others, of Hinton; J. P. Brace and others, of St. Albans; R. E. L. Lloyd and others, of Gassaway, all in the State of West Virginia, in favor of House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petitions of James Smith and Moses Alwine, of Johnstown; John C. Cosgrove, of Cherry Tree; John L. Zeth, of Hopewell; I. J. Hoover, of Patton; I. L. Binder and Amandus Baker, of Hastings, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against a war tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hostetter Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of the Hollock Denton Co., of Newark, N. J., protesting against tax on alcohol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Phillip Matty, H. B. Smith, Carl Wilk, F. H. Plate, H. Planten & Son, C. F. Hatterman, Prof. Otto Rauenheimer, J. H. Schell, W. G. Turner, M. Arneman, I. D. McElhenie, T. C. Bonaeu, P. H. Henkel, J. H. Rehfuss, H. Neetzoldt, Adolph Schwartz, S. Glasscoff, W. H. Bresheuschu, H. Flinning, Alexander Gardner, Fred Burgett, all of Brooklyn; C. L. McClouth, of Little Valley; and Henry R. Lathrop, of New York, all in the State of New York, against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. Quackenbush, of New York, favoring Moss bill (H. R. 17329); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARR: Petition of W. H. Kanter, of Somerset; G. N. Schrock, of Somerset; Arthur L. Knepp, of Sand Patch; Charles A. Trapp, of Listie; Will T. Gordon, of Hastings; Carl J. Fronheiser, of Johnstown; U. F. Rayman, of Berlin; H. W. Judy and Cornelius Judy, of Garrett; Dr. R. B. Colvin, of Somerset; Max Halpert, of Jerome; S. E. Engle, of Boynton; Axel Person, of Ridgway; John C. Cosgrove, of Cherry Tree; Daniel Statler, of Johnstown; H. L. Holsteinle, of Confluence; S. J. Maust, of Elk Lick; J. C. Reiman, of Berlin, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against tax per horsepower on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the A. Schrader Co. and Robert M. Dado, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of D. Ransom Son & Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., and the Iowa Pharmaceutical Association, of Algona, Iowa, protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of the Hallock, Denton Co., of Newark, N. J., and Otto Edler, of West Hoboken, N. J., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co., of Chicago, Ill., protesting against tax on chewing gum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Labor Council of Greater New York, protesting against the war in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Iowa Pharmaceutical Association, of Algona, Iowa, protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of the commissioner of docks and ferries, New York City, relative to improvement of New York Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petitions of the Iowa Pharmaceutical Association, of Algona, Iowa, and sundry citizens of Brooklyn and New York, protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of the Salt Lake Federation of Labor, of Salt Lake City, Utah, protesting against contract system of Post Office Department for printing stamped envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the St. George (Utah) Commercial Club, relative to amendment to bill for construction of a Government railroad from Marysville, Utah, to the Kisbert Forest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the National Association of Life Underwriters, favoring a national department of health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Utah Federation of Labor, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: Paper to accompany a bill for relief of heirs of James Spiars; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of various business men of Dunbar, Nebr., favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Telegram of the Lake Placid Pharmacy, Lake Placid, N. Y., protesting against proposed tax on proprietary medicines and toilet articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, telegram from Sweet & Martin, druggists, Port Henry, N. Y., urging modification of proposed stamp tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY: Petitions of sundry citizens of Oklahoma, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of the National Council of the Daughters of Liberty of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Mrs. Ida L. Aldrich, Mr. L. P. Payne, and Miss Louise Emmons, of Hughson; Miss Lillian J. Backstrand, of Riverside; Mr. J. W. Oakley, Mrs. L. W. Lawsher, and Mr. F. G. Richardson, of Los Angeles; Miss Athelene Spoon, Miss Beula Marie Spoon, Miss Ruth V. Runyan, Mrs. Carrie Spoon, Mr. W. E. Spoon, and Miss Lucile R. Spoon, of Pacific Grove; Mrs. M. B. Farwell, of Denoir; Miss Emily A. Swanson, of Hughson; Mrs. Rachel G. Stubbs, of Los Angeles; and Miss Lucy C. Gay, of Glenburn, all in the State of California, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of F. S. Ackerman, of the Yreka (Cal.) Pharmaceutical Association, and Moorons' Drug Store, protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Bank of Corning, Cal., protesting against tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Athens Parlor, No. 195, of Oakland; Lakeside Lodge, No. 143, Knights of Pythias; Independent Order Odd Fellows' Military Band; Alpha Neighborhood Club; Yosemite Tribe, No. 103, Improved Order of Red Men; Reinold Ritcher Camp, No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans; Monadnock Tribe, No. 100, Improved Order of Red Men, all of San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of the Hamill bill (H. R. 5139); to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of S. C. Painter and William Painter, of Lake City; Charles Morton, of Bayles; Thomas Reynolds, of Portola; and Martin Hveem, of Bayles, all in the State of California, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Protest on behalf of 50,000 members of the Iowa State Traveling Men's Association, against proposed war tax on mutual accident insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of 19 citizens of Worcester, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *October 14, 1914.*

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 8, 1914.)

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

EMERGENCY REVENUE LEGISLATION (S. DOC. NO. 600).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, which will be read.

The communication was read, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, October 13, 1914.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: In compliance with Senate resolution of October 8 (calendar day, October 9), 1914, I have the honor to submit herewith an estimate in detail of the amount of revenue that will be raised by H. R. 18891 as amended by the Senate Committee on Finance and reported to the Senate on October 8, 1914.

The estimate submitted covers collections to be made for one year.

From—		
Fermented liquors		$43,795,000
Rectified spirits		5,000,000
Wines—		
Sweet	$4,960,000	
Dry	3,260,000	
		8,220,000
Total		57,015,000
Special taxes:		
Bankers		4,300,000
Pawnbrokers		250,000
Brokers—		
Commercial		250,000
Customhouse		12,000
Total		4,812,000

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Proprietors of—		
Theaters, museums, concert halls—		
Motion picture	$750,000	
All others	250,000	
		$1,000,000
Circuses		15,000
Other public exhibitions		150,000
Bowling alleys		75,000
Billiard and pool rooms		600,000
Commission merchants		300,000
Total		2,140,000
Tobacco:		
Dealers in leaf		100,000
Dealers in tobacco n. s. p. f.		4,800,000
Manufacturers of tobacco		47,000
Manufacturers of cigars		360,000
Manufacturers of cigarettes		11,000
Total		5,318,000
Schedule A:		
Bonds, debentures, etc		4,000,000
Certificates of stock, issues, transfers, etc		8,000,000
Sales of products at exchanges		1,500,000
Promissory notes		4,500,000
Express bills of lading, etc		1,000,000
Freight bills of lading, etc		700,000
Telegraph messages		1,000,000
Telephone messages		500,000
Bonds, indemnifying		400,000
Certificates of profit, etc., and certificate n. o. s.		300,000
Brokers' contracts		150,000
Conveyances		4,500,000
Entries of goods at customhouses for consumption and warehousing	$290,000	
Entries for warehousing for withdrawal	310,000	
		600,000
Insurance—		
Marine, inland, fire		$2,500,000
Casualty, fidelity, guaranty		1,000,000
Passage tickets		100,000
Powers of attorney—		
Proxy for voting	$25,000	
To sell real estate, etc	175,000	
		200,000
Protests		40,000
Total Schedule A		30,990,000
Sleeping-car berths and parlor-car seats		125,000
Schedule B:		
Medicinal proprietary articles and preparations		2,000,000
Perfumery, cosmetics, etc		2,000,000
Chewing gum		3,000,000
Total		7,000,000

SUMMARY.

Additional tax on fermented liquors and tax on rectified spirits and wines	57,015,000
Special taxes on bankers and brokers	4,812,000
Theaters, circuses, bowling alleys, billiard and pool rooms, and commission merchants	2,140,000
Dealers in and manufacturers of tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes	5,318,000
Schedule A	30,990,000
Sleeping car and parlor car	125,000
Schedule B	7,000,000
Grand total	107,400,000

The foregoing estimate includes an estimate of additional tax on fermented liquor based upon the quantity tax paid during the fiscal year 1914. During the months of July and August last the decrease in the quantity of fermented liquor tax paid as compared with the same months in the previous year was 1,494,393 barrels. If the same ratio of decrease continues, the additional revenue from this source for a year would be $14,901,714 less than is shown on a basis of the fiscal year 1914 tax payments. It will thus be seen that on a basis of the quantity of fermented liquor tax paid during July and August, 1914, the estimate of the revenue that will be raised by the bill will be $92,498,286 instead of $107,400,000.

Respectfully,

W. G. McADOO, *Secretary.*

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18891) to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, pursuant to a notice which I gave yesterday I desire to submit a few remarks on the pending bill, but I will yield to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to ask leave to print in the RECORD an article by Mr. A. S. Terrill, chairman of the United States Lumber & Cotton Co., of Chicago, on the subject of handling cotton. This subject will be before the Senate tomorrow and I think it would be of value to Senators if this article, not a very long one, should be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

SUGGESTED GOVERNMENT AID IN HANDLING COTTON.

[By A. S. Terrill, chairman, United States Lumber & Cotton Co., Chicago.]

Unless the planters secure speedy financial assistance, the South will suffer irreparable loss, but if they can be assisted to carry the crop until the end of the war, or until conditions materially improve, they will realize good remunerative prices.

For the past 12 years I have been interested in large cotton planting operations, and during that period have spent much of my time in the South.

My business affairs also have required my presence at our English office at intervals, for extended periods of time, upon matters connected with the cotton industry, and I have just returned from a six months' stay abroad, consequently I have been in close touch with the cotton spinners of Europe, and have for several years attended many of the meetings of the International Federation of Master Cotton Spinners & Manufacturers' Associations as a guest of honor from the United States. As such I had the pleasure of being the sole guest of honor at the meeting of their executive committee, received by President Poincaire in Paris last June.

As a result of my connection with the industry, and my close association, both with the growers of the raw product and large manufacturers of the finished goods in Europe and America, I have had unusual opportunities for studying the industry from all points of view, and thoroughly familiarizing myself with all its different phases and ramifications.

Ever since my first connection with cotton planting I have watched with keen interest the unceasing efforts of the people of the South to develop their country, exploit its natural resources, and add to its material prosperity. I have had some small part in this work myself. I believe through my efforts some $30,000,000 of foreign and northern capital has been invested in southern enterprises.

At the close of the war of the sixties the South found itself with its credit seriously impaired, verging on the stage of bankruptcy, and drained of money and men. Since then its people have been engaged in a tremendous struggle for economic success and the creation of a prosperous agricultural and industrial section. In their undertakings they have labored under great handicaps. In recent years their efforts have been commencing to bear fruit, and they have beheld the dawn of a new era of prosperity. Now the blight of war has fallen upon them and the sanguinary struggle in Europe has deprived them temporarily of a foreign market for their cotton—America's greatest export crop.

According to the United States Census Bureau's report, the South produced in 1913 14,315,015 bales of cotton, which, together with the cotton seed, was valued at over a billion dollars. Some conception of the gigantic size of the crop is gained when it is noted that its value exceeded the world's output of gold and silver for the year 1913 by $400,000,000. Of the total crop, only 42 per cent was consumed by home manufacturers, the remainder having been exported to Europe, England taking more than any other country. The cotton crop of this year will be fully as large, in all probability larger than that of last year. As a result of the European war, with its consequent business stagnation and paralysis of industry, the European manufacturers will be unable to consume that quantity of cotton this year, thus depriving the southern planters of a market for about 58 per cent of their crop. This situation is, however, but temporary and will last only while the war is in progress. As soon as peace is declared and business abroad resumes its normal course, the demand for cotton and the prices obtainable will inevitably exceed those prevailing in normal years. Were there adequate means for the storage of the crop and were cotton planting established upon a firmer financial basis, the crisis might not be so acute. Moreover, the situation is further complicated by the inadequate methods of financing the crop during the growing period. In the past, bankers in the North have not taken a great interest in this matter; they have rather left it to the South, where money is scarce and high rates of interest prevail. It has been customary for the country merchant or banker to furnish the requisite supplies and money attendant upon the production of the crop until its harvesting, and for the planter to rely upon the quick sale of his cotton to meet his obligations, reimbursing his banker or merchant as he sells his crop, the security for such loans not being such as would be discounted by the Federal reserve banks.

The condition, then, confronting the cotton planter at the present time is such that if, upon the harvesting of his crop in the near future, he is required to meet his pressing obligations, he will be forced to sell his cotton at a price in many instances less than the amount that it cost him to produce it. The results of this would be that the South, which has been making such rapid strides in economic developments in recent years, would suffer an irreparable setback, and the cotton-growing industry would dwindle to such quantities as would be insufficient to meet our home demands. The situation, then, is most serious. Its gravity can not be overestimated.

Bearing in mind that loss of the European market is but temporary, it is readily seen that what is needed is the devising of some means whereby the cotton planters may secure relief from their creditors, enabled to store their crop, and reap the benefit of the increased market that the close of the war will bring. Private efforts have proved unavailing for the proper financing of the crop. It is then imperative that the Federal Government extend aid to cotton growers at this time. It occurs to me that the situation can be relieved if the Federal Government will act along the following lines:

1. The Government of the United States should temporarily inaugurate a system of examination and certification of cotton by a corps of district inspectors, whose duty it should be to stamp every bale as to quality and grade.

2. The Government should designate warehouses suitable for the storage of cotton; such warehouses might be temporarily under Government control.

3. The Government should provide for the issuance of receipts to the owners of cotton, stating the number of pounds they have stored in the warehouse.

4. The Government should arrange with banks to loan, at a fixed rate of interest, given amounts per pound of each grade of cotton upon these warehouse receipts as security.

By this means the planter would be equipped with security upon which he could borrow the funds requisite to enable him to carry the crop through the duration of the war, and the banker, in turn, would be enabled to make loans upon security which would be backed by governmental certification. The advances upon these receipts need not be in excess of 75 per cent of the actual value or the market price upon the day of advance, the planter carrying the difference himself and obtaining whatever profit there may be in holding his cotton.

The creation of cotton-warehouse receipts that will serve as negotiable securities is really no new and radical departure. It has long been customary for bankers to advance funds on corn, wheat, and other grains deposited in elevators. Why not provide for loans on cotton properly inspected, especially when such action will avert the disaster that is threatening the South? Why not extend to cotton the privileges granted other agricultural products under similar conditions?

For the United States Government to extend aid at this time is no more than European Governments have been doing. They have long realized the necessity of furnishing a stimulus for the culture of cotton. At these international conferences of which I have spoken I have heard many able men propose that their Governments furnish money for the development of cotton growing in their colonial possessions. In fact, it was in accordance with the opinions expressed at one of these conferences at The Hague, which I had the pleasure of attending, that the British Government passed a law appropriating £3,000,000 ($15,000,000) to promote the growing of cotton in the Sudan. Several millions have been spent by the British cotton-growing associations in experimenting in the English colonies on cotton culture, and there are gigantic efforts being made to produce Indian cotton in large quantities. I am informed by the secretary of the International Federation of Master Cotton Spinners & Manufacturers' Associations that the growth of Indian cotton is increasing at the rate of about 500,000 bales a year. In view of these efforts to stimulate cotton culture upon the part of European countries—efforts which will undoubtedly be renewed upon the close of the war—it is all the more essential that every care be taken by the United States to prevent any serious calamity striking the industry in this country.

The need of preventing any injury to our cotton crop is fully appreciated in England, and English cotton manufacturers are a unit in desiring that steps be taken looking toward the relief of the present situation. For example, upon the eve of my departure from England, Sir Charles Macara, president of the International Federation of Master Cotton Spinners and Manufacturers' Association, had the secretary of the organization meet me at Liverpool and most urgently request me to urge the adoption of some means of relief for the cotton planters. Further, Sir Charles Macara wrote me a few days ago a letter under date of August 31, of which the following are extracts:

"The purpose of this letter is to confirm to you the statement made by our secretary on Saturday that it would be a great calamity if, owing to the European war, the cotton farmers of the United States of America were ruined. Their ruin will certainly be brought about unless steps are taken by the Government of the United States of America, in combination with large financial houses, to hold back several million bales of cotton. It must be borne in mind that if the war lasts longer than the end of this year there will be a surplus of American cotton of some 5,000,000 bales, and this must necessarily have a depreciating effect on the price of American cotton, and the producer will necessarily be the greatest sufferer in the end. It is neither to the interests of the cotton spinners of the world nor to that of the United States of America, as a Nation, that the price of cotton be reduced to such a low level as, say, 6 or 8 cents.

"I recognize more fully than perhaps anyone else the very serious situation, having—in consequence of my various public positions, and especially as president of the International Cotton Federation—been obliged to give a very close study and attention to the question of the cotton supply. On the occasion of the tour of 120 cotton spinners and manufacturers of all nationalities, which I led in 1907 through the cotton-growing States of America, it became evident to me that in years of exceptionally large cotton crops it would be in the interests of the millions of cotton producers and cotton-mill operatives that a scheme for properly packing and warehousing the surplus cotton crop should be initiated, and in view of the certainty that there will be an enormous surplus in this year's American cotton crop, such a scheme undertaken by the Government of the United States of America would be a safeguard against dire calamity.

"I trust you will submit this letter to President Wilson, who, I am sure, will share my opinion."

Sir Charles Macara, the writer of this letter, is considered the highest authority in England on the cotton industry, and his opinions are there regarded as the last word upon the subject. He has spent a lifetime in connection with the cotton industry, and is thoroughly acquainted with all the various stages of the evolution of the cotton seed into the cotton fabric.

We are confronted with a crying need; a situation is at hand imperiling the prosperity of a great section of this country. The means of relief are present. The Government has the power, it has the funds, it can render this aid without fear or loss or disaster to itself, and with the realization that it is conferring inestimable benefits upon the South and saving a great industry from jeopardy. Let us not delay; let a committee of broad-minded, careful business men be formed at once to cooperate with the Federal Reserve Board in the formulation of a plan of relief.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York American of October 13 in regard to the cotton situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NO ADJOURNMENT FOR CONGRESS WITHOUT COTTON LEGISLATION.

Senator OVERMAN yesterday announced to the Senate that he would oppose the enactment or consideration of any further legislation until some action had been taken by Congress for the relief of the cotton situation in the South.

"I want to say," said the Senator, "that there will be no unanimous consent to a vote on this bill or to hasten adjournment unless something is done about the cotton situation. Some of us are working on an amendment to this war-tax bill which we believe will tend to relieve the South. I shall object to any unanimous consent to vote until that amendment is disposed of."

This is the first voice raised in sturdy assertion of the need for swift and effective action by Congress to dispel the financial clouds which, gathering in the South, are likely to sweep over the whole Nation.

For it is utter folly for anyone, or for any section, to imagine that the second crop of the United States, a crop representing in normal times $800,000,000, can be made unsalable and its producers reduced to beggary without the most disastrous results to business in every other part of the land.

The peril is a national one and the National Congress must be looked to to avert it.

But what has this National Congress been doing? The House last week spent its time in debating the futile and unnecessary Philippine bill. Friday it spent an hour or more listening to the leader of the minority, Mr. MANN, and an Alabama Representative, Mr. HEFLIN, exchange bitter and abusive personalities over the question of which of them had the more grossly insulted the advocates of woman suffrage by his utterances in the House. Nero fiddling over burning Rome furnishes an historic parallel to Congress loafing along, and quarreling over personal matters, while day after day the fetters of a financial stringency are being the more tightly fastened upon the cotton producers of the South.

Senator OVERMAN has done well to sound the note of defiance to those who are seeking to avoid any cotton legislation. In no more honorable purpose could a filibuster be employed than in compelling an unwilling Congress to give attention to this vital problem, and to solve it if human ingenuity can obtain a solution.

It is perfectly apparent that the administration as a force is covertly hostile to any action favoring the cotton planters. It has been prolific of soft words, but utterly unproductive of political results. A President who has never yet failed to force through Congress the legislation he desired is either incapable of formulating a measure which will meet this need or unwilling to use his great power to compel congressional action to this end. He could make the Panama Canal useless as a competitor to the transcontinental railroads and futile as an agency in building up the American merchant marine, but when it comes to saving from complete disaster the producers of one of America's greatest export staples he loses his fertility of resource and fails to employ his political power over legislation.

It can not be too strongly emphasized that the cotton situation is not a local but a national menace; that the need for its correction is immediate, and that the agency for its correction is the United States Government, acting through Congress. It is a pity that the rules of the House do not permit some such drastic action to be taken there as Senator OVERMAN has taken in the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have a letter here in the form of a memorial, signed by a great number of druggists in Michigan, which I desire to have printed in the RECORD, together with the names, which are about 15 or 20.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, as follows:

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *October 10, 1914.*

Hon. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We take note of the report that Congress is on the point of introducing and passing bills for the purpose of raising revenue. We also understand that, as in the past, the tendency is to shift more than his reasonable share on the millionaire druggist (?) as an easy mark and along the line of least resistance.

We have no objections to offer when an extra revenue tax is placed on articles considered as a luxury, as perfumes, toilet articles of all kinds, grape juice (Bryan's), cigars, and others not absolutely necessary for a comfortable existence. This country is not at war. There is no reason for an extraordinary tax. The tendency in all our history of legislation for raising special revenue has been to make medicinal drugs and medicinal preparations a most desirable object. Why, is a conundrum for me. It certainly does not conform with a true American spirit and principle of generosity and the keen sympathy displayed in misfortunes of their fellow citizens or others.

If anyone should be exempt from special tax, it is the sick, the individual having the misfortune of being unable to earn. Does it look reasonable that a person put in a condition by sickness, making the person incompetent to earn—to tax one for being sick?

To show you how unreasonable and how unjust a special revenue tax on proprietary remedies is to the retail druggist we will take, for example, the conditions brought on by the special tax in the Spanish War. The tax levied on a proprietary remedy was added to the price by the owner, but not satisfied with adding actual tax, the opportunity was seized to boost the existing jobbing price. As, for instance, proprietaries listed prior to the tax levy at $8 and $9 per dozen and retailed at $1 per package, which demanded a tax of 30 cents per dozen, were raised to $8.50 and $9.50, respectively. This resulted in an actual tax of 50 cents per dozen to the retailer. The proprietary owner got back the tax paid the Government and even made a good investment bearing interest at the rate of 66⅔ per cent. But how about the retailer in this deal? It was practically absolutely out of the question to attempt to collect the paid-out tax from the consumer, thus placing the whole tax, which should have been borne by the entire population, on the shoulders of a small per cent set aside as a class for themselves.

If such a stamp tax is passed as contemplated, it will be a gross injustice and the most detestable form of the so-much-criticized class legislation.

Respectfully submitted to your consideration by—

U. A. Goulding, L. A. Wikel, O. L. Alward, Sugden Drug Co. (M. B. Sugden), A. E. Crippen, Dauran Bros., Remis Daskam, F. E. De Voist, Ottmar Eberbach, Arthur E. Mannuley, J. J. Goodyear, H. G. Mayer, E. C. Edsill, Mann & Walker H. F. Miller, J. J. Quarry, G. Claude Decke, L. O. Cushing, E. E. Calkins.

P. S.—On soliciting signatures to our protest, the fact developed that we are to this day still paying the Spanish War tax on most proprietary medicines, although the Government has long since relinquished the same. At the time the tax was levied interested parties availed themselves of the opportunity, as stated in the protest, to boost their price considerably above the actual amount of the tax, and retained the advance after the tax was removed by the Government. This fact alone ought to justify our objection and demand your careful attention.

Mr. GRONNA. I have telegrams in the nature of memorials from J. H. Oliver, of Oberon; Botton Bros., of Edmore; T. J. Greene, the South Side Drug Co., and Welton McDonald & Co., of Dickinson; and from Otto Stensrud, of Beach, all in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the proposed tax on drugs and proprietary medicines. I ask that the telegrams be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They will be so referred.

Mr. GRONNA. I also have a letter from Mrs. E. B. Matters, corresponding secretary of the Fargo Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of North Dakota, protesting against any further tax or any tax whatever on intoxicating liquors. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, this proposed bill is a war revenue measure in a time of peace. The United States is not at war with any nation. In the great conflict that unhappily involves eight European Governments, our country is absolutely neutral; and there is no fear that our territory or our people will be endangered or our peace disturbed.

It was different in 1898. Then the War with Spain was our own war. It demanded a sudden and great increase in naval and military appropriations, which were given with an ungrudging hand. Not one cruiser, not one regiment, has been or will have to be added to our defensive establishment because of the terrible strife in Europe. Our remoteness, our complete and honest neutrality, are the only present safeguard we need.

Why, then, this extraordinary proposal to increase the Federal taxes by an amount of $105.000.000 at a time when, because of business stress, all private manufacturing and mercantile enterprises and the people in their homes are economizing in their expenditures as they have not done for many years before? The answer is that the money is needed, not because of any war, not because of any external emergency, but to cover up the extravagance of the political party which, though it represents only a minority of the voters, is now in power in this Nation, and the utter breakdown of its antiquated fiscal policy of tariff for revenue only, that has failed to produce the necessary revenue.

The Democratic Party in its national platform of 1912 declared:

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

The President of the United States, when a candidate for election to his high office, in an address at Washington Park, N. J., on August 15, 1912, said:

> Our platform is not molasses to catch flies. It means business. It means what it says. It is the utterance of earnest and honest men, who intend to do business along those lines and who are not waiting to see whether they can catch votes with those promises before they determine whether they are going to act upon them or not. They know the American people are now taking notice in a way in which they never took notice before, and gentlemen who talk one way and vote another are going to be retired to a very quiet and private retreat.

PLEDGES THAT WERE IGNORED.

Those platform pledges of "simplicity and economy" have been as coolly and contemptuously disregarded by the Democratic Party in power as that other pledge of exemption of American coastwise ships from tolls at Panama. Appropriations have been increased, and not diminished, and there has been an expansion in the number of those "useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people." Excluding the river and harbor bills in each year, the total of Federal appropriations just made will be $1,089.408.777, as compared with $1,057,605.694 in the year preceding, and $988.353.340 in 1912. Under this administration, with the political party pledged to "simplicity and economy" in full control of the Government, expenditures are not decreasing. They are mounting up, not going down. The reduction is not in the Federal disbursements; it is in the Federal revenues.

It is the national income that has been falling off, and it was falling off before this great European war began—before the first clouds of that war could be seen on the horizon. The new Democratic tariff law is professedly a tariff for revenue only, but as such it has signally failed to justify the one consideration which its authors urged for its existence.

It has undermined American industry, demoralized the country's business, robbed and ruined many American manufacturers and merchants, and driven thousands of American wage earners to idleness and want. Its pathway is marked by silent machinery and cheerless homes; its monuments are the smokeless chimneys of the factories.

INCREASED IMPORTS, DIMINISHED REVENUES.

Though this Democratic tariff for revenue only in its operations from the 3d of October to the end of July had increased the imports of foreign merchandise into the United States by the enormous sum of $102,323,319—a large part of this simply displacing the products of American industries without any apparent effect upon the cost of living, or any appreciable benefit to the ultimate consumers—the national revenue collected on this immense mass of importations has steadily been falling below the income from the tariff for revenue and protection that preceded it.

The Democratic tariff was approved on October 3, 1913. This is the comparative record for the 10 months up to July 31, 1914, of imports and duty collected:

Comparative statement of imports, and duty collected, under Republican and Democratic tariffs, by months, for 10 months, beginning October, 1912 and 1913.

Months.	Republican tariff.		Months.	Democratic tariff.	
	Imports.	Duty.		Imports.	Duty.
1912.			1913.		
October ..	$177,987,986	$30,216,824	October...	$132,878,896	$30,138,049
November	153,094,898	25,666,353	November	148,216,536	21,173,628
December	154,095,444	24,248,161	December	184,587,571	21,510,140
1913.			1914.		
January ..	163,063,438	29,334,124	January ..	154,418,247	23,528,080
February.	149,913,918	27,605,116	February.	147,973,376	17,609,604
March	155,445,498	27,457,489	March	182,762 954	25,927,213
April	146,194,461	23,693,967	April	173,896,476	22,232,766
May	133,723,713	20,434,749	May	164,209,515	20,800,573
June.....	131,245,877	23,608,599	June.....	157,529,450	23,533,448
July	139,061,770	27,806,655	July	159,677,291	22,988,465
Total...	1,503,826,993	260,072,037	Total ...	1,606,150,312	229,441,967

Therefore, the new tariff policy had brought to this country up to the outbreak of the great European war an increase in imports of $102.323.319, and at the same time a decrease in customs revenue of $30.630.070. The new law had benefited foreign nations, had increased unemployment in the United States, and had seriously lessened the national income. These facts are indelibly written in the official records, which any man may read. A tariff for revenue only had failed to achieve the one professed purpose of the legislation, and an onerous income tax had failed to make up for the tariff deficit. We had untaxed foreigners to tax our own citizens, and the result was a national loss and a national humiliation.

TO COVER UP DEMOCRATIC FAILURE.

This is the real reason why this war revenue measure is sprung now upon Congress and the country. It is to cover up the breakdown of the financial and economic policies of this Democratic national administration. The record shows clearly that if there had been no war the Nation would have had a lessening income and an accumulating deficit. No economist of standing has any doubt that the income tax provision produced its maximum revenue in its first year. Not the most inquisitorial methods that human ingenuity can devise will draw more revenue next year, for the tax will be levied on incomes reduced everywhere by a year's severe depression in general business. Few, indeed, will be the business or professional men of America whose earnings in 1914 will not be very considerably below those of 1913.

In all this dismal record of Democratic failure history is simply repeating itself. The Democratic tariff for revenue only of 1894–1897, the Gorman-Wilson law, brought national disaster in precisely the same way. In its first fiscal year, 1895, the ordinary receipts of the Government were $313.390.075, and the ordinary disbursements were $356.195.298. In the following year, 1896, the ordinary receipts were $326,976,200, and the ordinary disbursements were $352.179.446. In 1897 the ordinary receipts were $347,721.705, and the ordinary disbursements were $365.774.160—a total deficit for the three years of this memorable free trade experiment of $86.060,924.

Democratic control in these modern times is manifestly fatal to the financial and industrial well-being of the United States.

A SHRINKING EXPORT TRADE.

It has long been the favorite Democratic doctrine, proclaimed from press and platform, that a protective tariff was a "Chinese wall" about the country; that there could be no great foreign trade under a protective tariff policy, and that a Democratic tariff for revenue only would bring us quick and easy mastery of the "markets of the world." But, like the Democratic promise to reduce the cost of living, this theory of a world trade has been totally demolished by experience.

Exports from America have not increased under the Democratic tariff. On the contrary, they have constantly and very greatly decreased. American manufacturers and their employees have seen their own home markets successfully invaded by the foreigners, but American manufacturers and their employees have been able to secure less and less of those prom-

ised "markets of the world." Following is a comparative statement of the exports from this country for 10 months from October 1, 1913, to July 31, 1914, under the Democratic tariff law, and of exports under the Republican protective tariff for the same 10 months of the year preceding:

Comparative statement of domestic exports under Republican and Democratic tariffs, by months, for 10 months, beginning October, 1912 and 1913.

Months.	Republican tariff.	Months.	Democratic tariff.
1912.		1913.	
October	$251,587,995	October	$268,997,024
November	275,077,667	November	243,386,413
December	247,344,417	December	230,775,481
1913.		1914.	
January	224,272,058	January	201,674,044
February	191,135,844	February	171,605,138
March	183,446,790	March	183,934,601
April	196,233,706	April	158,967,303
May	191,055,800	May	157,492,718
June	160,172,880	June	154,105,460
July	158,173,653	July	150,959,659
Total	2,078,500,810	Total	1,921,897,845

In every month but two of the 10 months from October to July, inclusive, in which the new Democratic tariff for revenue only has been in operation the American people sold fewer of their products to foreign countries than they sold under the Republican protective tariff, which this ill-fated Democratic measure has displaced. The Democratic law was not an open sesame to foreign markets. It failed there as it failed at home. It has cut down American trade and American industry everywhere, and it has benefited no one but foreigners.

FEWER MANUFACTURES SOLD ABROAD.

The one most notable feature of American export trade for many years under the Republican protective tariff policy has been a constant and gratifying increase in the amount of American manufactured goods—the products of our great national industries—sold abroad to foreign consumers. The value of finished manufactures ready for consumption exported from this country has increased under Republican protective-tariff policies from $222,537,358 in the fiscal year 1898 to $776,297,360 in the fiscal year 1913. The proportion which these finished manufactures bear to our total exports has increased in the same period from 18.38 per cent to 31.97 per cent. Between 1912 and 1913 the increase of exports of finished manufactured goods was more than

American trade was prosperous then at home and abroad. But now mark the contrast: In the first 10 months of the present Democratic tariff for revenue only our exports of finished domestic manufactures ready for consumption fell off to $581,124,168, as compared with an export of $652,671,433 for the corresponding 10 months of the previous Republican tariff law—a decrease of $71,547,265 as a part of the price which the American people have had to pay for turning the business management of their Government over to men who do not possess the wisdom and experience to conduct it.

All this happened before the outbreak of the disastrous European war. Our commerce was declining, our finances were shrinking. In a period of peace a deficit in the national revenues was in sight, and bonds would have had to be issued or additional and extraordinary taxes imposed, even if there had been no war, to make up for the inevitable consequences of an unsound economic policy condemned and repudiated almost everywhere else in the world. This is not a war-revenue measure now. It is deceptive to call it so. This revenue bill is a new proof and price of the historic Democratic genius for blundering.

TURNING THE BALANCE OF TRADE AGAINST US.

For many successive years under Republican protective-tariff policies the balance of trade had been heavily in favor of the United States. Exports had far exceeded imports. We had sold more than we had bought, and thus had secured the resources to pay the interest and dividends on foreign investments in this country, and in addition the huge sum of between two and three hundred million dollars annually demanded by foreign shipowners for carrying our mails, passengers, and freight in over-seas commerce.

But the new Democratic tariff-for-revenue-only policy has changed all this. No sooner had the Democracy come into power than the favorable balance of trade began to dwindle, until it has now wholly disappeared and an adverse balance is rolling up of greater and greater proportions. Here are the certain results of the Democratic tariff policy written in the figures of total imports and domestic exports of merchandise for the 10 months from October, 1913, to July, 1914, inclusive:

Imports and exports, and balance of foreign trade of the United States, 10 months, October, 1913, to July, 1914, inclusive.

[Compiled from Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce.]

Months.	Imports.	Exports.	Balance in favor of United States.	Balance against United States.
1913.				
October	$132,878,896	$271,855,054	$138,976,158	.....
November	148,216,536	245,550,392	97,333,856	.....
December	184,587,571	233,487,765	48,900,194	.....
1914.				
January	154,418,247	204,131,641	49,713,394	.....
February	147,973,376	171,605,138	23,631,762	.....
March	182,762,954	187,499,234	4,736,280	.....
April	173,896,476	162,550,870	.....	$11,345,606
May	164,209,515	161,732,619	.....	2,476,896
June	157,772,973	157,119,451	.....	653,522
July	159,677,291	154,138,947	.....	5,538,344
Total	1,606,393,835	1,949,671,111	363,291,644	20,014,368

The Democratic tariff policy has succeeded in 10 months in changing a monthly balance in favor of the United States of $138,976,158 to a balance against the United States in July of $5,538,344.

HOW HISTORY IS REPEATING ITSELF.

The American people are now in the unfortunate position of people buying more than they can sell, and under the necessity of raising large sums of money every year to discharge their debts to foreign capitalists and foreign shipowners. This process, long continued, can not but impoverish the United States, as it did in the memorable tariff-for-revenue-only period before the Civil War, which ended in utter disaster and the downfall of the free-trade régime, President Buchanan himself recommending that it be abandoned and the tariff duties increased to meet the necessities of American industry and the American Government—and this in 1859–1860, before the Civil War began.

Like this, that earlier Democratic tariff for revenue only produced a financial deficit and industrial disaster. It was overwhelmingly repudiated by the American people, just as this present Democratic tariff is going to be. This war revenue bill, rushed through Congress under the pretext of a war emergency in a year which for the United States is a year of peace, is the first step toward the destruction of the sinister legislation of 1913.

The one hope of escape from overthrow now cherished by the leaders of the administration party is a hope that rests in the calamity of the European war. It is supposed that this terrible combat may divert the attention of the American people from the demoralization and loss of American business that has followed on the Democratic tariff policy thus far. But merchants, manufacturers, and wage earners know what the consequences of the Democratic legislation have been to them, and they are going to see that these results shall not be forgotten. The country and the world are shocked by the scenes that are being enacted on the battle fields of Europe, but our business people and our working people are not unmindful of the idleness and the suffering here at home, over which there hangs no glamor of military glory. One of the great industries of Pennsylvania and of the Nation is the textile industry, a peculiarly sensitive index of the real condition of the country's business. The textile industry was singled out for particularly savage treatment in the Democratic tariff law, and we are in a position now to begin to measure the consequences of that vindictive legislation.

TEXTILE MILLS HIGHLY PROSPEROUS BEFORE THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1912.

Before the presidential election of 1912 conditions in the great American textile trades were highly prosperous. Thus the Boston Commercial Bulletin said in its weekly report upon the wool trade October 19, 1912:

> Not in the history of the trade, we think, has the New York goods market shown such signal buoyancy and activity during a Presidential campaign as it has this fall. Everything practically has been in demand, while the call for the spring trade has rarely been better. Nearly all the larger factors are well sold up on their spring capacity, and some mills have lines withdrawn from the market both in staple and fancy goods. This applies both to men's wear as well as to dress goods. The yarn spinners are likewise well sold ahead, and out of all these factors probably very few have sufficient wool to cover the orders already taken.

The American people were busy and happy then. They had work and wages and the money wherewith to buy their woolen clothing. That explained the "signal buoyancy and activity"

of the woolen business. It was prosperous because the American nation was prosperous.

The Textile Manufacturers Journal of October 12, 1912, said:

Viewed in its entirety, from start to finish, the woolen trade is advancing. Spinners are generally rather independent, as most of them are sold up to January, and a few even further ahead. Men's wear and dress goods popular numbers of yarns are rather scarce and are becoming very hard to obtain.

A week later, on October 12, 1912, Fiber and Fabric said:

Both spinners and manufacturers continue busy. There is hardly a worsted mill of any description that has not about all it can attend to for the time being. The market is bare of stock, and owing to the sold-up condition of the spinners but very few spot lots are being offered.

The New York Journal of Commerce of October 24, 1912, remarked:

Mercantile bankers in the dry goods trade say it is not realized to what extent the volume of business in the country is expanding, or rather growing, toward what has been regarded as a high-water market. * * * The great activity in the woolen goods trade is now acknowledged by the leaders in the business in a public way.

The Boston Transcript of October 31, 1912, said:

Not since 1909 had there been such an eager and constant demand for woolen fabrics from the manufacturers of clothing. From all sections of the country large operators are making preparations to get woolens and worsteds for their final winter requirements, and they do not let an opportunity escape to increase stocks of staples in medium and heavy weights. So far as can be judged from the volume of business so far placed, the yardage is in excess of last year or the year before.

So active and prosperous were American textile mills that they were hard pressed to secure a sufficient number of employees. Before that fateful presidential election which so changed the whole aspect of American affairs and transferred prosperity from America to Europe, there was more work to do than there were men to do it. As the Daily Trade Record said:

The present scarcity of textile operatives is forcing curtailment of production in practically all the mill centers of New England, according to current reports. One manufacturer is quoted as saying: "You can not find fault nowadays with an operative for doing poor work, because he is ready to leave on any slight provocation, and he will probably be welcomed next door at higher wages than you can give him."

HOW THE NEW TARIFF BROUGHT REJOICING AND PROSPERITY TO EUROPE.

But the election of a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress in November, 1912, had a quick and significant effect upon the American labor market. Presently there were more workers than work. Hundreds of thousands of American wage earners voted their jobs to men in Europe when they voted the Democratic ticket—though they did not know it.

