two bodies so that all the objects and interests concerned may be understood without confusion or misapprehension, because all are important to the people of this city, the people of the lowlands, and the owners of the swamp region.

The movement for river regulation is in aid of a bill already before Congress which embraces among its chief provisions that since the destructive floods in the great continental river are caused by the waters that are brought down by the main tributaries, and since protection from these floods is a public duty, and since all the natural interstate waterways in the Nation are necessarily under the direct jurisdiction of the National Government, it is the duty of the National Government to prevent these floods.

This prevention, according to the terms of Senator NEWLANDS's bill, is to be accomplished by constructing great dams on all the chief tributaries and store up the superfluous waters of each tributary so that no flood can occur in the main river, and in seasons of low water the contents of the lakes or reservoirs formed by the dams are to be drained out by degrees, so that there can be no flood, while the water in the channel will be reenforced when needed for navigation. In the absence of flood waters in the Mississippi River the operation of draining the lowland swamps can go on undisturbed by any fears of future inundation.

But in order to carry out this plan of keeping the flood waters away from the southern lowlands, they will have to be stored up on the lands of Northern States. For every square mile of southern land protected by the proposed process a corresponding area of northern lands must be covered by the water stored up in lakes created for the purpose, and as these artificial inundations will necessarily be in the valleys of the tributary rivers they will cover up a large extent of valuable lands nearly equal in area to those it is designed to protect in the South.

The great tributaries on the east side of the Mississippi are the Ohio, the Tennessee, and the Cumberland. The Ohio takes water from the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Tennessee, and Kentucky. This is an immense area, with an annual rainfall of 40 to 50 inches. Many reservoirs or artificial lakes will be required to store up the excess of waters, and much of this land is of large value, much of it underlain, with coal, oil, and iron ore.

Then, there is the Tennessee River, as long and draining as great an area as the Ohio and taking water from Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Alabama, carrying off as great a rainfall and requiring large spaces in which to store its surplus waters.

On the west side of the Mississippi is the Missouri, not less than 3,000 miles long and taking water from British America and a vast region of the United States, equaling a half million square miles of area. It is true the rainfall is not so great as on the east side of the Mississippi, but for all that the Missouri floods must be caught and stored up in great lakes.

Then there is the Arkansas River, taking water from Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas. It will require large reservoir capacity to hold its floods.

It is to be remembered that the land upon which these mighty waters are to be arrested and imprisoned will have to be bought and a vast work of construction required, and the lands so covered up will be lost to agriculture and every other productive use.

On the other hand, experience in this country and for many centuries in Holland proves that the river floods can be fenced out from the lands, and in this country it has been done for years in the past to a large degree. There is no question of the efficiency of the levee system, provided the stability of the banks on which they are built can be assured, and that they can be has been demonstrated.

The Mississippi River Commission, a national body charged with the improvement of the river for navigation, worked out to a certainty that the current of the river would clear out its channel and maintain it for every purpose of commerce and navigation if the swiftly moving waters could be prevented from corroding and undermining the rich alluvial lands which formed the river's shores. Not having the funds to devote to bank protection, that sort of work was only done in short stretches and not in a connected, systematic way, as is required. There are localities in which the ordinary work of revetment has not proved efficient, but there is no trouble in meeting every local condition and difficulty.

The entire work, since it devolves largely on the National Government, should be left as to the methods to be employed to the United States engineers, since no mere uninformed, impractical theorist is competent to decide on it. It is a matter of experience and not of theory that levees properly built on properly protected banks will fulfill every demand for protection from floods, and the operation of draining and reclaiming the swamps of Louisiana and Mississippi can be carried on with as much security as that enjoyed by the people who live and have lived for centuries behind the dikes and embankments that keep out the high tides of the North Sea and the floods of the River Rhine.

What is of the greatest importance is that the entire subject of protection shall be fully discussed and made fully intelligible to all concerned and an agreement arrived at to leave the decision as to measures and methods to the United States Army engineers. The grand success made by those engineers in the construction of the Panama Canal has established universal confidence in their sound professional judgment as well as their scientific knowledge, and the final decision can be left to them with the assurance that the work will be faithfully and efficiently done.

—

[From the Stockton Daily Evening Record, Stockton, Cal., Tuesday, Nov. 26, 1912.]

MEN WITH A VISION.

The man with a "vision" is no longer championed by Y. M. C. A. orators alone. Like the man who was once considered soft-headed because he "stood for principle," the man with a vision is being called into the public service. In a hard-headed, practical age, society is turning for relief and hope to the dreamer of great dreams.

One was reminded of the fact last evening in listening to the closing words of Senator NEWLANDS's address on our country's river problems.

Sentiment is not indigenous to levees. Landscape art is hardly expected to gather its inspiration from dams and ditches. Esthetic conceptions are not searched for in the reclamation of swamps. The figures that tell of the devastation wrought by floods do not sing in poetic strain. The possibilities of water conservation and distribution have never been the inspiration of epic or flowery prose.

But the human mind is breaking from the thongs of purely utilitarian conceptions of values. Senator NEWLANDS, in his plea for his

bill, urged it at once as a business measure and as one that would lead the people into easier, happier, and fuller enjoyment of the bounties of nature. His call was for men of vision, for men whose perspective could sweep far beyond the half billion dollars the Government is asked to spend for irrigation, flood protection, and navigation. He asked that man fix his mind not on piles of profits counted in shimmering gold, but on the desert that would be made to bloom as the rose, on the river running free and clean in the interests of peaceful commerce, on the mountain water storage lakes from which the thirsty valleys could drink deep and long for their nourishment.

It was a pleasure to hear the Nevada Senator extol a noble, humanitarian sentiment; it was a pleasure to learn that he bases his plea for his magnificent project on the good it would do mankind rather than the profits it would bring to "business." It was even more interesting to note that such sentiments found ready response in an audience composed largely of business men. Our citizenship seems to be far more receptive to great visions than it was a few years ago. The dull, dreary grind of the business man and the laboring man has not lessened, but both of them—equally victims of the system evolved by the sordid past—are looking forward to the day when the peace and plenty spread in the lap of nature by the Creator shall be the common, free, and full heritage of all mankind.

—

[From the Stockton Daily Independent, Nov. 26, 1912.]

NEWLANDS DOING GOOD WORK.

There is a growing interest being manifested by all classes of people in water problems, and throughout the country there is a general awakening to the fact that the land's greatest heritage has been negligently left to go to waste in its flow to the ocean and too frequently doing untold devastation and enormous damage to property in its path. That every ounce of water that flows to the sea should be made to serve a useful purpose is now dawning upon the people as sound business policy, and throughout the Nation conservation schemes are being given more attention than ever before. Stockton has been among the foremost in its efforts to harness the waters, and the progress made here in effecting an organization to that end and the public-spirited interest taken in the conservation movement bids fair to win for this section much earlier relief than may be gained in other parts of the country. Conservation of flood waters is now recognized as one of the most crying needs of the Nation, and until the waters have been made to serve all, with damage to none, the country's development will be held in check and the people deprived of the fruits of their greatest asset.

Senator NEWLANDS's plan of Federal recognition of the waterways problem is most logical, viewed in a general sense. How it may work out in detail may be debatable, but the general plan to have the Government, through appropriations, enable localities to deal directly with their waterway problems offers the greatest hope of any plan yet submitted to the people, and the educational work the Senator is doing throughout the country in the interests of the waterways, flood-water control, navigability of streams, and the conservation of all waters is accomplishing a great deal of good, and his efforts will stamp him among the foremost of conservationists and the author of one of the most important bills ever presented to Congress.

—

[From the Los Angeles (Cal.) Times, Nov. 27, 1912.]

CHECK THEM.

The workers of the Arizona and California river regulation commission have a great work before them at Washington in aiding, by their presentation of facts and arguments to the committees of Congress, to obtain the passage of a bill appropriating $10,000,000 per annum for reservoirs and aqueducts in California and Arizona. In this work they will have able allies, or, to speak more accurately, they will ably aid those who are already allied for the work. There is Senator FRANK NEWLANDS, of Nevada, who is the father and mother and uncle and aunt of the policy of Federal aid to irrigation. There is the poetical young Senator HENRY T. ASHURST, of Arizona, who in one term has leaped to the front as the blue-sky orator of the Senate. There is Senator SMITH of Arizona—good old Mark—who always knows what he wants and usually gets what he goes for. When the Secretary of the Treasury sees Mark coming with a demand for an appropriation for Arizona he places the key of the Government strong box on a desk and crawls under the office lounge. There are Senators SMOOT and SUTHERLAND, of Utah, who will leave their dinners at any time to explain to a New England Congressman the advantages of irrigation. There are our own Senators and those from New Mexico, from Colorado, from Wyoming, from Idaho, from Washington, and from Oregon. In all there are 20 Senators from the Pacific and Rocky Mountain States, and there are 24 Senators from States fronting on the Mississippi River who can be counted upon to push legislation for the impounding of flood waters and the irrigation of arid lands.

With the passage of the bill in behalf of which the Arizona and California river regulation commission will do stalwart work, the cry of "back to the farm" will no longer be a barren ideality, for there will be farms to "go back" to on both sides of the Colorado River. Parker will be the third city of Arizona, the lower San Joaquin Valley will be densely populated, and Los Angeles will be the depot and entrepôt of an additional million of people. The Arizona and California river regulation commission ought to be checked by our merchants and manufacturers and home owners—checks in three figures preferred, those in two figures gratefully received.

—

[From the Stockton (Cal.) Mail, Nov. 27, 1912.]

SPLENDID START FOR RIVER REGULATION.

The results that may be accomplished by thorough organization, persistence, and attention to detail are shown in the action of the realty dealers, who have assumed the initiative and taken up the responsibilities of a campaign for the Newlands bill. The sentiment was here; energy and influence were not lacking; but it needed the practical advice of George H. Maxwell to give proper direction to the work. Since he has handled similar conditions in practically every parish of Louisiana, and has organized scores of associations having in view the same ends, his cooperation was appreciated to the utmost.

How general is the desire for solution of the water problems of this section of the State will be indicated by the fund Stockton business men are raising to exploit the needs of the San Joaquin River and to assist in bringing about adoption of the Newlands bill. That California knows the situation and is fully conversant with the needs of this community is not sufficient. Mr. Maxwell wants the matter explained to the whole United States, so that there may be no interference because of congressional ignorance. The movement has a good flying start, the object is a most worthy one, and it is to be hoped that every Stockton business man will contribute toward the campaign fund.

—

[From the Los Angeles (Cal.) Cultivator, Nov. 28, 1912.]

RECLAIMING THE LANDS.

We doubt not that the communication in last week's Cultivator by Mr. George H. Maxwell will be considered a wild dream by many readers; wilder perhaps the one outlined in this issue calling for reclamation of the 5,000,000 acres along the Colorado River, but we trust the address made at the recent River Regulation Congress held in Los Angeles will attract attention to the benefits to this country should the dreams be realized. That they will be goes without saying, if the American people awake to the necessity of the realization.

For the Government to expend $500,000,000 will call for strenuous work; but with the party now in power committed to flood storage, and with the necessity more apparent than ever for parties standing on their platforms after election as well as before, we believe the greatest need is immediate action to bring before Congress and the East the necessities in the case.

Fortunately the Newlands Act will not only benefit California and Arizona and the whole West but much of the East.

—

[From the Redlands (Cal.) Review, Dec. 1, 1912.]

THE CAUSE OF NATIONAL RECLAMATION.

The cause of river regulation through source-stream control, the use of now wasted flood waters, and the prevention of floods and overflows has been given great impetus through the consolidation of the National Irrigation Association and the National Reclamation Association under the name of the latter, with C. B. Boothe, of Los Angeles, as president, and George H. Maxwell, of New Orleans, as executive director, and the announcement that a national conference will be held at New Orleans January 6 and 7, 1913, for the purpose of finally deciding upon the details of the campaign to secure the enactment of the Newlands-Bartholdt river-regulation and flood-prevention bill by the Federal Congress.

This conference will be held by the National Reclamation Association, under the auspices of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the New Orleans Progressive Union, the Pittsburgh Flood Commission, the Louisiana Bankers' Association, the Stockton (Cal.) River Regulation Association, the Arizona and California River Regulation Commission, the Louisiana Reclamation Club, and other organizations and delegates representing the commercial organizations of every State in the Union are expected to attend.

The primary object of the conference will be the consideration of the Newlands-Bartholdt bill as it affects the interests and needs of the several sections of the country.

This bill provides a continuing appropriation of $50,000,000 annually for 10 years, and the organization necessary to enable the Federal Government to harness the source streams of the great rivers in such manner as is necessary to permit the use for irrigation, for power, and for dry-weather navigation of the flood waters that now go to waste in destructive torrents, for the building and maintenance of necessary levees, and for other works of a protective nature. Its application is general, and all of the great rivers come within the scope of its operations.

The conference will pass upon the adequacy or inadequacy of the specific appropriation provided for the improvement of such rivers as the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Sacramento, the San Joaquin, and recommend such changes in the specific appropriations as seem wise in the light of the great flood of last spring. No attempt will be made to change the fundamental principle on which the bill has been created. In this way it is planned to safeguard the interests of those sections needing levees, of those sections needing water-power and dry-season navigation, and of those sections needing irrigation.

With the specific recommendations of this conference in hand, backed up by resolutions of indorsement by many leading organizations in all parts of the country which have already been secured, the combined forces of the allied organizations of the National Reclamation Association, headed by George H. Maxwell, will go to Washington to begin the fight for the bill at close range.

The Democratic Party is committed to a policy of river regulation through source-stream control, and in a telegram dated Sea Girt, N. J., September 29, to Senator FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, president of the National Irrigation Congress, then in session at Salt Lake City, Gov. Woodrow Wilson, President elect, said: "Please express to the National Irrigation Congress my hearty approval of the policy it is met to promote, and especially of the policy of supplementing bank and levee protection by storage of flood waters above for irrigation and water power, turning floods from a menace into a blessing and at the same time abundantly feeding navigable waters."

With thousands of letters from manufacturers and business men in all parts of the country indorsing the Newlands-Bartholdt bill and promising full cooperation in its possession, the executive committee of the National Reclamation Association, which is domiciled in New Orleans, is of the opinion that opposition to the bill will be short lived once the fight for its enactment shall have been carried to Washington.

—

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times, Dec. 4, 1912.]

RIVER REGULATION.

The cause of river regulation through source stream control, the use of now wasted flood waters, and the prevention of floods and overflows has been given great impetus through the consolidation of the National Irrigation Association and the National Reclamation Association, under the name of the latter. The announcement is made that a national conference will be held at New Orleans January 6–7, 1913, for the purpose of finally deciding upon the details of the campaign to secure the enactment of the Newlands-Bartholdt river regulation and flood-prevention bill by the Federal Congress.

This conference will be held by the National Reclamation Association, under the auspices of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the New Orleans Progressive Union, the Pittsburgh Flood Commission, the Louisiana Bankers' Association, the Stockton (Cal.) River Regulation Association, the Arizona and California River Regulation Commission, the Louisiana Reclamation Club, and other organizations and delegates representing the commercial organizations of every State in the Union are expected to attend.

The Newlands-Bartholdt bill provides a continuing appropriation of $50,000,000 annually for 10 years and the organization necessary to enable the Federal Government to harness the source streams of the great rivers so as to permit the use for irrigation, for power, and for dry-weather navigation of the flood waters which now go to waste in destructive torrents, for the building and maintenance of necessary levees, and for other works of a protective nature. The application of the bill is general, and all of the great rivers come within the scope of its operations.

The conference will pass upon the adequacy or inadequacy of the specific appropriations provided for the improvement of such rivers as the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Sacramento, the San Joaquin, etc., and recommend such changes in the specific appropriations as seem wise in the light of the great flood of last spring. No attempt will be made to change the fundamental principle on which the bill has been created. In this way it is planned to safeguard the interests of those sections needing levees, of those sections needing water power and dry-season navigation, and of those sections needing irrigation.

With thousands of letters from manufacturers and business men in all parts of the country indorsing the Newlands-Bartholdt bill and promising full cooperation in its possession, the executive committee of the National Reclamation Association, which is domiciled in New Orleans, is of the opinion that opposition to the bill will be short lived once the fight for its enactment shall have been carried to Washington.

[From the Los Angeles (Cal.) Tribune, Dec. 5, 1912.]

WIDE INTEREST IN RECLAMATION MEASURE.

Interest manifested in the Newlands-Bartholdt river regulation bill is highly encouraging to its friends. A national conference, to be held in New Orleans January 6 and 7, in behalf of the movement to secure a $50,000,000 appropriation each year for 10 years from Congress for the harnessing of streams and prevention of floods promises to be one of the notable gatherings of recent times.

With the year's appalling destruction of property and life along the Mississippi fresh in mind, the folly of meeting the protective needs of river valleys by feeble levees or any other method than control of headwaters should impress Congress. The Mississippi flood and similar catastrophies in the Missouri, Ohio, and other valleys are monuments, so to speak, to American stupidity and waste.

With proper control of headwaters there need be no floods. There could be millions of blooming acres in California and elsewhere, now barren with thirst for water that not only goes to waste, but, gathering sudden volume, becomes an engine of terrible destruction. It is not too much to say that the Newlands-Bartholdt bill proposes the surest and most promising investment ever made by the Government.

Volumes of water that are a curse to humanity may be turned into a blessing. It will be done—if not by the next Congress, then by a later one. And when it is done and the fruits in the form of radiant land and mighty electric power are enjoyed by our children, they will marvel at our primitive stupidity that so long wasted the gifts of God right at hand and whined about the high cost of living.

[From the Brawley (Cal.) News, Dec. 6, 1912.]

MAKING HISTORY.

No movement more important to the Southwest has been ever undertaken than the conservation of the flood waters. If the Newlands bill, with an appropriation of $5,000,000 a year for 10 years for work on the Colorado River and its tributaries, becomes a law, the Imperial Valley will be the chief gainer.

As the largest irrigation system in the United States it commands respect; with the Mexican lands added, it will rival the largest in the world, with more than a million acres under water.

The local aspect of the movement alone is stupendous. When considered as a part of the whole the proposition reaches a magnitude placing the United States among the wonder workers of the world.

But not the lands along the river alone will benefit. Irrigated sections call for more of the necessities and luxuries of life, owing to the dense population, than any other section of the country. Instead of seeking new markets maintained precariously abroad the United States will provide them at home and dollar diplomacy will be outdistanced.

With such an aim the Imperial Valley can not fail to stand behind the Arizona and California River Regulation Association with all the vigor and money at its command.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 7, 1912.]

TAFT ON THE MISSISSIPPI.

President Taft took unassailable ground when he declared that he was in favor of an appropriation of fifty millions to conserve the waters of the Mississippi so that the damage from the annual floods might be prevented, but was opposed to spending a dollar simply to dredge the channel for the sake of a commerce which does not exist and which is not likely to revive.

As the Inquirer has often pointed out, the Mississippi can never be made a great highway of transportation until more fundamental considerations are first given attention. At present the river has a small amount of local steamboat traffic, for which the channel is sufficient. Otherwise the Government maintains the lower reaches at the delta for the benefit of the great and growing commerce of New Orleans. It can do no more in this specific direction.

But it must be apparent that the channel should be looked after, not on transportation grounds but those of public safety and conservation of property. Every year the natural hindrances to drainage disappear and the floods become higher and shorter, with consequent damage of enormous extent.

The suggestion to create great reservoirs in Arkansas and elsewhere, to convert present swamps into lakes, so that the floods may be regulated, just as are the waters of the Nile, seems to be the only practical proposal. Congress would do well to have this consideration carefully examined and spend money on any good plan. The "pork-barrel" feature of the Father of Waters must disappear.

[From the Arizona Gazette, Phoenix, Ariz., Dec. 10, 1912.]

NEWLANDS'S RIVER REGULATIONS.

(By B. A. Fowler.)

There is now a bill before Congress which is attracting much attention North, South, East, and West. It was introduced April 6, 1911, by Senator FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, of Nevada, is known as the Newlands river regulation bill (S. 122), and like the national irrigation act, with which Mr. NEWLANDS's name is inseparably linked, this also is a masterpiece of constructive statesmanship. For years the subject matter of this bill has been before the National Irrigation Congress for discussion and action. Some of our citizens will recall that the irrigation congress, held in Phoenix in 1896, passed a resolution calling on the Congress at Washington to appropriate money for the building of reservoirs, and the river and harbor bill of that same year provided for the examination of reservoir sites in the West to determine whether they were practicable and desirable for three things: First, for improving the navigation of navigable rivers; second, for providing water for irrigation of arid lands; and third, for preventing destructive floods.

Under that appropriation Capt. Chittenden, since advanced to rank of brigadier general, made an exhaustive report which was a model. He clearly demonstrated that reservoirs on the headwaters of navigable streams would regulate the flow of the rivers by holding back the water that otherwise would be wasted in time of floods and turning it into the stream at the low water season when it was needed both for navigation and irrigation. Thus navigation would be improved, irrigation water provided, and destructive floods prevented.

This was in 1896–97, but the Nation was not awake to the wisdom or necessity of such an economic policy. However, "all things come to them who wait" and "hustle while they wait," and the irrigation congress and others who believed in the Chittenden report hustled and waited.

In June, 1902, the national irrigation act was the first notable result of this hustling and waiting, and nine years later comes this "river regulation" by the Nation. As introduced, this is a bill "to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection, and for the beneficial use of flood waters, and for water storage, and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion, and from forest fires, and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other agencies."

There is "reserved, set aside, and appropriated" $50,000,000 annually for each of 10 years, and "made available until expended, out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated." The "board of river regulation" will consist of the Chief of Engineers of the Army, the Director of the Geological Survey, the Forester of the Department of Agriculture, the Director of the Reclamation Service, the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, one civil engineer, one sanitary engineer, and one hydroelectric engineer. The last three shall be appointed by the President, hold office at his pleasure, and each receive $7,500 per year. All formal action taken and expenditures authorized by the board shall be reported to the President and by him transmitted to Congress.

Broad powers are given the board for cooperating with States, municipalities, corporations, towns, counties, districts, persons, and associations, as well as with the various scientific and constructive bureaus of the United States, for the encouragement of independent initiation and construction.

The board is also empowered to harmonize and unify and bring into correlation and coordination the investigations made and information and data obtained by the various bureaus and offices of the Government relating to questions involved in this act and with a view of securing unity of action, promoting economy and providing against duplication, unrelated or incomplete work.

The board must develop and prepare comprehensive plans for the conservation, use, and development of the water and forest resources in such manner as will best regulate the flow of source streams, navigable rivers, and a hundred other phases of the subject, like flood protection, drainage, reclamation of swamp and overflow lands, etc.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution is to secure all obtainable knowledge concerning the problems involved, establish a museum of conservation to aid in the education of the public on these subjects.

The Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, the Forester, the Director of the Geological Survey, the Director of the Reclamation Service, and the Chief of Engineers of the Army shall each use all the resources of their offices to contribute to the vast work of this board, and the three engineers of this board, appointed by the President, are to supplement the above.

Should the current revenues be insufficient to provide the $50,000,000, the President is authorized to make up the deficiency by issuing 3 per cent 30-year United States bonds.

For carrying out the provisions of this act the moneys annually appropriated shall be apportioned as follows:

Smithsonian Institution, $1,000,000.
Bureau of Plant Industry, $2,000,000.
Geological Survey, $3,000,000.
Reclamation Service, $10,000,000.
Forest Service, $10,000,000.
Corps of Engineers, United States Army, $24,000,000.

Should this bill become a law it would save annually millions and tens of millions of dollars and thousands of lives, would multiply transportation facilities and solve vexing transportation problems, improve national sanitation, reclaim more than 80,000,000 acres of swamp lands, increase food production and decrease cost of living, and save this Nation from disastrous floods, such as are a curse to China to-day and which made of the surpassingly rich and fertile plains of Mesopotamia a "land of desolation" over which the jackal, the hyena, and other wild beasts now roam at will and alone.

[From the Stockton (Cal.) Independent, Dec. 12, 1912.]

CURRY FAVORS NEWLANDS BILL, PROVIDED IT IS AMENDED TO INCLUDE AN APPROPRIATION OF $50,000,000 FOR CALIFORNIA RIVERS.

Strong efforts will be put forth by Congressman Elect Charles F. Curry, of this district, to secure the passage of the Newlands conservation measure and to secure under that bill $5,000,000 per year for 10 years for the conservation of the flood waters of the San Joaquin and Sacramento Rivers. He defined his position yesterday morning, following a conference with George H. Maxwell, executive director of the National Reclamation Association, who chanced to be in Stockton yesterday.

Mr. Curry states that he had at first planned to introduce a bill asking $40,000,000 to be immediately available for the San Joaquin and Sacramento Rivers, but he agreed to withhold it provided the Newlands bill is amended to provide $50,000,000 for the two California streams, and to do all in his power to secure the passage of the bill embodying a nation-wide conservation plan.

[From the Pomona (Cal.) Times, Dec. 13, 1912.]

FLOOD WATERS.

Egypt is the creature of the Nile. In other words, the great valley and the level lands about the delta have for centuries been dependent on the flood waters of that great river. When the Nile poured its annual floods through the valley and inundated the fertile fields on either side, then Egypt had a year of plenty and the land brought forth by handfuls. If the floods failed, then Egypt had a year of famine.

It may never have occurred to our readers that right at the very doors of California we have another Nile and another Egypt. The great Imperial Valley and the Colorado River every year enact the same thing that has gone on for centuries in Egypt. With the great floods of the Colorado River comes the riches that have made the Imperial Valley the granary of the Southwest as well as the most wealthy agricultural district in the world. Every inch of available water that under the present system can be secured is now at work in the Imperial Valley, and yet there are thousands of acres that are ready to blossom as the rose if they can only receive the life-giving fluid. What is to be done? There is only one thing that can be done, and the great movement is already under way; it is no less than the conservation of the flood waters of the Colorado River. Every year hundreds of thousands of inches of water are emptied into the Gulf of California or poured in a flood over the fertile fields along its banks, just as often carrying devastation as prosperity to the lands on either side. Senator NEWLANDS has introduced into Congress a bill whereby millions of dollars are to be appropriated for the erection of great storage reservoirs, which shall be filled to the brim with the flood waters during the time of the annual freshet. These waters shall remain impounded until such time as they shall be needed, and then slowly conducted through canals to the thirsty fields of the great Imperial Valley to bring riches to thousands of ranchers and to raise food and clothing for a great multitude of people.

It is a great undertaking and worthy of the effort of a lifetime; for if Senator NEWLANDS accomplishes nothing more during the remainder of his life than to bring to a successful issue the great undertaking that he has inaugurated he will have reared to himself a monument that shall be almost as imperishable as time itself. It is to be hoped that every Congressman and the two Senators from California will give their very best efforts to support the bill that shall bring prosperity and millions of dollars to this great State of ours.

For many years past we have had a growing conviction that the future of the water problem of southern California was connected inseparably with the conservation of the flood waters of the country. We have a half dozen natural locations in this vicinity where, with the expenditure of a few thousands of dollars, great storage reservoirs could be built. These great impounding places can be connected with every acre of land and orange grove in these valleys by water pipes already installed and floods of gravity water be poured on our thirsty orchards at a price much less than is now demanded of the rancher. The use of these flood waters will serve several purposes; the problem of caring for them during the winter season will be greatly lessened; the ruin that they frequently accomplish will be avoided; their use early in the season will conserve the underground supplies and remove the anxiety of the men whose business it is to furnish from an ever-decreasing supply the life-giving fluid for an increasing acreage of citrus trees.

This move for the conservation of the flood waters is one in the right direction, and we see no reason why the matter should not have the hearty support of every Member of Congress. As to starting the work of flood-water conservation in southern California, we believe that the movement is worthy of serious consideration by practical men. The drilling of wells by small companies represents a makeshift necessary because of a scattered population and very limited capital. With our rapidly increasing population and the rapid growth of capital, there is no reason why we should not seriously contemplate the massing of our means and saving for our future prosperity that which at present is an annual source of waste aggregating hundreds of thousands of dollars.

—

[From the Stockton (Cal.) Mail, Dec. 16, 1912.]

MAXWELL, THE NEWLANDS BILL, AND THE OPPORTUNITY OF STOCKTON.

On behalf of northern California, the region most vitally interested in river control and flood prevention, Stockton has taken the initiative in support of the Newlands bill, and a week's effort has sufficed to demonstrate that the movement will be an unqualified success. For the time being there is no matter of more importance to the community, and even in this busiest of seasons it is not unreasonable to suggest that the bankers, merchants, and landowners contribute some portion of their time to getting fully acquainted with the plans and purposes of the campaign and the men who have had the enterprise to gain this credit for Stockton.

Because Los Angeles, having no rivers of her own, is interested in the improvement of the Colorado, several hundred miles away, the live and energetic commercial bodies of that city have formed their own association, thereby seizing the distinction of being the first California city to organize a branch of the National Reclamation and Irrigation Association. It needs no prophet to foretell that Los Angeles will take a prominent part in the campaign for passage of the Newlands bill, and it will be interesting to compare the methods of the south with the efforts of all the commercial bodies in northern California. This is a subject in which more than 50,000 citizens of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys have been interested for nearly half a century. Without recourse to complicated legislation and without the danger of vexatious delay, there is to be procured through the Newlands bill for immediate use a fund of $50,000,000 for improvement of the two rivers, for prevention of floods from which Stockton has been the greatest sufferer, and for the construction and maintenance of canals and reservoirs that will irrigate millions of acres of semiarid land—an empire that will support its hundreds of thousands.

Sacramento would gladly have taken over the central organization that will campaign for the Newlands bill on behalf of California, but Stockton already had founded the river regulation commission, and George H. Maxwell, executive officer of the national association, came here to find a few public-spirited men already battling for recognition and already seeking relief from the annual dangers of floods. It is through the days and nights that Maxwell has devoted to the work, through his matchless energy and his long experience, that Stockton is to-day so well advanced in the preliminary work.

Maxwell has undertaken, in good faith, to do something that northern California, even in the hour of gravest danger and heaviest loss, has never attempted. He is endeavoring to get together the fund necessary for a campaign that will make an impression upon Congress, to be expended in the same manner and at the same time as the funds raised in Los Angeles, in Arizona, in New Orleans, and Pittsburgh. He knows the value of concentrated results and organization. He prefers to depend upon the voice of the Nation rather than upon the efforts of one Congressman or of one congressional delegation.

Out of the $12,000 necessary to launch the two-year campaign, Maxwell will not receive a dollar. The completion of this fund will simply obligate him to remain in California and direct another fund-raising campaign for $30,000 more, to be secured outside of Stockton, and from which is to be deducted one-third of his annual salary and expenses. At a meeting in the chamber of commerce last week President Nims of that organization intimated to Maxwell as broadly as possible that he might name his own salary and remain in Stockton as its chief booster, but Maxwell only smiled and shook his head. Maxwell's salary of $12,000 a year, in view of the work he has done, the experience and acquaintance he has gained, and the sacrifices he has made to continue this work in and out of season for many years past, is more than reasonable, since it is procured largely through his own efforts, the contagion of his enthusiasm, and the soundness of his advice. It is not more than is paid to-day to the manager of an interurban railway. It is exceeded by the remuneration of a dozen department chiefs of the Panama-Pacific Exposition, and it is the minimum for the executive heads of many California corporations who are not the equals of Maxwell in ability or enterprise.

It was Maxwell who analyzed the sentiment of northern California upon the river-control question, and it was Maxwell, the confidant and assistant of Senator NEWLANDS, who obtained his consent and the consent of all the eastern and southern river-improvement associations to incorporate in the pending bill the clause which provides for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers an annual appropriation of $5,000,000 for 10 consecutive years—a fund that is admitted by all engineers to be adequate to solution of all the problems the people of this section have faced for many years.

That Stockton will gain prominence in this campaign can not be doubted. The work that can be done with $12,000 is laid out so that none may doubt its efficacy. The names of the hundred men who will compose the river-regulation roll of honor will be worth remembering when Stockton has a population of 100,000.

—

[From the El Centro (Cal.) Progress, Dec. 17, 1912.]

MAXWELL SHOWED US.

"Where does the money go?"

That was the main question put up to George H. Maxwell yesterday at the meeting called to hear the Newlands bill discussed.

The situation locally is almost identical with the situation nationally. Here the irrigation directors wish the people to express themselves as to their desires in helping to finance the campaign of education in favor of the Newlands bill. The directors themselves know the great benefits that would accrue to the valley should the bill with the Colorado River amendment attached be passed. They naturally want the O. K. of the people before acting in the matter. Congressmen are the same way. When it comes to making an appropriation of practically half a billion dollars, Congress wants to know if the people of the United States favor it.

This favorable sentiment must be created. To create it 20,000 editors must be converted; daily, weekly, and monthly mail must be sent out; tens of thousands of dollars must be spent for postage; more must be spent for literature, its composition and printing; the whole Nation must be aroused.

The Newlands bill must become a household word. It must be made popular. Its provisions must be heralded from Maine to California.

Men must be employed to do this work. Mr. Maxwell himself has given 20 years of his life to this work already. He is the foremost exponent of conservation of flood waters of various rivers; his time is valuable; he has drawn no pay for almost a year; he said he would continue this great effort even if he had to beg pennies on the streets to pay his expenses.

It cost a million dollars in honest effort to elect Woodrow Wilson President of the United States.

It surely is worth one-fifth of that amount to create a public sentiment that will compel the passage of the great Newlands bill, which is the masterpiece of legislation of the twentieth century.

Imperial Valley's part can surely be $5,000 if Stockton City can put up $12,000.

—

[From the New Orleans Item, Dec. 24, 1912.]

THE FLOOD-PREVENTION CONFERENCE.

The National Flood Prevention and River Regulation Conference set for January 6 and 7 should challenge the interest of every citizen of Louisiana and the greater area affected by the recurrent overflow of the Mississippi River. This meeting will bring together a good many of those who believe that the right way to attack the problem presented by the river is to begin at the headwaters and prevent floods, instead of taking hold at the bottom of the valley and trying to dam the floods as they sweep down. Those who advocate this course are opposed in political as well as in engineering policy to those who cleave to the present scheme of levee administration.

The cost of controlling the flow of great rivers is stupendous. So also are the damages continuously arising from failure to control their flow. The engineering problem which the process involves is tremendous and largely undeveloped. So also were the technical problems which beset the men who spanned the continent with railroads, irrigated the dry lands of the West, drove a plexus of rails through the rock beneath New York, tunneled the Hudson River, and severed the Isthmus of Panama. All these processes have resulted, and are expected to result, in gigantic benefits and profits, overwhelming even their own enormous costs. So also would the control of the great river which drains the continent between the Appalachians and the Rockies.

Not only would this stop the millions of dollars of loss sustained every year from high water on the Mississippi and its tributaries, and the tens on tens of millions of values destroyed now and again when high flood stages are attained, but it would also, say its advocates, fertilize and fructify great dry, barren areas now awaiting the waters which they propose to impound.

The proposals here outlined are given concrete shape in a bill now pending in both Houses of Congress. This was prepared by Senator NEWLANDS, one of the comparatively few men in Congress with the breadth and depth of real statecraft. Congressman BARTHOLDT, of Missouri, presented it in the House. The opponents of the plan it embraces call it a lunatic fancy. The very charitable among them say it is impracticable. These are precisely the same things which have been said about every large enterprise which the mind of man has conceived since man has had a mind. Sometimes they delay the consummation of great

conceptions, but they never prevented the realization of a single one. Soon or late NEWLANDS's plan of river control, or some modification of it, will rule the streams of the United States, because the levees alone will not hold a flood that is constantly undermining them, or climbing over them, or doing both.

The acceptance of any such plan as this would mean the transfer of all control of the levees and all responsibility for them to the Federal Government, which is where their control belongs. This, however, is not a pleasant prospect for the numerous clans of levee patchers whose maladministration of the levees in the States along the lower course of the river has been characterized by dissipation, waste, and graft. Those who are absolutely conscientious never attain efficiency, because they lack the essentials of efficiency, and not all are either conscientious or capable. Whatever they attain or fail to attain is gained or lost at tremendous expense to a few States which ought not, in simple justice, to bear such a burden alone.

The people of New Orleans are more or less familiar with the old idea of river control. They have had the pleasure and profit of hearing Mr. RANSDELL a number of times. The last occasion on which they heard him, he addressed a large audience of them nearly two hours, after which another speaker presented the Newlands plan for 20 minutes, at the end of which the intelligent crowd indicated its very plain preference for the latter-day idea.

Our Representatives in Washington are now contending for a large appropriation for levees, with the enormous losses of this year's floods as their key to the country's consideration. We hope they get the money. Every little helps. The only way, however, to settle a question like this levee question is to settle it right. No amount of money piled into dikes will obviate the necessity of flood control. The higher they rise the harder they will fall when their foundations are scoured away.

Everybody in New Orleans has a pocketbook interest in the river and the levees. If you want to hear more about the proposals of Mr. NEWLANDS, the objections to it, and the answers to them, you should attend the conference which is to be held next month.

—

[From the Times-Democrat, Wednesday, Jan. 8, 1913.]

RIVER REGULATION AND FLOOD PREVENTION.

While the conference held in this city for river regulation and flood prevention has not been as well attended as was expected, it has none the less accomplished its purpose of presenting to the people of Louisiana and the Southwest, properly and strongly, the river problems and issues involved, and it has made them better acquainted with the Newlands bill, which the conference is so warmly advocating. The meeting was held in New Orleans for this very reason, to acquaint the State and city with what the River Regulation Association proposes to do to bring about a broader and better study of the problems in their broadest sense, and secure the cooperation of all who are interested in the regulation, control, and improvement of the Mississippi and its tributaries.

It is natural that the people living along the lower Mississippi should look at the question mainly or altogether from the standpoint of overflow, and that they should magnify the importance of levees, as this has been in the past the only way in which they have secured protection. To most of them the Mississippi and levees were regarded as one and the same problem. Latterly, even in this section, and especially after the experience of last year's floods, some doubts have arisen as to whether levees alone will assure us all the protection we need.

The conference in this city was for the purpose of calling attention to the other problems involved in river improvement, the use of reservoirs for retaining the flood, and thus preventing the freshet coming down in one gigantic wave; the use of water thus stored up to make the river navigable during low seasons; its utilization for irrigation purposes, and also for the production of water power.

All these points have been successfully presented in the speeches and resolutions; the plan of improvement urged has been launched before the community and will receive the consideration and study they deserve. The conference has also dwelt upon the importance of unity of interests, and insisted that by cooperation, acting together in all matters affecting the regulation of the river, we are most likely to secure the appropriation and legislation desired. An earnest effort has been made to prove that the interests having at heart the construction of reservoirs, irrigation of lands, etc., were not inimical to the demands of the people along the lower river, were not opposed to levees or failed to recognize the part they must play in any system of river regulation and improvement; and a number of changes and amendments have been proposed in the Newlands bill that will make it provide more liberally for the Mississippi south of St. Louis and for the construction of levees.

This, as we understand it, is what the conference was intended to accomplish—to present the question of river regulation more broadly than it has been presented before, to lead to the discussion of all the river issues, of all the plans suggested, and to show how all interests are affected, with the confidence that only by such general discussion and interchange of views will it be possible to reach a definite conclusion as to what ought to be done to secure united action.

Never has a better occasion presented itself than the present to secure favorable action from Congress and to protect the lower Mississippi Valley from overflow. The country realizes that this heavy loss must be prevented in future; it can not stand it without serious injury; that the Federal Government is responsible for the care of the river and its protection from overflow and must assume charge and control, and those along the river—the States, levee districts, and people—are now unanimous in favor of surrendering to the Federal Government all control of the rivers, all obligations in the matter of levee construction and the prevention of overflows. If we do not get all we want now it will be because we quarrel among ourselves and can not agree as to what we want done. The river regulation and flood prevention conference will, we believe, help to bring about an agreement by laying before the people of the lower valley many ideas and suggestions as to river improvement and regulation which have never been sufficiently considered here before.

—

[From the Daily Picayune, New Orleans, Wednesday, Jan. 8, 1913.]

THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND THE PROTECTION OF THE VALLEY FROM FLOODS.

The bill proposed by United States Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, for the regulation and control of the waters of the Mississippi River and its tributaries, which has been offered in Congress, was considered at a meeting of delegates, chiefly from Louisiana, yesterday at the hall of the Progressive Union in this city.

The bill in question has not specially commended itself to the people of this city because it proposes to disregard the methods that have been employed in this part of the country, with a large measure of success, in protecting the lowlands of this State from the river floods, and have to a large extent been effective, and that is the building of levees. The people of this part of the country are confident that if the systematic protection of the river banks be added to the proper building of levees the problem of protection will be solved.

Senator NEWLANDS's scheme, in brief, is to build dams on all the upper tributaries of the Mississippi River and store up the flood waters, only turning them loose gradually after the flood season had passed, and it was proposed that the entire burden of the work should be undertaken and maintained by the National Government. Such artificial lakes, established on the tributaries that have their rise in the Rocky Mountains and flow through the dry plains of the West, could furnish large quantities of water for irrigation, but the greatest part of our flood water comes from such eastern tributaries as the Ohio, the Tennessee, and Cumberland Rivers, and there is no need for irrigation in that region.

While the stored-up waters would cover large extents of land in West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, underlaid by coal and iron ore, the damage would be greater than the benefit. Moreover, it would cause the spending of all the public money in the highland States of the great valley and none in the lowlands. While this statement smacks of "pork-barrel" politics, there is at least some justice in the claim for a more equitable distribution of the money.

Moreover, what the Newlands bill proposed was a land reclamation scheme that had no reference to the improving of the rivers for navigation. It is not at flood tide that the banks are undermined and the caving occurs, but in the season of low water. The protection of the banks from caving and establishing their permanence and ability to support the levees is the grand object in view, and when that shall be accomplished, as it can and should be, everything that can be desired will have been done to protect the lowlands from overflow, so that the work of drainage and reclamation can be carried to the utmost limits.

At the meeting on Monday a committee was appointed to revise the terms of the Newlands bill, and the committee most properly insisted that all the proposed work should be carried on under the direction of the Mississippi River Commission, a national body charged with the care of the river and the improvement of its navigation, as well as protection from floods, and the entire work should be under the supervision of that body. It was also insisted that an appropriation of $10,000,000 a year be devoted to the care of the river from St. Louis to the Gulf of Mexico. With such amendments added to it and incorporated in the body of the Newlands bill, it can be made acceptable to our people and to assist in giving protection from floods to the southern lowlands and aiding in the development of the Mississippi Valley, besides improving the river as a channel for a great commerce. Then all interests will be promoted and the protection and development of the lowlands of the Mississippi River will be established.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to add just a few words regarding the debate in which we have been participating for some days. What contentions have arisen during that time? First, the contention relating to the development of hydroelectric power near St. Paul, under the amendment introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and approved by the committee. The contention there was the same as the contention regarding the Connecticut River dam. The only difference between the two cases was that in the case of the Connecticut River dam it was constructed to serve the double purpose of navigation and the development of hydroelectric power by a private corporation acting under the authority both of the State and of the Nation, and it was sought to impose some charge upon the profits of the private corporation with a view to using the moneys thus received by the National Government in the promotion of navigation upon that river.

In the other case the dam was constructed by the National Government, but was to be constructed in such a way as to serve a double use, to serve the use for navigation and to serve the use for the development of hydroelectric power, a larger expenditure being acquired for the two uses than would be required simply for navigation. So the Government there was to impose a charge upon the corporation using the hydroelectric power compensatory in the shape of interest on the additional portion of the construction assignable to hydroelectric use.

Now, we had two contradictory votes, one striking out this charge as an invasion of State rights, the other approving the charge by the National Government as a reasonable charge for the extra expenditure made in meeting the requirements of the State.

I ask with reference to that specific matter, Is the time of the National Congress to be wasted year after year in taking up each one of these individual projects and dealing with it? Would it not be much wiser to have a board under whose general powers works could be undertaken covering both the use within the jurisdiction of the State and the use within the jurisdiction of the Nation under an apportionment of cost between them that will fairly distribute the burden?

Then we have another contention, a contention over the lower Mississippi River. We have there an Inland Waterways Commission, organized years ago, whose jurisdiction extended over the entire river. The jurisdiction there was so generally expressed as to embrace, in my judgment, not only the river itself but its tributaries.

Yet we found, as a matter of fact, the operations of that commission were confined to the lower reach of that river, from the Passes to Cairo. Later we extended its work as far up as Cape Girardeau, a total distance from the mouth of a thousand

miles. The purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Missouri was to add nearly 500 miles to the area of its operations, so that they would extend up as high as Rock Island.

The Inland Waterway Commission is an example of cooperative action, and illustrates the principle for which I contend regarding the entire waterway system. That commission was composed of three men belonging to the Engineer Corps of the Army and one representative of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, thus insuring the coordination of these two engineering forces, whose jurisdiction pertained to our rivers, but whose jurisdiction varied in character, and to these officials were added two engineers and a lawyer, appointed from civil life, thus making up the seven members of the Mississippi River Commission.

So in its very organization it was a coordinated body, and in its work it was a cooperative body, for, under the organic act of that commission, it was to cooperate with the States on the Mississippi River with a view to dovetailing river regulation and swamp-land reclamation and protection. Their operations have been cooperative ever since, the commission undertaking the dredging of the river, the bank revetment and protection to prevent caving banks, and undertaking, in cooperation with and through a division of expense with the States and lèvee districts, the construction of levees, which, it was held, were a part of the scheme of navigation as well as of swamp-land reclamation, the levees serving to keep the river within its channel and to prevent it from practically losing its channel by spreading over vast areas of swamp land.