They listened to political declamation against the high cost of living, and presently they found the cost of living higher than it ever was, with no work to do, and no money in their pockets to pay it.

From trade authorities it has been shown how flourishing were the American textile and other trades before the presidential election of 1912. Business abroad was not so good then, but the inauguration of a Democratic President and the assembling of a Democratic Congress in the spring of 1913 brought a most significant change on both sides of the Atlantic. The situation had been completely transformed; America was depressed and Europe prosperous. As the London World of July 1, 1913, while the tariff for revenue only was in the making, said:

The Wilson tariff is certain to have a very important effect upon the cotton industry of Lancashire. Only this week a representative of a powerful American syndicate arrived in Manchester from Pawtucket to arrange for a supply to America when the new tariff comes into force of a large quantity of half-manufactured goods, which will be completed on the other side and placed on the American market.

This is supposed to be only the initial step in a big movement.

It is predicted that Lancashire can look forward with certainty to five years of remarkable prosperity. Trade will rapidly develop with the United States.

It is now a matter of record how those brilliant trans-Atlantic anticipations were realized. The Wilson tariff did make business good in Europe at the cost of the United States. It increased the profits of European manufacturers at the expense of the American dinner pail.

A BOON FOR ENGLISH SHODDY MILLS.

In the heavy woolen district of Batley and Dewsbury, England, is the center of the vast British shoddy industry—an industry for which there is no equivalent in America. As the report of the Tariff Board of the United States says:

The greatest shoddy producing center in the world is in and near Batley and Dewsbury, England. Of the 900 rag-grinding machines in the United Kingdom, Yorkshire, in which Batley and Dewsbury are located, has 881 machines. In the whole of the United States there are only 346 rag-grinding machines. * * * The English of the district of Yorkshire are very skillful in the production of cloths from shoddy and other waste products.

Until the Democratic tariff for revenue only came to their rescue, the shoddy makers of Batley and Dewsbury were exceedingly depressed. As the Yorkshire Observer of November 8, 1913, said:

The dullness in the cloth trade of the heavy woolen district is causing not a little unemployment. Night work has ceased at several mills.

Then observe the frankness with which this English journal notes the quarter from which relief will come:

Orders have been placed in Batley for cloth to be delivered in the United States early in the new year, and it is probable that when the revised tariff comes into operation a valuable market for the products of this district will be found across the Atlantic.

Thus the Democratic tariff for revenue only came in the nick of time to save the situation for the shoddy manufacturers of England. A few months later, on June 26, 1914, this same English journal, the Yorkshire Observer, said:

The effect of the new tariff in the United States is now seen to be beneficial to cloth producers in the heavy woolen district, and there is no doubt that even better results will be obtained when the requirements of customers on the other side of the Atlantic have been more definitely ascertained.

The use of shoddy in woolen goods had been steadily decreasing under the protective-tariff system in America. As the Federal census of 1910 said:

The figures show a marked decrease in the use of shoddy. The quantity purchased decreased 35 per cent and the amount manufactured in woolen mills for use therein fell off 10 per cent. In 1899 the total amount of shoddy consumed by woolen and worsted manufacturers was 68,663,000 pounds; in 1909 it was only 53,621,000 pounds, a decrease all the more significant when the growth of the industry is considered.

In 1907 the production of shoddy in the United Kingdom was 137,056,000 pounds. That is to say, with one-half the population the United Kingdom uses two and one-half times as much shoddy annually as the United States.

That is, this was the fact under the protective-tariff system, but apparently the Democratic tariff for revenue only not only increases the market in this country for foreign "woolen" fabrics made of shoddy, but compels the use of more and more of these substitutes for new wool by American manufacturers; for, as the Yorkshire Observer, already quoted, said on the 26th of last June:

It is quite evident that the Americans are converting more rags for manufacturing purposes in their own country. Last month they sent only 526 tons, compared with 1,200 tons in May, 1913, and, in addition, they are probably the chief buyers to account for an appreciable increase in our export of rags, which has been on the upgrade during the whole of the present year.

If I recollect rightly, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], who sits before me, called attention to this fact as one of the results of the change in the wool schedule—that the American people would become a nation clad in clothing made of rags and shoddy and not clothing made from pure wool. Am I correct?

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PENROSE. Therefore, not only have our own woolen manufacturers been jeopardized, in many cases bankrupted, closed up, or working on part time, but the clothing which the average person is compelled to use is of the lowest grade of any so-called woolen material.

Here is frank British testimony to the usefulness of the present Democratic tariff in encouraging the rag and shoddy industry in America and Europe.

ROBBING AMERICA TO ENRICH EUROPE.

In the worsted mills of Bradford, as well as in the shoddy mills of Batley and Dewsbury, the Democratic tariff of 1913 was frankly hailed as a great benefaction to British manufacturing. A London cable dispatch to the New York Daily Trade Record of December 8, 1913, said:

The Bradford textile district is temporarily depressed. Some of the mills are already on short time, but there are predictions of active revival after the American tariff reductions on woolens become operative January 1.

Across the English Channel and the North Sea the Simmons-Underwood tariff law brought quick acclamation. At Verviers, in Belgium, the quarterly report of the Chamber of Commerce, noted in the Daily Trade Record of October 27, 1913, recorded "a drop of 25 per cent in the quantity of tops conditioned," and significantly added that all this would be changed by "an increased trade with the United States under the new tariff." A cable dispatch to the New York Commercial of January 19, 1914, reviewing British business, stated that "British business men are decidedly optimistic over the prospects for the new year," and added:

Chief among the factors favoring 1914 are the American tariff reduction, the effect of which is being felt in the woolen and tin plate industries, two lines which shared some slackening up in 1913. The

condition of the tin plate industry was particularly bad in 1913, until the passage of the new American tariff bill, but to-day mills are working overtime to accommodate American orders.

The American people do not complain of prosperity in Europe so long as that prosperity is not purchased at their expense. But the Democratic tariff policy robbed America to enrich Europe. It took employment and wages away from American men and women to lift the profits of European mills. The Philadelphia Public Ledger of July 21, 1914, gives this illuminating case in point:

A Philadelphia underwear mill recently placed an order for 25,000 pounds of French-spun worsted yarn, taking the foreign yarn at a cost saving of $3,000, after a local spinner's best price had been submitted. The mill that lost the order in competition with a foreign establishment estimates that the labor involved is equivalent to the work of 60 men for 10 days.

It means that about $1,400 in wages that might have been paid to work-people here will go abroad. That's the way to look at it.

Abroad—in foreign countries—the Democratic tariff for revenue only was beautifully impartial in its benefits. A dispatch from Biella, Italy, to the Daily Trade Record of December 8, 1913, said:

Owing chiefly, it is reported, to the new American tariff, the Italian woolen industry has recovered to a large extent from a long period of depression, both in the spinning and weaving end of the industry. The revival is said to be especially marked in light-weight woolens and flannels.

WHAT THE NEW TARIFF DID TO AMERICA.

That is one side of the story—the bright side of the shield. Now let us look at the American side—the side of our own country, of our own people. On December 31, 1913, the directors of the Contoocook Mills Corporation (knit goods), of Hillsboro, N. H., "passed the quarterly dividend of 7 per cent preferred stock due January 1, the operating results of the year having been unsatisfactory."

Thus the Democratic tariff experiment began promptly to get in its work on this side of the Atlantic. Even earlier than this, on September 25, 1913, Mr. J. F. Maynard, the president of the Globe Woolen Co., of Utica, N. Y., one of the oldest and most famous wool-manufacturing concerns in America, making particularly fine all-wool fabrics, announced that the mills "would shortly be closed indefinitely." On October 8 the Globe Woolen Co. shut down entirely "on account of the new tariff." Nine hundred skilled workers were thrown out of employment. The owners state that the suspension is indefinite and may be permanent.

Thus the "New Freedom" was in practical operation. On January 24, 1914, the Alexander Smith & Sons Carpet Co., of Yonkers, N. Y., which in three years had distributed $342,000 among its employees under the profit-sharing plan, announced that beginning February 7 wages would be reduced 10 per cent to 7,000 operatives.

On January 28, 1914, the Enfield Manufacturing Co. a wool-manufacturing corporation, by a vote of its stockholders, filed a voluntary petition in bankruptcy. On January 31, the Emmott Worsted Spinning Co., of Chester, Pa., was stated to be "in financial difficulties" and "to have made an offer of 50 cents on the dollar to its creditors by way of settlement."

On February 19 a reduction of the night-shift wages went into effect in the fustian mill of the Crompton Co., at Crompton, R. I., due to a falling off in the demand for the product, owing to the importation of German-made goods under the new tariff. The Crompton Mills made corduroys, velvets, and velours.

On February 28, 1914, the Rev. Charles E. McClellan, pastor of the Fairhill Baptist Church, No. 521 Lehigh Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., was quoted as saying in the Philadelphia Press:

Every day I am besought by persons to assist them in finding employment. Except in some of the hosiery mills there is widespread depression in Kensington manufactures, and it is as difficult to find work for men as it is to procure funds for relieving their distress.

We are on the ragged edge, both from the workingman's point of view and that of the manufacturer. No work and prices soaring! Yet people will believe a theory rather than the established facts of history.

ALL THIS WAS LONG BEFORE THE WAR.

All this was long before the great European war had loomed on the horizon. Dullness of trade, idleness of workers, crowding demands on public charity and the philanthropic work of churches, were the result, in the United States, of what will be known in history as the colossal political and economic blunder of the Simmons-Underwood tariff law, which gave away the profits of American business and the wages of American workpeople to swell the dividends of the manufacturers of Great Britain and the Continent. Early in April, 1914, Mr. C. H. Brown, the secretary of the National Association of Hosiery and Underwear Manufacturers, was quoted as declaring:

The common hosiery, known as the "poor men's hose," cotton lisle, and retailing at 25 cents per pair, is now entering the United States at $1.25 per dozen. The United States mills' selling price is $1.85 per dozen; the cost price, without profit, is $1.70 per dozen.

The foreign manufacturers, however, are only landing the goods at $1.36 per dozen pairs; they are selling at the American price of $1.85, and the difference, or 49 cents, is going into the pockets of the importer, jobber, and retailer, but with no difference in cost to the consumer.

Under the Payne law, this class of hosiery entered at between $1.85 and $1.90 per dozen pairs.

Under the Underwood law the foreign manufacturer can undersell the American manufacturer whenever he makes up his mind to do so, but for the present he is taking all he can get.

Mr. George C. Hetzel, a successful worsted weaver of Chester, Pa., said:

We are running about 60 per cent of capacity. I can not recall any time since 1896 that we have not run full capacity in March. Wages paid in our mill were 21 per cent less than in 1912. This represents a deduction, not in the rate of wages, but in time.

The Radmoor Mills, Thomas E. Brown & Sons, of Philadelphia, said:

Our seamless-hosiery plant has been practically at a standstill since the new tariff went into operation.

A few weeks later, in June, 1914, the Daily Trade Record, of June 20, 1914, said of the Philadelphia situation:

Mills making men's wear are operating about 70 per cent of capacity. In the lace industry nearly 60 per cent of the machinery is estimated to be idle. The carpet and rug mills are represented as having little business.

A few days earlier the Axminster department of the local plant of the Bigelow Carpet Co. at Lowell, Mass., had gone on half time.

The Lawrence Manufacturing Co., of Lowell, Mass., announced on May 25, 1914, through its treasurer, Mr. C. P. Baker, that:

Production at this plant is being curtailed 50 per cent. The small amount of business and general unsettled conditions are the causes. Dullness is due chiefly to the increased importations of knit goods.

MILLS CURTAILING AND CLOSING EVERYWHERE.

Depression was widespread throughout the industrial communities of New England, as throughout those of Pennsylvania. On June 20, 1914, the Textile Manufacturers Journal announced that:

Mill B of the Sanford (Me.) Mills, which operates on plushes, has been put on a four-day-a-week schedule, the mill to close down for the week on Thursdays until further notice. Mill C of the company has been running on a four-day schedule for about seven weeks, which means that 500 operatives are on short time. Supt. George G. Emery is quoted as saying that orders have fallen off steadily since the passage of the tariff bill.

That was in New England, which like Pennsylvania was one of the particular targets of the authors of the new Democratic tariff law. But it is difficult in the United States to single out any special section for slaughter without sacrificing the prosperity of other sections and other States. The New York Mills Co., located in a suburb of Utica, N. Y., and employing more than 2,000 hands in the manufacture of cotton cloth, was announced on May 5, 1914, as insolvent to the extent of $1,500,000. The preferred stockholders of the company were offered 10 cents on the dollar for their holdings.

On June 28, 1914, the Crawford Woolen Mills, of Martinsburg, W. Va., went into the hands of receivers, with liabilities placed at $160,000. "The mill has been in operation 20 years and employs 300 persons."

A few days later the Sterling Mills Co., of Bridgeport, Pa., manufacturing cassimeres and cloakings, shut down an equipment of 5 sets of cards, 35 broad looms, 2,660 spindles, and dyeing and finishing machinery.

At almost the same time the woolen mills of James Lees & Sons Co. in the same town, Bridgeport, Pa., closed down for two weeks. "Our shutdown," a member of the firm was quoted as saying, in the Daily Trade Record of July 10, "is due to two things—the operation of the tariff and the threatening of industries by proposed new laws in Washington. In other words, the business interests of the country are afraid of the present National Government."

On July 11, 1914, the Textile Manufacturers Journal announced that a voluntary petition in bankruptcy had been filed at Portland, Me., by the Somerset Woolen Co., of Monson, Mass., liabilities being given at $50,499. "No announcement has been made as to the future disposition of the plant, but it is thought that a resumption of operations by the present company is improbable."

These troubles could not be chargeable to the European war, which had not yet begun. The one cause, and the only cause, was the new Democratic tariff for revenue only—the ill-fated law of October 3, 1913—which was proving destructive alike to the prosperity of American industries and to the national revenues. On July 29, 1914, the New York Journal of Commerce announced the appointment of receivers for the Fern

Rock Woolen Mills, of Philadelphia, with assets of between $175,000 and $200,000 and undetermined liabilities.

SHORT TIME OR BANKRUPTCY IN SOUTH AND WEST.

There are not many woolen mills in the Southern States, but the new Democratic tariff policy of southern origin did not spare those that did exist there. On July 28, 1914, a voluntary petition in bankruptcy was filed in the Federal court at Nashville, Tenn., by the Nashville Woolen Mills Co., with liabilities of $80,000. This company had been incorporated in 1882, operating 5 sets of cards and 44 broad looms and manufacturing cassimeres, overcoatings, and worsteds. It was an important southern industry, but as it happened an industry on which the sun of southern Democratic favor did not shine. The unfortunate officers and employees of the Nashville Woolen Co. should have had the foresight to engage in growing rice or raising Angora goats in Texas.

West, East, North, South, the Democratic tariff policy was showing its handiwork before the European war began. On July 22, 1914, the Daily Trade Record, of New York, announced that the Knight Woolen Mills, of Provo City, Utah, "in order to prevent the laying off entirely of a large number of employees, or the indefinite closing of the mills, would be put on short shift five days in the week—reducing by 25 per cent the earnings of the operatives.

"It is further stated that the reduction follows the receipt of word from the eastern selling agents of the company to the effect that, because of the influx of English-made goods, there is no market for the product of the Provo Woolen Mills."

It was further stated:

The first severe blow to the local company following the enactment of the Underwood tariff law was the falling off in the demand for Mackinaw woolens, for which there was formerly a demand amounting to $20,000 to $30,000 a year from the Northern States. This business has now fallen to $3,000 to $4,000 a year, and the reason given is that, because of the enormous influx of English woolens, the woolen mills of the East have taken to the manufacture of the goods, of which Provo formerly made a profitable specialty.

The gravity of the situation here is felt keenly, and it is generally believed that, unless the demand for American woolens picks up exceedingly well, the local woolen mills will be obliged to shut down entirely, or else reduce the force of employees to half of the number now employed at reduced earnings.

HOW BUSINESS BOOMED IN ENGLAND.

These are depressing pictures—in America. Let us turn again to the bright side of the shield—to the lands where the Democratic tariff legislation had brought the active business and the good times, the full employment and the full wages that were so conspicuously lacking here. Let us turn to where the real, grateful beneficiaries of the Democratic tariff live—to the other side of the Atlantic Ocean.

As early as April 25, 1914, "there was a common report in Yorkshire that several Bradford shipping houses were declaring their invoices in London and provincial centers in order to hide the real extent of the trade that was being done with the United States. It was also stated that British manufacturers and merchants were objecting to the publication of the monthly export statistics of American consuls"—as giving the American newspapers and the American Congress too much information of the havoc wrought by the Democratic tariff with American industries. Thus, the Bradford correspondent of the Daily Trade Record of February 27, 1914, said:

The piece-goods trade exhibits further signs of expansion. Whether American manufacturers like it or not, there is an important business doing in fabrics which could be essentially produced in American mills. They consist of an almost endless variety of goods, from the thinnest summer-wear fabrics of a popular order to thick overcoats for next fall wear. Bradford shipping houses are unable to cope with their orders.

There was at that same time no noticeable difficulty in coping with the orders of American mills, where one-fourth or one-half of the machinery was idle and one-fourth or one-half of the workpeople out of employment. It is not strange that the British beneficiaries of the Democratic tariff legislation were solicitous that the real facts should not be disclosed to the American public.

But the American consuls could not be successfully muzzled either by British manufacturers or by a disconcerted State Department. In the Daily Consular and Trade Reports of March 23, 1914, the American consul at Huddersfield, England, said:

There is no doubt that Huddersfield woolen manufacturers are benefiting materially by the new American tariff. Many of the mills are gone on full time after many weeks of depression. The value of all kinds of textile goods invoiced through this consulate to the United States in February, 1914, exceeded by $199,000 the exportation of similar goods during the same month of 1913.

From Great Britain and the Continent generally woolen fabrics are coming into the United States in amounts and values three or four times as great as under the Republican protective tariff. There are imports almost as great in other departments of industry. The displacing of American-made goods by foreign-made goods in a hundred lines, and the consequent throwing out of work of American wage earners, begin to affect very seriously the purchasing power of the American people.

RAILROADS AND WAGE EARNERS HARD HIT.

The railroads—the amounts of their passenger and freight business—are unfailing barometers of the state of general business. Between January 1 and March 28, 1914, the New York Central Railroad, according to A. T. Hardin, vice president, had laid off 25,000 men—about 15,000 on lines east of Buffalo and 10,000 west of Buffalo. "Compared with 1913," said Mr. Hardin, "the business of this year on the New York Central suffered a reduction of from 8 to 10 per cent. The reduction of the working force has been in the same ratio."

Mr. James M. Lynch, commissioner of the State department of labor at New York, announced in his annual report that not since 1896, with the single exception of the financial panic year of 1908, had so many union workmen been idle. The cause, Commissioner Lynch said, was "simply lack of work. * * * At the same time idleness due to labor disputes was almost a negligible factor." There were 47,000 idle people in the clothing trades and 16,000 or 17,000 in the building trades.

That is what a few months of Democratic tariff for revenue only had done to the toiling masses of the Empire State.

The total operating revenue of the Pennsylvania Railroad system, East and West, for the seven months from January to July, 1914, inclusive, showed a decrease of $18,745,102.93—a shrinkage almost equally divided between East and West.

The New York Journal of Commerce of July 30, 1914, in its Pittsburgh dispatch, stated that:

A majority of the steel mills are operating actually from 33 to 55 per cent of their capacity, and the same can be said of the blast furnaces. A careful report on labor conditions submitted this week from official sources shows that in the Pittsburgh district, including a radius of 40 miles, there are 75,000 idle men. Of these probably one-third are railroad employees, and over 20,000 are in the coal fields. The steel trade and metal industries supply the bulk of the remainder. Financial reports indicate further that the pay roll of the district is $350,000 per day less than a year ago, when it was averaging $1,000,000 a day.

The American Protective Tariff League, of New York, in a bulletin issued in July last, said:

A startling decrease in the income and purchasing power of American wage earners in this period of industrial and business depression, following the enactment of the Underwood free-trade tariff law, is shown as the result of careful inquiry by the American Protective Tariff League. The decrease in pay-roll checks passing through the banks in the chief centers of industry and business is the surest possible proof of the serious blight that free trade has inflicted upon the earning and spending capacity of American labor.

This shrinkage in wage payments, as reported by 64 banks, amounted to $866,908.01 in the third week in June, 1914, as compared with the third week in June, 1913, when the Payne protective tariff was in operation. If the same rate of decrease should apply for the whole year from the 64 banks reporting, it would show a decrease of wages paid amounting to $45,079,216.52. If applied to all the banks of the country for a full year, the shrinkage would amount up into hundreds of millions of dollars. It is a shrinkage that is felt in every line of business. When a free-trade tariff thus reduces the number and contents of American pay envelopes the calamity becomes nation wide.

PROTEST OF PENNSYLVANIA MANUFACTURERS.

The Manufacturers' Association of Montgomery County, Pa., over the signature of C. F. Williams, president, and W. W. Finn, secretary, on July 17, 1914, sent a letter to President Wilson, stating that—

In a great measure that part of the Schuylkill Valley for which we now speak is industrially paralyzed—

Urging modifications and increases of the tariff, and reminding President Wilson that—

No finer opportunity ever presented itself to any political party to rise above partisanship and serve the people than is now offered the Democratic Party to so change the present tariff law as to give both capital and labor a decent chance in the country in which that Democratic Party boasts that it is the servant of the people.

This memorial of the Montgomery County manufacturers further said:

Is capital to be tabooed? Are successful business men to be declassed as citizens and classified as malefactors? Is the law to say to one class of citizens, Sabotage is lawful; and to another class, Property is plunder? The feeling is abroad that malice and class hatred are being toyed with by our representatives in Washington. Men are frightened as never before in the history of this Nation. They tremble for their country. They fear the cause of the depression is more dangerous than the effect. Men bear to you the tidings, so it is said, that there is no depression; men are not out of work; the country suffers from nothing but "calamity howlers." Our answer is this: In the Schuylkill Valley there is depression; the streets of the Schuylkill Valley towns are lined with men who have no work and who one year ago were well employed; the floors of the Schuylkill Valley warehouses are piled with goods for which there is no market and no demand. We speak only for the Schuylkill Valley, but for that we do speak. When any man rises in your presence to tell you, as President of our country, that these men in the Schuylkill Valley can work if they will, that the work is here and that they

are crying out merely to discredit your administration, that all this talk about depression is due to an inflamed imagination, then we rise to say that that man, whoever he may be, is guilty of mockery that is exquisitely cruel.

Up to the present time no reply has come from the White House.

During the ten days ending May 24, 1912, 35 coke ovens were put out of blast in the Connellsville district.

Mr. Alba B. Johnson, president of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, in a statement on June 24, 1914, before the United States Commission on Industrial Relations at Philadelphia said that "In the last year the number of men employed by the Baldwin Locomotive Works has decreased from a normal working force of between 17,000 and 18,000 to 8,200."

On July 16, 1914, the New York Journal of Commerce announced that—

Revision of the tariff schedules affecting glass is responsible for the establishment by the Von Gerichten Art Glass Company of Columbus, Ohio, of a plant in Munich, Germany. It was explained by an officer of the company that under the reduced tariff the product can be manufactured more advantageously and imported into the United States on better terms than can be made here.

HAVOC IN THE STEEL AND IRON TRADE.

On June 25, 1914, Judge Gary, in an address to the presidents of the subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation, said:

I think you will agree with me that in our line, taken as a whole, business conditions during the last few months have been worse than before at any time during the last decade.

That the tariff law lately passed has adversely affected the business condition of this country is my judgment. This is not or ought not to be a political question. It is an economic question. To my mind it is unfair to any country to place it upon a free-trade basis if it has to come into competition with another country which is on a protective basis, assuming, of course, that the interests of the countries respectively are the same with reference to the application of laws of this kind. I have never believed in protective laws which would permit the citizens of any country to collect unreasonable prices for their commodities. I believe protection should cease at the point where mere protection is afforded and where opportunity to oppress commences. But the present laws, so far as they affect our business at least, are not in my judgment adequate to protect. We have reason to expect that with the present tariff law the earnings of manufacturers will not be as large as they ought to be in order to furnish to the investor a fair return on the capital actually invested in his business or the payment to his employees of the wages they need and should be entitled to receive. If this be true it is only a question of time when the majority of the people will realize that unreasonably low-tariff rates are not of general benefit, and in that case there will be a change in the policy of the country.

Mr. J. C. Maben, president of the Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Co., as quoted in the New York Sun of April 14, 1914, declared that—

The outlook in the steel industry is devoid of hope for even a moderate return of activity in the near future, as a result of the tariff. This is the trouble with the new tariff—

Said Mr. Maben:

It makes this country subservient to Europe. The minute business picks up here the European manufacturers will ship goods in and underbid us until their home market improves. There can be no independent steel market movement in this country under the new tariff.

Mr. Maben added that he was a southern manufacturer; his company was a southern company; he had served as an officer in the Confederate Army under Lee; but that the new tariff was producing a profound effect upon southern sentiment, and that the widespread business depression should operate to make it impossible for the Democrats to elect even one man to Congress north of Mason and Dixon's line, except possibly in the Tammany strongholds.

Mr. John A. Topping, president of the Republic Iron & Steel Co., speaking after the new tariff had been a few months in operation, declared that—

About 250,000 steel workers were either out of work or on reduced pay, due to foreign competition at seacoast points following the tariff reduction.

Mr. Topping added:

While the American manufacturer has not abandoned seacoast markets, yet to hold those markets on account of the high labor and transportation costs profits have been sacrificed and it necessarily follows that if present conditions should be long continued or should lower prices from abroad confront us, wage reductions are inevitable.

The iron and steel trade is often and well described as the barometer of business in America. That its indications under the new disastrous Democratic tariff have been faithful and unerring is proved by the further fact that the new incorporations of business enterprises reported in the Eastern States in May, 1914, amounted in capital to only about $62,000,000, against $172,000,000 in May of 1913, while the total amount of new incorporations from January 1 to June 1 was only $428,000,000 compared with $1,060,000,000 in the same period of the previous year. "A shrinkage of more than one-half in new enterprise or initiative," said the New York Journal of Commerce of June 6, 1914, "means something more than a state of mind or mental mourning."

AN OLD-CLOTHES TARIFF.

When times are dull people must still eat and food must be purchased. But they can postpone the buying of new clothes and wear old suits another year. This, apparently, is what has happened under the Democratic tariff for revenue only, which may well be called an old-suit tariff. In the New York Daily Trade Record of June 19, 1914, one of the chief clothing manufacturers of the country said:

We have not sold 50 per cent of what we sold this time last year, and if this is not an indication that the boys' clothing trade is far from good, nothing is.

The retailer is afraid to buy. He is living from hand to mouth. A few years ago he would place a substantial order, covering perhaps the entire season, whereas now he buys just what he needs and no more. There is no fear of cancellation. There is nothing to cancel.

So thousands and thousands of American schoolboys are and have been wearing old clothes another season because of the blight to business and the loss of employment of their fathers, due directly and solely to economic blundering in Washington.

One of the few business men quoted in favor of a reduction of the tariff last year was Mr. Frank S. Turnbull, vice president of the Rogers Peet Co., a great clothing concern of New York. The Daily Trade Record quoted Mr. Turnbull thus, May 25, 1914—he had just returned from Europe on the *Mauretania:*

Thirty-five per cent ad valorem duty on products of wool, as defined in Schedule K, is too low. Forty-five or 50 per cent would give us all the foreign goods we need, for style, quality, or competition, at practically no greater cost to the consumer, enabling our own mills to be more generally employed, and at a living profit. Invite capital to-day to invest in woolen or worsted plants, and watch the response. * * * British manufacturers who have been doing business with the United States under the old protective tariff have doubled and trebled their former business under this new tariff.

Mr. Turnbull was one of the gentlemen whose criticisms of the former Schedule K were most impressively quoted by the Democratic authors of the present tariff law, whose effects he now describes as beneficial only to Europe and disastrous to America.

A CASE IN POINT IN PENNSYLVANIA.

It is significant that Schedule K has almost dropped out of the Democratic vocabulary these days. Some weeks ago Representative PALMER, of Pennsylvania, ventured to declare:

In my own town of Stroudsburg, Pa., a large woolen mill which closed down before the tariff law was passed has been reopened for business with apparently good prospects.

Whereupon the president of this large woolen mill, Mr. Thomas J. Kitson, of Thomas Kitson & Son (Inc.), stated in the Textile Manufacturers Journal of June 27, 1914:

Congressman PALMER is perfectly right in saying that the mill at Stroudsburg closed down before the tariff law went into effect. This is true; but at that time I was sole owner, and did it on account of local conditions, and when I closed the mill I had four months' work before me, which was turned over to other manufacturers.

The mill was opened in March as a corporation, and we had to start with orders on a semistaple fabric, which we have been making for the last five or six years, and by constant effort we have been able to keep running, and if we retain our health we expect to continue as long as we can run without a loss.

In my limited experience as a manufacturer I do not recall as uncertain a market as the present, not only in the selling of merchandise, but in the purchasing of raw materials. I hope that the people who read the extract from the Philadelphia North American will not take the item seriously, as it appears to me as a joke. Nevertheless, business is unsatisfactory—low prices, constant change in styles and fabrics and ruinous competition. We do not give any credit to the Democratic Party for being able to run our plant, but will be thankful if we can continue without loss.

We have other industries in Stroudsburg that are working three days a week, and most of the plants are working short time. I wonder if the explanation is psychological.

The great manufacturing communities of Pennsylvania, as well as the small communities, are learning every day by their keen individual experience the inevitable consequences of the economic policy which Representative PALMER champions. The Daily Trade Record of September 30, 1914, speaking of conditions in one of the most important of Philadelphia manufacturing districts, says:

"Never has Kensington experienced such poverty and destitution," states Mrs. M. W. Ketchum, the manager of the Richmond Soup Society. "Virtually all mills in this part of the city have shut down, and the poorer employees are absolutely without food. In many cases also they lack clothing. Thousands are undergoing the tortures of hunger. Fathers and sons tramp the streets despondently, while wives and little ones cry for food at home. Children can not go to school for lack of shoes. Each morning hundreds of people line up before the offices of the mill still in operation in a vain attempt to receive work.

"If the people who are so anxious to sympathize with and help the destitute of Europe could spend one day at my home, and see starving children and mothers beg me for food, they would realize that there is more than enough for them to do here in Philadelphia," added Mrs. Ketchum.

PRICES OF FOREIGN GOODS HIGHER THAN EVER.

Though American mills were hard pressed under the new Democratic tariff policy, no compensating benefits reached the masses of the people. Most European manufacturers apparently did as did those Chinese growers of coarse carpet wools,

according to L. O. McGowan, the head of the China-American Trading Co., of Tientsin, China, who said in the Daily Trade Record of July 20, 1914:

The Chinese wool growers and dealers have increased the price of their wool to offset the elimination of the tariff. It costs us as much to deliver raw wool in New York as it did under the old tariff.

Said Isadore Saks, a member of a great dry-goods house, in the New York newspapers of December 29, 1913:

Our buyers have been told before and since the new tariff went into effect that those from whom we buy goods intended to exact higher prices from us.

At the same time Appraiser Higgins, of the Port of New York, said:

I have heard reports that the foreigners intend to take advantage of the tariff reduction by adding on the duty to their selling price.

The editor of the American Sheep Breeder, of Chicago, a few weeks ago asked the principal department stores and merchant-tailoring establishments of Chicago whether there had been any reduction in price to retail purchasers of clothing under the new tariff law. They said that they could get their cloth for somewhat less, but that the completed clothing was sold to the people for the same prices as before—only one house making an exception to this—but declaring that men's ready-to-wear suits showed a decided reduction in price when offered at clearance sales. In other words, in order to secure cheaper clothing in Chicago under the new tariff law it is necessary to watch for and grab at the bargain counter.

NO MORE TALK OF THE COST OF LIVING.

Innumerable instances could be cited to prove that though employment has been reduced and wages thereby cut, the cost of living is as high as or higher than ever in America. Our Democratic Department of Commerce, in its Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States for August, 1914, quotes the monthly average export prices of principal domestic products for July, 1914, under the new tariff law and for July, 1913, under the previous tariff legislation. Anthracite coal, which sold for $5.09 a ton in July, 1913, was selling in July, 1914, at $5.32 a ton—an advance in the cost of the fuel of the people. Coffee had gone up slightly, from 15.6 cents to 15.9 cents a pound. Unbleached cotton cloths had advanced from 6.9 cents a yard to 7.6 cents, and bleached cotton cloths from 7.7 cents to 8.8 cents.

Eggs, which were selling wholesale at 19.8 cents a dozen in July, 1913, were bringing 20.6 cents in July, 1914. Dried apples had gone up from 7 cents to 8.7 cents a pound, prunes from 5.1 cents to 8 cents, and raisins from 6 cents to 7.3 cents. Fresh beef had advanced from 11.3 cents to 12.7 cents, and bacon from 13.4 cents to 13.9 cents. Butter, which was selling at 23.4 cents a pound in July, 1913, brought 23.9 cents in July, 1914—and there was less work and less income for the average family. Refined sugar, which sold at 3.6 cents a pound in July, 1913, sold at 3.8 cents a pound in July, 1914—according to these official figures of the Government. Potatoes had advanced from 77.6 cents to $1.08 a bushel.

These official records tell their story—but there is no real need of presenting them. Everybody knows that the Democratic pledge to reduce the cost of living has not been kept—that the Democratic prophecy has proved an utter failure. It is probable that this promise to reduce the cost of living did more than any other thing to win for President Wilson the plurality vote which in the face of the division of his protectionist opponents gave his party the victory in the election of November, 1912. It was a promise which in the very nature of things could not be kept, but it served its purpose of humbugging some of the American people. They can not be humbugged again. It is everywhere tacitly recognized that they can not be fooled a second time—and all talk of the cost of living has dropped suddenly out of Democratic discussion of the issues of the day.

WORSE THAN WAS FEARED.

The authors of this so-called war-revenue measure themselves acknowledged the utter failure of their original fiscal legislation by framing a bill which is estimated to yield as great an additional income as $105,000,000. They assume and acknowledge with reason that bad as the record of their tariff legislation is already, it is going to be worse. They are providing liberally for the utter collapse of their fiscal system. In their hearts they have no more faith in it than have Republicans. Therefore, they are using this occasion and opportunity of the European war to make a very generous provision for the future and to cover up the inevitable consequences of their own shortcoming for several years to come. Their foresight now is more to be commended than their sagacity last year when their tariff bill was pending. They have learned something in the interval. They have come to a realizing sense that an economic policy that closes mills in the United States and transfers their trade to Europe will inevitably bring disaster not only to the manufacturers and their employees, but to the National Treasury also. A year ago, in this Chamber, I predicted failure and disappointment as the certain result of the Democratic tariff bill, but I did not anticipate what has actually happened. I did not foresee that before that tariff legislation had completed its first year an emergency measure would have been brought into Congress under the shadow of a foreign war with which we have nothing to do—a measure estimated to eke out the failing revenues of a revenue-only scheme by the huge sum of $105,000,000. The Democratic record of achievement, or lack of achievement, is proving worse than its Republican critics prophesied, and in view of what has actually happened, I can only wonder at and regret my moderation of a year ago.

ONE GREAT COST OF THE WAR ON BUSINESS.

Without any desire to impugn the honest purpose and the patriotism of the leaders of the Democratic Party, it must be said that the warfare which that party has so long conducted on the conservative business interests of the United States has led to some very serious consequences for that party and for the Nation. The free-silver agitation, the free-trade agitation, the radical and vindictive assaults on large corporations and prosperous business, for no other reason, apparently, than that they were large and prosperous, have year by year been driving out of the Democratic Party in the Northern States the business and professional men who were once the choicest portion of its members.

So long as the Democratic Party was out of power this did not seem to make much difference, but now, unfortunately for the country, and merely because of a passing division in the ranks of its antagonists, the Democratic Party is in power; and it is suffering and the country is suffering because of a lack in its membership and its leadership of clear-headed, responsible, conservative business men. These men were in the Democratic Party once; that party long had a fair share of the merchants, the manufacturers, the bankers, the employers of the country. But one blunder after another, one unsound propaganda after another, has caused men of this type to leave the Democratic Party everywhere. Therefore, when the chance of politics has brought that party into control of the National Government, these men are not available for Democratic councils. The party leaders are handicapped without them. No such tariff law as the law now on the statute books would ever have been framed if the business men who used to be in the Democratic Party were any longer in that party. If they had remained there would have been no such tariff as the present tariff, and there would have been no war-revenue bill—none would have been needed.

The Democratic war on business has proved a terrible misfortune to that party by driving out of it so many of the men who are most needed in the councils of any great political party. But it has been also a terrible misfortune to the whole United States.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I arise to address myself to the speech just delivered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. The distinguished Senator gives as his reason for speaking at the first hour of the morning that he wishes to leave on an afternoon train for somewhere. I trust the Senator may do me the courtesy of remaining a while with us upon this particular occasion. Apart from the gratification it would be to the Senate to see him occasionally, it would be a source of personal compliment to me to feel that he might remain to hear such observations as I might deign to contribute concerning anything tendered by him.

I will assure the Senator that I have listened with increasing interest to his manuscript address, which, if it did nothing else, added much to the infant industry of clipping bureaus, and gave great reward in certainly one direction to the usually unemployed; that is, those who busy their lives in slandering their country by making misrepresentations of its conditions. Having listened to the able utterance of the Senator, and noting what industry has characterized his pursuit, I thought that I discerned a reflection of many things uttered by him during the making of the tariff bill which we now speak of as the Underwood-Simmons bill. I thought I recognized many old friends that had been introduced at that particular time to stage their performance; and I am quite content now to be convinced that the Senator found it profitable to reintroduce them, much as the master of a Punch and Judy show, who, with his little manikins upon his knees, presses the lever at the proper moment that they may yap forth what the master spirit has whispered to them to gabble.

I am not a man to condemn a thing which my jealous nature really envies. A capacity, believe me, I do not criticize, which I

am compelled to confess myself wholly lacking; but I wonder if the able Senator from Pennsylvania realizes the real situation presented by his arraignment of his country, written out with deliberation, delivered after reflection, and presented without apology. What a strange spectacle would be presented to the gallery of this legislative body were it occupied by those who were not at heart with our system and did not have an appreciation of the exceeding partisan hypocrisy which is oftentimes indulged in by those put out of power and whose anxiety is by any method to return. That an able Senator of the United States, coming from so distinguished a State as Pennsylvania, should find it profitable to arraign before the civilized world his country as having resolved itself deliberately into an almshouse, its citizens begging from door to door, its factories stilled, its industries paralyzed, its capacities ended, its honor shamed——

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. LEWIS. Oh, certainly; I yield.

Mr. PENROSE. I would be the last Member of this body to say that such a result was brought about deliberately. I expressly said that I gave every credit for the patriotism and well meaning of the members of the party in power. At least, I meant to convey that idea; but I said that was the result, so apparent to all men that it hardly required discussion from me.

Mr. LEWIS. I am pleased to see the Senator recognize that there was due the apology for his utterance, after he delivered it, that he should have recognized before he made it; and to the degree that he continues to wish to apologize I yield at any time for such interruption, that he may at least clear his personal character of the accusation, which is bound to follow, of want of thought or want of patriotism on the part of so distinguished a representative of so eminent a State.

Mr. PENROSE. I am not apologizing to the Senator. I am trying to correct him. I do not believe he listened carefully to all of my remarks. I would not expect him to do so.

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator says he is not apologizing—I regret his confession of a default of duty—but that he is seeking to correct me. In many things the Senator could do so, for I have really no practice in the art in which he seems so proficient, judging by the address delivered this day. He says I did not hear him. I assure my able friend that I gave the most patient consideration to his paper, for at the outset it attracted me for its mendacity, and it continued to hold me for its misrepresentation. [Laughter.]