That commission had an expenditure of about $3,000,000 a year when it ought to have had the power to expend at least $10,000,000 a year between Cairo and the Passes, and while it has done much good work in cooperation with the States, the deficiency in its work has been the fruitful cause of enormous disaster to this great area of reclaimed land in five States, in itself an empire of unexampled productiveness. Every one of these overflows can be attributed to some deficiency in appropriation. We have gradually enlarged our vision upon this subject, and we are now expending $6,000,000 annually where formerly we expended $3,000,000.

Now, what was this area? An enormous area of swamp land, over which the Mississippi River was accustomed in the olden days to spread itself, composed of an inexhaustible soil, a soil equal in fertility to that of the Nile. That entire area came into the possession of the National Government through the Louisiana purchase as a part of the national domain. At the very inception of that ownership and title, if the statesmen of that time could have read the future, they would have realized the folly of parting with that great domain to any sovereignty or any individual incapable of dealing with it in a big and comprehensive way.

Yet the United States, not realizing the value of that immense area, but realizing only the burden that might be imposed upon it by the construction of the works necessary to reclaim it, granted it to the States upon the condition they should reclaim it. The weak States threw their burden upon individuals, and so this domain fell in large areas into the hands of individuals who were incapable of dealing with it in the scientific way that would be required to increase its productiveness and make its production certain. So they have been at work in a feeble and ineffective way exhausting their resources for a century in the development of that great region, the work of one year being entirely destroyed by the flood of another, vast areas devastated, and large populations deprived of the resources of life.

We have attempted in a half-hearted, ineffective way to recover the ground lost, and the National Government, not now the owner of this area, finds itself called upon to aid in its reclamation, and the question is as to the constitutional power of the Nation. We all know, of course, that the entire power of the Nation over navigable rivers arises from the commerce clause of the Constitution. The promotion of interstate transportation comes within the national powers, and so we have gradually built up a system there of cooperation between the Nation and the States with reference to that vast area, but a cooperation lacking sufficient funds, a cooperation lacking a sufficient area of operation; for instead of at the start regarding the Mississippi, with all its tributaries, the Ohio, the Cumberland, the Tennessee, and the Missouri, with all its tributaries, the Platte, and the Arkansas River, as a unit and undertaking the complete regulation and control of those waters from source to mouth in aid of navigation, with a view of checking the floods in such a way as to delay and spread out their operation over the regions below, the Nation took control only of the lower reaches of the river and waited for these enormous floods coming from nearly 30 States of the Union to gather in enormous volume in the Mississippi River below Cairo, and thence down it sought to restrain these floods after their accumulated force was directed against this unfortunate region, instead of harnessing the floods at their very source, arresting their flow to the regions below, and extending the flood season over a longer period, thus diminishing the crest of the flood and diminishing its destructive power.

Now, what can be done in the way of scientific arrest of these flood waters that fall during the spring and winter upon the Appalachian Mountains and the Allegheny Mountains on the east and upon the Rocky Mountains in the West, and on the whole intermediate region, and make their way through the small source streams and tributaries into the main river itself, receiving additional accumulations from the very region affected?

We have done nothing practically with reference to arresting those floods. Yet, if we would only arrest them, we could make them instrumentalities of benefaction instead of destruction. What benefaction can be secured from the arresting of the floods at or near that source? In the first place, in that Rocky Mountain region to the west of Kansas and Nebraska and Oklahoma, including parts of those States, we have a vast area of land that is thirsty for water every season of the year, and upon which it is impossible to raise profitable crops without artificial irrigation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Nevada, and I am sure the Senator will accept the suggestion in the spirit in which I make it. The Senator has offered this amendment to the river and harbor bill. The amendment is the subject of a bill introduced by the Senator some time ago in the Senate. That bill has been before the Committee on Commerce and has been reported and is now on the calendar.

The subject which the Senator is discussing is a very important and a very interesting one, and he is discussing it in a very lucid and interesting way; but it must be, I think, apparent to the Senator that the conditions here are not favorable to a real discussion and consideration of this subject. We are anxious to pass this bill to-day, if possible. The subject which the Senator suggests is one that ought to call for very extensive and very thorough and very full consideration. Senators naturally feel that the proposition which he makes is one that will change the policy of the Government in reference to the improvement of rivers and harbors, and if it were engrafted upon this bill it is probable the bill would be defeated and we would not get the river and harbor bill, and the Senator would not get what he wants.

I was going to suggest to the Senator, in these conditions, in view of the great importance of the subject he is discussing, and the fact that his bill has been reported and is on the calendar, would it not be better that this discussion be postponed, and that at an early day we take this matter up as a separate proposition, a proposition involving a change in the policy of the Government with reference to appropriations for river and harbor improvements, and give it a thorough discussion? I do not think that conditions are now favorable to the discussion or the real consideration of the important matters which the Senator is suggesting to the Senate.

I merely wanted to make that suggestion to the Senator. I fully appreciate the importance of the matter he is discussing, and I am anxious that the Senate should take it up as a separate proposition and give it full discussion. I hope he will not insist upon it as an amendment to this bill and a discussion of the matter at this time, because I think it is a matter that ought to be thoroughly discussed as a separate proposition, not as an amendment to a bill, especially in view of the fact that the amendment the Senator proposes would change the whole policy of the bill. It is at variance with the policy of the bill, and if it were adopted it must be apparent to the Senator that it would defeat the bill, and defeat his amendment along with the bill.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am not insensible to the appeal the Senator makes to me. It is an appeal that has been made whenever I have addressed the Senate upon similar amendments proposed to the river and harbor bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. But, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the Senator has never had his bill on the calendar where it might be considered as a separate proposition, as is the case now.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That is true; but it has been reported only recently and at a time when it can not possibly be considered. As I regard the amendment as entirely germane to the bill, I am disposed to urge it. At the same time I shall be very con-

siderate with my colleagues, and I shall endeavor to close my remarks in time to secure a vote upon the bill before the time fixed for the memorial addresses. But I understand that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] proposes to offer as an amendment the Connecticut River dam bill. I will ask him whether it will be possible to conclude the consideration of this bill before 2 o'clock?

Mr. BORAH. The interrogatory was addressed to the Senator from Connecticut, but I will state, if the original Connecticut River bill is offered as an amendment, of course, it will not be possible to dispose of the bill to-day, if there is any disposition to carry that amendment. If a Senator offers it for the purpose of offering it that is one thing, but if there is a disposition to put it on the bill, the bill will not be passed to-day.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. My attention was diverted when the Senator from Nevada referred to the matter.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I asked the Senator whether it was his intention to move as an amendment the Connecticut River dam bill?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], I understand, gave notice last night that he would offer as an amendment to put the Connecticut River bill as it came from the committee on the river and harbor bill, and my colleague [Mr. McLEAN] intends to offer the bill as it was passed by the Senate as an amendment to the river and harbor bill. What would develop in the way of language in the way of those two propositions I do not know. My experience would lead me to expect some expression of views.

Mr. NEWLANDS. So, it would not be possible to conclude the consideration of the bill to-day before 2 o'clock.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That depends upon the staying qualities of long-distance talkers, and I can not guarantee anything about it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I assume, then, the Senator does not intend to address the Senate upon his amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I would a great deal rather have a vote on it in quiet, because I should think it would be perfectly acceptable to the Senate to accept what it had already accepted. But if anyone objects, then I would like to answer him if he makes any points that I think need answering.

Mr. NEWLANDS. We shall doubtless hear from the Senator as we heard from him during that debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. As I understand the situation, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] proposes to offer the original Connecticut River bill as an amendment to the pending measure, and the Senator from Connecticut will offer as an amendment that bill as it was finally adopted by the Senate. The offer by the Senator from Ohio will certainly develop some language.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I therefore see——

Mr. MYERS. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. I am in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, and I hope he will go ahead and address the Senate on it and bring it to a vote. I have learned that the time to press a bill here is when one gets a chance to press it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, it does not seem probable therefore that we can reach a conclusion on this bill to-day, and I shall go on with my presentation of this subject.

I will state, in reference to the appeal of the Senator from North Carolina, it has been an appeal that has been made upon every occasion when I have presented the river-regulation bill in the shape of an amendment to the river and harbor bill. I have been compelled to present it as an amendment to the river and harbor bill because it is impossible to get for it serious consideration by the Committee on Commerce, the members of which are so bent on securing appropriations for individual projects that they have not time to consider a broad and comprehensive measure that will deal with this subject in such a way as to relieve Congress of a large portion of its burdens and at the same time secure enlightened administration of river and harbor development.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator from Nevada having indicated that it is his purpose to debate this matter at length, even to the extent of delaying the passage of the bill to-day, that presents a question of duty to those of us who are interested in its passage. His amendment is not in order. He is proceeding outside of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I do not yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. He is trespassing upon the courtesy of those interested in the passage of the bill, and I think the time has arrived——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. It is not a question of the Senator yielding to me. I am on my feet in my own right to make a perfectly proper point and to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Nevada is not addressing the Senate otherwise than by courtesy. There is no proposition pending that can be made at this time. His amendment never was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I deny the right of the Senator to take me off the floor.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Except for parliamentary purposes and within the rules of the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am discussing the bill in its general aspects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada will suspend for a moment. The Senator from Arkansas has made the point of order that the amendment is obnoxious to the rule. The Chair, without expressing an opinion on that point at present, will suggest that the Senator from Nevada can not be taken from the floor in the midst of a speech on a point of order. The Senator from Nevada will proceed.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I was remarking that the Committee on Commerce has been so busy in considering the individual projects of the individual members of that committee that it has had no time to devote to the consideration of a broad and comprehensive measure, even though that measure would lighten their own labors and would more efficiently accomplish the purposes which they have in view.

We passed through the same conditions regarding the reclamation act. I entered Congress, in the lower House, over 20 years ago. For 10 years there we insisted upon it that the great work of reclamation of our arid lands should be taken up as a national enterprise by the Government in the development of its public domain. We sought there that, as a matter of river and harbor development, we should secure in the upper reaches of these great rivers the storage of waters, which would serve the double purpose of arresting the floods and of leading them over arid wastes, thus turning them into regions of productiveness. It was only by a constant iteration and reiteration, by amendments offered, by speeches made, by attacks made upon the very vitals of the river and harbor bill itself that we secured a hearing before the great American people, which resulted in the passage of the reclamation act—an inestimable boon to the entire intermountain region. Had it not been for the aggressive course which we took with reference to this very bill in its annual course we would have made no headway whatever in that legislation so essential to the welfare of some 15 States.

Mr. President, we are renewing the struggle that we then commenced, insisting upon it that the great and destructive agencies in the lower reaches of the river are the floods, and that the only proper way to deal with those floods is not only to protect the channel below, to protect the banks by revetment, to construct levees, but also in this vast watershed, covering 30 States, to arrest the flood waters, so as to put them to beneficial use.

We are renewing to-day the very argument that we made 20 years ago, not, as then, out of a selfish regard for the advancement and welfare of our section, but as a means of developing every interest in the Union, the development of waterway transportation as an aid to railway transportation and to our ocean transportation, and the development of the rivers, in the development of water transportation in such a way as to put them to every beneficial use that civilization affords. We, however, will get no hearing unless we finally take the very position which we then took with reference to the Reclamation Service, that we would hamstring the river and harbor bills until the claims of the region which we represented were recognized. No sectional interest now controls our views or our action. We are now working for the entire Union. We believe that there should be an efficient development of our waterways, such as there is in France and in Germany, so that inland waterway transportation and ocean transportation and rail transportation should be so coordinated and dovetailed together as to aid and promote both domestic and foreign commerce. So far as I am concerned, I intend to press this subject upon the attention of the Senate at every convenient moment.

The Senator has remarked that the bill which I have introduced has been reported by the Committee on Commerce. I admit that that bill has gradually gained converts there. The

Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] was a qualified convert. He signed our Inland Waterways Commission report as the chairman of the commission. He indorsed in that report every principle for which I have contended in this bill, yet, for some reason or other, I have not his hearty cooperation in the passage of the bill. He has doubtless intended to amend the existing methods in order to accomplish the result which he has in view, but I am sure he has become hopeless regarding existing methods, for you find him here in the Senate the opponent of every river and harbor bill that comes in, instead of its advocate, as he was in the House of Representatives. The chairman of this committee [Mr. NELSON] is another convert. I can recall the time when the chairman of the committee resented the idea of turning over what he regarded as the functions of Congress to an administrative board, but he has now finally come to the conclusion that the functions of Congress are best exercised by the creation of a board acting as its servant in the scientific adjustment of these questions.

Only the other day he declared in committee—I made the statement the other day, and the Senator corroborated me—that he was tired of this piecemeal system of appropriation that has existed for so many years; that he was conscious it is full of abuses and is characterized by absolute inefficiency in many cases; and that, so far as he was concerned, he was for the creation of a board, to which large powers should be given, and to the prosecution of whose work an ample fund should be appropriated.

There are other converts upon that committee, but they are differing all the time as to details. If you should put it to the vote of that committee to-day as to the essential principles of this bill, I believe that it would have the votes of a large majority of that committee. They always differ as to details here and there, as to the segregation of this fund, as to whether it should be segregated at all between different waterways, or as to the proportion that should be segregated to this watershed and to that watershed; as to who shall compose the board; as to what its powers shall be; but whilst they agree upon the essentials as to a board, as to a large fund, as to continuous work, as to covering all the related uses of the river, covering cooperation with the States, they differ as to the details of the organization through which its work is to be effected. It will take a long time to concentrate the mind of that committee, as it will take a long time to concentrate the mind of Congress, upon a feasible and practicable method of administration. Therefore the friends of this measure must press it at every convenient opportunity. That is the reason why I am pressing it now. All the various amendments to the bill have been considered in detail; this amendment is reserved to the last.

Now, the appeal is made to me when I am presenting this matter to the consideration of the Senate that this bill contains large appropriations for needed work and that its passage may be imperiled if I should continue to debate this important question. I wish to be considerate always of the views and the demands and the requirements of my associates, but I do not think that it is my duty now to limit my discussion.

Mr. President, I was discussing the Mississippi River and its tributaries; I was referring to the use of this water for irrigation above. The practice of irrigation still is in its infancy. The time will come when irrigation will be universal throughout the entire Mississippi Valley, for nature, unfortunately, does not distribute the waters at such time in their fall from the heavens as to meet the scientific requirements of agriculture.

There is not a region in the entire Mississippi Valley, I do not care what its waterfall is, in which there are not periods of drought, periods in which growth is arrested, periods in which growth is sometimes destroyed. Why should we allow these productive waters, falling upon this vast area, to rush into the Gulf, where they will be unutilized, when by arresting their flow throughout the entire region, whenever it is practicable as an engineering matter to do it, we can hold those waters under control, available not only for irrigation, but for the development of water power?

Electricity is made with water power—a most valuable factor in the lives of our people. Electricity has more to do with the general comfort and convenience of the masses of the people of to-day than has almost any other force. It is used for lighting; it will be used for heating; it is used for power. It can be carried into the humblest cottage, and made there the instrumentality of production. Why should we allow these waters, which can be put to these beneficial purposes above, to drift down to the destruction of vast areas below? Why do we permit them to sink into the Gulf of Mexico and into the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans without any productive results? All of this, of course, requires cooperation, and for a hundred years we have been debating as to where was the dividing line between the jurisdiction of the Nation and the State, as if it were utterly impossible for these sovereigns to deal with each other. We have no difficulty in dealing with Canada upon matters relating to our waters; we have no difficulty in dealing with any foreign country; we have ambassadors and ministers through whom negotiations can be conducted; but we seem to have the greatest difficulties in dealing with sovereign States, component parts of the great Union that constitutes our Government. It never seems to have occurred to us that by the organization of a national board, empowered to deal with similar organizations in the States, we could, instead of debating endlessly as to the dividing line between National and State jurisdiction, bring them into partnership, so as to produce beneficial results to both classes of sovereigns existing upon the same soil.

So we have gone along in this ineffective, inefficient, and dribbling way, identifying the greatest constructive work of the country with the spoils system; turning over these individual projects, practically, to individual Members of Congress for their initiative; denying in every river and harbor bill itself the poor privilege to the Corps of Engineers of the Army of making a suggestion to make this system efficient. That seems an extraordinary statement. I recall that I was condemning the Engineer Corps of the Army for its lack of initiative, for its lack of suggestion. I thought that that corps had been in charge of the rivers and harbors of the country for a long period, that they ought to have framed and submitted to Congress an efficient method of administration, but, to my surprise, an eminent officer of the Engineer Corps of the Army pointed me to specific legislation in the river and harbor bill absolutely preventing them from making any such suggestion outside of the immediate matter intrusted to them for report. So we hamstrung our own servants, our own engineers, our own experts, and denied them the poor privilege of giving us advice.

It is hardly necessary to inquire what agency there was back of all this, of which agency Congress was the unconscious servant. We know that the railroads of this country for 40 years have been going through a period of phenomenal development, almost ahead of the requirements of the areas which they cover. They have been pioneers of civilization, reaching out in advance of the population, and hence greedy for freight; and so they have looked with hostility upon every waterway enterprise that affected any part of that which they regarded as their legitimate service. The great enemy of waterway transportation has been the railway systems of the country, with the instrumentalities of which only of late years has the transportation of the country caught up. They are not so hostile now, because they have enough business and many of them more business than they can handle, and so we do not find their hostility displayed to this great policy in as intense a manner as it was years ago. We find some broad-minded men among them even insisting upon the development of waterway transportation as supplemental to railway transportation; but to a large element, imbued with the old traditions, waterway transportation is the enemy of rail transportation and must be discouraged and suppressed. So they have permitted the development of our rivers, provided they were developed in such a way as not to make them efficient instrumentalities of transportation.

Take the entire region upon which most of the money has been spent between Cairo and New Orleans. Has there been any effort made in the prosecution of the development of that enormous waterway to develop it as efficiently as you would a railway? Would we think of constructing a railway without a terminal? Would we think of constructing a railway without a sidetrack? Would we think of constructing a railway without the station houses, freight sheds, and so forth, that accompany a great transportation system? Yet we have been planning the restoration of our rivers and waterways and not paying any attention whatever to transfer facilities, to terminals, to the freight establishments, and to cooperation, above all things, with the railways, so as to make both the railway and the waterway efficient public servants.

I apprehend the reason that we have such a defective system of river development is the fact that all the way along there has been a discouragement in the line of making the rivers effective for transportation. How is it in Germany? There the waterway is just as efficient as the railway; there the waterway is protected and developed by the Government just as perfectly as the railway; connections with the railways are provided, and every stopping place upon the river is developed in such a way and with such facilities for the transfer of freight and passengers as to promote their highest efficiency. So Germany has developed a system of railway transportation and waterway transportation and ocean transportation, all coordinating with

each other as an efficient and scientific system of transportation, whilst we have allowed the waterway development of our country simply to drift into the protection of cultivable areas. You will find the appeal made by southern representatives in Congress to-day not so much in the interest of navigation as in the interest of large areas of cultivable lands which are threatened with destruction.

They are claiming now that it is the duty of the Nation to take care of the waters that fall upon the Nation's watershed and prevent those waters from taking their accustomed course. How is it the duty of the Nation? These waters from time immemorial have spread over the entire delta of the Mississippi. When we took them they were swamp lands, and how is it our obligation to turn them into cultivable lands?

It would have been our obligation had we maintained the ownership of that region; it would have been our duty as the owner and the proprietor of those estates to prepare them for settlement; but we parted with the ownership; we turned them over to the States, and threw upon the States the burden of reclamation. How is it our duty, then, to take care of their reclamation? It is not our duty, and yet I regret to say that our southern statesmen have made that practically our primary duty. I have heard little suggestion from the statesmen of the lower Mississippi River region regarding the efficient development of those waterways in aid of transportation, with transfer facilities and sidings and terminals and all the paraphernalia that belong to a complete waterway transportation.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me to present a brief conference report?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL (S. DOC. NO. 1102).

Mr. WARREN. I present the report of the committee of conference on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 26680) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 27, 61, 68, 76, 77, 78, 139, 148, 149, 151, 152, 154, 155, 160, 161, 162, 163, 179, and 235.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 11, 23, 24, 25, 26, 37, 38, 39, 147, 180, 181, and 190, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Assay office at Boise, Idaho: For the following, including wages of workmen and contingent expenses, from July 1 to December 31, 1913, both dates inclusive: Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, $1,125; assistant assayer, $800; chief clerk, who shall also perform the duties of cashier, $750; assayer's assistant, $750; clerk, $600; in all, $4,025."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,770"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,125"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Assay office at Charlotte, N. C.: For the following, including wages of workmen and contingent expenses from July 1 to December 31, 1913, both dates inclusive: Assayer and melter, $750."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in the said amendment insert "$450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Assay office at Deadwood, S. Dak.: For the following, including wages of workmen and contingent expenses, from July 1 to December 31, 1913, both dates inclusive: Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, $1,000; clerk, $600; assistant assayer, $800; assayer's assistant, $700; in all, $3,100."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Assay office at Helena, Mont.: For the following, including wages of workmen and contingent expenses, from July 1 to December 31, 1913, both dates inclusive: Assayer in charge, $1,250; chief clerk, who shall also perform the duties of cashier, $900; assistant assayer, $850; assayer's assistant, $700; clerk, $700; in all $4,400."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Assay office at Salt Lake City, Utah: For the following, including wages of workmen and contingent expenses, from July 1, to December 31, 1913, both dates inclusive: Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, $1,250; assistant assayer, $800; chief clerk, who shall also perform the duties of cashier, $800; clerk, $700; in all, $3,550."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 150: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$232,210"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153; That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$78,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$26,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 184: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 185: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,000"; and the Senate agree to the same:

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 189: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For surveyor general of South Dakota, $2,000; clerks in his office, $4,500; in all, $6,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 192: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$16,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 195: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 196: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 196, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

F. E. WARREN,
GEO. PEABODY WETMORE,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
J. T. JOHNSON,
ALBERT S. BURLESON,
FREDK. H. GILLETT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator in charge of the bill what is the status with reference to the assay offices?

Mr. WARREN. They are provided for until the 1st day of January next; otherwise there is no legislation which changes their status. We simply appropriate for them until the 1st day of January, 1914.

Mr. BORAH. What effect will that have upon the offices when the time comes when the fund is exhausted?

Mr. WARREN. There will have to be some legislation, either before or after, or the officers will be without salary.

Mr. BORAH. And the offices would likely disappear, then, if Congress did not affirmatively act?

Mr. WARREN. That might be the effect, but not through this legislation. There is nothing in the report that closes the offices, but it fails to provide for them in the same manner as in previous years. It stops the appropriation at a given time, which, as I have stated, is the 1st of January. Congress will again meet in December, and, of course, it can then take care of the matter by an urgent deficiency bill, if it shall so desire.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator want this bill to go through to-day?

Mr. WARREN. Well, the conference report has been agreed to in the House, and I should like to have it acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. I know the conferees have agreed, but the report has not been adopted.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator wish to have it go over?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, if I may make an inquiry, I should like to inquire regarding the mint or assay office at Carson City, Nev.

Mr. WARREN. The mint at Carson City had to be dropped out, and in the matter of the removal of silver coin we had to take the House provision, but the assay offices referred to are provided for until January.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The mint at Carson City, as the Senator well knows, some time ago was reduced to a mere assay office. Do I understand that that is continued until next January?

Mr. WARREN. It is only provided for until the 1st of July.

Mr. NEWLANDS. May I ask why the distinction between that assay office and the assay office in Idaho?

Mr. WARREN. There are other offices which also went out, but not of the particular class of which I was speaking. One was under the name of a mint and the others were designated as assay offices.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I shall have to object to this method of legislating out of existence on an appropriation bill an office that is authorized by law.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say only a word because I do not desire to interfere with the consideration of the pending bill. This is the first appropriation bill that was passed by both Houses, and the conferees have struggled——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will suggest to the Senator that there is a special order for 2 o'clock.

Mr. WARREN. I so understand. The conferees have for a long time struggled over the amendments in disagreement between the two Houses, and the conferees on the part of the Senate have done the best they could to secure the retention of the amendments made to the bill by the Senate, but could accomplish no more than this conference report shows. If, however, it is sought to have the report go over, that action can be taken. Having submitted the report, as the hour for the consideration of the special order of the day has arrived, I shall ask that the report go over and that it be printed in the RECORD and as a public document and shall call it up at the first seasonable opportunity.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

UNITED STATES V. JOSEPH H. PATTERSON ET AL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that the remarks of District Judge Hollister, in imposing sentence on defendants in the case of United States against Joseph H. Patterson et al., in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

United States District Court, Southern District of Ohio.

UNITED STATES V. JOHN H. PATTERSON ET AL.

REMARKS OF DISTRICT JUDGE HOLLISTER IN IMPOSING SENTENCE ON DEFENDANTS.

The COURT (addressing counsel): I am not unmindful of the force of all that you say, and particularly of the fact of the punishment the

defendants have already undergone. It is a consideration of the last fact which causes me to hesitate to say what I had expected to say in anticipation of the overruling of the motion, because I did not see how, unless something new were urged, a different conclusion could be reached this morning than that which I had reached upon the conclusion of the case upon the coming in of the verdict.

Nevertheless, I think that, in order that the nature of the penalty may be understood, I am called upon to say something in connection with the nature of the offenses of which the defendants have been found guilty. While it is true, technically, there are three offenses, yet they are based upon the same facts, upon the application—a little different application of the same facts—and I would think a sentence upon each count would be, while permissible, unjust; and I have considered the matter as if there were but one offense charged and a verdict of "guilty" upon one only; that is to say, there will be no cumulative sentence in this case. I think it would be lawful to regard the maximum in this case as $15,000 fine and three years' imprisonment, but I do not think it would be just; so I regard it as one offense.

[Addressing defendants:] You have had a fair trial. You have been defended by counsel than whom there are no lawyers better equipped to perform such service. Throughout the long trial there has been no point or question which could possibly be availed of in your interests that has escaped their observation and presentation.

The jury was composed of men of high character and intelligence. The attention they gave to the evidence as it was presented was earnest and never failing. You could not have had a better jury, or one better qualified to do exact justice between the Government of the United States and yourselves upon the issues involved in this case if you had selected them yourselves. The testimony amply justifies their verdict of guilty.

My personal feelings toward each of you and all of you have been and are only of extreme kindliness and regret. I can not, however, regard any personal consideration in the matter, but regard the present duty as only a part of the day's work—a most disagreeable part of the day's work—of the kind of work in which I am engaged.

It now becomes my duty, and a very painful duty it is, however impersonal one tries to make it, to impose sentence upon you and each of you for having been convicted of conspiracy in restraint of trade in one count and of monopoly in two counts within the meaning and preventive purpose of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

However much that law has been misunderstood by many because of their ignorance and misrepresented by others or charged with uncertainty by designing persons who would cripple it, fearing its application to their own conduct, or for other reasons, it is nevertheless in itself a clear statement of its meaning, and it can not be misunderstood by anyone who really desires to obey it. It contains no standard of conduct other than the standard every fair-minded reasonably conscientious man applies to his conduct in the various relations of life. It seeks to protect the common right of every citizen, however humble, to enter into any lawful business he chooses, and there to exercise such talents as he has, his enterprise, his skill, and such capital as he can command; to lawfully develop in such ways as his judgment may dictate his business into a success, if he can accomplish it; but if he must fail, then to fail, whether through want of skill or sufficient enterprise, or capital, or bad judgment, or because of inferiority of product, or bad management, or misfortune of one kind or another; but not because of ruthless acts of oppression sometimes illegal in their very selves, and sometimes through the exercise by competitors of acts amounting almost to physical force, and in some instances amounting to assaults by putting his agents in fear.

Such acts as have been proved in this case show beyond peradventure, from the similarity of their character and from their occurrence in various parts of the country, that they could only have been done in pursuance of a plan to do them; but, more than that, it has been proved that the National Cash Register Co. actually had a department organized and continually maintained for a long period of years for the sole purpose of carrying into effect acts against competitors which any fair-minded man would say were outrageous.

The wonder to me is that some of the agents of the company did not lose their lives at the hand of some agent of a competitor whose lawful business was ruthlessly and relentlessly interfered with. So unfair and so harsh and so, at times, cruel, have been the acts of agents of this company, that the wonder is that any self-respecting man would have permitted himself to remain in the employment of a company which required its agents to produce results by such means as they in fact employed. I have no doubt that many a time many an agent of the National Co., and many of you, were ashamed of being a party to such things. I would like to believe this, and I do believe it. When I say the company required these things, I mean it. Nobody ever heard—at least I never did—of a concern doing a legitimate business having a competition department and a competitive committee, whose primary duty it was not to sell the product of the business but to prevent their competitors from selling their product, by any and whatsoever means, short of physical violence. The very maintenance of such adjuncts to a business was illegal and was a restraint of trade and was indefensible from any standpoint.

What was the purpose of the required reports from agents in the various parts of the country of the appearance of any competing cash register? And if that register seemed to be meeting with success, what was the purpose of sending to the territory special agents or company salesmen or "knockout men," as they were known among their competitors, and not unknown by that name, at least in the earlier years, at headquarters? These agents were not paid as salesmen were whose primary duty it was to sell cash registers by fair means and through their merits, but to assist those sales agents in directly destroying the business of their competitors. There is no doubt about it.

The things done were not only unkind—any man of reasonably tender sensibility would have shrunk from doing them; but they were petty and mean, and the pity of it all is that, in any event, if the cash registers of the company had the merit claimed for them—and they probably had—such acts would have been totally unnecessary and the National Co. could have still sold millions of dollars' worth of machines each year and their comparatively small competitors could at least have made a living pursuing their respective industries, as they were entitled to do, of common right.

Nor was it the number of patents or their comprehensive nature or their importance which drove many of the National Co.'s competitors out of business or caused them to sell out.

"Our organization is our best patent," said one of the conspirators at one of the conventions at Dayton. But if every competitor were indeed an infringer the National Co. had the right to pursue that competitor wherever it found him and to exclude him by exercising its right of exclusion through the suits authorized by Congress for the purpose, instead of trying to defeat every sale a competitor made by acts which at times were unlawful in themselves and at all times oppressive and unfair.

It is quite clear from the evidence that there were a number of competitors of importance who were not even sued for the purpose of testing the question of their infringement, but were sued in the process of oppressive measures, running over a period of time, as part of the plan to intimidate, discourage, and finally overcome and compel them to sell.

I think it is highly probable that some of those competitors did not infringe at all; or, if they used in their registers any principles embodied in the construction of a national register, it was the principle of an old patent the life of which had expired. This is to be gathered from the testimony of the case and from the lack of evidence of suits brought against those competitors to test in good faith the question of infringement and obtain an injunction.

All this sounds harsh, but there is much more that might be said. I forbear reference to the unconscionable transactions in which the contemptible Edgar Park (alias Foote) was concerned, who escaped only because of the operation of the statute of limitations.

I would like to believe that such acts as were done in various parts of the country—many were proved, we can only imagine how many more might have been proved if the witnesses could have been obtained—were done without the knowledge of those who managed and controlled the company, and were the acts of overzealous agents who wished to show results; but the evidence is conclusive that many of the defendants actually participated in some of the things; that all had notice, from circulars and publications of the company, and that most, if not all, of them attended the annual conventions at Dayton where the kind of competition under discussion was, for the most part, illegal competition, contemplating and inciting to illegal or unfair acts against competitors. The officers of the company, the district managers, the sales agents and the attorneys who were in touch with the management, and the directors must have known that that kind of competition was, which was continually under discussion, suggestively alluded to and encouraged at the conventions.

Each department of the business had its head in John H. Patterson, president and founder of the company. He early became possessed of the idea that the cash register business of the United States belonged to him and that anyone who came into that field was a trespasser and must be destroyed. The evidence shows that he and some of those in touch with him expressed views only capable of that interpretation. Whatever virtues Mr. Patterson had—and common report attributes many to him—whatever evidences of public spirit he has shown in his own town—and they are doubtless many—nevertheless, he set out deliberately to build his business up, not only through the merits of its product and through the extraordinary efficiency of his organization, but by harassing, annoying, interfering with, discouraging, and pursuing his competitors to the point that they would be compelled to give over the unequal struggle and to go out of business or to sell out to his company.

I can not but feel that many of the defendants would prefer it had been otherwise. I am aware that some of them did not personally participate in any direct act against a competitor, though they all conspired to do the acts, or some of them, alleged in the indictment. I am aware that a large salary will tempt a man to do things he would rather not do. I know that the thought of wife and children and the comforts which money will bring them, will sometimes lead a man into situations which he regrets.

While to some extent these considerations may excuse, yet they do not justify—they can not justify.

It is a proper inference to be drawn that such acts as are complained of by the Government, must have been done, or connived at, by each of you, through a more or less extended period of time, and by many of you for a great many years, or, as the alternative, you would lose your positions.

There is no evidence showing the selaries other than were paid to John H. Patterson, Edward A. Deeds, William F. Bippus, and William H. Muzzy, but from this evidence and from other circumstances in the case, it is a fair presumption that your various salaries must have been large, and probably more than you would have received for similar service rendered a competitor. There is evidence that in 1907 Mr. Deeds received about $18,00 to $20,000; Mr. Bippus, about $8,000, and Mr. Muzzy as much as $10,000 to $12,000; and there is evidence from which the deduction is irresistible, that agents of competitive concerns were offered large sums to desert their employers and enter the employment of the National Co.

You belong to the walks of life in which men are supposed to be actuated by considerations of humanity, whose conduct is controlled by high ethical standards and whose lives should be an example to their fellow men engaged in trade; walks in which success ought not to be measured by the number of dollars a man has, but in which the proper standard of conduct is patriotic service to country and kindly, generous service to fellow men not so wealthy and not so advantageously circumstanced. The lives of such men as you appear to be, chould be examples, whether in social life or in trade, through which others may be inspired to the attainment of high standards of conduct; but you have, thus far, not only lost that opportunity, but through desire for gain and business success not worth the while, have contributed to the breaking down of the ancient standards of fair dealing among traders, not only required by law, but inspired by the finer instincts of every fair-minded man.

It is conduct such as has been shown in this case by you and others, some of whom have been reached and some of whom will be reached by prosecutions under the Sherman Antitrust Act, which has brought about the conditions of unrest and apprehension in the minds of millions of our fellow countrymen, and brought doubt to them of the stability and efficiency of our institutions, and the power of our Government to protect the individual and the man of small means, in the common right he has of entering into competition with any concern however powerful, and whatever the merits of its product.

Through the actions taken in very recent years by the Government of the United States in applying the Sherman Antitrust Act to many harmful situations, that doubt begins to fade away as the people realize that no man is above the law, whatever his condition in life may be.

This verdict is a vindication, not only of the wisdom and efficiency of the Sherman Antitrust Act, as it is written, but it is a promise to every man, however small his means, that if he engages in any lawful business which carries his product into interstate commerce the Government of the United States will see to it that he is protected and that the public are protected against conspiracies against his trade and monopolies built up upon its destruction.

By virtue of the provisions of the Constitution passed and adopted by the fathers, under the guidance of Providence, the arm of the Gov-

ernment is long enough and strong enough to protect the commerce between the States, whether from conspiracies of misguided workingmen, so called, to transport dynamite contrary to the laws of Congress for purposes involving results too awful to contemplate or from conspiracies of wealthy and powerful manufacturers and traders to crush out their competitors by illegal and unfair methods of competition.

I have thought it proper to say what I have just said, because all of it must be borne in mind in determining what penalty should be meted out to you upon your conviction of conduct which is made criminal by the Sherman Antitrust Act.

The object of a penalty is only incidentally to punish; its main purpose, its chief purpose is to afford an example to others, so that they may not engage in acts in infringement of the law in the future, or, if they are committing them, that they will abandon the practice.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR ISIDOR RAYNER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. GALLINGER). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the pending bill will be laid aside and the memorial services set aside for this day will be proceeded with.

The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 2, 1913.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. ISIDOR RAYNER, late a Senator from the State of Maryland.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions submitted by the Senator from Maryland will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 472) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sorrow of the death of the Hon. ISIDOR RAYNER, late a Senator from the State of Maryland.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended, to enable his associates to pay proper tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, what we say within these walls to-day of our late colleague, Senator ISIDOR RAYNER, can avail little to mold the judgment of mankind as to his life, less to comfort those who so sincerely mourn his loss.

The achievements of his life were in the courts, in literature, in the halls of legislation. They are of record in the Maryland reports and in the journals of this body—monuments and memorials to his genius that all men may see. But perhaps after all they are most deeply engraved, if not as permanently perpetuated, in the mind and the memory of his friends and myriad admirers.

Any man might be pardoned for a feeling of overwhelming pride to have stood where RAYNER stood and to have done what RAYNER did. But so far from ministering to his vanity, the rarest and most sought honors, which came to him as if by magic, did not elate him, and were in no sense necessary to his happiness. In fact added honors and increased experience seemed to fill him with vague feelings of unrest and yearnings for hitherto untraveled fields of usefulness and power.

I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate in speaking of that which all men can learn of Senator RAYNER, and of what many know of him from the printed page. Nor shall I rehearse his rarely equaled triumphs at the bar, on the stump, in the field of letters, and in legislative halls. Better men than I have done this better than I can do at the memorial exercises had in the Court of Appeals of Maryland and in the House of Representatives within the past few weeks.

I want to sound such personal notes and touch the human chords in his nature which are not of record in books, nor apparent to all. Unfitted as I am, I feel that as his oldest friend on this floor I should attempt that task.

Few men, perhaps none I have known, had Senator RAYNER's mental endowment and his natural gifts. Nature was prodigal in her generosity to him. So that it is not to be wondered that honors born of an intellectual supremacy were his from his boyhood. The wonder is they did not bring him more personal gratification and real satisfaction. It was almost pathetic to note that even in times of his greatest successes he always felt a minor touch of sadness and incompleteness in the present, and wistful hopes not unmixed with forebodings of the future.

Fortunately for the country, he was relieved of the necessity of devoting his time to actual bread winning, and thus enabled to gratify his ambition and serve his country by turning the full tide of his talents into the channels of public life—always in elective positions.

By reason of the exigencies of life occasions have arisen when I have fought with him, fought against him; been intimately associated with him in political and official relations for years, and again far from him in both. But during the 30 or more years I have known him I always cherished for him a personal understanding and esteem at no period affected by the varying gusts of political storms which several times swept us on divergent courses.

No one could know Senator RAYNER without being dazzled by his talents. As a student at the University of Virginia, a member of the Maryland Legislature, State senator, Congressman, attorney general of his native State, unpaid volunteer in the service of a misrepresented and oppressed gentleman and gallant warrior, Admiral Schley, he everywhere established a new and higher standard, alike the inspiration and despair of his fellows.

His career was indeed meteoric—his nature a paradox.

Incorruptibly honest, he was proof against all temptations of avarice. His life was uniformly distinguished by the purest and most refined morality. Dissipation and vice, even of the mildest order, were unknown to him—unwelcome to him. Still he knew and appreciated the temptations of others, the unworthy motives of others; and, in short, knew all classes of the world as they are. But he sympathized with the weaknesses, which he in no way shared, of those who fall.

With a voice that compelled attention and won the ear and heart and a power of logical argument which conquered doubt, a pen as easy and discriminating as Macaulay's, with wealth, power, admiration, applause, and position he was rarely at peace.

Unduly sensitive to the small annoyances of life, he bore in tranquil serenity the pains of death.

Shrinking, and in nervous dread of any sort of contest, none surpassed him in vigor of defense or bravery of attack when the fight began.

He shrank from giving pain to anybody or anything. He was always on the side of mercy, always first to urge forgiveness and charity.

So fine were his feelings, his sympathies so susceptible, and his heart so tender that he felt and bore the pains of others as if his own, especially when he could not afford relief.

Yet withal none could be more drastic, more inexorable than he in attacking corruption or moral weakness in official life, and none more unsparing in denouncing cowardice.

Twice he boldly bolted his party and repudiated his party's nominees. Yet within a few months his party tendered him the nomination as attorney general, a position of honor and trust entirely in line with his taste and which he filled with magnificent success.

Despising organized politics, decrying political clubs and organizations as pernicious, he received loyal and cordial support from his party and was elected to every political position, but one, he was willing to accept.

He single-handed swayed men and molded public opinion as he willed. The faith of the masses of the people in him, their admiration for him, their pride that his State was their State, was never surpassed. He always held the hearts of the people for his own. He could always get their ear.

Thus often defying the conventional methods, by his originality and personal power he won success—phenomenal success, in the general acceptation, as measured by achievments which are of record; but success of a quality far more vividly and accurately indicated by the affection and admiration of the people he served, whose ills he felt, whose battles he fought so long.

Always a prey to nervousness, accompanied by an inveterate insomnia, for years in physical pain, his insatiate energy drove him on. Rest he sought, and rest for his tired, pain-stricken body, or for his luminous mind, he never found above the sod.

He was fired with ambition, driven by a force which made no allowance for the limitations of physical endurance. His great mental powers, always alert, always accurate, responded to every call and every demand long after the time when it was evident that his physical frame was about to collapse and crumble under the rack and strain. But on he went until his last public appearance in joint debate in the last campaign at Baltimore. The cord snapped. He died in the hour of the triumph of principles he had long looked for, had long advocated, and which will long endure.

Small wonder the people of his State loved him, for he loved the people, and ended his life work in the battle for principles he conceived to be for the highest welfare of his country. He was indeed a statesman and a patriot.

But his life was not by any means all tinged with disappointment or crowded with care.

The sweetness and solace of his life was found in his family. He was the truest and most adoring husband and the kindest, most indulgent father. His pride and interest in his grandchildren was beautiful. His home was the refuge from his cares. The society of his devoted wife, the association with his only son and grandchildren, provided the balm which soothed his troubled spirit, sweetened his work, and drove away his cares. There he found his only happiness, which was free from all residuum or reaction of bitterness or disappointment.

He lived and died with his family about him. I am glad to think that their assiduous care and tender love were near to comfort him under the increasing weight of pain and weakness, which after weeks of suffering finally crushed him.

And while he has passed away, leaving in their lives a void none can fill, the same is true of the Nation and of this body. He has left no successor. No one in my State or in our Nation has arisen who can fill the place of ISIDOR RAYNER.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it is said that a man's character is what he is; his reputation is what others think of him. In my brief but earnest tribute to the memory of Senator RAYNER I shall deal with his character rather than his reputation.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has well said of Senator RAYNER that he was a paradox. All great men are; and the greater the man the more apparent the antithesis of his nature seems to stand out irreconciled. Yet, this is due to a natural law. The greater the man, the more earnest the man, the stronger the projection from one source of divergent forces.

Senator RAYNER, in his advocacy of what he believed was right, in his opposition to what he believed was wrong, was so strong, so earnest that ofttimes it seemed to trench even upon bitterness, not alone against the thing to be assailed, but the person who stood for the thing he assailed. His assault upon the wrong was enriched with a wealth of invective, and yet not to reveal a wealth of expression; but every line and every word was simply the outward expression of the thought and purpose within. Reaching almost the point of bitterness in his opposition to the things against which he stood, at the same time I never knew a man more ready, more quick to respond to a sympathetic plea. This is accounted for by the fact that the shaft forged for combat and the throb for sympathy both came from one great, earnest nature, one great, earnest soul.

Perhaps nowhere in Senator RAYNER'S life activities two thoughts stand out in antithesis more than in his relations to governmental problems. Senator RAYNER was in full accord, in deep sympathy with everything that tends for the betterment of humanity. He was in full accord with that great movement that to-day not only agitates our own Republic, but seems world-wide in its activities. Yet, upon the surface his sympathy for that cause seemed ever to find a limitation in a reverence that almost amounted to worship of whatever man may have uttered upon these questions, if that utterance came with the sanction of convention, legislature, or judicial decree. He inherited this. In fact, the Christian world, recognizing that in the dim mists of the past law first came in the commingling of the divine through the human instrument, man, has ever given and to-day gives a sanctity to human expression when that human expression relates to a certain function of government and forms a part of that abstraction which we call law, forgetting that, aside from the divine expression, every expression of authority reflects the infirmities of human nature. It may be the limitations of the mentality which pronounces it; it may be the limitation of environment; but so long as it comes from a human source, it partakes of the weakness of human nature.

Inheriting this as a part of his racial inheritance, his adherence to this thought was almost a worship. But, Mr. President, I am not certain but that it is well that we have great, strong characters like Senator RAYNER, who hold reverence for the past, because every step of human progress is a reflection upon the past—a reflection either upon the wisdom of utterances or the supineness of human nature in so long tolerating a condition from which man has ever been ready to make a sacrifice to escape. And perhaps it might come to pass that our eagerness to get away from the past would be prompted not only by a lack of reverence for the past, but perhaps would be somewhat hastened by a feeling akin to a lack of respect for the past in the light of its mistakes, were it not that here and there stands a great, strong character like ISIDOR RAYNER, holding man somewhat in reverence to the past.

I believe, in this hour and day, we require here and there a great, strong character like his; because, whether you take his sympathy for humanity at one extreme, or his adherence, his devotion to what he considered the law at the other, like those other two traits of his character which I have described, they are forces reaching out in divergent directions from the same great source, the great soul of a great, earnest man.