I say to the able Senator that all of these conditions to which he alludes are born of imagination, undoubtedly, or, rather, are the result, I fear, of his having had little opportunity to be here in his seat and observe the official records which have been tendered from time to time in this body of the real conditions of his country at large, rather than that particular and specific condition which seems wholly to apply to the State which the Senator represents. Deplorable must be that situation; and, believe me, I view it as regrettable that a State which has been consecutively Republican since the Civil War, with very rare exceptions, could, with officeholders in every branch of it dominated by the policies directed by the able Senator himself, confess its situation in such blight and misery as to be the object of pathos and sympathy of the generous and the contempt of the just. I realize that we read from the public press that this very excellent State, with its unlimited resources, every now and then is presented to the country—with the administration in power guided by the able Senator from Pennsylvania—as having public officials who, when not in a penitentiary for having robbed the State, pillaged the statehouse, looted the treasury, are in office until they get from office back to the penitentiary. Now, this rapid mutation that seems unfortunately to characterize the coming and going of Pennsylvania's Republican officials, their entrances and their exits, no doubt may be due to the conditions which Pennsylvania presents to them in the way of opportunities for that political pillage of the Nation generally and of itself frequently. Yet if the Senator himself can find a pride in presenting his glorious Commonwealth as being so desolate in situation, so wanting in industry, so degraded in condition, then, while I deeply deplore that one of the great States of my country should have descended to such a low level, I must leave him to the fate of his constituency when he returns to them, when they look upon him as recording their State in the annals of the Nation as the most unworthy Commonwealth in the Union.

The Senator, I do know, has read his classics. I know him to be an educated gentleman, a man learned in those things which characterize the thing we call literature and education. Thus he will recall a character of Cassandra, who was the individual who could see nothing save in a very doleful light, the atmosphere of whose very life was murky and putrefying, whose every prophecy was of disaster of the present and the death of the future. While I feel that the Senator has been a disciple of the classics, I regret to feel that from this example alone he seems to have absorbed his policy, and therefrom seems to pattern—a Cassandra of ill fortune, a prophet of dire disaster, one who hopes for the destruction of things around him, that upon their wreck he may himself rise to some form of political conquest.

But I must again remind my able friend that his absence from our midst, regretful as it is, has been the real reason for his having obtained and absorbed this erroneous vision. I had the honor to know my distinguished friend when I was a Member of the House from the State of Washington and he then a distinguished Member of this body; and when I later was complimented by my now State of Illinois with the privilege of returning here, among others I naturally looked for in old and familiar places were those with whom I had borne an acquaintance. Often since I have been in the Senate I would look over to the seat which my able and learned friend was wont to occupy, trusting that I might see him in his radiant effulgence, in his personal contentment, and in his prominent personality. From these I hoped to gather that pleasing inspiration which comes from viewing things attractive to the eye and consoling to the spirit. But, alas! I would find the chair empty, from day unto day desolate, no shadow of my able friend shading his place.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, does it interfere with the logical sequence of the Senator's remarks for me to address an inquiry to him?

Mr. LEWIS. No; I welcome an inquiry from my learned friend.

Mr. PENROSE. The dreadful rumor has reached my ear from this side of the Chamber that the Senator was recently arrested by the Sergeant at Arms and haled into this Chamber by reason of his absence. I can hardly credit the rumor, and I hope the Senator is in position to deny it. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, it is true that if any information came to the Senator as to my being absent or present on any particular occasion it would have to come by rumor, for he was never present enough to ascertain the fact himself. [Laughter.] It is likewise true that at midnight, when this body was sacrificing much to attend to public business and the able Senator sacrificing public business to attend to his political business, when, wearied and fatigued, I had departed and gone to my club, thereafter an emergency did arise; and my colleagues, so that I should remain at my post, brought me forward with force and against my objections. But the able Senator from Pennsylvania had so hied himself off to such distant posts of anywhere, rather than hereabouts, that his presence could neither be ascertained by the officers of the law nor by his colleagues. Thus he could not be apprehended, even to be forced to do his duty in any form within the law. [Laughter.] It is that to which I am now adverting—the absence of my distinguished friend, but it is not the absences which have attracted me so much as his occasional returning after his absences.

Mr. President, if one turns his eyes to the heavens, when the mind is aided by the contemplation of astronomy, one recalls that the planet Saturn has a method, during the cycle of time, of coming, ever and anon, once in a while, and looking out from the heavens, blazing its brilliancy upon mankind below, and then retreating and retiring under a cloud, that when it shall come again the interval between its visits may attract, and its illumination upon return be all the grander. I must assume my able friend has been watching the course of Saturn and duplicating his errands, because I recall on one particular occasion I happened to note the able Senator in the Senate. We were then having under consideration a resolution touching our interests in Mexico—upon the affairs of Vera Cruz. From the public press of the Nation the able Senator had gathered that there were very serious matters afoot in the Senate. He knew that at that time his constituents, no doubt, would wonder why he was not present, and he had read in the public papers how a large attendance would no doubt be at the Senate, the galleries crowded. He could not lose that opportunity either to contribute his usual wisdom or to make the display of his attractive personality. Then he came, and I wish him now to note that on that particular occasion I credit his presence, and I remember he came with a view and for the purpose of opposing whatever was being done by the majority. True, the able Senator had not been here previously to understand the reasons for what had been done, nor had he knowledge why it was being done, nor information concerning the manner in which it was to be done. It was enough that the

opportunity was his to oppose whatever was to be done by this administration.

I heard my able friend exult in the reflection that great trouble was possibly ahead for us. He could not see how we should avoid it. A cowardice he charged had beset us because we did not, with great force of arms, go into Mexico to avenge what in his mind were the wrongs to American citizens and American interests. I thought, as I saw the able Senator then, that we would soon lose him; that we would find him shortly taking his departure to Mexico, and with the aid of his perfect military presence and his command generally of the things which only succeed with the eminent resources which he can summon, giving to Mexico the aid of his great belligerent service. But no; the Senator had no doubt read of Don Quixote, who, mounted upon his Rosinante, took a tilt at a windmill, and my friend did not hesitate to come into the Senate and take a tilt at it with his personal "wind jabs." I was particularly attracted by my able friend as he poured out, in the completeness of his capacities, his declamation against us, pouring forth upon the air his maledictions on the Democracy, President Wilson, and the tyrants in Mexico. Then, with this eruption, the volcano subsided and apparently sunk into earth.

I did not see the able Senator again for some time, and then it was when we had before the Senate the question of the repeal of the tolls. The Senator had read that a very large and eminent population of Pennsylvania, designated the Irish, were likely to be greatly aroused, and he fancied, no doubt, how he could capitalize these distinguished and very loyal people into political supporters if he would give them the appearance that he, too, was now against England and make them feel what an Irish patriot he had become. Notwithstanding a short while previous to that the able Senator had voted here in the Senate for the very theory presented by the Democratic President in his recommendation for repeal of free tolls, he found it agreeable to return here for the purpose which his political experience sometimes had rewarded—that is, to vote against the very thing which he previously had advocated and voted for.

Now, I do not wish to be understood as making any reflection upon my friend. Personally our relations are most agreeable; but as I witnessed that peculiar acrobatic performance I could not but contemplate how the record recited that the Senator at college was an athlete in body. Now I noted he had become one in mind, as he disclosed such an agility in political somersaults.

Then my able friend would depart; aye, he did depart. I would not see him again until many moons waxed and waned. I do not know in what he was engaged, nor would that concern me; but I remember again when I saw him here in the Senate for the third time. It was when the shipping bill was here and when there was an effort made by the Democratic administration to relieve the oppression of the Nation and seize it from the clutch of the Shipping Trust by affording some form of competition in shipping to aid commerce. The able Senator was promptly upon the spot, that the Philadelphia shipping yards might not be neglected or that the Shipping Trust which had so long drawn its revenues from his particular domain might not be overlooked in the favors which might be granted it by assuring it that no competition was to be permitted against its monopoly privilege. Then the Senator, with his voice and with his presence, regaled us again with his opposition.

I would have the Senator to understand that I rather admire him. There was something about these recurrent visits and departures which rather attracted me, because I remember it has ever been a maxim among a certain sort of men that familiarity with the great and too constant presence of the powerful weakens their influence and lessens attraction. I recall that history tells us that Pericles had a way of walking through the back streets of Athens on his way to deliver his orations, and when concluded taking his departure to the villa amid olive groves, only to be seen by a few; that he would hie himself to the classic valley where he resided until subsequently called again by a great occasion where his wisdom might illumine and shape the surroundings.

We also do recall that there was such a thing as the Delphic oracle. What an interesting personage that was. He was a very splendid citizen as we understand, and stood outside a very sacred place, seldom uttering an expression until an occasion arose—some particular untoward event—and then would in grave demeanor give forth the oracular utterance, sage, marvelous, mysterious, and confusing. For that he was known as the wise. The able Senator has patterned well after the oracle as it can be found sitting upon his tripod uttering occasionally his mystic utterances and sending forth his frightening and horrifying forebodings.

I will say, therefore, the Senator has something of my admiration for the success he has in emulating the oracles. The Senator will recall with me that little passage as I recall from the old editions of Shakespeare's comedies where Falstaff rushes up to Prince Hal and says:

> By my faith, dear Prince, you go to it; I will rush quickly and give the cut mortal and then me back to the woods, behind a tree. You remain, and if any comes to harm me unhorse them, as ye love me.

[Laughter.]

Now, does the able Senator from Pennsylvania fancy that merely by these recurring visits here and there to the Senate upon these particular occasions, when only he pretends in some manner to utter a mere protest against that which is—though he know not what it is—that from this he may gather the information of the condition of the country?

Ah, Mr. President, in a more serious vein I ask my able friend what would you think of this spectacle if presented in the reverse picture—if an able Senator, whose only voice in behalf of his constituency was to protest against any advance and whose only cry was one of disaster and defamation against his own country, one whose whole record may be searched in vain to find an instance when he could have ever found it in his soul to give approval for any work, however admired by men, merely because it came from a Republican President and a Republican administration? Shall it be said, and said in truth, that the able Senator who holds that altitude of place as a Senator from Pennsylvania shall perform the whole of his office with credit to him and true service to Pennsylvania by filling merely the position of one who would veto the right in order to advance the wrong, who would defeat righteousness in order that that which is evil might prevail, only because the right and the righteous came from a Democratic administration?

Is there nothing anywhere in all this administration good enough to meet the approval of my able friend? Where in the record of the distinguished Senator will he lay his finger now, to me his colleague and friend, where he ever found anything he could give his vote and approval to in the policies of the Democratic administration in two years?

Does the able Senator fancy that he can convince the American multitude that there sits in the White House a despot of legislation on the one hand and a traitor to patriotism on the other? Was there never any deed on the part of his fellow American and his neighbor, the President, worthy of the approval of himself in his capacity as official of the eminent State and the worthy people which with his ability the distinguished Senator represents?

How long does the Senator himself feel that the reflective sense of a just people, the judgment of a wise people, will continue in supine indifference to such things as this without their condemnation? If such should have transpired from a man on this side with such regularity and consecutive performance against a Republican President for no other motive than partisan opposition, what would have been the judgment of the Senator? I can fancy him crying out from the sacred scripture law demanding of that man's constituents, "Is thy servant a dog that he should do such thing?"

What is the complaint? It is, as I gather from the Senator's address, that there are things which in his estimate have gone awry in the country, and he will picture it as being of such desolation and distress as having dishonored this Republic. He holds up that disgrace for the gratification of her rivals, for the joy and satisfaction of her enemies. Mr. President, we recall that Pitt in the House of Commons, in his famous speech on the overtures of Napoleon, said, "Can it be possible that there are those in this House who would rather have glory from their country's enemies for destroying the honor of their nation than the reward of their own people for upholding its credit and dignity?" If the shades of Pitt were within this assembly it would not be difficult, indeed, to observe that in this great American House there are instances here and there when such a spectacle was presented to the American heart to the astonishment of the mind and to the sadness of the soul.

Now, the able Senator says that this bill which is the theme of his discussion comes as a tax upon the American people without justification, without excuse, and with nothing that can offer defense in its favor. What is the position of the able Senator? It is, as I construe it, that money has not been dragged from the taxpayers of this country by a Democratic administration in such quantity and amount as could repose in the Treasury in volume sufficient to have contemplated the

mishaps of conflict in Europe and the disasters of war upon the world. How could such have been done? Now, my able friend, in the language of the sacred law, "come, let us reason together." What do you ask in that speech which is to go out to your constituents in millions of copies? Do you ask that the Democratic administration shall have levied taxes upon the American public to such an extent and such volume in excess of its needs that merely such should slumber in the Treasury in the form of a war tax, there to abide the time when the conflicts of the world might make such available?

If the charge be that the Democrats have failed to levy taxes sufficient to produce and maintain a surplus in the Treasury of such great quantity that could have been sufficient to meet all emergencies of extraordinary demands of the Government, as well to be in a sum equal to the demands caused by the devastation of the war in Europe, our answer is, we confess such is true. The Democracy declines to sit by and contemplate the prospective wars of the world and for such hold in the Treasury for emergency such millions of dollars, which may be required should such arise, and thus lay the heavy hand of the Government's taxing power upon the bread of the laborer, upon the clothes of the toiler, the milk of the baby, and the miserable needs of the poor, in order to heap into the Treasury millions of dollars dragged from the millions of our needy countrymen, to the object of providing a war fund to meet the demands of a war of pride in the Old World; nor, sir, to give exemption from the obligations of duty to the monopoly speculator, to the money baron, or that favored stock gambler who in previous administrations prospered in the distress of his country and in the oppression of his countrymen.

How could this sum suggested by the Senator or that which is claimed should have been reposing in the Treasury have been obtained? In what manner could it have been brought forth to slumber in idleness in the Treasury, or to serve as the resource of the favored money lenders of the land? It could have been gotten but in one way—war taxes upon the breakfast table of the poor and increase the prices of his food. The Democracy declined to put unnecessary taxes upon the poor man and to wring from his poor possessions unnecessary dollars merely because it had the power to do so. The tax could have only been obtained by levying it upon the clothing of the masses of our people, and then increasing the price of garments they must wear to protect their bodies from the rigors of weather. The Democracy declined to place this oppression upon those defenseless merely because it had the power to do so. These taxes could only have been obtained by levying it upon the iron and steel implements of the farmer necessary to his occupation, to his plowing the field, to has garnering the grain, thus increasing the price of everything he had to purchase wherewith to make his existence. The Democracy declined to burden his already pained and chafed back merely because it had the power to do so. This money could only have been obtained by laying the draining pipe of taxation against the breasts of the prosperous of the middle class and the treasury of the well to do merely because it had the power to do so. The Democracy was laying up no war chest of money by filching the pockets of the humble, draining the life of the miserable, confiscating the property of the wealthy, which cheated the industries of the Nation and paralyzed the independence of its country. It confesses that it levied only such taxes as was absolutely necessary for the times and conditions under which the tax was laid. It refused to build a fortune for the unknown to-morrow out of the distresses of the yesterday. It laid no heavier hand than that which justice impelled and such as the then present necessity justified. It was content to await any emergency which might demand a further reaching to the treasuries of the people, and then make that necessity known in complete confidence that the sacrifice of the Democracy ever made for its people would be understood by the Nation and approved; that if an emergency arose that called for exactions of an unusual nature and of an unexpected kind the Democracy to the full extent that the severity demanded would comply, and then, and only then, would it entail upon its people the inconvenience or the loss—only then would it shift on the shoulders of the Nation the unexpected and disagreeable burden. But in doing this, in whatever hour it was called for, the Democracy had the abiding faith that, judged by the solicitude it had shown for its people in the past, it would be welcome to approach in the future the patriotism and regard of its fellow citizens, and to these make its appeal for whatever necessities the hour may require, conscious that the response would be in obedience to the demand and an indorsement of the course. As the Democracy has never lost consideration for the condition of its people, and ever served them to the full need of their justice, it has full confidence that the people in return will respond to the need of the Democracy and its demand upon the citizenship for the preservation of their Nation, the maintenance of the dignity of the country, and the upholding and sustaining the honor and devotion of its President.

Says the Senator, "All is a failure." What has been a failure, my able friend? He answers, "The tariff law passed has been a failure." To what extent, according to the charge and accusation? we ask. He replies, in effect, "It has failed to produce a surplus of money sufficient to have met these unusual conditions and the extraordinary emergency which has come upon the Nation, unexpected by all, which all would have avoided."

Again I answer, the policy of the Democracy, let the Senator understand, is in no wise whatever to lay its hands upon the purses of the people, upon the prosperity of the well to do, upon the poor possessions of the humble, merely because they can do it. Our policy is as little taxes as necessary, not as much taxes as possible. Then could the Senator assume that $100,000,000 now made necessary by the conditions could have been anticipated by this particular framing of the tariff bill? My friend, $100,000,000, you say, is about to be levied upon your countrymen to meet this emergency. Well, under the Dingley tariff law passed in 1897 there was no anticipation of the Spanish-American War of 1898, nor did the wisdom of the leaders suggest the course of levying a tax so high and gathering the surplus in such volume that there might repose in the Treasury the $700,000,000 which became necessary for the Spanish-American War emergency. Where is the logic which in one breath can say that the Democratic tariff bill is a failure because it could not anticipate the war emergency of $100,000,000 and yours a success that failed, likewise, to anticipate one of emergency that called for seven times more?

How shall we conduct Government, if it be not upon the theory of ordinary business and in the course of common sense? The Democracy felt that if there came a time or a reason for additional taxes upon their countrymen in addition to that which was levied, they needed only tell their people the reason, give them the justification, trust to their patriotism and the approval of their sense and judgment in order to support the undertaking. Therefore I anticipate in the future that the opposition will be so discounted in the confidence of their countrymen that they dare not fail to tell the truth of the situation wherever it exists.

Fortunately for the Democracy we neither needed to apprehend such a state of the want of confidence in her or loss of patriotism on the part of her people. The address of the able Senator will be fruitless in seeking to frighten them on the one hand as it will be profitless to benefit him on the other.

Now, says the able Senator, here is this $100,000,000 to be raised. Well, I have a word with my friend. What have you to say, my learned friend, and the Senators who join with you in this protest, to this query? What remedy do you suggest for your country's predicament, this embarrassment which is not brought on ourselves by ourselves? What remedy do you offer? What refuge do you give? What is the thing you tender? You admit the condition of war in these European countries from which we had previously gathered great imports and which had paid revenues for the Treasury. These countries now have passed into that condition where bloody strife possesses them, and death has overtaken them. Their streets are deserted and their waters are red with the blood of life, while their babes cry and mothers moan for father and husband. Shall countries cursed as these be in a condition that they may contribute to the welfare of other nations? Unhappily for them their masters of trade are paralyzed in distress, many silent in death; all stricken in loss and desolation in this unprecedented calamity of earth!

Then, say I to the able Senator, $100,000,000 has been made essential. Why? Because the revenues, as the distinguished chairman of the committee in his very copious and unanswerable logic pointed out, our loss of revenue is now destined to be approximately $1,000,000 a day. If revenues have begun to approximate the loss of a million dollars a day, a hundred days, I say to you, my able friend, must exhaust this particular measure that has for its purpose making up this particular surfeit and deficit. Then what will my able friends on the other side say as to those other days to come? There must unhappily be recurring and multiplied other hundred days, and still another hundred days and—alas, for the gift of prophecy born only from events which the eyes may behold!—still yet another hundred days, until one year shall have gone into another.

Then with these many hundred days there will be the need of many hundred millions. How does the able Senator from Pennsylvania offer to obtain them if he characterizes this bill as a fraud in its inception and an injustice in its execution?

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LEWIS. I am perfectly willing to yield.

Mr. PENROSE. I can reserve my answer until the Senator is through unless he would like to have me proceed now. If he has any objection I will not interrupt him.

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator may adopt either plan which pleases him best, and which serves his purpose, either to reserve or at this time suggest to me a reply.

Mr. PENROSE. I could suggest to the Senator a number of ways of raising revenue which would not only produce the revenue but would bring back a certain measure of prosperity to the country; but I know that the hatred of the customhouse shared by most of the Senator's associates would render such a suggestion beyond any possibility of consideration. We could restore the duty on woolens and on sugar, and put a duty, perhaps, on Mexican oil and help the oil fields of Oklahoma and Texas, and raise this revenue without going into the pockets of the wage earners and the great masses of the people.

Mr. LEWIS. That, Mr. President, from the Senator is a very natural suggestion, but I say to the Senator, since he has given me a slight glimpse into his remedies, in what way will the Government get revenues from wool, iron, or oil from countries whose commerce is desolate, whose workmen are soldiers prostrate in the field, whose factories are dead, whose toilers are bleeding—lands which have no commerce and tender nothing to ship, nor have revenues to pay? The theory of the eminent Senator is born of a fallacy which indicates a lack of reflection on the part of his distinguished capacity. I invite his attention to the fact that he with his own deft fingers and artful brain framed and participated in the making of the tariff bill designated the Aldrich-Smoot-Penrose measure, yet he did not include these particular provisions to which he now alludes, but, to the contrary, wisely omitted them, for reasons quite acceptable to Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator will permit me, there is no war with Australia or with South America. Our trade is uninterrupted. England preserves the peace of the pathways of the ocean, and we could put these duties on and get revenues the first day they went into effect, and the Senator knows it.

Mr. WEEKS rose.

Mr. LEWIS. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to interrupt me?

Mr. WEEKS. Either now or when the Senator is through.

Mr. LEWIS. I yield now, if the Senator from Massachusetts so desires.

Mr. WEEKS. I was going to suggest to the Senator from Illinois the Treasury figures show that if the same rate of duty had been carried on the wool imported in the first seven months of the operation of the Underwood-Simmons Act that were imposed in the previous act, it would have produced a revenue of $19,000,000, and substantially all that wool comes from countries which are now at peace.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts is in line with the policy of the theory of our opponents and is in the language of Iago to Cassio:

> Get money if you can. Get it honestly, if not, get it.

The suggestion now of our able Senator from Massachusetts is that according to his judgment one of the methods would be to levy a tax upon the back of every poor man, to levy a tax upon the clothes men wear, and despite the fact that the American people vetoed that very suggestion at the ballot box my learned friend, in the line of the peculiar despotism that marks the imperialism of the party that he represents, would defy the popular will as did his former President in vetoing the very relief from the oppressive course of that monarchical order of the Payne-Aldrich wool tax which the popular will had denounced at the ballot box. Yet, sir, despite the fact the tax was put on the people by tighter and more oppressive laws; for we recall that after the people had elected a Congress for the specific duty of repealing those taxes on clothing, and after the Congress had repealed the tax, the then President Taft vetoed the people's will, and by his imperial order riveted the tax upon them—a daring usurpation of the popular will—all indifferent to the fact that in a land of kings for less usurpation than this the enraged people struck the crown from the head of one Stuart, the head from the shoulders of the other——

Mr. WEEKS rose.

Mr. LEWIS. And the able Senator no doubt has in mind that if this tax on wool could be so high that it could give continuance to the wool monopoly represented in Boston, and where they gather from all the world the riches from this monopoly, this would give revenues, even if it stifled competitive industry. I answer yes, but the putting of this money in the Treasury as suggested by my able friend could only be done at the expense of many men who must wear clothes and pay the excessive taxes for the privilege, while the barons and manufacturers under their trust privileges go free and exempt. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts if he desires.

Mr. WEEKS. May I suggest to the Senator that the price of wool has not been decreased by the removal of the duty; and may I ask the Senator if he can inform the Senate whether the price of clothing has in any respect been lowered by the removal of the duty on wool?

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator, with that unusual but unconscious facility, unappreciated by himself, has adverted to the very thing to which I alluded. I answer, first, wool, it is said, is still at high price. Then I ask my able friend, Where is that prophecy he and the Senator from Pennsylvania gave but a few months ago, that if wool went on the free list it would be so cheap that it would impoverish the farmer and beggar the toiler? If it has remained at the price stated, why this false complaint of the Senator from Pennsylvania a moment ago from his moaning lips? I answer my friend, if he says the price of clothing has not decreased, abide a little while. The reason is not because of the operation of tariff on raw wools just now, but because those monopolies, evidenced by the conduct that we have lately seen through Massachusetts, have been enabled by combination agreements to keep the price of clothing high through monopoly contracts initiated by the order of things prompted by previous administrations, and despite the forms of relief tendered by legislation passed by this Democratic Congress have been enabled to defy the popular will and to defeat the relief to the country.

But now this Democratic administration, under the guidance of the President and on his recommendation, has passed a law creating a Trade Commission, which, when it has gone into power, will address itself to those gentlemen who have been enabled, notwithstanding the law and justice, to perpetrate these infamies upon the American public. The able Senator from Massachusetts need only abide his time for the establishment of the rights of the people and the sure method of the relief being executed.

Mr. WEEKS rose.

Mr. LEWIS. I yield again to the Senator.

Mr. WEEKS. If the Senator will permit me to make a suggestion, when I did speak during the consideration of the tariff bill I said the world's supply of wool was limited, and therefore a reduction of duty, in my judgment, would not benefit the people. But it will make the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] smile when the Senator from Illinois suggests that there is a monopoly of making clothes in Massachusetts or in New England, because the State which he so well represents makes more clothing than all the New England States and probably all the States in the Middle West.

Mr. LEWIS. Nothing pleases me more than to see a kindly smile on the radiant and genial face of my delightful companion from New York, and if anything I have said could produce that result, I am enjoying a blessing that in all kindliness oftentimes radiates to all from his countenance. But I will say to the able Senator from Massachusetts that he misapprehends the methods I denounce that have kept the high price of clothing unabated. I refer to those wool merchants, those manufacturers, those heads of establishments who hold the wool after monopolizing it, or who held it before through monopoly, and in combination, forced necessarily, together with the Woolen Trust and all its environments, the price of clothing to the point where it still remains in oppressive terms, despite all the efforts of a just Democracy.

Mr. President, my able friend from Pennsylvania says the seas of Japan are open. Yes; but Japan is an ally of one of the powers who are at war with another. He says the seas of Australia are open. I answer "yes"; but the finances of Australia, those of South America, and those of Japan were in the banks and in the vaults of the European countries which are at war, and to-day they have not the goods to sell nor the wherewith to enable them to stimulate their own manufactures.

I digress to ask my able friend, What avail would be the opportunity of imports? With your policy it would be to keep out by a protective tariff all forms of imports to this country. What avail would be the doctrine of yours? There being no goods to come in, no revenue could be had. But it is apparent to all that the condition of those countries is such, and will, unhappily, remain so for some years yet to come, to make impossible the realization of the suggestion of the able Senator from Pennsylvania—even accepting his free-trade theories on his limited articles.

Mr. President, I invite my able friend's attention to his history. Is there anything unusual in what the Committee on Finance have undertaken in this bill? There has come a condition upon our country, caused by other nations being involved in war, and you have to meet the depleted revenues to provide some recourse and resource.

I will ask the able Senator from Pennsylvania if it be not true that when Germany and France were at war in 1870–71, and the importations coming into this country were cut off and the revenues thereby proportionately depleted, did not the Republican Party then in power, of which the Senator from Pennsylvania is so distinguished a leader, do as we are doing now, so far as the principle is involved? They levied an income tax in 1870 of the date of June 4. They cut off a portion at least of the returns from internal-revenue taxes, and sought to make up deficiencies caused by the conditions which then surrounded them, similar to that which, in greater degree, surround us now, by the imposition of an income tax. Shall my able friend forget that only lately, when Japan was at war with Russia in 1904–5, and the exportations of Russia necessarily were curtailed and those of Japan such as she sent to the Pacific coast were limited, your own Government, recognizing that finances had tightened abroad, not knowing how far the war would extend, proceeded to do that which is in the memory of my able friend, namely, to dispose of bonds in the Treasury in order to obtain extra money to meet the deficiency of the Treasury? Then, where is the want of statesmanship in the Democracy now doing what was done by the party of the Senator's administration upon two occasions similar to that which paralleled the present event? Let us appeal more to the justification of history and less to the deception of politics.

Mr. President, what does this bill present? First, it tenders a tax upon beer and spirituous liquors. I ask my able friend, Do you oppose that tax? Do you oppose the tax levied upon beer and spirituous liquors? And in the time that the able Senator says he expects to take in reply to me I ask that he answer that. Will you, instead of laying a tax upon beer and spirituous liquors, levy it upon coffee, upon tea, upon sugar, upon the breakfast table? Say "yes," if you dare, and go to your constituents with the statement that you tender a tax on tea, coffee, and sugar instead of upon beer and whisky.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LEWIS. I again yield to the Senator.

Mr. PENROSE. In answer to the Senator's question, I will say that I have no objection to the increase of the tax on beer and on unrectified alcohol.

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator says, Mr. President, that he has no objection to it. Therefore, sir, how righteous it must be if the Senator from Pennsylvania at last has found a thing against which he has no objection. The able Senator has no objection.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not think, however, it would have been necessary if proper economic and fiscal legislation was the law of the land. The States could have taxed those articles. You have got to leave something for the jurisdiction of State taxation, to the State governments, and my economic theories are those that urge the Federal Government being supported, as far as possible, by the indirect taxes of the customhouse and to leave direct taxes for the great Commonwealths of the Union. Of course the Senator and I differ on those subjects. I know that.

Mr. LEWIS. There never has been a time in our form of government since I have been permitted to observe its operations when the Federal Government did not levy some form of tax through the internal-revenue department upon beer and spirituous liquors. The levying of a State tax does not interfere with that, nor has it by virtue of levying the taxes intruded on the authority of the Federal Government, nor does the Federal Government, by virtue of levying them, deprive the State of that which it has heretofore enjoyed.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator from Illinois will permit me, I will state, of course, that the excise tax is a time-honored tax. It is not a new feature simply because it is in this bill. Therefore I say that there is nothing new in the excise tax. The taxes on beer, spirits, and tobacco have been the recognized sources of revenue of the Federal Government, and are the only direct taxes that our Government has ever levied, except in time of war.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the conditions having been conceded, as we must concede them, the exigencies certainly are admitted that a tax, if to be levied now, can be levied upon no more appropriate subject, as conceded by the able Senator himself, than on these items.

Then, the next tax is imposed on the transactions of banking. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania say that he will oppose levying a tax upon the profits of those who use the money of others, or will he, instead of that, say that the tax shall be put upon the clothing, shall be put upon the shoes, shall be put upon the homes, shall be put upon the shelter of the people? Where, then, will the Senator put this tax? Will he say to his constituents in Pennsylvania that he opposes a tax upon banking transactions and would give them exemption, and to make up the deficiency would levy it upon the clothes on the backs of the toilers, the shoes on the feet of the children, who, he says, are going naked and hungry through the streets of Pennsylvania? Surely not. Then, what objection will the able Senator have as to this tax? I am unable to see that he has tendered any as a substitute.

I have this to say to my able friend, and I say it to all others with whom I bear in this Senate companionship delightful, however much I must discredit their political judgment, the Government can not be supported by carping criticism; caustic denunciations can not pay off the obligations of the United States, nor can unjust accusation as to the causes of the conditions of the Nation discharge our unfulfilled undertakings before the world. There must be some other method—something suggested that in its shape can be partaken of and enjoyed in practical results. Here we find able Senators on the other side of this Chamber, every time anything is undertaken and offered at the instance of the Democratic administration for the relief of a people who so long were burdened by the miseries, exactions, and persecutions of Republican administrations—these able men find some reason, some voice, by which they can oppose and misrepresent because it is politics.

I invite you for a minute to a spectacle that at least may interest you, if it will not convert you. In Germany and in France the socialists in the national legislature declined to put opposition against their Governments in the hour of peril. They joined in the legislative branch in aiding the measures necessary for the refuge and the rescue of their people in the hour of their travail, while our distinguished friends, in this constitutional assembly, in a constitutional government, under the name of Republicans, tender a form of opposition in the time of this country's peril that not even those who seek to blight all forms of representative government ever dared to sink to, but who, in a commendable form of patriotism, rise above mere partisan advantage—a fitting example which I may tender to my able friend, if not to be patterned after, at least to be reflected upon.

Mr. President, I must move toward a conclusion. My friends must understand that mere blind partisanship upon the eve of an election, however temporarily profitable, will not avail them for long, and has its sure penalties which can not be avoided.

As I took note of the observations of the able Senator, I find that the able Senator's position is that we have failed to accurately calculate. Then, say I to the Senator, let us concede his arraignment. Shall the Senator tell the Nation, because out of due caution for a people's rights and out of that regard which refused to take all the money we could have, that if we have failed in some slight regard to take as much as we should, for that reason the Nation shall be punished; that it shall be paralyzed in all its movements; that it shall be left hopeless; that it shall be given no opportunity to discharge its obligations; that it shall stand palsied? Does the able Senator present to the country the thought that because—even if he be accurate in charging that there has been a miscalculation upon the matter of revenue—that there shall be no support of the Republic and no provision now for any revenue? Has his Nation got to go out before the world a beggar, dishonored before her creditors, and repudiated before the world for lack of patriotism and want of statesmanship on the part of those who pose as the guide and support of the Republic? Heaven forbid that the able Senator should take his place in that category and have those who know him view him in that despicable attitude!

The Senator said, if I did not misunderstand him, and I do not inadvertently misquote him, that the income tax we provided for was a failure; that it did not realize its expectations or calculations. Come, my able friend, let us again employ a frank consultation. As to the income tax, I ask my able friend, Will he say that he opposes the income tax? Will he say now that he is for its repeal? Will he go to his constituents in Pennsylvania and denounce it? Will he ask that those who pay this income tax under the law shall be exempt? I say he dare not, and he will not. Again, I say to the able Senator, if the crime he charges is that the calculation has failed of accuracy, I ask why? The calculation, it is true, is based upon one of experience. For years the Democracy had tried to put an income tax

upon the Nation, to make the powerful and the wealthy pay their just share in government; but through the manipulations of bodies that need not be referred to here, exercising their influence upon others, of whom charity and delicacy prohibit me from mentioning, the tax was assailed and ever defeated. Thus we were unable, until now, through voice of the American people, to put the income-tax law upon the statute books and enforce its execution. Untried in its present shape, wanting in experience on the part of its executors and administrators, if some slight error in calculation was made, it was but a natural thing, one to be apprehended.

But, let me say to the able Senator, the calculation of $70,000,000 to be derived from the income tax was not a miscalculation of revenue; it was a miscalculation of events. That it has realized but $31,000,000, I assure my able friend, history will record was the result, not due to miscalculation of figures, but, before God, a miscalculation of men.

These powerful rich, who find the able Senator ever a voice seeking their exemption from burden, while it was laid upon the backs of the miserable—these in numbers sped to Europe, hid their possessions, put their securities in strong boxes, where the eyes of the law could not behold them and the officers of the law could not lay hands upon them—they hid their possessions of millions and millions that it might escape the hand of justice and they might cheat the Government in refusing to pay the just share of their burdens. It seems as if a visitation of heaven has been ordered upon them by the events which have broken over them, for in those nations to which they took their refuge—these shades of delight and profligacy wherein they found their ease and pleasure—these have been rutted by rumbling cannon, trampled upon by marching hosts, thundered upon by shot and shell, washed by blood running in rivulets, and now inhabited only by terrified women, horrified men, and homeless children. Amidst all these their hidden possessions have found a way to separate and part; leaving their possessors helpless before their own crime, giving no relief, it is true, to their own Government because of the craft of embezzlement, and giving no blessing to mankind because of this visitation of God upon their offense. So, if we did miscalculate, my distinguished friend, it was not as to figures and dollars; it was upon the honor of wealthy men and loyalty of patriotism—all failing in such inglorious conduct as certain rich men have given evidence before all the world.

Why, the able Senator, speaking of the railroads—if I do not misquote him—says their incomes have decreased. I warn and inform my able friend that a body of railroad presidents, as quoted in the public papers and according to the speech of the able senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]—as I had it fresh a moment ago—stated to the President that a vast amount of income would be denied unless there was some increase in freight rates. If their calculations be accurate, I say to the distinguished Senator, not $70,000,000 but $170,000,000 would have been realized from the income tax levied alone upon the value represented by these men as existing in the report they made to the President of the United States. They either misled him to frighten him and terrorize him, or, if they told him the truth—those who had these securities—they had hidden in a great quantity their securities by which they could cheat and swindle that Government from which they sought protection.

Now I say to my friend, it may be that a system suggested by him, if accepted, might produce some results approximate to his anticipations and possibly fulfilling some of his hopes. I can not see it so.

But my friend refers to the extravagance of appropriations—and I ask my able friend not to hesitate to interrupt me if I misquote him, for that certainly he knows is not my intention; I was compelled to make my memoranda merely as he proceeded, and he reads the figures of appropriations from one administration to another, and then says there is an increase on the part of the present administration. From that I deduce, though the able Senator did not make it his own conclusion, that his purpose was to intimate that but for these excess figures there would have existed ample revenue in the Treasury.

I say to my friend that the Republican administration, of which he is so distinguished a representative, set on foot great undertakings. They were both alive and in process and in progress. Those undertakings had for their purpose, let us concede, not so much the benefit of our country as to serve a certain set of powerful agencies, so that those agencies out of the profits could serve the political uses of a certain political cabal and certain favorites in this country. But whatever may have been the motive, see what was done. Shall the able Senator tell his people in Pennsylvania that he would have had the Democratic Party, merely because it was opposed on political principle, cut off every one of those undertakings, stem them up, slay them as they had progressed, leave the men out of employment, and put an end to that which seemed the object of so much solicitude on the part of the able Senator? What could the Democratic administration do? The contracts had been made; they had received the approval of the engineers of the Government——

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I left out the river and harbor bill in the figures which I gave, and it will save the Senator a whole lot of vehemence if he will bear that in mind.

Mr. LEWIS. Does the Senator say "vehemence"?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator compliments me. I did not know there was anything in my address that he could characterize with a sufficient quality of attention. He speaks of "vehemence." Yes, "vehemence" is a good word to apply to me. I can imagine that no man could hear the Senator's declarations without noting statements within them that would drive him vehemently to denounce them. It is not vehemence the Senator means to apply to me, but indignation. The Senator may make his confession whenever he wishes, and his avoidance whenever he will. What the Senator did was to point out these appropriations, and he pointed them all out in bulk. If the Senator meant to exclude the river and harbor appropriation, he did not make it clear in his address, and when he turns to his manuscript he will discover that these appropriations helped to aggravate the charge which he made against the Democracy.

Mr. PENROSE. The stenographer's notes will show that I expressly omitted the river and harbor appropriations of this Congress and of the last.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the river and harbor bill was but a part. I remember a distinguished Senator a short while ago characterized the Democracy as unpatriotic for its failure to care for the American Navy. That is a charge which has fallen from the Senator's eminent associates time and time again, that we will do nothing to uphold the Navy. We have provided $31,000,000 additional for the provisioning and maintenance of the Navy; and yet we are condemned for doing the very thing that they condemn us for not doing.

Mr. President, the conditions in Mexico, as unhappy as they are regrettable, forced upon us expenditures far in excess of that which was desired by anyone. Yet shall the Senator say he would have had all this enterprise of peace, dignity, and honor in Mexico paralyzed and stayed? He was one of those who lent his powerful voice and influence to the condemnation of the President and the administration wherever raised in connection with affairs in Mexico. How would he now behold the situation if he would do so in justice? He would contemplate the course of the President and the administration as having been rewarded by such success that the only individual who tendered an insult to our country was compelled by the pacific course of the President, surrounded with the force and resolve of a manly man and patriotic statesman, to flee his shores and become a refugee from his own country; salutations paid to our flag by his whole nation, and the honor of our country recognized throughout the world; all, too, without firing a shot in the offensive, without the death of a man in declared war, without the sacrifice of one principle of the theory of our Republic. Shall the Senator then condemn in order that it avail in some political hour with those who might not understand?

Mr. President, I have heard the allusion—I do not know whether the Senator from Pennsylvania made it—to $75,000,000 in the banks. Yes; where did we get this money? If the charge is, as the distinguished Senator would have you understand, that the tariff law has been a failure, that it could provide no revenue, that it has wholly failed in its undertakings, where did the $75,000,000 or any million dollars of surplus now in the Treasury come from? Well, it may be answered from many sources the money came, but from the tariff must be admitted. Now, who condemns this placing the money in the banks? The distinguished Senators, the colleagues of my able friend, condemn what? Why, I heard one of the allies of our distinguished bombarding general talk about the great infamy on the part of Democracy of placing this $75,000,000 in the banks. Let us have the truth. The Democracy never placed any $75,000,000 in any banks. Sixty million dollars of this money was placed there by a preceding Republican administration, but the Democracy had too much patriotism and pride merely to extract it because it happened to be placed there by a Republican administration. To that $15,000,000 more has been added by the present Secretary of the Treasury, and many other

millions scattered throughout this country, in order that there might be a crop-moving fund. We get $1,500,000 annual interest from this money. Where, may I ask, is that annual panic that has heretofore come upon our country every year just before the moving of the crops, caused by those favored bankers who, having the money from the Treasury and paying not one cent of interest upon it, would tighten it so as to make it impossible for the farmer to get money to move his grain to market except at usurious rates—prohibitive—all to give favor to those borrowing "call money" for stock gambling?

Ah, that day went by under the patriotic zeal of the present distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, whose keen business sagacity scented their purpose, and with the strength and courage of one of his political progenitors, Andrew Jackson, gave these men to understand that if they dared to commit that crime again upon the American public punishment would be meted out to them before the eyes of America; and in order to assure that they should not have the chance he provided the method by which the people's money should be enjoyed by the people. Do I hear complaints from my able friends because of this? Would you bring decay upon the crops? Would you leave them in the furrow? Would you rot them in the bin? Would you prevent them from reaching market? Would you deny prosperity and opportunity to the farmer? Then, why this cavil? Why this criticism? Why this condemnation? Where is the justice, aye, where is the sense of it?

My friends on the other side—for such you are—your position, if I understand your spokesman, my able and distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, is that the tariff law has built up enterprises in Europe and has destroyed enterprises in America. In one breath I heard you refer to the tariff law, if I do not misquote you, as being the southern-made tariff law, to leave the impression upon the thousands of constituents who will read your speech, that that ancient sectionalism of which many of you gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber in years past capitalized to such an extent still exists here in the Senate.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PENROSE. Does not the Senator think that the epithet is well applied when the wool of the Wyoming ram is put on the free list while the hair of the Angora goat of Texas is protected at the old Dingley rates at the request of a Texas Congressman?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, it is not the Angora goat but the Republican goat which has been gotten by this administration. [Laughter.]

Mr. PENROSE. Well, the Angora goat is the chief beneficiary. The answer of the Senator from Illinois is on a par with a large part of his argument, infusing into a serious discussion frivolity.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, my able friend referred to the Angora goat. I remember hearing his very witty and attractive speech upon the question of the Angora goat and Texas Congressman during the tariff debate. That seems to be introduced here. Evidently my able friend feels that a dissertation on goats introduced here is not frivolous, but is very dignified, very ponderous, and very pregnant with much wisdom. We will dismiss the subject of goat as being the butt of the Senator's joke. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I referred to the charge which the able Senator intended to convey, that the tariff bill had been made in sections to serve the private exemptions and privileges of the South as against the North. I can not speak for the South. I do not offer any defense in her behalf. She needs none. While born from her bosom and cradled in her generous arms and reared to manhood beneath her blessed skies, I moved out to the West, where the capacious hospitality of the western heart has placed me under a debt of gratitude far beyond expression. I speak as a western Representative, honored by the noble West to speak for her, yet I serve as an American.

Yet these eminent men who represent the South need go no further in the defense of the accusation made by the Senator than to take the speech of the able Senator, which points out how these mills in the South, these cotton mills in the South, these woolen mills that have been undertaken, have withered and died. He read from a Tennessee correspondent calling attention to how this tariff act, which he says was southern, had slain the southern industries. Can it be that these men are so short-sighted that they drew their swords against themselves?

I merely invite the able Senator to this that he may see how utterly inconsistent was his attitude and how manifestly without logic or decency was the implication.

Mr. President, the existing tariff act, like all tariff acts, has its weaknesses and deficiencies, because we can not distribute a tariff measure in such a manner as to fit equally upon all parts and property of the Nation. Certainly this one can not be free from some of those particular shortcomings that will attend every other form of tax measure. But the main principle, with which I conclude, is this: The justice which we submitted to the American public for its acceptance or rejection, after having been accepted, was embodied in the bill, carried to the countrymen, and received their approval at every opportunity since then.

And here we must recall the obstructions of this first undertaking, which recorded this test of this bill before the world. Disturbed commerce, caused by the war in the Balkans—with Roumania, Servia, and Turkey—frightened money back to the war chests, reversing all advance in commerce, because of the fear of the great European nations that the flame lighted in the Balkan States would become a conflagration through the whole of Europe. Following this, and in the shadow of this obstruction, came our troubles in Mexico, with our borders aflame with revolution, with our Army and Navy forces on guard, and our commerce from our southern seas frightened by the prospect of continuous conflict. China followed in a new revolution following the installation of a Republic, to which was added the panic of famine. These cut off the prospect of commerce with that Asiatic zone. Then Japan, preparing for an expected conflict, having internal dissension, coupled with the charge of national fraud, which exhausted the treasury, likewise added the additional financial obstructions to the due test of the tariff measure. All this was but the beginning of the entrance into the great European holocaust, which in blood and death has finally stricken from the seas the vehicles of commerce from which we expected the contribution calculated upon at the time of the shaping and framing of our tariff bill. Our legislation was based upon the regular and normal conduct of nations as well as men. But fate played tricks with the calculation of statecraft, as with the world's hope of peace.

To the Senator and his colleagues who indict the Nation of America as a people misgoverned and who are invited to revolt against the Democratic administration that has guided it: Contemplate your country and search yourselves within and ascertain if there be not pride to be awakened when we view her station compared with the world. There are the great nations of Europe locked in death grapple; the blood of their children running red in rivers, the wails of mothers piercing the heavens, children dying of hunger, lands once classic and beautiful desolate and laid waste—fifty million dollars a day the estimate of their increasing indebtedness for fire and sword. Yet, previous to the war, France was indebted in excess of six billions of dollars; Germany, five billion; Russia, four billion five hundred million; Austria, three billion five hundred million; the United Kingdom of England, Ireland, Wales, and Scotland, three billion five hundred million; and blood dripping Belgium, seven hundred and fifty millions. Compare to this your own Nation, her industries active and prosperous, her commerce thriving and industrious, her people God-fearing and hopeful, her Nation at peace with the world, teaching liberty to mankind, furnishing an example of freedom and justice to the enlightenment of earth and to the salvation of man, with the single property of her railroads alone equal to the combined debt of these great countries which are weltering in each other's blood, while the national debt of this unparalleled America in June, 1913, was little in excess, in round numbers, of but a billion of dollars.

Here she stands—our country—the envy to-day of the earth and the guide of civilization, speaking the lessons of liberty and justice to mankind as she tenders herself as an example of what the creed of equality of man, justice to nations, and obedience to God can make of a people. Long may she stand, peaceful to all, extending her generous benefits to mankind everywhere and by her influence leading and guiding the children of earth to the eminence and glory of peace and happiness, the enjoyment of every American in this ill-fated hour to her sad rivals. Then let this be known, that however many there may be of those who, like the chaos of Beelzebub in the hell of Milton, would dishonor his nation's glory, deny her justice, and invite destruction upon their own people, that such may serve the devils of dissension and the disciples of dishonor, we the Democrats to-day are proud of the spectacle afforded by this, our country, and the achievements of the godly man who sits as President at the helm, tendering by day his services to mankind and by night offering his prayers to Heaven to bless his fellow men. In such presence we say unto such as you, if you shall continue your service in the cause of strife and confusion, that you may serve in the hell of hypocrisy, then, sad as may be your fate, pursue your task—it will meet its just penalty at the hands of those whom you attempt to deceive and who when aroused by your iniquity will work your just destruction. As

for us in the democracy, we know that this which we serve is righteous, and in the presence of watchful mankind, beholding our deeds to men and our achievements for the Republic, we say to you in the words of Joshua, "Serve whom ye will, but as for us and our house we will serve the Lord."

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate more than a very few moments. I had not expected to address the Senate again—at least to-day—had it not been for the personal references of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

I am sure our passages at arms have been indulged in with the greatest good humor; and certainly, so far as I am concerned, I can not contemplate the pulchritude of the Senator from Illinois with any sentiment but that of good humor. When, however, he devotes a large part of his discourse to what I have been compelled in the greatest good humor to designate as frivolity, in that it is an argument personal, an address ad hominem, and referring to my absence from the Chamber, it does not seem to me that he has measured up to the seriousness and the dignity of the careful statement which I submitted to the Senate.

I shall not refer to the absences of the Senator from Illinois. I have no information as to whether they were on the public business or in the pursuit of his private affairs. I know that they have been extensive. I also know, and it will be generally admitted by my colleagues who served with me in previous Congresses, that there has been no Senator more constant in his attendance or more industrious in the discharge of his duties than I have been during the 18 years I have been in this body, and more particularly during my present senatorial term. If I have been absent recently, it has been with the full knowledge and acquiescence of my constituents; and they have in fact urged me to be present in Pennsylvania and to leave a scene of activity where it is practically only permitted to the minority to vote.

My movements have been published for six months in every daily paper of importance in Pennsylvania and have been recorded before the people of the State. I have been mingling with them, and have gone before them in the full spirit of the new popular dispensation. It is going a long distance out of the way for the Senator from Illinois—a notorious absentee himself, notwithstanding the fact that he fills with dignity the statesmanlike position in his party of whip—to be injecting into the middle of a serious discourse matters which I can not but condemn as frivolous and unworthy of him.

I have no excuse to make for my absence. My constituents approve it, and I expect will vindicate it and the policies which I represent by an overwhelming majority in November. Why should any of the minority remain here?

We have heard many threadbare anteelection epithets in the annals of American politics. "Economy"—"economy"! What has become of "economy," and "the new freedom," and "the extravagance of the Republicans," and the "high cost of living," and "the burdens of taxes"? These and scores of other campaign terms, now unused or forgotten, run through my mind. After their uses are over they are thrown into the junk heap, almost too shabby and worn even to be expected to be of any use in any future campaigns. But if there was one thing that we did hear about it was the awful tyranny of Czar Reed, and the iniquities of Cannon, and the suppression of debate, and the evils of the caucus, so that Republicans were almost beginning to take these phrases as if they had some intrinsic truth, and they hesitated, in States and at the Capital here, to enter a caucus. It had to be conducted under the polite name of "conference"; and many persons gave a willing ear to the stories about the dreadful evils of political czars in the House of Representatives. Yet hardly had the Democracy gotten into power when a czarlike method of legislation is adopted which would make Speaker Reed turn in his grave, and make ex-Speaker Cannon look like a Progressive when he returns to Washington, as he will.

For days, for weeks, in the House of Representatives Democratic Members have sat in secret caucus behind closed doors legislating upon a tariff bill, the American public absolutely kept out of any knowledge of what was going on, no record kept of votes, members of the party dragooned and coerced, frequently against their conviction, on rates and schedules, in utter subversion of the spirit if not of the letter of the Constitution of the United States, which declares in effect that legislation shall be conducted in the open, that a record shall be kept, and a journal made of the proceedings. Just as the Republicans were being educated by our political opponents in the beatitudes of publicity, of the light of day, of the participation of the great American public in all legislative proceedings, even to the extent of having committee meetings open, and abolishing executive sessions, so that some men were so sensitive as to their political virtue that they hesitated to go into a room that the public was not surrounding in the galleries—after all this declamation of "the new freedom" we have the dark, secret caucus, lasting for weeks at a time, and perfecting legislation; and then, when the Republican minority in the House and the Senate, after days and weeks of weary waiting, not knowing what was going on, not knowing the nature of the various matters discussed, are summoned to a meeting of the House or Senate, they have handed to them the result of this caucus action, and they are told, and they have been told on more than one occasion on this floor: "Here, take this. Sit here from 10 or 11 in the morning until midnight, and pass this bill as we have framed it. We want no amendment; we invite no discussion. This is our ultimatum. You are simply here to see us register it. We do not want any information that you may have, as members of the minority, bearing upon these schedules. We intend to wear you out by physical exhaustion." No opportunity to study this voluminous measure, an encyclopedia of the industries of the Nation, but a long, continuous attendance from daylight until dark, and even until midnight, until the bill is passed—the verdict of a jury in a locked room. Is that any inducement to a member of the minority to participate continuously in the labors of the present Congress?

I came here to Washington a few days ago prepared to speak upon this measure. I have a number of things that I should like to submit to the Senate in addition to what I have said. I entered the Chamber, and I was informed that this august body must adjourn and hold no sessions for a day, perhaps for two days, maybe for a week, while the Democracy of the Senate retired to a dark room and there held their caucus on a bill imposing millions of direct taxes upon the American people. In all the record of the Republican Party I defy any Senator or anyone else to point to a condition approximating that, after all this folderol about publicity, and about "the new freedom," and about legislation in the open, and about the absence of any coercion or of any "boss orders," to use a general political term. I can inform the Senator from Illinois, as a member of the minority, that that is an additional reason. We have not in reality been given any opportunity to participate in the legislation which has been pending.

Nor do I take at any substantial value the statements of the Senator from Illinois that I have in any way discredited the industrial conditions of the country. Every statement which I read to the Senate came from a recognized trade journal, or from some well-known philanthropist, or from some gentleman prominent in industrial circles, and accepted as an authority. I did not indulge in generalities. I gave facts and figures of sheriffs' sales, receiverships, curtailments, and suspensions. These facts are apparent to all men. I accused no one of any deliberate purpose to precipitate this condition. I stated that it was the unfortunate result of what, in my opinion, are wrong and ill-conceived ideas as to economic and fiscal legislation as adapted to the American Republic.

The Senator from Illinois could have accompanied me last week on a trip through western Pennsylvania, when I was again absent from this body, and he could have seen the scores and the hundreds of men with bundles under their arms walking along by the highways of those western counties hunting employment, not knowing where they were going to sleep that night, not knowing where they would get a meal the following morning. I will take him any day into those western counties and show him a condition of blight and distress where a year ago there was an industrial paradise. I am exposing nothing that is not apparent to everybody, that is not well known to everybody. It can not be put off, and it is no sufficient answer to say that this condition is psychological, that it is unfair to refer to it, or that it is due to something else to which this economic legislation has no relation.

The American people know what they are confronted with. They do not need newspapers to tell them. They do not need arguments. From all I have heard, the city of Chicago, the great metropolitan center of the Senator's State, is as badly off as any other part of the country. Generalities will not be an answer to this vast army of unemployed, increasing as it is every day and every month, and likely to continue to increase with intensified conditions as long as the present political status is maintained.

I have nothing further to say. There is not an article in this pending tax bill, with the exception of the usual excise, which has already been referred to, that any Member of this body has received a single letter in behalf of or in commendation of. On the other hand, the condemnation from all over the country has been overwhelming. With the exception of that excise, there is not a single item which will not turn out to be in-

quisitorial and burdensome and arouse a just resentment on the part of the American people.

This so-called emergency revenue bill will not be sufficient to preserve the Government from future deficits if present extravagances and present fiscal legislation continue as now, and I predict an additional tax bill or the issue of bonds to provide for the current expenses of the Government. There is not a dollar of this deficit that could not be provided for by tariff taxes which would relieve some of the industrial conditions now existing and would at the same time furnish adequate revenues to the Government.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, my very attractive and ubiquitous friend the Senator from Pennsylvania has now, in his speech replying to my answer to his first arraignment, indulged in the form of defense known as "You are another," and in certain forums, of course, that does apply. His intimation that I have been absent because of his confession of his own absence, I assure him, is based wholly upon misinformation. He has been informed, possibly, of some individual absence, such as that to which he referred. That was at midnight. My life is a little different from that of some of my friends. At midnight I am supposed to be in my own home, quietly reposing; and there I was found. I assure the Senator that my presence here has been daily witnessed, constant. I wanted to get away. I was anxious to get away. I would have gone if I could, and I am going to get away as soon as I can.

But now, Mr. President, apart from that personal matter, the able Senator addresses himself at considerable length to what he evidently regards as the deficiencies of the House of Representatives, its manner of doing business, its despotism in the conduct of its affairs. Of these matters I do not know. I am not a Member of the House of Representatives. The only thing I can observe is that the able Senator seems to be bleeding from wounds inflicted by a Member of the House by the name of PALMER, who, in a contest in Pennsylvania, if we read the papers aright, has no doubt left some impress upn my able friend; and he retaliates by making a general charge or accusation against the House of which that gentleman is a Member. Now, I am unable to defend the House, if it needed a defense, as I can not speak from knowledge; but I assume that at a proper time a reply to the observations, if they require any reply at all, will come from those better qualified from information.

Now, as to the Senate. I have heard the able Senator upon this floor denounce what he characterizes as "caucus rule," and I have heard him longingly implore the great graces of creation, wherever they are, against what he called then "close government" and "lack of publicity." Yet the able Senator forgets that no measure has been brought into this body that has not been out before the public, and all that the public desired to know obtained. The Senator says he knows no parallel. He forgets the manner in which the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot-Penrose measure had its incubation in this oven, and he likewise realizes how few hands were allowed to shape its destiny other than the favored few to whose keeping it was committed.

I say to the able Senator I will not make a response to observations about the Senate which records publicly the presence of the minority party. There were Members who were here. The Senator could not see them; he was absent. Not being able to see me, because I was here and he absent elsewhere, he assumes that I must be absent, because I was absent from him. The minority remained here and attended to its affairs as it saw its duty, and he did that which was according to his judgment as to his duty elsewhere. I merely recited the fact.

Now, Mr. President, the references of the Senator to the President, which seems to be a constant indulgence on the part of my able friend when all things are exhausted from his mind and nothing any longer occupies it, is but his favorite engagement—the assault upon the President. The Senator's reference to New Freedom and the New Era of Publicity is intended to elicit the observations that there was fraud perpetrated upon the American people.

Mr. President, in conclusion I have this thought to suggest to the able Senator: There was no legislation brought into this body that was not in direct compliance with the platform declaration, and then a vote of the American public upon those platform promises. We therefore assembled under the pledge to execute and to construct this form of legislation. The President of the United States took his solemn oath before high Heaven that he, too, would fulfill his obligation in imposing on this body and its collaborate body his sense of duty to comply with these promises to the American public, differing indeed from that other promise when the tariff bill was brought in here by alleging specific promises made to the public, when the promise and guaranty was given to revise downward, but when the officers were created that bill came in here, violating the provisions for the lack of proper stimulant on the part of the President; and there was the revising upward, to the barbarity of the method adopted and the persecution of the American public in the result.

Mr. PENROSE rose.

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator is always very courteous about yielding, and I appreciate it. Does the Senator consider the Panama legislation as a compliance with the Democratic platform?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I am complimented by the observation. I answer the Senator specifically. The Senator refers in his speech to an address made by the President of the United States touching the platform. This speech was made in New Jersey, in which speech there was a reference connected with the Panama Canal. The Senator would have left the impression that the President of the United States at that time made the allusion on the platform or that his own position was that there should be a charge of tolls. The President was referring in his speech at that time in New Jersey to the question of railroad-owned ships, to prevent a monopoly of canal and railroads in one single concentration; and the construction that has been given his address has been constantly and frequently and directly at variance with every object and purpose of the address under consideration.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator is leaving one subject and going to another. I see that the Senator is in some little difficulty and embarrassment in explaining it. We will probably drop that as a painful subject.

Mr. LEWIS. Believe me, there is nothing painful about my distinguished friend or anything he could suggest.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator is doing very well under the circumstances.

Mr. LEWIS. Under the circumstances it is difficult to do well and to find such agreeable to the Senator. In this matter let me answer the Senator to the point. I answer the Senator that he must treat the question as having been given for reply. In his suggestion in the matter of the charge of tolls, or rather the free tolls to certain forms of shipping, I repeat what I said, which is that no legislation has come into this body that has not been first considered by the public. On a few points asserted in the platform it may be said that subsequent events developed which called for a modification of the platform. These were called for because of happenings that did transpire before the eyes of the American public and from which they commanded this body and the other legislative body to act as the sense of justice required. What was done was in response to the popular needs as well as to the popular demands.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, one question, and then I am done. We will have to overlook these little deviations from party platforms, I suppose, but can we get an assurance that all the rest of the platform is to be complied with during the present administration—all the other pledges? Is the Senator in a position to assure the American people that every other pledge of the platform will be complied with?

Mr. LEWIS. This much I say, speaking only for myself, as I am not a guaranty of the conduct of others. If there could be less opposition and factious warfare from the opposing side, led by the distinguished Senator, against measures needed by the people and more cooperation to the response and demand from the ballot box, all things would be complied with as promised by the Democracy.

Mr. PENROSE. There is one feature of the Democratic platform that I am a very firm believer in, and I am on common ground with my Democratic associates in it, and that is one term for executive officers, one term for President of the United States. I would give no executive officer more than one term, even the sheriff or treasurer of a county. I think the old Roman people had that idea pretty well through their heads when they allowed their consul or any of their executive officers only one term. Now, can we have any definite assurance that the majority in control of legislation will bring it in? They could bring up the measure to-morrow, if they wanted, and have it acted on before adjournment. Can they give us any assurance that our aspirations and working for a one-term office will be gratified?

Mr. LEWIS. I answer the Senator, I am not aware, of course, of any of the conscientious scruples which may be possessed by the President. I do not know what his attitude of mind is, but this much I say to the Senator, since he has become wedded to the theory of a single one term for a public office, I can understand why he struggles to be returned term after term as Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator is omitting a material part of my statement. I said "executive officers." There has always, in all places, been a sharp distinction between an executive

office, with its vast power of patronage, and the legislator, who has no power, who is one of a large number. That, in our experience, has always been accounted as preeminently a factor. That distinction, I admit, has been largely wiped out under the present administration because the executive and legislative functions have been combined in the Chief Executive of the United States.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator for a query, and he introduced an installment of some undisclosed, undeveloped manuscript.

Mr. PENROSE. I asked the Senator the specific question, Could we have any assurance as to whether there would be legislation providing for one term for the President of the United States? And he started to tell me something about what he thought the President might want.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I desire to reply to the Senator specifically as to that. I think I can read the Senator's mind. Having a legitimate aspiration to the Presidency, which he feels might come to him from Pennsylvania, he desires to be assured now that his rival will not be Woodrow Wilson. [Laughter.]

Mr. PENROSE. I will be satisfied with one term.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, Mr. President, that feature of the platform, like anything else, will largely be decided, I dare say, by events as they largely control. I want to say to the Senator I had not finished the sentence when he interrupted me, by my permission, upon the question of the platform as to tolls. The Senator will not forget that the platform likewise denounced subsidies in any form, and a compliance with that part of the platform, amongst others, resulted in the expression of the legislation to which he refers.

In conclusion I must give to the able Senator one viewpoint of the President. I assume that the President of the United States felt when he gave his word to the country when he was elected a Representative at Large in behalf of the Nation, that he would aid any legislation according to the desires of the Nation. That he meant to execute that promise and that he could not, as had others in his place, sit silently and supinely in the White House and see his oath of office violated, his honor debased, as he allowed the needs of the Republic to be neglected and the pledges to the people violated, and this without constantly reminding his colleagues of his duty before the Nation, for his word had gone forth and his position was, in the language of the gentleman in the Merchant of Venice, "My word once gone forth can not be recalled. Must I lay perjury to my soul? No; not for Venice." And his position was: I can not ignore my duty nor violate my word of honor. No; not for office, how high, or position, how great.

Mr. President, with appreciation for the compliment of the patience of the Senate I take leave of this debate, secure in the confidence that the people only await their opportunity to vote their approval of the Democracy and their indorsement and praise of Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] if he will now request that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily?

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside in order that the Senator from Montana may take up the conference report on the Alaskan coal bill. After that has been disposed of I shall ask that the unfinished business be again proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

COAL LANDS IN ALASKA.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the report of the conference committee on the bill H. R. 14233 be laid before the Senate.

The Senate proceeded to consider the conference report on the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I will in a very few words explain the present report which is before the Senate and the changes which have been made. The conferees in making the second report took as the basis the bill reported by the last report. This report is very much as the bill reported by the last report. There are some few changes to which I will call attention. If Senators who feel an interest in it will get the comparative print of the bill which was made on the last report, I can point out very easily the few changes that were made. I take the comparative print of the last report as the basis of my explanation. As I said, the bill reported by the last report is the basis of that report.

I will state the only changes which were made: On page 5 of the comparative print, right-hand column, in the second paragraph of the third column on page 5, after the word "corporation," the words "or municipality" are introduced and inserted in the present report. The object of that is to allow municipalities of the Territory of Alaska as municipalities to obtain the benefit of the proposed leases provided by the bill. It is to allow a municipality to be a lessee. The word "municipality" was in the House bill, but it was left out by the Senate. It was left out in the last report and at the request of the House conferees the conferees inserted it in the present report.

On page 7 of the comparative print, in the right-hand column, after the third line, the words "and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe" are omitted. They are omitted in obedience to the rule laid down by the Senate, because they constitute new matter. They were not in either the House or the Senate bill, and for that reason they were left out of this report.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERN in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. MYERS. With pleasure.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator please refer to that again? I did not catch the place where it is found or what is the provision.

Mr. MYERS. On page 7 of the comparative print, in the third column, after the third line of section 5.

Mr. BORAH. "And under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe"?

Mr. MYERS. The words omitted are "and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe." The conferees thought there was wisdom in inserting those words, but as it was new matter, in obedience to the rule laid down by the Senate they eliminated them. We think, however, that they are covered by section 17 of the bill as reported by the last conference, which says—

> That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe the necessary and proper rules and regulations, and to do any and all things necessary to carry out and accomplish the purposes of this act.

We think that provision covers this instance quite well, and that these words may be omitted, as they have been, without any injury to the bill.

Down at the bottom of the same column, the third column, on page 7 of the comparative print, in the next to the last line, the words "one year" are changed to "two years." The House bill had it two years, and the House conferees wanted it to remain that way, and we acceded to their desire and made it two years. That is to conform to other parts of the bill which call for two years in some other matters of like character, and it makes it uniform.

On page 10 of the comparative print the conferees, at the end of the first paragraph, third column, inserted the revenue amendment which was offered in the Senate by my colleague [Mr. WALSH] and adopted by the Senate. It will be found in the middle of the column of that page, beginning, in the eighth line, with the word "All." It reads:

> All net profits from operation of Government mines, and all royalties and rentals under leases as herein provided, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate and distinct fund to be applied to the reimbursement of the Government of the United States on account of any expenditures made in the construction of railroads in Alaska, and the excess shall be deposited in the fund known as the Alaska fund, established by the act of Congress of January 27, 1905, to be expended as provided in said last-mentioned act.

That was not in the House bill, but the House conferees very readily agreed to accept it as it was passed by the Senate, and we put it in the report.

I will say that that amendment, I think, at the first conference hardly received the consideration which was due it. The conferees apparently did not give it the full significance to which it is entitled. When it came up, something was said by some of the conferees to the effect that the Alaskan railway act provided practically the same thing and that there was no use of repeating it here. But the conferees seemed to have, without much investigation, adopted that assurance or suggestion and struck it out accordingly, but after it was stricken out, after the last report had been made, the conferees examined the Alaskan railway act more carefully and realized that the provision of the Alaskan railway act is not just the same and is not as satisfactory, and the Senate having declared that they wanted the provision in the bill we very gladly and cheerfully put it in by unanimous consent of the conferees. We feel that it is a wise provision and that it makes the bill better.

On page 12 of the comparative print, in the third column, at the bottom of the column, the last paragraph, beginning with the word *"Provided,"* which is the provision for court procedure, which was the basis of so much objection in the Senate and which was characterized and determined to be new matter, the conferees omitted altogether. They struck that out in obedience to the will of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand that the entire paragraph, beginning with the words "*Provided*, That the possession of any lessee of any lands covered by his lease," is left out?

Mr. MYERS. That is left out. It is new matter, and we had nothing to do but leave it out. At least, the Senate decided that it was new matter. In lieu of that, going to the middle of the column, we took so much of section 14 of the Senate bill as was put in the last report. The first paragraph of section 14 was kept in the old report. The second paragraph was left out of the former report, but the second paragraph was passed by both the House and the Senate substantially, and upon objection that the conferees had no right to leave out anything which in substance had passed both the House and the Senate, the second paragraph of section 14 was reinserted.

So section 14 of the Senate bill, both the first and second paragraphs, is now in this report as the court section, the section which provides how disputes may be disposed of and controversy may be adjudicated. It is a Senate provision, just as it passed the Senate without any change. The House conferees receded and accepted the Senate section on that subject.

Mr. BORAH. As I understand, then, section 14, just as it appears in the comparative print in the second column, is now in the bill.

Mr. MYERS. It is. It is the Senate provision. Turning over to the next page, page 13 of the comparative print——

Mr. POINDEXTER. Before the Senator leaves that——

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

Mr. MYERS. With pleasure.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The concluding paragraph of section 14 of the Senate bill reads:

> And the lease may provide for the enforcement of other appropriate remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

Is that left in the conference report?

Mr. MYERS. It is. It was put back, rather. We had no alternative when those words, substantially as they appear here, passed both the House and the Senate. Under the construction of the Senate we had no right to leave them out, and they were put back.

Turning to the next page, page 13 of the comparative print, I will ask attention to the blank space near the bottom, just after section 16, between section 16 and section 17 in the last report. If you will look at the middle of the column and look at the second paragraph of section 16, middle column, you will find these words:

> And any person making false oath, representation, or report shall be subject to punishment as for perjury.

Those words were substantially in both the House and the Senate bill. They were left out of the last report. During the course of the conference there was some suggestion made that the general criminal law covering Alaska covered that and there was no use of putting it in here, but none of the conferees had any objection to it, and it having been put in by both the House and the Senate it is put back. So section 16, third column, is now made section 16, second column, in its entirety, without any elimination. It is the Senate provision. The House conferees accepted it, and it goes into the report just as the Senate passed it.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator what has become of section 15 in the second column? Was that eliminated entirely?

Mr. MYERS. Section 15, second column, was eliminated by the last report and remains eliminated; it is out. I am enumerating just what was put back; nothing else.

Those are all the changes that have been made. I have enumerated them. They are very few. They may be recapitulated by saying that the amendment offered in the Senate by my colleague [Mr. WALSH] and adopted by the Senate, the revenue section, providing specifically for the revenues, leaving out such matter as was determined to be absolutely new matter and reinserting a couple of paragraphs that I have enumerated as matter that was passed by both the House and the Senate and was left out, is now put back.

The changes I have enumerated are all the changes that have been made Other than those changes, the bill as reported back by this report is just the same as the bill reported by the last report.

I think the conferees—the majority of them, at any rate—think the bill has been made better by going back to the conference and being reported the second time. I feel very positively and strongly that the bill as now reported is a better bill than it was as reported before, and is more in accordance with the determination of the Senate. It is more in accord with the bill as it was passed by the Senate.

I think the wisdom of the Senate in sending the bill back to the conferees has resulted in good. It has resulted in the improvement of the bill and the benefit of the subject matter of legislation. Personally, I am glad that the bill went back to the conferees, because I think they have done better work and have made an improvement in it. With that, I submit the report to the Senate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have no desire to be factious or to impose my opinions and judgments on the Senate simply for factiousness' sake. If we are to have a leasing bill, this may be a good bill; but, as I have said before, I am utterly and positively opposed to the whole policy and principle of leasing these coal lands. The lands are ours. We have gone through experiences enough in this country from the days of the Homestead strike until the days of the West Virginia and Colorado strikes, I think, to prompt prudent men to set their faces against the policy of leasing these lands. The lands in West Virginia are leasehold lands, from nonresident miners, who are exploiting them for their own purposes and their own gain and their own greed. Colorado is in much the same condition. We have similar conditions in Pennsylvania in very many instances.

I insist, Mr. President, that coal is a prime necessity of life. We can not get along without coal. It is all very well, you tell us, and that we have myriads of tons of coal. I heard the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] say that in Colorado they have enough coal to last the present population for a hundred years.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that Colorado has sufficient coal to furnish the world with coal at the present rate of consumption for 300 years.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I mistook what the Senator said. But the Senator is taking the present population. We are not going to stand still. This great country to-day has approximately very close to a hundred million people and it is growing with leaps and bounds each year in population. Our consumption of coal will naturally increase. Three hundred years, the Senator says. Well, after all, 300 years is but a day in the life of a great nation. I anticipate and trust in God that this country will last longer than 300 years. Mind you, when a ton of coal is burnt it is utterly and absolutely destroyed. It can not be brought back or resuscitated in any form. It is unlike wood. Wood produces ashes, and potash is a fertilizer. From coal it is of no value whatever except to fill a hole in the earth.

I say such a policy would be dangerous and disastrous. I believe wise legislation demands that this great deposit, made by Providence, the eternal God, for our welfare and the welfare of our people, should be husbanded, maintained, taken care of, and worked prudently for the well-being of the whole people. While, of course, coal grows, it grows by such an infinitely slow process that for all purposes we may say that coal in a practical way does not increase in amount.

I fear this measure will pass; but there is a strong public sentiment against it. The argument that this is undertaking business upon the part of the Government I admit is true; but the world has changed and the public mind has changed marvelously within the last 25 years on this matter. There has been Government buildings and Government construction. We have constructed the Panama Canal; we are maintaining it; and we are carrying on business of all kinds on that strip of 10 miles in width in Panama to satisfy the objects, demands, and wants of an intelligent and progressive people.

I say this legislation is to my mind a black mark, a cloud, on our progress. I know full well the great interests are behind and are pressing this measure. I do not mean to say that Senators who are here pressing it are governed by anything other than laudable motives; but I do say that it would be a disaster and a wrong, amounting almost to a crime, to further fix a leasing system in Alaska. It would be to transplant from this part of our continent to Alaska the uncanny and outrageous system that has prevailed in West Virginia. I do not urge that to stir up the feelings of my friend the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON], but the outrageous system that prevails there, which has led to riot, disorder, and bloodshed, with no profit to anybody, and a system that is in progress in Colorado as well.

As this Territory is ours, in God's name, Mr. President, do not let this Nation give up this prime necessity, coal, which belongs to us in this our land, over which we have made an appropriation of $50,000,000 to build a railroad. I adjure you, for the welfare of the people of this land and for the credit of the great body which the Senator and I in part represent, do not allow this coal land to go into private hands under a possible absentee lease-holding system. I shall vote against the proposition.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, notwithstanding some very objectionable features have been removed from this bill since it was last before the Senate, I can not give it my support. Having heretofore discussed the measure somewhat at length, I do not intend to do so now. I intend only to reaffirm what I then said on the subject.

The most favorable view that can be taken of this legislation and the system which it inaugurates is that it is experimental. That being the case, it should be treated as experiments usually are—by first trying them out in a limited way, and, if found to be desirable, to adopt them permanently. That is not the course pursued here. On the contrary, at least one-half of the coal lands of Alaska are thrown open to lease for a term of 50 years. We are hazarding an empire on the venture. Its authors should at least have followed the precedent heretofore adopted by Congress when it devoted portions of the public domain to internal improvements by reserving to the Government alternate tracts. This could easily have been done in this experiment and still have given ample opportunity for the development sought to be accomplished by its friends. Then, if the scheme should have proven beneficial, the public would have shared in the benefits.

I do not question the motives of those who are pressing this legislation; on the contrary, I am sure they are patriotic, and I am also confident that they sincerely believe in the wisdom of the policy they are inaugurating; but I am just as sure they are mistaken in their view. Therefore I shall vote against this measure.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I differ from the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] as to the best system to adopt for the development of the coal lands of Alaska. I do not share the apprehensions which he entertains that the coal lands of the world will be soon exhausted. It is true that, according to the Geological Survey of the United States Government, the total amount of coal in the State of Colorado is 371,000,000,000 tons, which is enough to supply the world at the present rate of consumption for 300 years. I will also state to the Senator that the State of Wyoming, to the north of Colorado, has still greater coal fields. It has been estimated by the same Geological Survey that there is enough coal in the State of Wyoming to supply the entire world for more than 425 years. It has been further estimated that there is enough coal in the United States to supply the entire world for 5,000 years. When you take into consideration that there are other coal fields in the world, that China has large coal fields, it seems to me that the supply is practically inexhaustible, at least within the range of years during which we should reasonably guard against its consumption.

Mr. President, the coal question has been agitated by the alarmists, and that agitation has made a great many believe that there was danger of a coal famine, but from statements made by the authorities of this Government it is clear that there is no danger of any such exhaustion. Alaska herself, according to the estimate of the same bureau, has 115,000,000,000 tons of coal, sufficient to supply the world for nearly 100 years, and enough to supply the entire Pacific coast, which consumes less than a million tons a year, for more than 1,000 years. So the theory that we are all going to freeze to death soon is not substantiated by the figures that are furnished by geologists, and which they report to the United States Geological Survey.

Mr. President, I have opposed this bill not that I have any interest in Alaska, but because she has no representative on the floor of this body, no one to state the conditions that exist there.

I am very much interested in the bills that are to come before the Senate at the next session, especially in the bills for the application of the leasing system to almost all of the natural resources of the public domain in the States of the Union. I am convinced that such bills, if they are passed, will be followed by leasing bills for our mineral lands, because the conservation congresses have repeatedly asserted that that is their object. Further than that, you will find that these measures will be defended upon the very ground and upon the same principle on which this coal-leasing bill is defended.

Mr. President, I have sought in the argument upon this measure before the Senate to show that it was inconsistent with our form of government that we should have a leasing system, because it keeps lands in perpetuity in the Federal Government. That was never intended by the framers of our Constitution, nor is it in line with our theory of government. That being the case, I propose to vote against the conference report, as I did vote against the bill.

Mr. President, what effect has the principle of perpetual ownership by the Government of land in Alaska? Perpetual ownership of lands by the Federal Government means exemption from taxation forever. That means that upon an insigificant quantity of lands in private ownership, you must levy assessments and taxes for the purpose of maintaining government. I think, if this bill shall pass and its policies shall be permanently maintained, that Alaska can bid farewell forever to any hopes of statehood. Why? Because Alaska has only one-fiftieth of 1 per cent of its area in private ownership. One five-thousandth part of the total area of Alaska is in private ownership. When she knocks at the door for admission into the Union, what will be said to her? The same that has been said to every Territory that has applied, namely, what are your resources and wealth? How can you maintain a State government? What are your assessment rolls? When it has simply the right to tax one-fiftieth of 1 per cent of the property within its borders, it is impossible to maintain State government; it is impossible to have a school system; it is impossible to have county governments. Thus by the passage of this bill you will retard, nay, it seems to me, you will make it impossible for Alaska ever to attain statehood. Yet these are our own people; they are Americans; they have gone through the hardships of pioneer life to settle and develop that country. To keep those lands in Federal ownership forever means that you can never raise money upon them to maintain statehood and the subsidiary divisions of government that go with statehood. Mr. President, this very act is the measure that will retard the growth of population and wealth in Alaska, because it prevents the acquisition of property by which taxes can be raised with which to support government.

Mr. President, poor Alaska has had a severe trial with the leasing system. I want to read you a statement which was presented by the committee of the American Mining Congress, which reported upon the system of leasing coal and other public lands as proposed for Alaska. It is as follows:

> Poor old Alaska has surely had quite enough of the leasing system. It was leased by Russia from 1799 until 1867 to the Russian-American Co. That company was the absolute lord and master, and its leasehold sovereignty absolutely prevented development. Fortunately, nobody was lured there under false premises. Only those went there who did so for the Russian-American Co. A leasing system was not inflicted upon honest, hardy pioneers as is now proposed by the American Government. Fortunately for the United States, Alaska was not colonized or settled by the Russians. Their leasing system prevented it. Otherwise the Russian people would have so well developed Alaska by 1867 that the United States could not have bought it for 2 cents an acre, with its wonderful fisheries and a fur-seal herd of 6,000,000 thrown into the bargain. The first thing we did, however, was to lease that seal herd to a company which in 40 years made a net profit of $5,738,000 and depleted the seal to about 75,000. In the meantime the United States Government spent more money in patroling the seal islands than it obtained from royalties on the lease, and Alaska got absolutely nothing, not a cent in taxation, not a lighthouse, not a schoolhouse, not as much as a flagpole.