Mr. President, ISIDOR RAYNER has passed beyond. We shall miss him. I believe those who differ with me politically will feel that it is no trespass upon the courtesy or the solemnity of this hour when I say that the party the certainty of whose victory he lived only to see will miss him in its councils in the future. We will miss his association here; but we have the reflection that a great life is an inspiration, the study of a great man's career is a daily sermon from which we may gain inspiration and strength.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, the Sixty-second Congress, which will close within a few days, has a mortality record perhaps unprecedented in the history of the Government. Of the Members who assembled in the Capitol two years ago to discharge their public duties, 6 Senators, 18 Representatives, and the Vice President of the United States have responded to the final summons which every mortal must obey; and "no man knoweth the day or the hour." Death is never so distressing, its chilly hand never so unwelcome, as when it withers one whose brilliancy and rare attainments set him above the ordinary level of mankind as a character to be emulated and admired. When nature blesses a man with unusual talents, when it invests him with nobility of mind and soul, his passing leaves a void difficult to bear, because so difficult to fill.

The Senator to whose memory we pay tribute to-day was such a man. Nature was generous with him in her endowments, which he well repaid by more than 30 years of patriotic public service. As a member of the Maryland Legislature, as attorney general of his State, as a Member of the National House of Representatives, and as a distinguished Member of the Senate of the United States, ISIDOR RAYNER devoted his talents and high character to the service of his country with an energy and enthusiasm that did honor to himself and to his native State.

He was an orator worthy of the best traditions of this or any other Chamber. He was a student whose books brought him sound counsel and that wide information which made his judgment universally respected. He was a statesman eagerly seeking the best interests of his country and the maintenance of its honor. Scion of a race whose history has been one of persecution, his life has given to the world another proof that this is a land where merit knows neither race nor creed—a Nation where honest achievement will receive its just recognition.

The late Senator from Maryland was able and brilliant; but he was more than that. Intellect without heart is cruel; brilliancy without human sympathy is vain; and our departed friend won his place in the affections of his colleagues and in the esteem of the country because the gentleness of his soul measured up to the strength and vigor of his mind.

He served his country long and faithfully. He was a lawyer of great ability, an orator of rare power, a citizen of stainless life, a patriot of high purpose and lofty ideals. Ever earnest in his purpose to fulfill the obligations of life in his home, in society, and in the Nation, he typified in all things courtesy, courage, honor, and fidelity.

Mr. President, Senator RAYNER has passed forever from this Chamber; his career is closed; his public record is part of the history of the Nation; and now his sorrowing colleagues pay him a last farewell. The eloquence that charmed and stirred is silent. His words have mingled for the last time with the shadowy troop of immortal voices whose echoes have resounded through the Halls of the Capitol.

We sympathize with his bereaved family, but no words of ours can assuage their grief. Yet in this solemn hour, devoted to a contemplation of his character and achievement, it must be comforting to those who loved him in his lifetime to remember that though his distinguished career is closed he has left behind him the heritage of a name respected and honored throughout the Nation.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I desire to pay a short tribute of warm regard and high esteem to our late distinguished colleague, Senator RAYNER. I do not purpose to deliver a studied eulogium. The incidents of his successful life have already been portrayed and eloquently presented to the Senate. My purpose is to bear testimony to his worth as a man, his noble and patriotic instincts, and his preeminent abilities as orator, statesman, and lawyer.

My acquaintance with Senator RAYNER began in the extraordinary session of Congress called by President Cleveland in 1893, of which Congress both he and myself were Members. Early in that session he delivered a speech urging the repeal of

the "purchasing clause" of the Sherman Act, which measure was then deeply disturbing the financial conditions of our country. His speech was eloquent, striking, and impressive. It made a profound impression upon me and upon the House of Representatives. In it was a rare combination of eloquence, knowledge of financial matters, and a clear, striking exposition of the evils which would accrue from the continuance of this policy. This speech exhibited the rare qualities possessed by Senator RAYNER in presenting dry and usually uninteresting questions with a vigor and eloquence to make them not only entertaining but convincing. That address convinced me that he was one of the most finished and able speakers upon public questions then in public life. This conviction continued during the many years I was associated with him in the public service, during which time I had many opportunities of hearing him speak.

He was preeminent alike in finished oratory and in the array of argument and facts. He possessed a fine voice, a splendid presence, and a magnificent delivery, which, combined with his eloquence of expression, his beauty of illustration, and the deep solidity of his speeches, made him one of the best parliamentary speakers of this Nation. In addition to these brilliant qualities, he was endowed with a logical mind and a great solidity of learning and judgment. His success as an orator was largely due to his rare ability of combining beauty and strength. In the House of Representatives and in the Senate, upon all important matters, whether foreign affairs, the tariff, or constitutional questions, he discussed them with preeminent excellence, exhibiting a thorough knowledge and a most attractive brilliance. His speeches will fully repay study by those who desire to succeed in oratory or to have models upon which to construct speeches.

He was, without question, one of the most learned and able lawyers of this body. His knowledge of constitutional law was deep, broad, and far-reaching in statesmanship and conviction. Conflicts in intellectual debate were ever pleasing to him, and he rarely indulged in them without coming out successful. The more difficult and important the questions the more they possessed interest to him and the more strenuous were his efforts to clear the mists surrounding them.

Few have surpassed him in intellectual attainments. A perusal of the great debates of the House and Senate while he was a Member of these bodies will bear testimony to his great ability, eloquence, power and strength of mind, and breadth of information. These splendid qualities of mind were united with noble purposes of heart. All of his instincts were patriotic and sought the betterment of State and Nation. His record as a public servant was clean and most honorable. No stain ever followed his footsteps. No whispering of suspicion ever clouded his name or record. His ambitions and ideals were high and lofty. It is by the lives and achievements of such men that the halls of legislation are made promotive of the moral, educational, and material development of the people.

His untimely death removed from this Chamber one of its most illustrious Members and one whose attainments pointed to a still greater life of usefulness. Well may we pause in the pressing activities of this body to pay tribute to one whose talents gave to this Senate distinction and whose life was consecrated to the public service of Maryland and the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the death of ISIDOR RAYNER marks the passing of another of those illustrious men who, just as their splendid powers were in the full glory of perfect maturity, have gone to join that distinguished company of departed Senators, whose names are come to be numbered with those of Webster, of Calhoun, of Sumner, and of Hoar. It is not for me, his successor, to add new luster to the name of ISIDOR RAYNER or to perpetuate his fame, for his work, his life, are their own enduring monuments for posterity; but a feeling of profound respect for his ability and of sincere admiration for the man himself prompts me to pay this my tribute to his memory.

I know but little of his boyhood. If it be truly said that the "boy is the father of the man," then ISIDOR RAYNER, the youth, must have been as conspicuous among his comrades as was ISIDOR RAYNER, the man, among his associates—among whom he stood forth clothed in the strength of his own power. He was born on April 11, 1850, 10 years before the outbreak of the War between the States. Prior to 1866 he had attended the public schools of Baltimore and the University of Maryland. In that year he entered the academic department of the University of Virginia, the famous old institution from whose picturesque lawn and ranges have come those other distinguished Marylanders—Edgar Allen Poe and the late Maj. Venable. It is possible that here in the shadow of Monticello, in the university that Jefferson himself had founded, first grew the passionate admiration for Jeffersonian democracy that so distinguished his after life. Four years were spent at Charlottesville, during the last of which he studied in the law department. Already his oratorical powers had begun to develop, for at 18 he was the anniversary speaker of the Jefferson Literary Society. His subject was religious liberty. We know that this principle, the right to worship according to the dictates of one's conscience, free from the restraint of man-made laws, continued to be cherished by him as long as he lived, as, in fact, it has been by that remarkable race from which he sprang, whose sufferings from Christian intolerance have been no less noteworthy than the steadfastness of their adherance to the faith of Abraham.

In 1871 he was admitted to the bar. He became a brilliant lawyer. It was natural that his forensic ability should lead him to prefer the active trial table—the duties of the pleader—to the more somber office practice. He never hesitated to champion the cause of the weak or oppressed. His deeply sympathetic and emotional nature, those distinguishing characteristics of the race that has given the world the Bible and two great religions, was stirred most deeply when, as the champion of the downtrodden, he sought justice from the powerful. The late Admiral Schley selected him from a vast array of legal talent to insist that the history of the naval Battle of Santiago should go down to posterity correctly recorded. His work in that celebrated case did much to spread his well-merited fame throughout the Union. He displayed in that memorable inquiry after truth a remarkable knowledge of naval warfare, of the technique of sea fights, that could have been acquired only by the most earnest preparation. And if I were asked to name the distinguishing characteristic of ISIDOR RAYNER I should say without hesitation that it was earnestness, enthusiastic earnestness, the earnestness that is in fact the only true genius. His efforts in behalf of his fellow Marylander had at least this most satisfactory result—that the people of the United States, the great people, were enabled to judge for themselves who should rightly wear the laurels of the victory over Cervera.

Mr. RAYNER's political career began with his election to the Maryland General Assembly in 1878. During this session he served as acting chairman of the judiciary committee. Even then his work indicated latent abilities that were ultimately to place him triumphant upon the lofty pinnacle of political fame. He was then, as throughout his life, primarily a friend of the people—the mighty average people who are struggling, sometimes foolishly, often misguidedly, but always sincerely and irresistibly, toward a larger measure of political happiness. He felt their sorrows; he sympathized with their endeavors; he saw through the sometimes absurd manifestations down to their sincere desire for better things. He espoused their cause with that same enthusiastic earnestness which I believe to have been his dominant trait.

In 1885 he was elected to the Maryland State senate and three years later to the House of Representatives of the United States. He was three times elected to that body, but I will not dwell at length upon his work in Congress. He was most active in his efforts to repeal the Sherman silver-purchase law in the panic-stricken days of the early nineties. His course was a fitting preparation for the senatorial career which marks the maturity of his ability, the splendid realization of the promise of early years. The climax of his career came with his election to this body in 1904. That was a memorable fight, a triangular battle for control, a struggle in which the tide slowly turned toward Mr. RAYNER, because public opinion, the resultant of the wishes of all the people, the force slow to move but irresistible when once aroused, demanded it. Gentlemen are familiar with his splendid services in this body. His consummate ability brought new luster to the State whose representative he was, new prestige to the Senate of the United States.

When he entered this body, Mr. RAYNER abandoned his law practice and devoted himself with singleness of purpose to the discharge of his public duties. And this is but an indication of his high conception of the office he honored by filling. He believed that it was worthy of the devotion of all his time and energy, and he plunged into his new duties with his own peculiar enthusiastic earnestness.

Senator RAYNER achieved distinction as a constitutional lawyer. I use the term to mean that he was a close student of the Constitution; that he applied his trained legal intellect to the mastery of its provisions; that he tested his own conception of its provisions by keeping in close touch with the interpretations of the courts; that his studies were based upon an abiding faith and belief in the Constitution as an efficient guaranty of the rights and liberties of the governed. In the early days

of the Nation he would probably have been called a strict constructionist. But nevertheless his views were tinged with the notion sometimes called modern or progressive, but really as old as the Federalist Party—that it is necessary to give the grant of powers to the Federal Government a more liberal interpretation than a literal construction would make necessary in order to accomplish for the people reforms obviously beyond the powers of the individual States. And thus he sympathized with the modern democracy that advocates an extension of the Federal power to the enactment of the so-called progressive measures of reform. While Jefferson and his party would secure liberty to the people by insisting that the powers of the Federal Government be not increased, the modern democracy would secure liberty by expanding the Federal power in order that there may be an effective agent to protect the people against themselves or certain of their number. And there is this difference in the result: For while the Jeffersonian idea looks to individual liberty, the modern democracy tends to a restriction of individual liberty and a relegation of individuals into certain, definite, and fixed classes.

That ISIDOR RAYNER was one of the great modern orators no one will deny. But he regarded his oratory as merely a means to an end, a fine tool at his command by which he might accomplish the ends dearest to his heart. As Plutarch says, "It is an ignoble thing for any man to admire and relish the glory of his own eloquence." Senator RAYNER combined somewhat the painstaking, studiously prepared style of Demosthenes with that more sparkling and satirical manner of Cicero. He was possessed of great natural ability, and this native gift he had cultivated by careful effort to the finished perfection we remember. There is a vast difference between mere public speaking and oratory. Anyone with a fair degree of intelligence may become a public speaker, but an orator is like a poet. He is an artist. He must have imagination. He must have intensive earnestness to make his audience see and feel his own visions. These qualities the late Senator had in high degree. He was possessed of the passionate earnestness of David, of the same racial qualities that matured so splendidly in Disraeli and Judah P. Benjamin. His masterful intellect was able to polish, to direct, to drive home the thoughts that could have arisen only in the mind of a true orator.

It is perhaps too early to estimate the exact place that Senator RAYNER will occupy in the lists of American statesmen. I believe his position will be high. He had the misfortune to belong to the minority party during the period of his greatest powers, and so there was not the opportunity for constructive statesmanship; but as a critic of dangerous tendencies, as a wise forecaster, as a balance wheel to constructive leaders, he certainly should go down to posterity as one of the typical statesmen whose efforts have so enriched and strengthened the institutions of this great Nation. I know of no single service he performed with more credit and which will result in more lasting good than his insisting that the President should not disregard the limitations of the Constitution; that he should not set in motion a dangerous tendency in order to accomplish a present and immediate advantage. He insisted that in government the means are quite as important as the end, for the means of to-day become the precedents of to-morrow.

But the RAYNER I admire is not so much RAYNER the constitutional lawyer, RAYNER the orator, or RAYNER the statesman, as RAYNER the man, the great kindly gentleman. I love to think of him in his family, in his daily contact with his fellow workers. I love to wonder at the perfection of the human qualities he possessed in such attractive form.

He was a man, take him for all in all,
I shall not look upon his like again.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE UTTER.

Mr. WETMORE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives on the death of Mr. UTTER, my late colleague in that body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAGE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions of the House, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 9, 1913.

Resolved, That, in pursuance of the special order heretofore adopted, the House proceed to pay tribute to the memory of the Hon. GEORGE HERBERT UTTER, late a Representative in Congress from the State of Rhode Island.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished career and his great service to his country as a Representative in Congress, the House, at the conclusion of the memorial proceedings of this day, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Mr. WETMORE. Mr. President, I submit the resolutions which I send to the desk, and ask for their adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 473) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate expresses its profound sorrow on account of the death of the Hon. GEORGE HERBERT UTTER, late a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Rhode Island.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be now suspended in order that fitting tribute may be paid his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the family of the deceased.

Mr. WETMORE. Mr. President, at his home in Westerly, R. I., on Sunday afternoon, November 3, 1912, the life of GEORGE HERBERT UTTER was suddenly terminated after a rather unsatisfactory condition of health extending over a period of several years.

Mr. UTTER was born in Plainfield, N. J., July 24, 1854, the son of George Benjamin and Mary Starr (Maxson) Utter. He was a direct descendant of the earliest settlers of the State of Rhode Island through his mother, who was the daughter of John Maxson.

Mr. UTTER received his early education in the private schools of Westerly, where he came with his parents in 1858, after which he spent two years in Alfred Academy, Alfred, N. Y. He then returned to Westerly and two years more were devoted to the pursuance of his course of instruction in the Westerly High School. The latter part of Mr. UTTER's education was secured at Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., from which he was graduated with the class of 1877. He was a member of the Delta Kappa Epsilon Fraternity of that college.

Before entering upon his collegiate career Mr. UTTER learned the printer's trade, and after graduation became associated with his father and uncle, G. B. and J. H. Utter, in publishing the Narragansett Weekly. On the death of his uncle in 1886 he was taken into the firm, and on the death of his father in 1892 he became sole proprietor of the paper. Through his efforts the Westerly Daily Sun was started, the first issue appearing on August 7, 1893.

Mr. UTTER was engaged in public life for more than 30 years, first serving on the school board of the town of Westerly, with which he was so long identified. His political career was commenced in 1883, and for two years he was on the staff of Gov. Augustus O. Bourn. In the year 1885 he became representative in the general assembly, and when the Republican Party again came into power in the State in 1888 was chosen speaker of the house. From May, 1889, to May, 1891, he was a member of the State senate and served on the judiciary committee for both years, acting as chairman of that committee during the latter year. He was then the choice of the people of Rhode Island for secretary of state, in which office he served from 1891 to 1894, but was compelled to retire because of increased business demands upon him. Mr. UTTER again served the State in 1904, when he was elected lieutenant governor. The following two years, 1905 and 1906, he was chosen chief executive of Rhode Island, and in the fall of 1910 was the successful candidate for Representative in Congress from the second congressional district, which office he held until his death.

He received the unanimous nomination of his party for a second term in Congress, and would undoubtedly have been reelected had his life been spared, his death occurring only two days before the election, November 5, 1912.

He was always an active church worker and devoted a considerable portion of his time to the Young Men's Christian Association movement throughout the Eastern States, being a member of the Young Men's Christian Association executive committee for Massachusetts and Rhode Island. He was made a deacon of the Seventh-day Baptist Church of Westerly in 1894, and for 20 years acted as superintendent of the Sabbath school. For 15 years he was treasurer of the Missionary Society of the Seventh-day Baptist denomination.

I desire to read the following tribute to Gov. UTTER, which appeared the day following his death, in an editorial published in the Providence Evening Bulletin, a Democratic newspaper:

GEORGE HERBERT UTTER.

It is only the simple truth to say that no man in the public life of his time in Rhode Island occupied the same place in the affectionate esteem of his fellows as Representative UTTER, who died at his home in Westerly yesterday afternoon.

Mr. UTTER was a man of exceptional capacity for personal friendships. In his contact with other men he had a happy faculty of reaching their point of view, understanding their position on debated issues, and sympathizing with their difficulties. Nor could anyone be more loyally appreciative of their success.

Unassuming to an unusual degree, he was nevertheless a capable public officer in all the important places he was called upon to fill. He served in succession as a member of both branches of the general as-

sembly, as speaker of the house, as secretary of state, lieutenant governor, and governor, and finally as Representative in Congress. If he had survived, it is probable that the doors of the United States Senate would have opened to him.

Mr. UTTER was a growing man in his party. In the campaign now closing he had been drafted for service by the Republican national committee in many parts of the Union. He participated in the primary campaign of last spring as far west as Ohio, canvassed Vermont and Maine previous to the September elections in those States, and had since given too liberally of his strength to the national campaign. When he should have been recuperating he was on the speaker's platform instead, and his activities in this respect very likely accelerated the disease that has now caused his death.

A striking proof of the impression he made at Washington in the short period that was vouchsafed to him there may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17 last. Mr. RICHARDSON, of Alabama, the Democratic chairman of the Committee on Pensions, paid the following exceptional tribute to him in an address before the House:

"Mr. Speaker, I regret very much indeed that a very distinguished Member of this House, a member of the Pensions Committee, and, in my opinion, justly and worthily classed among the ablest lawyers on the floor of this House, from the State of Rhode Island, Mr. UTTER, is not present."

This is the tribute of an experienced Democratic legislator to a Republican serving his first term, and it is rendered the more striking by the fact that Mr. UTTER was not a member of the bar.

To many of his fellow citizens in Rhode Island the quality that chiefly commended him as a public servant was his courageous independence of thought and action. Devotedly loyal to the principles of his party, he could nevertheless not be persuaded into compromises and transactions which his conscience did not approve. He had a peculiar hold upon the Republicans of the State, because they trusted him to stand clear of unworthy partisan machinations. In his independence lay his largest strength, and even the party bosses realized that fact. He could not be bossed, and the people knew it.

Mr. UTTER was much more than a politician. He was earnestly interested in many goods works, both in his home town and elsewhere. He spoke throughout this part of the country in behalf of high causes and was gaining a continually wider reputation as a master of the art of easy and effective address.

The State is poorer for his death. It is no exaggeration to say that Rhode Island mourns for GEORGE UTTER, as he was familiarly and effectionately known, to-day. It saw in him the best type of public servant—efficient, modest, and industrious; a man of high ideals, blameless private life, instinctive friendliness, and stout convictions.

Though modest, on his unembarrassed brow
Nature had written "gentleman."

Mr. President, my acquaintance with Mr. UTTER extended over a period of many years, and I held him in the greatest esteem.

He had a high standard of political and civic conduct, which he exemplified in his life.

He was an orator of ability, always ready to give this gift of his to the Nation and his State, and it may be truly said his life was shortened by complying with the many demands of this nature made upon him.

His personality was attractive and his disposition lovable.

The world is better for his life.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, during the past year death has exacted a heavy toll from among the men in public life, included in the list being Hon. GEORGE H. UTTER, of Rhode Island, an able and influential member of the National House of Representatives, in honor of whose memory fitting words are to be spoken to-day.

My acquaintance with the late Representative UTTER was rather limited, but I knew him well enough to entertain the highest possible regard for him as a faithful, industrious, and able public servant. He was a strong party man, who could be relied upon to vigorously defend the principles and policies in which he believed. He was especially an earnest and able advocate of the Republican doctrine of protection, the beneficent results of which he had particularly noted in the industrial centers of his own State. His oratorical abilities were of a high order and his services were in great demand as a political advocate beyond the borders of Rhode Island, his voice being heard in many campaigns in other States than the one he so well represented in Congress.

Mr. UTTER was a man of strong religious convictions. He made many addresses before religious gatherings, being always ready to aid in every good cause. His predominant characteristic was courage, mental and moral as well as physical. He never shirked what he considered his duty as a public servant, his action on a measure being governed by his convictions rather than by considerations of policy. Having once taken his stand in a matter he did not hesitate to express his views with force and vigor, and to labor unceasingly to bring about what he believed to be for the public good.

Starting as a printer, Mr. UTTER rose through the various stages of the profession to be owner and editor of the Westerly Sun. Through the columns of that paper he found a means of impressing his high ideals upon the people of his home town, as well as upon the State at large. His newspaper was one of those which set a high moral standard, living up to it without regard to temporary financial losses occasioned through the rejection of news or advertisements which he considered unfit to be placed before the public. In that regard it is to be regretted that there are not more editors of that type.

Mr. UTTER was a strong Republican but free from any suspicion of narrow partisanship. As governor of his State he was uninfluenced by clamor, and his record in that office reflects the high tone of his private, business, and public life. He inaugurated many reforms in the laws of Rhode Island, which stand to-day as monuments to his broad understanding of the people's welfare, and which at the time they were enacted required an unusual degree of courage to support in the face of much powerful opposition.

The death of a man like Mr. UTTER is a great loss to not only the community in which he lived, but to the State and Nation as well. It is fortunate for him that his lifework left a monument more enduring than marble or bronze, which in the memory of those who knew him will always remain as the best possible proof of his high character and distinguished achievements. It can well be said of him that he made the most of his opportunities and that he did the best he could to advance the material and moral interests of those whom he so well represented. Measured by the standard of uprightness and integrity, Mr. UTTER left a priceless legacy to his family, a legacy in which his legion of friends in private and public life all share.

Mr. President, it is undeniably true that—

'Tis not the whole of life to live,
Nor all of death to die.

Of this man it may truthfully be said that he lived his life well, and that in his death no clouds dimmed the sweetness and beauty of his earthly existence. We may well believe that he still lives amid environments free from the cares, the toil, and the vicissitudes of this world. For him the great mystery of death has been solved, and for us he has left the lesson of a life well spent—an example to the youth of the land, and an admonition and inspiration to us all. Mr. UTTER's life was one of unselfishness, filled with genuine sympathy for all classes and conditions of our people. He strikingly illustrated in his life the thought of the poet expressed in these words:

If men cared less for wealth and fame,
And less for battle fields and glory;
If writ in human hearts a name
Seemed better than in song or story;
If men, instead of nursing pride,
Would learn to hate it and abhor it;
If more relied
On love to guide,
The world would be the better for it.

If men dealt less in stocks and lands,
And more in bonds and deeds fraternal;
If love's work had more willing hands
To link this world to the supernal;
If men stored up love's oil and wine
And on bruised human hearts would pour it;
If yours and mine
Would once combine,
The world would be the better for it.

If more would act the part of life,
And fewer spoil it in rehearsal;
If bigotry would sheath its knife
'Till good became more universal;
If custom, gray with ages grown,
Had fewer blind men to adore it;
If talent shone
In truth alone,
The world would be the better for it.

If men were wise in little things,
Affecting less in all their dealings;
If hearts had fewer rusted strings
To isolate their kindly feelings;
If men, when wrong beats down the right,
Would strike together and restore it;
If right made might
In every fight,
The world would be the better for it.

Mr. President, this brief tribute to the memory of Mr. UTTER falls far short of doing adequate justice to the subject, but others, who knew him better than I, will tell more in detail of his high character, his great work, and his splendid public service.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I esteem it a privilege to have this opportunity of speaking about the career of GEORGE H. UTTER, for, as I have studied his methods and achievements, I have been more and more impressed with the fact that his was an unusual character. I have known him for years as he has been known to a majority of the other people of Rhode Island, as a man who has occupied high office with credit to himself and with credit to the State. But of an exact knowledge of the type of man he was, of his motives, of the nature of his views upon public and private questions, I confess to have had until recently a somewhat vague idea. During the two years he was in Washington it was my privilege to come into somewhat close contact with Mr. UTTER and to obtain thereby a clearer knowledge of his individuality. It was his habit to frequently come over to the Senate wing of the Capitol to discuss with me the many questions that come before Con-

gress, and which, for a newcomer not yet thoroughly in touch with the accumulation of information upon national questions possessed by older Members, are difficult to decide. I was impressed in these conversations by the mental attitude with which Mr. UTTER approached such problems. I found that he always knew the exact question he wanted to discuss and the exact form in which that question was coming before Congress. I also discovered that in considering these questions what he wanted to arrive at were the facts in regard to them and the propriety and wisdom of the alternative courses which these facts offered for his choice, as they might affect the people particularly interested and the country at large.

I never knew him to be thinking about the effect his action might have upon his individual fortune. He never seemed to be concerned about whether his constituents would approve his course, but, rather, to so decide that he might have his own commendation. As time went on, it began to strike me as somewhat remarkable that a man of Mr. UTTER's long experience in public life should come to me to discuss such public questions in the inquiring and modest manner with which he always seemed to approach them. It would have been ordinary human nature for a man who had behind him the successful public career that this man had to have acquired such confidence, or, perhaps, I might say such esteem, for his own judgment that he would approach these conferences rather with a disposition to teach than with the desire to learn, and I became interested gradually in the problems that such a disposition presented.

Mr. UTTER's experience, I believe, is unique in the State of Rhode Island. There certainly has been no case in recent years of a man who has arrived at the high political positions to which he was elected by the gradual political steps that Mr. UTTER did. I am told that almost from his first appearance in Westerly, as a graduate from Amherst College, he began to take an active, if not important, part in the public questions of this community. It was in the days when town meetings were good training for public life. The questions there considered perhaps were not of Nation-wide importance, but they were those in which the local community took a strong and often bitter interest, and partisanship ran high; in fact, it has often been claimed that in the discussions and experiences of our New England town meeting the American people obtained that political training that has made the stability of this Republic such a contrast to that of many of our competitors in the art of government.

By what subtle process it is that in the daily association with each other it is gradually discovered that one man or another has the ability and the character that we want to see in public men is not always plain, but it is tradition that those qualities early made themselves apparent in Mr. UTTER, and once he had been put in the line of promotion his upward progress was rapid and almost uninterrupted. Appointed as a colonel on the personal staff of Gov. Bourne in 1883, when he was but 29 years of age, he went on two years later to fill the office of representative in the legislature, which culminated at his fourth term in his occupying the office of speaker of the house of representatives, then, as now, a position of such importance to the efficiency of that body and the comfort of its members that it is seldom acquired without merit. In this case the office was filled by Mr. UTTER with entire credit to himself and satisfaction to his colleagues. His talent as presiding officer made that session of the legislature unusual for the celerity with which the public business was dispatched, and the legislature adjourned at the appointed time with clean slates and without hurry.

For the next two years, 1890–91, he occupied the position of senator from Westerly, and as chairman of the judiciary committee was the majority leader in that body. The six years thus spent in the legislature made him generally known to the people, and so generally liked that he was nominated and elected secretary of state, which position he held for three years until the expiration of 1894. During the next 10 years, though not occupying public office, he was constantly speaking in different parts of the State upon political and other questions, and so constantly adding to his reputation that in 1904 he was elected lieutenant governor, and in the following year was promoted to the office of governor, to which he was reelected in 1906. In 1910 he became Representative in Congress, succeeding Mr. Adin B. Capron, the condition of whose health prevented him from again being a candidate. Many other men have held some of these offices, some other men have held several of these offices, but I believe there is no other man that has held all of them, and it becomes interesting to inquire into the type of man to whom this experience was given. I think that by such an inquiry you will find that the personal qualities that made it possible are as unusual and as admirable as the career itself is unique.

Mr. UTTER was an orator. Throughout his career he has been a pleasing and popular speaker in every part of Rhode Island. As a speaker his methods were those of a practical man talking to a practical people. His addresses were simple in their language, clear in their thought, direct in the way he treated his subjects. He was not profuse in oratorical illustrations. He did not have the imaginative flights of an Ingersoll or a Bryan, with their Plumed Knight and cross of gold, but he was full of ideas, that when he became interested in his subject poured forth in a rapid stream of well-chosen English and at a speed that could only be attained by a man of an active and well-filled mind. It was not easy for any but an expert stenographer to follow him.

"I like to hear you talk," said an old lady in New Hampshire to him one day, "for you never have to stop to think."

His manner on the platform was such as would naturally spring from the kindly nature of the man himself. He was vigorous and energetic, but not violent nor rasping. He did not excite opposition, but rather inclined men's minds to move along in the way in which his own mind was going, to receive acceptably the thoughts he was trying to put into their minds rather than to seek arguments in opposition. He was naturally inclined to affection. It was his disposition to seek for the things that he could admire in others and he attracted affection because he saw things in others to like. This disposition colored and stamped the character of his public appearances, and if he did not always convince his audience, he seldom failed to inspire that friendship among them that made the firm foundation for his popularity.

"As Jonathan would have been delighted to have presented the name of David to the people of Israel, so do I approach the pleasant duty which this opportunity affords," was the way in which Adin Capron offered Mr. UTTER's name in nomination for the position of governor in 1904, and two years ago, when the Republican Party leaders were hesitating over the availability of several most eligible candidates to succeed Mr. Capron at Washington, the practically unorganized movement of his friends from all parts of the State drove his nomination through the convention with a rush that would not be stayed.

What, now, were the habits of thought, the mental characteristics, of the man of these achievements? For after all the true test is the man himself rather than what has happened to him. In a rough way men can be divided into those whose nature it is to seek something to commend and who commend it, and those who seek something to condemn and who condemn it. Men have achieved high positions and have produced important results by each of these methods, but if for Mr. UTTER to have been a member of the legislature, speaker of the house of representatives, leader of the senate, secretary of state, lieutenant governor, governor, and Representative in Congress, to have won the affection and esteem of his fellow citizens and kept it to the day of his death, it had been necessary for him to be a critic of individuals, to delight in exposing evil things, to be a man who pulled down rather than one who built up, he would never have occupied any of these offices, for all such methods were so utterly foreign to his nature that you will search his career and his speeches in vain for any sign of them.

Active as was his mind, it was active in the discussion of ideas not in the discussion of men, except so far as men could be helped. During a large part of the time—for nearly 30 years—he was actively engaged in the duties of public offices and of a political career; but the remarkable thing to me about this man is that he was no more interested and active in the subjects that pertain to a career of this kind than he was in the thoughts and activities that pertain to an entirely different side of human life. For during all this long period often as he spoke upon political questions no less often did he speak upon moral questions. During his two years as governor, week after week, in one part of the State and another, and before one class of religious thinkers and another, he was carrying the message of the broad and tolerant morality in which he so earnestly believed. It is rather unfortunate that but few of his public addresses have been preserved, and even these are only in fragmentary form, but there are enough to show clearly the kind of ideas upon which his mind loved to dwell.

"One of our failings is to find fault. It is human nature to overlook the multitude of good things and to see that which is evil. Let us have charitable judgment on our neighbors," is what he told the people at the Park Street Church.

"True friendship means that we must overlook our friends' faults and magnify their virtues" is the way he was talking a few days later at the Pythian celebration, and again he says:

There are three virtues that every man must cultivate toward his fellow man—forbearance, confidence, and help. The practice of these constitute the square deal.

Similar ideas, simply but emphatically expressed, is the message he was constantly carrying from one end of the State to the other.

If he was a practical politician, who discussed practical questions in a practical way, he was no less a man with lofty ideals of public and personal service, and if he felt and inculcated these ideas toward individuals, you may well believe that he was no less desirous of serving the State when he was called upon to serve her in a way that would redound to her glory and to the increase and upholding of her good name.

"I want to meet the people of this State and talk to them and of them, finding good instead of evil to speak of in the State and its institutions; I tell you Rhode Island is a State to be proud of," he said to a reporter just after his second election as governor, and this was no accidental state of mind. Continually, through all his public addresses, you will find ardent and eloquent expressions of his love and admiration for Rhode Island.

"Let no man throw discredit upon this State; let every man protect this State, her honor and all that pertains thereto," he said to the jewelers at their banquet in March, 1906; and on another occasion, speaking of Rhode Island, he says:

> Her richest inheritance is her glorious record throughout the history of this Nation, and the promise of her future is in the character of her sons.

However often in the active current of a busy community we may sometimes forget it or be inclined to doubt it there is such a thing as public spirit. There is that form of it which we call patriotism, and if the thoughts in this man's mind, if the constant trend of his teachings, if his lifelong acts and occupations are reliable guides he was on fire with it. Not as a noble sentiment to be eloquent about. I never happened to come across the word in his speeches, but as something that was constantly, though unconsciously pushing him on to praise and extol Rhode Island—her people and her institutions. I can imagine him hot with indignation when she was unjustly or ignorantly assailed—eager and keen to defend. His very first act as Representative in Congress was to speak in her praise, as to praise her had been the theme he loved the best through all his gubernatorial career.

Thus his speeches and acts bear testimony to his natural disposition to look for the good wherever it can be found, for to so do was his idea of service and service was the passion of the man, service to the men and women with whom he came in contact, service to the State which it had been given him to represent, service that would make the men and the State think better of themselves and would make their neighbors and associates think better of them also.

"There is no nobler motto, there is no greater wish that we each one can take to ourselves to-day than this and this only, 'I serve,'" is the conclusion of one of his inaugural addresses to the general assembly; and again, in one of his Sunday talks—

"Put into the thought of your children that the highest duty of an American is to be of service to some one else. It will have a good effect in some place and at some time."

"Let no man think he can advance himself by closing the door of opportunity to his neighbor," he tells the Master Carpenters' Association.

Still in his thought mere giving is not enough. The manner of the giving and the manner of serving must be as complete and as perfect as the service itself. There is a couplet of Lowell's which I am told was constantly in his mind and which he constantly quoted, so constantly that to some of those who knew him best its sentiments stand to them for the character of the man.

> Not what we give, but what we share,
> For the gift without the giver is bare.

I am aware that we sometimes associate the use of such sentiments as this with something of insincerity or with some tendency of character that fails to impress us as manly, but no man who followed the career of GEORGE H. UTTER, some of whose characteristics I am trying to bring before you, ever associated any such idea with his unpretending modesty, his unmistakable enthusiasm and force. There was nothing mawkish or effeminate about this vigorous and independent political fighter. If the ideals of human conduct were constantly in his mind, and they were, they were there as something not to be worshiped from afar, but as something to be used in the constant activities of daily life. They were not to him merely something to be talked about in the sacred surroundings of a Sunday evening church meeting, and forgotten during the week.

"The way to save the Nation is to keep on doing it day after day, and every day," is the energetic plan he urged upon his hearers.

"There is danger in the notion," he said, speaking of government, "that it can obtain equal results for all men. The only thing which the law can do is to give each man an equal opportunity," and he urged his hearers to look for and to use all their opportunities, for no one will do it for them.

This, then, is the portrait of the man as I see it revealed in his acts, in his thoughts, and in his speeches. That he had a remarkable and honorable career I have already said. That, combined with that career, there was the constant evidence of an admirable and unusual type of mind, of heart, and of conscience I think no one who may study Mr. UTTER's record will deny. I will confess that I started to prepare this address gladly, but nevertheless, as somewhat of a perfunctory duty, I stand now as a great admirer of a career that I believe had its foundation in the loftiest ideals of human conduct. I believe that I have been studying the acts and thoughts of a man than whom no other is entitled to stand higher in the minds and hearts of the people of Rhode Island, so that what I began as a duty I now bring as a tribute of affection, of appreciation, and high esteem.

The archives of Rhode Island will preserve the list of his honors, and to his friends and neighbors his memory will long be dear. I think we may safely believe that he himself, with his clear and active mind, with his high ideals and his spotless record, has gone on to—

> Join the choir invisible
> Of those immortal dead who live again
> In minds made better by their presence; live
> In pulses stirred to generosity,
> In deed of daring rectitude, in scorn
> For miserable aims that end with self,
> In thoughts sublime that pierce the night like stars,
> And with their mild persistence urge man's search
> To vaster issues.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE WEDEMEYER.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives on the death of the late Representative WEDEMEYER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAGE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 16, 1913.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. WILLIAM W. WEDEMEYER, late a Member of this House from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased and in recognition of his distinguished public career the House, at the conclusion of the memorial exercises of the day, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan offers resolutions, which will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 474) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sorrow of the death of the Hon. WILLIAM W. WEDEMEYER, late a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be suspended in order that proper tribute may be paid to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the family of the deceased.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I fear that the custom of memorializing those who die while serving in Congress is coming to be more a perfunctory duty than a sad yet grateful opportunity, but in rising to speak at this time I am deeply impressed with the solemn privilege of expressing to my colleagues and to the friends of the late Congressman WILLIAM W. WEDEMEYER my appreciation of his high character and splendid ability. I realize, however, how futile it is for the mind to attempt to frame and the lips to utter thoughts which would adequately convey the feelings, confused and inexpressible, which overwhelm those who have not yet recovered from the shock of Mr. WEDEMEYER's tragic and most distressing death.

Death is not a stranger. He has visited every home. He has knocked, or will knock, at every door, and neither love nor knowledge nor power nor any other thing can bar his entrance. He is no respecter of persons, and the wise and the foolish, the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the famous and the obscure he treats with merciless impartiality. All know this. Every thoughtful person understands that either to-day or tomorrow the grim reaper will call and strike him from the roll of the living, and yet he ever prays for a postponement until

to-morrow and tries not to think that to-morrow will come; but it will come.

As we grow older and get more tired we look upon death differently from what we did when we were younger. Then life meant much. The world was big and beautiful. Hope reigned supreme and death was the end of joy and gladness. In after years, however, when we had come through experience to know that life was a struggle and that its tasks could not be completed in time, we sometimes had longings for rest, and gradually we came to find comfort in the Psalmist's words, "He giveth his beloved sleep."

From the time the first intelligent man looked upon the vacant tenement of his companion until this hour, death has been regarded as a solemn mystery, and yet it is no more mysterious than is life. Who knows the origin of being? Who understands the relations between spirit and matter? Who can explain that strange phenomenon called thought? Every sentient being has a brain which the chemist can analyze, weigh, and measure, but who can discover its workings and find out how it paints pictures, builds houses, explores the stars, finds atoms, dreams dreams, loves, hates? Death itself is but an operation of life. Prior to so-called death we could see but could not understand the phenomena of life, because they were demonstrated through a body with which we were familiar, but death is only a name for that change from the finite to the realm of the infinite. Can we say that birth was the beginning of life, that it did not exist somehow, somewhere, before? Can we say that it does not exist somehow, somewhere, after the body dissolves? The million larvæ in the pond live their lives and one by one they vacate their bodies and leave their native home, the water, and disappear. We know they have been translated into a new world of light and air, but their fellows can not know this; to them the departed are dead.

This little span we call human life does not end with the dissolution of the body. It is brief when measured by earth revolutions, but it is eternity long in comprehension. Redwood trees now growing on the Pacific coast were there when Homer sang, when Socrates taught, when Alexander fought. They were centuries old on the first Christmas morning, and yet man in his infinitesimal day comprehends all that growth of trees which for 3,000 years have been climbing skyward and resisting the shocks of centuries. Man can read the record of development from swelling seed to giant tree. In a day he comprehends the experience of 30 centuries.

We are told that some of the stars are so far away that if one had been blotted out at the dawn of history its light, traveling with such tremendous velocity, would still be streaming on us, sufficient time not having elapsed for the last ray to reach the earth, and yet in a moment man traverses that appalling space and sees the star that was, but is not. He can pass through the eons of sun-building time and comprehend all from nebula to star.

Can we measure man by years? He is greater than matter, older than time, coexistent with God.

So runs my dream, but what am I?
An infant crying in the night;
An infant crying for the light,
And with no language but a cry.

Philosophy fails to relieve heartaches caused by death, but the departure of a good man with an untarnished record of honor and helpful usefulness does not leave the mourner so hopeless and miserable as does the going of one who has not contributed to the happiness and betterment of the world, and as we gather on this sad memorial occasion memories of our departed friend excite only beautiful and loving thoughts, for WILLIAM W. WEDEMEYER was a good and useful man. For a quarter of a century I knew him intimately and well. I met him first when he was a student in the University of Michigan. He was a poor boy and had to work his way through school. This was a blessed hardship, for it was the experience which develops character and makes men. As a student he gave promise of the orator which he later became. Few men in Michigan were his equal in presenting a cause to the public and none surpassed him. He possessed that necessary qualification of the true orator, sincere earnestness, and the later political history of his home county is the record of his triumphs. The cause he championed there seldom failed, and time has disclosed that he was, almost without exception, right. His friendly manner, his open honesty, his superior ability made him a natural leader in political thought and action, and coming from the people he understood them and became their advocate, and they loved and admired him. Few men in Michigan knew more people by name, and all familiarly called him "WEDE."

Soon after leaving the university he became a State character and every county committee of his party in the State besieged the State central committee for his services in every campaign.

He was a Republican in politics and a progressive one. Gov. Pingree was the pioneer of modern political reform, and he selected Mr. WEDEMEYER, then a very young man, as his aid in the office of railroad commissioner. It was during the Pingree administration that Michigan changed her system of railroad taxation from the specific to the ad valorem plan, and Mr. WEDEMEYER was one of the governor's most effective advocates of the change.

He had little more than reached the constitutional age of 25 years when his home friends selected him as their candidate for Congress, and at the convention of 1896 he came within 1 vote of being nominated. In 1902 he was candidate for Congress again and received the unanimous and enthusiastic support of his county. He was twice defeated for the nomination for Congress, but after each defeat he entered the campaign and supported his successful rival with great zeal and ability. He had a happy faculty for making and keeping friends, and when in 1910 he entered the primaries he had enough admirers in all parts of the district to triumphantly nominate him over his strong and popular three-times opponent, the Hon. Henry C. Smith. At the November election following he was overwhelmingly elected, and he entered upon his congressional career backed by a proud constituency and possessed of high ideals for public service.

In the 10 years I have been in Congress I have met and known nearly a thousand Members and Senators, and I am sure I never knew a man who worked harder and more conscientiously to perform his full duty than did Congressman WEDEMEYER. No citizen of the second congressional district ever appealed to a deaf or careless ear when he wrote to Mr. WEDEMEYER. He accomplished much while in the House, and even his political opponents recognized in him a growing legislator who would soon take a prominent place among the leaders of the American Congress. His was the genius of industry. Every day, every night, he was at work upon matters appertaining to the duties of Congress, and those duties were exacting, frequently they were difficult, and often they were a great drain upon his nervous energy. He took life seriously. No duty came to him that he did not regard important, and somehow it seems to me now that he must have been impressed with the brevity of his time, for he could not consent to put anything off until to-morrow. He must do it at once.

Big in body and mind, he impressed the casual acquaintance as being a great, strong, kindly boy. His spirits seemed high and his genuine friendliness gave him a welcome everywhere. In whatever place he was he became an active, prominent figure.

As a citizen he had no superior. As a statesman few men in Congress have had a more promising prospect than was his. As a friend he was loyal to the core. The brightest spot in my memory of him, however, will be his devoted love for his family. He never wearied of telling me of his beautiful children. He carried their little letters to him about in his pocket, and however excited he might get in his conversation with me, he always closed with a joyful incident connected with the little ones. I recall that about the last time I saw him, and after he had dwelt to some extent upon his defeat for Congress last November, I told him that he ought not to feel badly, for with his energy and ability there were bigger and better things for him than a seat in Congress, and that he could be at home with his family more now. He brightened up and the old smile came back, and he exclaimed: "That's right. Don't think that I want to boast of my children, but they are nice youngsters, and I can see more of them hereafter. I'm all right, and have the finest family in the world."

He had a sensitive soul, tuned to the higher, better things of life. He was instinctively honest, and unjust criticism cut him to the heart. He had the keen and quick perception and the attractive personality which made him a natural political leader, but his sensitive mind was easily injured and the scars showed. With the ambitions of the politician was joined the sensitiveness of a child. He always fought in the open, and against the attacks of an honorable foe he was invincible. He knew how to parry the thrusts of the spear, but he was unskilled in avoiding the stabs of the stiletto.

I still recall the real suffering which he endured when he was flippantly criticized by some newspaper reporter who understood that the mission of the newspaper is to ridicule rather than to strengthen.

It is wicked to be false to a public trust, but it is more wicked to poison the public mind with suspicion about an honest Representative; and this is not so because of the evil effect upon society alone, but also because of the suffering and the weakness it brings to the faithful servant.

At this time, as I look back over the last few years, I can see that a change was being wrought in Congressman WEDEMEYER'S mental condition. He lived under continuous excitement.