Mr. President, that is a terrible arraignment of what has occurred there. Now, we propose by this legislation to force another leasing system upon the people of that Territory against their will. We tried the experiment of leasing the lead mines of the United States in 1807, yet we found that we paid $4 for inspection and the collection of the royalties for every dollar collected.

Mr. President, this bill provides for the withdrawal of coal lands. It is to be followed by other measures of a similar nature. A bill has been reported, or is pending in the committee, providing that there shall be subject to lease all sodium lands, phosphate lands, asphaltum lands, oil lands, and other lands. Logically there will follow a leasing system applied to the resources of the entire public domain.

This bill as it came from the House provided that there should be two distinct pieces of coal lands reserved to the United States; one, I think, of about 6,000 acres and the other of about 7,000 acres. There was added by the Senate a provision reserving to the United States one-half of all the other coal lands in Alaska to be withdrawn not only from entry and sale but from even leasing. Oh, Mr. President, it seems to me that we who know something of the disadvantages of withdrawing lands from entry, must recognize that in this act there are the seeds of discontent and irritation which will continually grow among the citizens of the Territory of Alaska.

There was one man in the American Mining Congress who made a speech as to the reservations which have already been made there, to which I wish to call attention. He said:

> Alaska is being literally reserved to death. We have forest reserves, military reserves—one of them 100 miles in diameter—coal reserves, fish reserves, naval reserves, missionary reserves, church reserves, school reserves, seal reserves, bird reserves, and, I suppose, by this time, bug reserves and cranks crying for more reserves.

Mr. President, it does seem, from the enumeration of the reserves which have actually been made, that Alaska is truly being reserved to death; and yet, right in the face of that, there comes a proposition in this bill to reserve to the Federal Government about two-thirds of the coal lands of Alaska and to

withdraw them from occupation and development even under a leasing system. In one sweeping declaration it is provided that one-half of all the rest of the coal lands shall be reserved to the Government. How can you develop a country under such circumstances?

Mr. President, the people of Alaska do not want a leasing system. I have not heard of a single man who said that he wanted such a system. It might be that they would be willing to have a leasing system imposed upon them if they could not under any circumstances secure legislation granting the right of entry and purchase as it exists now in other portions of the United States; but when we know that orders of withdrawal can be canceled; that it will take only a few minutes to issue such an order and allow the miners to go to work in Alaska it seems to me that the simple way is the entry and sale system under which this Nation came to be the most wealthy and powerful of all the countries of the world.

Mr. President, Secretary Fisher went to Alaska during his administration of the Interior Department. Of course there is a feeling of natural pride among citizens and hearty welcome to a Cabinet officer when he goes to a distant portion of the Republic. He is greeted with hospitality and silence is maintained concerning his policies that may be in conflict with the views of the people of the Territory. Yet these men were possessed with the ideals of liberty and freedom, and they wanted Secretary Fisher to understand their position as to the coal-leasing proposition entertained by him. So they met him at Valdez and they presented to him resolutions upon the subject unanimously adopted. Among those resolutions we find the following:

> The leasing system is unanimously opposed in Alaska, because it is un-American, and, further, because it would intensify rather than diminish the chances of monopoly. None but wealthy corporations could do anything with a lease and they would demand concessions unlikely to be granted, and which, if granted, would license monopoly. The leasing dream would mean indefinite postponement of coal mining in Alaska.

Mr. President, the Alaskans are the ones most vitally affected, they are the ones who will be the victims if monopoly prevails. Why not, in the determination of a policy which so vitally affects their happiness and welfare, heed their warning and request?

Mr. President, what is government for? The chief end and object of government is the happiness of its citizens. Are we going to put upon them a system which they abhor—a system which experience has shown has not been for the benefit of the people of the United States?

What was the old leasing system? A thousand years ago it was universal in Europe. It was then called feudalism, and under it the men who held the lands, held them by a leasehold estate and not by a freehold estate. When a man attained that prominence where he could assert the fact that he did not have to pay rent and did not have to contribute to the defense of his high lord, then he became known as a freeholder. It was an honor to rise from being a vassal to be a freeholder. So, when our forefathers came to America, abhoring the idea of landlordism and vassalage, they recognized that the freehold principle was the true principle upon which to found a free and independent Republic. There have been tabulations made as to the development of this country which show that with only 6 per cent of the area of the world and only 6 per cent of the population of the world we produce more than one-third of the minerals and coal of the world. With that kind of development, with that great advance, is it possible that we are now to go back upon the very principles that have produced that great result?

Mr. President, there are some things in the bill which I do not feel are for the best interests of the people. I believe that the royalties that are exacted in Alaska should not go to the United States Government, if there are any royalties to be paid.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Colorado?

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MYERS. I desire to say that under the amendment offered in the Senate by my colleague [Mr. WALSH] and adopted by the Senate, the royalties and all profits from the leases will go, first, to pay for the expenses of building the Alaskan railway, and, after that, will go into what is known as the "Alaska fund" for the exclusive benefit of Alaska, for the purpose of building roads, schoolhouses, and other improvements in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, when we voted for the Alaska railroad we had no right to say that all Alaska should contribute to that railroad. The railroads which are built through my State get their return and are able to pay their bonded indebtedness from the imposition of traffic rates. Those rates affect the people who were benefited by the construction of the railroad. What interest has a coal miner or other citizen in one part of Alaska, a thousand miles away, in that railroad? How can he be benefited by the construction and operation of it? Why should his coal mine be required to pay a royalty to reimburse the expenditures for its construction? When we pick out one locality for an improvement and without the consent of the people there make the entire Territory contribute to the improvement, then, Mr. President, we are doing a wrong; and I can not help believing that the requirement that the money derived from leases of coal lands in Alaska should go to any other people than the people of Alaska is an injustice to them and is not a compliance with the trust which has been reposed in the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I object to the action of the conferees in striking out the provisions granting to citizens injured the right to sue the Government of the United States. I feel that the provision in regard to that matter in the Senate bill was much better than the provision in the House bill or the provision in the pending conference report. It seems to me every American ought to repudiate the idea that the Government should take advantage of the doctrine that the king can do no wrong. I can not understand why, if a man has been injured, he can not sue the Government. We have had an illustration in the State of Colorado that is very plain and clear. In the San Luis Valley there is a tract of land of more than 1,000,000 acres. Filings were made for reservoirs and for ditches under the laws of the United States and the State; and yet by reason of an order made by the Secretary of the Interior 16 years ago they have been unable to proceed with the development of the valley. The rights of way have never been granted, and consequently that valley, rich in everything except water, has lain a barren waste. We have begged for years to have the United States Government sue some of those who are attempting to avail themselves of the laws as to rights of ways and the appropriation of water for beneficial uses, but we could not get the Government to bring suit.

Now, there is pending upon the Senate calendar a bill introduced by my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] providing that the State of Colorado, or some of the persons who have rights under the laws which existed in the United States and in the State, shall be permitted to sue the United States Government for the purpose of determining their water rights. Under the conditions which have existed for some time the Government of the United States is absolutely taking water which, according to all laws, belongs to prior appropriators or to those who have initiated their right for the appropriation of water for beneficial uses.

Mr. President, if this right is given, it may be said that a number of suits will be brought; but is it possible that a great and powerful Nation wants to hide behind the fact that it is a sovereign and let the people suffer because they can not enforce their rights? That provision of the bill as it passed the Senate was much better than the provision of the conference report.

A leasing system has never paid. It did not pay from 1807 up to 1847, when it was repealed. It does not pay now, so far as it is carried out in the administration of the Forestry Service. Every year we appropriate $3,000,000 for that service more than we get out of the forests from sales of timber and grazing taxes, although the rents have been raised for grazing purposes to the extent in some parts of the country of more than 700 per cent above what they were when the system was inaugurated. It was an endeavor upon the part of the Forest Service to make the service pay, but the overhead charges, as the railroads call them, and the amounts required to pay the salaries of the large number of men employed in the Forestry Service have always exceeded the amount of money which can be collected. So it will be in the case of Alaska. You will find that this very system will fail to bring any net returns. Of course the United States Government is rich and can afford, if it wants to do so, to pay to the Forestry Service $3,000,000 a year in excess of what it collects, and it can pay in the case of Alaska $3,000,000 a year in excess of what it realizes from the royalties which will be collected; yet, Mr. President, that very thing shows the impracticability of the proposition. We will find that the Government can not undertake a leasing system and make it a success.

Mr. President, I believe that the withdrawal by the conference committee of the part of the Senate bill which limits to 5 cents a ton the amount to be charged as royalty was wrong. There is no telling what the amount of royalty may be, and every time an increased amount of royalty is added to a ton of coal it hampers commerce. It must be borne by the consumer

to the extent of two or three times the amount of the royalty. It is going to be a continual discrimination against the industries of Alaska and against the development of that country. It is a charge which never has been made against any other Territory. If other Territories had been charged with a royalty, then there might be some excuse for it, but none has ever been exacted. Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, clear to the Rocky Mountain line, have gotten the benefit of all their natural resources. It seems to me that to take that far-distant country, where pioneering is most difficult and distressing, and to say that it shall be made to pay something that no other State in the Union in its Territorial days was required to pay is something that is wrong.

In the United States there is no monopoly of coal—or, at least, of bituminous coal—which runs almost all of the industries of the United States. A comparison with the countries that have governmental leasing systems demonstrates that we get coal in the United States now, according to the Geological Survey, at the mouth of the mine for an average of $1.11 a ton and in West Virginia for 90 cents a ton. No other country in the world that has a leasing system gets anywhere near as cheap coal as that. In Nova Scotia it is $2.01; in New South Wales, $1.82; in New Zealand, State mine, $2; in Victoria, State mine, $2.28; and in West Australia, $2.22 per ton.

Why do you say that we are attempting to control monopoly by this legislation? This has nothing to do with monopoly. Monopoly may exist under a leasing system just as well as under ownership of property. Any tendency toward monopoly arises from the attempt to control the transportation and market of the product, not the production. Take the American Smelting & Refining Co. It does not operate mines to any appreciable extent. It busies itself with the treatment of the ore. Take the Standard Oil Co. It may have a few wells, but not many. It has control of the pipe lines and has such great capital as to be able to make contracts in restraint of trade. That is why there is no effort made to control the product itself before it is brought forth from the ground. We have never heard anything of a monopoly in the mining of precious metals. All over the country there are thousands and thousands of miners, but we have never heard of a combination among them.

So, Mr. President, there is not a tendency in ownership to make monopoly, nor could there be, from the vast quantity of our natural resources; but Alaska has done one thing—or, at least, the United States Congress did it for her—it has passed a law which is the best law against monopoly in the world, and if that law is observed and enforced there can be no such thing as monopoly in Alaska. I regret very much that we have not in the United States the same provision. It reads as follows:

> If any of the lands or deposits purchased under the provisions of this act shall be owned, leased, trusteed, possessed, or controlled by any device, permanently, temporarily, directly, indirectly, tacitly, or in any manner whatsoever, so that they form part of or in any way effect any combination, or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust, or form the subject of any contract or conspiracy in restraint of trade in the mining or selling of coal, or of any holding of such lands by any individual, partnership, association, corporation, mortgage, stock ownership or control, in excess of 2,560 acres in the District of Alaska, the title thereto shall be forfeited to the United States by proceedings instituted by the Attorney General of the United States in the courts for that purpose.

It seems to me that under that law, making a forfeiture of title and imposing penalties for any combination to acquire lands in excess of 2,560 acres, the laws of Alaska right now are better safeguarded than the laws of any other country on the Western Hemisphere.

So, Mr. President, I want to say that I am opposed to this leasing proposition. I think it is wrong. I think it is productive of a feeling and irritation that defeats the chief end of government in the localities affected. I feel that the United States Government has started on a policy of sale of its public domain which has produced such great development that to return now to a leasing system will produce depression and stagnation and will retard that development which we have so much hoped would be the result of this legislation.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, just a word. Notwithstanding the Senator tells us about how well this bill is safeguarded and how much coal they have in Alaska—enough to last the entire world 300 years, as he says—the fact remains that poor humanity in my part of the world pays $7 a ton for it. Somebody is making an uncanny and an unfair profit on it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; and the cause of it is that you have not the laws enforced to prevent contracts in restraint of trade.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It is all very well to tell the people what is the cause of it. The dire situation is that they pay $7 a ton, or go without heat with which to keep their bodies warm or fuel with which to cook their food.

I am conscientious in my position on this matter, and I believe our friends on the other side may be just as conscientious. I will not aid or abet, so far as my vote is concerned, a measure of this kind. I know there is a powerful sentiment abroad in this country against the further leasing away for a paltry 4 cents a ton, as your bill says, of this great deposit, the beneficent handiwork of our God for humanity's welfare and blessing. Never, never, will I vote to aid such a process.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If the Senator pleases, just a second there. Is it fair to charge monopoly against a product unless monopoly exists there?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It has not yet had the chance to get there.

Mr. SHAFROTH. When coal is produced in West Virginia at 90 cents a ton, and the average of coal in the United States is $1.11 a ton, and it is sold to you at $7 a ton, is it possible that that can be charged up against the mine? It must be charged against the people who manipulate it in transportation.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes; but I desire primarily that these people shall not have the opportunity so to manipulate it. Since we have this coal, why, in the name of Heaven, shall we give it away? Why not try some other process? We tried it in West Virginia, we tried it in Pennsylvania, we tried it in Colorado, and the result has been murder, bloodshed, poverty, misery, and woe to every man who was engaged in it except the man who sits in yonder great metropolis, in New York, stuffing his coffers with the result of their labor.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, that can be done under a leasing system as well as under an ownership system; and the Senator must recognize the fact that when coal is produced at an average price in the United States of $1.11 a ton, and 90 cents a ton in West Virginia, there can not be sustained a charge of monopoly in the production of the coal.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, the genial Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and myself are at one in our votes on this bill, but as far apart as the poles on the reasons for those votes.

The Senator from New Jersey asks, in the last moment of the colloquy, "As we own this coal, for heaven's sake why do we give it away?" I take the position now that the United States does not own a foot of the coal land of the United States for commercial purposes; neither does it own an acre of the public land of the United States for commercial purposes. It is an owner simply as a trustee for the people, and to the man who puts to usefulness an acre of the public land or of the coal land belongs the usufruct.

But, Mr. President, I am not going to discuss this bill. I am not at all concerned in regard to the details of it. I simply rise to enter my protest against entering upon a system of landlordism in this country. It makes no difference whether the Government of the United States or my neighbor is my landlord; the minute I become a tenant I cease to be a free citizen of this great Republic; and when you put the people of Alaska under tenantry you remove from them every incentive to become real citizens of this country.

I remember a debate years ago upon this very subject, when the lamented Senator from Montana, Mr. Carter, was discussing it. "Ah," said he, "a man will take his shotgun to defend his home, but a man seldom is impelled to take his shotgun to defend a boarding house." The people of this country must own their homes, they must own that upon which their industry centers, if you are going to have a real citizenship in this country; and if this vote shall be favorable to this bill, I for one shall not accept it as a precedent for any future legislation along these lines.

I rose to enter a further protest from the fact that this legislation is sought and demanded under false pretenses. It has been urged here, urged in the other House of Congress, and urged through the press—the great metropolitan newspapers and the magazines—that we must pass this bill, so that the people of Alaska can have coal wherewith to warm themselves. Mr. President, legislation is not needed for that. If the Executive of this country, if the Interior Department, will enforce the laws in regard to Alaska that are now upon the statute books, the coal fields will be opened, the coal can be mined. It is not kept back by those who are opposing a leasing system. The development of that country, so far as its coal is concerned, is not kept back by those who object to having the Government hand laid upon all their industries. It is kept back by the strong arm of the Executive of this Nation, which suspends at will the act of Congress under which these coal lands may be disposed of.

So I say that this whole propaganda is a propaganda carried on under false pretenses. The fact that the people of Alaska are without coal to-day should be laid where it prop-

erly belongs—not upon those who are opposing this sort of legislation, but upon those who by the acts of Executive authority suspend the act of Congress, as they have a right to do under the authority given by us.

Just one other matter. I will not be drawn into a discussion of this withdrawal matter now, but I want to say to my friends who believe in this sort of legislation that if you could see the condition that exists in some of our Western States because of legislation of like character, and because of Executive orders of like character, you would not vote for this legislation. In my own county—my own county, mind you—there is withdrawn from occupation, withdrawn from sale, withdrawn from opportunity of taxation, withdrawn from all source of revenue, an area of land greater than the whole State of Massachusetts. What county can prosper under those conditions? The county is compelled to keep up the roads, the schoolhouses, the bridges, and have nine-tenths of its area under the withering hand of Government control—a control that will not and can not be released.

If Senators could see those conditions and realize them, they *would not* wonder at the earnestness with which some of these propositions are opposed.

Mr. President, I simply want to protest against the passage of this legislation, because I know that it is but the entering wedge that shall finally cleave its way through the whole Rocky Mountain region and through every Rocky Mountain State. There is not a resource of all those States, barring the precious metals only, but that is now locked up under the strong arm of the Government. Not an oil field can be discovered but that immediately the Government of the United States takes it out of active operation. Not a coal field can be discovered but that the Government at once reaches out and closes it to the entry of him who would develop it. Not a resource except the precious metals remains.

I suppose this conference report will be agreed to; but I want to make my protest here and now, and enter it upon the record, that it shall not and must not be considered as a precedent for legislation of like character that may be sought to be imposed upon the sovereign States of the Rocky Mountain region.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I shall occupy the attention of the Senate for a moment, and a moment only.

I regret very much, of course, that this leasing bill did not retain section 18, which provided for the repeal of section 16 of the act known as the reclamation extension act; but I presume the conferees did the best they could with that provision, and I shall not undertake to delay the passage of the bill by reason of that fact. I am assured by all that we are to have assistance in the repeal of section 16 at a more opportune time.

I presume, if we are going to have a leasing system, that in all probability the details of this bill, soon to become a law, are as acceptable as any original bill could be made. In other words, necessarily, there will have to be changes as experience is had and practice under the leasing system is put in vogue. This bill as it now stands for a leasing system, however, does not meet with any serious objection upon my part. I only want to say that I am opposed to the leasing system in its entirety. I am not an advocate of public ownership of public utilities generally, but I do not hesitate to say that I prefer to try public working of the mines to that of leasing the mines. There would be some hope of serving the people by cheaper fuel under the former system. There is no hope of giving them cheaper coal under the leasing system.

I sincerely hope this bill will result in opening up Alaska. I sincerely hope it will bring prosperity to those people up there and give them an opportunity to develop that great country and to make out of it what its natural resources justify us in believing it could be made. My judgment, however, first, is that it will not result in the development of Alaska; secondly, that it will not result in giving any cheaper fuel to Alaska or the Pacific coast; and, thirdly, that it will not prove satisfactory to the Government. That, however, is not due to the fact of the particular terms of the bill. It is due, in my judgment, to the principle involved in the whole leasing system.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] stated the amount of coal which it is supposed Colorado contains within her coal beds, and the amount of coal which may be found in the coal beds of Wyoming, and the amount of coal, generally, which may be found in the United States, supposedly sufficient to satisfy the demand of the world for the next 5,000 years. The only question left is how to get that indispensable fuel to the people at a reasonable price; because, as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] has said, while these vast coal fields are there and this vast supply is at hand, the people very close to those coal fields are paying exorbitant prices for the coal. There is but one question connected with this entire proposition, and that is not the keeping of the coal in the ground or conserving it in the sense that you are locking it up for all time to come, depriving this generation and the succeeding generation of the use of it, but the sole and only question is as to how to get the coal to the consumer at a price which he can afford to pay, or which, in justice and conscience, he ought to pay.

That being true, Mr. President, how is it possible from any system of reasoning to arrive at the conclusion that you can put coal down to the consumer upon which is paid a large royalty, and upon which a leasing system is operative, cheaper than it is put down under the system heretofore obtaining, or under Government ownership and Government operation of the mine? My opinion is that if the Government can not successfully operate the mine, the same reasoning with additional force will show that a leasing system would be unsuccessful, and that they could not put down the coal to the consumer as cheaply as private ownership.

But back of all this question is this question for the West; and we had just as well face the proposition and understand that that is going to be the result. That is, that the vast fields of the West are to be withheld from private ownership and from home building, from taxation, and put under a leasing system.

That seems all right for those who are not there to see its effect. It seems to be, upon theory and upon paper, a very practical and safe and sane system; but the State which I have the honor in part here to represent has about one-third its area in Government ownership now, withdrawn from entry by the private citizen. I do not complain at all as to the withdrawal of any acre of that vast domain which is purely timberland and exclusively dedicated by the God of nature to the growing of timber; but the evils of this system are accentuated by the fact that while they withdraw hundreds and thousands of acres of land that are truly timberland, they have withdrawn and are holding within the withdrawal hundreds of thousands of acres which are just as tillable and as well fitted for cultivation and for the making of homes as those lands upon which fine homes to-day exist.

The result of it is that we have vast areas of agricultural land called timberland—land which would make good homes and provide means of livelihood for citizens—withdrawn and dedicated to eternal silence, upon which we can not lay taxes, and over which we can not cross without the consent of the Federal Government. The result is that it robs us of the means of building churches, of building schoolhouses, of building courthouses, and imposes upon the people an extraordinary burden by reason of the small portion of the land which is now under cultivation and subject to taxation.

If all this would result in the destruction of what is called monopoly with reference to natural resources, or if it would result in laying down these natural resources to the consumer at a lower rate and price than now enjoyed, there would be a strong argument, nevertheless, in its favor. You can not get a foot of timber of the Government of the United States a quarter of a cent cheaper than you can buy it from the most denounced timber monopolist in the West; so that the people get no benefit whatever from this system, and are to-day deprived of the advantage of settling up the lands without any compensation in return for that deprivation.

Some people seem to think this will benefit the Northwest in some way. I do not think so. If I thought it would open up Alaska, that would be some benefit. I do not believe it will. If I thought it would result in laying down the coal cheaper on the Pacific coast, that would be some benefit. I do not believe it will do so. But, Mr. President, like all other things, we can only learn in regard to it through experience, and I presume we have arrived at the point where we must have some experience in regard to the leasing system again in order to know whether or not it is a workable proposition. We have tried it some two or three times in this country, and each time it has been a failure; but human memory is short. We soon forget the experiences which we have had, and it is altogether probable that we have got to have some of those experiences again. That being true, Mr. President, while I have the greatest sympathy in the world for the people of Alaska, while I wish them well and hope that they will succeed, I would prefer to have this leasing system operate upon Alaska rather than in the United States. If it results in good, they need it more than anyone else. If it results in evil, we can get out of it there quicker than if it were fastened upon the States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was one of the conferees appointed on the part of the Senate to consider the differences between the House and the Senate upon this bill. I was in hopes that the agreements arrived at would be of such a nature that I could sign the report, but I felt that I could not sign the re-

port as long as some of the provisions remained in the bill that are now found in the conference report.

I wish to refer particularly to section 9 of the conference report in which the maximum amount charged for royalty is eliminated. The Senate passed the bill and specified that the royalties to be charged by the Government should not be less than 2 cents per ton nor more than 5 cents. The conferees have stricken out the maximum price and left it so that the Government can charge any royalty they can get anyone to bid. I protest against the Government undertaking to secure the highest possible royalty, which will have to be paid by the consumer and collected with the avowed purpose of paying the United States back the $35,000,000 appropriated for building a railroad in Alaska. Mr. President, eight years ago nearly every person who was interested in the development of Alaska was told that there could be no coal mined in Alaska until Congress passed a coal-leasing bill, that no title should pass to an acre of coal land in that Territory, no matter whether the law had been complied with in every particular or not, until a leasing system was approved. The position then taken has proven true. When the first announcement of that policy was made and was to be hereafter followed by the Interior Department, I could hardly believe that it would be successful, but to-day Congress yields, and the first leasing law is to pass.

Four years ago I felt something must be done, and upon the pleading of the people of Alaska for some relief I myself introduced a leasing bill for Alaska. Senators and those who were the most pronounced conservationists, who said their only desire was to conserve the natural resources of the country, stated not only to the Committee on Public Lands but to the public generally that it was not their policy to create revenue for the Government out of the sale or leasing of the public lands of Alaska or the United States. They stated that all they wanted was to see that the natural resources were not wasted, that they were cared for, that the life of those who worked in the mines should be protected, and the Government should at least regulate questions of such vital importance.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], for instance, who, as everyone knows, believes in conservation and has preached it as long and as loud as any Senator, has always taken the position that the Government of the United States was not to speculate in coal lands, either in Alaska or in the United States. None of us will deny the fact that every dollar that is paid in royalties will have to be paid by the ultimate consumer.

It has been stated that the reason why the maximum is to be removed in this bill is to allow the collecting, through leasing coal lands in Alaska, every dollar possible in order to pay back to the Government of the United States the $35,000,000 appropriated for building a railroad in that Territory. It has been stated further that it was the opinion of some that they could get a dollar a ton royalty for coal mined in Alaska. If a dollar a ton is paid as a royalty for the coal in Alaska, it will have to be paid by the men who buy the coal and ultimately will fall upon the consumer.

Again, Mr. President, I am opposed to the leasing system in the United States. Whenever that policy shall be adopted by Congress and become a part of the laws of our land, the further development of the western part of this country will be retarded.

I do not want to go over the same ground this morning that has been gone over so well already by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and others. I want to say, Mr. President, that if this bill applied to the United States I would be one who would insist that every reason should be fully considered by Congress before any action could or should be taken upon it. I realize that we are in the closing days of this session. I hope that Congress can adjourn by Saturday of this week. If I were opposed to this measure in the same degree that I am opposed to leasing land in the United States, I would not undertake to filibuster against the passage of the bill and keep Congress in session. We have been in session now for about 18 months, and I know Senators and Representatives are weary and tired, and the strain they have been under during these long months of toil and labor is almost more than the physical strength of any man can stand.

But I want to say to the western Senators who are in favor of this bill that at the next session of Congress its passage will be pointed to as a precedent, and their attention will be called to the fact that we have already adopted a leasing system in the United States, and if they want to put a limit upon the royalties paid they will be forced to admit that they voted that there should be no limit on royalties from the coal mined in Alaska.

I believe that coal in Alaska should be produced at the very lowest possible price. I, as one of the conferees, insisted upon a maximum royalty. I said, "Let it be higher than any royalty paid in any part of the United States; strike out a 5-cent maximum and raise it to 15 or 20 cents." That was not agreeable to the balance of the conferees.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state, if the Senator will yield, that the maximum in the State of Colorado is 10 cents a ton.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish also to add, Mr. President, that the average of the whole United States is less than 10 cents a ton. There should be some maximum put upon the amount of royalty to be collected, and I was willing to make it twice the average amount charged in the United States. No; it was stated that some Members of the House thought that they could get a dollar a ton royalty out of the coal mined in Alaska.

Mr. President, I believe that whenever Congress passes a law it ought to be passed with the idea of meeting some situation of which the people of the country may take advantage. I do not believe there will be much mining of coal in Alaska under this bill; but I do hope that under the provisions of the bill citizens living within a stone's throw of millions of tons of coal can secure the right, at least, to obtain enough Alaskan coal to keep them warm through the winter.

We would not pass a coal-leasing bill for Alaska if it had not been that the coal lands of Alaska were withheld from development and people were compelled to send to West Virginia and Pennsylvania for their coal when they had millions of tons at their very doors. That was the sentiment back of this bill, and without it the bill could not pass this body. But it is going to pass; and I shall take no further time of the Senate to discuss the other provisions which seem very objectionable to me as contained in the conference report. However, I want it distinctly understood that, as far as I am personally concerned, the passage of this bill shall never be considered as a precedent for a leasing system in the United States.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. Referring to what the Senator has said upon the matter of placing a maximum limit upon the royalty which can be collected under this leasing system, let us assume, which is not an improbable case, that there was, in fact, a maximum limit of 10 cents per ton, and by reason of the peculiar conditions which might exist in a given locality some one would come along and bid 8 cents per ton, another 10 cents, another 25 cents per ton, does not the Senator feel that under those circumstances the Government ought to be in a position to accept the best bid?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not believe it. I believe Congress should provide that there shall be no royalty paid upon the coal land in Alaska above a certain limit, and then if there were one or two or a half dozen or more bidders upon the tracts of land that shall be surveyed under the bill, and if the royalty bid was exactly the same, the bill itself provides how a case like that shall be taken care of. The whole power is left in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior. He has absolute authority to grant the lease to the person who, in his judgment, he considers would develop the mines for the best interest of the Government.

Mr. POMERENE. Assume, under the circumstances named, that one of the bidders offered 25 cents a ton; ought not the Secretary of the Interior to be in a position where he might accept that bid?

Mr. SMOOT. The bid he accepts, whatever amount it may be, will be passed on to the consumer, and the speculation in Government lands has not been the policy of the United States in disposing of its lands from the time that the leasing system proved such a failure years ago. The same theory might be advanced in relation to homesteads and public lands of all kinds.

Mr. POMERENE. There might be a situation where the operator could afford to pay a royalty of 25 cents per ton and yet be able to furnish that coal cheaper to the consumer than the man on another site could furnish it at 10 cents per ton.

Mr. SMOOT. That is absolutely true; but the same man could produce it still cheaper upon that same site at a royalty of 10 cents than he could at 25 cents.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the American people want to become tenants of the Government. I say, Mr. President, that the best citizen in the United States is he who owns his own home. He is at all times ready to defend his country. But it is different with a company. Foreigners may own a large part of the stock of it. I would like to see the time come——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to inquire of the Senator if there are many in his State who live on coal mines?

Mr. SMOOT. They live around coal mines, some of them above a coal mine.

Mr. WALSH. Do they acquire public lands there, or do they lease the ground?

Mr. SMOOT. Some of them, under the laws existing to-day, make homestead entries on lands that are classified as coal lands; they only secure the surface right, however.

Mr. WALSH. Unquestionably; but is not that quite apart from the question of ownership of coal lands?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly it is quite apart from the ownership of coal lands; but it is not apart from the question which the Senator asked.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, just a moment, if the Senator from Utah will permit me. The Senator spoke of cases of corporations where the list of stockholders showed that the majority of stock was held by foreigners.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I said a large part of the stock may be so held. I did not say a majority.

Mr. MYERS. I beg the Senator's pardon; I thought he said a majority. I merely want to say that of course this bill provides that a majority of the stock shall be held by citizens of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah was perfectly aware that that was carefully guarded, and did not make the statement that the majority of the stock could be held by foreigners.

Mr. MYERS. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what I am fearful of is that the adoption of this conference report will be only the forerunner of not only the leasing of our coal lands in this country, but of the leasing of our mineral lands and of our other public lands. I know the same power which is back of this bill—not perhaps in as great numbers—is also back of the propaganda that is going on in this country for the leasing of a great part of the remaining public domain. This legislation will merely be pointed to as a precedent. We shall be told that Congress has approved of the leasing system; that the American people want it, and if they want it it should be given to them. So much, Mr. President, for the question of leasing. I shall not say more at this time, nor do I even care whether or not we have a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of the report.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I believe that the conferees have vastly improved the bill. While I voted for the bill as it passed the Senate, it contained some provisions which I believed were quite unwise. As I read the bill as now reported by the conferees, those provisions have practically all been eliminated. I was very much pleased to note that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who originally opposed the bill, and is entirely opposed to the plan contained therein, stated very frankly that, if we were to have a leasing system, he thought the bill reported by the conferees fully complied with that plan and gave us, on that theory, a No. 1 bill; that it contained the requisite qualifications and limitations which were necessary to safeguard that kind of a plan. So I believe the conferees are entitled to congratulations on having improved this measure and put it in such excellent shape.

Mr. President, there are three methods by which coal may be mined and coal lands may be operated. The first is for the Government to give patents under the law to those who desire to operate the mines or to own them, so that they are owned in fee simple; second, that the Government should retain the title and lease the lands for operation; and third, that the Government should not only retain the title, but that the Government should, as well, operate the mines and sell the coal upon the market.

Those who favor the ownership idea, as do the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and a great many other Senators, will vote against the adoption of the conference report, because they believe the bill goes too far; that we ought to have private ownership and not Government ownership. Some of those who believe in the other extreme, that the Government ought not only to own but ought to operate the mines, have voted against the bill because it does not go far enough. Among those are the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

A great many arguments can be adduced for each one of these particular systems. Personally I agree with the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Idaho. When the bill was before the Senate I voted for an amendment which provided definitely for the operation of the coal mines by the Government. I should like to see the Government undertake that. I believe it at least could do as well as we have seen the business managed under private ownership. It could not do much worse. So my sympathy is with the Senator from New Jersey, although I am going to vote for the conference report, because I think it is a great deal better than no system or than the other extreme.

The present situation has come about, Mr. President, because the people of the United States have become dissatisfied with the operation of the coal lands. Coal is one of the prime necessities of life, which has been given to us by an All-Wise Creator in abundance; and yet there are very many difficulties in getting it from the bosom of the earth to the fireside, where it is consumed. It is not that there is not coal enough, as the argument of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] would seem to sufficiently demonstrate; it is not that there is not enough coal to supply people for millions of years to come; but it is because by private ownership so often combinations have been formed; and the coal that ought to be furnished to all the people at as near cost as possible has been kept from them to enrich those who are already supplied with more than any one individual can possibly use in this life.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator from Nebraska realize that when the Geological Survey have reported that on the average coal is furnished at the mouth of the mine for $1.11 a ton there can not be any monopoly in its production, but that the monopoly arises from transportation?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and I also recognize that down in West Virginia, where the Senator from New Jersey has gathered a great deal of his information, where hundreds of people have been deprived of their liberty, and some of them have been deprived of their lives on account of existing conditions under the present law, coal mines are operated under private ownership.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Just a moment. I also recognize that in the Senator's own State the President has been compelled to send the soldiers of the United States Army in order to protect the lives of citizens.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The situation in respect to a strike may exist anywhere in the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. And does exist.

Mr. SHAFROTH. In West Virginia they have a private leasing system, and the same conditions have prevailed there.

Mr. NORRIS. They have no leasing system in West Virginia such as this bill provides for.

Mr. SHAFROTH. They have no governmental leasing system, but they have a private leasing system.

Mr. NORRIS. Under private ownership you will always have private leasing; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That may be, but these conditions do not arise by reason of leasing or the absence of leasing.

Mr. NORRIS. Difficulties have arisen under the present system, and they exist now. We have had trouble within the recollection of all of us in practically all of the coal mines of the United States. The system has been unsatisfactory. Perhaps we are about to enact legislation that will not help the situation, but I believe it will; I believe this bill provides for a system that will be an improvement at least over the present system, which certainly is unsatisfactory. There is much in the argument, and I agree with the Senator from New Jersey when he says that the coal, a necessity of life, placed in the bowels of the earth by the all-wise Creator, ought under proper law and regulations to be so managed that such conditions as we have had in the past and which exist now in some places may not again occur.

Mr. President, the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Colorado have said that they believed in a system of laws governing our public domain that would bring about the establishment of homes. So do I, for where the man residing on the land owns his home we have a better citizenship, we have a higher patriotism, and we have more happiness amongst the people; but, Mr. President, coal mines are not homes, and if you are going to establish and want to establish the kind of homes of which we have heard in the coal fields of West Virginia and Colorado, then the less of them the better.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator must remember that I was not referring to this bill when I spoke of the question of homes. I referred to the fact that a measure which I expect before Congress at the next session will not only provide for the

leasing of coal lands in the United States, but for the leasing of the public domain, and that, of course, will involve the question as to whether or not the people shall be able to make homes on this leased land.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington if the Senator from Utah is through.

Mr. SMOOT. I am through.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the Senator from Utah inform us when and by whom that proposition is going to be presented?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that it has already been presented many times in Congress.

Mr. POINDEXTER. This is the first time that I ever heard of it, and it is quite astonishing. Does the Senator mean to say that it is proposed to repeal or to substantially repeal the homestead laws of the United States?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say that the proposition is not to repeal the homestead laws of the United States, but it is to classify public lands and allow them to be leased, subject to homestead entries; but the Senator knows very well that after a piece of land is leased to a cattleman or a sheepman the man who would enter a homestead within that leased tract would stand no chance on earth of ever perfecting his entry and securing title to the piece of land.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The movement which the Senator from Utah and a number of other Senators have been criticizing has been the very opposite of the system to which the Senator now refers. The purpose of that movement is to give the benefit of the public lands to the individual citizen who wants to make a home on them. The object is to try to keep the public domain out of the hands of the big cattle and lumber companies.

Mr. SMOOT. That would not be the case if the cattle companies of this country do what they intend to do under the leasing system. There is not a cattle concern in the United States that is not in favor of the leasing proposition. They all want a leasing system for the public domain; and the Senator knows why, and so do I.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Then I infer they, or those who represent them, are the ones who will present that proposition.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am not worried over what is going to happen because of some imaginary power that shall swoop down on us like a German Zeppelin, take all of our public domain away, and lease the homes of the people all through the West to some corporation or to some rich millionaire who wants to own the earth. I am in favor of homes. I do not believe there is any danger of Congress ever passing a law by which that part of the public domain which it can reasonably be expected will be occupied by actual settlers for the making of homes will ever be leased. Nobody has undertaken, so far as I know, to propose such a scheme. The leasing of lands not fit for homes for grazing purposes and the leasing of forest reserves not fit for homes is a different proposition. Those are questions upon which there may be a great deal of argument both pro and con; but there is always a question of fact involved as to whether the land in question is fit for homes or otherwise; but that has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LANE. I should like to suggest to the Senator, for his information, that there is a bill pending which proposes to lease for a term of 50 years water-power sites throughout the country, and which will control the water-power situation of this country, if it is entered into, as a general public plan of handling those properties.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. LANE. Given possession, we will say, of a strategic point which controls the entire water power for an entire district, with that put into the hands of some corporation at a nominal figure—I think the price is very small for the rental of the land as provided in the bill to which I refer—it follows that that particular corporation will have entire control of the welfare of the entire community affected by its operations.

Mr. NORRIS. That may be.

Mr. LANE. That, I think, was perhaps what the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] referred to. There is such a bill being considered. I do not know whether it is out of the committee or whether it has even been recommended or what is its status, but it is being considered.

Mr. NORRIS. When that kind of a bill comes before us we will consider it. There may be some merit in it, but there will be a good deal of argument on each side. I wanted, however, to call attention to the fact that the question of homes can not be involved in a coal mine. The kind of ownership—by private parties—for which some Senators have been contending has not been a success, because we have had that system for, lo, these many years, and under it we have had strikes, we have had combinations, we have had monopolies, and we have had bloodshed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES. I just wanted to suggest, in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, that in the bill to which he refers there is a provision also for the regulation of the price at which the power shall be sold to the consumer.

Mr. LANE. I will ask the Senator to what extent that proviso goes?

Mr. JONES. The bill provides that no such lease shall be granted except in States where they have public-service commissions having power to regulate the price, and that if this power is distributed in an interstate way, then the Interstate Commerce Commission shall regulate the price. So I think that is just one important suggestion to go in the RECORD in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon without argument.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not care to discuss the water-power question. It is of itself a great question; and as to what we shall do, what kind of a law we shall pass, it is very important. In my judgment it is more important than the Alaskan leasing bill or the bill for the leasing of coal lands in the United States. I consider it one of the most important questions that will ultimately have to be settled, because we will wake up some morning, in my judgment, not far in the future, and discover that during the preceding night some enterprising Yankee has invented a storage battery by which he can carry enough electrical power in his valise to run a railroad train across a State. When something of that kind is developed—and the battery is being improved every day—when a practical storage battery is developed, every little mountain stream that trickles down to the river and to the plain will be worth millions. We will come some day, perhaps within our lifetime, to the great electric age, when coal will be almost forgotten. I believe that even now, with the various utilities to which electric power has been applied, we ought to guard with jealous care the concentration of the water power of the country in the hands of any combination of men.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator recognize the fact that nearly every State in the Rocky Mountain region has a public-utility commission with power to regulate the rates at which electric companies shall supply electricity to the people?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I think that is true.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And that has also been true with respect to irrigation. The rates for water have been prescribed, under the statutes of Colorado, by the county commissioners, and they never have allowed an excessive rate. The theory that the Nation can do something better than a State, it seems to me, is all wrong.

Mr. NORRIS. I believe there will be a great deal of work on that line by the Nation. I believe it will be necessary.

I remember, just two or three years ago, going up the Columbia River, through the great State of Washington, and I came one evening to the place where I was to speak—a little town located at the head of a lake. In getting to the town, just about dusk, I drove over the outlet of that lake. It went out between walls of solid rock at a place narrower than the width of this Chamber, the water falling down over quite a precipice. The first thing that occurred to me was: "Why is not this wonderful power utilized?" I made inquiry of some of the citizens: "How large is this lake?" I do not remember the dimensions, but I think it was somewhere in the neighborhood of 70 miles in length, and not quite so wide; but it was a vast body of water, away up in the mountains, fed by springs, always maintained at about the same height, with a large volume of water continually going down over the rocks. I said: "Why, here you have power enough to do everything that anybody in this community can possibly need. Have you ever had it surveyed?" The man said to me: "It has been carefully surveyed, and between this outlet and the Columbia River"—which, I believe, was only 2½ miles away—"there is 750,000 horsepower now going to waste." They had electric lights in

the little village, where I spoke that night, supplied by coal or some other power. They did not use the water power. I said: "Why do you not utilize it?" There was not a railroad within 50 miles. The reply was: "Why, Jim Hill owns all the water-power sites between here and the river. We do not have much to say about them." Yet there was not a Hill railroad, as I said, within 50 miles of the town.

Those things have been going on all over the United States. Wise and shrewd men, realizing that the water power of the country would some day, perhaps in the very near future, be the great means by which transportation would be had, by which even heat and all the other conveniences of life would be brought about, have acquired them.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. I want to observe that in the case to which the Senator refers it may have been that somebody had a monopoly of the site, but the Government of the United States has withdrawn from entry nearly all if not all of the water-power sites upon the public domain in the United States, and since that time there has been almost an absolute paralysis in the development of water power in the States. The State engineer of Colorado told me that up to the time of that withdrawal order there was plant after plant going up, and that since that time practically no filings for water-power lines have been made in the State engineer's office, but that if permitted there would be ample development made of the water power. We have only 4½ per cent of the water power of the State of Colorado developed now.

Mr. NORRIS. That only emphasizes what I was saying. It only emphasizes the necessity of placing the proper safeguards about the water-power proposition. The proper authorities must properly safeguard the development of water power in order to prevent it from getting in the control of monopoly, so that the people as a whole may get the benefit of the power that is given to them by God Almighty.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, Mr. President; but if you have a utility commission in your State that can control the prices of electrical power, why is it not the proper thing to make the development, and let the price be regulated by the commission?

Mr. NORRIS. Assuming that your commission is right, and that that is the right way to handle the question, that would be proper. I am not here defending every withdrawal that has been made. I believe they have been made in good faith. The Senator from Idaho told us of the vast withdrawals that were made in his State for timber purposes—another proposition that ought to be safeguarded. My own judgment is that there have been vast amounts withdrawn in the State of Colorado, and in all of the Western States, probably, that ought to be restored to the public domain. I think the Department of the Interior will, in due time, do so. Perhaps they will not do so as rapidly as the Senator would wish. He may get impatient, and his people may; but I think they are acting in good faith, and that they ought to and will restore those withdrawals where, upon fair and due investigation, it is disclosed that they ought not to have been made in the first place. But out of caution they would perhaps withdraw at the beginning—and it is perhaps natural that they should, guarding the public interests, as I believe they are trying to do—any region or any locality where there was any reasonable ground to believe that a withdrawal ought to be made.

But, Mr. President, that has not anything particularly to do with the question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator recognize that the waters of nonnavigable streams belong to the States, or to the people of the States?

Mr. NORRIS. I would not quarrel with the Senator about that. The legal question involved will be determined properly by the courts. I think there is a good deal in what the Senator says. I am not claiming that the Federal Government owns the water, but the Federal Government often owns land that controls the situation. If the Federal Government, by proper law and proper regulation, should impose upon the disposition of that land such conditions that the power could not gradually, or in any other way, be put in the hands of monopoly, and so that an unreasonable price for electric current could not be asked, it would be the proper thing for the Government to do it. I am not particular whether the Federal Government or the State government does it, just so it is done, but it must be done.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Everybody, of course, is opposed to monopoly and wants to regulate prices, and we believe that the States that have the control of the water should have the control of the price of the current that can be generated by these plants. It seems to me that when the Government, which simply owns a lot of rocks along which the pipe runs that produces the fall in water which produces afterwards the power that makes electric current, should not hold up and control the enterprise in a State. You might just as well say that a man who owns a piece of land that a railroad wants to go through has got to go and negotiate for part of the dividends of the road before it can be put through. It destroys the very power of eminent domain that is supposed to be the indicia of the sovereignty of the State.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; the Senator's illustration does not apply at all. There is a vast difference between giving to an individual the power to say absolutely that his land shall not be taken for railroad or for other public purposes and saying to the Government, "You shall do nothing with your land except to give it away."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no; they can sell it, and should sell it; but they ought not to stand in the way of an enterprise looking to its development and use.

Mr. NORRIS. But suppose the Government does not sell it. I believe that the Government, in cases where it has the legal right to do so, ought to put conditions on any title that it parts with or any lease that it makes that controls a great water power so that it may be safeguarded against monopoly. If it is safeguarded, then it will inure to the benefit of the people just as well if it is safeguarded by the Federal Government as if it is safeguarded by the State government.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Inasmuch as the right to the water belongs to the State, does not the Senator recognize that any attempt on the part of the National Government to get a royalty on water power is simply an indirect way of doing it by withholding the land?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and the Senator ought to recognize, too, that the rocks he speaks of that are by the side of the water the Federal Government owns.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No more than an individual would own them.

Mr. NORRIS. And the State owns the water no more than an individual. In fact, the State as such does not have title to the water. It is the people of the State that have it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But the water is the thing that makes the power, and when the Government of the United States recognizes that ownership in the State, or in the people of the State, it seems to me it is not fair for them indirectly to do that which they can not do directly, namely, charge a royalty on the water power.

Mr. NORRIS. And the rocks that the Senator speaks of by the side of the water being owned by the Federal Government, as I look at it, the Federal Government should have the same rights, if it desires to use them, to control the electric energy that is generated by the fall of the water, which, in fact, could not be generated if it were not for the use of those rocks on the side that the Government owns. It seems to me that the Senator is captious. He says, "I want to regulate this electric power; I want the people protected in its use, but I do not want the people to regulate it. I want the Government to give it away. I want the State to regulate it."

As far as I am concerned, I am willing that either the State or the Nation should regulate it; but as long as the Government has it, or has that which controls it, I am not in favor of giving that away, even to a State, except with proper safeguards that shall protect it against ownership by monopoly.

Now I am coming to the question before the Senate. I have been diverted by some of these interruptions, to which I do not object, because I think they are all conducive to bringing out information, although not especially on this particular bill.

I want to say to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] that this bill provides for the reservation in the Matanuska field of 7,680 acres of coal lands and in the Bering River field of 5,120 acres, and in all other fields it provides for a reservation of not to exceed one-half of the coal lands. Then the bill further provides, in another section, that the President of the United States shall have the right to operate these reserved coal lands. The Senator must remember, also, that in Alaska there are a great many coal lands outside of the Matanuska field and the Bering River field, so that there are still ample reservations made in the Government and authority given to the President to operate those mines.

When this law is passed the authority will be placed in the hands of the President of the United States to do that thing. If the Senator from New Jersey were President—and I wish he were—he would immediately exercise that right and operate these mines. I wish the President would do that; but I think the fact that he has the right to do it will be a great incentive to prevent any undue manipulation of those mines that are operated, even though the President does not exercise the right.

I understand that President Wilson is opposed to the Government operation of mines, although he is in favor of the leasing system as provided for in this bill; so I presume that unless some contingency should arise he would not himself operate the mines.

It is said by the Senator from Colorado, who had a good deal to say about reservations of other kinds of lands than coal lands, that these reservations in Alaska mean that Alaska will never have statehood; that so much of the land of Alaska will be reserved, and consequently not subject to taxation, that they will not have the means to support a State government.

Now, Mr. President, it looks to me as though this bill makes a very liberal provision to Alaska, as far as any revenue is concerned from these mines. In reality Alaska gets every cent there for the building of the railroad or for other purposes. It all goes into Alaska. I can see that, for instance, in some counties, I think, in Colorado and in some other States, where there have been such large withdrawals of land for various purposes that the municipal or county authorities are unable to operate their municipalities or counties properly on account of the fact that they have not enough property left to tax. I agree with the Senator from Colorado that that is a condition which ought to be avoided. I would not like to see that occur. I think every fair-minded man must agree that such a condition is to be abhorred. But, Mr. President, if the royalty obtained by these mines to Alaska does not amount to more than the taxation, or what ought to be considered reasonably fair taxes upon the property, when we come to admit Alaska as a State, if we do, it could easily be provided that these leased mines should pay in lieu of taxation a certain per cent on their output, or something of that kind. It could be easily provided for. There would be no difficulty in connection with it, in my judgment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator from Nebraska find any obstacle to prevent authorizing the State to impose a tonnage tax upon the coal?

Mr. NORRIS. None whatever.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator find any difficulty about authorizing the State to tax the lease?

Mr. NORRIS. The State would do that even without any provision here. There is not any question about that, in my judgment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield in just a moment. In my judgment, if Alaska should be admitted as a State to-morrow she could tax the leases that exist, and probably would. Now I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] asked whether any objection the Senator could conceive of could be made to taxing the tonnage, the output, of the coal mines. Mr. President, that could not possibly be done unless an act of Congress authorized it. Wherever the Government has a system and something is to be done for its accomplishment, the instrumentality that is necessary to accomplish that purpose can not be the subject of taxation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield in just a moment. If the Senator had any such coal mine up there, and he put an engine in it, or built a tramway, or built a lot of houses, washeries, and put in a whole lot of machinery, does the Senator contend that, if Alaska were a State, it could not tax that property?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, not in view of section 13. What does section 13 in the bill provide?—

SEC. 13. That the possession of any lessee of the land or coal deposits leased under this act for all purposes involving adverse claims to the leased property shall be deemed the possession of the United States, and for such purposes the lessee shall occupy the same relation to the property leased as if operated directly by the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. That is, as to the possession. That would not affect the taxation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It does, because you can recover possession by seizure for taxes. If the State could tax a piece of property, even then by the collection of taxes——

Mr. NORRIS. Suppose that were the case, the fact that a tax collector levied on an engine and sold it, that would not oust the man who had the mine leased from the Government or had possession of the mine.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But it would destroy the very lease of the United States, and unless it is expressly provided in the statute that the right of taxation does exist, it does not under the existing law.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator's theory is right, the star-route carrier or the rural-route carrier, who carries the Government mail, would not have to pay any tax on his horse or on his wagon, for if a tax were levied and the collector would sell it, he could immediately say, "This is a part of the machinery by which the United States mail is manipulated and carried, and therefore it is exempt."

Mr. SHAFROTH. I want to call the Senator's attention to a line of decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States where the question of the right of taxation upon the stock in a national bank is considered, and it is held that unless it is expressly provided in the act that it shall be the subject of taxation by the State it is exempt. If there is nothing said with relation to it, the power of the State does not exist, because it might be within the power of the State to destroy the national banks. So the power here to levy the tax upon the output of the mine would be, in effect, the power to destroy the very leasing system of the Federal Government, and for that reason the Government, as held by the Supreme Court of the United States, does not tolerate that line of taxation.

Mr. NORRIS. Every national bank in the United States is taxed by State authority and pays taxes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly; because there is in the law a provision that that can be done. In Seventh Wallace it is expressly stated that stock in a bank in the hands of a person can be taxed only because the United States Statutes authorize it.

Mr. NORRIS. Then in order to protect the rural-route carrier who carries the mail we ought to put in a provision allowing the State to tax his horses.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know about that; but anyway——

Mr. SMOOT. That is private property.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Anyway, as a matter of fact, that does not affect the matter, because that is a question of private property.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and the engine that the man uses, or the timber that he uses to build a ladder to go down into his mine, or the pick that he uses, the nails that he uses are private property, just as much as the horse is the private property of the rural carrier.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator recognize that, for instance, real estate——

Mr. NORRIS. Would the Senator say that you could not tax the shovels or the axes or the hammers or the tool boxes of the man who had leased a Government coal mine in Alaska?

Mr. SHAFROTH. It may be that there are some exceptions. I do not know that any of the courts have attempted to go to that extent.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly. Every one of those is necessary in order to operate the mine.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The rule is that the instrumentalities that are needed by the Government for the purpose of the accomplishment of their system are not the subject of taxation unless it is expressly provided in the act giving the right of taxation.

Mr. MYERS. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska and others to the fact that section 13 says:

That the possession of any lessee of the land or coal deposits leased under this act for all purposes involving adverse claims to the leased property—

That is all. It is for purposes involving adverse claims.

Mr. NORRIS. As I called to the attention of the Senator from Colorado, it refers only to the question of the possession of the mine. It is put in there to protect the miner against some third person who might want to dispossess him.

Now, Mr. President, I want to take up another proposition, and then I will be through. A great deal has been said by those who have debated this question about the conference report taking out of the bill the maximum royalty. As the bill passed the Senate it provided that the royalty should not be less than 2 cents a ton and no more than 5 cents a ton. As it passed the House it had no maximum. The Senate conferees have receded, and in the bill we have before us now, as reported by the conferees, the maximum is removed and it provides only that there shall be 2 cents or more exacted on each ton as royalty.

I wish to say that I would not for a moment desire to put a royalty on the mining of the coal if it would increase the cost of the coal to the consumer; and, as a general proposition, I want to admit that the consumer of the coal pays the royalty. But let us consider now what I think was in the mind of some of those who took part in the debate in the House and those who were on the conference committee—the conditions existing in regard to the Cunningham claims, about which we heard so much a few years ago, and which were the subject of an agreement by which they should be operated by the Guggenheim interest. It was an agreement by which they were to be operated and released to this combination, providing that they should pay a royalty of 50 cents a ton, as I remember. If I am wrong, I would be glad to be corrected. As I remember

hearing the evidence in the Pinchot-Ballinger investigation, that agreement provided that they should pay 50 cents a ton.

Now, let us assume a condition, and the figures I am giving now I give only for illustration. I know nothing about the price of coal on the Pacific coast, but let us assume now that such coal as is mined in Alaska is selling in Seattle at $5 a ton. Let us further assume that the lessee of one of these mines in Alaska can get that coal down to Seattle and sell it at a reasonable profit at $4 per ton, and that his competitor there can not sell for less than $5. What would happen? He would put the coal to about $4.95 a ton. He could properly do so; I am not criticizing him for it. Anyone who was in the business would do it if he could. He would sell it for just as much as he could get. He could beat out his competitor if he sold it at $4.95.

Now, if he got it down there for $4 a ton he would have a profit of 95 cents a ton. Suppose he had to pay a royalty to the Government of 50 cents a ton. Would it make any difference in the price at which he would sell it down there? He would sell it, perhaps, at the same price, if there were conditions where he would come in competition with other men dealing in the same kind of coal. He would put the price as high as he could put it and still be able to sell the coal. If the Government charged no royalty it would simply add to his profit in that case. If the Government charged a royalty, the price to the consumer *would be* absolutely the same, and the Government would get some of the profit; or, in other words, Alaska would get it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Does not the Senator take into consideration that there are a great many leases there and competition will enter in if leases are to be made as we anticipate? If they are not to be made, then, of course, nothing would come from it.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course that is a disputed question. I am in hopes there will be leases made, and I believe there will be. It is my own idea that, with a properly guarded lease, such as the department can enter into under this law, a very high royalty would not be charged.

Mr. SMOOT. They would have to charge what is bid.

Mr. NORRIS. They will not need to lease it in that way.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the bill provides for competitive bidding.

Mr. NORRIS. It can be competitive bidding, but it does not necessarily have to be a bid on the royalty to be paid. The lease can very easily provide under the bill regulations by which the royalty would be lowered or raised under conditions that might arise. I do not anticipate that there will be a high royalty. If the Senator's theory is right, that the Secretary of the Interior should only advertise for bids on a royalty basis—that is, that he should give it to any man who would bid the highest royalty—the very fact that they were bidding a high, unreasonable price might, if they were bidding in that way, result in an increase to the consumer, which, of course, should be avoided.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator the bill requires that the Secretary must advertise these different tracts after they are surveyed as being open for bids.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly; but it does not say that he is to lease it to the various men in accordance with the royalty that they will agree to pay in their bid. There are a great many conditions.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that if one man bids 10 cents and another man bids 15 cents and another man 20 cents, the man who bid 20 cents would get the lease.

Mr. NORRIS. Everything else being equal, he would, I suppose. Now, let me put this to the Senator: Suppose we had the Senate provision, which provided that the royalty should not be less than 2 cents nor more than 5 cents, and then the Secretary should advertise for bids, how would they bid? They would all bid 5 cents.

Mr. SMOOT. If they did, the Secretary of the Interior would have the power under the bill to enter into a lease with the party who, in his opinion, would mine the coal the best or give the best public service, or whatever his judgment might influence him to do for the public good.

Mr. NORRIS. But that is the power which has been criticized all through this debate. The critics say it has been criticized too much. I have not said so.

Mr. SMOOT. He has that power.

Mr. NORRIS. He has a good deal of power, and of course he must have it in order to carry out the provision of the bill and get good results.

But, Mr. President, when the Secretary accepts bids there will be different kinds of coal in different localities. It is fair to say that the bids will correspond somewhat with the quality of the coal. He can put conditions in the offer for bids in regard to the price at which it shall be sold or the method in which it shall be mined or handled, and have competition on that. There are various ways in which there might be competition. I do not anticipate that there is going to be anything like a royalty of a dollar a ton paid for this coal. My own judgment is that it would be bad if that should occur, because I am satisfied that if it went up as high as that it would be beyond the limit of competition in the localities where the coal would be sold, and the effect would be injurious.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia obtained the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for a moment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

DRESS AND WAIST INDUSTRY.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that "Wages, regularity of employment, and standardization of piece rates in the dress and waist industry of New York City," by N. I. Stone, chief statistician of the wage-scale board of the dress and waist industry, be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. POINDEXTER. What is the report?

Mr. SMOOT. It is a report made by Mr. N. I. Stone, chief statistician of the wage-scale board of the dress and waist industry of New York City. I will say to the Senator, it is a rather remarkable report. For years there has been a dispute between the wage earners and the employers of labor in the dress and waist industry of New York. I have no doubt the Senator will remember the trouble that has existed in the State of New York and, in fact, other States in this industry. This board was appointed by the State for the purpose of seeing if there could not be some plan evolved whereby the regulation of the wages of employees could be arrived at on a scale basis. That has been arrived at, and I think it is the first time in the history of the industry where employer and employee have arrived at a plan that was satisfactory to all concerned, and this was the result.

Mr. CHILTON. What will be the cost?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Is that a Government board, a State board, or a board appointed by the employers and employees?

Mr. SMOOT. It is a State board. I want to say to the Senator that it is perfectly satisfactory to all concerned, and the labor people here desire that this report be printed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It would be very expensive, would it not?

Mr. SMOOT. It would not be very expensive.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Has the Senator estimated what the cost will be?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not printed matter, and there are a number of tables in it; but my opinion offhand would be that it would cost to print the usual or up number of copies, about 1,672 copies, something between two hundred and three hundred dollars—not to exceed that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course that is rather indefinite.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator objects, I certainly shall not make the request. I simply want to say that it is a remarkable report, and the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Labor is greatly interested in it, and asks that it be printed. I am perfectly willing, if the Senator objects, to withdraw my request; but the laboring people of the State of New York have requested it. Not only that, but the employers of the men and women in the dress and waist industry have asked it; and I think, after examining it, that it is a very remarkable piece of work.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

THE COTTON SITUATION IN THE SOUTH.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed to the tax bill, which is the unfinished business. I do so because I desire the amendment to be printed in the RECORD and also to be printed for the use of the Senate.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. SMITH of Georgia to the bill (H. R. 18891) to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes, viz: Insert the following:

"SEC. 26. That during the year of 1915 a special excise tax is hereby levied, and shall be paid and collected not later than December of said year, upon every person, firm, or corporation engaging in the business of planting, growing, or producing cotton, said tax to be measured as follows:

"Every such person, firm, or corporation shall pay a tax of 2 cents a pound upon all lint cotton produced or grown by such person, firm, or

corporation in excess of 50 per cent of the total amount of lint cotton produced by such person, firm, or corporation in the year 1914: *Provided*, That where any such person, firm, or corporation was not engaged in the business of planting, growing, or producing cotton in the year 1914, such person, firm, or corporation shall pay a tax of 2 cents a pound on all lint cotton produced by such person, firm, or corporation in excess of 50 per cent of the total amount of lint cotton produced in the year 1914 on the farm or plantation operated by such person, firm, or corporation in the year 1915.

"The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations for the collection of the tax herein provided for.

"SEC. 27. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to have immediately prepared bonds of the United States to the amount in face value of $250,000,000. The said bonds shall be in denominations ranging from $10 to $500, and shall be made due on or before three years from date, and bear interest at 4 per cent per annum, and shall be payable in gold.

"SEC. 28. That the said bonds shall be used at their face value for the purchase of 5,000,000 bales of lint cotton, payments to be made in said bonds to the sellers of such cotton, and the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby constituted a board with authority to conduct such purchases and to carry out the provisions of this act in connection with the purchase, handling, and sale of said cotton.

"The said purchases shall be made exclusively from the producers of such cotton.

"Said purchases shall be made at the price of 10 cents per pound for middling lint cotton. Other grades of cotton may be bought at prices higher or lower than 10 cents, based on the difference of their values, as the same are more or less valuable than middling cotton. The purchases shall be made in the States where the cotton is grown, and shall be prorated between the States, as far as practicable, according to the quantity of cotton grown in each State. The cotton so purchased shall be handled under the direction of the board hereinbefore provided for, and none of the same shall be disposed of earlier than January 1, 1916, unless, in the opinion of the said board, parts of said cotton are required to furnish cotton for manufacture, in which event parts of said cotton may be sold at a price of 11 cents a pound or more. During the year beginning January 1, 1916, said cotton may be sold in blocks of 100 bales or more at the market price, but not for less than the amount that it has cost, including interest on the bonds, storage, etc. On and after January 1, 1917, so much of said cotton as has not already been disposed of shall, within six months thereafter, be sold by said board. The money received from the sale of said cotton shall be kept separately in the Treasury and shall be used to pay off the bonds provided for in section 27 of this act, and whenever $5,000,000 has been accumulated from the sale of said cotton, blocks of said issue of bonds shall be called in and redeemed, and said board is given full power and authority to make such rules and regulations as are necessary for the purpose of executing the provisions of this and the preceding sections.

"SEC. 29. That for the year 1916 a special tax is hereby levied, and shall be paid and collected during the months of August, September, October, November, and December, upon every person, firm, or corporation engaging in the business of planting, growing, or producing cotton, said tax to be measured as follows:

"Every such person, firm, or corporation shall pay on all lint cotton produced or grown by such person, firm, or corporation during said year an amount equal to one-half cent per pound on such cotton, and the same shall be payable before said cotton leaves the gin house.

"The taxes provided for in this section and in section 26 of this act shall be kept as a separate fund in the Treasury, and shall be used for the purpose of paying the interest on said bonds provided for in section 27 of this act and the expenses of handling said cotton provided for in section 28 of this act, and any surplus shall be used for the purpose of paying off the principal of said bonds.

"SEC. 30. That after the cotton, the purchase and sale of which is provided for in sections 27 and 28 of this act, has been disposed of, it shall be the duty of the said board to prepare a statement covering the entire expenditure by the Government in connection with said transactions, including the redemption of said bonds, and if any part of said expenses has not been met under the provisions of sections 28 and 29 it shall be the duty of said board to officially report the amount remaining unpaid, and said report shall be filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. For the year 1917, and annually thereafter, a special tax is hereby levied and shall be paid and collected during the months of August, September, October, November, and December upon every person, firm, or corporation engaging in the business of planting, growing, or producing cotton, said tax to be measured as follows:

"Every such person, firm, or corporation shall pay on all cotton produced or grown by such person, firm, or corporation during each of said years an amount equal to 1 cent per pound on such cotton, and the same shall be payable before said cotton leaves the gin house: *Provided, however*, That if the report of said board, filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, shows that no amount remains unpaid, the excise tax provided for in this section shall not be collected: *And provided further*, That no tax shall be collected under this section except for the balance of the amount remaining unpaid as provided for in this section.

"SEC. 31. That the sum of $1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated and made immediately available under the direction of the said board, for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of sections 27 and 28 of this act."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that to-morrow morning I will address the Senate upon the subject embraced in the amendment. I desire to call attention to the fact that while this amendment provides for the issuance of $250,000,000 of short-time low-rate bonds for the purpose of exchange for cotton, with the view of absorbing 5,000,000 bales of cotton, it also provides that that cotton shall be sold in 1916 and 1917; and it levies a tax on the cotton produced in 1917 for any amount that the sale of the cotton does not reimburse the Government, if it fails in any way to reimburse the Government.

In this connection I also wish at this time to call attention to these facts: That the Government has loaned its credit to build railroads in the West to the amount of $120,000,000. That it has furnished money for the reclamation of lands in large quantity in the West. That at this session we voted $35,000,000 to build railroads in Alaska. That the Government has used its resources to ward off disaster by the deposit of hundreds of millions of dollars at one time in the banks. That we have furnished money and loaned the credit of the Government to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars to advance the citizens of the Philippine Islands toward civilization, with the avowed purpose of doing it simply as a philanthropy, and of giving up the islands as soon as the philanthropy shall have been completed. To-morrow I hope to have an opportunity to discuss this subject and to present my views upon it.

I desire the RECORD to show, in this connection, that the amendment which I have presented is presented not simply for myself, but for quite a number of Senators who took part in its preparation.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 5614. It is really an emergency measure. It provides for a change regarding the appointment of United States consuls and secretaries to embassies. It has the unanimous approval of the Foreign Relations Committee. When I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill a day or two ago the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] objected, but he now understands the bill and withdraws his opposition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would inquire of the Senator from Montana if he is ready to have the conference report laid aside?

Mr. MYERS. Is the Senator from New York aware that the conference report of the Alaska coal-leasing bill has not yet been disposed of?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I realize that I must have the Senator's consent before I can proceed with the bill which I desire to have passed upon.

Mr. MYERS. How long will it take?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I do not think there will be any discussion on the bill.

Mr. MYERS. Will there be no remarks for or against it?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I understand not. The department is desirous of having it acted upon. The only change it makes in existing law is that at present when a secretary to an embassy is appointed he is appointed to a specific embassy, and he can not be transferred by the State Department from that embassy to another except by the consent of the Senate. So when a consul is appointed he is appointed to a particular post and can not be transferred by the department to another post of the same grade without the consent of the Senate. This bill is designed to permit the State Department to make such transfers according to the exigencies of the service.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I shall object to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Regular order, Mr. President.

ALASKA COAL LANDS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] on bringing in this report and on accomplishing what he was really afraid the other day he would not be able to accomplish. I am satisfied that the bill which he has reported is a better bill than the one presented by the conference report a few days ago. I voted for that conference report because of my desire to see something done for Alaska, and I will vote for this conference report with much more pleasure than I did for that one.

Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] has depicted the conditions in Alaska very vividly and very correctly, and the conditions which he has mentioned constitute really the reasons that I have for supporting this legislation. I am going to vote for this conference report and, as has already been stated by others, I shall not consider it a precedent when the general leasing legislation comes up for consideration. I may be in favor of those bills, and I may not be; but I consider that they should be determined on the merits of the respective propositions.

As stated by the Senator from Colorado, lands are absolutely tied up in Alaska; nothing can be done there; nothing has been done for several years; and there is no prospect of anything being done. I think I can recognize a stone wall when I see it; and, to my mind, there is absolutely no hope for any Executive ever releasing those lands from the condition they are in now. I know that the Executive can do so; he can do so to-

morrow; but, in the face of the public sentiment that exists in the country, no Executive would do so; and I should blame no Executive for not doing so. The only hope is in some legislation by Congress to get these lands opened up; and this is absolutely the only legislation that Congress can pass; you can not bring anything else up even for consideration; and this is in response to the public sentiment that prevails in the country.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, as I understand the attitude of the Senator, he advocates this bill as a choice of evils?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator thinks it is a lesser evil than to submit to longer delay in opening up the coal lands of Alaska?

Mr. JONES. Yes; under the conditions which now prevail. I shall vote for this bill in the hope that it will better conditions in Alaska; I shall vote for it in the hope that it will result in the opening up and in developing the coal industry in that country.

Mr. President, there is one provision in the bill, if it did nothing else, which I think would decide me to vote for it, and that provision improves existing conditions. I think that was referred to by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. The provision I have in mind is the one which will make it possible for the individual in that country to get coal, at least for domestic purposes, where the individual is at all near the coal fields and coal lands. In other words, there is a provision under which a man can get a 10-acre tract without going into competition, without making competitive bids, and having complicated leases and operations of that sort, but not for the purpose of supplying the home or domestic market. That is a great benefit in itself, if nothing else comes from this legislation.

As I stated the other day, I doubt if very much will be done under this legislation. I join with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], however, in believing that if we are to have a leasing system, if we must have it—and that seems to be the only thing to relieve the conditions in Alaska—the system provided for in this bill is just about as good a one as could be provided. I do not know of any improvements that I would really suggest in the matter.

I agree with the Senator from Nebraska with reference to the royalty feature of the conference report as now presented. As I said the other day, I think that the price at which the coal will be sold will be determined not by the royalty that is imposed, but by what can be gotten in the market. If there is no competition in Alaska, then the man who has the coal to sell will get everything that he can out of it, royalty or no royalty; and if there is no royalty, of course there will be more to go into his pocket than if the royalty is imposed.

I can see where advantage might come to the large interests by competitive bidding with this unlimited royalty, and that is that the strong interests that desire to get control of some particular locality or some particular coal tract will, of course, bid high and finally get it; but I think that probable situation is overbalanced by the other interest.

This is the situation there: The coal is all tied up; there is no hope of getting it released; nobody can get even a bucketful of coal for his own use. That is an intolerable condition; it is an intolerable situation. This is the only way to open up those lands; it is the only way to relieve the situation; and I am glad to see that we are doing something, that we are adopting some system under which a change will possibly come about. If it does not come about under this act, we can change it. It is not an unchangeable act on our part; it is not like a constitution, which it is difficult to change by a constitutional amendment; but if it does not work well, if it does not accomplish what we hope to accomplish by it, we can change it or repeal it and adopt some other system, and that is what we will do.

I am not very fearful about its even being cited with any great force as a precedent for a general leasing system in this country, because the conditions in Alaska are exceptional; they can not be duplicated anywhere in the United States; and a system that would be applicable there or that might work out there would be wholly inapplicable in this country. So that I am very glad, indeed, that the conferees have brought in this report, and I hope it will be adopted.

The provision with reference to the claimants up there I shall say nothing about. I had indulged the hope that the conferees, in considering the matter further, would be able to comply more nearly with the provisions of the bill as it passed the Senate; but I know the difficulties under which they labored, and I know they have done the very best they could. I think they have improved the situation in that respect also. So I shall cheerfully vote for the conference report.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, before the vote is taken—and I trust it will be taken speedily—I desire to take the time of the Senate to make a brief statement.

In the course of some remarks made upon this bill when it was first before the Senate for consideration I made the statement that the Rocky Mountain Fuel Co. is owned and controlled by the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. and has the same board of directors. An error occurred in that statement. I should have said that the Rocky Mountain Coal & Iron Co. was controlled by the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, just an observation. I will detain the Senate but a moment or two. Practically all the objections that have come to this report have come from those who opposed the bill itself. I regard it as res adjudicata that the Senate wants this bill; it has said so, and decided that question. The only objection that has been made to the report is that the maximum royalty has been abolished; and, in a few words, I want to read to the Senate what the Secretary of the Interior said about that, because it states the reasons very concisely. I quote from a letter of the Secretary of the Interior:

> Another objection to the measure as reported by the Senate committee and passed by the Senate is the fact that it fixes the minimum royalty which may be collected under a coal-land lease in Alaska at 2 cents and the maximum royalty at 5 cents per ton. The bill as passed by the House fixes the minimum at 2 cents per ton, but fixes no maximum. In my judgment it is unwise to fix a maximum royalty which may be exacted, and especially so to fix it at 5 cents per ton. The minimum was purposely fixed low, because of the existence of many fields of lignite or other low-grade coals in Alaska, but if report and expectation be realized there will be found in the Bering River and Matanuska fields and perhaps elsewhere in Alaska high-grade anthracite, semianthracite, and coking coals, easily mined, accessible to water transportation, and for which a maximum royalty of 5 cents per ton would be ridiculously inadequate. Every lessee will know in advance of the taking of a lease the maximum royalty which he will be required to pay, and it is clearly unwise to hamper and restrict the United States in leasing its Alaskan coal deposits by imposing a limitation on the maximum royalty. High-grade coals under lease in the United States proper produce much higher royalties than 5 cents per ton, and no good reason occurs to me why the operators in Alaska, who are fortunate enough to secure leases upon high-grade coal deposits in that Territory, should be especially favored in obtaining the benefits of 5-cent royalties for choice coal.
>
> I earnestly hope that Congress may decide to eliminate the maximum royalty provision and content itself with fixing a minimum royalty of 2 cents, leaving the maximum to be determined by the circumstances and conditions, character and location of the coal to be leased, and the willingness of the would-be lessee to pay what he regards as a reasonable royalty for the coal leased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 362) to correct an error in the enrollment of certain Indians enumerated in Senate Document No. 478, Sixty-third Congress, second session, enacted into law in the Indian appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented a petition of sundry citizens of Riverton, Wyo., praying for relief from mining assessments for the year 1914, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. WEEKS presented a memorial of sundry pharmacists of Greenfield, Mass., remonstrating against the proposed tax on drugs and proprietary medicines, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented petitions of sundry citizens of Woodlawn and Emory Grove, in the State of Maryland, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. O'GORMAN, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 196) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permission to the Southern Commercial Congress to place a tablet at Gamboa, Canal Zone, as a memorial to the late Senator John T. Morgan, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Library, which was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5890) for the relief of settlers within the limits of the grant to the New Orleans, Baton Rouge & Vicksburg Railroad Co., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 819) thereon.

Mr. BRYAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4738) for the relief of Frances L. Snell,

reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 820) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 6638) to pay the claim of the American Towing & Lightering Co. for damages to its tug *Buccaneer* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE (for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN):

A bill (S. 6639) for the relief of Jonathan J. Totten (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, Executive clerk, announced that the President had, on October 13, 1914, approved and signed the following joint resolution:

S. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to authorize the President to grant leave of absence to two commissioned officers of the line of the Navy for the purpose of accepting an appointment under the Government of Brazil as instructors in naval strategy and tactics in the Naval War College of Brazil.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 362. Joint resolution to correct an error in the enrollment of certain Indians enumerated in Senate Document No. 478, Sixty-third Congress, second session, enacted into law in the Indian appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow forenoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m., Wednesday, October 14, 1914) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, October 15, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *October 14, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Hasten the day, O God, our heavenly Father, when Thy children shall live together in peace and harmony. In the world's broad fields of endeavor there is room enough and plenty for all, but for the selfishness, greed, ambitions, and unholy desires of men. Quicken the good that is in us, that as individuals and as a nation we may live what we profess to believe, practice what we preach, doing unto others as we would have them do unto us, that we may be an example to all the world in righteousness and in good government. That Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done, in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Journal be approved.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I wish to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech made by Representative MORRISON, of Indiana, before the convention that nominated him for Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by his colleague [Mr. MORRISON] to the convention which nominated him. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on yesterday evening the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks by incorporating a speech delivered by Representative WINSLOW, and, also, Representative PLATT, of New York, asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of the Grand Army, to which objection was made. If these two requests be coupled with the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss], I will have no objection to it.

Mr. MANN. Do not couple them together.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume there will not be any objection to their requests.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing a speech delivered by Representative WINSLOW at the Republican State convention in Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a speech made by his colleague [Mr. WINSLOW] at the Republican State convention in Massachusetts. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Representative PLATT, I ask unanimous consent that he be given the privilege of printing his remarks in the RECORD on the subject indicated last night, namely, the Grand Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of pensions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wyoming rise?

Mr. MONDELL. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on sundry political subjects.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on sundry political subjects. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, does not the gentleman think two to one is sufficient for one day?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yesterday it was three to one—three on that side and two on this.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But not political speeches.

Mr. STAFFORD. They were political speeches, too.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD extracts from a speech made by Mr. Roosevelt at the great Progressive convention at Bay City, Mich., recently.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by Col. Roosevelt at Bay City, Mich. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The SPEAKER. Under the special rule the House will resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18459, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18459, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

With the pending amendment.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that there is a little error here that I think the chairman of the committee will agree to correct, and I move to strike out the last word in order to make the suggestion. On page 22, lines 21 and 22, it is provided:

That no franchise or right shall be granted to any corporation except under the conditions that it shall be subject to amendment—

And so forth. Now, I propose to strike out those words, "to any corporation," or else add "to any person or corporation." Any franchise granted to John Jones or Bill Smith would not, if he assigned it to a corporation, come under this provision. It says that any franchise granted to any corporation shall be subject to amendment, alteration, or repeal.

Mr. JONES. What line?

Mr. BRYAN. Line 22, page 22, "No franchise or right shall be granted to any corporation except under the conditions," and so forth. Now, I suggest that we strike out those words "to any corporation" and make the provision apply to any franchise that is granted. It amounts to a "joker" as it is—unintentional, of course—but it is a "joker" whose bones ought to be cracked.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I suggest that the language usually used, and that which would probably be necessary, would probably be "individual, firm, or corporation."

Mr. BRYAN. That would be all right. But the word "person" would, I understand, cover corporations under our statute, but "corporation" is restrictive. If you strike out the words "to any corporation," there will be no question left, and I suggest that the chairman either revise the language that I have suggested or else strike out those words.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, of course we can only return to this section by unanimous consent. I think it might be well enough to make this change, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to return to this section, so that I may offer to amend, in line 22, after the word "any," by adding the words "individual, firm, or."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Virginia the number of the section.

Mr. JONES. Section 26.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] asks unanimous consent to return to section 26 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 22, line 22, after the word "any," by inserting the words "individual, firm, or."

Mr. STAFFORD. No; the word "person."

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

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman what is a right granted to a person where you reserve the right also to take away the lands or use and occupation of the lands? Is it designed not to permit the Philippine Legislature, under a general or special law, to grant any rights to persons over lands in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. JONES. I believe, Mr. Chairman, the words "franchises and rights" are somewhat synonymous as here used. They are the words employed in the organic law. I think the word "right" is simply used to broaden the meaning and purpose of this provision.