Everything he did was done vigorously. His desire to be right always caused him to weigh all matters, great and small, with rigid exactness, and his fear of making a mistake bred doubts within his mind, and he who contracts the habit of doubting is lost. This is especially true of the legislator who is called upon to decide the many questions upon which honest and intelligent men differ. During the last year he was always fearful of making a mistake, and the destroyer Doubt was doing his work. I can see now that his nervous energy was being depleted and his overworked brain was showing strain. His defeat last November did not cause his death. It may have hastened it a few months, but eventually the effects of a mind diseased would have been fatal.

How much better for his friends and loved ones to remember him as we knew him—strong, vigorous, and complete—than to remain familiar with the splendid body which once was his, but out of which he had gone.

At about 7.30 on the evening of the 2d of January he stood on the deck of the steamship *Panama* and gazed out into the star-gemmed heavens. Who can say what thoughts passed through his mind? Who can tell what he saw and heard besides the stars and the music of the waves? Maybe he saw the light ineffable; maybe he heard the heavenly choir. We know that a moment later he cast into the sea the shell in which his cramped spirit had been confined and soared away to realms eternal.

O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there is a lesson for each of us in the tragic death of WILLIAM W. WEDEMEYER. Earnest, honest, sincere, ambitious, and serving his people well and faithfully, he put forth his utmost endeavor in their behalf and in behalf of the right as he saw it. Anxious to please his people, he was, nevertheless, steadfast to his convictions of right and duty. His action in some instances was not in accord with the views of some of his constituents and thoughtless partisan criticism was launched at him and his motives impugned. This grieved his sensitive nature. So honest and sincere himself, he could not understand why his motives should be questioned by those who did not approve his conduct. He brooded over this injustice, and this doubtless snapped the delicate cord that held reason to its throne and led to his tragic death. If there is one lesson for me and you and all of us to learn it is to look to the motive behind human action, and if that is good, honest, and pure, all honor is due the man for acting upon it, however much we may differ from him in judgment. Unjust, intemperate, partisan criticism brought pain, sorrow, ruin, and death to a man whose character was spotless, whose purposes were noble and ambitions high. Let us think before we speak or write the word of censure lest we unjustly wound. That man who may search his own acts or words and find in them the arrow that pierced the honest brain of our friend will surely suffer the tortures of hopeless remorse.

My first meeting with Mr. WEDEMEYER was the outgrowth of his friendly, sociable nature. I was stopping at his home city for a day or two when he came and introduced himself, and did what he could to make our stay a pleasant one. Our mutual interest in Alaskan affairs brought us into close contact here. He was a member of the Committee on Territories in the House, and we were both interested in securing local self-government for Alaska. I found him most earnest and active in behalf of this measure, and of everything else that was thought to be beneficial to our citizens in this far-away land. He could not have been more interested in a matter of vital benefit to his own people. He came to the Senate frequently and conferred with me after the bill passed the House, and I came greatly to admire his energy, earnestness, and good judgment. The people of Alaska owe much to this man who worked so faithfully for them and their interest without hope of reward save the approval of his own conscience. His action in this matter illustrated well his character and his idea of his duty as a legislator. He was, indeed, a servant of the people, not only of those of his own district, but of the whole Nation. All of his time, all of his energy, and all of his great ability was given to promote their welfare. He was an ideal public servant.

I have never forgotten the evening I spent with him at a meeting of the railroad employees of the Young Men's Christian Association, at the Union Station about a year ago. He radiated good nature and wholesome good fellowship. A giant in stature, a boy in spirit, a man in wisdom and intellectual attainments, he impressed all with his good humor, his strong intellect, and his lofty manhood. He delivered an address that charmed, pleased, and elevated everyone. It was witty, humorous, pathetic, lofty, learned, and inspiring, and fully justified all of the encomiums that have been said of him as an orator. His native ability, his breadth of intellect, his knowledge gained from books and travel, and his fund of apt and delightful stories, all displayed in a way that charmed and delighted his hearers, proved him to be a public speaker of rare attainment. Publicly and privately he drew you to himself almost unconsciously and made you love him.

It is often said to-day that a young man has no chance, no opportunity to make a name for himself, unless he has money or influence back of him. Let the young man who hears this read the life and achievements of our friend. He was born on a farm in Michigan in 1873. His parents were poor and he had no means. After working at whatever his hands found to do, going to school in the winter, he entered the University of Michigan in 1890. He paid his way by working at whatever he could find to do and living frugally. I was told that he and a friend lived in a garret and did their own work and cooking. He graduated with honor and distinction in 1894. He served in various positions of trust and confidence, and in 1910, at the age of 39 years, was elected to represent his congressional district in what is considered by many as the greatest legislative body in the world.

This brief statement of his life struggles and accomplishments is eloquent with encouragement to our youth. Without means and without influence, except that which always comes to honest toil and faithful endeavor and a steadfast purpose, he attained high distinction in a few short years. In his short life he proved that success and achievement do not depend upon birth or wealth, but largely on industry, thrift, and perseverance. He has left a rich heritage to his loved ones and friends and a brilliant example to our boys, teaching them that the day of opportunity to honest, faithful work has not yet passed.

My acquaintance with him, though brief, is a precious memory and an inspiration. In his death I have lost a friend, his family a loved husband and father, his country a splendid citizen, an earnest statesman, and a lofty patriot.

He has gone, gone to the higher life beyond. For him the mystery of mysteries is solved. With us his life is a precious heritage beckoning to better things. That he still lives we must not doubt. A character so great and with such promise is surely not so soon ended.

Said one among them: "Surely not in vain
My substance of the common earth was ta'en;
And to this figure molded, to be broke,
Or trampled back to shapeless earth again."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States has not paused in its vast labors and arrested its attention to the public business for the purpose merely of indulging in formal eulogistic remarks upon the character of this deceased Representative. Services of this nature are for the living as well as to honor the memory of the dead. They are for the dead, because the stricken can no longer speak for themselves, and it must depend that friends who remain will see that justice is done to their memory.

They are for the living, because they serve as a monitor to teach how transient, how fleeting, how evanescent are fame, power, riches, and glory.

"Death," said one of the world's wisest men, "hath this also—it openeth the gate to good fame and extinguisheth envy." And that "to praise the dead is held proper, for only after a man is dead will the score of destiny be made even, as in life man is sometimes criticized, therefore in death man may be eulogized." It is not to be inferred that during life he whose memory we honor to-day was criticized, for I do not forget that he was quite generally praised, loved, and respected, and certainly no congressional district ever had a more faithful Representative than Mr. WEDEMEYER.

I became acquainted with Mr. WEDEMEYER some nine years ago, while in attendance as a student in the University of Michigan, and frequently spent a vagrant hour in his office discussing with him some mooted question of law.

He was well equipped for a congressional career. He was a brilliant and powerful orator and possessed a vast fund of rich and wholesome humor. He dealt with facts and figures in a charming manner, and could almost arouse an audience to enthusiasm even in discussing an auditor's prosaic report. When I first met him he was in the flush, strength, and pride of young manhood, and he incarnated the poet's lines—

How beautiful is youth! How bright it gleams,
With its illusions, aspirations, dreams!
Book of Beginnings, story without end,
Each maid a heroine and each man a friend!
Aladdin's Lamp, and Fortunatus' Purse,
That holds the treasures of the universe!
All possibilities are in its hands;
No danger daunts it and no foe withstands;
In its sublime audacity of faith,
"Be thou removed," it to the mountain saith,
And with ambitious feet secure and proud,
Ascends the ladder leaning on the cloud.

The news of his tragic death was especially shocking to all who knew him, for none suspected that his health had been impaired to the serious extent that was disclosed by information which subsequently came to light.

This public servant literally worked himself to death in honorable labor in behalf of his constituents.

He represented a proud constituency, a district long and ably represented by the present distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], and in Mr. WEDEMEYER's ardent desire to measure fully up to the high standard of excellence set by his predecessor, he did that which many new Members of Congress do when they become impatient with the periphrasis, circumlocution, prolixity, and delay which characterizes proceedings in Congress and the various departments of government—allowed himself no holiday, no moment of relaxation, no respite from work. This intense application to duty, with no playful interludes, reduced his vitality to a low ebb, while the heat, conflict, and tumult of the last election wore his strength away; and thus with his vitality reduced, with his nervous energy exhausted, the silver cord did not snap and break, but unraveled and fell to pieces, and he entered into that wide penumbra which lies between the sunlight of reason and the baleful shadow of insanity—that wide penumbra, Mr. President, in which there walk at times more men than the world suspects, as—

> Great wits are sure to madness near allied,
> And thin partitions do their bounds divide.

Hoping to regain his health and strength he sailed to Panama, but found no relief, for returning home, and while about 10 leagues out of the harbor of Colon, after sunset, pacing the deck of the steamer, he looked out upon the heaving billows, which the twilight of an early evening seemed to sow with orient pearl, looking down into the waters he saw reflected the quenchless stars and their shining trains, which had resumed for another night their eternal vigils of the sky; he saw mirrored within the waters the "floor of heaven thick inlaid with patines of bright gold." And our sick and weary friend, momentarily believing he saw a radiant place of refuge and of rest, where his heart would not be harassed, plunged himself instead into the airless meadows of the mysterious deep.

We know he suffered much, but let us believe his pangs are over; let us believe that the ocean's healing waters relieved his troubled brow, cooled his heated and accelerated pulse, and that "after life's fitful fever he sleeps well."

It is not given to mortal eyes to gaze upon the invisible, or to know the inscrutable, and thus the most vital problem of all, the problem of our own existence and our own death, is the one which is the most difficult for finite minds to try to understand. Faith alone vouchsafes a reply, for in the innermost sanctuary of every soul faith gives the assurance that after we shall have crossed what we call the frontier of the dark kingdom we shall find death is not a wall, but a door to a larger and more useful life. One of the most helpful and hopeful sentiments to be found in all our literature is the stanza from Bryant's Ode to a Waterfowl:

> He who, from zone to zone,
> Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
> In the long way that I must tread alone,
> Will lead my steps aright.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, my acquaintance with WILLIAM W. WEDEMEYER was comparatively short, but rather intimate than otherwise. During his term of service here we lived at the same hotel, and as he represented the district and resided in the city in which my alma mater, the University of Michigan, is situate, we found many subjects which we could discuss with mutual interest.

Of course, the marvelous growth and development of the great university, the personnel of the faculty, the mighty changes wrought by the lapse of years, and the great success attained by the alumni of that institution, scattered as they are throughout the Republic, were the subjects most frequently discussed, but on many occasions he sketched the story of his life and gave me glimpses of his hopes and aspirations.

Mr. WEDEMEYER took degrees in both the literary and law departments, and was deeply interested in everything pertaining to the university and always active in every movement looking to the advancement of its interests, and in return he received in a marked degree the appreciative confidence of the regents and the faculty.

Less than a year ago it was my privilege to attend a large meeting of the Alumni Association of the Mississippi Valley, held at St. Louis. That meeting was attended by the president of the university, the deans of the several faculties, and a number of other gentlemen prominently identified with that institution. All these men manifested the greatest interest in Mr. WEDEMEYER's career and expressed their highest appreciation of his services as Congressman and his loyalty at all times to his alma mater. They were proud of his accomplishments, and pointed to his career as illustrating the possibilities which are within the grasp of all young Americans who, with such energy as he possessed and such earnestness as he manifested, avail themselves of the opportunities that are presented to them on every hand.

WILLIAM W. WEDEMEYER was born on a farm not far from Ann Arbor. His parents were sturdy German people, who with many others of that nationality had settled in that county years before and had contributed largely to the development of that part of the country.

There was not much in the monotonous life of a German farmer's boy to encourage him in his desire for education and his ambition to occupy a higher and better position in society than his parents with their limited opportunities could hope to occupy; but the great educational institutions in his immediate vicinity, and the presence of the thousands of young men from every part of the Union whom he saw thronging the streets every time he came to his county-seat city of Ann Arbor with his marketing from the farm gave him inspiration for the effort to secure for himself the education he so much desired.

Surely the surroundings there were inspiring. Here in this county seat was the greatest university in the mighty West, attended annually by thousands of young men hailing not only from every State but every country in the civilized world. Here in the same town was the splendid high school in which so many sons of Michigan and adjacent States had been prepared for admission to the university. Here, too, in the same county—only a few miles away at Ypsilanti—was the great normal school of the State, also attended by thousands of young men and women who were preparing themselves for the noble profession of teaching. It is not strange that with these surroundings young WEDEMEYER should have been fired with that laudable sort of ambition which took him from the farm and led him into a field where he might prepare for a life of greater usefulness and lay broad and deep the foundations for that career in which in so short a time he achieved distinction.

But it is not my purpose to speak of the achievements of his public life nor of his many victories over adverse circumstances as he struggled on from year to year to the attainment of the success which finally crowned his efforts, but rather of his devotion to wife and children—of the discharge of his obligations as a husband and father.

During his term of service here I saw him every day in the company of his charming wife and three little children—one sturdy boy and two beautiful daughters. I could not fail to observe the affectionate interest with which he regarded them and the tender solicitude he always manifested concerning their welfare and happiness.

Everyone who knew of his devotion to this delightful little family and of the great love he bore them will sympathize deeply with them in this great calamity which has deprived them of that wealth of affection which he bestowed upon them, and of his aid, counsel, and support through that period of dependence and helplessness in which children most need a father's loving care.

While their loss is irreparable, their future lives will be blessed by the memories they will have of the sweet companionship of a father who has left to them the priceless heritage of a blameless life and an example of courage and energy which, followed by them, will carry them safely over every obstacle and enable them to achieve the same success which crowned his career.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, to epitomize the life and character of one who had become very dear is indeed a difficult task when his death, so tragic and unexpected, has left such a void. But the eloquent words of the Senators who have preceded me and the brilliant, just, generous, and fitting tribute of my honored colleague make my task a very simple one.

Mr. WEDEMEYER had been my warm personal friend from his young manhood. I had been associated with him under circumstances so delightful and had learned to love him so much that his loss came with telling effect upon me.

When the ambition of his life had been realized and he was accorded a place in the House of Representatives all his friends throughout our Commonwealth looked forward with confident expectation to a career of unusual brilliancy, honor, and achievement. Brief though that career was, there have been few men in public service who have left a stronger impression upon their associates or accomplished more in real constructive legislation than the man whose memory we honor to-day.

He was young in years; he was strong and vigorous in mind and body, possessing those rare qualities that attract and

hold him in close communion with his friends. The congressional district that he represented was greatly honored by his service, while his personal friends could be numbered by thousands in every walk of life, a rare tribute to his magnetic genius and his attractiveness as a man.

His colleagues from Michigan looked forward with confidence to a continuance of his public service in this Capitol. His defeat was not personal and cast no stigma upon him. In the recent election he ran far ahead of the candidates upon his ticket, and indeed his candidacy greatly strengthened the party to which he belonged.

He was a man of unusual talent, and had the rare faculty of seeing clearly and distinctly the path of highest duty, and when convinced of his course nothing could influence or dissuade him to turn aside or falter in its performance.

Something has been said about his interest in Alaskan affairs. I know full well how deeply he was concerned in all the legislation intended to relieve those sturdy people in that distant Territory. Often he has come to me in this Chamber and urged that those people might have the right of self-government, and we worked together in the accomplishment of that result. When the bill was passed his happiness was unrestrained.

He was deeply interested in the Territorial bill before he entered Congress, and as I see my honored friend from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] across the aisle I am again reminded of that contest in which our beloved friend was deeply concerned.

Mr. President, our friend has gone. We are overwhelmed by the catastrophe which ended a life of such singular usefulness. I do not pretend to comprehend it. I know that he had much to live for. He was rarely blessed in his home circle and devoted to his wife and children. His companions in life sympathized in his every aspiration. He had climbed the ladder from humble beginning without aid and had made for himself an enviable place in his Commonwealth and in his country.

His death cast a gloom over our entire State. Its darkness refuses to be dispelled. We hope it is for the best, but many of us can not understand why such a tragedy should have befallen our friend in the very vigor of his young manhood and at the time of his greatest usefulness to the State.

After the Battle of Lodi it is said that the soldiers of Napoleon noticed that his eyes were closed and that, overcome with the exactions and the labors of the day, he had fallen asleep upon the field. Those nearest to him formed a hollow square about him and stood with patient vigil until rest opened his tired eyes. In this awful calamity those who knew and loved our friend, inspired by his memory, have formed a hollow square about his loved ones and will guard with earnest vigil the fatherless little children and the stricken widow in her woe.

I love to think of WEDEMEYER, of his happy, cheerful, beautiful affection for his friends, of his loyalty and love for those who were dependent upon him, of the charm and grace of his manner, and the purity of his private and public life.

Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read:

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 475), as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of Mr. RAYNER, Mr. UTTER, and Mr. WEDEMEYER the Senate do now adjourn.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 24, 1913, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 22, 1913.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Samuel H. Fisher, of Connecticut, to be United States district judge for Connecticut, vice James P. Platt, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *February 22, 1913.*

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

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

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, that time has not diminished the admiration, gratitude, and reverence for the "Father of his Country"; that he still lives in the hearts of all true men the ideal patriot, soldier, statesman, Christian gentleman. "Taking him for all in all, we shall not look upon his like again." Wise, strong, pure, noble, brave, his deeds live in a Republic which has become the admiration of all peoples. We thank Thee that millions of hearts still beat in unison with his great heart, for so long as his influence shall thus live our Nation shall live and liberty widen its sweep among the peoples of the earth, to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal.

Mr. SISSON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

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

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

Adair	Fitzgerald	Korbly	Prince
Aiken, S. C.	Focht	Lafean	Redfield
Ainey	Fornes	Lafferty	Reilly
Ames	Gardner, Mass.	Langham	Reyburn
Andrus	Gardner, N. J.	Langley	Riordan
Ansberry	George	Levy	Roberts, Nev.
Anthony	Gill	Lindsay	Rodenberg
Ayres	Glass	Littleton	Rucker, Colo.
Barchfeld	Godwin, N. C.	Longworth	Sabath
Berger	Goldfogle	Loud	Scully
Blackmon	Gregg, Pa.	McCall	Smith, J. M. C.
Bradley	Gudger	McCreary	Speer
Brantley	Guernsey	McDermott	Stack
Brown	Hamill	McGuire, Okla.	Stanley
Burke, Pa.	Hamilton, W. Va.	McKinney	Stevens, Minn.
Calder	Hardy	McMorran	Sweet
Carlin	Harris	Maher	Talbott, Md.
Carter	Harrison, N. Y.	Matthews	Taylor, Ohio.
Conry	Hart	Mays	Thistlewood
Cooper	Hartman	Merritt	Townsend
Copley	Heald	Mondell	Underhill
Crago	Hill	Moon, Pa.	Vare
Cravens	Hinds	Morgan, Okla.	Vreeland
Crumpacker	Howard	Needham	Warburton
Danforth	Howell	Olmsted	Watkins
Davenport	Howland	O'Shaunessy	Weeks
De Forest	Hughes, Ga.	Palmer	Wilson, Ill.
Dickson, Miss.	Hull	Parran	Wilson, N. Y.
Difenderfer	Johnson, Ky.	Patten, N. Y.	Wood, N. J.
Donohoe	Kent	Peters	
Evans	Kindred	Post	
Ferris	Konig	Pray	

The SPEAKER. On this roll, 257 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

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

PENSIONS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 8275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, and move that the House insist on its amendments thereto and agree to a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama calls up the bill S. 8275, an omnibus pension bill, and moves that the House insist on its amendments thereto and agree to a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WOOD of New Jersey.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Washington's Farewell Address may be read to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that Washington's Farewell Address be read to the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] to read the address. [Applause.]

Mr. BARNHART read the address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country, and that in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness, but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this previous to the last election had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you, but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety, and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed toward the organization and administration of the Government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself, and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country for the many honors it has conferred upon me, still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me, and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which, not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts and a guaranty of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which can not end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger natural to that solicitude urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation and to recommend to your frequent review some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively, though often covertly and insidiously, directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it, accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity, watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety, discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint counsels and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The North in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The South in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the North, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the North it finds its particular navigation invigorated, and while it contributes in different ways to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength to which itself is unequally adapted. The East in a like intercourse with the West already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water will more and more find, a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad or manufactures at home. The West derives from the East supplies requisite to its growth and comfort, and, what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one nation. Any other tenure by which the West can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While, then, every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined can not fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations, and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government, which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations—northern and southern, Atlantic and western—whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You can not shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heartburnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the Executive and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the General Government and in the Atlantic States unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties—that with Great Britain and that with Spain—which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, toward confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This Government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government; but the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the Nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Toward the preservation of your Government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what can not be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the State, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight), the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the Government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This, within certain limits, is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest, instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human

heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments, ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation, for, though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that toward the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object, which is always a choice of difficulties, ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations, cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas, is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation or of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retalitate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils. Such an attachment of a small or weak toward a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence—I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens—the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

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

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

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

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world—so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it—for let me not be understood as capa-

ble of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But, in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

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

Harmony and a liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences, consulting the natural course of things, diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the Government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will control the usual current of the passions or prevent our Nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations—but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good, that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism, this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself the assurance of my own conscience is that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your Representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take and was bound in duty and interest to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity toward other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country, to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence, and that, after 45 years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things and actuated by that fervent love toward it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking in the midst of my fellow citizens the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES, *17th September, 1796.*

ADDRESS OF PORTO RICAN FREE FEDERATION OF LABOR (H. DOC. NO. 1415).

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a House document an address by the Porto Rican Free Federation of Labor relative to the tyranny of the House of Delegates of Porto Rico and setting forth legislation which, in the judgment of the federation, is essential to the welfare of Porto Rico.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILSON] asks unanimous consent to print as a House document an address of the Porto Rican Free Federation of Labor. Is there objection?

Mr. EDWARDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how this document is to be distributed—whether through the folding room or document room.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Through the document room.

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

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 26680, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that there is one mistake as printed in the RECORD, and I send a corrected copy of the statement to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read from the corrected copy.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1563).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 26680) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 27, 61, 68, 76, 77, 78, 139, 148, 149, 151, 152, 154, 155, 160, 161, 162, 163, 179, and 235.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 11, 23, 24, 25, 26, 37, 38, 39, 147, 180, 181, and 190, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Assay office at Boise, Idaho: For the following, including wages of workmen and contingent expenses, from July 1 to December 31, 1913, both dates inclusive: Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, $1,125; assistant assayer, $800; chief clerk, who shall also perform the duties of cashier, $750; assayer's assistant, $750; clerk, $600; in all, $4,025."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,770"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,125"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Assay office at Charlotte, N. C.: For the following, including wages of workmen and contingent expenses, from July 1 to December 31, 1913, both dates inclusive: Assayer and melter, $750."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in the said amendment insert "$450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Assay office at Deadwood, S. Dak.: For the following, including wages of workmen and contingent expenses, from July 1 to December 31, 1913, both dates inclusive: Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, $1,000; clerk, $600; assistant assayer, $800; assayer's assistant, $700; in all, $3,100."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Assay office at Helena, Mont.: For the following, including wages of workmen and contingent expenses, from July 1 to December 31, 1913, both dates inclusive: Assayer in charge, $1,250; chief clerk, who shall also perform the duties of cashier, $900; assistant assayer, $850; assayer's assistant, $700; clerk, $700; in all, $4,400."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Assay office at Salt Lake City, Utah: For the following, including wages of workmen and contingent expenses, from July 1 to December 31, 1913, both dates inclusive: Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, $1,250; assistant assayer, $800; chief clerk, who shall also perform the duties of cashier, $800; clerk, $700; in all, $3,550."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 150: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$232,210"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "9"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$78,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$26,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 184: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 185: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 189: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For surveyor general of South Dakota, $2,000; clerks in his office, $4,500; in all, $6,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 192: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$16,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 195: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 196: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 196, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. T. JOHNSON,
ALBERT S. BURLESON,
FREDK. H. GILLETT,
Managers on the part of the House.
F. E. WARREN,
GEO. PEABODY WETMORE,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The Clerk read the corrected statement, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 26680) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year 1914 submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee, and submitted in the accompanying report, as to each of said amendments, as follows:

On amendment No. 2: Strikes out the name of Woodbury Pulsifer as an employee of the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 7, 8, and 11: Increases the salaries of two Assistant Doorkeepers of the Senate from $2,592 to $3,000 each, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 23, 24, 25, and 26, relating to the Capitol police: Appropriates for the number of police and for the contingent fund, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 27: Strikes out the name of George H. Carter as clerk to the Joint Committee on Printing.

On amendment No. 37: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, $300 to pay Etta J. Giffin, assistant in charge of the division for the blind in the Library of Congress.

On amendments Nos. 38 and 39, relating to the Copyright Office: Provides for an additional clerk at $1,800, proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 61: Appropriates $10,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $25,000, as proposed by the Senate, for freight on bullion and coin.

On amendment No. 68: Strikes out the provision proposed by the Senate, increasing the number of internal-revenue districts from 63 to 67.

On amendments Nos. 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 93, 94, and 95, relating to mints and assay offices: Omits the appropriations for the mint at Carson, Nev.; and appropriates for the assay offices at Boise, Idaho, Charlotte, N. C., Deadwood, S. Dak., Helena, Mont., and Salt Lake City, Utah, until December 31, 1913.

On amendment No. 139: Strikes out the appropriation, proposed by the Senate, for expenses of a national aerodynamical laboratory commission.

On amendments Nos. 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, and 156, relating to the Indian Office: Increases the compensation of the second assistant commissioner from $2,250 to $2,750, as proposed by the Senate; provides for nine clerks, at $1,400 each, instead of five as proposed by the Senate and three as proposed by the House, and strikes out all other increases in the clerical force of that office proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 160, 161, 162, and 163: Strikes out the increases, proposed by the Senate, in the force employed in the Patent Office.

On amendments Nos. 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, and 196, relating to surveyors general and their clerks: Appropriates $9,000, instead of $7,000 as proposed by the House and $11,000 as proposed by the Senate, for clerks, and $2,500 as proposed by the House, instead of $3,205 as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses, in the office in Alaska; appropriates $12,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $11,400, as proposed by the House, for clerks in the office in California; appropriates $23,000, instead of $23,590 as proposed by the Senate and $22,000 as proposed by the House for clerks in the office in Colorado; appropriates $17,000, instead of $17,500 as proposed by the Senate and $16,000 as proposed by the House, for clerks in Idaho; appropriates $10,000, instead of $11,400 as proposed by the Senate and $8,000 as proposed by the House, for clerks in Nevada; appropriates $17,000 instead of $18,100 as proposed by the Senate and $15,500 as proposed by the House, for clerks in New Mexico; appropriates $1,000, instead of $900 as proposed by the House, for contingent and incidental expenses in Oregon; appropriates $4,500, instead of $5,000 as proposed by the Senate for clerks, and $600, instead of $800 as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses, in South Dakota; appropriates $16,000, instead of $20,300 as proposed by the Senate and $14,000 as proposed by the House, for clerks in Utah; and appropriates $20,000, instead of $22,300 as proposed by the Senate and $17,000 as proposed by the House, for clerks in Wyoming.

On amendment No. 235: Strikes out the paragraph inserted by the Senate, appropriating for the Commerce Court from March 4 to June 30, 1913.

J. T. JOHNSON,
ALBERT S. BURLESON,
F. H. GILLETT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the legislative, executive, and judicial bill just adopted is final and complete. As the bill passed the House it carried $34,899,583.50. As it passed the Senate it carried $35,403,040.62, an increase of $503,457.12. The Senate receded on amendments carrying $192,506.12. The House receded on amendments carrying $310,951. The bill as finally agreed upon carries $35,210,534.50. The amount appropriated for the current year for the items included in the bill just passed is $35,216,133.38. This bill, therefore, shows a net reduction under the current law of $5,598.88. This reduction is made without reducing a single salary. On the other hand we have provided for a considerable number of increases and promotions in the governmental service. This reduction is also made in spite of the fact that we were compelled to provide a much larger sum to pay the salaries of Representatives on account of the increased membership of the House after the 4th of March. We also appropriate in this bill forty-odd thousand dollars expenses for the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, an item that has not heretofore been included in this or any other appropriation bill. We have brought into this bill items amounting to about $1,000,000 that properly belong here, but have hitherto been carried in other appropriation bills, and in so far as we have increased this bill on account of these items, we have correspondingly reduced the bills in which they have hitherto been carried.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 28812.

Mr. PADGETT. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may be limited to four hours and confined to discussion of the bill, two hours of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG] and one hour by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] and one hour by myself.

The SPEAKER. And pending the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent that general debate shall be limited to four hours, and confined to the bill.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will wait until the Chair can put the request.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I rise to a point of order. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if he proposes to give those members of the committee who voted against the report on this bill in the committee room an opportunity to be heard?

Mr. PADGETT. I am giving two hours of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG], who controls the opposition to the bill, reserving one hour for myself, and yielding one hour to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS].

Mr. TRIBBLE. Then I would like to know if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG] will yield some time to those two mem-

bers of the committee who voted against the bill in the committee room?

Mr. GREGG of Texas. The gentleman has never asked me for any time. I would take great pleasure in giving him some time, but I can not, because I have promised all the time that I shall have.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Then I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. It is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

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. 28812) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 28812, the naval appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 28812) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill in the committee. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I shall not occupy a great amount of the time of the committee in the discussion of this bill under general debate. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that we have only about seven more working days before the adjournment of the Congress, and the state of the public business is such as to require the dispatch of business.

I have filed with the bill a report stating in detail the various items of the bill, explaining the increases and the decreases, and setting forth clearly and succinctly, yet completely, the character of the bill. The aggregate amount of the appropriations carried in the bill is $146,618,364.53. The bill last year carried aggregate appropriations to the amount of $123,151,538.76. This bill represents an increase this year of $23,466,825.77.

The bill is divided into three general parts. The first part relates to the maintenance of the Navy. The appropriations last year for the maintenance of the Navy were $102,655,634.28. In this bill the appropriations for that purpose are $105,387,948.53, which is an increase of $2,732,314.25.

The items of this increase are as follows: The pay of the Navy is increased $1,983,690.75. Last year we increased the enlisted force 4,000 men, and we added 400 marines. There is also an increase in pay on account of longevity of service, the pay of the enlisted men increasing with the length of their service.

Another item of this increase is equipment of vessels, $756,700. The department asked for one million three hundred and some odd thousand dollars, but the committee allowed only $756,700. We now have more vessels in commission and larger vessels than heretofore, and the demand for a large equipment is growing every year.

We increased the target-practice item by $300,000. The committee believed that the target practice is a very necessary and essential and important part of the effective administration of the Navy. Without an efficient personnel, a personnel that can handle the guns effectively and shoot accurately, the ships of the Navy would be useless in an engagement, and we felt that this $300,000 increase was required and was justified. The bureau chief wanted an increase of $800,000. The department recommended $400,000. But the committee, under the exigencies of the case, have reported an increase of $300,000.

Another item is an increase for experiments in the Ordnance Department, $100,000. The committee believed that it was very essential that as to our ordnance—the guns, the torpedoes, the projectiles, the powder, the high explosives—there should be tests and experiments in all of those matters which are very essential to the efficiency of the Navy.

Another item of increase is an item of $240,000 increase in the wages of the employees, the workmen in the navy yard at Washington, the gun factory, and at Indianhead.

There is a board authorized and appointed by the Secretary known as the wage board. The workmen appeared before the committee and insisted that their wages were not adequate and were not proper; that they were entitled to an increase. At the suggestion of the committee a joint board, consisting of representatives of labor and representatives of the department, took up the matter, made a thorough investigation here and in neighboring cities, and they reported a wage scale of increase. This was submitted for review and for approval or disapproval to the regular wage board, and they, with some modification, approved it, and the department submitted supplemental estimates for this increase, and we have included the amount of it.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How much is the per cent of increase?

Mr. PADGETT. Approximately 10 per cent. We have increased the coal and transportation $1,000,000. More coal is required, because of the enlargement of the Navy. There is an increased price of about 20 cents a ton now in coal over former prices. Transportation charges have increased largely, for the reason that heretofore we have been able to transport coal in foreign bottoms at a great reduction below the charge in domestic bottoms; but on account of the increased commercial demands the price of foreign transportation has largely increased, necessitating an increased payment for transportation of coal.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Is that increase on account of the transportation of coal to the Philippine Islands?

Mr. PADGETT. To the Pacific coast largely, and to the Philippines.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I notice, on page 5 of the hearings, that it is stated that the bureau is of the opinion that much of the coal purchased during the year 1912 was without profit to the contractor, and Admiral Cowie states "this I know to be a fact."

Mr. PADGETT. That was the statement of Admiral Cowie.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Does the chairman of the committee think it was any of Admiral Cowie's business whether or not the contractors were getting a profit on their coal, or was it his business to make the best deal he could?

Mr. PADGETT. He was making the best deal he could, and, as I understood his testimony, he drove a good bargain, and got it at a price which did not make any profit for the seller.

Mr. TRIBBLE. And he offered that as an excuse why they did not get it any lower?

Mr. PADGETT. No; he said they made no profit on the other sale, and that they wanted some profit now, and for that reason demanded the increased price. He says the increased cost will be about 20 cents a ton.

Mr. ADAIR. How much more coal will be required next year than was used last year?

Mr. PADGETT. He did not state the exact quantity, as I now remember it, but he said that there would be a slight increase in the quantity, and there would also be a slight increase in the price.

Mr. ADAIR. My purpose in asking the question was to ascertain how fast our Navy is growing, and how much more coal will be required each year by reason of new construction, and so forth.

Mr. PADGETT. The increase in the quantity of coal is not so great, but the increase in consumption of fuel oil is remarkable. Two years ago we were using about 12,000,000 gallons of fuel oil a year. It is estimated that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, we will consume 30,000,000 gallons. Not only has there been an increase in the quantity of fuel oil, but the price of fuel has recently advanced 60 per cent, and a large amount of this is on account of fuel oil.

Mr. ADAIR. Our appropriations for fuel oil and coal will increase each year, as the size of our Navy increases.

Mr. PADGETT. Necessarily.

Mr. ADAIR. And that accounts very largely for the increase this year in the amount of coal and oil that will be required.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. For instance, on page 6 of the report I have an itemized statement of the coal purchased at home. The estimate is $200,000; freight, $200,000; fuel oil, $500,000; handling coal, $35,000; coal purchased abroad, $15,000. Those are the items of the increase of $1,000,000 which I was stating.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The increase in this bill for coal and oil is about $1,000,000, is it?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Over that of last year?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman tell us what the increase was the year before?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember just now, but I can get it for the gentleman.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Let me ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. PADGETT. My recollection is that the coal appropriation last year and the year before was the same; but of that I am not sure.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentleman states that the oil is the principal cause of this increase; will he look at page 6 under this item and see if he does not find that oil in 1911 was $131,000

and in 1912 oil was $340,000? How does the gentleman use oil as an illustration of the increase with so much force now?

Mr. PADGETT. I stated that last year, for 1912, the value of the oil purchased was $340,387. That was for 14,146,714 gallons; but for the fiscal year 1914, on account of the increased number of oil-burning vessels, we will need 30,000,000 gallons instead of 14,000,000 gallons. And then, there was an increase in the cost of about 60 per cent over the price of the year before.

Mr. TRIBBLE. That being true, I will ask the gentleman if oil is taking the place of coal, why does not the coal cost decrease?

Mr. PADGETT. The coal-burning vessels we still have. We are not disposing of any of those, and the new vessels are burning oil instead of coal.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Is it not the contention on the floor of the House and in the Naval Committee that you are abandoning the old vessels because they are gone out of date and new ones are taking their place?

Mr. PADGETT. No; there are a few small boats, like tugs and things of that kind, which wear out, but all of our principal ships we still have.

Mr. TRIBBLE. How many battleships have we now?

Mr. PADGETT. Thirty-eight completed, building, and authorized.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. ADAIR. According to the gentleman's statement, our expenditures for the item of coal and oil alone will increase about a million dollars a year if we go on increasing the Navy as we have.

Mr. PADGETT. No; not that much a year. We are increasing this year, but I hope the price next year will not be 60 per cent over what it is this year.

Mr. ADAIR. It is partially due to the price this year, then?

Mr. PADGETT. Very largely.

Mr. HOBSON. If the gentleman from Tennessee will allow me, it is the plan to put four battleships, beginning with the older battleships, out of commission, and when they are put in reserve, of course their consumption of coal will be nil.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask now that I may proceed consecutively with my statement. The provisions are increased $321,113.50 on account of the addition of 4,000 men that I stated were added last year. They were authorized last year, but they have not all yet been recruited. This bill takes effect on the 1st of July and runs until the 30th of June, 1914, and the department states that they are recruiting at the rate of about 300 a week and expect to have the full enlistment by the beginning of the fiscal year.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The first item of this appropriation includes pay of officers and retired officers?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Does the gentleman know that in the increase of officers you are at the same time decreasing them and placing on the rolls retired officers by plucking them not over 30 years of age on retired salaries?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know what their ages are?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will furnish the gentleman with the information.

Mr. PADGETT. I will take the gentleman's word for it. We are plucking some every year in order that a young man who goes into the Navy as an ensign will not remain an ensign, but will have some hope of promotion and advancement.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Is there no other way to get them out?

Mr. PADGETT. The only other way I know is by death or resignation.

Mr. TRIBBLE. You have voluntary retirement.

Mr. PADGETT. I said for them to die or resign.

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

Mr. TRIBBLE. I have the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Why, the gentleman from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. TRIBBLE. But he yielded to me. Officers are taken off the active list on account of incapacity?

Mr. PADGETT. Some are taken out on account of incapacity, and others are taken out who are capable officers, but who are taken out for the purpose of producing a flow of promotions.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I understand that. I will ask the gentleman now if he knows this condition to exist, that men voluntarily retire from the Navy as officers on account of incapacity, so certified by the surgeon, and that after those men retire they are again taken back on the active list as active officers and paid the same salaries again?

Mr. PADGETT. There was a provision of law in the personnel act of 1899 that allowed the Navy Department until the 30th day of this past June to employ men on the retired list in the active service. That expired, and in the last Congress a modified law was enacted providing for the retirement and for a reduced pay of retired officers doing active duty.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that on June 7, 1910, on account of physical disability incurred in the line of duty, under section 1453, Lieut. Oscar F. Cooper was retired, so certified, for incapacity, and if he was not immediately taken back into the service after he was retired, and if he is not in the service to-day drawing a salary at an increase of $1,323.68?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know the exact salary. I understand that he was incapable of doing sea duty and was retired; but he was capable of doing clerical duty, and was put back to do that.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I ask the gentleman if that is not the case in a number of instances?

Mr. PADGETT. There may be some. I do not know how many.

Mr. TRIBBLE. If a man is incapable of doing official duty as an officer and is retired and placed upon a salary as a retired officer, incapable of service, does the gentleman stand here before this House and state to this House that such incapable officer has the right to be put back on the active list, to draw $1,200 and $1,500 a year more than he was receiving?

Mr. PADGETT. He can only be put back on the active list after he is retired by the express legislation of Congress, and that is a matter for the Congress. I have always opposed reinstatement by legislation of that character, but Congress has not always followed my wishes in the matter.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Has the gentleman joined me in the Naval Committee to reconstruct these laws and abolish the plucking board?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not joined the gentleman in abolishing the plucking board, because I do not think it ought to be abolished.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Then, I will ask the gentleman this: Does he not know that it is charged that the plucking board is an instrument that frightens officers, and that many resign and get out of the way of the plucking board, knowing that they will be put back again on the active list?

Mr. PADGETT. I know nothing whatever of that.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee permit me to ask the gentleman to specify one case or all cases?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Apply the facts as a general principle without being personal.

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

Mr. PADGETT. In just one moment. When a man is once on the retired list he can never get back on the active list except by legislation of Congress.

Mr. TRIBBLE. How did these men get back?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia to the fact that before interrupting a gentleman he must first address the Chair.

Mr. PADGETT. Officers who are on the retired list may be employed. They are not on the active list, but they may be employed, providing the salary does not exceed a certain amount. On the retired list they receive three-fourths of the pay of the grade in which they retire. If they are used in active duty, although on the retired list, the Government is getting the benefit of their services at a very little additional pay, and in the higher grades there is nothing additional, whereas if they were not employed they would receive the retired pay, and the Government would get no service.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Then, I will ask the gentleman if he does not think it would be better not to retire them at all?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I do not. It is necessary to provide for retirement if we are to have capable officers and an efficient Navy.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I do.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Does not the gentleman know it is the mecca and hope of all officers to get back on land, and this is one scheme they have of doing it when they are retired to get back on the active list, and you can not then draft them for sea service?

Mr. PADGETT. They are not getting on the active list——

Mr. TRIBBLE. They are getting active pay.

Mr. PADGETT. While doing active duty they are getting pay which is less than active pay unless it is the pay in the lower numbers.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Does the gentleman espouse on the floor of this House the proposition of Mr. Cooper and Mr. Sorely and

Mr. Pryor, and a number of others which I have in my hand, drawing $1,200 to $1,500 more for having gotten back on this active duty? Does he think it is right?

Mr. PADGETT. I will simply say that these gentlemen were retired under the law that existed prior to the last appropriation bill, and I contributed somewhat in the last appropriation bill to the enactment of legislation to repeal the provisions under which those gentlemen were retired. It is no longer the law, and I would call the gentleman's attention to a speech which he made a few days ago upon the floor of the House in which he stated these matters, but he was in error with reference to the law. The law he referred to was repealed last year.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentleman does not mean to say that the plucking board has been repealed?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I said the law was repealed that advanced them one grade upon retirement.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I did not make that statement; Capt. HOBSON is the one who made that statement; I pursued the argument on the statement of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PADGETT. It is in the gentleman's printed speech in the RECORD.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentleman is mistaken. Mr. HOBSON is the man who made that statement. I think I stand pretty close to the RECORD. I only accepted his statement as authority. I will quote the language of the gentleman as it appears in the RECORD, so that I may not do him any injustice in my understanding of his language:

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman from Georgia states that the incompetent officers are the ones who are plucked.

Mr. TRIBBLE. No; I did not state that. I say the department pretend that they are plucking incompetent officers, but I did not make that statement. I say they are competent.

Mr. SISSON. If the incompetent ones are the ones who are being plucked, then they are adopting a system of pensioning men for incompetency, are they?

Mr. HOBSON. It is worse than that.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I say it is a terrible arraignment of the Navy of this country and the officers of the Navy if 177 men have been retired for incompetency or something else; and still there are deadheads in the Navy yet who should be plucked for retirement, and you continue to retire them year after year. It is a terrible arraignment on the whole system as well as the men. What is the matter with them? The Secretary of the Navy says there is nothing the matter. Ah, yes; they want to promote officers to better pay.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman's arraignment is not as strong as he can make it, if he will allow me. I simply want him to lay all the facts before the Members, and to state that those who are plucked are promoted a whole grade in being plucked.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Why are they promoted?

Mr. HOBSON. In order to retire them in the next higher grade.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes; I thank the gentleman; when they are retired they are promoted to another grade in order that their life salary may be increased—rewarded by promotion for so-called incompetency.

Mr. PADGETT. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KENDALL. The gentleman was discussing the increase carried in this bill by reason of the enlarged Navy, as I understood him, when he was interrupted by the gentleman from Georgia. I was correct in that, I think. I notice at the top of page 10 of the somewhat elaborate report that has been filed by the minority a statement that we now lack 3,000 officers and 6,000 enlisted men for the operation of the ships we now have in commission. I would like to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, to address himself for a moment to that statement.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, the fact is we are about 3,000 officers short, on a war basis, to operate the ships we now have, but we are not that many short on a peace basis. Of course, if we were in war we would have to have every ship in commission with a full complement, but upon a peace basis many ships are in what is called a reserve, where they have about 25 or 30 per cent of a complement of men and officers.

Mr. KENDALL. I suppose that is ample during peace?

Mr. PADGETT. That is ample for a peace basis; and now, as a matter of fact, while the gentleman says about 6,000 enlisted men, on a war basis we are about 20,000 enlisted men short.

Mr. KENDALL. How is the compensation fixed for enlisted men, by Executive order?

Mr. PADGETT. It is fixed by Executive order, and the law provides for a certain increase for each enlistment, so much increase every time a man reenlists after a four years' enlistment.

Mr. KENDALL. I think it will be interesting to the committee if the chairman will explain how the compensation paid to the ordinary enlisted man in our Navy compares with that received by similar employees in the navies of the world, because that enters largely, I think, into the general budget for the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. I think it is much higher; I can not give it in detail just from memory as to figures, but the men in our Navy are paid much higher than any foreign navies, as well as in all other occupations abroad, and the cost of living is much higher here than abroad.

Mr. KENDALL. And they are provisioned much better.

Mr. PADGETT. And ours are provisioned much better and they are clothed much better.

Mr. KENDALL. Is not that a circumstance that ought to be taken into account in instituting a comparison between naval expenditures here and abroad?

Mr. PADGETT. It must necessarily be so.

Now I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY], if he desires.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted the gentleman from Tennessee to have an opportunity to conclude his statement without interruption. It seems to be the purpose of certain gentlemen to question him paragraph by paragraph. He has only an hour, and may not be able to get more time than that.

Mr. KENDALL. I disavow any intention of unduly interrupting the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, I did not have in mind the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. PADGETT. I wish to yield to all which the time I have will permit me to do.

Mr. MURRAY. But over half of your time is now gone, and you have not gone more than half through the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, these items are mentioned, and all of them together total an increase of $4,667,679.25; but we made reductions of something like one million and six or seven hundred thousand dollars in other items of the bill, making the net increase, as stated, $2,732,314.25. And I have taken the pains and the time to call the attention of the House to the items which constitute this increase, showing that the amount that I stated to be $4,600,000, and in other portions of the bill we made decreases, reducing the net increase to $2,732,000.

Now, then, there is another part of the bill—the payment of the obligations for the increase in the Navy heretofore authorized, amounting to $22,284,091. These are on account of ships which have been authorized heretofore. Now, I thought it would be proper to make this statement: Something more than $4,000,000 of that is on account of the fact that at the last session of Congress, instead of appropriating, as customary, six million two hundred thousand and some odd dollars on account of a battleship authorized, we appropriated only about $2,000,000. For this reason, as the bill did not become a law until the 22d of August, and we were providing for a new type of ship, the like of which we did not have, and it was necessary to prepare plans and specifications and details, all of which would consume many months, and we knew that it would be up into this spring before they would be ready to submit bids for contracts. The bids, as a fact, were opened on the 18th of the present month, so that they would have not a full year, but would have only three or four months at the most in which to do work upon the vessel authorized. So we appropriated only $2,000,000, which the department said was sufficient for the time they would have to work upon the ship.

We have got to make up that $4,000,000 in the present bill. If it had been appropriated in the bill last year, the $22,000,000 carried in the bill this year would have been reduced to eighteen millions.

Now, in the present bill there is new authorization. Two battleships, six torpedo-boat destroyers, four submarines, one supply ship, and one transport are authorized, the total cost of which will be $41,710,611 instead of forty-six million and some odd, as stated in the report of the minority. They were about five millions excessive in the statement of the aggregate cost.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Why do you authorize more battleships when you have not enough officers now to man the battleships we have?

Mr. PADGETT. Speaking personally, in committee I favored only one battleship.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Why do you need any battleships when you have not the officers to man them?

Mr. PADGETT. I think the Navy ought to be proportionately increased, and our party says we want an adequate Navy.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Why have the battleships with no officers to command them?

Mr. PADGETT. It takes from 30 months to 3 years to build a battleship. We are increasing our officers 150 a year. The course at the academy is four years.

Mr. TRIBBLE. In the gentleman's explanation of the increase on account of battleships he did not mention the fact that we did not authorize but one battleship last year, and heretofore they have been building two, and we are taking care of one. Will he explain that?

Mr. PADGETT. I think the battleships we were building in early days were costing from four and one-half millions, in round numbers, to seven millions. The battleship we authorized last year, in round numbers, will cost $15,000,000.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentleman does not mean to say that the battleships authorized previous to last year will cost much less than the ship authorized last year? You mean the early construction and not the late ones.

Mr. PADGETT. I said it cost $15,000,000. I said from $4,500,000 to about $7,000,000 for the earlier ships, and then the later ones up to about $10,000,000.

Mr. SLAYDEN. At total cost?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ADAIR. The increase in this bill, outside of these battleships and the authorizations made heretofore, must be taken care of in this bill——

Mr. PADGETT. Is $2,732,000.

Mr. ADAIR. That is the increase outside of these other items?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; that is the increase outside of these items, and it is made up of the items which I stated at length to the committee.

Mr. ADAIR. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, then, the amount of the appropriations carried in the present bill on account of the new authorizations is $18,946,325. The amount for a battleship is in round figures $6,200,000 and for each of the other ships there is carried an amount which appears in the hearings, but I do not have them at my command at this moment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BATHRICK. In the explanation of the bill I understand that $105,000,000 is appropriated for the purpose of keeping what we have—taking care of what we have?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BATHRICK. Does the gentleman think that any part of that $105,000,000 could be excluded from this bill and still enable us to take good care of what we have?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not. In fact I concur with that part of the statement of the views of the minority where they say that the committee has been so economical that we have failed to provide things which the real efficiency of the Navy would justify.

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, does the gentleman think that if there is a failure to provide such things as the real efficiency of the Navy might require it is because of a sinister purpose to increase the extension program?

Mr. PADGETT. There is no such purpose; none whatever.

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, let us take the second part of the bill. It is about $22,000,000, for the purpose of paying present obligations and those which were incurred before this Congress, were they not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; for several Congresses back.

Mr. BATHRICK. Yes; for several Congresses. That makes the bill $127,000,000?

Mr. PADGETT. In round numbers $128,000,000.

Mr. BATHRICK. Does the gentleman think that as to the second item of $22,000,000 anything could be taken away from that and the Government still be honest and fair with the people they have made contracts with?

Mr. PADGETT. As to that I will say that the gentlemen who filed their minority views so state, and state that that $22,000,000 must be appropriated.

Mr. BATHRICK. Then it is quite apparent, is it not, that the minority views agree on the question of the $105,000,000, which is for maintenance, and as to the $22,000,000, which is to pay our obligations?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, the minority in their views on the $105,000,000 insist that we should not make appropriations for the navy yards, for their maintenance and upkeep, because there have been some discussions, I presume, in the newspapers to the effect that some of those yards might be abandoned.

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, just one word more, if I can have the gentleman's attention. How much do these navy yards require or take in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. The estimates submitted were $6,526,445, and we recommend in the bill $4,433,945; in other words, $2,000,000 less than the estimates and $189,000 less than was appropriated last year.

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, in reducing that amount, did you take into account and have in mind the fact that we might change or abandon some of these yards? Was that one of the reasons why you reduced it?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. We have got yards there, and we have got millions of dollars' worth of property involved. We have got men working there. We are doing repair work. We are doing manufacturing work. We have got these establishments, and we have provided only those things which are necessary for the upkeep of the yards and have recommended amounts which any prudent business man would expend in the maintenance and preservation of his own property.

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, in the total appropriations for these two parts, namely, that which is required for keeping what we have, and that which is required for the payment of contracts, how much did the committee reduce the estimates brought to it by the department?

Mr. PADGETT. We reduced the total estimates more than $22,000,000.

Mr. BATHRICK. That is all.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PADGETT. One moment; let me find out how my time stands. Mr. Chairman, how does my time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I yield for a moment, and will reserve the rest of my time.

Mr. HENSLEY. I understood the gentleman to state that in his opinion none of the items could be taken out of this bill.

Mr. PADGETT. I said they could be taken out, but could not be taken out in justice to the yards.

Mr. HENSLEY. I call the attention of the gentleman to the item of $35,000 that previously was on page 34 of the bill, and will ask the gentleman if the original draft did not contain that item, and whether the gentleman and the other members of the committee who made up this bill did not confess that that was a duplication, and finally consented to let that item be stricken from the bill on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK]?

Mr. PADGETT. That $35,000 item is not in the bill at the present time.

Mr. HENSLEY. No; but it was reported to the committee in the first draft of the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. It was in the first draft of the bill. It was for a duplicate air compressor at the Boston manufacturing navy yard, where we have a great number of men working who depend upon constant and unfailing power. The department said that if the existing air compressor should break down the men would be idle until it could be repaired, and they wanted $35,000 for a duplicate. But while the subcommittee felt that as a business proposition it would be well to have that protection for the yard, the proposition was eliminated in the full committee, because we desired to bring in as economical a bill as we could.

Mr. HENSLEY. May there not be other items in this bill that are duplications, just as it was shown by the testimony before the subcommittee that this was a duplication and not needed in the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall any now. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 12 minutes remaining, and reserves the remainder of his time.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that the members of the Naval Committee on this side of the House are substantially in favor of this bill. It has been carefully considered in the committee, and it comes before this House, in my judgment, a carefully and well-digested bill in every respect. What is more, it continues the naval policy which obtained in this country prior to the time that the present Congress came into power. There are a number of gentlemen upon the other side of this House who, I greatly regret, have made a minority report against this bill. And yet, if any one of you will read the minority report, you will find that very little objection is raised to most of this bill.

In the first place, they divided the bill into three parts and they say we appropriate in this bill $105,000,000 for the maintenance of the Navy as it is to-day. After making some objections they close their consideration of that part of the bill with these words:

> The only just criticism on that part of the bill which appropriates $105,587,948.43 for the maintenance of the Navy is that it embraces about $2,000,000 to be expended for various purposes on the navy yards, and this criticism is not that these items are too large, or that the improvements for which this money is sought to be expended are not useful and needed, but the objection is that the navy yards and stations in which this money is to be expended may be abandoned, in which case the expenditure would be useless.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. I regret that I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FOSS. There is not a dollar of this $2,000,000 appropriated in this bill which is recommended for any navy yard which is abandoned to-day. It has been the policy of the present administration to close up a few yards, the yard at New Orleans and the yard at Pensacola, and some others; but not one single dollar of this $2,000,000 goes into those yards which

are closed up, or may be said to be temporarily abandoned. So there is no useless expenditure or appropriation of money here in this bill.

When the next administration comes into power they may perchance abandon or close up some of these yards. If so, that will be the policy of the incoming administration, but so far as the navy yards are concerned at the present time there are no appropriations recommended for any navy yards which are abandoned or closed to-day. The question of the abandonment or closing of navy yards has been a mooted question for a number of years. Different Secretaries of the Navy—and we have had any number of them in the last 10 years—have recommended from time to time the closing of this yard or that yard.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Does not the gentleman think it is the duty of Congress to close some of the yards and rearrange the locations of them?

Mr. FOSS. No; I do not think it is the duty of Congress to close them. I think it is the duty of the administrative part of this Government to close them if advisable.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Do you not think it ought to be done?

Mr. FOSS. The Secretary of the Navy has a perfect right to close a yard if it is not necessary for the performance of work upon our ships. He knows how much business is to be done in our industrial plants, and these navy yards are largely industrial plants. He has the distributing of the work upon the ships and can send them to this yard or that. It is properly within his jurisdictoin to recommend and enforce the policy of closing navy yards or abandoning them.

That seems to me the real situation in regard to the matter. But this minority has no objection to the appropriation made for the maintenance of the Navy except for $2,000,000 recommended for navy yards which may possibly in the future, but which are not now, be abandoned or closed. What an idle objection to this feature of the bill.

Then we come to the second feature of the bill, and that is the appropriation of money to carry out contracts on ships that are authorized. What does this minority say? After discussing this phase of the bill they say "the second phase of the bill to which we call attention is the appropriation of $22,000,000 to complete the construction of ships heretofore authorized. These vessels are partly built, and the Government is under contract to complete them. We will either have to abandon these partly constructed vessels or lose what has already been spent on them or appropriate the $22,000,000 necessary to complete them. We therefore agree that the $22,000,000 should be appropriated."

This voluminous minority report, after all has been said, comes down finally to the proposition that we must appropriate the money for the ships already authorized—which anybody ought to know is the sensible thing to do—and raises only the trifling objection that I have mentioned as to the appropriation of $105,000,000 for the maintenance of the Navy.

So the minority report is substantially in favor of this bill, of the $105,000,000 for the maintenance of the Navy, of $22,000,000 for the appropriation of ships already authorized. But where do they balk?

Upon the third feature of the bill—the naval program. That is the only real question before this House, whether or not we shall have a naval program this year; whether or not we have an adequate Navy to-day. Those are the real propositions before this House.

Now, during all the time in which we have been engaged in building up an American Navy—I want to say it with pride—we have never made it a party question. Until last year the gentlemen on that side of the House took the question of a naval program into a party caucus. They held caucuses—three or four of them—even after they had declared in favor of an adequate Navy at their national convention in Baltimore. Even after that declaration, in a rather bumptious plank in their platform declaring for the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine—even after all that they met time and time again, and in a Democratic caucus passed resolutions declaring against all battleships whatever.

Finally, when the public press of the country had become aroused against it and they saw that they were upon the unpopular side of this question, a final caucus was held in which it was permitted—think of it; notwithstanding the constitutional obligation and oath which every Member of Congress takes here—it was permitted to Members upon the Democratic side to vote for one battleship, but only one.

This was the first time in the history of our country in the building up of our new Navy when it was ever made a party question. The national defense, I say here and now, is above all parties [applause], and under Republican administration we always treated it so.

But the fact of the matter is that the Democratic Party has never been in favor of building up the American Navy. As I look over the record for 15 Congresses prior to this Congress I find that under the Democratic Congresses there were authorized only 144,000 tons of ships for the new Navy, whereas under 10 Republican Congresses—only twice as many as there were Democratic Congresses—there were authorized 1,066,000 tons of ships for the new Navy. That speaks volumes on the question of which party in this House has been in favor of building up the Navy and maintaining the honor of our country. [Applause.] It is reported in the newspapers that Mr. William Jennings Bryan will be the premier of the new Cabinet, and this morning it is said that he is now measuring tensile strength with the President elect. It is quite likely that he will be the dominating factor under the new administration.

William Jennings Bryan a number of year ago was a Member of this body, and in the debate which took place upon the naval bill on July 9, 1892, he made the following statement in his speech. It will be found upon page 5956 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Fifty-second Congress, first session. Mr. Bryan said:

> I believe in a sufficient Navy. We have this now, either in existence or in construction. We do not need more.

How much of a Navy did we have at that time, when Mr. Bryan thought it was sufficient for this country? We had built and building 3 first-class battleships, 2 second-class battleships, 1 armored cruiser, 13 protected cruisers, 6 monitors, 3 unprotected cruisers, 8 gunboats, and 2 torpedo-boat destroyers—a small Navy. But if we had carried out the policy which Mr. Bryan enunciated at that time, where do you think we would have been when we met even the small naval power of Spain in 1898?

No; it has never been Democratic policy to build up the American Navy, but it has been built up under the administration of the Republican Party.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that I can not yield. I want the country to know this. I would never have spoken of this from the standpoint of party if the party side of the question had not been forced upon us by the action of the Democrats in the last session of Congress and in the numerous conferences which they have held during this session of Congress for the purpose of filibustering against this bill and preventing a sensible and reasonable and conservative naval program in continuance and in line with our past policies up to the time that this Congress came into power.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. FOSS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand from my colleague's statement that the Democratic members of the Committee on Naval Affairs have had conferences concerning this bill from which the Republican members of the committee were excluded?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Sure.

Mr. FOSS. I am informed, I will say to the gentleman, that they have had numerous conferences.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I can state, as a member of that committee, that I went to the Naval Committee room and was told I could not go in because the Democratic members were having what they called an executive session, and that all of the employees of that committee had been excluded from that room, and they were standing out in the hallway.

Mr. MANN. Is it not entirely unusual for a committee like that to turn the whole thing into a partisan proposition?

Mr. FOSS. Why, it is something never before heard of in the history of the country, and we will undoubtedly hear of a lot of other things——

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Oh, we will teach you a lot of new things before we get through with you.

Mr. FOSS. Which have never been before heard of in the history of the country.

But why did the gentlemen on the other side object to the continuation of the naval policy? Why do they go back on the platform which was adopted in the last Democratic convention at Baltimore, in which they spoke of the Monroe doctrine and of maintaining the Monroe doctrine? Why do they go back on it, and why do they propose, a large number of them, to vote against the naval program recommended in this bill?

In the first place, I say that at heart they have not been for the building up of the American Navy, but the second reason is because they are beginning to realize that the appropriations under the management of that side of the House have been running away up beyond their dreams and expectations. For

years on that side of the House, they have said to us that we have been extravagantly appropriating for the maintenance of the Government, and they have said to the people of the country, "Let us get into power, and we will cut down the appropriations, and we will give you an economical administration." They are finding out now that the appropriations are running higher and higher, until I am told they will be at least $100,000,000 more than they were two years ago, the high-water mark under Republican administration. And before we get through with this session of Congress, they may reach $200,000,000 more. That is the reason why. You are beginning to see that you can not carry out your promises to the American people, and therefore you say "We will cut down the naval bill, we will cut down the naval program and try to reduce expenditures in that way." But the country will see through that sham economy, that pretense of economy.

Mr. Chairman, this program which we recommend in this bill, and which I say meets with the approval of this side of the House, is a continuance of a policy which obtained prior to the present Congress, and obtained for a number of years. We recommended two ships a year. As I look back over the history of the last 16 years I see that the Republican Party, when in power upon this floor, authorized on the average two ships a year.

It is a conservative policy, two ships a year. It only will take care of the wear and tear upon the tonnage of the American Navy. We have a tonnage to-day of about 1,300,000. One of these great battleships might be likened unto a great machine shop, and any man who knows anything about machine shops knows that there is at least from 5 to 10 per cent which is struck off for wear and tear every year upon one of these great industrial establishments, and yet in the appropriation bill of this year we only recommend these two battleships with some smaller ships which will no more than equalize the annual wear and tear upon the ships in the American Navy.

We have never tried to rival any foreign program in presenting a program to this House. England last year authorized four battleships, and it is said that she will authorize five great battleships this year, and Canada, we are informed, has already made her a gift, or is about to do so, of £7,000,000, or $35,000,000, for the construction of three great ships in addition thereto. We have not sought to rival any foreign power, but we have maintained through the course of years a systematic, uniform naval policy in the building up of the American Navy.

There ought not to be any question in the minds of the American people but what we need some kind of a Navy, and if we need any Navy at all we need a good one. We have great interests upon this hemisphere and also upon the other. The United States to-day stands in a high position among the nations of the world because she has always been ready and always has maintained her national honor. We are to-day building the great Panama Canal. We need a Navy to defend it. Ah, you may say, we will defend it by neutrality, by an agreement among the nations, but we may be called upon to defend that neutrality in time of war, and there is nothing but a navy that can defend it, a navy that will be able to maintain the control of the sea against the contending power. Not only that, but in the building of that great canal we are opening up a great sea to the commerce of the world—the Caribbean Sea. We are changing the routes of commerce and trade. The nations will send their ships through that great canal, and the causes of friction and of trouble and of international difficulty will be magnified a hundredfold, and for that reason we need be in a position where we shall be able to maintain our rights in the new commercial and tremendous development of that new Mediterranean of the Western Hemisphere. Then, we have islands of the sea under our dominion, and it is necessary for us to protect them, and our foreign policy, which is not one whit bigger than our Navy, and for these reasons I appeal to you upon this side of the House and upon that to throw aside all consideration of party and stand once again for national honor and national defense, which is above all other considerations. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the passage of this bill. In the committee I voted against reporting it to the House, and I shall vote against its final passage unless it is materially amended. My opposition to this bill, Mr. Chairman, is based upon the fact that the bill, in my judgment, ignores and sacrifices the efficiency of the American Navy and proposes to squander millions of dollars upon ships that we do not need. The bill seeks to appropriate $146,818,364.53. This sum is $23,666,825.78 more than the last appropriation and $9,763,165.48 more than the Republicans in the days of their wildest extravagance ever appropriated in one bill. Of this vast amount $105,587,948.53 is proposed to be appropriated to the maintenance of the Navy and $22,284,091 to the cost of completing the construction of naval vessels heretofore authorized and $46,418,925 for the building of new vessels, on account of which the bill seeks to appropriate $18,946,325 for the first year's work of construction, leaving $27,472,600 of that sum which will necessarily be included in the appropriation bill of the next fiscal year, if we pass this program.

In regard to the first item of $105,587,948.53, it is nearly $3,000,000 more than the amount appropriated for the maintenance of the Navy in the last appropriation bill, and this large increase in the appropriations for the maintenance of the Navy is brought about notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary of the Navy and every bureau in the Navy Department has exercised the greatest economy. The examples of this economy are these: In regard to powder, the testimony before the committee shows that the department is now manufacturing powder 10 per cent cheaper than it ever did before and 15 cents a pound less than it can be bought in the market. In regard to torpedoes, the first torpedoes purchased by the Navy Department cost $9,500 apiece; that cost has been reduced to $5,800 apiece, and the department itself is now manufacturing a good part of the torpedoes needed at $3,500 apiece. In regard to the manufacture of large guns, the testimony shows that a short while ago they were costing $60,000 apiece, and now our gun factory is making them at less than $50,000 apiece, and that the cost of the gun and mount of the large 14-inch guns that we are now making is between $20,000 and $30,000 less per gun than the 12-inch guns cost a few years ago. Not only this, but in the matter of accounting the evidence shows that reforms have been adopted which have resulted in great saving to the Government.

Not only have the bureaus of the department manifested this commendable economy, but the Committee on Naval Affairs itself, after spending months upon this bill, have reduced, with the exception I will point out presently, every item in the bill as low as was possible consistent with the efficiency of the American Navy. Not only has the committee made a consistent and continuous struggle to reduce this appropriation as low as possible, but it has actually neglected a great many matters upon which the very efficiency of the Navy depends.

First, in regard to target practice, the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance has told us that in his judgment we needed a certain amount of money to give the naval officers the practice that is necessary for them to know how to shoot accurately, and this bill proposes for that purpose $400,000 less than the experts tell us we need. I wish to impress upon you the importance of this. It makes no difference what number of battleships you have, it is utterly immaterial how efficient your powder is, it makes no difference what sort of guns you have, it all amounts to nothing if the men behind the guns can not shoot with that skill and accuracy that will strike the ships of the enemy in the case of battle, and they can not acquire this skill in any other way except by target practice. And yet on this vital point of the efficiency of the Navy, this bill refuses by $400,000 to appropriate the necessary amount of money. Again, in the matter of torpedoes, the testimony before us shows that we are deficient; that our factory is incapacitated to manufacture as many torpedoes as we need; and that we are therefore compelled to purchase them at a price $2,400 apiece higher than we can make them. It was on this account recommended to us, or rather the experts stated, that it would require $250,000 to so enlarge our factory that we could provide this necessary means of defense. We refused to give that $250,000 because we were struggling to keep this appropriation for the maintenance, the efficiency, the adequacy of the Navy down to a point where there would be more chance for this Congress passing a bill to waste $45,000,000 on new vessels. [Applause.]

The hearings make it plain to my mind that the result of a naval battle would under many conditions depend upon the use of torpedoes, and this bill has just sacrificed the efficiency of the Navy to gratify the extravagance which seems to have run wild in this whole country. Again, in the matter of mines, it is shown that they are among the most important means of defense. They are proven to be terrible engines of destruction and indispensable in time of war. In the naval battle between Japan and Russia 6,000 of these mines were used, and with them the Russians destroyed two Japanese battleships and several other vessels, and with them the Japanese destroyed a Russian battleship and so disabled several others that they could not take part in the engagement. But these mines do not cost very much. You can not squander very much money on mines. They cost just $500 apiece. [Applause.] But a battleship costs $16,000,000, and therefore that is the thing with which you can effectually squander the people's money

with the greatest rapidity. And so we neglect the matter of mines and devote our thought to the subject of battleships. It is the best means by which to gratify extravagance and wastefulness. [Applause.]

This all-powerful means of defense has been neglected. The experts in the Navy have from time to time urged Congress to appropriate $1,000,000 for mines, and only $200,000 has been appropriated. This bill carries for this purpose only $100,000 and the result is that we have only 325 mines, while if we had a war we would need thousands of them, and our fleet would probably be defeated and destroyed because we have neglected to make provision for them. But when we run the appropriations up to $150,000,000 to get what is useless we are compelled to deny ourselves what is needful on the principle that when we spend all of our money for ice cream and chewing gum we have nothing left with which to buy an automobile.

In regard to powder, we have only one factory, which has not the capacity to supply our needs, and if an explosion should occur there we would become wholly, as we are now largely, dependent upon the Powder Trust. We should have several powder factories. The public defense requires it, and the safety of our Navy as well as a proper regard for the personnel of the Navy demands that we should be prepared to supply them at all times with plenty of powder, but we can not appropriate the money for this purpose because we prefer to squander it on battleships.

Another matter, and that is this: It is shown to us that at present we lack 3,000 officers of having a sufficient number to man and operate the vessels that we now have. It is shown that if we did not build another ship it would take the Naval Academy 20 years at the present rate of graduation to supply the Navy as it exists to-day with a sufficient number of officers. That is the fact before the committee. But I undertake to say that the Committee on Naval Affairs did not give two and one-half minutes' attention to that fact, because we were driving toward the $45,000,000. We did not have time to consider a question that affects the very vitals of the Navy. A battleship is utterly useless without men to operate it. Enlisted men have to be trained, and it takes time to train them. Officers have to be educated, and there is no other way that you can get officers who are competent to take charge of ships of war except to train them at the Naval Academy. And yet no provision is made for the increase of our officers to supply the vessels we now have, and not only is no provision made, but there has never been in the committee any discussion of that subject or any consideration of it, because we did not have time to do it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the fact that every bureau has exercised these economies, notwithstanding the fact that the committee itself has cut down every item it could, notwithstanding the fact that it has neglected to provide what is necessary and required for the adequacy and efficiency of the Navy and for the public defense, this item of $105,000,000 is nearly $3,000,000 more than it was last year. In that $105,000,000 there is only one part of it that the minority of the committee feels is subject to criticism, and that is the number of items covering about 10 pages of the bill and amounting to between two and three million dollars for the construction of new things in the navy yards. And on that point the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], stated in his remarks that the minority report assailed items for the upkeep and maintenance of the navy yards.

I want to tell you that he is mistaken about that. These items that we object to have nothing to do with the upkeep and the maintenance of navy yards. Ample provisions have been made in other parts of the bill to keep the navy yards going just as they are now. Why, our navy yards have been sufficient to manufacture the greatest battleships in existence with what they have now, but here is a proposition to construct new things, to make them better than they have been. We say they can go along as they are now, because they are already efficient to do the work at the present time, and our objection to these items is not that they are too large; it is not that the objects for which the appropriations are sought to be made will not be useful and needful, but we base our objection to the appropriation of this vast sum of money on the fact that nearly all of those navy yards will probably be abandoned in the near future, and if they are abandoned, then the expenditure of this money will be wasted.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I endeavored to interrupt the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] when he was speaking about navy yards that might be abandoned, and I interrupted him in order that I might have some enlightenment about what the committee considered in regard to those navy yards.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Oh, I have not time to listen to the gentleman talk, but if the gentleman will ask me a question I will answer it.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Then I will ask it.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will try to answer it.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Can the gentleman tell me what the committee did relative to any legislation dealing with the proposed abandonment of useless navy yards?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The committee did absolutely nothing; and it did not do anything on anything else hardly, because it was driving toward these battleships. [Applause.]

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I can not yield much time. If I did, I would not have time to make my argument; but I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BATHRICK. Does not the gentleman think that in order to abandon these navy yards it would be necessary to have legislation or a new bill?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I can not yield. I do not think that is pertinent.

Mr. BATHRICK. Is this question pertinent, then——

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I decline to yield, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The Secretary of the Navy has told us that these navy yards ought all to be abandoned except three. He mentioned three that he said absolutely ought to be abandoned. One of the bureau chiefs has explained to us how it increases the expenses to have so many navy yards. We have 10 navy yards and 18 naval stations. The result is that a certain navy yard will want a large crane, for example. Another navy yard wants a crane. If the work of two were concentrated in one, you would need but one crane.

Another illustration is that a great deal of money has to be expended to dredge and deepen the channels of the rivers and harbors to enable our vessels to get to those navy yards. Where you have 28 navy yards and naval stations you have got to dredge and deepen the channels in 28 places, whereas if you had them all at one place you would have to provide a channel only for one. It is pointed out to us that if they were concentrated in two or three places you would not need nearly so many power plants, and you would not need so many of nearly everything in the Navy, and it would greatly reduce the outlay and promote economy to concentrate the work in a few places. That is the argument, and the department has been contemplating, according to the Secretary of the Navy himself, the abandonment of nearly all of these navy yards. And yet it is proposed to squander two or three million dollars in those useless navy yards. We protest against that.

Now, I want to point out to you how this same folly has been exercised in the past. We expended $12,000,000 on the navy yard at Pensacola. We expended, if I recollect rightly, about three and one-half million dollars on the navy yard at New Orleans. After all that money was wasted, then we discovered that we did not need either one of those navy yards, and we have actually abandoned both of them.

Another illustration: We invested nearly $2,000,000 in some coaling stations. There has never been but a small amount of coal put in those coaling stations. After the money was wasted and squandered, we discovered that we did not need them, and both of them have been abandoned.

I could give you, if I had time, many other illustrations of this folly. The folly of the past consisted in not discovering that we would not need those navy yards before we expended the money. But you are asked now to commit the worse folly of squandering this money after you have found out that it is going to be useless. [Applause.]

And so we insist that the bill, as to all of those items of the class I have discussed, should be amended, and that these items should be stricken out.

So much for the contention which the minority makes as to that portion of the appropriation of $105,587.53 which the minority report submits should be stricken out of the bill. But the point that we want to emphasize and impress upon the House is that that item is nearly $3,000,000 more than it was last year, not because there is anything in it too great, with the exception of the feature I have pointed out, but that it is increasing and has increased solely on account of the continual increase in the number of vessels; and as long as we continue to add new vessels to our Navy this item for its maintenance is going to continue to increase by leaps and bounds, and it will be only a few years until this Committee on Naval Affairs will surpass the Committee on Pensions in the amount

of money to be expended for the maintenance of the Navy unless you stop building these new vessels.

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

And so I leave this, with the thought that you must either make up your mind that you are going to let this naval appropriation run up rapidly until it gets so big that the American people will turn us all out of office, or you have got to stop the increase in the number of vessels. That is the conception that the minority have of this bill.

In regard to the second item in the bill—$22,000,000 for the completion of the construction of vessels heretofore authorized—we do not object to that. Those vessels are partly completed. The Government is under contract to complete them. If we did not complete them, we would lose the millions we have already spent upon them, and we see no way to reduce that item of $22,000,000. The only thing I want to say about that is that it is $22,000,000 in this bill, but it will not be $22,000,000 in the next bill if you pass this building program.

Notwithstanding the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] said we had $5,000,000 too much in our estimate of the building program, I have obtained my figures in a way that makes me believe I am correct when I say that it is $46,000,000.

Now, we appropriate $18,946,325 for the first year's work, and that leaves $27,472,600 to be provided for in the next appropriation bill. And not only will that $27,472,600 have to be provided for in the next fiscal year, but you must have in the next appropriation bill an amount to complete those five great dreadnoughts now in process of construction that are not completed by that time, and the whole thing will run this $22,000,000 up above $30,000,000 in the next appropriation bill if you pass this building program.

We ought to look ahead and know what is going to confront us in the future. It is just this way: You might go down town here and buy $10,000 worth of diamonds if you could get a man to sell them to you on condition that you pay $5 cash and the balance next year, and it would be the next year that that balance would put you to your trumps. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to the third part of this bill, and that is the portion which proposes to build two battleships costing $16,345,275 apiece, or $32,690,550 for both; six torpedo destroyers that will cost $7,657,810; four submarines that will cost $2,478,936; a transport that will cost $2,051,179; and a supply ship that will cost $1,534,450. I speak in round numbers, but if you will add up all those amounts you will find that they aggregate $46,418,925.

It is manifest that no substantial reduction can be made in this bill if this program for the increase of the Navy is adopted, and the principal question presented by the bill is whether this enormous increase is wise or necessary. The wisdom of this proposed expenditure depends upon the question whether we now have an adequate Navy or not.

I admit that our Navy is inadequate for a great many purposes. It is inadequate for the purpose of conquest. If we were to undertake to conquer England, Germany, France, and Japan, we would find that we have an insufficient fleet for such purpose, and I hope that our Navy will always be inadequate for any such purpose. It is also inadequate to gratify the greed and avarice of those who annually make millions of dollars out of the construction, repairs, coal, powder, armor, and armament necessary to maintain and increase our Navy, and for such purpose the Navy would be inadequate if we had a thousand battleships. It is also inadequate to gratify the wild-eyed extravaganace of those who measure all political wisdom by the magnitude of the fund to be squandered. It is also inadequate to defend our country from invasion in case all the great countries of Europe should unite in a war against us, and I am not in favor of building any Navy adequate for defense in such case, both because I believe we will never be confronted with any such misfortune, and also because in such case I believe the wisest course would be to permit them to land their armies on our shores and depend upon such armies as we could raise to determine again the oft-decided question whether America can be conquered. But for the purpose of defending our country against attack from any nation on earth I confidently believe that our Navy is amply sufficient and fully adequate, and for any other purpose we need no Navy at all.

The question is whether the efficiency and adequacy of the American Navy and the public defense require the addition of all these vessels to our Navy. No man can intelligently determine that question unless he gets into his mind what the Navy is at present, and I want to call your attention to the meaning of the words "American Navy" and what those words signify.

For the legitimate and reasonable purpose of the public defense we have a Navy whose officers and enlisted men number 65,614 and whose vessels, of all kinds, number 277. Among this large number of vessels there are included 38 battleships, of which 33 are ready for service and 5 are in process of construction; 11 armored cruisers; 63 submarines, of which 47 are complete and 16 in process of construction; 28 torpedo boats, 54 destroyers, and other auxiliary vessels. The 38 battleships are equipped with one hundred and forty-eight 12-inch guns, thirty-two 13-inch guns, and fifty-two 14-inch guns. The one hundred and forty-eight 12-inch guns can shoot a steel shell weighing 870 pounds 12 miles, the thirty-two 13-inch guns can shoot a steel shell weighing 1,100 pounds 13 miles, and the forty 14-inch guns can shoot a steel shell weighing 1,400 pounds 14 miles, nearly twice as far as the human eye can see a battleship on the ocean. Each of these huge guns can shoot three of these immense shells every minute, or, altogether, they can shoot 696 of these terrible missiles of destruction every minute, and in five minutes they can shoot 3,480 steel shells weighing in the aggregate 223,240 pounds. In the discharge of each gun there is between 300 and 400 pounds of powder. In addition to this we have guns of smaller caliber which no man can number.

If that many shells a minute, if that many shells in every five minutes—shells weighing 223,000 pounds of steel—if that is not enough to make the Navy adequate, I would like to know how many it would take. [Applause.]

In order for the committee to more clearly understand the adequacy of our Navy I want to compare it with the other navies of the world.

Comparing our Navy with that of Japan, ours has one hundred and forty-eight 12-inch guns and theirs 84, a difference of 64 in our favor. Ours has thirty-two 13-inch guns and theirs has 56, a difference of 24 in their favor. Ours has fifty-two 14-inch guns and theirs has 12, a difference of 40 in our favor. Ours has, in large guns 12 to 14 inch, 232 and theirs 152, a difference in our favor of 80.

And yet some people are kept from sleeping at night on account of visions that they have of the American Navy being sunk to the bottom of the sea under the weight of Japanese shells. [Laughter and applause.]

Comparing our Navy with that of France, ours has one hundred and forty-eight 12-inch guns and theirs has 118, a difference of 30 in our favor. Ours has thirty-two 13-inch guns and theirs 54, a difference of 22 in their favor. Ours has fifty-two 14-inch guns and theirs none. Ours has a total of 232 large guns and theirs a total of 172 large guns, a difference of 60 in our favor. And yet they will tell you that we ought to build more battleships because France is doing it.

Comparing our Navy with that of Germany, ours has one hundred and forty-eight 12-inch guns and theirs 198, a difference of 50 in their favor. Ours has thirty-two 13-inch guns and theirs no 13-inch guns. Ours has fifty-one 14-inch guns and theirs has 40, a difference of 11 in our favor. Of the large 13 and 14 inch guns ours has 232 and theirs a total of 238, or a difference of 6 in their favor.

But while Germany has 6 more of these large guns, yet this preponderance in her favor is on account of her having 50 more 12-inch guns. We have a large preponderance of 13 and 14 inch guns over Germany, and, as I will show you later, we have so many more larger guns that they more than overcome the difference of the 6 in favor of Germany.

Now, comparing our Navy with that of England, she surpasses us 162 guns of the 12-inch type and 152 guns of the 13-inch type. But she has no 14-inch guns and we have 52. I admit that the English Navy is much more powerful than ours, but when you remember the fact that in the case of a war England would be compelled to divide her Navy into a great many fleets or leave her vast possessions in every part of the world unprotected, it is not so clear that even England could send against us a fleet which we would be unable to resist.

But if it be true that we have not enough ships, if it be true that these 232 guns on our battleships are insufficient to defend us in an attack, then I submit to this House that no increase in the number would help the matter. If we were engaged in war with some other country and our guns were to shoot 696 of these immense shells at them every minute, 3,480 of them, weighing 23,000 pounds, every five minutes, if that did not destroy them, then no amount of shells could destroy them.

It is just like if you had 232 men around the Washington Monument well supplied with baseballs, and they were throwing those balls at the monument and it did not fall, would you say that the trouble was that they did not have baseballs enough to knock it down? Would not you know that the reason it did not do it was because the balls did not have the destructive force necessary to destroy it? [Laughter and applause.]

It is the same way if you had 38 American battleships shooting at a fleet of the enemy, and with all these 696 shells flying every minute it did not destroy them, it would demonstrate to any sensible man that these shells would not do it for the lack of sufficient destructive force, and to multiply them would not help the matter at all. [Applause.] The truth of the matter is it is almost inconceivable how you could use any more battleships than we have. It is impossible to conceive, and your committee has had before it no testimony to show how more than 38 battleships could be used to advantage in a naval battle. When these battleships are taken out on the ocean to search for an enemy they go in line. I was present last year on these ships for four days when they were engaged in target practice. The admirals explained to me that the manipulation of the ships in target practice was made such as to be as near as possible to what it would be in an actual engagement. If our fleet were sent out on the ocean to search for an enemy and destroy it, the front ship would be 9½ miles ahead of the rear ship, and if it should meet the enemy the front ships would destroy one another before the hindmost ones would get close enough to begin to engage in the battle, and if the enemy had twice as many ships as we had, in such a case as that their line would be 19 miles long, and the battle would be over, so far as all those in front were concerned, hours before the last ship in the enemy's line would get in sight. But suppose that our Navy should start out to hunt the enemy and the ships should travel abreast, there has to be a certain distance between the ships. If it should meet an enemy that had twice as many ships as we had, its line would be twice as long as ours, and consequently the ships in our line would engage in battle with those in the enemy's line opposite to ours. The ships of the enemy in that part of their line not opposite to ours would be too far off to take part in the engagement at all. Of course, if these naval battles were going to last for hours and days like a battle on land, it would be different, but with these immense, destructive shells, a naval battle can not last but a few minutes. If the guns can strike the enemy's ships and they have the destructive force to destroy them, the battle would be over in a very few minutes, and consequently those ships in the line of the enemy double as long as ours, which were not opposite to ours, would not be able to take part in the engagement until it was over.

It is just for this reason that you can use only a certain number of battleships in a battle. One of the admirals of the Navy told me that 16 was the number. The impossibility of using 38 battleships in an engagement is the very reason we have divided our Navy into two fleets. One is called the active fleet and the other is called the reserve fleet. The fact is that we have so many battleships that we take half of them and tie them up and call them the reserve fleet, to be used in case the active fleet is defeated.

I say that the number of battleships does not determine the adequacy and efficiency of the Navy, but that it depends upon other things. These conditions of success are the character of the powder, of the guns, of the shells, and of the men behind the guns.

First, it depends on the powder. If we have manufactured a kind of powder that is so much greater in force and of so much greater uniformity than that of the enemy, then our guns will shoot with more accuracy and with more destructive force; and if that be great enough for our shells to penetrate the armor of the enemy's vessels and their powder is not of sufficient force to penetrate ours, it is perfectly manifest to a man of common sense that our fleet would destroy the enemy's fleet, even though the enemy had ten times as many ships as we have. That is one of the real conditions—powder.

Another condition is the character of the guns. The superiority of the guns is a condition that would determine the result of the battle. The size and mechanism of the guns are far more important than their number. It has been explained to the committee by the experts that a 14-inch gun has a destructive force 50 per cent greater than a 12-inch gun, and that on account of the flatness of the trajectory, the winds, and other causes explained to the committee it shoots with 30 per cent more accuracy than a 12-inch gun. On that point I will read to the committee what Admiral Twining says:

The CHAIRMAN. What is the result of your tests of 14-inch guns? Are they entirely satisfactory?

Admiral TWINING. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the comparison between the 12-inch 50-caliber gun and the 14-inch 45-caliber gun? I believe those are the calibers.

Admiral TWINING. The 12-inch-50-caliber is the latest type of 12-inch gun.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you regard as the destructive force, the power of those two guns, speaking relatively, at 10,000 yards?

Admiral TWINING. I suppose the destructive force of the 14-inch gun is 50 per cent greater than the 12-inch at that range.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the relative percentage of accuracy of the two guns at that distance?

Admiral TWINING. The 14-inch gun is probably 30 per cent more accurate at extreme range.

Mr. FOSS. What do you base that on?

Admiral TWINING. The flatness of the trajectory and the fact that the 14-inch shell, having almost twice the weight of the 12-inch, will keep its steadiness of flight much longer and be affected much less by winds and other external conditions toward the end of its trajectory. Whereas the comparison would be in favor of the lighter shell with greater velocity over the first part of the trajectory, in the latter part the comparison is in favor of the heavy shell.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the accuracy at different distances, say 10,000 yards?

Admiral TWINING. At 10,000 yards I should estimate that the 14-inch shell would have in the neighborhood of 5 per cent more accuracy than the 12-inch.

The CHAIRMAN. And what would be the difference at 5,000 yards?

Admiral TWINING. There wouldn't be very much difference at that distance. It would be slightly in favor of the 12-inch.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the difference as to destructive effect?

Admiral TWINING. That is based on the greater probability of hitting and the greater effect of a hit. A shell weighing 1,400 pounds will have more effect when it hits than a shell weighing 870 pounds, and its bursting charge is 50 per cent greater.

Mr. FOSS. How far will a 14-inch gun throw a projectile?

Admiral TWINING. We used to have a thumb rule that a gun would fire a mile for every inch of caliber. In that case the 14-inch gun would fire 14 miles, and I think it would not fall far short of that.

If that statement is accurate, then the fact that our Navy exceeds the navies of Germany, France, and Japan so much in the number of large guns would show that our Navy would be more than a match for any one of them.

Assuming this statement to be accurate, then if the entire German Navy were engaged in a battle with ours, and if the positions could be so arranged that every ship on both sides could take part at the same time, then our eighty-four 13 and 14 inch guns, on account of their 50 per cent greater destructive force and of their 30 per cent greater accuracy, would inevitably soon put her ships with one hundred and ninety-eight 12-inch guns out of action, and on account of the greater number of our largest guns we would be more than a match for her ships with 14-inch guns.

If all of our ships were at the same time engaged in a naval battle with the French fleet, the excess of thirty 12-inch guns in our favor and the excess of thirty-two 13 and 14 inch guns would leave no doubt as to the result.

And in the case of a naval battle with Japan, the excess of sixty 12-inch guns in our favor and the excess of sixteen 13 and 14 inch guns in our favor makes our great superiority unquestioned.

But, Mr. Chairman, the efficiency of the Navy depends more upon the man behind the gun than upon anything else. It is the patriotism, the courage, the nerve, the willingness in the hearts of the men behind the guns to die rather than to see the flag go down that will enable them to shoot with the accuracy which will bring victory. [Applause.] On this point I want to call attention to the fact that the provisions made for the American Navy guarantee and assure us in the best possible way that we have secured the best officers on the face of the earth. The rigid examinations for entrance to Annapolis, the rigid examinations for passage from one class to another, and then the rigid examinatons that are kept up after they become officers, whenever the time comes for them to be promoted from one rank to another, eliminates the inferior and leaves as the officers of our Navy the very highest grade of men. Besides that, we have now a great number of schools giving postgraduate courses in which our naval officers are taught and made experts in every department of naval knowledge, and these provisions make me believe that we have the best officers and the best Navy in the world. [Applause.]

If instead of exhausting our resources and impoverishing our overtaxed people in building more ships we would devote more attention and spend a little more money in torpedoes, mines, powder, target practice, and supplying the ships already constructed with an adequate number of trained officers we would, in my judgment, make the wisest possible provision for the adequacy of the Navy and for the public defense, and at the same time save the people millions of dollars.

But if I am mistaken in all this, if it be true that our Navy is not adequate and efficient, I have the consolation of knowing that I have a great deal of good company with me, and I want to call attention to that. Whether or not the efficiency and adequacy of the Navy would be increased by adding more ships to our battle fleet is a subject I want to tell this House the committee that reported this bill has never given any attention to at all. If it be true that we need more battleships the committee has not tried to find it out. We started out on the assumption that we were going to have them, necessary or not

necessary, and we have never gone into the question of whether there was any reason for having them or not. [Applause.] There has only been one question asked, and I want to call attention to that. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK], who is always of a somewhat inquisitive turn of mind and anxious to discover the truth, is the only member of this committee who ever propounded a single question to find out whether it is necessary to have more battleships, and he propounded it to the Secretary of the Navy in these words:

Mr. BATHRICK. You have stated that it was necessary to build battleships. What are your reasons; why do you believe it necessary?

Secretary MEYER. I believe it to be necessary in order to have a fleet that will meet the possible requirements of emergencies that might arise. Otherwise, if you are not going to have a fleet that will meet emergencies that may arise, a fleet made up of vessels of a character which other navies which may come in contact with us are building, it would be better to have no Navy and no fleet; better than to have a lot of vessels which would be crushed like a lot of pasteboard boxes.

Look at that answer. He was asked to give the reasons why it was necessary to build more battleships. The question meant, why is it that 38 battleships are not enough; it meant why 232 big guns are not enough; it wanted to know what good it would do to have a greater number. That is the meaning of the question, and the Secretary's answer is, to provide for emergencies that may arise in the future. Well, is that any answer to say that we want to provide for emergencies that may arise, or does it explain why 38 battleships would not provide for the emergencies that might arise; is that any answer why 41 would provide for them and 38 would not? Mr. BATHRICK was not to be put down by any such answer as that and so he said this:

Mr. BATHRICK. I rather expected to get some reason other than "may" or "might." I thought, perhaps, that you might have some specific special reason.