Mr. MANN. Of course, if it has been settled by any construction that the word "right" really means "franchise," very well. I understood, when we passed the original legislation, that it was designed to curb the authority of the Philippine Commission to grant land to corporations, but it was not designed to prevent them from granting the right of land to individuals. Now, if you insert in every patent of land that is granted a provision that land may be taken away from the individual, it looks to me as though you were destroying the value of the grant.

Mr. JONES. I think the gentleman is confusing this section, which applies entirely to franchises, with those sections which relate to the disposition of land. As has been suggested to me by a gentleman sitting near me, Mr. GARRETT, the word "right" might be used in connection with the exercise of the right of eminent domain, whereas the word "franchise" would not be applicable in that connection. This language has been in the present law for 12 years. I do not know how often it has been construed, but I do know it has been the law for 12 years, and the committee thought, inasmuch as there has been no complaint in respect to it, that it would be best to reenact it in its present form.

Mr. MANN. This proposition is to change it from its present form. It now restricts the right to make a grant to a corporation, and then it goes on and says "rights of use and occupation of lands thus granted shall revert to the governments by which they were respectively granted," and so forth. It plainly covers, or plainly could be held to cover, the granting of lands for other purposes. If, however, the gentleman is satisfied with it, I shall not object.

Mr. JONES. There has never been any criticism of this section, so far as I know, and we were content to keep the language of the present law. I ask for a vote on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I think when we rose last evening there was an amendment pending which I had offered to section 27. I had moved to strike out the figures "$18,000," in line 20, and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$25,000." I was assured that that would be opposed, but that the chairman of the committee was willing to accept an amendment to this effect: "not less than $18,000, the amount to be fixed by the Philippine Legislature." I am perfectly willing to accept that.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman says is true, but since I indicated that I would not object to his amendment I have conferred with other members of the committee, and we think that no minimum should be fixed unless there is also a maximum limit. If the gentleman cares to offer an amendment substituting $20,000 for $18,000, I shall not oppose its adoption.

Mr. MILLER. Is it not the disposition of the committee to accede to the wishes of the Filipinos, expressed as they have been many times, especially through their Resident Commissioner and the speaker of their assembly?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I think that the sentiment which was voiced by Commissioner QUEZON is due to the fact of Gov. Gen. Harrison's exceptional popularity. The Filipinos would like, I am aware, to increase his salary. But I do not think that that fact, however, ought to be taken into consideration in fixing the salary for this position. I really think that in view of the impoverished condition of the islands and the fact that the government is retrenching expenses in every direction, we ought not to increase the salary above what it originally was.

Mr. MILLER. I believe it was $20,500.

Mr. JONES. It was $20,500. I suggest that the gentleman modify his amendment by making it "$20,000," and there will not be any objection on this side.

Mr. MILLER. I readily appreciate the fact that the force of numbers is on that side, and they can vote it down. But I would like to have a vote to decide the question whether or not the committee is willing to accede to the wishes of the Filipinos, expressed as clearly as they can be expressed. I do not concede the position that the gentleman takes now, that the only reason why the Filipinos have ever suggested an increase in the salary of the Governor General is that they like Gov. Gen. Harrison. If that is the situation, they are the most shortsighted and the most nearsighted people imaginable, possessing not at all the qualifications for self-government claimed time out of mind for them by the gentleman from Virginia. Surely they see farther than the noses on their faces. Surely when they speak of the salary of the Governor General it means the salary of all Governors General, and not merely this one.

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

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Since when have you become so deferential to the wishes of the people over there?

Mr. MILLER. I have always been.

Mr. GORDON. Then, why do you not vote for their independence?

Mr. MILLER. Will you vote for their independence now?

Mr. GORDON. I will, and you will vote against it.

Mr. MILLER. This bill is as far from giving independence to the Philippine people as the gentleman is far from knowing what the wishes of the people are.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I hope we will not take up any more of the time of the committee in the discussion of questions that have already been thrashed over. I do not understand that the Philippine people have expressed a desire to have this proposed increase of salary. The representative from the Philippine Islands did say that he believed his people would like to see it increased, but I know of no action that has been taken by the people in the Philippine Islands relating to the subject.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from the Philippine Islands, as I recall, interrupted me for the purpose of explicitly stating that it was the desire of the Filipino people that the Governor General should receive a salary of $25,000. He substantiated that and emphasized it by stating that he had received a letter or a cablegram from Señor Osména, speaker of the Philippine Assembly, in which he said that the salary of the Governor General should be $25,000. I will say, in addition, that men I have talked with on the subject of salaries in the islands, no matter how they may have differed in other matters, all agreed that the salary of the Governor General should be $25,000.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman knows that the assembly over which Señor Osména presides voted last winter to reduce this salary.

Mr. MILLER. I understand full well that they did that at the personal request of Gov. Gen. Harrison, and he is not to be blamed for the attitude he then took. They desired to reduce many salaries in the islands, some which I think should properly have been reduced, and he saw at once that it would not be consistent for him to urge or recommend the reduction of other salaries unless his own were cut. So he voluntarily requested that his own salary be cut nearly $3,000, and the gentleman

knows that the salary does not cut much figure with a man like Gov. Gen. Harrison.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman can offer his amendment for $25,000, but I hope he will modify it so as to make it $20,000. I will not object to making the amount $20,000.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

Strike out the figures "$18,000," in line 20, page 24, and after the word "General" insert the following: "not less than $18,000, the amount to be fixed by the Philippine Legislature."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRYAN. My amendment pending which was to be taken up to-day as a new section comes in before section 27. Will the consideration of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota interfere with the new section 26a?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that following this section the amendment referred to by the gentleman from Washington will be taken up.

Mr. BRYAN. But the gentleman from Minnesota is offering an amendment to section 27, and my new section is 26a.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. Did I understand the Chair to say that we would go back to some other section of the bill after the consideration of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. We so agreed yesterday afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that was agreed to before the adjournment last night.

Mr. MOORE. That does not cut off offering further amendments to section 27.

The CHAIRMAN. We are considering section 27 now, which the Chair understands is subject to amendment.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to say that I have some amendments to section 27.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will glance at the RECORD of yesterday afternoon, he will see that the agreement was that we should pass over the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington and read section 27, and after the completion of that we should return to the consideration of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MOORE. That agreement was not made to the exclusion of other amendments to section 27.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly not.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. His amendment provides that there shall be a minimum amount fixed in this statute for the salary to be appropriated for the Governor General by the Philippine Legislature. Now, the only reason, as I understand, that we throw any restrictions about the Philippine Legislature is that the restrictions may operate in favor of the Filipino people. If we make any restriction as to the amount of the salary, it ought to be a maximum amount above which they could not take from the treasury to pay an American sent over there to act as Governor General. If we fix a minimum amount, that leaves it open for them to give $100 000 a year. There ought to be a maximum with it, of course. I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota, that after the words "Governor General," line 20, page 24, insert the words "not more than $15,000, the amount to be fixed by the Philippine Legislature."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I find that on yesterday afternoon I offered an amendment to increase the salary from $18,000 to $25,000, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment he speaks of. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota by substituting $15,000 for $18,000.

Mr. BORLAND. No; change the wording. The amendment is to insert $15,000 and change the wording, the amount to be fixed by the Philippine Legislature.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting "not more than $15,000, the amount to be fixed by the Philippine Legislature."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] is unquestionably right. If there is any utility in fixing the salary in the organic law, it is to fix a maximum above which the legislative body or those having control of the treasury can not go. The idea of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] in fixing a minimum below which they can not go is clearly in the interest of the officeholder, who in this case happens to be not a citizen of the islands.

Mr. MILLER. The minimum in the amendment is not my own opinion. I inserted that at the request of gentlemen on the other side as representing their views last evening, before we adjourned. I myself would prefer to leave it entirely to the Philippine Legislature, without fixing the maximum or the minimum.

Mr. BORLAND. I am discussing the unwisdom, from my point of view, of putting in a minimum amount.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted a moment, I would like to add a word to what the gentleman from Minnesota has said. That suggestion was made from this side on yesterday evening, but I distinctly said to the gentleman a few moments ago that after further considering the matter we were not willing to accept it.

Mr. MILLER. And I distinctly made that statement, that I am representing the views of that side, last evening.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman can not now say, however, that his amendment represents the views of the majority of the committee, because it does not.

Mr. MILLER. I do not. I do not know how much the gentleman has changed since last evening.

Mr. JONES. I distinctly informed the gentleman that we had changed our minds in regard to his amendment.

Mr. MILLER. I so understand it, and have so stated at least three times.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know who has the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has the floor.

Mr. TOWNER. Then, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that in my judgment his amendment will result in making it impossible for the President to ever send anybody there except a millionaire as Governor General. What we ought to do is to be very careful that we may give a sufficient sum so that men may be chosen upon their merits and not because of the size of their pocketbooks.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit one more interruption there?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. In connection with what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has said, it is interesting to recall that when Gov. Gen. Taft returned from the Philippine Islands he said to a committee of the House that the salary he was receiving made it utterly impossible for him to do justice to the position over there and save one dollar. I think the salary then was——

Mr. GORDON. Twenty thousand five hundred dollars in gold.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. He said that his statement sounded as though he had been indulging in extravagance, but he insisted that it was absolutely necessary under the conditions which obtain in the Philippine Islands to have that salary. In my judgment $18,000 is as low as we should now go.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to force my individual views upon any of the gentlemen further than to present this matter to the calm judgment of the House. There may be special reasons why in the Philippine Islands a man has to spend a large amount of money to maintain the dignity of the office of Governor General. I have heard that claim urged in regard to a great many different positions—that of foreign ambassadors, that of the governors of the different States, and other positions of that kind—that the incidental expenses required a man to draw upon his private purse, and that the salary was inadequate. We are utterly unable to determine that. It is a question of taste and of temperament, as much as anything else, so far as I can discover. We do send great men to the foreign courts of Europe on salaries infinitely less than we are fixing for this Governor General. We do have 48 great States governing themselves, some of them containing a population equal to that of the Philippine Islands, and the governor in not one of them has any such salary, to my knowl-

edge, and in many of them the governor draws less than a third of the salary mentioned here.

I do not assume that it is possible in all cases where a man who takes an office of dignity and prominence to have enough salary furnished him to keep up the dignity of that office. I assume that there is, in a case like that of the Philippine Islands, some sort of civil list out of which the necessary expenses for the dignity of the position may be obtained outside of the personal purse of the man who occupies the office. If it is not so, it ought to be so. I see the gentleman from Minnesota shakes his head, but it ought to be so in every case where a man occupies a regal or vice-regal position. Where he is the official head of the Government, there is a civil list which aids him in carrying out those necessary duties; but I think if we make this salary $25,000 it will make it one of the greatest political plums in the United States, if not in the known civilized world. I never heard of such a position being thrown into the political arena to be scrambled for as a $25,000 Government job.

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

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

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. In a moment I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio. No man in this House has a higher respect for the magnificent ability of the present Governor General of the Philippine Islands than I. I served with him in this House, and I came to recognize his great intellectual ability, his great moral courage, his splendid tact, all of his likable and attractive qualities, and his inflexible integrity in the discharge of public duties. He is a man, in my judgment, who is vastly beyond the qualifications necessary for the position. I think he has ample—and to spare—of qualifications for the position, and I cherish for him, in addition, a high personal regard and a sincere personal affection. Nothing that I say in regard to salary could be influenced pro or con by my personal feeling toward the gentleman who now occupies the position. If it were a question of personal friendship, I would be glad to vote for any amount for that man; but it is not a question of personal friendship.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. In just a moment. It is not a question of personal friendship; it is a question, among other things, of teaching these people self-control, self-restraint, self-sacrifice necessary to build up a form of government among themselves, and I do not see how we can start out with a list of $25,000 salaries for appointive men. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. The Governor of Porto Rico gets $8,000 a year. What is the difference between the duties in the Philippines and the duties there that will require such an additional salary?

Mr. BORLAND. Among other things the population of the Philippines is at least eight times that of the population of Porto Rico. It is a distant point from home, and the responsibility of the man who is on the ground is very much greater.

Mr. FESS. But would that require eight times the salary?

Mr. BORLAND. I think the salary of the Governor of Porto Rico of $8,000 is ample, and yet I know it would probably take all of that for a man to maintain the dignity of the position.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to say in reply to the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] that there is a vast difference between Porto Rico and the Philippines. Porto Rico is a parallelogram of about 40 by 90 miles, whereas the Philippines——

Mr. BORLAND. I am sorry I can not yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for that. I yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I fear that the remarks of the gentleman touching the personality of the Governor General of the Philippines will leave an impression that the present Governor General of the Philippines was in some way interested in this increase of salary.

Mr. BORLAND. I should be sorry to leave that impression. From my knowledge of things I am confident that no suggestion emanated from him in regard to such increase——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. As a matter of fact——

Mr. BORLAND. I would assume that to be true, and I am confident that it is true.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. We ought to be specially careful in criticizing, and as a matter of fact the Governor General of the Philippine Islands suggested the necessity that the salary, which had been heretofore $20,500 a year, should be reduced, and it was reduced to $18,000 per annum; that is, the 10 per cent in common with the others.

Mr. BORLAND. Well, that is exactly in line with my judgment of the present Governor General, and I would assume he would take that ground, without knowledge on the subject.

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if the recommendation of the Governor General is to be taken, as his mature judgment, as to the amount we are required to appropriate for the administration.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. As to that I can not say.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I presume from his recommendation it must have been.

Mr. JONES. It applied, I will say, to all of their officers, 10 per cent reduction.

Mr. BORLAND. I am sorry, without asking that my time be extended, that I can not yield again. I simply want to say this, that we have got to show those people, among other things, an example of public service that may not be adequately compensated for or free government will not exist among them. Free government does not succeed unless public service is performed beyond the monetary consideration involved. And I say we are setting a wrong example to start out with a $20,000 or $25,000 appointive position and setting a new legislature at work upon that basis of salary. They will assume that as a barometer by which other salaries are to be gauged and you may be sure they will say, "This is the American scale; this is what Americans feel ought to be paid," and they will assume that that is our judgment as to conditions there in the Philippine Islands. We ought to set in this law a maximum in the interests of the taxpayers of the Philippine Islands as is set in all organic laws, or ought to be, beyond which the tax-disbursing power can not spend the people's money. Then we ought to make that limit fairly low. [Applause.]

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. The statements of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] voice my sentiments in this matter. I do not mean by that that I shall vote for his amendment, because I shall stand by the provisions on this subject in the bill, but his ideas are sound, and if there has been any test, a real test of the sentiment of the Philippine Legislature under existing conditions, it was when, upon the recommendation of the Governor General himself, the Philippine Legislature reduced the salary of the Governor General from $20,500 to $18,000. What better test can you have than that? The cablegram of the speaker of the Philippine Legislature must yield in weight and importance to the action of the entire body. Now, from what has been said here on the floor, this committee must have learned by now, especially from the statements made by my good and much admired and appreciated friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], who very recently visited the islands, in almost every declaration that he has made on the floor he has constantly referred to wild men in the islands. His oft-repeated statements would lead a person to think that the only kind of people there are wild men. He has spoken every time he has arisen in his place on the floor of wild men, wild men, wild men. Wild men do not pay taxes——

Mr. MILLER. Oh, yes, they do; every one of them.

Mr. HELM. Wild men, I take it, do not own or accumulate property of any kind. They are neither captains nor malefactors of great wealth.

Mr. MILLER. Every one of them pays the cedula tax and is on the roll.

Mr. HELM. Doubtless the gentleman from Minnesota saw the wild man from Borneo. [Laughter.] The gentleman would convey the idea that it is necessary to lasso those men to get within speaking distance of them; but be that as it may, we do know, and the gentleman had informed us, that thousands and thousands of natives of the Philippine Islands wear nothing and own nothing but G strings. Do these men wear these things as a matter of style? Is it a matter of taste——

Mr. MILLER. Of taste and preference, most of them.

Mr. HELM. Or have they abundant means of buying such clothes as the gentleman from Minnesota adorns himself with——

Mr. MILLER. Oh, no.

Mr. HELM (continuing). And other people like to adorn themselves with, or are they reduced to the necessity of the simple, plain, and unadorning G string? Mindful of conditions in Ireland and India it becomes us to make the burden as light as possible. The gentleman from Minnesota and other

gentlemen want to impose the magnificent salary of $25,000, raised in part by taxing these poor classes, upon a man to look after the welfare of that type of people. I say that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has presented the proper gauge and standard. The duty of this Congress is to teach lessons of frugality. [Cries of "Oh!" on the Republican side.] Yes; it is a very natural thing for the Republicans to sneer at a proposition of frugality. [Laughter.] If there has been one characteristic sin of the Republican Party it has been waste, more waste, and extravagance. That is your long suit, and a Democrat who rises upon the floor of this House and voices any other expression may expect to reap nothing but sneers and jeers at the hands of the Republicans. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say only one word in reply to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], and it was rather a pointed suggestion, that inasmuch as we give only $8,000 to the Governor of Porto Rico there is no occasion for the $18,000 or $20,000 as salary of the Governor General of the Philippines. Now, I am in favor of economy as much as is the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. However, there is no similarity between conditions in Porto Rico and conditions in the Philippines. Porto Rico is about as wide as from here to Baltimore—about 40 miles—and a little more than twice as long. In other words, it is a parallelogram of about 40 by 90 miles. Its population is homogeneous. There are no wild tribes. It is one island, and the Governor can travel all over it in one day; but in the Philippines the Governor General, in order to do his duty, must travel for weeks over many islands. An air line from the northern end of Luzon south to the southern end of the lowest of the large islands would measure more than 600 miles, and to go from island to island and go by boat, as he must of necessity do, and then to travel over the islands and visit their inhabitants, would make a journey of thousands of miles and necessitate a great deal of expenditure that would not be necessary in Porto Rico. In other respects the situation in Porto Rico and that in the Philippines differ widely. The people in the Philippines are not homogeneous. They speak several different dialects. There are wild tribes which have to be visited. The great markets of oriental trade are close at hand. The whole situation is different from that in Porto Rico, and of necessity the Governor General of the Philippines is entitled to a larger salary than is the Governor of Porto Rico.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], because I do not think the Governor General's salary should be as high as $25,000.

Mr. MILLER. I do not offer it as $25,000. I leave that to the legislature.

Mr. JONES. Not less than $25,000.

Mr. MILLER. Not less than $18,000, leaving the exact amount to be determined by the legislature.

Mr. JONES. I am opposed to the amendment, because it would permit the legislature to fix the Governor General's salary at $25,000, or even a larger sum. I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], because I think that the sum of $15,000 is too small a salary for the Governor General of the Philippines.

I would like to give the House some information which I do not think it possesses. The salary of the Governor General was until recently $20,500. It became necessary last winter to cut down the expenses of the Philippine Government in order to avert an impending deficit, but Gov. Gen. Harrison would not consent to any reduction of salaries which did not include his own. The assembly, I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota, was opposed to the reduction of the salary of the Governor General. The Filipinos did not wish his salary reduced; but Gov. Gen. Harrison was not willing, as I have said, that other salaries should be reduced and his left where it was—a commendable position for him to take, I think. So the law which was passed provided that the salaries of all of the higher officials should be reduced to the extent of 10 per cent. The salary now is not just $18,000; but it is 10 per cent less than the $20,500 heretofore paid.

There are nine members of the Philippine Commission. One of them is the Governor General. Four of the others hold portfolios. They are the heads of the great departments, and each of those heads of departments had been drawing a salary of $15,000 up to last winter, when it was reduced by 10 per cent.

Mr. QUEZON. Fifteen thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. JONES. Fifteen thousand five hundred dollars. It was reduced to the extent of 10 per cent, as all other of the higher salaries, except those of the judiciary and one or two other classes, were. If the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri should be adopted, then the salary of the Governor General would be little more than the salary that the heads of the departments are receiving. This bill does not undertake to fix those salaries. They are to be continued as they are under this bill until changed by the legislature provided for in the bill.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. JONES. Just one minute, and then I will answer the gentleman's question, if I can.

There is a vast difference, as I happen to know, between the expense necessary to maintain the position of the Governor General and that to maintain the position of a head of a department. The Governor General has to do a great deal of entertaining. He lives in an immense old Spanish palace. He has to have a large retinue of servants, a number of carriages and automobiles, and he is obliged to live in a much more lavish manner than any other official. I am quite sure that the Governor General spends more than $25,000 a year. I know that Gov. Gen. Taft out of $20,500 did not save anything, and that he was as poor a man when he came from the Philippines as he was when he went there. I do not think, therefore, that the salary ought to be reduced to the amount that the gentleman from Missouri suggests, but I do believe it would not be amiss to fix it at $20,000. I therefore suggested to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] that if he would move to amend by making it "$20,000" there would be no objection to his amendment so far as I am concerned.

Now I will answer the question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. A few minutes ago the chairman was speaking about the salary of these other members of the commission, being executive heads of bureaus, but not having the duty of entertaining which falls upon the governor. Now, I notice in this bill that the chief justice of the supreme court gets $10,500. Would not that be a pretty fair and adequate salary for the head of the department of education, for example, or the head of the department of internal works? Is not $15,500 a pretty high salary for a member of the Philippine Commission? Could they not be well reduced in comparison with the salary of the governor?

Mr. JONES. This bill does not undertake to fix those salaries at all.

Mr. BORLAND. But it does fix the salary of the chief justice.

Mr. JONES. Yes; it does fix the salary of the chief justice, and I will tell the gentleman the reason.

Mr. BORLAND. I am not concerned in the reason, but I am speaking of the amount.

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. I am calling the gentleman's attention to the fact that you have fixed the salary of the chief justice, who, we all agree, is a very important officer in the islands. Now, is not the salary fixed for him adequate in every way for a commissioner of education? Is it necessary that a commissioner of education shall have $15,500?

Mr. JONES. I will answer that question. Mr. Chairman, the only officials in the Philippine Islands who are appointed by the President of the United States are the Governor General and the members of the supreme court. The committee thought it was proper to fix the salaries of the appointees of the President so that they could not for any reason be changed by the legislature. We thought that these officials should be entirely independent of the legislature. The salaries of all other officials, including those of the four heads of departments, are to remain as at present until changed by the legislature. Whether they are too large or too small, I can not say, but they have been fixed at $15,500. That is the heads of departments, mark you. The heads of departments are members of the Philippine Commission and therefore members of the upper branch of the legislature, and they receive a salary as members of the upper branch of the legislature and also receive a salary as heads of those departments. The two together aggregate $15,500.

Now, that is a pretty good salary, I admit, and I rather agree with the gentleman that it is too large. But it is the present salary, and the legislature can decrease it. This bill does not undertake to say what salary shall be paid to officials who are not appointed by the President of the United States.

As to the salaries of the members of the supreme court, I do not think they are too low. I will say to the gentleman that, while I have no information on the subject, it is believed by some Filipinos that they are too high and it has been suggested to the committee that they ought to be reduced.

I wish to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], who referred to the salary of the Governor of Porto Rico as being $8,000, that whilst that is true there is a bill pending in this House, which has the unanimous support of the Committee on Insular Affairs, which proposes to increase the salary of that official to $10,000. The committee unanimously agreed that the present salary was too small.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. MILLER. Is it not a fact that in this bill the old commission, as we understand it, has been discontinued, and therefore those salaries that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] speaks of as at $15,500 will disappear with them?

Mr. JONES. That is true. The legislature will then fix the salaries of the four heads of departments.

Mr. MILLER. There will be really new duties—what you might call new offices—and a corresponding readjustment of salaries?

Mr. JONES. That is true.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] will be voted down, and I more sincerely hope that the amendment to the amendment, offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], will be voted down. I repeat that if these amendments are voted down and any gentleman offers one to fix the salary at $20,000 instead of $18,000, I for one shall not object to it.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, both the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] have said so much regarding their ideas of the position of the Filipino people and of myself with reference to the salary of the Governor General that I believe it is time for me to say something about it myself.

Mr. Chairman, I do think that the salary of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands should be higher than it is now, and even higher than it was before that salary was reduced by the legislature, for reasons that I shall at once give to the committee. When the President of the United States was about to appoint the Governor General of the Philippine Islands I found that his concern was to find a man who was not only qualified, but also had enough private means to defray the expenses of his position. The President believed that the salary of the Governor General was such as to prevent the appointment of any but a rich man. You can readily see that with this belief in mind the President felt disposed to select his Governor General from among the wealthy men of this country. During a call I made at the White House the President told me that he was constrained to appoint a wealthy man as Governor of the Philippines, because his information was to the effect that no Governor General could live on the salary of the post. In view of these expressions we felt that we should pay the Governor General a salary high enough to permit the choice of the best man to be found for the appointment regardless of whether he be rich or poor. Thank God the President was able to find a man who, besides possessing wealth, had ability, character, and real desire to serve the Filipinos; otherwise I do not know what would have happened to us. We were more than fortunate when the President found Francis Burton Harrison, a man who had ability, character, and patriotism. [Applause.]

Of course I informed the speaker of the assembly of what had happened, and this explains why he thinks that the Governer General should have a high salary. Besides, he and I and the Filipino people know how expensive it is to fulfill the requirements of the position of the Governor General. But let not the idea enter your minds that we favor this salary for the Governor General because of our extravagant tendencies. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inform the committee—and this information is particularly pertinent in connection with the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]—that the people of the Philippine Islands have expressed through the assembly their disapproval of some of the very high salaries paid to many of the officials of the Philippine Government. I refer particularly to the secretaries of departments, who, as commissioners and secretaries, receive a total of $15,500 annually. The assembly has on several occasions tried to reduce the salaries of these officials. The Filipino people could not understand how under any circumstances such salaries as these could be defended.

Mr. BORLAND. Did I understand the gentleman to say that that was too high?

Mr. QUEZON. It is too high.

Mr. BORLAND. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. QUEZON. We think that it is absolutely indefensible for the members of the cabinet of the Governor General to be paid $15,500 when the members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States only receive $12,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate what I said yesterday about Gov. Gen. Harrison's attitude regarding the question of his salary. The legislature would not reduce it when it reduced the salary of every other officer of the Philippine Government, but the Governor General himself thought that it must be done, since other salaries were reduced. He therefore insisted upon the action.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be frank enough to say that while I believe the salary of the Governor General is not at all sufficient unless he is given a certain amount as allowance for entertainment, I am not sure but that the salaries of the members of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands could be somewhat reduced; but I shall not ask that this be done. I wish only to make the point that there is no due proportion between the salary of the Governor General on the one hand and the members of his cabinet and the justices of the supreme court on the other.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. I do not care to occupy more than a minute or two, because I have already expressed my feelings with respect to these salaries. Much has been said with reference to the salary enjoyed by Mr. Taft when he was Governor General. Something has been said in reference to the salary of the present Governor General, and the attitude of each is to their credit. Nothing has been said whatever in reference to another great Governor General, William Cameron Forbes, of Boston.

I want to say a word in respect to him. This may be surprising to a good many, but nevertheless it is entitled to the most serious reflection. I am told on the highest authority, so that there can be no question as to its accuracy, that during each of the four years that Mr. Forbes was Governor General of the islands he expended not less than $100,000 out of his own pocket exclusively devoted to the public welfare of the islands. Not a bit of it in regal splendor, not a bit of it in sumptuous living, not a bit of it in extravagance, not a bit of it in wastefulness, but all of it devoted exclusively to the public work and to the welfare of the Filipino people.

I think the most powerful argument that has been made to-day is that made by the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON] when he called the committee's attention to the difficulty confronting the President of the United States in selecting a suitable person to fill the high office of Governor General. It is the same thought that has come to me time and time again, and must have come to other members of the committee. It is a sad day for us or for any people when it is necessary to fill a high office with a man of great wealth. Do not give any salary that is ridiculously high, any salary that will attract Tom, Dick, and Harry for the purpose of the salary alone. No; not that for a moment, but do give a sufficient salary so that a man who has ability, whether he is wealthy or not, can take the office and fill it respectably. That ought to be good Democratic doctrine, and I think the Members on the other side of the aisle must acknowledge that it is good Democratic doctrine.

It seems to me that the testimony so far advanced is all to the effect that the Governor General should have at least $18,000, and probably more than that, for a salary. I am willing to leave it to the Philippine Legislature. Is not that fair? Is it not really better to leave it to the people that are going to pay the bill than for us to say here what it shall be? Is it not better to leave it to the people who know the needs of the situation, rather than for us to legislate from this distant point?

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], in a very clear and emphatic manner, called attention to the distinction between the Governor of Porto Rico and the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, a powerful argument in support of my amendment. The only correction I would offer by way of suggestion is that instead of its being 600 miles from the tip north end to the tip south end, it is 1,100 miles.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 9, after the word "other," strike out the word "help" and insert the word "employees."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to debate this amendment. I have offered it by way of suggestion, and if the chairman of the committee does not care to accept it, I do not care to urge it.

Mr. JONES. We will not oppose the amendment.

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

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, after the word "each," in line 25, insert: "*Provided*, That the term of the Governor General shall not continue beyond the term of the President of the United States by whom he shall have been appointed, or until his successor is chosen and qualified."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that proposition has already been passed upon, and the further point of order that it is not germane to this section.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman indicate wherein it has already been passed upon? Does the gentleman make reference to section 21, page 17?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is correct. It is there provided in the bill:

He shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, and hold his office at the pleasure of the President and until his successor is chosen and qualified.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is germane, I think, since it follows almost literally the language just quoted by the gentleman from Tennessee, and is in entire harmony with it; it proposes, in addition, merely to fix a limitation upon the time that shall be served by the Governor General, to harmonize with the term of the President who appoints him.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, is the Chair prepared to rule upon that?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order based upon two propositions: First, that that question has already been disposed of; and, second, that it was not germane to the section now before the House. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me. If the Chair is in doubt, I will be very glad to argue it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. Is there not a difference, in that the amendment proposes to harmonize the tenure of office of the Governor General with that of the President of the United States who makes his appointment?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would qualify that provision in section 21 which has already been adopted, and if at any time such an amendment were to be proposed, it should have been proposed when section 21 was under consideration.

Mr. MANN. Do not the two propositions mean the same thing? One is that the term of the Governor General shall be at the pleasure of the President of the United States, and the other is that the term of the Governor General shall end with the term of the President, if he appoints somebody else.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is not what the amendment says.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will see that under the provision of section 21 the Governor General, once appointed, remains in office at the pleasure of the President, and under this proposed amendment identically the same thing takes place. There is no distinction. There may be an argument against the adoption of the amendment. It does not say that it ends with the term of the President, but it ends when his successor has been appointed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, even if we concede that the first point I made is not well taken, the point still remains that it is not germane to this paragraph. If the gentleman desired to offer that amendment, he should have offered it at the time that we had section 21 under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not germane to this section, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 25, after the word "each," insert "*Provided*, That no Governor General shall be paid at the rate of $18,000 per annum to exceed the aggregate of $72,000."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a little more germane, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is a little less meaningless.

Mr. MOORE. I think it has a great deal of meaning.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, it fixes a four-year term. Is that the idea?

Mr. MOORE. That is the idea.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then, Mr. Chairman, it is subject to the point of order, and I make the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that in the discussion anywhere, nor in any action taken by the committee thus far——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, how many more amendments has the gentleman to this section?

Mr. MOORE. I think I have two germane amendments. I will be very frank with the gentleman. I desire to say something about the limitation of the tenure of office of the Governor General.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. It may involve the general question of political ethics, but I think it is all pertinent to the discussion.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows what good faith means. Is it a good-faith discussion of this amendment or of this bill?

Mr. MOORE. I would not offer it if I did not mean to say something in good faith to the committee. We are now discussing a bill which is fraught with great consequences to a people numbering eight million or more. We are undertaking to establish a form of government for them. We are giving them the best advice of which we are capable. We are putting to them the pretense, at least, of liberty and freedom of action on their own part, but we are adding certain strings which tie them up, and about which it seems to me we ought to inform them. If, for instance, we give the people of the Philippine Islands to believe that they shall have their freedom and independence, and their own right of action without restraint on our part, we ought to say that frankly, and we ought not to hamstring it in a way to lead them to believe that they have been deceived by the American Congress. My purpose is to discuss the matter of the tenure of office. I have an amendment pertaining to the tenure of office of those who are appointed by the President and by the Governor General.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's time is running, as I understand it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I was answering the gentleman because he wanted to be enlightened upon the question of good faith. If the Chair is ready to rule on the point of order——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MOORE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, after the word "Philippines," in line 18, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following words: "but all officials of the Philippines appointed by the President shall hold office at the pleasure of the President and until his successor is chosen and qualified."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman make any point against that? He does not? Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with the view of bringing to the attention of the committee the importance of our exercising good faith toward the people of the Philippine Islands. The Democratic Party is undertaking by this bill to lead the people of the Philippines to believe that the United States intends to give them their freedom and their exclusive right of government. The bill justifies that pretense as set out in the preambles, which are yet to be acted upon, but the enacting clauses of it hold the people of the Philippine Islands in check with regard to many of their so-called legislative functions. The bill reserves to the Congress and the President of the United States certain jurisdiction over the people of the Philippine Islands that they may not clearly understand if these preambles to the bill are accepted as the action of the Congress. To that extent the bill is unfair to the Filipinos themselves.

I have offered this amendment with a view of calling attention to the good faith that Congress ought to display toward these people. That question of good faith has been raised, and I have the right to suggest that, so long as it has been raised by a member of the majority party, we can refer to the action of that party not only with respect to its treatment of the Filipinos but with respect to its treatment of the people of the United States. Thus the people of the Philippine Islands may judge for themselves whether by this legislation "good faith" toward them is intended or not.

Now, I propose a limitation upon the tenure of office both for the Governor General and all local officers appointed in the Philippine Islands. On the question of good faith we have the testimony of the Democratic Party itself with respect to the tenure of office of the President of the United States. At the Baltimore convention, when the platform of that party was read, it provided:

We favor a single presidential term, and to that end urge the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution making the President of the United States ineligible to reelection, and we pledge the candidate of this convention to this principle.

So your party pledged the President of the United States "to this principle," and yet in the newspapers of yesterday morning we read—I am quoting from the New York Times—headlines as follows:

"Wilson blocked one-term bill." "Letter he wrote to A. MITCHELL PALMER in 1913 said to have sidetracked it." "It develops that House committee filed Senate measure on advice of President elect." "Silent on Baltimore plank"

Now, in the matter of "good faith" there is something for the people of the United States as well as for the people of the Philippines to consider. What are those people over yonder in those islands, whom we take by the hand to lead so they may tread by themselves—what are they to think of the "good faith" of the United States Congress passing a bill which in its preamble gives them freedom and which in its vital clauses holds them up to limitations from which they can not escape?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the gentleman from Pennsylvania attacking the present administration I was reminded of a poem which I read many years ago. Now, it may seem strange—I know it will seem strange—that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should remind anyone of poetry [laughter] in the first instance, but perhaps after the committee shall have heard the poetry to which I refer it will not seem so strange. It has been many years ago since I read it, and I do not know that I can recall the lines with exactness; but I think I can quote them with substantial accuracy. This poem read:

A LITTLE DOG.

A little dog barked at the big, round moon,
Which smiled in the evening sky.
And the natives smote him with rocks and stones,
But still he continued his rageful tones,
And he barked till his throat was dry.

Oh, the little dog bounced like a rubber ball,
For his anger quite drove him wild;
And he said, "I'm a terror, although I am small,
And I dare you, impudent fellow, to fall."
But the moon only smiled and smiled.

But at length, 'hind a cloud which obstructed the west,
The moon sank down out of sight,
And it smiled as it slowly slipped over the crest,
But the little dog said, as he laid down to rest,
"Well, I scared him away, all right."

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The last recourse of a man who has no argument is ridicule, and ridicule is one of the best arguments that can be employed by one who has no other means to stop an adversary. The gentleman has quoted his little-dog poem, not literally, but he has so quoted it as to present no possible argument at all upon the question at issue. The gentleman knew I did not have the time in which to fully explain the question I desired to raise a little while ago, but he has aroused me now sufficiently to say to him that his little-dog argument has no special effect upon me, since I am endeavoring to do my duty by the people, and am endeavoring honestly to inform the Filipinos, for whom we are legislating, as to just what the intended legislation is.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has not said a word about the sudden change of front of the Democratic Party, for which he speaks, upon the question of one term for the President. The gentleman knows that in the Baltimore platform, which was the gospel of his party, it was provided that the President of the United States should have one term and that the party pledged its candidate to one term. The gentleman also knows that there has been a change of front since that party platform was adopted, and that the President himself has sent to the Judiciary Committee of this House a notification that he does not desire that party platform observed. This is in line with other instances of pledge-breaking by the Democratic Party, as, for instance, in the matter of the Panama Canal tolls. The Democratic Party pledged this Nation that ships should pass through the Panama Canal free. It went back on that pledge; it reneged on that pledge; and it now has to resort to "Little dog Tray" to excuse it for its bad faith to the American people.

The Democratic Party has done more than this. It has recently brought out its textbook for the use of orators to go out and again fool the American people. And in this textbook, from cover to cover, there is not one line of the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore upon which the Democratic Party deceived the people of the United States in the election of 1912. Apparently the party does not now stand upon that platform. Oh, if you will deceive 90,000,000 people in this way on the Panama Canal plank and the one-term presidential plank, what will you do with these civilized and semicivilized millions of people in the Philippine Islands to whom you are making promises to-day? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does the Chair understand that the debate on this bill ought to be confined to the subject matter of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. DONOVAN. Then I would like to inquire by what means did this gentleman get the right to utter this tirade we have been obliged to listen to?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Connecticut had wanted to interrupt the gentleman from Pennsylvania he could have done so when he was speaking.

Mr. DONOVAN. It is remarkable what an intellectual gentleman will do. [Laughter.]

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 24, lines 11 and 12, by striking out the words "and approved by the Governor General."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, lines 11 and 12, strike out the words "and approved by the Governor General."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get the attention of the gentleman in charge of the bill. The language of this section provides that all of the officials and employees not named by the President shall have salaries to be fixed by the Philippine Legisalture, as I understand it, and to be approved by the Governor General.

Now, the only way the Philippine Legislature can act is by passing a bill, and we have already provided in this bill that the Governor General may veto a bill passed by the legislature, and also provided a method by which that bill can be passed over the veto if it shall be approved by the President. Now comes this provision specifically requiring that the salaries of all these officials shall be approved by the Governor General. There is an apparent conflict in the two provisions of this bill, and under this language, if this remains in, any bill which is passed by the Philippine Legislature fixing a salary can not be passed over the veto of the Governor General, even if it be approved by the President. Was that the design of the committee, may I ask, or is that something that was taken out of the present law?

Mr. JONES. I do not think that was the idea of the committee. So far as I am concerned, I see no objection to the elimination of that language.

Mr. MANN. Well, it seemed to me there was a conflict. I think it is already covered fully, and I am afraid this would make trouble.

Mr. JONES. The committee did not think, of course, there was any conflict; but I am willing to put the matter beyond any question of doubt.

Mr. MANN. I think this, probably, may be in the existing law.

Mr. JONES. That is.

Mr. MANN. Well, of course, under the existing law there is no way of passing a bill over the veto of the Governor General, as I understand, and you have already provided for that.

Mr. JONES. I think there will be no objection on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in lines 12, 13, and 14, on page 24, the language:

And if the legislature shall fail to make an appropriation for such salaries the salaries so fixed shall be paid without the necessity of further appropriations therefor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, lines 12, 13, and 14, strike out the following language: "And if the legislature shall fail to make an appropriation for such salaries, the salaries so fixed shall be paid without the necessity of further appropriations therefor."

Mr. MANN. Is there not in the bill a provision that if an appropriation act shall not be passed that the former appropriation——

Mr. JONES. That is applied to the general appropriation act.

Mr. MANN. That is true. But here, supposing the Philippine Legislature wants to discontinue an office that ought to be discontinued? We know our method frequently is not to make an appropriation for that office, and it may be—and is true—that in legislative bodies it is sometimes much easier to drop an appropriation from an appropriation bill where it ought to be dropped than it is to pass a bill repealing the law that created the office.