Secretary MEYER. I do not want to for this reason: The other day I talked rather freely about the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific, and it was all in the papers the next day. You have asked a question which it is perfectly proper to ask, and I will sit down and discuss it with you some time, but I do not want to embarrass foreign relations by making statements which might be misunderstood and create offense where none is meant to be given.

Then you are confronted with this situation: When the Secretary of the Navy is asked to tell us whether we should build more battleships, why he believes it is necessary, he declines to give any reason on the ground that it might get into the newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may conclude his speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may conclude his speech.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope no one will object to that.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like the information from some one as to how long general debate is to run on this bill. If some gentleman desires to ask unanimous consent for some length of time, I shall not object.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi be given 15 minutes to continue his remarks.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I ask that he be given half an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object to the request to continue until he concludes.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 40 minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for 40 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Navy has not only declined to give any reason to the committee and the committee has not only no reason to give to this House which it got from the experts, or in the evidence before us, but the Secretary of the Navy has plainly told us that we did have about as many battleships as we need. He was asked this question:

Mr. GREGG. Twenty-one in the first line.

Secretary MEYER. The ideal number which the Navy Department hopes to work up to is a fleet of 41 battleships, with necessary auxiliaries, 21 in the active fleet and 20 in the reserve fleet.

According to that statement of Secretary Meyer, the ideal number of battleships is 41, and we already have 38.

Again, on page 21 of his annual report, the Secretary uses this language:

A total of 41 battleships, with a proportional number of other fighting and auxiliary vessels is, in the opinion of the Secretary, the least that will place this country on a safe basis in its relations with other world powers. This number should be reached as soon as practicable, and then the fleet should be kept up to its standard strength by replacing obsolete vessels with new ones by a uniform yearly replacement program.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Navy himself refutes the idea that we must have a yearly program and continue to build battleships every year. He clearly tells us there is a limit to the number of battleships beyond which it is useless to go. He fixes this limit at 41, and declares that is the ideal number, but he declines to give us any reason at all why 38 is not just as ideal as 41, and I think it would be an impossibility for any human being to sit down and figure out and prove how 41 battleships with 30 more guns on them would do any more good than 38 with 232. The truth is that we have long since passed the ideal number of battleships that could be effectively used in a battle, and the building of more is a useless waste of the people's money.

But not only the present Secretary of the Navy has told us this, but it was not the first time that the Congress has been so advised by the officers of the Navy Department. We have had that information before, and I call your attention to the fact that the Secretaries of the Navy have means of information which we have not. They are in constant contact with experts on this subject. They have nothing to do but study this question, and they learn more about it than we can possibly learn.

Now, I want to call your attention to what the Secretary of the Navy said in 1905. He used this language in his annual report:

The aggregate of our battleships, armored cruisers, coast-defense vessels, built, building, and authorized, would seem, according to present indications, sufficient to provide for any contingencies within the limit of probabilities.

That is what he said about the Navy in 1905. This statement of the Secretary of the Navy was indorsed by the then President of the United States in his annual message in these words:

It does not seem to me necessary, however, that the Navy should, at least in the immediate future, be increased beyond the present number of units. What is now clearly necessary is to substitute efficient for inefficient units as the latter become worn out or as it becomes apparent that they are useless.

Mr. SHERWOOD. What is the date of that?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Nineteen hundred and five.

Now, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1905, at the time the Secretary of the Navy advised Congress that our fleet was then sufficient to provide for all contingencies within the range of probability and at the same time when the President of the United States in his message informed Congress that the units of the Navy should not be increased, our Navy consisted of 24 battleships, 12 completed and 12 under the process of construction. Since that time we have constructed 1 more battleship and 13 *Dreadnoughts*, which have more guns and more powerful guns, and which more than double the capacity of the Navy. If a Republican President and a Republican Secretary of the Navy believed, as they said they believed in 1905, that our Navy was sufficient to provide for everything within the range of possibilities, and that the units should not be increased, and if since then we have more than doubled our Navy, then I ask Democrats if they think we ought to add still more to it? [Applause.]

And I call your attention to the position of the highest authority on naval affairs in this House, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], who said, in his speech to the House in 1908, that he protested against adding four more battleships to our Navy, and he declared on the floor of the House that the Navy as it then existed was magnificent. Since that time we have added nine dreadnoughts to the Navy, and if it was magnificent then I defy any Member of this House to suggest an adjective that will accurately describe it now. [Applause.]

In 1911 there was a mobilization of a part of our fleet at New York. The number of vessels present was 123. President Taft was present, and he made a speech on that occasion, and in that speech he described the Navy as magnificent. He boasted that he had there under his eyes the fastest and the most powerful dreadnoughts in the world. That was the opinion of President Taft. The fact is that over a period of 120 years, from the time that John Paul Jones first unfolded the flag to the breeze of the English Channel down to this time, our Navy has always been efficient, adequate, vast, magnificent, glorious, and victorious; but when it stands in the way of extravagance and greed it sinks down to the low level of inefficiency and inadequacy. [Applause.]

But if all this evidence is insufficient to show that our Navy is fully adequate for the public defense and that its increase in the number of units would not increase its efficiency, then we submit that the expenditure of $46,418,925 more would not help

the matter. Since 1883 we have spent on our Naval Establishment $1,963,094,608.77, and of this vast sum $202,195,607.83 has been invested in battleships, besides the five now under construction, which will run the amount up to $250,000,000. If this vast sum will not secure an adequate battleship fleet, it is useless to spend more. Excepting Egland, we have spent more already than any other nation of the world. We have in the last decade spent $410,455,321 more than France, $452,666,114 more than Germany, and $1,019,890,156 more than Japan.

The greatest total naval expenditure in one year by Germany was, in round numbers, $110,000,000, or $26,000,000 less than we spent in 1911. The greatest spent by France in one year is $89,000,000, or $47,000,000 less than our greatest expenditure. The greatest amount ever spent by Japan in one year was $46,000,000, or $90,000,000 less than our greatest annual expenditure. If with this enormous expenditure of money we have not been able to build a fleet adequate to protect us against any of these powers, then we had better place our reliance on other means and not depend on naval vessels.

And, again, if our Navy is inadequate to the public defense for the want of a sufficient number of vessels, then it will not help matters to build more, for the reason that we have not and can not procure the officers to man them. The testimony before the committee shows that we lack 3,000 officers and 6,000 enlisted men necessary to operate the ships we have. The enlisted men have to be trained and officers have to be educated before they are competent to take charge of war vessels. Battleships without officers and men are useless, and at the present rate of graduation it will take the Naval Academy 20 years to supply the ships we already have with officers. It is therefore nothing less than folly and the most inexcusable extravagance to continue the building of more ships when we know that we can not use them.

If the public defense were the object to be attained, if the efficiency and adequacy of the Navy were the purpose in view, if the profits to be made out of the construction of more ships were not the inspiration of the clamor for them, we would take a few of the $46,000,000 which the bill proposes to expend on new ships and invest them in the enlargement of the Naval Academy, so as to provide the officers necessary for the ships we have.

I submit, however, that the correctness of the position taken by the minority of the committee will become still more apparent if you will just consider the arguments put forth in favor of increasing the Navy. The clamor for a bigger Navy is so dogmatic and insistent that it is perfectly plain that if there were any good reasons to be given for it they would be given, and if the reasons given for it are fallacious, it is the best assurance that no good ones exist.

I want to call your attention to these pretended reasons. I am frequently told the Navy is an insurance, and the Secretary of the Navy himself states in his annual report that it is an insurance, and uses that as an argument.

Any resemblance between the Navy and a policy of insurance is impossible for me to detect. Insurance is a contract by which the insurer, for a small amount of money called a "premium," agrees to pay a much larger amount in the contingency insured against. Now, what resemblance has a navy to that?

In the last 20 years we have had one war which, according to the best estimates, cost us about $300,000,000. During that time we have spent $1,963,094,608.77 on the Navy. In other words, if that be regarded as the premium on the insurance, we have paid as a premium six times as much as the loss itself and then paid the entire loss besides. [Applause.] And yet this loose, nonsensical talk about insurance finds lodgment in the minds of sensible men.

But if it is meant by saying that a navy is an insurance against war in the sense that it will prevent war, I deny that proposition. Japan and China both had navies, but that fact did not keep them out of war. Russia and Japan both had navies; it did not keep them out of war. The United States and Spain both had navies, and it did not prevent a war between them. England had a great navy, but that fact did not keep her out of war with the Boers. The fact is that three-fourths of the nations of the earth have no navies at all, and they do not have as many wars as these great countries with navies have.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How about the navy of Italy in the war with Turkey?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; that is another example. Since the destruction of the Russian fleet and of the Spanish fleet and of the Chinese fleet, and since Russia and Spain and China have ceased to have any fleet at all, they have not had any wars. The fact is that nations, just like individuals, are led into wars by their passions. It is the feeling of some real or fancied wrong, or the greed and avarice for aggrandizement or commercial advantages, that leads them into war, and it does not make any difference whether they have navies or not. People are going to fight just as long as human nature remains as it is, and navies can not prevent it.

I would rather depend upon the Bible of God than upon these engines of destruction to protect us against war. [Applause.]

But it is told around on every side that we ought to build more battleships because we have a number of battleships that are obsolete. They tell us that when a battleship is 20 years old it becomes obsolete and should be discarded and not counted. If that were a good argument it would have no application here, because the oldest battleships we have—the *Massachusetts*, the *Iowa*, the *Indiana*, and the *Oregon*, built in 1896 and 1897—are just 17, 16, and 15 years old now, and if the 20-year argument is a good one why not just wait until the time comes before you make it?

But I say that there is nothing in that. Admiral Dewey tells us that the hull of a battleship will last 100 years, and so far as the guns are concerned, they are just as good as they were when those ships were new. Each one of those battleships has four 13-inch guns—four guns that take three or four hundred pounds of powder in them to shoot a shell—and they will shoot that shell 13 miles with the same accuracy and with the same destructive force as they did when they were first made.

How, then, does a vessel become obsolete? The only thing that wears out about these guns is the lining. After you have fired them 300 times the erosion caused by the smokeless powder prevents them from shooting with the same accuracy as before. But we have expended thousands and thousands of dollars in keeping all our guns relined, and the testimony of our experts on that subject is that when you reline a gun it shoots with the very same accuracy and with the very same destructive force that it did when the gun was new.

But the Secretary of the Navy himself tells us that the policy of the Government has been and is now to keep all these ships, with their guns, up to a state of efficiency according to the original design; and, in accordance with that policy, within the last few years these old battleships, with their armament, have been repaired and renewed and made like new. Their mounts and their turrets have been modernized. On the *Oregon* alone they have expended $627,000 to make her as good as she ever was. Now, if these old ships are so soon to die of old age, then I say it was criminal extravagance to waste all that money on them.

But the money has not been wasted. These guns will shoot just as well as they would when they were new, and this pretext about these ships being obsolete is just one of those inventions to induce us to squander the public money. That is all there is to that.

But we are told that if we stop building battleships it will be only a few years before we will sink to fifth place among the navies of the world. That is an argument that is frequently advanced. That contention is based on a comparison between our Navy and the navies of foreign countries, and a comparison which leaves out of consideration 25 of our battleships, which 25 are to be regarded just like the drinks of Rip Van Winkle—they are not to be counted at all. [Laughter.] And it is based on the assumption that these advocates of a larger navy know what foreign governments are going to do in the future. In other words, they are prophets. They can tell you what foreign governments are going to do next year and the year after. Secretary Meyer says it is very difficult for the department itself to find out about these matters.

So, not counting the 25 of our battleships and then counting how many battleships other countries are going to build in the future, they have a process of counting by which the American Navy will sink to the fifth place in a few years. Of course that is based on the assumption that the strength of a navy is proportionate to the number of guns, which I have shown is not correct. But if that be true, I submit to this committee that it is useless to spend any more money. Since 1883 we have spent nearly $2,000,000,000 on our Navy. Of that vast sum $202,000,000 has been invested in battleships alone, not counting the five great dreadnoughts that are now in process of construction, and when they are completed we will have invested more than $250,000,000 in battleships alone. Within the past 10 years we have spent $452,666,114 more than France has spent. We have spent $410,455,321 more than Germany has spent. We have spent over a billion dollars more than Japan has spent. The highest expenditure that Germany has ever made in one year is $110,000,000, which is $29,000,000 less than we spent in 1911. The greatest expenditure that France has ever made in one year is $89,000,000, which is about $50,000,000 less than we spent in that year; and the greatest amount that Japan has ever spent in one year is $46,000,000, which is just $90,000,000 less than our highest annual naval expenditure. We have spent in the last 10 years $109,146,966 more than Ger-

many and Japan both together. In other words, for the last decade we have spent $10,000,000 every year more than both of those countries put together. We have spent $66,936,173 more than France and Japan both together have spent in the last 10 years, or $6,000,000 more every year for 10 successive years than both of those nations combined. And I say that if the expenditure of this money has not given us an adequate Navy, we had better quit and depend on something else for our defense. [Applause.]

This contention really is that we ought to build more ships, not because our Navy is inadequate, but because foreign Governments will build more. The truth is that foreign Governments have been struggling to keep up with us. When within 10 years we spend $410,455,321 more on our Navy than France, $452,666,114 more than Germany, and $1,019,890,156 more than Japan, it looks like the cheek of logic to contend that we ought to spend more because they will do so. We build more ships because they do and they build more because we do, and so all the enlightened nations of the earth, according to this contention, are running a race of folly to build useless ships each because the other does. Since Germany, France, and Japan have all these years been under our influence and have been impoverishing their people to build useless battleships because we have set them the example, the only logical conclusion is that if we were to abandon this foolish policy these great Governments of Europe would follow us in our wisdom more readily than they followed us in our folly. At any rate, we do not favor that monkey-like statesmanship which imitates the follies of foreign Governments.

Now, in conclusion, I want to say that the expenditure of $46,418,925 for new ships is an inexcusable, unjustifiable, criminal waste of the public funds. [Applause.] And I appeal to the majority in this House to stand up for economy. I appeal to you to vindicate the wisdom of the Democratic caucus, which determined three different times that we did not need any more battleships, and that determination stands there unreversed and unrescinded to-day. It is the last expression of the party on that subject.

Not only that, but every Democratic platform from 1832 down to the present time has pledged the party to economy, and it is now up to us to say whether we will stand on the promises that brought us into office, or will ignore and break them after we have gotten the goods that we obtained by making them.

If there is anyone who is not willing to respond to the appeal to comply with Democratic promises, then I want to make this appeal, that they be at least as good as the Republicans have been in the past. The Republicans have had sufficient regard for economy and for the condition of the Treasury, they have had sufficient sympathy for the toiling masses of the people, who are groaning under the burdens of taxation and looking with longing hearts and expectant hopes to us for relief—the Republicans have had sufficient regard to these things during five different years to refuse to authorize any battleships at all.

In 1891, in 1893, in 1894, in 1897, in 1901 the Republicans did not authorize any battleships. In 1892, in 1904, in 1906, and 1907 the Republicans showed a sufficient regard for the condition of the Treasury, and a sufficient regard for economy, and a sufficient sympathy for the overburdened people of this country to refuse to authorize more than one battleship. And I now put it up to Democrats to show the country whether it is possible for them to be as good as Republicans. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, on Monday last, the 17th of this month, a very different scene was presented in this Chamber, a much more interesting scene than this. Members were present in their seats to the number of about 300, and each Member with bated breath was asking his fellow Member, "Will the bill pass?" There was no declaration of war, Mr. Chairman, about to be declared, no great question of national import was under discussion; the question merely was, "Will I get that public building for my district?" and nearly all the membership of the House was here to obtain, if possible, that delectable piece of patronage. [Laughter and applause.] I venture the assertion, Mr. Chairman, that if we could take a battleship home to our district and run it up and down some local creek or river in one of the doubtful counties of our own home domain that every Member of the House would be present in his seat to-day crying for a vote on the pending measure and asking that the number of battleships be increased so that every district in this country of ours could have one.

But this is a different matter. This is a question which touches the subject of national defense and the general welfare of this country. My amiable and distinguished friend from Mississippi who has just taken his seat [Judge WITHERSPOON] informs us that wars are always the result of avarice and passion. If I read history correctly, the distinguished gentleman's ancestor was a signer of the Declaration of Independence. I should like to ask him what element of avarice or passion entered into his ancestor's heart when he with his compatriots entered into war for this country against the yoke of England? What element of avarice or passion entered into the hearts of the American people when, with one accord in 1898, we demanded of Spain that they cease their cruelties and withdraw from the island of Cuba?

Mr. Chairman, I am old-fashioned enough to have some regard for the words and the expressed sentiments of the great Americans who have gone before. We opened the exercises of this House to-day by reading the noble words of Washington on the occasion of his farewell.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is our bounden duty to regard the immortal words of that man, and these are the words of Washington to which I refer:

> The United States ought not to indulge a persuasion that contrary to the order of human events they will forever keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms with which the history of every other nation abounds. There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

What is an adequate Navy? I think all parties and all men agree that we ought to have an adequate Navy. The Democratic platform says so. The Baltimore convention announced only last summer:

> The party which proclaimed and has always enforced the Monroe doctrine and was sponsor for the new Navy will continue faithful to and observe the constitutional requirements to provide and maintain an adequate and well-proportioned Navy, sufficient to defend American policies, protect our citizens, and uphold the honor and dignity of the Nation.

The Republican platform declared:

> We believe in the maintenance of an adequate Navy for the national defense, and we condemn the action of the Democratic House of Representatives in refusing to authorize the construction of additional ships.

The Washington or Progressive Party declared:

> We favor an international agreement for the limitation of naval forces. Pending such an agreement, and as the best means of preserving peace, we pledge ourselves to maintain for the present the policy of buildng two battleships each year.

Those three expressions I have just read announce the determined policy of the three parties which contended for mastery last fall, and in a direct manner reflect the sentiments of the large mass of the American people. The President of the United States in his message this year said:

> I urgently recommend that the Congress make up the mistake of last session by appropriations authorizing the construction of three battleships in addition to destroyers, fuel ships, and other auxiliary vessels, as shown in the building program of the general board. We are confronted by a condition in respect to the navies of the world which requires us, if we would maintain our Navy as an insurance of peace, to augment our naval force by at least two battleships a year, and by battle cruisers, gunboats, torpedo destroyers, and submarine boats in a proper proportion.

Mr. Chairman, what is the advice of the Secretary of the Navy? I think he ought to know, from an administrative standpoint at least, what the needs of the country are and what is an adequate Navy. To quote from his report:

> Experience has shown the wisdom of systematic preparation for war. If we wait until a crisis comes it is then too late to make effective preparations, and the result is confusion, waste, and unnecessary loss of life. In any war involving the United States the control of the sea will be of the utmost and deciding importance. Such control can be obtained only by an efficient Navy of sufficient strength.

The question I ask of this House is, Have we an adequate Navy? Shall we recognize the truth of the proposition that the world moves? An adequate Navy depends not upon what our judgment may be concerning our armament of to-day, but it depends on how it compares with other armaments with which it may come in conflict in the coming days. I suppose, in the judgment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], the navy of Commodore Perry in Lake Erie, 100 years ago this coming June, was an adequate Navy then and ought to be to-day, or that the Navy that Farragut used at Mobile Bay was an adequate Navy then and ought to be to-day; or that the Navy which Dewey employed at Manila, and Sampson and Schley used at Santiago, was an adequate Navy 15 years ago, and therefore ought to be an adequate Navy to-day. Not at all, Mr. Chairman. I beg to call to the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi, and to the attention of every gentleman of this committee who listened or applauded or said amen to his words, that the world moves, that the battleships that we are building to-day are three times the size of the battleships employed by Dewey in the last engagements in which this country took a part.

Mr. LOUD. Six times as large.

Mr. BATES. Some of them six times as large, but our first-class battleships then, the *Iowa* and the *Indiana*, were ships of only about 10,000 tons, while the ships we are building to-day, like the *Pennsylvania*, are of 31,500 tons. The iron that they threw was thrown from 6-inch guns, 4-inch guns, and 8-inch guns. Our best ships were equipped with only two 13-inch guns, whereas the *Dreadnoughts* we are building to-day, to cope, if necessary, either in moral effect or in actual warfare, with the navies of the world have 12, 13, and 14 inch guns, so that one of the ships that we are building to-day is equal to three or four in fighting capacity of those that we built 20 years ago.

What is necessary to maintain an adequate Navy? My good friend admits in his first premise that he is willing to maintain an adequate Navy, and then adds that he thinks that we have an adequate Navy. He quotes the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], who has presided over the Naval Committee not only with dignity and impartiality, but with fairness and rare consummate ability, delving with great diligence and research into the subjects which have come into the making up of this bill, and he quotes him as saying three or four years ago that we had a magnificent Navy and did not need four battleships. Suppose we did have a magnificent Navy four years ago. The world has moved in naval architecture and naval munitions even in the last four years.

Referring again to the very interesting remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], I would like to ask him why Japan won over Russia—the little nation over the big? It was because Japan was ready; Russia was not; because Japan had sunk five of the enemy's ships before her opponents realized that war was on. Why did Japan conquer over China? Because she had more money? No. It was because she was ready to strike first; she was prepared; she was known among the nations of the world; and she was ready to strike when the occasion arose. The war between England and the Boers was cited by my distinguished friend as an illustration that nations would engage in wars, although they had an adequate navy. Why, the Boers had no navy, and the English navy played little part in that internal warfare. That war was not a question of naval strength at all, except in the long run it gave England an advantage which its opponents did not at any time possess. Suppose, for instance, that the Boers had had a navy, not, perhaps, as large as England's or ours, but an adequate navy to repel England's transports; that might have prevented England from landing her troops in Africa; and have even won in the end if they had been equipped with even a navy. And I want, in passing, to call to your attention what the moral effect of a navy is of benefit before hostilities are entered into. I suppose gentlemen read in the papers last week—I know I did, and with a feeling of just pride—the fact that on the west coast of Mexico, when the battleship *Georgia* and three other battleships went into those harbors, the whole feeling of danger for Americans or danger for foreigners or foreign interests at once disappeared. The moral effect of the battleships there spread a sentiment throughout Mexico that the United States was ready; that we were prepared; and because we were prepared we have not had to strike a blow in Mexico, and, in my judgment, will not be required to, because we are ready to strike the blow if occasion should demand it. And for that reason when the United States speaks, when Mr. Knox, the Secretary of State, sends a note, he speaks with authority, and when Mr. Bryan, if he should be his successor, shall speak to Mexico for order and discipline and right regard for lives and property of foreigners in that Republic, the note coming from the office of the Secretary of State, not because it is couched in this or that language, not because they have regard for the statesmanship or brains that pens it, but because they have a wholesome fear of the battleships that are behind it, it goes with authority in Mexico and it will be heeded. [Applause.] Talk about insurance. The insurance that the Navy of this country means to this country and to its people is not an insurance in money, is not the insurance in mere valuable possessions, it is an insurance against the taking of life, it is an insurance against the shedding of blood, it is an insurance against the spending of untold millions in a long-drawn-out war, and it is my candid opinion that because this country, under the administrations with which it has been blessed for the last 16 years, has maintained a state of preparedness in case war should be imminent, has averted intervention in Mexico this year. A million or two here or there may be spent each year, with great propriety and economy too, to maintain the efficiency, to keep up the adequacy of our fighting units and our fighting strength.

Oh, they say, let us put it in public buildings, let us have it in our districts, let us have it count for our renomination or reelection where the people can see it, let us build roads; all good projects; agriculture, Indian affairs, the Interior Department, all splendid projects, but they all pale into insignificance, they all become as nothing, they all become as mere toys and flippant things compared with following the words of George Washington, to maintain an adequate defense and keep up our Army and our Navy so that in case peril should arise, in case war should at any moment be imminent, we shall be ready to strike the first blow and if possible bring about peace before hostilities shall actually commence by a settlement under the rules of honor and decency and international regard which we shall impose from time to time through the mouth of our Secretaries of State. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I again emphasize this proposition, that the words "increase of Navy" is a misnomer. If we should build or authorize three or four more battleships this year, as is recommended by the general board and the Secretary of the Navy, we would perhaps be increasing our naval establishment. The Secretary of the Navy, in his annual report December last, recommended 4 battleships, 2 battle cruisers, 16 destroyers, 1 destroyer tender, 2 transports, 1 ammunition ship, 6 submarines, 1 submarine tender, 1 supply ship, 2 gunboats, 2 sea-going tugs, 1 dry dock, and 1 submarine testing dock. I ask the members of this committee if in view of the request of the Secretary of the Navy, reflecting the recommendations of the general board, in view of the recommendations made in the bill that was reported practically unanimously from the committee, if that is not a modest program, to wit, instead of 4 battleships, 2 battleships; no battle cruisers, as were asked for; instead of 16 destroyers, 6 destroyers; no destroyer tender; instead of 2 transports, 1 transport; no ammunition ship; instead of 6 submarines, 4 submarines; 1 supply ship; no seagoing tugs; no dry dock; and no submarine testing dock?

If I should make no other point, I desire to make this one, that the present bill, with its 2 battleships, its 4 destroyers, its 4 submarines, its 1 transport, and 1 supply ship, is merely maintaining the present efficiency of the Navy. Why? Because, as the Secretary points out, there will be 4 battleships next year over 20 years old, and they will have to be withdrawn from the second line. They will not continue to be counted in the present strength of the fleet.

You ask me what battleships those are. Why, Mr. Chairman, their names are household words. They are the *Indiana*, the *Oregon*, the *Massachusetts*, and the *Iowa*. It was most fortuitous or providential for the people of this country that Secretary Whitney had the honor of inaugurating in a large degree what is called the modern Navy, and because there was foreknowledge enough to build those ships, whose names I have just read, we were saved from an everlasting disgrace in 1898.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Then the gentleman disagrees with his colleague from Illinois [Mr. Foss] that the Democratic Party has never done anything for the Navy?

Mr. BATES. No. I think as a general proposition the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] is right. I will tell the gentleman from Rhode Island why: Mr. Secretary Whitney in a lucid interval arranged for the building of our first modern cruisers—at least they were modern for that time. After the War with Spain and we had demonstrated the wisdom of that action, how wise it had been on the part of the American people to be supplied with those battleships, and had saved ourselves from a national disgrace, the Republican Party has come into this Chamber every year since with an adequate naval program and the Democratic Party has opposed it.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield for a moment to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss].

Mr. FOSS. I will say to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] that the birthday of the American Navy was when we authorized the first ships of the present Navy. That was on March 3, 1883, in the administration of President Arthur, when Mr. Chandler was Secretary of the Navy. It is true that in Mr. Cleveland's time, under his Secretary, Mr. Whitney, an advance was made in the policy of building up the American Navy; but after that it is well known that Cleveland and his administration were repudiated by the Democratic Party and Cleveland repudiated the Democratic Party, and since that time it has passed into the possession of William Jennings Bryan.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the gentleman to say that Mr. Whitney in a lucid moment——

Mr. BATES. Oh, I used the word "lucid" purely in a Pickwickian sense. Let me substitute the words "opportune or fortunate moment."

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I want to say to the gentleman it was a very good thing for the Republican Party and the entire Nation that we had a Mr. Whitney to lay an enduring foundation and set an example for the Republicans to follow.

Mr. BATES. I agree with the gentleman from Rhode Island in the sentiment that it was to the great credit of Secretary Whitney to assist in inaugurating the movement, but it was not to the credit of the Democratic Party to desert him and his chief, Mr. Cleveland, after he had helped inaugurate the movement.

Mr. FOSS. In other words, it is not to be put down to the credit of the present Democratic Party?

Mr. BATES. No. And, Mr. Chairman, I will say in further answer to the question of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY], before we had learned the lesson of 1898 we would never have had occasion to engage in war with Spain, and Spain would never have had the temerity to engage in a war with the United States had she known that we had within a few years built our modern battleships. You remember the saying of Secretary Taft, when he was Governor General of the Philippines, when our President suggested sending our fleet around the world, that "It is a good thing to fill the eye of the oriental." Very good. If we had filled the eye of the oriental, and had filled the eye of the citizens of Old Hispania about a year or two before the occurrence of 1898, I assert that it would never have been necessary to have engaged in the War with Spain, because if they had had the knowledge that we were as prepared as we were, they would never have allowed us to strike a blow, but would have withdrawn peaceably from Cuba and left the island, or at least reduced it to a peace basis, as we demanded.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are going on with the program, and I congratulate a large number of Members on the other side of the aisle that we are proceeding to maintain and keep up the adequacy of our present Naval Establishment. I am glad that so many of the Members on the other side of the aisle have some faith in the efficiency of their own party, that it will not run amuck, that it will not so cripple the affairs of this country that we can not pay the ordinary bills for the maintenance of our country, not only for battleships, but for the general maintenance of the Army and Navy and the construction of public buildings, and provide the means for the enactment of all the other great supply bills that come in from time to time. I congratulate a large number, I believe a majority of the majority, on the fact that they have confidence in the ability of their party to conduct the affairs of state, to carry on the fiscal affairs of this great Republic, and to see to it that there shall be sufficient revenues, sufficient funds to meet the needs of the country, and to keep up an adequate Navy, as was advised by Washington and is advised now by the party platforms, and to retain the place that we have won so proudly among the nations of the world. [Applause.]

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I do.

Mr. WARBURTON. The gentleman understands, does he not, that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations feels it absolutely necessary to deprive the States of internal improvements in order to get this second battleship?

Mr. BATES. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Will he please state that question again?

Mr. WARBURTON. I say the gentleman understands that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations thinks it necessary to deprive the States of necessary internal improvements in order to get a second battleship, does he not?

Mr. BATES. Oh, no; I think not.

Mr. WARBURTON. Well, the other day he showed how he had eliminated probably $20,000,000 from the sundry civil bill that the different departments had recommended.

Mr. BATES. Well, but he stated that that had no effect on any other supply bill or appropriation bill.

Mr. WARBURTON. I am not talking about supply bills. I am talking about internal improvements recommended by the different departments, assuming that they act with some sort of judgment.

Mr. BATES. But what was the question the gentleman asked? [Laughter.]

Mr. WARBURTON. I will state it again. That the chairman of the Appropriations Committee showed how the committee had cut down the appropriations from 20 to 30 per cent on necessary internal improvements to meet the necessary deficit, and then, of course, to help out the second battleship proposition. Does the gentleman understand that?

Mr. BATES. I understand it as well as I did in the first place. [Laughter.]

I want to say to the gentleman that if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations made such a statement—I did not hear him make it; I have a great deal of confidence in the correctness of his statements—and if he made——

Mr. WARBURTON. Did not the gentleman hear him state this, that the appropriations that he recommended on the sundry civil bill were about 20 or 30 per cent less than those recommended by the departments, and that his recommendations, or the recommendations on his appropriation bill, amounted to $113,000,000? I think I am right about it.

Mr. BATES. I have no doubt about that. That is good housekeeping. But I do not know how that touches on the question of national defense, which is a question of national importance.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a suggestion on that point?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. I wanted to suggest that I think the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WARBURTON] is slightly mistaken. Many of the items in the sundry civil bill were cut down, including the item the gentleman himself is interested in, in order that we might appropriate $5,000,000 for the fortification of the Panama Canal.

Mr. WARBURTON. That is the gentleman's own conclusion. He cut it down to $113,000,000 in order that we might get two battleships or colliers to carry coal to Panama.

Mr. BATES. That would not have anything to do with the naval program.

Mr. WARBURTON. It had everything to do with it.

Mr. BATES. It was because the Panama Canal expenses are met by the Appropriations Committee that its chairman was concerned for colliers and transports for Panama. It had nothing to do with battleships.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman stated that the building of two battleships by this Congress, or the authorizing of their building, would not increase the Navy; that there would be four battleships withdrawn from the second line.

Mr. BATES. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask whether or not those four ships are retired from the service, or is the expense of maintaining them and their crews continued?

Mr. BATES. I think I can answer that question. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] used an unfortunate word when he said they became "obsolete." That is a little too strong. They are merely withdrawn from the first and second lines of defense and used for harbor protection or in case of emergency, in case they need to be pressed into service. They are only maintained at a partial expense. Only a few men are maintained on them, not a full complement of officers and men at all, and they are usually anchored around the navy yards as emergency ships in case we should be pressed or need them, possibly, for transports for carrying purposes in case of war. They are not under the usual expense, however, of first-class battleships or cruisers.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman know about how much that reduction would be?

Mr. BATES. I should say 50 or 60 per cent. I have not the figures here, but they are reduced to a minimum, some of them to merely a nominal expense of possibly 10 per cent.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not asking these questions for the purposes of criticism, but for information. The gentleman said there would be no increase.

Mr. BATES. I understand. How much more time have I, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 21 minutes.

Mr. BATES. I desire to use only a few of those minutes. The four battleships which the Secretary states will be over 20 years old next year, and will have to be withdrawn as fighting units at all, except in the direst extremity and necessity, are comparatively small ships when compared with those that we are now authorizing. I believe that the two battleships which are authorized in the bill this year will be able to take the place of the four which will be retired before those can be built which we are authorizing, because it takes from 30 to 36 months to build a battleship after it is authorized.

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

Mr. BATES. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. Then, what is there in the argument of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] that these battleships are just as effective for fighting purposes now as they were 15 or 20 years ago?

Mr. BATES. I am glad the gentleman alluded to that point which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON]

seemed to dwell upon so long, because I think the gentleman from Mississippi spoke with great lack of information on that subject. The ships which won the battles in the last three or four naval engagements have been the big ships, the ships that speak with 13 and 14 inch shells, and the ships that can throw 12 or 14 of those shells within a few moments. One of those ships can do more destruction in battle than three or four or half a dozen of the old ships of 10 or 15 or 20 years ago.

Mr. LOUD. As much as 60 such ships as they were then.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], in his very unique views of the minority which he has prepared, states a hypothetical question:

If you had 232 men around the Washington Monument and hurling baseballs at it at the rate of 696 a minute, and 3,480 every five minutes, and if these balls did not destroy it, you would not conclude that the failure to destroy it was because the number of balls was too small, and that a greater number of baseballs would destroy it, but you would know that the cause of the failure was the lack of destructive power and that an increase in the number would be useless.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. No; not for a moment. The logical conclusion of every patriotic American would be to use more formidable projectiles against the Washington Monument if we desired to destroy it, and not to throw the 6-inch shells, which were used 10 or 15 or 20 years ago, but to bring up the dreadnought *Pennsylvania* or the dreadnought *Oklahoma*, which has been authorized, or the dreadnought *Nevada*, which has been authorized, and that with a broadside of twelve 14-inch guns we can reduce any fort or put out of commission a dozen of the battleships that were in use 10 or 15 or 20 years ago, and speak with the highest degree of efficiency against any ordinary armament of any ordinary nation in the world. There would not be an increase in the number of baseballs, but an increase in the size, weight, efficiency, tensile strength, and velocity with which they could be propelled.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I will.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentleman has referred to the naval battle in which the Spanish ships were captured. I will ask the gentleman if he knows that one year before the Spanish-American War the whole appropriation for officers, men, and everything connected with the Navy, from men to ships, was only twice as much as is now paid for the active and retired officers of the present Navy? Does he know that the appropriation now is nearly $15,000,000 for officers, active and retired, in the Navy, and that the entire naval provision in 1896 was only $30,000,000 for all the Navy; and will the gentleman explain why the people should be burdened to pay this enormous sum to officers when a $30,000,000 Navy sent the whole Spanish Navy to the bottom of the sea?

Mr. BATES. I fear that the gentleman has not been in the Chamber, or, if he has, that he has not caught the drift of my remarks. I have been trying to insist to this committee that the world moves, and that we have more battleships to-day—more formidable ones—a larger complement of officers and men, than we had 15 or 20 years ago. We are a greater Nation than we were then, we are greater than we were then by twenty millions of people, we have greater revenues in the Treasury than we had then, and we have more proportionate revenue to invest in a Navy than we had then. We have a greater national pride than we had then. We speak with greater authority among the nations of the world than we did then, and we have a greater responsibility than we had then, because we have the Panama Canal, we have the Philippines, we have Porto Rico, we have the Hawaiian Islands, and we have the surveillance of Cuba as well.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. Certainly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the comparative naval strength of the possible enemies of the United States to-day as compared with 14 or 15 years ago?

Mr. BATES. They are much larger. I will read for the information of the gentleman and for the benefit of the committee the comparative strength of the leading nations of the world to-day as to tonnage. It is tonnage that counts; it is not the number of craft, of superannuated ships of the line 20 years ago, but it is the tonnage that counts.

England has built and is building 1,978,000 tons. Germany has built and is building 837,000 tons, or less than half that of England. We have built and are building 773,000 tons. France has built and building 630,000 tons, and little Japan has almost 500,000 tons built and building. Russia has built and building 286,000 tons. We are the third, with France and Japan pressing us closely, and if we omit our building program to a sufficient amount to maintain our present strength, they, with the great impetus they are under to-day, with their ambitious naval program, will put us in fifth place in less than three years.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. If in less than 15 years in a time of profound peace our naval bill is five times as much as it was 15 years ago, how many times what it is now will it be 15 years from now?

Mr. BATES. That is a fair question if it was founded on correct premises. It is not five times as much as it was 15 years ago. It has been increasing with the growth, increased wealth, and responsibility of this country, but no faster than the growth in population and wealth and efficiency and responsibility of the country.

Mr. HARDY. I do not want my premises incorrect. My understanding is that the naval bill of 1897 amounted to $30,000,000, and to-day it is almost $150,000,000, and that is five times the amount. Now, what will it be 15 years from to-day?

Mr. BATES. I can not tell the gentleman what it will be, but if the patriotic citizens of the Republic, irrespective of party, will have due regard to the strength, both numerical and financial, of this country, and a due regard to the building program of the other great nations of the world, our naval program will be sufficient in 3, 7, or 10 years from now. If they are wise, they will keep abreast of the times.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman favor me with just one guess of what it will be 15 years from now?

Mr. BATES. That will depend upon the prosperity and strength of the country.

Mr. HARDY. Five hundred million dollars; or what would the gentleman guess?

Mr. BATES. Oh, I am not a prophet.

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

Mr. BATES. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. I take it from the gentleman's remarks that he favors the extension of the Navy for the purpose of national defense, for the purpose of being ready for an emergency.

Mr. BATES. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Has the gentleman read in recent months of the strained relations that existed between England and Germany?

Mr. BATES. I have.

Mr. KAHN. Does not the gentleman think that war has been averted between those nations by the fact that each of them is prepared in its own sphere of military and naval readiness?

Mr. BATES. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the time of universal peace will come when every great nation will be in that condition of preparedness that will make war impossible, and that is the condition that exists between England and Germany to-day. I believe that this Nation will avert war and maintain its own dignity when it is able to speak with authority, when it sends a note not only to Cuba or to Mexico but to some South American Republic, or to Spain, or some of the prouder nations beyond the Atlantic. I say, let no war come, but I believe that the day will be nearer when no war will be in the horizon when we shall have actual preparedness, so that there will not be the hardihood on the part of the other nations of the world to provoke us into a bloody struggle.

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

Mr. BATES. Certainly.

Mr. CLINE. The gentleman says that next year we are going to retire the *Indiana*, the *Oregon*, the *Massachusetts*, and the *Iowa*.

Mr. BATES. Yes.

Mr. CLINE. I would like to know for what reason. Is it because of the defectiveness of the construction of those vessels or because the equipment is not up to date?

Mr. BATES. Both. They are too small and too slow. They have no capacity for the big guns that are needed to-day to cope with the big guns of other nations, and because in a hundred respects they are out of date.

Mr. CLINE. I would like to ask the gentleman if all of those vessels are not equipped with 12-inch guns?

Mr. BATES. Oh, no; they are equipped with two each. The *Massachusetts* has two or four of the large guns. Their guns are mostly small. The ships that we are building to-day have 12, 13½, and 14 inch guns.

Mr. CLINE. I would ask if there was not recently expended on one of those vessels over $600,000 to equip it with up-to-date equipment?

Mr. BATES. Oh, no; they are not heavy enough.

Mr. CLINE. Was not that amount of money expended on one recently?

Mr. BATES. One or two of them have been well overhauled. But if we are going to sell either a navy yard or a ship, we

want to keep it in good repair. If the gentleman has a house that he does not need any longer for his family, that is no reason why he should not paint it and indulge in all ordinary repairs. These are the ordinary repairs that are being put on the older ships of the line.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the way to avert war is to be prepared for war. I hope that war will not come to this country in any way whatever, as long as anyone in this Chamber sees the light of day; but if it should come, I believe it is the desire of every patriotic man and woman and child in the country that we shall be ready; that we shall be as ready as Perry was in his poor way 100 years ago on Lake Erie, or as ready as Farragut was at Mobile Bay, or as Dewey and Schley and Sampson were at Manila and Santiago, to strike and strike successfully for the honor and dignity of the American people and the American flag. [Applause.]

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, in the limited time allowed me I will have opportunity only to make reference to a statement made on the floor of the House yesterday by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in relation to the fortification of the Panama Canal. I read from his remarks:

As our treaty obligations now stand the two greatest nations in the world are pledged to the defense of the canal.

I wish to call attention to the fact that that statement is incorrect. Under the first Hay-Pauncefote treaty the following language was used:

The high contracting parties adopt as the basis of said neutralization—

And so forth.

Under the second Hay-Pauncefote treaty, the one which was finally ratified by both great Governments, the following language is used:

The United States adopts as the basis of such neutralization—

And so forth.

In a memorandum sent to the Senate at the time the treaty was pending, Secretary Hay made this statement:

By a change in the first line of article 3, instead of the United States and Great Britain jointly adopting as the basis of the neutralization of the canal the rules of neutrality prescribed for its use, as was provided by the former treaty, the United States now alone adopts them.

Continuing, Secretary Hay states:

It relieves Great Britain of all responsibility and obligation to enforce the neutrality of the canal which, by the former, has been imposed upon or assumed by her jointly with the United States, and thus meets the main stress of the objection which semed to underlie or be interwoven with her other objections to the former Senate amendments. The United States alone, as the sole owner of the canal, as a purely American enterprise, adopts and prescribes the rules by which the use of the canal shall be regulated and assumes the entire responsibility and burden of enforcing, without the assistance of Great Britain or of any other nation, its absolute neutrality.

The gentleman from Wyoming made the statement I quoted as an argument to show that we did not need to fortify the canal, and the same argument could be advanced to prove that an adequate battleship fleet was not necessary to maintain the neutrality of the canal. These are the facts, for I have quoted the exact language of the treaty and the memorandum which was sent to the Senate by Secretary Hay, proving conclusively that the full responsibility now rests upon the United States.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a consecutive statement before taking up in detail the remarks of gentlemen who have preceded me, and during the period of the consecutive statement I would request gentlemen to postpone interrupting me.

The earnestness shown on both sides in discussing this question is a matter for general congratulation. It is when men are really in earnest that they proceed to search carefully and find the truth.

There is no great subject of national importance upon which there has been given so little earnest thought by the American people, and no great subject upon which careful thought and investigation are more necessary to avoid error and fallacies. I understand this perfectly. We are a nonmilitary people. We are absorbed in a great period of internal development, a period of spreading industrialism and commercialism, and it is natural that we should not give attention to questions of the outside world.

It is unfortunate to hear applause as we have to-day from Members of this House when references were made a short while ago to the supposed uselessness of navies, that we could get along very well if we had substantially no navy, that three-fourths of the nations of the world do get along all right without any navy. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not consider that the question at issue in this bill. I am convinced that the majority of Members on both sides of this House realize that we must have a navy, and are searching to determine what is an adequate navy, not whether we should have no navy or whether we should have an overweening navy. Therefore my theme is what should be the dimensions of an adequate navy.

In order to remind gentlemen that this is an inherent part of our institutions I will take up the authority upon which it is founded. Starting first with the preamble in the Constitution of the United States we find in the first sentence the reasons stated for establishing the Constitution of the United States, and amongs those comprehensive reasons is the following: "To provide for the common defense."

Again, in paragraph 13, of section 8, of article I of the Constitution, Congress is given power "to provide and maintain a Navy." It is not necessary to follow further the question of authorities, other than to cite the Democratic platforms of the last two campaigns. I will read a paragraph from the Democratic platform of 1908, as follows:

The constitutional provison that a Navy shall be provided and maintained means an adequate Navy, and we believe that the interests of this country would be best served by having a Navy sufficient to defend the coasts—

That is plural—

of this country and protect American citizens wherever their rights may be in jeopardy.

The provision of the Constitution referred to in the above plank is the one cited above:

To provide and maintain a Navy.

It follows paragraph 12, of the same section, which authorizes Congress to raise and support armies with a limitation that no appropriation for the Army should extend more than two years, but it will be noted no limitation is put upon the duty to provide and maintain a Navy.

That means all over the world.

I now read from the Democratic platform of 1912—the Baltimore platform—as follows:

The party that proclaimed and has always enforced the Monroe doctrine—

I desire my Democratic colleagues to bear that in mind—the specific reference to the Monroe doctrine. I shall refer to it later—

and was sponsor for the new Navy will continue to develop and observe the constitutional requirements to provide and mantain an adequate and well-proportioned Navy sufficient to defend American polices, protect our citizens, and uphold the honor and dignity of the Nation.

Therefore, accepting the proposition that gentlemen on this side as well as the other desire to provide and maintain an adequate Navy, I shall endeavor, very briefly, to point out what the elements of national defense are from which to determine what constitutes an adequate Navy.

To start with, what is it we must defend? In my analysis I invoke the careful analytical and logical thought of all Members. What must be defended? Life, property, institutions, and policies. I wish to remind gentlemen here when they begin to systematize the elements involved to bear in mind that we have 5,300 miles of coast line on the Atlantic Ocean; we have 4,700 miles on the Gulf; we have 3,100 miles on the Pacific; and this is continental coast line. When we refer to Alaska, to the Aleutian Islands, to Hawaii, to the Philippines—yes, when we refer to Panama, when we refer to Cuba and Porto Rico, without including the coast lines under the Monroe doctrine, we find that America has a vaster coast line exposed to attack from the water than any Nation in the world, not excluding Great Britain.

Furthermore, we find this: That the Old World built its centers of population inland in the early ages of the race, when water transportation was in its infancy. America, on the other hand, laid the foundation of her centers of population late, when she depended largely on transportation by water. Our great centers of population are exposed to attack by water as in no other country. To sum it up, without dwelling too long on the details of this one element, America has 30,000,000 of her citizens living within gunshot of the water, and America has thirty-seven billions of her property lying within gunshot of the water. There are more values of homes and property exposed to naval attack in America than there are in all the rest of the world combined.

Next to the question of life and property, and closely allied with them, comes the question of our institutions. Let me remind my colleagues that our institutions are founded on the principle of the right of local self-government, and that that principle has not been accepted by the other nations of the world. The first element in this principle is State's rights. No great military nation on earth has accepted that principle in America. When Italian citizens were lynched in New Orleans, and the Italian Government said she would hold our Federal Government responsible, our Federal Government

calmly told her they regretted the incident very much, but the Federal Government's authority under the Constitution could not invade the police power of the State of Louisiana, nor could the Italian Government negotiate with that State. Italy replied she would still hold the Federal Government responsible.

When the school question arose in San Francisco, a municipality on the coast, when the question of segregation arose in the Legislature of California, the city of San Francisco and the State of California could not insist upon being protected in the exercise of their rights. The Federal Government was not in a position to fulfill the first obligation it owes to the States—that of protecting them in their rights.

The colonies, when they gave up their armies and navies to the Federal Government, did so under the contract that the Federal Government would maintain them. Think of it, gentlemen, the Federal Government to-day can not protect the States of the Pacific coast in the exercise of the functions of a republican form of government.

The next element of our free institutions is the principle of equality of opportunity, which principle is being projected out by us into the competition for the commerce and the markets of the world. We should not forget that every great military nation in the world with a colonial system absolutely denies that principle. Take our Monroe doctrine. We may differ in many respects as to the responsibilities we bear for the weaker peoples in this hemisphere, but we do not differ on the principle that the colonial systems of Europe shall not be extended over any of them. Those peoples and their countries are going to be developed under the principle of equality of opportunity for all. We shall not hoist our flag there and claim any special advantage, and we will not permit any other nation to do the same. The completion of the Panama Canal will bring to a head the question of the future development of Central and South America. You can not escape that fact. Now, as man is conquering the obstacles of nature, controlling steam and electricity, and conquering the air as well as the land and water, these developments come swiftly. The great natural resources of the world are not going to be held back from supporting the civilization of the world. These lands and these countries are going to be developed, and the question must be settled as to whether they are going to be developed by the system of European colonization and restriction, which embodies the principle of privilege and special advantage of the distant mother country, or whether they are going to be developed under the Monroe doctrine, with the principle of equality of opportunity for all along with the freedom of those people.

Let me also remind my colleagues on this side of the fact that, whether we like it or not, the Monroe doctrine has extended across the Pacific Ocean. We have a greater responsibility for the destiny of the Filipinos than we have for that of the Mexicans or the Cubans. We may give them independence. I believe Americans wish them to have independence as soon as it is consistent with their capacity for self-government. But whether they are made independent or not, we can never allow any monarchy, whether of Europe or of Asia, to establish a colony there. We must defend them as we must defend the weaker peoples of Central and South America, whether we like it or not.

I say this principle of equality of opportunity has gone across the Pacific Ocean. It has been proclaimed in far-off China in the open-door policy, and yet great military powers have already closed the door in Korea and are now closing the door in Manchuria.

When Japan and Russia went into Manchuria, the very first year we lost $22,000,000 of our market for cotton goods and have never gotten it back, and their systems of transportation and administration, now controlled by their Governments, are throttling American trade.

This principle of equality of opportunity, the very end of justice, lies at the foundation of the world's future happiness, and in my judgment is the foundation of peace between nations. America embodies it and is committed to it, and no other great military country of the earth admits it.

We thus have great principles underlying our institutions and great world policies affecting our prosperity and happiness, and the welfare of the world, as well as stupendous values of lives, homes, and property of our citizens, all of which must be defended.

Having taken account of what must be defended, let us now examine the means available for their defense. Inside of a civilized community the means for defense of peace and security of life and limb and rights are provided by the community as a whole. But be it remembered the foundation of this defense is power, power provided by the community, that is greater than the power of any outlaw or any person who does not wish to abide by the law and agree to the settlement of differences by recourse to law founded on right and justice. I will ask my colleagues here, without going into a lengthy discussion, Would they for a moment leave the defense of their country to rest upon any international organization for a common defense of the nations of the world?

As yet there is no organization with authority to make law for the nations to live under. The Hague Conference is but a parliament in embryo. The delegates to The Hague Conference have no authority. Even among themselves they take rank not by any principle of justice, but according to the military power of their countries. At the last conference the Chinese delegates went there representing 450,000,000 souls. They were put down as a fourth-rate power, with Montenegro. The Japanese delegates went there representing 40,000,000 of souls and were put in the first rank. The Korean delegates went there to plead the right of their country to live; they were not allowed to enter the conference.

There is no international judiciary with authority to adjudicate. There is no international judiciary with authority to say what is international law and what is not. In the true sense of the word there is no such thing as international law. Some writers have simply been expressing their opinions about principles of justice and the precedents and practices of nations.

Out between the nations of the world we are to-day, at the present stage of international evolution, about where the English-speaking people were 1,500 years ago. In the evolution of international common law we have not reached the point of having an authority even to say what is precedent. The nations are a long way off from the development of an authoritative international parliament and an authoritative international judicial system, but they are still further off from the development of an international executive, of a power out among the nations stronger than any individual nation, a power which would protect the individual nation in the exercise of its rights as society protects you in the exercise of yours. There is none such.

In the absence of any real international organization for peace and justice some would rely upon treaties of arbitration. Yet the best arbitration treaty in the world between nations of any size in the very terms of the treaty specifically excludes arbitration for questions of honor and questions of vital interest—the very questions over which nations fight. As a matter of fact, the opportunity for recourse to earn this limited arbitration is proportional not to the justice of the appeal but to the size of the applicant's armaments. Would you rest your country's defense upon the strength of treaties of any kind? With whom would you have treaties? Suppose you succeeded in getting every nation in the world to enter into an agreement to protect America, as they agreed to protect Turkey, what nations would they be? The seven great nations of Europe who are now signatories to the treaty of Berlin?

Austria-Hungary is a signatory of the treaty of Berlin; and yet Austria-Hungary proceeded to seize Bosnia and Herzegovina. Was there a protest from the other signatories? No. Germany and Italy backed her up. Italy is a signatory of the treaty of Berlin, yet Italy proceeded to seize Tripoli. Did the other signatory nations protest? No. They backed Italy up. Has China realized national defense from her treaties with the great nations or these nations among themselves? Have treaties defended Korea?

Some argue for defense in the balance of power between other nations. Turkey has worked this a long time; so has China, playing one nation off against another. But nations thus played with sooner or later agree upon the spoliation of their common victim.

My friends and colleagues, amongst the great nations of the earth, in the evolution of social organisms, which goes on like the evolution of all other living things, there is only one defense that is now available to guarantee survival, and that is individual provision by each nation for its own defense.

No other means is reliable. No other means is worthy of a great nation. Realizing that we have vast interests and sacred principles to protect, and that we must rely upon ourselves, let us examine the agencies and instrumentality available for our national protection. A nation's defense is founded upon its people. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] was absolutely correct when he said in the last analysis it is the man behind the gun. It depends upon the physique, the intellect, but above all the character of the average citizen who makes up the nation, provided he has the implements and the weapons that compare with those of his opponents.

But give an Indian a Winchester and he could kill a hundred white men of the highest evolution if they undertook to attack him unarmed. It is all well enough to talk about the man behind the gun, but I will ask the gentleman from Mississippi,

why does he not take some of the advice of the man behind the gun? [Applause.] He says our officers are such wonderful officers. True enough. Why does he not follow their unanimous advice as to matters of national defense upon which they are experts? If the man behind the gun is such a fine fellow, then he is entitled to have a weapon in his hand with which to have a chance not only for his own life, which he holds lightly, but a chance to deliver victory into the hands of his country and to give effective defense to the great principles for which his country stands. If you believe in the man behind the gun, give him a chance. [Applause.]

But let us go further. There must be the resources behind the population. When I see gentlemen go far afield upon the question of the actual needs of national defense, when I hear them begin to discuss the national defense as though it were a hairsplitting proposition of a compromise between public building bills and other matters of ordinary domestic economy, it is actually discouraging. To listen to them you would believe that the question of having one battleship, more or less, in a naval program would determine whether the American people were going to be ground down with the burdens of taxation or not. America has $17,000,000,000 in bank assets. All the rest of the world have but $17,000,000,000. There are gentlemen here who would have us recoil from making provision for national defense on the supposition that other nations would go on faster and that we can not keep up with them and parallel their great armaments. The idea is absurd. We have the men and we have the money. Now, what is the rational method of procedure? It is to take the money and provide economically and efficiently the instrumentalities through which the Nation can operate for an effective self-defense.

There are two great national weapons of defense. One is the Army and the other is the Navy. The Army is founded upon the military activity of the population. I am now speaking of modern armies. Olden-time armies oftentimes were paid mercenaries, hired to fight for the country which employed them, but modern armies are founded upon the principle of the military activity of every able-bodied citizen.

My analysis of the origin of institutions has convinced me that it is military activity of the people that produced and brought forth monarchical systems with attendant oppression. In the centralization that is necessary for efficiency in armies I see the centralization of Governments that were founded after the great wars and invasions of the past. In the hierarchy of the military system I can see the social stratification of the nations of the Old World which confine men's activities to narrow spheres in contrast with the unlimited possibilities of men's activities in our land. I can see there the taking away of men from industrial pursuits that lowers the productiveness of the people. I can see the turning of men's thoughts to the pomp of the military and the cult of privilege and power, lowering the true ideals that a people ought to have of individual worth and useful service. I can see in militarism the greatest obstacle of the past and the greatest obstacle of to-day to the development and progress of Christian civilization. This is fundamental. A nation should employ her men in military activities as little as possible, and the nations that have done so in the past and that were able to do so are the nations that have made the greatest progress.

In contrast with an army, a navy demands but few men. Sea power does not involve military activities of the people. Consequently industrial activities and liberal institutions attend upon sea power.

History shows that every Republic has been founded upon power by sea. There has been no great Republic founded on militarism. For a thousand years England has never been invaded, and to this good day the English have not been compelled to resort to conscription of citizens for their army. That is why the Anglo-Saxon has been able to evolve free institutions ahead of all others. Members of all parties and all ideas will accept this proposition that a nation should employ her resources, her property, rather than her men, as far as she can, for her national defense. The Navy represents property; the Army represents men.

It is estimated that one battleship requiring 1,000 men is the equivalent of an Army corps taking 50,000 men. That one little thousand out on the sea may be military among themselves, but they do not exert any example of militarism to our people. The beauty of our geographical situation is that it is transcontinental, and that all the great nations of the earth lie across the ocean from us. Having boundless wealth, it lies within our power to derive an almost perfect and complete defense through property by putting adequate fleets upon the seas to stand between ourselves and the world's great armies. When I say "great armies" I speak accurately. We are living in a period of armaments such as the world has never seen. There are 30,000,000 armed men across the water ready. When I say "ready" I mean they are not only organized, drilled, armed, and equipped, but that they have the transportation with which they can cross in a few days and reach our shores. It is simply in keeping with elemental instincts of self-preservation, and it is in accord with the evolution of free institutions that America should take full advantage of her geographical position and put sufficient ships between her peaceful shores and the world's great standing armies. [Applause.]

Since we stand only for equality of opportunity, against which none can justly complain, and would never seek a quarrel with others, and, being thus protected, others would not seek a quarrel with us, we could live in peace and security as complete as is possible at the present stage of evolution of the race, and could exert an ever-growing influence in the course of peace and free institutions for the world at large. Thus the Navy should be the main instrumentality for our country's defense; indeed, upon it will rest, in large measure, our country's destiny and the future of the world.

We are now prepared to determine the proper size of the Navy, our true naval policy, and the number of vessels that should be provided in this year's appropriation bill. The size of a nation's Navy is intimately connected with the size of the Army in an inverse proportion. The greater the ability of the Army to provide defense, the less the reliance upon the Navy, and vice versa. A big Army can go with a small Navy, but a small Army requires a large Navy. A Navy without a great Army behind it, as in our case, can not deliver a death blow beyond the water; but a great standing Army, when the sea is cleared, can strike a deadly blow beyond. America having no great standing Army could have control of the sea without menacing any nation, but a military power with a great standing Army would be a serious menace to us if left in control of the sea. It should be borne in mind that without a mobile Army our coast fortifications are open to capture by an enemy in control of the sea, landing troops beyond the range of the forts' guns and taking the forts from the rear. It is logical, it is just and right, that as between America and any great military power we are entitled to and must have control of the sea, for we are absolutely dependent upon this control of the sea as no other nation in the world.

Now, take the Atlantic. On the other side there is a great nation that should be different from all others, and that is Great Britain. She has no great standing army that could strike us, and has her most promising colony with a long contiguous frontier here with America. Canada, like America, has no army, and our preponderating size places her at our mercy. I therefore proceed at once to eliminate the power of the British Navy in deciding the question of what is the proper strength of our fleet in the Atlantic.

What are the other nations? Take the greatest nation with the greatest standing army. This is Germany. Germany has no coast line to defend to speak of, and we could not strike that coast line to do serious harm even if we had control of the sea. But if Germany should have control of the sea in case of a war with America, she could strike our coast line from Maine to Texas, and then through the Panama Canal—because the control of the sea is going to settle the possession of the Panama Canal in war—she could strike it as far up as she pleased in the Pacific.

If Germany has undisputed control of the sea, our American policies must also fall before Germany's policies in Central and South America. Over the sea we are as far from South America as is Germany.

The Germans have not accepted the Monroe doctrine. Their citizens are colonizing in South America. This is not a matter of hypothesis. Many of you remember a few years ago that Germany landed in Venezuela and hoisted her flag. We called on her to retire. Fortunately, as the result of the Spanish War, not from any foresight of our own, but by accident, the mere condition of public opinion temporarily giving some attention to this question having caused us to build up a good Navy for those days, we were the second naval power in the world. Our fleet was probably 60 per cent stronger than the German fleet. We had undisputed control of the sea as compared with Germany. We assembled our whole fleet at Guantanamo. We ordered Admiral Dewey to go down there and take charge. Then, in the most polite and diplomatic language, we requested Germany to retire. She retired in peace with good grace, recognizing that if we insisted our policies must prevail while we controlled the sea.

Since the Russo-Japanese War a new type of ship has come into being—and I will refer a little later to the details of ships—called the dreadnoughts. Gentlemen who are familiar

with industrial matters know that from time to time new machinery is introduced in all of the great industries, and when new machinery is introduced every up-to-date manufacturer who does not wish to go to the wall begins to systematically equip himself with that new machinery. That is what every nation in the world has been doing in respect to dreadnoughts. Take Germany, for instance. Germany has been building four battleships a year, three of them known as dreadnoughts, and one as a dreadnought cruiser, the law providing for them years in advance. America has not averaged two. Last year we got down to one. Suppose when the Panama Canal is completed, and when the question of the development of Central and South America becomes acute, Germany should again hoist her flag in Venezuela or in Brazil or the Argentine. That is not hypothetical. She would be far more likely to hoist her flag then than she was before the Panama Canal was undertaken, far more than formerly, since her citizens have steadily gone to Brazil and the Argentine. Suppose she were to hoist her flag on any part of Central or South America. America would then promptly call upon her to retire, and what would be the situation? By tables I could show you just what it would be, but it is not necessary. I can tell you briefly. We would have all told 12 dreadnoughts and Germany would have 29. I will discuss in a few moments the marvelous theory of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] as to what constitutes a fleet and its integrity. I will simply now take what the nations of the world look to. They look to the first line, to the dreadnoughts. Germany would have 29 and we would have 12. Germany would be in absolute control of the sea. Under those circumstances we would be compelled to surrender the Monroe doctrine or to fight, and fight at great disadvantage.

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

Mr. HOBSON. I would like not to be interrupted.

Mr. MURRAY. I just want to ask the gentleman a question about the relative marksmanship of the men of the two navies.

Mr. HOBSON. I will come to that a little later.

Mr. MURRAY. I wondered if that would have any serious weight in our favor.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I will tell the gentleman that the general principle is that while you have trust and confidence in your own men you do not assume that your opponent is so much your inferior. I know the time—and some of you can remember—when gentlemen like the gentleman from Mississippi—and unfortunately there were many such men in those days in Mississippi and Alabama and other States in the South—thought that 1 southerner could whip 10 Yankees. That is not a wise basis for national defense. I am assuming that the nations, backed up by adequate resources of their own and realizing fully the necessity of national defense, when the time comes will be found as well prepared and with as high efficiency as we are, where our people are continually neglecting the whole question and do not hesitate at times to sacrifice the efficiency of the Navy for a pork barrel. I would like to have the gentleman ask all those questions when I get through with my consecutive statement.

To continue, we would be compelled to fight or surrender the Monroe doctrine. I want each Member here to answer in his own heart which he would do. We would fight. If the gentlemen here would not, the American people would. I claim—and you can not escape it—that the war would be due absolutely to the fact that while this Nation asserted the Monroe doctrine it did not proceed in an intelligent way to make the provision under which that doctrine would be respected and would be effective.

I come back now to a reference of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BATES] to the Spanish War, which furnishes a good illustration. You may recall that in the early nineties we began to insist upon reforms in Cuba, and Spain continued to refuse to make those reforms. Anyone looking into the questions at issue between the nations would have recognized that the policies of the nation that had control of the sea leading to Cuba would have to prevail. If we had proceeded to insure an undisputed control of the sea in the nineties, all of the problems in Cuba would have been settled by diplomacy. Our demands would have been reasonable, and Spain would have granted them. But we failed to provide for control of the sea, and yet became more insistent in our demands for reforms in Cuba.

While the world believed and Spain believed that her fleet was superior to ours, the result was inevitable. We had war. I want now to refer to the cost. Four more battleships at that juncture, which would have been double what we had, would have given America in the eyes of all the world and in the eyes of Spain the undisputed control of the sea and we would have had no war. As soon as we gained control of the sea the war ended. Twelve million dollars would have bought and paid for those ships, but then, as now, were were dealing with pork barrels and quarreling about economy. We did not provide those ships and we had the war. During its progress the war cost $500,000,000, and it is conservatively estimated that directly and indirectly, all told down to date, with pensions which are just beginning and they will run for 100 years, that war has cost us $1,500,000,000. Gentlemen will tell you what it will cost to have equilibrium with Germany on the sea. They will tell you that it will mean tens of millions. They do not tell you what would be the cost of the war that would result from not possessing control of the sea while we insisted upon our policies in conflict with German policies in the development of a continent. Twelve million dollars more put into battleships would have prevented the war with Spain and a few tens of millions now put in judiciously to give us control of the sea would absolutely insure permanent peace with Germany or any other great continental nation of Europe. The Monroe doctrine would be a reality and we would insure the peaceful development of the continent that is below us. We would insure the spread of free institutions and the principle of equality of opportunity in the Western Hemisphere. Gentlemen can well imagine the cost of such an unequal war with Germany.

As I said before, we were the second naval power in the world a few years ago. We are now the fourth. Germany has gone ahead of us. France has gone ahead of us. Germany is building four Dreadnoughts a year and has 23 of these Dreadnoughts available, whereas we have 13, and that is assuming we have completed all and is counting the *South Carolina* and *Michigan*, which only are of 16,000 tons, which we ought not to count. They are good ships, but they are but 18 knots speed, but admitting those, we find France has 13 and is building 7. We have gone below France. And keeping on at one battleship a year what do we find? In 1914 we would have 14, France 15, Japan 11; in 1915, we would have 15, Germany 28, France 17, Japan 13; in 1916, Germany 30, United States 16, that is counting two more than ought to be counted, France 21, Japan 15, Italy 14, and Russia 11.

Going a few years longer, on a one-battleship program, by 1920 we would have 20 dreadnoughts, Germany 40, France 27, Japan 22, Italy 22. We would be the sixth naval power in the world, with Russia coming up fast to make us the seventh. Thus, a one-battleship program would speedily cause America to drop out from among the naval powers of the world. Does any Member of this House imagine that the American people wish their Navy to thus disintegrate at this critical juncture when the world is so disturbed and the Panama Canal is nearing completion?

Now, gentlemen, suppose war does come as a result of our not controlling the sea? Have you investigated what it would mean? Our fourth, fifth, sixth rate Navy, as the case may be, is quickly swept from the sea. The war games show that Germany could then land an army on the coast of Long Island and another on the coast of New Jersey and capture Norfolk, Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and destroy our navy yards, shipyards, and arsenals before we could organize any serious opposition. After exacting a high ransom from these cities, she would reembark her troops and occupy strategic positions in the West Indies, would occupy the Panama Canal and Panama Canal Zone, and would occupy any part of Central America or South America she chose. Her fleets would destroy our coastwise and high-sea commerce, and blockade our harbors on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, and prostrate business from one end of the land to the other, and we would be absolutely helpless, unable to strike a blow. In 1866 Prussia struck Austria. The war was over in a few weeks; Prussia was prepared, Austria was not. In 1870 Germany struck France. The war was over in a few weeks; Germany was prepared, France was not. Reference has been made to the war between Russia and Japan. Gentlemen who rely solely upon America's vast resources should carefully note the course of this war. Russia had boundless resources. The Japanese Army never got within 4,000 miles of Russia's vital territory, but the war was over in a few months, with Russia in defeat. Russia had gone on the supposition Japan would not dare attack her, and was found unprepared. Japan for 10 years had been making preparations for just such an attack. You may recall that America was foremost among the civilized nations of the earth that went down to Russia after the Battle of Tsushima and the Battle of Mukden and insisted that she accept the defeat and end the bloody war. With America's fleet swept away and America powerless to strike, the nations of the earth would come down to us and take the very words out of our mouth which we used to Russia and say, you must not continue to disturb the world's

peace; you are whipped; renounce your Monroe doctrine, cede the Panama Canal or buy it back, pay your billions of war indemnity, and in the name of humanity put an end to this bloody war.

Pressure from within would join the pressure from abroad. Great financial centers, where stocks and bonds preponderate, controlling the cosmopolitan press, would demand that the war end. Project your thoughts into the crisis that would arise. Do you see what it would mean? Pressure from within, pressure from without, to end the war. Suppose under this pressure that we should allow the war to end in humiliation and defeat. I do not know what good gentleman it was who said that if we go on building naval programs the American people, writhing under the taxation, would some day rise and wipe us out of office. I want to say, neglect to take the elemental precautions for the defense of your country that you take for yourself, that you take for your animals, and have the country actually precipitated into war because she did not have the instrumentalities you should have provided, and then, through the same neglect, entail upon this proud Nation the humiliation of defeat—can you picture the public wrath that would fall upon your guilty heads? What would you think of the paltry millions you saved on battleships when for every million you saved you entailed a loss of a hundred millions and put your country in the ashes of defeat and brought about the overthrow of her beneficent policies for this hemisphere? But these terrible consequences would not compare with the after effects upon the course of our institutions. An all-consuming wrath of public opinion would shake the Nation from ocean to ocean and imperiously demand that stupendous preparations be made to fight the war over again in the future—a far more imperious public opinion than that in France, which, since Alsace-Lorraine was surrendered, has for 40 years demanded the militarization of the French Nation.

Now, project yourselves into those conditions and picture what the consequences would be. Every able-bodied man would be drafted into the Army. Military systems would permeate the Nation. Yes; we quibble over 1 battleship or 2 battleships now, but there would not be any quibbling of 10 or 20 battleships then. Yes; we would find it would take some 15 or 20 years to become adequately prepared. During that period there would be anger, rancor, and revenge in the hearts of the American people, and especially the hearts of the growing youth. Talk about amity and good will for all the world! We would have it no more. The militarization of the people would bring the centralization of our Government, the curtailment of State rights and individual liberties. Then it is the demagogue would rise, and if he had sufficient power of intellect would menace our institutions.

This country is safe and its institutions are safe as long as the fiery furnace of war does not engulf us in its flames. By the time we were finally prepared and fought out that second war, what would be the condition of the Union? America would be as military as France. America would be as military as any military nation of the earth. You need not think we are so different from the European nations that our industrialism is fixed. We sprang from them. The heredity of thousands of generations is behind us as it is behind them. Begin to beat the drum here as in the Venezuelan message of President Cleveland, scratch the skin of an American, and you find a fighting man. We would experience what is called in the biological history of evolution a reversion to type. This beautiful civilization of ours, built upon the principle of peace and producing, and not the soldier with the rifle on his shoulder—this beautiful civilization based upon equality of opportunity for all—would have reverted back to the old civilization of the bayonet, from which it recently sprung. The wreck of free institutions would rest upon our heads. The victory of Prussia over Austria gave an impulsion to armaments; the victory of Germany over France gave another impulsion to armaments; and the victory of Japan over Russia gave another impulsion to armaments. No wonder that all the nations of the earth who have looked into this question have leaped to arms. And such a defeat for America at the hands of a great military nation would give a new and even greater impulsion to armaments. For generations the hope of peace would recede, while industrialism would be engulfed again in the old militarism that produced and maintained the oppression of the world for ages. I am not a pessimist, but as a scientific man I know that the forces of gravity are going to hold and the mighty sociological forces operating between nations are going to hold. No one can name the hour, the month, or even the year of its coming, but as surely as this policy of neglect continues—and I believe it is going to continue, for a two-battleships-a-year program is but a policy of neglect—the day is going to come, whether you believe it or not, when we shall find ourselves in the crisis I have described, humiliated at the hands of a great military power. In my judgment, that will be the greatest crisis in the history of the human race. The future of industrialism, the peace of the world, the happiness of mankind will hang in the balance. Oh, the pity of making such a crisis inevitable! But when it comes we can not allow the war to end. With our institutions and the future of civilization at stake, the war of survival must not end in defeat, no matter what may be the cost of victory——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. HOBSON. Suppose you give me the time you gave to Judge WITHERSPOON.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I revise my request, and ask that 40 minutes more be given to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBSON. I shall try not to impose unduly on your patience.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] be extended 40 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to request my colleagues here who are to return to their homes—and it is a great regret to me that some of them are not to come back—that when they go back amongst the people they will bear this coming crisis in mind, whether they agree with me or not as to its approach, so that when it does come they may be prepared to help create at once the public opinion that would cause Congress to act wisely from the very start. Otherwise, it is possible that under this stupendous pressure to end the war the consequences of defeat might not be fully realized by our people. Upon the approach of war the American people ought quickly to be shown how the future of our civilization is at stake, with the future of peace and industrialism for the world hanging in the balance, so that, like one man, they may resolve from the outset that the war shall never end in defeat. [Applause.]

In the face of the inherent weakness of free institutions, the inevitable neglect by our people of these great questions, the mightiest element of our national defense will be this: To let the great military nations of the earth recognize that we foresee that we shall be found unprepared, and therefore that they can not reasonably expect us to permit the issue of the war to be settled simply by a test of preparations, as we have none. Therefore, immediately—simultaneously with the declaration of war itself—we ought to serve notice upon the nations of the earth that we can not entertain at any time any suggestion to end the war quickly, but propose to turn the pages of history back about 300 years and compel a war of endurance; that we do not propose to let the stupendous issues be settled by a test of preparations, where we are weak, but by a test of resources, where we are strong; that we propose to make it a war of exhaustion, as in our Civil War. When this great war comes it will be a test of survival between militarism and industrialism. The happiness of generations unborn will hang upon the issue. Industrialism unprepared must not be measured against militarism ready and prepared. Industrialism's strength is in its boundless resources. When the test of survival comes, we must appeal to the strength of industrialism and not rely upon its weakness. We must not have to fight but one such war. When we are challenged by some great military power because we are unprepared and because we insist on just policies, then, no matter what may be the odds against us at the start, no matter how long it may take, no matter what the cost in treasure and in blood, that nation, whether in Europe or in Asia, must be brought to an unconditional surrender or it must be ground to powder. If Germany or any other great military nation fully realized that a war would not end with the test of preparations, it would very substantially increase our national defense.

But, my friends and colleagues, it is such a pity that there should be any such war. The Almighty has planted industrialism here on the face of the waters so that it could, for all time, insure its free institution, its peace and prosperity through property instead of men with no danger of war and its attendant militarism. The same ships that would guarantee to us peace and security at home would make effective the Monroe doctrine in the Atlantic and the open-door policy in China. Such a Navy would project the influence of America across the waters to the nations of the earth in the interest of equality of opportunity—with equality of opportunity insured in the

Atlantic and in the Pacific, the mighty armaments of the world would not bring special advantage, and survival would be determined by productiveness, not by war.

That is the way to put an end to the mad race of armaments to establish this mighty equality of opportunity and render the armaments unprofitable. Then our Nation and the other industrial nations would survive. The nation that insisted on maintaining great armaments would be handicapped by the operation of economic laws, the stratification of society, turning men away from productive pursuits. America and similar nations that produce would gain the markets and the commerce of the world. The great forces of commerce and industry, the forces of education, the moral and religious forces, the forces of growing sympathy would undermine militarism in its own strongholds. It would be really the dawn of the day of disarmament. Then it would happen, my friends and colleagues, that when American delegates go to The Hague conference and plead that larger authority ought to be given to delegates in order to hasten the evolution of an international parliament, they would be heeded as they have not been heeded thus far. Then it would happen that when we appeal for The Hague tribunal to be developed into an international court instead of a diplomatic body, we would be heeded. The world would then heed us when we suggested the advisability of passing from individual armaments to collective armaments, to the advisability of organizing an international army and navy under the direction of an international council of nations and the ultimate pooling of armaments amongst the most civilized, so that the combined armaments would be greater than the armament of any individual nation. When such an international organization had demonstrated its capacity to protect individual nations in their lives, liberty, vital interests and rights, and had fully demonstrated its ability to settle the differences that inevitably arise between great nations by recourse to law and to justice instead of war and might, then the world would be ripe for the laying down of its armaments, and we should see the dawn of that happy day that has been dreamed of and longed for down the ages, when there would be peace on earth and good will to men.

But, Mr. Chairman, whether we choose this happy road of peace or whether through neglect we stray down the long road through the fiery furnace of war we come out at the same point, America's control of the sea in the interest of the principle of equality of opportunity. We can not escape this impending destiny. The day is going to come when America, the Nation that has no enemies, the Nation that seeks no conquests, the Nation that embodies for the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor, the Jew and the Gentile, the principle of justice and equality of opportunity, when America will reach her white arms out over the oceans and in the name of humanity command to the troubled waters, "Peace, be still," and then a great calm will reign, and we will teach men no longer to raise their hands against their fellows, but to reach out with a hearty handclasp of cooperation extending from State to State, from nation to nation, from continent to continent, till we shall have a veritable handclasp of cooperation girdling the whole world in a brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. HOBSON. I have almost reached the point when I shall be glad to meet all interruptions. One more point, and then I am ready.

Our investigation, then, shows that America has stupendous values of life and property to protect, great and beneficent world policies to insure in the Atlantic and the Pacific, and institutions which we hold in trust for all mankind that call for peace and security. We have found that the Navy is the instrumentality upon which we should rely. With conflicting policies of European nations as to the Western Hemisphere the true basis for an adequate fleet in the Atlantic is one able to insure to us the control of the sea as against any nation of Europe maintaining a great standing army, which at present means Germany. Such a fleet in all human probability would insure our peace and could give no offense to any nation that harbors for us no sinister purposes. We are in a position to define the minimum fleet as well as the adequate fleet.

In case militarism is not willing to abide by the Monroe doctrine, in case it seeks to encroach upon liberty and to destroy equality of opportunity, in case it insists upon oppressing the weak peoples of Central and South America and of the world, in case war must come, we must have at least enough of a navy to enable us to keep the enemy from destroying our shipyards, navy yards, arsenals, harbors, and ports, to keep him from destroying those resources that would enable us to develop the Nation's fighting power so that we would not be compelled to conclude an ignominious peace in order to turn our resources into fighting power. That is the minimum foundation for a rational national defense.

Now, recognizing that we have no mobile Army as the other great military powers have, I submit to you that while we ought to have undisputed control of the sea in the Atlantic, which would mean a good margin of superiority, the minimum basis is at least an equilibrium of naval power in that ocean as compared with any great military power of Europe that has a mighty army ready. It would mean that in the Atlantic we must have at least an equilibrium with Germany.

Now let us turn to the Pacific. My former speeches on this question have dealt largely with the Pacific. I have purposely avoided the Pacific to-day. When I have discussed international relations and strategic positions and have analyzed forces in an impersonal way as officers and legislators of all nations always do in dealing with these great questions, my motives have been questioned. But I want to sum up and remind gentlemen here that the question of the open-door policy is not the only question in the Pacific Ocean to be settled now. We are located in Pearl Harbor. A circle of 4,000 miles in the heart of that ocean has only one harbor, and that is Pearl Harbor. We can control the sea for 2,000 miles from a base. The nation that has control of Pearl Harbor will enjoy the control of the Pacific. As between the white race moving westward with the sun, that has now at last put its frontier out in mid-Pacific; and the yellow man, moving east against the sun, who has put his foot there, too, the race that permanently controls Pearl Harbor will imprint its civilization as against the other on the future of the world. There is no use of ignoring this great historic fact, this critical question of destiny. Our flag is flying over Pearl Harbor, but there are 35,000 Japanese troops there. That is the official report of an Army officer. Pearl Harbor is the most strategic point in all the history of the world. Do you think this Nation or any nation can occupy Pearl Harbor, out in midocean, without the control of the sea? If you think so, you fly in the face of history; you have never looked up the history of Gibraltar and Malta and every other strategic point. Take Guam and the Philippine Islands and the harbors there right on the flank of the great trade routes of the Far East. Do you think we can hold those without control of the sea? If you think so, you rush in the face of history. Take Alaska, a defenseless treasure house. Take Panama. Say what you please about it, the completion of the Panama Canal makes Panama, next to Pearl Harbor, the second most vital strategic point in all the world. If we have control of the sea, Panama is ours for mobilization, for the passage of reenforcements. If the enemy has control of the sea, Panama is his. Do you think we can occupy that vital strategic outlying territory without control of the sea? If you do so, you rush in the face of all history.

Now, it is unwise for us to ignore the fact that the peoples of Asia and the peoples of Europe and their descendants do not live together in close contact. The war in the Balkans ought to remind us that they never have lived together, and that the race hatred that is beginning to develop on the fringes of the Pacific Ocean is but a forerunner of the problem between the white and yellow races that must be settled some day, and settled by America.

I referred to San Francisco, the municipality that had to surrender its right to manage its own schools in its own way. I refer to the Legislature of California, that had to surrender the right of passing segregation laws, laws that would have been just, because the Japanese segregate us. You can not go to Japan and buy a house and lot and live there. I lived there, and they segregated me. They should not find fault with us for treating their people like they treat ours; but we could not mention this—we were at their mercy. The legislature had to surrender the right of local self-government. The full exercise of the police power of this municipality and the Commonwealth, the exercise of the principle of the right of local self-government, were surrendered and are surrendered to-day.

However, I will not dwell on this, but will sum up briefly: The open-door policy involves the great question of the ages, the competition of trade and commerce, a prolific cause of war; the possession of vital outlying territory is a second great historic cause of war; race hatred is a third cause of war; and the conflict of vital institutions the fourth. Those are the four great historic causes of war between nations. They are all four in operation. The only possible way to remove them is to establish a condition of equilibrium. We should establish a condition where we could meet Japan in mutual respect and make mutual concessions. Only then can we hope to solve these problems. If these great causes of war are not removed or counteracted, war must follow as surely as effect follows cause. Reasoning for the Pacific as for the Atlantic, we should have control of the sea, as compared with any military nation of Asia, which means a fleet with a good margin of superiority over the Japanese

Navy. The very minimum is to have always in that ocean an equilibrium, a fleet equal to the Japanese Navy.

Since the Pacific is so vast and vital points so distant from the Atlantic, each ocean must have its own defense. Having the Panama Canal, with its possibilities for concentration, provided we can hold it, we can safely proceed on the minimum basis for the two oceans. Therefore our plan is simple—each year get the ships laid down in Germany, get the ships laid down in Japan, and then lay down enough ships to equal the two. That would mean at the present time, while Germany averages four and Japan averages two, we should average six dreadnoughts.

Now, one step further, and I am through with the analysis. I spoke of a dreadnought. There are really two classes of dreadnoughts—a dreadnought proper and a dreadnought cruiser. I have seen the war games fought out at Newport as to the advantage of the composition of the fleet. I have been there myself and helped fight them out with the naval officers. They find this: That a homogeneous fleet of battleships has advantage over a homogeneous fleet of battle cruisers, for the reason that, while they can not compel an engagement, they could go wherever they pleased and control the sea.

But it also shows that for the battle fleet to realize its full advantage it ought to have fast wings, just like an army whose strength is in the infantry ought to have cavalry. With the present strength of our fleet we ought to have four dreadnought cruisers, two for each wing. Germany builds one battle cruiser and three dreadnoughts; England about the same; Japan a larger proportion of battle cruisers. Therefore the program I am recommending this year, since we have no battle cruisers, is four dreadnoughts and two dreadnought cruisers. This is the program recommended by the General Board.

Now, I want to say to my friends here that for years I have not advocated on the floor of the House what I believed to be the proper program, and my colleagues on the Naval Committee have not done the same. I have never had sufficient time to fully discuss an adequate program in the committee.

It sounds strange to say I could not get the time in committee after the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi that the committee gave so much time pressing forward to battleships that it did not have time to consider the other items of the bill.

The subcommittee, that worked day in and day out for seven weeks on the other matters, did not even recommend the battleships. The whole question of the building program of the Navy was left to the full committee and was settled at one meeting. When I pleaded for time to discuss it a point of order was made, although it was withdrawn. I was going to be limited to 5 minutes, but I got 10. The position of the committee heretofore has been this: The older members would say that, considering the sentiment of the House, the wise thing to do was only to recommend what they thought we could get, and this never exceeded two battleships a year. I present here a table prepared by the Office of Naval Intelligence from the programs of foreign nations, which shows that a two-battleship program will consign us to the position of a fourth or fifth rate naval power:

Strength of the United States in capital of ships built, building, and authorized, compared with other naval powers on Jan. 1 of each year from 1913 to 1920, inclusive.

DREADNOUGHTS (BATTLESHIPS AND BATTLE CRUISERS).

Countries.	1913			1914			1915			1916		
	Built.	Building.	Total.	Built.	Building.	Total.	Built.	Building.	Total.	Built.	Building.	Total.
England	23	13	36	27	14	41	32	13	45	36	13	49
Germany	13	10	23	17	9	26	21	7	28	23	7	30
United States	8	5	13	10	5	15	12	5	17	13	6	19
France	6	7	13	8	7	15	10	7	17	13	8	21
Japan	4	5	9	5	6	11	7	6	13	9	6	15
Italy	1	7	8	4	6	10	6	6	12	8	6	14
Russia	0	7	7	0	11	11	4	7	11	7	4	11
Austria	1	3	4	2	2	4	4	0	4	4	1	5

Countries.	1917			1918			1919			1920		
	Built.	Building.	Total.	Built.	Building.	Total.	Built.	Building.	Total.	Built.	Building.	Total.
England	41	13	54	45	14	59	50	14	64	55	14	69
Germany	26	7	33	28	8	36	31	8	39	34	8	42
United States	15	6	21	17	6	23	19	6	25	21	6	27
France	15	6	21	17	6	23	19	6	25	21	6	27
Japan	11	6	17	13	6	19	15	6	21	17	5	22
Italy	10	6	16	12	6	18	14	6	20	16	6	22
Russia	7	4	11	11	2	13	11	4	15	11	6	17
Austria	4	2	6	4	3	7	5	2	7	6	2	8

The above table has been compiled from the most authentic information on hand.
German program last ship authorized to be laid down in 1917.
English program is that stated by the first lord of the admiralty and a reply to the German law.
The French program expires with the laying down of the last ship in 1917.
The Russian program provided for 4 battle cruisers by 1917.
The Japanese program has not been acted upon, but 13 ships extending to 1920 are to be asked for.
Austrian program expires upon the completion by 1915 of the 4 ships now building, an increase of at least 1 ship annually will be proposed.
The Italian naval law authorizes the expenditure of given sums of money for new construction up to and including the fiscal year 1917-18. The types of ships to be constructed is left to the minister of marine.
For the United States, an increase of 2 capital ships yearly has been assumed.
After the expiration of the current programs, an average of the new construction of each nation has been assumed for the ensuing years.

The effect of advocating only what we thought we could get has educated Congress and the country to think that two battleships a year is a big program. I believe the policy is wrong. I gave way to my colleagues' longer experience, but I shall give way no longer. The true policy for me and, I believe, for a committee is to recommend what we feel, after investigation, to be right and leave Congress to decide the result. Henceforth I am going to insist on time in the committee to discuss the question of battleships, and I am going to come into the House each year that I am here and tell my colleagues what, after earnest and careful and painstaking thought and investigation extending over many years, I believe to be the minimum program. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I shall now be very glad to answer any questions that may be propounded by any gentleman. I have kept a few notes, made during the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], and if I have failed to touch upon all of the subjects that he touched upon, I hope the gentlemen here will ask me anything they have in their minds to bring them out.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of fixing the time when the Philippines are to be given their independence; and I would like also to ask a question respecting the officers necessary to man our ships? I understand we lack about 3,000 officers. How would the gentleman provide for these officers in case of war?

Mr. HOBSON. For the officers?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Three thousand officers?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, we have not properly organized the personnel of the Navy. That is one of the great reforms that the Navy needs. I am hoping that we shall have the instrumentality before long by which we can proceed—under the joint direction of Congress and the Executive, through joint boards, made up of subcommittees from the Naval Com-

mittees of Congress and officers of the Navy, who will investigate and report plans for reorganizing the whole personnel of the Navy, plans for reorganizing the navy yards and naval stations, reorganizing the Navy Department and naval administration, and reorganizing the methods of making the annual estimates. When such a joint board reports, it will have worked out what the number of officers and men should be, and I am confident the number will be based upon and automatically made proportional to the tonnage of the active fleet, with a reserve personnel proportioned to the tonnage of the reserve fleet. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that we have to-day more than enough officers to man all of our battleships, including the old ones and the new, and there need not be any hesitation about providing battleships upon the supposition that we would not have enough officers to man all of the ships. When we put all vessels in commission when war comes—not only the old battleships and the old monitors and the old cruisers and the old gunboats, but every other old craft, down to the old torpedo boats and auxiliary torpedo boats, and all on a war basis—then we would be about 3,000 officers short.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. In the Naval Militia.

Mr. HOBSON. I would add that with enough officers to man the battleships we can improvise from the Naval Militia for auxiliaries and for mosquito fleets——

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like now to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HOBSON. But it is too late when war comes to build battleships.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman answer the question respecting the Philippines.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that Americans are a unit in wishing the people of the Philippine Islands Godspeed in their development and are a unit in encouraging their political capacity by giving them increasing opportunities to exercise it by teaching the child to walk by letting it walk, but I do not believe that we ought to expect a child to rise up out of swaddling clothes and run a race. [Applause.] I do believe we are going to protect them as long as American character is what it is to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman spoke something about manning the mosquito fleet. Does the gentleman count destroyers as part of the mosquito fleet?

Mr. HOBSON. No, indeed; and I am glad the gentleman has brought that out, because when you authorize a battleship you must not think that finishes the authorization. You ought to have four destroyers for every battleship, and the destroyers should be commissioned while the battleship is commissioned. I am glad the gentleman brought that out, and I want to pay my respects to him, for he has been a consistent supporter of the proposition of having sufficient of these auxiliaries to go along with the battleships. I am sorry that I can not say as much for the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], and it is a remarkable fact that men who come in here and talk about our lack of auxiliaries as a reason why we ought not to have battleships are the very men who vote against auxiliaries in the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have been very busy in my committee room, and I have not had the pleasure of listening to the gentleman, but, speaking of auxiliaries, has he discussed that question?

Mr. HOBSON. I have just gotten to it now.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, what I do not know practically about a navy would make a great library——

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him to say that his modesty, with a great deal of valuable information from long years in dealing with these problems, is exceedingly characterisitc and in extraordinary contrast with the astounding wisdom and know-it-all attitude of gentlemen opposing this bill, who have dogmatically settled all the technical questions from strategy and tactics down to the last test for ballistics of great guns [laughter and applause], while some of them never saw a battleship and have been here just long enough to sprout their pinfeathers as Members of this House.

Mr. CANNON. What I wanted to ask was this as a foundation of my query of the gentleman. When that fleet went around the world I was mortified beyond measure that the colliers and a number of other auxiliaries had to sail under a foreign flag, and I am anxious to vote for battleships; but at the same time I am anxious to know that in the event of war that we have proper auxiliaries, because it takes that class of vessels to utilize the battleships.

Mr. HOBSON. I am very glad the gentleman brought that point. We are slowly equipping our Navy with colliers, but in a great war a nation must have an ocean merchant marine from which to draw sufficient colliers and similar auxiliaries. I hope the time is approaching when we shall have a large merchant marine. In this connection I will remark that the naval bill to-day as it comes in is the best-balanced bill that has come in since I have had the honor of being in Congress. It provides six destroyers and six other auxiliaries. I think I may state without involving the secrecy of the committee proceedings that an effort was made to make the number 16. We have not one destroyer per battleship to-day, not one efficient destroyer for a battleship. We ought to have four. Every time we authorize a new battleship we ought to authorize four destroyers in the same bill.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOBSON. I will.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman believe it is necessary in time of peace to have a well-balanced Navy and auxiliaries?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly I do.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Equivalent to what you would have on a war basis?

Mr. HOBSON. I certainly do.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that it takes a longer time to build a battleship or a cruiser than it does to build these auxiliaries?

Mr. HOBSON. Very much longer.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Then, if it was the purpose of the gentleman——

Mr. HOBSON. That is, the necessary time.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania (continuing). To have a Navy to meet emergencies, what is the necessity of having auxiliaries that can be built in a short period of time?

Mr. HOBSON. I want to say that my statement was only comparative. On a pinch you can build destroyers very much more rapidly, but it is very much better not to have to do it. The destroyers ought to be built with the battleships; the mosquito fleets can be improvised and, for a maritime nation, the colliers to which the gentleman from Illinois referred, but in our case, without a merchant marine, it is necessary to provide colliers in advance.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Is it not a fact that it takes about three months to build a torpedo destroyer?

Mr. HOBSON. I will say to my friend we have run along about that time. I also mean to say you do not have to build any armor for them or heavy guns, and in number their engines are standardized. The armor and heavy guns is what usually takes the longest time in building the battleships.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Does not it take 30 months to build them now?

Mr. HOBSON. It takes about that time, a couple of years.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. In stress, can not we build battleships in a comparatively short time?

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman is very much mistaken. If you try to turn out large numbers of battleships you have to consider the question of armor-plate factories and gun factories, which are not commercial plants, and it takes time to make large extensions of these plants. If we tried to build 20 battleships it would probably take four or five years, or even longer on the average. But, if we had to build 10 or 20 or a hundred of these smaller boats, we could turn them out probably in 12 months and later on in 9 or 10 months——

Mr. LOUD. The war would be over by that time.

Mr. HOBSON. Yes; under certain conditions.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. I understand the gentleman that the department is willfully taking 30 months to build something that can be built in 12.

Mr. HOBSON. Oh, no. Does the gentleman have any other questions to ask.

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

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. CURLEY. How long did it take to settle the naval supremacy between Russia and Japan?

Mr. HOBSON. Well, the first battle was fought on the 12th of August before Port Arthur. Tsushima was fought several months later. War was declared in February, if I remember correctly.

Mr. CURLEY. Then the naval supremacy between Russia and Japan was settled in a period of about five months?

Mr. HOBSON. No. They carried on those operations around Port Arthur a long time before they fought the Battle of Tsushima, and the Russian fleet had to be fitted out at Cronstadt and come around. If I should guess at it, I should say about a year.

Mr. CURLEY. How long did it take to settle the naval supremacy between the United States and Spain?

Mr. HOBSON. The war was declared about the 21st of April, and the battle of Santiago was fought on the 3d of July.

Mr. CURLEY. A period of about four months. So that it is possible to destroy a navy in about one-fifth the time it takes to build a destroyer?

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman recognizes here that in that case it was settled by one battle. I will point out to the gentleman—and this brings up a very interesting line—the question of these other battleships. There ought to be two lines of battle, the first line composed of dreadnoughts, the second composed of older battleships. If two fleets of the first line are anywhere near balanced in power, they will both pretty nearly cripple each other. If an appreciable percentage of those dreadnoughts on either side come out unscathed, they will determine the control of the sea, but the chances are if it should be an equal fleet between America and Japan or America and Germany, the fair assumption is they would both destroy each other, and then the control of the sea would rest upon the old-time battleships of the second line that would be in commission and ready.

Now, then, a third line of defense would be behind those, and there is where you would have the mosquito fleets. But I will say to the gentleman that the battle between those dreadnoughts will take place very shortly if the inferior fleet is willing to accept battle, so that for your first line you can only utilize the destroyers you built in time of peace.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. I will.

Mr. SAUNDERS. This whole matter is within the meaning of the word "adequate." Having reference to present conditions, and what you think a reasonable likelihood as to the future, what ought our building program to be in order to have an adequate Navy?

Mr. HOBSON. For how long?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Starting now.

Mr. HOBSON. Just as long as Germany and the——

Mr. SAUNDERS. I mean in the number of ships. I said having reference to the present conditions and reasonable likelihood of the future, as you view it, what ought to be our present building program in order to establish an adequate Navy?

Mr. HOBSON. I am telling the gentleman——

Mr. SAUNDERS. I mean in the number of ships.

Mr. HOBSON. I am telling him. It would be what Germany is averaging a year plus what Japan is averaging, making six battleships—two of the battle cruisers and four of the dreadnoughts.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Our present Navy is very inadequate, because of that view?

Mr. HOBSON. It is fast becoming so. I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi, who was discussing those old ships, that if you let a manufacturing plant that is going to come in close competition with another rely upon its old tools and begin to patch up and repair those old tools it will soon go into bankruptcy. Under his standstill idea the American Nation would soon become insolvent as to national defense. [Applause.]

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DENT having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 8414. An act to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and after that I yield another 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, the conception of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] of an ideal nation is a large number of very large battleships surrounded by a sufficient amount of land for coaling stations. [Laughter and applause.] But I must thank him for relieving my nerves during the course of his remarks. He throws one of these fits annually upon the occasion of the bringing in of the naval appropriation bill.

Now, I am one of those gentlemen, like my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], who has scarcely sprouted his pin feathers, but I have already been here long enough to hear one of the gentleman's prophecies made when he wanted a larger appropriation for battleships. And, being a new Member, my nerves were of course shattered by the direful forebodings of the warlike gentleman from Alabama. As he stood there, with perspiration bursting from his patriotic visage, he portrayed what would occur in this benighted country within 12 months from the time he was then speaking. Twelve months, or 10 months? Well, a month or two in destroying a great Republic like this is not considered in the arithmetic of the gentleman from Alabama. [Laughter.] He destroys them upon short notice.

Upon that occasion the gentleman from Alabama was destroying this Republic with the grim guns of Japan. I wondered then why gentlemen did not go into paroxysms of fear. It is probably because they had heard his prophecies oftener than I had. [Laughter.] When he said our country would be flat upon its back in 10 months, and Japan would have her yellow hands upon our white throats, I was almost persuaded to give him the two battleships. But he said then just what he said a moment ago: Two battleships were not worth a baubee. It would take six to do the work. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama is the Don Quixote of this Congress when it comes to war measures. I do not believe, sir, that we are in any great danger from the nations of Europe. I do not believe that because England has a greater navy than we have we should strive to have a Navy equal to that of England. I do not believe that we should strive to have a Navy equal to Germany's navy. I do not know much about war, and not as much about history as the gentleman does, but I do know that England and Germany and France are arming themselves, and that for centuries they have impoverished the taxpayers and the agrarian populations of their lands to arm themselves in defense, one against the other. I do know that if Germany were to leave Europe and come over into this country, making war upon the United States she would be banished from the map of Europe.

It all resolves itself into this: The cry is for Armies and for Navies, and I say that in the light of history there is not a scintilla in the history of the nations of the earth to justify a standing Army or a great Navy in this Republic. We are separated from the politics of Europe by a great ocean. As long as we stay upon this hemisphere—ample, indeed it is to support all of the children of the generations to come—and attend to our own business, unless we are rushed into a war by loud-mouthed jingoes against the peace and security and happiness of this country, we shall remain at peace. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a good deal about economy, and, being an unsophisticated new Member, with pinfeathers scarcely sprouted, I took a good deal of it seriously. I heard a good deal, I say, about economy. But I have learned two things, Mr. Chairman, in my short service here. A man can bring himself into disrepute in this House more quickly by defending the Constitution and opposing the appropriation bills than by any other course that can be followed. [Laughter and applause.]

When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] began his delightful address, he prefaced his remarks by saying that he was gratified that a Democratic House was following the policy established by the Republican Party. The gentleman's criticism is well taken. The difference between an extravagant Republican and an extravagant Democrat is a difference of principle, and the compliments all go with the Republicans. [Laughter.] The Republican wants to uphold the protective-tariff system. He believes—or tells the gullible world that he believes—that you can make people prosperous by taxing the lights out of them [applause], and that all you have got to do is to tax everything and everybody and thereby make the country wax fat and happy. [Laughter.]

But we Democrats have taken the other view. There is not a Democrat on the floor of this House who has not told the country that for every dollar we take out of the pockets of the people by this protective-tariff tax and get into the Treasury of the United States, it costs the American people $5 to collect it. Then, if what I have said is true, we have an awful accounting to give to the people when they come to judge us for the deeds done in the Sixty-second Congress.

I do not know by just how many hundred millions the appropriations of this Congress will exceed the appropriations of the last Republican Congress, but I do know that we started off with a pork-barrel pension bill that increased the pensions of this country some $40,000,000 or $50,000,000. We promised then that the pork-barrel feature of private pension bills would be dispensed with, but still every Member comes in and gets his pork from the Pension Committee when the time rolls around. So as to the other pork-barrel bills that come before this body. Every man must have his public building in his little town; it is

immaterial whether it has 700 or 7,000 people, according to statements made on the floor of the House. He must have it. If it costs $100,000, according to our Democratic theory it costs the taxpayers $500,000. The trouble about these pork-barrel bills is this, that the committee practice that is followed is "Equal rights for every member of the committee, and special privileges to nobody else." [Laughter.] I do wish and I do fervently pray that the time may come when a public-building bill will be made according to the population and post-office receipts at the place where it is proposed to establish the building, and I do hope the time may come when it may be an automatic matter, so that when a town reaches a certain size and the receipts are a certain amount, the building may result. I say, and I measure my words when I say it, that these pork-barrel bills are a stench in the nostrils of the American people. [Applause.] I know that they are gotten up for the protection of the Members. I know that there is a powerful temptation and a powerful force behind their organization, but that temptation ought to be removed.

I am not as much of an economist now as I was when I first came here. [Laughter.] I have seen so much grand and petit larceny that I am like a soldier who has witnessed bloody carnage on many battlefields. I look upon a litle larceny with more complacency than I formerly did. [Laughter.] My feelings on that subject remind me of what occurred when I was a boy. I hope I may be permitted to rescue a dumb brute from some little obscurity. I was raised in the cross timbers of Texas; that is, with the prairie on one side and the timber of the woodlands on the other. We had a little farm of 114½ acres in the timber belt. We had a good rabbit dog that we called Hunter, and a faithful dog he was. He was part Newfoundland and part shepherd, and old Hunter, on good, level ground, could catch a cottontail rabbit in anywhere from 200 to 250 yards, and on plowed ground he only wanted 60 or 70 yards to catch him. As we boys grew up we needed a little more land to cultivate and my father rented a little farm over in the prairie section, and we carried old Hunter over with the wagon and plows. Over on the prairie they had what they called the mule-eared rabbits, and they said it took a fast dog to make one of them put down his fourth leg. [Laughter.] It was not more than a few hours before one of these mule-eared rabbits got up, and old Hunter took after him, and he made a noise about like a flock of quail flying. He ran the rabbit for a mile or a mile and a half, and in an hour or so he came back with his tongue hanging out, and he was shaking all over, and he lay down under the wagon and stayed very quiet.

The next day a mule-eared rabbit got up in front of him, and he ran him about 200 yards and came back. By the end of the third day the rabbits could play all around old Hunter and he would just raise his head and look at them, but would not stir a step. [Laughter.] I remember when I first came here some one ran into the cloakroom and said the House was about to squander $10,000,000. I jumped up and bounded into the Hall and ran down the aisle and shook everybody as if the Capitol was on fire, and I said, "The people are about to be robbed of $10,000,000." But now, Mr. Chairman, it can be announced in the cloakroom that they are about to be filched out of $50,000,000 and, like old Hunter, the Members just barely look up. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, while we are engaged in the erection of all these magnificent stone structures in Pumpkinville and other great centers of the country for our political safety, it is well to take a little peep into the future as to what people are going to do when we present them with the bill at the next election. They have authorized us now to levy and collect an income tax. We are likely to start out with $5,000 or $6,000 as the minimum income which will be taxed; but even though the tax collector only looks for men with $5,000 incomes, he will find a man or two in every one of these little towns in the South and the East and the West and the North, and I want to say that when a tax collector, authorized by Congress, taps this gentleman on the shoulder and says, "Mr. Brown, we want a couple of hundred from you;" "Mr. Smith, we would like to have $10,000 from you"—I am not referring to any one of my colleagues, but speaking figuratively—the gentlemen who pay this tax will be a powerful advance army fighting for economy in this country. They are going to say, "Why did they build that public building down in that little town over in RODDENBERY's district, where there are only 2,000 people?" They are going to say that there is $65,000 at 3 per cent interest, there is a janitor, there is the insurance, and there is all this expense, and they are going to wonder what sort of economy it is to spend these vast sums of money in towns where the rents are not equal to one-tenth of 1 per cent of the interest on the money. And so it is all along the line of appropriation bills. I wish, Mr. Chairman, and I look forward with pleasure to the time when the income tax shall be developed, as it is sure to be developed, in this country. As a matter of principle and justice, a man ought to pay taxes on what he owns and not on what he consumes, and as soon as our industries can all be made to stand alone and gradually from year to year we develop the income tax, we can take the money from the men who have money, taking a part of the income—if it is a little income, taking a little, and if it is a big income we will take a lot. They will hang a great many of the economists who passed the bill, but it will be a good thing for the American people. [Laughter.]

You will go home and face an outraged constituency. They will not meet you with brass bands and ask you if you got that appropriation for Mud Creek, to dredge it out where it is knee-deep, but they will meet you with a frown and a tax receipt in their hands, and ask you why you sent the tax collector for these amounts to squander in needless appropriations.

Oh, the Republican Party has searched for every excuse to spend money as a prop for the protective-tariff system, and, as was truly said on the floor of the House, that in order to bolster up the protective system the Republican Party would be willing to collect the money and put it in tugboats and carry it out and sink it in the ocean in order to sustain the stock argument that they believe that prosperity is based on the protective system, and to tax the people is to increase prosperity.

Now mark you, Mr. Chairman and my Democratic friends, our position is vastly different. We believe that a tariff is robbery. I want to see a system of direct taxation that will give pause to the tendency of the times to the increase of Federal activity.

You know at the last Congress we almost embarked on a good-roads system. That will come next. The public buildings and pensions are here. Now I want to pay a compliment to the old Union soldiers of this great Republic. Mr. Chairman, they not only saved the Government in the time of war but they have saved it in time of peace, because if they had asked this Congress for the Capitol and all the wealth of the Nation they would have gotten it by a large majority. [Laughter and applause.] Considering their opportunity, considering the flexible nature of the Congress, I wonder at the tremendous moderation of the Union soldiers rather than at their excess. I think they are to be complimented if they have not come in and asked for one hundred and fifty billions instead of a hundred and fifty millions.

There is going to be a great amount of wailing and gnashing of teeth at the next election. Now, I do not think for a moment that our friend RODDENBERY has done the Democratic Party a bit of harm. I wish they would keep talking about it. He said no more now than every Republican will say when it comes to the next election. He said there is no bridle on Congress, and there is none. For one, I doubted the wisdom of taking the power from the Speaker, because I thought it was necessary to lodge the responsibility somewhere that there might be a check on the committees of this House. If the Speaker had had the power that the previous Speaker had, while perhaps he would not have wielded it with such harshness and such unpopularity, still he would have been in a position to have said to these committees, "Thus far shalt thou go and no further." But, Mr. Chairman, I do not know how far the appropriations will go. The gentleman from Alabama wants six battleships, and they are likely to get two. Of course, the Republicans want to get us into all the folly they can. They were too wise to appropriate for battleships, too wise to let the public buildings get so large as to be a stench in the nostrils of every decent man.

They were too wise to let the pork barrels run riot, but rather the old gentleman who was in the chair at that time, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], of blessed memory—and his fame will grow in this country—sat upon the lid and kept it down to within proportions that the constituencies of the country would stand for. But there is nobody on the lid now, Mr. Chairman, and there is going to be an explosion. If you do not cut out this public-building bill, which will carry forty or fifty million when it gets back from the other end of the Capitol, and if you do not watch the river and harbor bill, if you do not get on your knees and pray to the economists who are in charge of the pension measures, if you do not do something to pare these appropriation bills, we will be known as the party who made more promises and more appropriations than any party which ever had charge of the Federal Government. [Laughter and applause.] I do not want this Government to go to building public buildings in every village in the country. I do not want it to go about undertaking to make navigable the dry creeks and small streams of this country, and, with all due respect to my economic friend from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], I do not want it to go into the road-

overseer business or the business of building public roads in this country. The pension bill, the public-building bill, the river and harbor bill, would be but as one hog jowl compared to the barrel of pork that we would have if they ever get a bill known as the public-roads bill. [Laughter and applause.] Think of what it will amount to. Every member of the committee will get a hundred miles of road, and every other gentleman, in proportion to his standing, will get from 30 to 40 or 50 or 60 miles. Mr. Chairman, I believe in economy. I do not want the kind of Nation that my friend from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] wants. I do not want an Army of hundreds of thousands of bristling bayonets and an ocean dotted with tremendous, frowning guns on dreadnoughts. I would rather that we would stay on this God-blessed land, between the oceans, away from the politics of Europe. I wish we could get rid of our miserable little pickaninny holdings in the Pacific Ocean. We have no business with them. They are 8,000 miles from our shores. I do not know where Pearl Harbor is. The gentleman says whoever gets Pearl Harbor will determine whether the race shall be white or black. [Laughter and applause.] Think of it, Mr. Chairman. Awful contemplation! I do not know where Pearl Harbor is, and yet the gentleman tells us if the yellow race gets it we will be yellow, and that it is up to the white race to appropriate all of their earthly possessions to build battleships to hold Pearl Harbor. Do you know we need a good deal of common sense in the Congress of this Nation? and we have got it, too.

Ninety millions of people, the greatest land thieves in the world, descended from the greatest land thieves of history, are not going to be driven off an inch of this tremendous country. We are here. We have driven back all of the foes of our firesides in the years that are gone. We have marshaled armies on the field of battle. We have met foreign countries when there were but three or four or five million of us, and from the issue of those conflicts has risen this great Republic. It is childish, it is foolish, to talk about these 90,000,000 of free people, practically the only republic in the world, giving away their history and traditions, going step by step to a military government, because some gentleman in his fevered imagination has heard something that a war college said might happen to the country. [Laughter and applause.] We can drive back any force upon this earth. So long as we uphold liberty in this country, so long as we uphold the equality of man in this Republic, all of the nations of the earth could not come on this soil and destroy the liberties of the people, and we ought not to want to wage a foreign war.

Mr. Chairman, instead of profiting by the lessons of history, which teach that navies and armies and generals are the bane and foe of liberty, instead of staying on this continent and attending to our own business, rearing schoolhouses and churches and teaching the rising generation to love and watch their liberties and to practice a devotion to their institutions, we are finding ways to build a great navy and a great army. We are tricked in this way and that way. We give our wealth to build a Panama Canal, to have a general come up with his epaulets and blandly advise us, "Now you have done that which means an addition of 25,000 to the standing army." We have been begged to build the Panama Canal, and then we are assured by gentlemen that in order to hold it we have to have a great navy at each end of it. I do not believe that. If the whole world is in conspiracy against us and the size of the navy shall determine the color of the race, we may not be yellow as the gentleman surmises, but we will undoubtedly be English again, because we will never be able to build a navy as large as England. I wish gentlemen could get rid of this nightmare, not only the gentleman with the grand nightmare, but gentlemen with little nightmares all over the land. [Laughter.] I wish they could get it out of their heads that we must stand here trembling because we are about to be invaded. Who wants to invade us, except to buy our cotton and corn and beef—and marry our rich girls? [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I challenge the historians of this House to point to a single nation that ever existed upon the earth that was completely fitted by geography to do without an army and navy to maintain free institutions, except the United States.

France can not do it; she has got to have an army and a navy. Germany can not do it, England can not do it, Japan can not do it, but God has placed us upon this continent, separated from the world by seas and impassable barriers of nature, and if we run to military seed, as every other republic has done in the past, if some general—some Diaz or Huerta—comes on horseback, and finally this Republic goes down in the night of military despotism, as every republic in every age of the world has done, we will owe it to the fantastic Don Quixotes who tax the people to fight windmills of their own imagination. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I reserved a portion of my time, and I desire to yield it to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LOUD].

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BATES] in his remarks made some comparison between the ships of our Navy at the time of the Spanish-American War and the battleships of to-day. It reminded me that when I was at Annapolis on the Board of Visitors, in conversation, a gentlemen—a civilian, but who was a graduate of the Naval Academy—said to me, "Do you know that a battleship of to-day is equal to 60 *Oregons* of the Spanish-American War?" I was astounded, and I said, "I think you are somewhat radical." He said, "You think of it and see"; and so I did study it afterwards, and I want to give you the result of my thought upon that subject.

As I looked into it I found that the guns of our Navy to-day are double the efficiency of the guns of 15 years ago. The 14-inch guns of our battleships to-day carry shot weighing fourteen hundred and odd pounds. The 13-inch guns of the *Oregon* carry 1,130 pounds. The 13-inch guns of those days were 35 calibers in length, and our 14-inch guns are now 45. We now have a muzzle energy and penetrating force of over double what we had then. So much for the guns.

The battleship *Pennsylvania* of to-day will carry 12 guns. The *Oregon* carried 4, so we have three times the number of guns on the battleship of to-day we had then, and three times two makes six—six times the efficiency we had at the time of the Spanish-American War. Then, at the time of the Spanish-American War, we could load and fire the 13-inch guns once in five minutes. Now we can load and fire three times in one minute. Speed in operating the guns is fifteen times as much as it was then. Fifteen times six makes ninety. There you have a little more than the 60 of my friend; you have 90.

Then, again, the accuracy of our gunners. We find that in those days the average percentage of hits was 3 to 5 per cent, but for comparison we will give it the larger number of 5 per cent. To-day it is upward of 50 per cent, or ten times the accuracy we had then. Ten times ninety makes nine hundred. I am not going to tell you a battleship of to-day is equal to 900 *Oregons*, but I am giving you the figures and you can draw your own conclusions. It only goes to show that skill and brains have gone into the building of our ships and what magnificent results they have brought forth. We now have larger ships—two or three times larger. We now have heavier armor on our ships, and our ships have 5 knots greater speed than they had at that time. The battleship range then was from 3 to 5 miles, and the *Oregon* in its longest shot, made at the Battle of Santiago, carried an elevation for 10,000 yards. Now the range of our 14-inch guns is at least 21,000 yards and a battle range of from 8 to 10 miles. So much for the ships of those days and the ships of to-day. I do not argue that the ships built by other countries have not been making the same advance. They, too, have been building better ships, and we must not underrate the ships of other countries

Now, what is the amount that we should expend? Our bill carries $146,000,000. We find Great Britain spent last year $228,430,064, and the year before $216,000,000, and the year before $197,000,000. Germany spent, a year ago, $110,715,043, and the year before $107,000,000. France spent $81,692,832, and the year before $80,371,109. Japan spent, 1912–13, $46,158,216, the largest amount, I think, that they have ever spent in one year. Now, there are two things to which I desire to call attention concerning the amount of money spent on the navy in those countries. In the first place, Japan, for instance, in its financial condition after the Russo-Japanese War, has had far greater difficulty in bearing the expense of $46,000,000, with the smaller population of that country, than $146,600,000 is with us, the richest nation on the whole face of the globe.

Not only that, but $46,000,000 in Japan will go two or three times as far as that amount would in the United States, and the same in smaller measure can be said of Germany. The amount of $110,000,000 in Germany will go at least 50 per cent further, because most of it in the final analysis goes to labor, which is far cheaper in that country than in this. That is equivalent to a good deal more than $146,000,000 in this country. How much shall we spend? We should spend enough to maintain the honor of this country, to maintain a Navy large enough to guard us from all danger from any other country. When you ask what size of Navy I would advocate, I believe with the importance of this country and our great wealth, the richest nation in the world, that we should stand at least second among the nations of the earth. [Applause.] If we stand second to Great Britain we need not have over half their naval strength and still be stronger than Germany, the now second power.

When we compare the navies of the various countries there are same facts which I think it would be well for us to consider and which I desire to put into the RECORD. We find that in capital ships—battleships and battle cruisers—built and building by the various powers that England will have 76, with a tonnage of 1,417,935; Germany, 43 capital ships, with a tonnage of 766,894; while the United States will have 37 ships, with a tonnage of 610,796; France, 27 capital ships, with a tonnage of 447,649; and Japan 20 ships, with a tonnage of 372,980. While England will have 76 ships and Germany 43 and we 37, do not overlook the fact that the average tonnage of the English ships will be 2,000 tons more than our own. The German ships will average more than 1,000 tons per ship than ours. When we take the dreadnoughts that are built or buiding we find that England will have 25, with a tonnage of 580,350; Germany 17, with a tonnage of 384,730; the United States 12, with a tonnage of 276,650. Of battle cruisers, England 11, with a tonnage of 248,300; Germany 6, with a tonnage of 139,364; with the United States, none at all; Japan 4, of 110,000 tons.

It is not because we do not want battle cruisers. They are strongly advocated by our naval board and by the Secretary of the Navy, but believing that the House would not consider any more than two battleships we have had to strike them out of this bill in the committee. I hope the day will come, and come soon, when we can have not only battleships but have a reasonable number of swift battle cruisers to go in our fleet. As far as other cruisers are concerned, England has 124, with a tonnage of 873,475; Germany 52, with a tonnage of 256,946; the United States 26, with a tonnage of 223,055; France 31, with a tonnage of 256,375; and Japan 27, with a tonnage of 198,813.

We have the smallest number of any of the five powers. England has 124, Germany 52, France 31, Japan 27, the United States 26.

Of torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers England has 233, with a tonnage of 147,074; Germany 140, with a tonnage of 73,894; the United States 50, with a tonnage of 37,815; France 241, with a tonnage of 52,046; and Japan 112, with a tonnage of 28,441.

This illuminates the subject of auxiliaries, which has been discussed here upon the floor, showing how poor we are in auxiliaries as compared with the other navies of the world.

In submarines England has 86, with a tonnage of 39,508; Germany has 32, with a tonnage of 15,340; United States 39, with a tonage of 13,781; France 109, with a tonnage of 35,259; and Japan 16, with a tonnage of 4,434. In total tonnage built and building here are the comparative figures: England, 2,478,152 tons; Germany, 1,124,257 tons; United States, 898,345 tons; France, 806,729 tons; Japan, 613,724 tons.

In every line, large and small, we stand far below the second nation—Germany. It is not for me to pose as an authority before this House as to what we should have as a Navy. I know you would prefer some higher authority, and I have it here on my desk.

At the time of the Spanish-American War it so happened that I was on the other side of the globe, and it also happened that I was in Dewey's fleet. I had the opportunity—a glorious memory to me—of seeing the personnel of our Navy in action, and it was a sight that would delight any patriot's heart to see how our men and officers carried themselves on that crucial day in far-off Manila Bay. [Applause.] While one admired every man in that fleet, officer and enlisted man, yet one carried away great admiration and love and respect for the grand man who commanded that fleet and who won that victory, utterly destroying the Spanish fleet without the loss of a single American life. [Applause.] And surely that man, who is now promoted to the head of this Navy of ours, who stands as the president of the General Board, is so respected that his opinion is worth consideration by every Member of this House. I am going to read in my time the views of Admiral Dewey upon the size of the Navy which he would recommend, and this article was published a week ago last Sunday in 11 of the largest newspapers of the country.

He says:

Admiral Mahan has stated that the size of the Navy must be determined not so much by what a nation is willing to accomplish as by what it is willing or unwilling to concede in respect to national policies.

The United States must, therefore, measure its strength with the nations that are most likely to oppose our policies, and this strength must be judged by comparative and not by absolute strength.

The United States Navy at present ranks third, with Great Britain and Germany first and second, respectively, and France fourth. With the definite building programs possessed by Great Britain, Germany, France, and Japan, the United States will soon drop to fourth place. The General Board of the Navy (of which I am president) recommended as early as 1903 that the ultimate strength of the United States Navy should be 48 battleships with the necessary auxiliaries, and this policy has been consistently advocated from year to year.

Dreadnoughts must constitute the basis of our building program. At the present time the United States and Germany are nearly equal in capital ships now built or building; but we will soon be third. At the rate of two battleships each year, the United States in 1921 will have 35 dreadnoughts and pre-dreadnoughts; Germany, according to her 1911 program, 55; and Japan, as nearly as can be determined, 36. Situated as we are with such an extensive coast line and interests in the Atlantic and Pacific, our Navy must be prepared for an enemy in either ocean.

PANAMA THE NEW NAVAL KEY.

The Panama Canal, however, will be of immense military advantage to us, because it will enable the concentration of the fleet on either coast in a much shorter time. Without the canal, to insure naval supremacy we should possess a fleet in each ocean superior to that of our most probable enemy in that ocean. With the completion of the canal, the United States, due to its ownership, assumes new responsibilities and obligations. It must exercise military control of and maintain peace in the Canal Zone and its vicinity. Our traditional Monroe doctrine and the open-door policy must be supported. We must be prepared to defend these policies and be ready to defeat any antagonist likely to challenge them. This can only be done by having a Navy adequate to meet any sudden emergency.

And here is a word—"adequate"—which is the very crux of the whole matter:

By "adequate" is meant a navy powerful enough to seek and destroy that of the enemy.

Wars are certain to come, and the Nation must be prepared. The history of all ages has shown that the proper provision for peace is preparedness for war. A large navy makes for peace and is an essential asset to the nation possessing it. National supineness has cost us much in the past, and we can not afford to have it repeated.

WEAK NAVIES HAVE SPELLED DEFEAT.

Cornwallis was not properly supported by the navy. Consequently England lost her colonies. Napoleon fell because Villeneuve was no match for Nelson. The Confederacy lost because the Federal Navy blockaded all its ports, shutting off supplies and revenues. After Spain's Navy was destroyed her colonies were no longer tenable. The defeat of the Russian Navy by the Japanese decided the Russo-Japanese War. Italy in its recent war had command of the sea, and Turkey had to make peace. The Greek Navy at the present time has been a powerful factor in the success of the Balkan States against Turkey.

To have a weak navy courts attack, disaster, and defeat. Diplomatic demands in international affairs will be heeded only if a nation has the necessary force to back them up. The navy is an important factor in international settlements. This Nation can not afford to be content to have its Navy relegated to fourth or fifth place.

The Spanish-American War, which lasted about 100 days, cost us approximately $500,000,000, or about four times the total annual expenditure for the Navy, and this does not include the yearly pensions resulting therefrom, to say nothing of the lives sacrificed. Fifty million dollars properly spent on battleships preceding 1898 would have made this war a hopeless undertaking for Spain.

OUR STANDING BEFORE THE WORLD.

The United States in recent years has become a world power, necessitating the assuming of corresponding responsibilities. These obligations our representative citizens are willing to accept, but turn to our military experts for guidance; and their studies, and not political or economic conditions, must decide.

We must have a Navy, not to wage but to prevent war. It must be a well-balanced Navy—that is, battleships, with the proper proportion of auxiliaries, such as destroyers, scouts, supply and repair ships, etc.; but battleships are paramount, and the building of them must continue. It requires three years to build a battleship, and they can not be bought or improvised. Battleships deteriorate and become obsolete in time, so that provision must be made to replace those in service. Carefully studied and scientific preparation for war must be made in times of peace by our naval officers, but Congress must provide them with the necessary ships. If they fail in this, when war comes—as it surely will—the Nation will not be entitled to win success, but only humiliation and defeat.

Mr. Chairman, during the existence of our country, in 137 years we have been engaged in a war six different times, on the average once in every 23 years; and according to the law of chances it is surely living in a fool's paradise to say that because we are at peace to-day there is no danger of war hereafter.

The condition in our country to-day is a good example of what is liable to come to us at any time. A year ago no one would have thought of such a thing as our being embroiled or brought into war with our neighbor on the South, and yet for the last 10 days we have been on the very brink of it, and we are now drawing a long sigh of relief, hoping that the danger has passed and that war will not come to us again at this time. And yet, Mr. Chairman, a year ago we were in just as much danger of being embroiled in a war with the countries of Europe as we have recently been in danger of becoming embroiled with Mexico. God forbid that the day will ever come, but on the law of chances we must expect that sooner or later we shall have a war with some other country.

I was not here in Washington, or, indeed, in this part of the world, when the Spanish-American War began; but one who is near and dear to me sat in the gallery yonder and heard right here upon this floor Members upon that side demand an immediate declaration of war against Spain, and because our good President would not at the moment consent he was vilified upon this floor and called all the names that congressional etiquette would permit here. He was vilified as much as a man could be simply because he would not declare war as soon as they wanted it right here, and he was burned, as I understand, in effigy in some parts of the country because it was thought

that he lacked the proper resolution. I do not know how to state the reason in decorous terms, but he was vilified because he would not declare war when they demanded it. And when a month had gone by and he, in the meantime, with his Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War, had made the preparations that were needed, war was declared, and from that day to this not a man in the United States has ever criticized our splendid President, William McKinley, because he did not declare war when it was first demanded. [Applause.] And those who object most to preparing for war and object most to the proper upbuilding of our American Navy would be the very first, if a crisis came, to complain of our unpreparedness. It is the duty of every patriotic citizen of this country, I believe, to stand by the Navy, because when war does come, as it will, it must come primarily upon the sea. This will probably be the last time I shall ever have a chance to vote for battleships, but if I had my way I would gladly vote for three this year to make up for the deficiency of last year, and I would continue the policy of two or more battleships year in and year out until we had a Navy fully equal or a little superior to that of any other power in the world except England. [Applause.]

Let me repeat with emphasis, and call it my swan song if you will, I believe it is the duty of this country to stand at least second among the nations of the earth as a naval power. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

[Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WARBURTON].

[Mr. WARBURTON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close general debate on the naval bill at this time, so that we may begin reading the bill under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that general debate on the naval bill do now close.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. 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. 22812) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, and pending that motion I move that general debate on the bill be now closed. On that motion I demand the previous question.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. PADGETT), there were—ayes 28, noes 20.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr, Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

During the call,

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the roll call and all proceedings connected therewith, and that general debate on the naval appropriation bill close at the expiration of two hours on Monday.

Mr. MURRAY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the standing order of the House to meet at 10.30 o'clock applies on Monday?

The SPEAKER. It does. The House meets to-morrow—Sunday—at 12 o'clock for eulogies, but that does not interfere with this request. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to vacate this roll call and all proceedings connected therewith, and further asks unanimous consent that general debate on the naval bill on Monday shall not exceed two hours. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for three days, on account of sickness in his family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 26279. An act granting the Fifth-Third National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio, the right to use original charter No. 20; and

H. R. 20102. An act relating to proof of signatures and handwriting.

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. 8414. An act to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 26648. An act for the relief of David Crowther;

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Isaac Thompson;

H. R. 17260. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish in the Department of the Interior a Bureau of Mines," approved May 16, 1910;

H. R. 28187. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across and over the Great Kanawha, and for other purposes;

H. R. 27837. An act to authorize the Buckhannon & Northern Railroad Co. to construct and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of West Virginia;

H. R. 21220. An act to extend the power of the Commissioner General of Immigration, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor;

H. R. 26812. An act to provide for selection by the State of Idaho of phosphate and oil lands; and

H. R. 23293. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Colorado Springs and the town of Manitou, Colo.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, February 23, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Wills Strait, Casco Bay, Me. (H. Doc. No. 1416); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Sulphur River, Tex. and Ark. (H. Doc. No. 1418); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Attorney General of the United States submitting supplemental estimate of appropriations required by the Department of Justice for the fiscal years 1912 and 1913 (H. Doc. No. 1417); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 28764) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act regulating fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 22, 1875, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1567), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 28809) to provide for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1566), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 28765) to amend section 44 of an act approved March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1565), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 7802) to amend section 103 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1568), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 28838) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Merchant and Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 28839) providing for the election of postmasters in second and third class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 28840) authorizing the construction of a railroad bridge across the St. John River between the town of Van Buren, Me., and the parish of St. Leonards, Province of New Brunswick, Dominion of Canada; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 28841) providing that the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing shall be a practical plate printer; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 28842) to improve the postal service and to fix the salaries of postmasters of the fourth class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PARRAN: A bill (H. R. 28845) to provide for the creation of the office of assistant to the medical officer in charge of physical training and naval hygiene and physiology at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: Resolution (H. Res. 860) to reprint 1,000 additional copies of the Soil Survey of the Biloxi Area, Mississippi, for use in the House document room; to the Committee on Printing.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress power to regulate the hours of labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), joint resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of Wisconsin, that Congress be memorialized to grant a pension of $2,500 a year to the widow of the late Lieut. Gen. Arthur MacArthur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to grant a pension of $2,500 a year to the widow of Lieut. Gen. Arthur MacArthur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring a pension for the widow of Gen. Arthur MacArthur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the granting of a pension of $2,500 a year to the widow of the late Lieut. Gen. Arthur MacArthur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 28843) granting a pension to Carrie Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 28844) for the retirement of James C. Gunn, first lieutenant, Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of the Women's Club of Beaver Dam, Wis., and of Mrs. H. E. Andrews and others, of Portage, Wis., favoring the passage of the McLean bill for the Federal protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of legislation for the establishment of a permanent tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of sundry citizens of Miami and Pensacola, Fla., protesting against the passage of certain bills regulating pilotage; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of W. T. Eddingfield, Henry J. Hallam, Jackson A. Winer, J. L. Redinor, N. M. Williams, and the Pastors' Federation of Washington, of Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of the Jones excise bill for limiting the number of saloons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Otter F. Stieffeland, H. A. Steinwender, and W. J. Steinwender, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Johnston excise bill for the proper observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Mrs. W. F. Dimock, New York, favoring the passage of Senate bill 5494, granting the George Washington Memorial Association the armory square as a site upon which to build the George Washington memorial building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Joseph Helde and 11 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 5461, to regulate the traffic of liquor in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of George M. Gibert, St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of House bill 25685, providing for the labeling and tagging of all fabrics and articles intended for sale under interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Francis O. de Luze & Co., New York; Iowa Liquor Dealers' Association, Clinton, Iowa; Melvale Distillery Co., Baltimore, Md.; Imperial American Wine Co.; Bishop-Babcock-Becker Co., and St. Louis Brewing Association, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 5461, to regulate the traffic of liquors in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of legislation for the establishment of a permanent tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress power to regulate the hours of labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of citizens of Utah, favoring the passage of legislation asking for a Federal investigation of the persecution of the editors of the Appeal to Reason; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Also, petition of the J. C. McDonald Chocolate Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring the passage of legislation for placing nuts on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Petition of J. P. Brest, Moravia, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 1339, granting an increase of pension to veterans of the Civil War who lost an arm or leg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of George E. Blackhall, George Brady, Richard Vdmittke, Alexander Findlay, and W. J. Murray, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the naval appropriation bill providing for the building of one of the new battleships in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Interborough Association of Women Teachers, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 19115, for payment due old men and women found by the Court of Claims for labor in the navy yards; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic of Nebraska, protesting against the passage of the bill to transfer the Pacific Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Petition of sundry citizens of Vale, S. Dak., favoring the passage of Federal legislation authorizing national banks to make loans on farm-mortgage securities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NEELEY: Petition of citizens of Pawnee County and Barton County, favoring the passage of House bill 28188, providing for reconstruction and maintenance of the old National

Road from Cumberland, Md., to St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Kansas, protesting against the passage of legislation requiring higher licenses and qualifications on rural salesmen of home remedies, spices, toilet articles, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Barton County, Kans., favoring the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill preventing the shipment of liquor into dry territory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Finney County, Kans., favoring the passage of legislation for the establishment of a system of foreign credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PORTER: Petition of citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., favoring the passage of the Weeks bill for Federal protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of citizens of Asbury Park, Woodbridge, Jamesburg, Englishtown, South River, Freehold, and Metuchen, all of New Jersey, favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, Bowling Green, Ky., protesting against the passage of the Johnston Sunday bill (S. 237) for the proper observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Mary Floyd Tallmadge Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring the passage of the McLean bill for the Federal protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of the United Hatters of North America, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of legislation reducing the tariff on hats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, *February 23, 1913.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Hear my cry, O God; attend unto my prayer. From the end of the earth will I cry unto Thee when my heart is overwhelmed; lead me to the rock that is higher than I. For Thou hast been a shelter for me and a strong tower from the enemy. I will abide in Thy tabernacle forever; I will trust in the covert of Thy wings.

From time immemorial, O God our Father, men's hearts have turned instinctively to Thee in great crises for help, in sorrow and grief for comfort, in every contingency for inspiration and guidance; so our hearts turn to Thee as we assemble in memory of men who by faithful service in State and Nation gained for themselves the respect and confidence of the people, wrought well among us, left the impress of their personality upon our minds, and made a place for themselves in our hearts which time nor space can erase. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

"We leave this and straightway enter another palace of the King more grand and beautiful."

We mourn their going, but not without hope. We are cast down but not overwhelmed, dismayed but not confounded.

For the love of God is broader
Than the measures of man's mind,
And the heart of the Eternal
Is most wonderfully kind.

Enter Thou O God our Father into the desolate homes and bind up the bruised and broken hearts with the oil of Thy love, that they may look through their tears to the rainbow of hope and follow on without fear and doubting into that realm where all mysteries shall be solved, all sorrows melted into joy, soul touch soul in an everlasting communion, and eons of praise we will ever give to Thee, in the spirit of the Lord Christ. Amen.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Journal. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

There was no objection.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT C. WICKLIFFE.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the special order.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana, by unanimous consent,

Ordered, That Sunday, February 23, 1913, at 12 o'clock m., be set apart for addresses upon the life, character, and public services of Hon. ROBERT C. WICKLIFFE, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 861.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. ROBERT C. WICKLIFFE, late a Member of the House from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased and in recognition of his distinguished public career the House at the conclusion of the memorial exercises of the day shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, we are here convened to pay honor to the memory and to delineate the life, character, and public service of one of Louisiana's most promising and polished sons, the late ROBERT C. WICKLIFFE, who, on the 11th day of June, 1912, was cut off in the flower of his youth and in the height of a career of usefulness to the people.

In the usual course of human events the sadness of death is softened in the preparation of its inevitable coming, but when, without premonition or warning, it takes from our midst the loved and honored and lays at our feet the cold and inanimate clay in exchange for the pulsate life of a warm and joyous heart, the blow falls heavily, and the will of God seems a wondrous way that is hard for us to understand. Yet I know of no one better prepared to face the judgment of God without preparation.

ROBERT C. WICKLIFFE was born on May 1, 1874, at Bardstown, Ky., while his parents were visiting relatives in that State; hence Kentucky commingles her pride and her sorrow with that of Louisiana in the life and death of her illustrious son. They both suffered a common loss.

He received his primary education in the public schools of West Feliciana Parish, La., thereafter entering Center College, Danville, Ky., from which institution he graduated in 1895 with the degree of B. S. Immediately after, he matriculated as a student in the law department of the Tulane University, at New Orleans, La., completing his course in 1897, after which he returned to West Feliciana Parish and actively entered into the practice of his chosen profession.

His people, at once recognizing and appreciating his transcendent ability, elected him to represent that parish in the constitutional convention of 1898, and after the adjournment of that august body he enlisted in Company E, First Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, and served throughout the Spanish-American War, and was mustered out with his regiment in October the same year. He returned again to West Feliciana Parish to resume the practice of law, and in 1900 was elected district attorney of the twenty-fourth judicial district of Louisiana, serving his people in that capacity with distinction up to 1904.

In 1908 he became a candidate for the nomination for Congress from the sixth congressional district, and, having received the nomination in the second primary, was elected to the Sixty-first and reelected to the Sixty-second Congress without opposition.

Mr. WICKLIFFE was of noble and distinguished extraction. His grandfather, Charles A. Wickliffe, served several terms in Congress, was governor of Kentucky, and subsequently Postmaster General in the Cabinet of President Tyler. His father, R. C. Wickliffe, was governor of Louisiana.

Now, while it is perfectly clear that a great name was handed down to "BOB" WICKLIFFE, yet it is equally obvious that he united distinction to the honors his ancestry had already gained.

In looking over the life of Mr. WICKLIFFE the soil of my nativity becomes dearer to me for having nurtured such a man, not that his accomplishments have drawn him into the spotlight of public recognition, not that his genius overshadowed the efforts of his fellow men, but that he crowned manhood with the dignity of honor and the spirit of loyalty, linked the refinement of the southern gentleman to the rugged worth of the son of toil, and by no act of his lessened the respect due to his life of usefulness. The result of his work in the estimation of his char-