Now, what objection can there be to leaving the appropriation for these offices created by the Philippine Legislature to the Philippine Legislature when it comes to providing the salaries? Certainly there is no desire on the part of anybody, if there is a useless office over there, to continue to pay the salary of the office, although the Philippine Legislature may refuse to make the appropriation for it. If they fail to pass the appropriation bills, as I understand, these salaries will be continued anyhow; that is, if an appropriation bill does not pass this year, then the appropriation act of last year remains in force. But this would seem to prevent the opportunity to discontinue a useless office, and we who have been here very long know that it is a very difficult matter to do at the best, and I do not believe in discouraging a legislative body that can find it can do without a job.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. Calling the gentleman's attention to the language on page 15, the provision is as follows:

If at the termination of any fiscal year the appropriations necessary for the support of government for the ensuing fiscal year shall not have been made, the several sums appropriated in the last appropriation bills for the objects and purposes therein specified, so far as the same may be done, shall be deemed to be reappropriated for the several objects and purposes specified in said last appropriation bill; and until the legislature shall act in such behalf the treasurer shall, when so directed by the Governor General, make the payments necessary for the purposes aforesaid.

That would allow the continuation of the appropriation for the salaries of officers. That would certainly be for the support of the government.

Mr. MANN. Certainly; if no appropriation is made, then these appropriations are continued in force.

Mr. TOWNER. So that the language used in this section that the gentleman moves to strike out is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. MANN. I take it that this provision was in the existing law. I do not know and have not ascertained, but I take it that it was for the very purpose of preventing the lower house over there from refusing to pay the salaries; but I do not think that applies now.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that it is in existing law, and also that provision in section 15 is in existing law, with a certain modification.

Mr. MANN. I understand. But does not the gentleman think that we can afford to trust the Philippine Legislature to make the appropriations for those salaries for offices they create when the salaries are necessary and when the offices are necessary to be continued?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me, I will say I have no doubt he has in mind especially clerical places and things of that sort; but if this were stricken out, if you strike out the salary of the head of a bureau or a high executive officer, would it not——

Mr. MANN. Well, even then, if the Philippine Legislature should conclude that a certain high place can be abolished which it has created, why should it not be permitted to do that? That is not going very far in self-government. For instance, supposing that we want to change an office, as we do sometimes here in Washington, discontinue one office and create another office. Under the terms of this, if you wanted to create an office you could, but you could not discontinue an office by dropping the appropriation.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I call the gentleman's attention to the language on page 20, beginning in line 9:

There shall be established by the Philippine Legislature a bureau, to be known as the bureau of non-Christian tribes, which said bureau shall be embraced in one of the executive departments to be designated by the Governor General, and shall have general supervision over the public affairs of the inhabitants of the territory represented in the legislature by appointive senators and representatives.

Now, the gentleman knows, of course, the delicacy of dealing with the non-Christian tribes in the Philippine Islands. I should not like to make it possible—I should rather go to the extent of tautology, if that were necessary—to prevent the possibility of the Philippine Legislature, if it should desire to do what I do not think it would desire to do, to abolish this bureau.

Mr. MANN. Well, I quite agree with the gentleman about that. But supposing the Philippine Legislature did not create this bureau?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This act creates it.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. It says, "There shall be established by the Philippine Legislature a bureau." Suppose the Philippine Legislature did not create the bureau. We are not passing all power out of our hands, and that is why the gentleman knows the Philippine Legislature will create the bureau, because if the Philippine Legislature did not create the bureau and Congress wanted it, Congress would create it. We have the power at any time, and if the Philippine Legislature would create a bureau by direction of the organic act and fail to make an appropriation for it, we would have the power to do it. I do not think there is any chance of their failing.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. We also continue the laws in existence. I would rather not take two bites at the cherry, seeing how difficult it is to take one bite.

Mr. MANN. I do not think we shall have to take two bites, but it seems to me that it is desirable to leave the power in the legislature to create and abolish a salary when they think it is a useless office. We know sometimes it is very effective here, and we know also that it is a frequent thing in the appropriation acts here to leave out one office, the title of ar office, and to reestablish it under another title with slightly changed jurisdiction. Under the terms of this provision I do not know whether that could be done. I doubt it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, of course the gentleman understands that they can carry that provision in the appropriation bill, and if the Governor General should veto that item, it would not become a law. But there is nothing here to prohibit them from abolishing the office if it became a law.

Mr. MANN. There is nothing to prevent them from passing a law and abolishing the office.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. They can do that upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. That will depend upon their rules. They will probably have rules something like ours, where legislation on an appropriation act is not permissible. I venture to say that if this provision were in our Constitution it would have cost our Government many millions of dollars, and often a large sum of money on any appropriation bill.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. I think that section of this bill which permits the continuation of a previous appropriation in case the legislature should fail to pass a new measure is enough protection against the danger that the government of the Philippine Islands might be left without any means of support. I do not think that this language should be retained if it leaves a doubt as to the power of the legislature to abolish unnecessary bureaus or offices.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I do not think there is any necessity for striking this out, but personally I have no objection to doing it.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, an amendment is pending, by unanimous consent, from yesterday—section 23a.

Mr. JONES. I suggest that we finish these two sections first.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought it was the understanding that we take it up after the consideration of this was completed.

Mr. JONES. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. It was to be referred to by unanimous consent?

Mr. STAFFORD. By agreement, Mr. Chairman. It can be returned to by agreement.

Mr. BRYAN. Unanimous consent has been granted to go back; but to continue it on the calendar as it is, unanimous consent is not necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to have it considered at the present time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES. Very well. Go ahead.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a new section, section 26a, the following:

"The sale, manufacture for sale, transportation for sale, importation for sale, and exportation for sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes in the Philippine Islands and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof are forever prohibited. The Philippine Legislature shall have power to provide for the manufacture, sale, importation, and transportation of intoxicating liquors for sacramental, medicinal, mechanical, pharmaceutical, or scientific purposes, or for use in the arts, and shall have power to enforce this article by all needful legislation."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which is offered is the Hobson amendment providing for national prohibition in its identical wording, excepting that "the Philippines" is substituted in place of "the United States." I am as much opposed to the original Hobson national prohibition amendment extending over the entire United States as I am to this amendment, which limits it to the Philippines. The principle in both cases is the same. The National Government has no right to legislate on a matter of purely State or internal policy.

There is a fundamental principle under our form of government that matters pertaining to the health, happiness, and internal affairs of a State are for the State to pass upon through its legislature. So in the bill under consideration we are following out that idea and vesting in the Philippine Legislature the right to legislate on all matters pertaining to the welfare of the Filipino people.

No question is better recognized as being a matter of local concern than the regulation of the liquor traffic, and nothing is better established in the history of liquor regulations than that where a State attempts to force prohibition upon a people in a community where the sentiment is lacking for its enforcement that prohibition becomes a farce and a dead letter. This is evidenced in the New England States in trying to enforce prohibition in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine when public opinion was averse to it. Every Member of Congress from Vermont with whom I have ever spoken admits, even though they themselves have been teetotalers, that conditions are far better under the present system of local option than under the former system of State-wide prohibition. The people who are not fanatical on this subject have no question that the conditions in Maine would be far better than under the farcical enforcement, or, rather, lack of enforcement, of the State prohibitory law.

Believing as I do in the principle of local government, and this bill being bottomed on that idea of granting to the Philippines the greatest amount of government that is compatible with its welfare, is the reason why I make a point of order against this obnoxious amendment to the freedom of action of the Filipino people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself for a few minutes to the parliamentary proposition. A point of order was made against this prohibition amendment by me last night, and I renew it again on the ground that it is not germane either to the provisions of the bill or to the paragraph or section of the bill we are now considering.

I wish first to direct the Chairman's attention to the title of the bill. It is a bill to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

If the Chair will scan the various provisions in the bill we have thus far considered, he will find first a bill of rights, then a statement of the legislative authority of the islands, the powers of the legislature, then the powers of the Executive, and now we virtually have concluded the consideration of all those matters and are considering merely the question of appointments to some of the executive positions.

The Chair is acquainted with clause 7 of Rule XVI, which provides that no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I would not contend that if at the proper place, for instance section 6, an amendment had been offered reserving to the Congress of the United States the power to pass upon the liquor question, or excepting that power from the legislative authority conferred upon the Philippine Legislature, that it would not have been germane; or to that section which relates to the powers of the Governor General that he should have authority as to the administration of the liquor traffic in the Philippine Islands; but I do contend, first, that there is nothing to this bill to indicate to any Member of the House that a prohibition amendment was likely to be considered, forbidding the sale and manufacture of liquors in the Philippine Islands. For the Chair to hold that this amendment is in order the Chair would have to hold that an amendment I might introduce extending the provisions of the Underwood tariff bill to be the internal policy of the Philippines would be in order. It would also, if I offered an amendment fixing the Glass-Owen currency bill as the currency to be established in the Philippine Islands, have to be held in order, or if I should offer an amendment providing that an appropriation for rivers and harbors shall be to the extent of $20,000,000 annually appropriated by Congress, would also have to be held in order.

But there is nothing in any part of this bill, from beginning to end, which attempts to determine the legislative policy by the Congress as to its internal or external policy.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does not the gentleman think that a question of this character affecting the internal policy of the government should be left to the legislature?

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no question as to the merits of the proposition, as I have just stated, that it should be left entirely to the legislature as a matter of home rule. The bill is predicated on the idea that the Filipinos are capable of governing themselves, and if they are, it should be left to them to determine their internal policy. No more should Congress determine the policy in the Philippines as to the liquor traffic, if we are transferring all legislative authority over their affairs to a constituted legislative body, than that Congress should determine as a national question national prohibition, where State legislatures exist, with the full power to determine what is best for the State's own welfare. But this amendment is part and parcel of the movement for national prohibition, and, believing as I do, that that Government is best which comes nearest to the people, and that States through their legislatures should determine their internal affairs, I intend to use my best endeavors to defeat this prohibition amendment.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. As a matter of revenue for the people of the Philippines, should not they be allowed to decide that question for themselves?

Mr. STAFFORD. Why, yes; just as I have argued that it would not be in harmony with the provisions of this bill for any Member to offer the provisions of the Underwood tariff and say that it should be applicable as a tariff policy for the Philippine Islands, and that is what this amendment is seeking to accomplish.

Why there are some Members who, as long as it does not affect their districts, would impose conditions on others that would be harsh and unworkable and absolutely work an injustice. It is no concern to them as to the revenues that will result, and even now, as the gentlemen know, there is a strong movement to impose on the beer industry a greater burden than it justly should bear. No objection was made by the beer-consuming public to a reasonable tax of 50 cents additional per barrel on beer to meet any possible deficit that might arise by reason of the European war, though from my point of view I consider that no such exigency exists, and accordingly have opposed this war-revenue bill. But it is now proposed to increase this by one-half and make the tax $1.75 per barrel, which would make the beer-consuming public pay nearly $50,000,000, or about one-half of the total tax to be raised to meet the deficiency. This I consider most unjust, especially as it is a substitute for the gasoline tax, which would have to be paid by the automobile users.

Let no one mistake the effect of this tax in that by raising the price of beer to the saloon keeper and to the thousands of people who purchase cases of bottled beer for home consumption that its ultimate effect by increasing the price to the consuming public will be to lessen the production of this beverage that is regarded as almost nonintoxicating. This burden will fall upon the poor man and not the rich, as beer is a poor man's drink, and when the defenders of this war-revenue bill claim that this tax is upon luxuries they are strangers entirely to the conditions and are imposing a burden that will be most directly felt by the working and middle classes. When $48,000,000 additional beer tax is to be thus levied I protest and will continue

to protest that it is unjust, inequitable, and sectional in its character.

Mr. Chairman, the supporters of this amendment are forcing their views upon others with no voice to oppose, against which, as a Representative of a district of liberty-loving people, I strongly protest. I am not in sympathy with any rule of absolutism that would take away the liberty of the individual.

I have digressed somewhat from the discussion of the parliamentary question, but this digression was suggested by the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN].

Now, I wish to direct the chairman's attention to one or two brief statements in the manual under clause 7 of Rule XVI, and particularly to subclause D, on page 344, which says that two subjects are not necessarily germane because they are related.

The first reference thereunder is this (these were held to be not germane):

To a proposition relating to the terms of Senators an amendment changing the manner of their election; to a bill relating to commerce between the States an amendment relating to commerce within the several States; to a proposition for the appointment of a select committee to investigate a certain subject an amendment proposing an inquiry of the executive on that subject.

I wish to direct the attention of the Chair to the latest expression—and perhaps the Chair was present when the Representative from New York, Mr. JOHN J. FITZGERALD, whom we all regard as one of the best parliamentarians in this body, was chairman of the committee on September 22 last in the consideration of the conservation bill providing for the leasing of coal, oil, and mineral lands of the country. There was a special provision under consideration for the disposition of the funds or rentals accruing from those Government lands when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] offered an amendment that the funds should be used for the purpose of the building of good roads.

I know of no decision anywhere on the subject of germaneness that is so comprehensive and so enlightening as this decision of Mr. FITZGERALD. In that opinion he states that it had been intimated that the question would arise, and he had given the subject, as the opinion shows, considerable thought and consideration.

I direct the Chair's attention to that decision, and particularly to certain language in it. The gist of the decision is, as to the question of germaneness, whether the amendment that is offered could reasonably be anticipated, or could the Members consider that the amendment would be a logical sequence of the provisions of the bill.

I wish to read the following:

The meaning of the word "germane" is akin to, or near to, or appropriate to, or relevant to, and "germane" amendments must bear such relationship to the provisions of the bill as well as meet the other tests; that is, that they be a natural and logical sequence to the subject matter and propose such modifications as would naturally, properly, and reasonably be anticipated.

Again, on page 15553, Mr. FITZGERALD said:

If it be apparent that the amendment proposes some modification of the bill, or of any part of it, which from the declared purposes of the bill could not reasonably have been anticipated and which can not be said to be a logical sequence of the matter contained in the bill, and is not such a modification as would naturally suggest itself to the legislative body considering the bill, the amendment can not be said to be germane.

In his concluding remarks he said:

It seems to the Chair that, applying these tests to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to determine whether it is germane, the question to be answered is whether the amendment is relevant, appropriate, and a natural and logical sequence to the subject matter of the bill. It is quite clear to the Chair that the amendment can not be so characterized, and that the committee could not have anticipated or reasonably expected that to a proposition that the money to be derived from the royalties of the leases authorized to be made under this legislation should be put in the reclamation fund, a well-established fund created for specific and definite purposes; that a proposition to create a new fund, to be known as the "national good-roads fund," could be considered as a natural, appropriate, relevant, and logical sequence to the proposal in the bill; and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Again, here is a pertinent suggestion by Mr. FITZGERALD that may be of some value to the Chair in this matter, to be found on page 15555, near the top of the first column:

Very frequently the difficulty in reaching a conclusion as to whether an amendment is germane arises from the fact that while the proposed amendment is somewhat similar to the subject matter of the bill, the particular predilection of Members favorable to the amendment makes them reason themselves into a frame of mind to believe the amendment to be germane without careful analysis of its relation to the matter proposed to be amended. * * * It seems to the Chair that such proposals could not reasonably be anticipated, nor could they be held as logical sequences to the provision in the bill.

Following out the logic of that opinion—and I repeat that I consider it the best opinion that has ever been delivered upon this subject of germaneness—I contend, Mr. Chairman, that the prohibitory amendment now proposed, which seeks to determine the legislative policy of the Philippines in advance, could not have been anticipated as naturally being a relevant proposition to the consideration of this bill. No more so than if some Member would offer the Underwood Tariff Act, as I suggested a moment ago, to determine the tariff policy of the Philippine Islands. This bill is founded entirely, from first to last, on the fundamental idea that the Philippines themselves shall determine through their legislature their internal and external policies.

I now wish merely to come to this other question, and that is, if it might have been in order, if the Chair should hold that it is germane to other provisions of the bill, it can not be held to be germane to this section. The amendment embodies a legislative policy, and it is a fundamental rule of germaneness that the paragraph must be germane to the section under consideration. If the Chair desires any authority upon that I have some authorities along that line. In Hinds' Precedents, Volume V, paragraph 5822, we find this language:

An amendment inserting an additional section should be germane to the portion of the bill where it is offered.

As the Chair knows, the reason for that is predicated upon the idea of expedition in the consideration of bills. If a Member should be granted freedom at any time, anywhere, to introduce any amendment to the body of the bill, there would be no end to the consideration of that measure in case some Member should wish to indulge in a filibuster. Assuming that the amendment is germane to the general provisions of the bill, then I contend it should have been offered to that section of the bill which relates to the legislative power, but the section under consideration here does not relate to the legislative powers. The powers of the Philippine Legislature were referred to in sections 3 and 6, prior sections of the bill.

Just to make a brief résumé, I do not contend, Mr. Chairman, that if an amendment had been offered at the proper place, stating that the Philippine Legislature could not have authority to pass upon the liquor question, that that would not have been in order at that place, nor do I contend that it would not have been in order if an amendment delegating that authority to the Governor General had been offered, but I do contend that it is foreign to the whole scope of this bill to introduce a legislative enactment that shall apply to the Philippine Islands direct. The title of the bill and every paragraph in it shows that that was not the policy or intent of the committee in introducing it, and that no Member of the House could reasonably anticipate that any such proposition would be submitted for consideration.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, briefly on the point of order, I am very glad that the point is to be submitted to a gentleman who can not be influenced by the suggestions of revenue or suggestions of home rule, coming, as he does, from the State of Virginia, for there the gentleman has heard all of these arguments and has passed on those matters outside of this Chamber. This bill states in the title that it is a bill to provide a more autonomous government for the Philippine Islands. The fact that it grants rights to the Philippine Islands, privileges to the Legislature of the Philippine Islands, necessarily carries with it that it reserves from the legislature such rights and such privileges and such large powers as this Congress may deem wise to reserve from that legislature. We can not grant these rights without reserving the rights that we do not grant, and under that broad head of granting a more autonomous government we are here to determine what constitutes a more autonomous government. We are here to determine where we are going to restrict and where we are going to extend privileges. Page 9 of the bill, section 12, provides that all local legislative powers of the Philippines, "except as herein otherwise provided," shall be vested in the legislature. "Except as herein otherwise provided.". That is the purpose of the bill—to make provisions otherwise wherever it is the will of Congress to do so. We begin right at the very first of the bill and provide that they shall not pass laws abridging life, liberty, and property, and then we pass another section restraining the Philippine Legislature from denying to an accused person the right of counsel, and we deny them the right to pass any law that puts any person twice in jeopardy, and we restrict their rights as to passing laws concerning bail and obligations of contract and imprisonment for debt and the right of habeas corpus.

We regulate taxes and we provide how far they can go on the subject to taxation. All through the bill these provisions and restrictions are set forth. It is just as much a bill to restrict the legislature to reserve rights as it is to grant those that we may choose to give to the legislature. The gentleman from Wisconsin, in his argument on behalf of the point of order,

suggests that if this were permitted in the form which he has stated at a different place, it perhaps would be in order. Now, the place where my amendment is submitted, or, rather, the point raised will attain with less force at the place where it is submitted, it seems to me, than any other place in the bill. This section 26 deals with franchises, concessions from the government of the islands to private parties, to corporations, to licensees, to those who come to the government and ask for privileges from the government. The gentleman who sits in the chair well knows that the United States Supreme Court has held that no man has the inherent right to sell intoxicating liquor, no man has the right to sell these debauching drugs to the public, and that sales of liquors are restricted on that ground, and every corporation, every State, every municipality has the inherent right to fix licenses and state conditions under which franchises will be given. Now, in these sections we have provided how franchises on the public domain, how franchises on the public land, how franchises of public utilities are to be granted, under what condition water rights will be granted, under what conditions we will allow the right to furnish gas to a municipality to be granted to a private concern. All of these grants, all of these concessions, all of these franchises are made the subject of regulations in this very preceding section. Now, Mr. Chairman, that point, of course, would not be resorted to except in the most extreme case, and the most liberal interpretation would be due in reference to that feature, but by a strict interpretation this is the very place for this amendment. This is the very location for it, and it is an independent section, not an amendment to any other section, and I submit to the Chair that there is no rhyme or reason in the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I submit that this committee has the right, without any shadow of question, without any thought in any parliamentarian's mind, sincerely and earnestly I believe that this committee has the right to say to the Philippine Legislature that we shall not permit the grant of this liquor franchise if they see fit to so do, and that this is the very place in the bill to say it, if we care to say it at all.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS). The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], makes two points of order against the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN]. First, that the amendment is not germane to the bill, and therefore is not in order under any circumstances. Second, that if it is germane to the bill, it is not germane to the portion of the bill under consideration, and hence is not in order at this time. Many decisions have been rendered upon the subject of germane, and nongermane amendments. Some of these decisions are plainly right, and easily referable to established principles. Others rest upon the most subtle and hairsplitting distinctions. Still others are flatly contradictory, and hopelessly irreconcilable. Should the first objection to the pending amendment be sustained, the ruling of the Chair would, in effect, be a declaration that the amendment presents a proposition unrelated to the subject matter of the bill. But is such the case? It is true that we find in the title of the bill a statement that this measure is intended to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, but it is further stated, that the bill is to provide a more autonomous government for the islands. In pursuance of, and in conformity with the latter declaration, the bill deals in great detail with the internal affairs, and domestic economy of the Philippine people. Section 3 affords many positive rights to the people of these islands, limits in many directions the powers of the Philippine Legislature, and contains many inhibitions relating to procedure, practices, and pursuits. For instance it is declared in this section, that neither slavery, nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist in said islands.

If it is in harmony with the purpose of this bill, to provide that a state of slavery, and the traffic in human liberty, shall not exist in the Philippines, it is not perceived why an inhibition directed against the manufacture of, and the traffic in ardent spirits, is not in order under, and directly related to, the subject matter of this section which is intended to establish by law and make effective certain fundamental principles deemed essential to the future welfare, prosperity, and progress of the Filipinos. The first objection of the gentleman from Wisconsin is overruled, the Chair being of opinion that the amendment under consideration is plainly germane to the bill. The second objection of the gentleman from Wisconsin presents a more difficult question for determination. Conceding pro arguendo, that the amendment is germane to the bill, it is insisted that it is not in order in the connection in which it is offered, in other words that it is not in harmony so to say, with its proposed environment. While the decisions relating to germaneness in this connection are conflicting, yet on the whole it may be considered as fairly established, that an amendment of this character, should be germane to the portion of the bill where it is offered. Hence it follows that to be in order, this amendment should be offered in its appropriate connection, unless it falls within the principle relating to amendments that are germane to the bill, and in some degree germane to different sections thereof. In that event the proponent of the amendment may select the connection in which he will offer it. See Fifth Hinds, sections 5822, and 5823.

Looking to the section of the pending bill which the proposed amendment is to follow, as a new section, it will be apparent that this amendment is in no wise germane to that section. If the Chair were not assured in his mind that the amendment is germane to section 3 of the bill which has been passed, so that full opportunity has been afforded to offer the same at a time when it was plainly, clearly, and positively in order; or if the Chair were of opinion that it was germane to more than one section of the bill, including the connection in which it is now offered, the Chair would have no hesitation in holding the same to be now in order. But the Chair is not in doubt either on the first, or the second point. The amendment was plainly germane to section 3, and therefore appropriate to be offered in that connection. It is not germane to section 26 which it is intended to succeed as a new section. Hence it falls within the rule that an amendment inserted as an additional section, should be germane to that portion of the bill where it is offered. (5 Hinds, sec. 5822.) The Chair sustains the second point of order raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution ceding to the State of California temporary jurisdiction over certain lands in the Presidio of San Francisco and Fort Mason (Cal.) Military Reservations.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 29. That all laws or parts of laws applicable to the Philippines not in conflict with any of the provisions of this act are hereby continued in force and effect.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to argue the matter, but I am going to offer the amendment I suggested here—the prohibition amendment—after section 27, and I shall do so in every section from now on.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment has not been reported, and of course I can not make the point of order, but the gentleman can not proceed with debate until his amendment is reported.

Mr. BRYAN. We have had the amendment read. It is the same as was read a moment ago, except it is to come after section 27 instead of section 26.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] asks unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I presume the waiving of the reading will not interfere with my making a point of order. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered is not germane to this section, and, furthermore, it has already been passed upon and is dilatory.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 29. That all laws or parts of laws applicable to the Philippines not in conflict with any of the provisions of this act are hereby continued in force and effect.

Mr. JONES and Mr. TOWNER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. I ask the attention of the chairman of the committee. I ask unanimous consent to return to section 22, on page 20.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, before that return is made, may I ask if section 29 has been read? I want to offer an amendment after section 29.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have somebody move for the reconsideration of that section. Somebody who voted against that amendment should move its reconsideration.

Mr. JONES. I ask that the gentleman withhold his request for the present. There are two sections that we are to return to, and I would like to perfect those before we take up anything new.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, the section I offered awhile ago I would offer now as section No. 30. There is an old adage that it is never too late to do good. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. STAFFORD. Without waiving the right to make the point of order against it, I do not object. I now make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this section of the bill, and, further, I make the point of order that the amendment is dilatory.

Mr. BRYAN. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to be heard briefly on that. This is entirely a different proposition. This amendment is offered here as section 30. The distinguished gentleman who has just left the chair held that the proposition was germane to this bill, but that it was not germane when being put in as section 26a, between these various propositions that were involved there; but here is a section—section 29—which says:

That all laws or parts of laws applicable to the Philippines not in conflict with any of the provisions of this act are hereby continued in force and effect.

Now, what is germane to that? What is the proposition that is involved in that section? That is a proposition as to what laws shall be continued in force, what laws shall be repealed, and what laws shall be observed from now on in the Philippine Islands. There is nothing there about public lands, there is nothing there about salaries to officers, there is nothing there about these propositions that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin presented a while ago and on which he obtained the ruling from the able Chairman who was presiding at that time. Not at all. The amendment I have proposed is applicable to that section, which says:

That all laws or parts of laws applicable to the Philippines not in conflict with any of the provisions of this act are hereby continued in force and effect.

Now, that is a very broad subject. That is as broad a subject as all the enactments that we have heretofore made in regard to the Philippine Islands. It involves the question of involuntary servitude, which the gentleman spoke of a few moments ago. He said if I had put it with involuntary servitude I could have gotten it through, or some crime or criminality, such as the peddling of opium, or of vice, in the Philippine Islands. But here is a section that involves everything you can think of, although it mentions no particular subject; and I would like to know why I can not offer it here. We have here a House composed to a great extent of Members from dry States, and is it possible that this House is going on record by saying that it is right to refuse to permit Congress to consider a prohibition amendment as to even the Philippine Islands? I hope that such is not the case. I hope it will not be laid against the record of the gentleman who sits in the chair now that he ruled that as to this proposed section 30 of the Philippine bill it was out of order in this Congress of the United States of America to incorporate a provision denying the peddling of liquor by infamous men in the Philippine Islands, who are debauching the men of those islands with liquor. I hope the Chair will not rule that an amendment restraining those people and putting them out of business is out of order. I hope the Chair will not rule that way. I hope he will never have to explain such a ruling as that to his constituents. I hope that no Member of this House will have to make such an explanation to his constituents. I would not want to go back home and make such an explanation. The laws that are in force over there—and there are any number of them—and the matter of passing such laws or incorporating such laws on the books have been discussed and considered. When we went over there it was said the Filipinos were not in the habit of drinking whisky and alcohol to any great extent.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not arguing the point of order but arguing the merits.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman from Milwaukee thinks that everything is in order from Milwaukee——

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; I do not hold that everything is in order. I believe we should confine ourselves to the rules of the House.

Mr. BRYAN. I am ready to submit, if the Chair please.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to return to section 18, on page 13. The right to return to that section has been reserved. I desire to move to strike out the word "next," in line 22 of that section, and to insert the word "next" after the word "October," in line 21, so that it will read:

On the 16th day of October next following the election.

Instead of:

On the 16th day of October following the next election.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the unanimous consent is to return to this section merely for the purpose of offering this amendment?

Mr. JONES. That one amendment; yes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, when that amendment is offered, I would like also to be permitted to offer this prohibition amendment.

Mr. JONES. Consent was given specifically to offer this amendment and none other.

Mr. BRYAN. Then I will withdraw the proposition so far as that section is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 21, after the word "October," insert the word "next." Line 22, after the word "the," strike out the word "next."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia about a cognate matter, possibly?

Mr. BRYAN. Cognac?

Mr. MANN. What is cognac? I know what "cognate" means. I suppose the gentleman from Washington is familiar with the "juice," however. [Laughter.] On page 16, in reference to the election of the Resident Commissioners, was that entirely changed? It is section 20.

Mr. JONES. Leave was given to return to that section. It is on page 17, in section 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to return to page 17, section 20. Permission was given to return to that section for this specific purpose. I desire to strike out the word "twenty-one," which was inserted as an amendment to line 5. The committee amended line 5 by striking out "nineteen" and inserting "twenty-one." I now move to strike out the word "twenty-one" and insert "twenty-two."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 5, strike out the word "twenty-one" and insert the word "twenty-two."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia if the term has been fixed at six years for the Resident Commissioners?

Mr. JONES. Yes; it has been fixed at six years.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman has had his attention called to the fact that, as the bill read before, there was an interim?

Mr. JONES. Yes. The attention of the Chairman was called to that fact by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. We have gone back to correct that. Now, the effect of this amendment is to extend the first term of the Commissioners for about two months. After that it will be six years.

Mr. MANN. May I ask another question? On page 16, line 16, it reads:

Each of said Resident Commissioners shall, in addition to the salary and expenses now allowed by law, be allowed the same sum for stationery and for the pay of necessary clerk hire as is now allowed to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Has that been changed?

Mr. JONES. That has not been changed.

Mr. MANN. Should not the word "mileage" be inserted before "expenses"?

Mr. JONES. No; because there is a special act which gives the Commissioners $2,000 in lieu of mileage.

Mr. MANN. I know; so that it would read "mileage expenses." They get a stationery account, and they get clerk hire. You do not want to duplicate that?

Mr. JONES. No; we do not want to duplicate that.

Mr. MANN. It says, "in addition to the salary and expenses now allowed by law," which includes stationery and clerk hire, they shall be allowed "the same sum for stationery and for the pay of necessary clerk hire as is now allowed to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States." Now, if we should insert, before the word "expenses," the word "mileage," it would read, "in addition to the salary and mileage expenses now allowed by law," and so forth. That would fix it. They should be allowed stationery and clerk hire. Otherwise you duplicate the stationery and mileage account.

Mr. JONES. I do not think it would be proper to put in the word "mileage," because a lump sum is allowed now in lieu of mileage.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I understand; but it is mileage expenses. It would be called "mileage expenses." They are now allowed, as Members of Congress are, mileage expenses, except that there is a fixed sum; and they are also allowed a stationery account and a clerk-hire account. Those expenses they are now allowed.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is asking unanimous consent, then——

Mr. MANN. No; I was asking if that was inserted.

Mr. JONES. The suggestion of the gentleman is that instead of "expenses" it should read, "the sums now allowed in lieu of mileage.' I see no objection to that.

Mr. MANN. Yes; so that it would not duplicate the stationery and clerk-hire account.

Mr. JONES. That is what the word "expenses" was meant to cover. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, then——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has another amendment pending.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment.

A little while ago the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] made a statement which, it appears to me, ought not to be allowed to go unchallenged. His attack on the Democratic Party should be refuted. And inasmuch as no gentleman on that side of the House has seen fit to answer it, I want to call attention to it for just a moment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] criticizes the Democratic campaign textbook because it does not contain the Baltimore platform.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I hope the gentleman will not do that now for two or three minutes. He will not make progress if he does.

Mr. JONES. I hope the gentleman——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will get through in three minutes.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman was frank enough yesterday to ask to be allowed to proceed out of order. I never knew of a gentleman to make a request like that before. Now, he is proceeding to do without permission what he asked permission to do yesterday, when permission was granted.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman will possess his soul in patience for three minutes, I will agree to quit.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will agree to quit permanently, all right. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Not permanently, so long as you have a Democratic majority here, but only for this time. [Laughter.]

What I wanted to call attention to is this—something which some one on that side ought to have called attention to, but did not—because the criticism of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] was unjust. He criticized the Democratic campaign textbook, because it did not contain the Baltimore platform. How could they have put into that textbook any part of the Democratic platform when there is none left? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE. Does not the gentleman know that, in addition to leaving out the Panama Canal plank and the one-term plank for President, they also claim credit for the passage of the seamen's bill? I would like to know when that bill passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Democratic campaign textbook is just as notable for what it leaves out as for what it puts in. Who would believe a Democratic platform promise, anyway? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE. Maybe the Filipinos.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, no. The Filipinos know how other people have been deceived, and instead of taunting them about not putting their platform into their textbook, you ought to compliment them on it. They are trying to forget it. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE. They used to tell it to the marines, but now they tell it to the Filipinos.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think I have sufficiently defended these distinguished gentlemen over there; they could not defend themselves. They are all tied to the President. I do not think it is fair for my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to taunt them when they are not in a position to reply.

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, may I not reply? A personal attack has been made upon me. I have been accused of defending the Democratic platform. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I must object to any further discussion out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, on page 16, line 16, to strike out the words "expenses now allowed by law" and insert the words "the sum now allowed in lieu of mileage."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 16, strike out the words "expenses now allowed by law" and insert in lieu thereof "the sum now allowed in lieu of mileage."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that he does not desire to strike out any more than the word "expenses," because "allowed by law" refers back to salary as well as mileage.

Mr. JONES. I think the gentleman is right about that; that was my first thought.

Mr. MILLER. It should read, "in addition to the salary the sum in lieu of mileage now allowed by law."

Mr. JONES. "The sum in lieu of mileage" should be inserted in place of the word "expenses." Mr. Chairman, I ask to modify my amendment so that we strike out the word "expenses" and insert "the sum in lieu of mileage."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 16, strike out the word "expenses" and insert the words "the sum in lieu of mileage," so that the amended lines will read: "Each of said Resident Commissioners shall, in addition to the salary and the sum in lieu of mileage now allowed by law, be allowed the same sum of stationery," etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the amendment just reported by the Clerk be made. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The Democratic Party having done so little toward carrying out its platform pledges, they felt it incumbent on them to carry out one promise, and that is the Philippine promise. This is, I assume, on the theory that even if they do not keep faith with the American people they should keep faith with the Filipinos. I do not think, however, that justifies the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] in defending the writer of the Democratic campaign textbook in all he says. That gentleman charges the administration with being responsible for all the present——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Wyoming is not discussing his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I was proceeding to discuss the matter that was discussed a moment ago. If the gentleman on the other side will inform me what the last word is, I will discuss that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman from Wyoming, with all his keen intelligence, has not perception enough to know what the last word is, I shall not inform him. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the administration ought to be charged with all the crime and chaos in Mexico, and that is what their Democratic campaign textbook has charged the administration with.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order again that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the next thing in order is to return to the preamble in accordance with the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any other part of the bill that was to be returned to?

Mr. JONES. Yes, Mr. Chairman; there is one other item.

Mr. MILLER. I was endeavoring to get recognition for the amendment that I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 19, line 4, by striking out after the word "law" the remainder of the sentence and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That whenever the Governor General shall exercise the authority granted in this section he shall at once notify the President of the United States thereof, together with the attending facts and circumstances, and the President shall have power to modify or vacate the action of the Governor General."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any objection on this side to that amendment.

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

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

Mr. JONES. Now, Mr. Chairman, the next thing is to return to the preamble, as I understand the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it was never the intention of the people of the United States in the incipiency of the War with Spain to make it a war of conquest or for territorial aggrandizement; and

Whereas it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein; and

Whereas for the speedy accomplishment of such purpose it is desirable to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines as large a control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without, in the meantime, impairing the exercise of the rights of sovereignty by the people of the United States, in order that, by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be the better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence: Therefore——

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, before the amendment is reported I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia if we can not make some agreement as to the time for discussion of this preamble.

Mr. JONES. I should be very glad to come to some agreement. It is now 10 minutes of 3 o'clock. We want to vote on this bill this evening. I think that was the understanding on yesterday, when the business in order on Wednesday was made in order on Thursday, so that we might be able to complete this bill to-day. We have taken up so much time now in the discussion of amendments that there is not a great deal of time left. What would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. TOWNER. I should think we ought to have on this side one hour. This is the most important thing in the whole bill.

Mr. JONES. That is, two hours' discussion of the preamble and all amendments?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. JONES. That would bring it up to 10 minutes of 5. Then there is to be a half hour of general debate.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to waive that.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman will waive the 15 minutes allotted to his side?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; on the supposition, of course, that the gentleman will do the same in respect to his side.

Mr. JONES. But I had arranged with a gentleman on this side to occupy those 15 minutes, and, of course, I can not waive that.

Mr. TOWNER. Let the 15 minutes be considered as part of the hour.

Mr. JONES. That the 30 minutes are to be considered a part of the two hours?

Mr. TOWNER. Very well.

Mr. JONES. I do not object to that.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman submit the request, or shall I?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the preamble and all amendments thereto be limited to two hours, one half to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and that the half hour of general debate which has been agreed to shall be included within the two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the preamble and amendments thereto be concluded in two hours, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and that the half hour of general debate heretofore agreed upon shall be included in the two hours. Is there objection?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some understanding about "where we are at" in this sort of a division. I understand that upon this side the chairman is opposed to any amendments to the preamble, and I do not understand what the position of the gentleman from Iowa is upon that side. I think the time ought to be divided equally in reference to the question at issue. I have no objection to limiting debate to two hours. I think that is longer than is necessary.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Iowa if he would object to so modifying the request which I have made that of these two hours, one half to be taken from the hour controlled by him and the other half to be taken from the hour controlled by myself, the gentleman from Texas be allowed 10 minutes?

Mr. TOWNER. No; we are as much opposed to the gentleman's amendment as the gentleman is. We have already given up 15 minutes of our time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit the amendment to be reported, and then take up the question of this agreement for time? I have not heard the amendment.

Mr. TOWNER. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the preamble and inserting the following:

"That it is the purpose of the United States to cease exercising sovereignty over the Philippine Islands as soon as may be with justice to them and honor to the United States, and that it is the preference of the United States to accomplish this purpose by establishing an independent government in said islands; that in pursuance of such purpose and preference the President is respectfully requested to consider the expediency of opening negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Spain, and such other Governments as he may think advisable, with a view of effecting a joint treaty with such Governments, by which it shall be provided that an independent government in the Philippine Islands, when established by the United States, shall be recognized and preserved; that pending the establishment of such independent Philippine government the Philippine Islands shall be neutral territory; that such Philippine government, when established, shall agree that it will maintain equality of trade relations toward all the signatory powers, and that in the event of war between any of the nations of the earth it shall be neutral; that such concessions as may be made by the United States in the establishment of such independent government shall be recognized by all the signatory powers."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, first, that that exact proposition has been voted upon, and, second, that it is not germane to the preamble. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I would rather the gentleman would make the point of order now.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. BURGESS. Then we will have a brief discussion of it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I am not much of a parliamentarian, but I take it that there are others here who are. I call attention to what Mr. Speaker CLARK said on October 2, 1914, in the discussion of this very matter. He then said:

If the gentleman will permit, of course I do not know the exact processes of the mind of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS], although I am remarkably well acquainted with him; but I take it that the reason he offered his resolution as section 1½ to this bill is that under parliamentary practice we do not get to the preamble until we get through with the bill. My own judgment about it is that as a parliamentary proposition it would come in as a substitute for the preamble; but it would be like locking the barn door after the horse is gone; and the gentleman has given notice that he proposes to strike out the preamble if his amendment goes in. So that it is practically offered as a substitute for the preamble.

I submit that in the absence of any authority or any pretense of any, that is the highest authority that we have in this House—the Speaker's own words. Further than that, to take a general and common-sense view of the situation, this resolution of mine which I have offered as an amendment to the preamble is so worded and framed as to come in line with the original preamble. The thing about it is that it goes further; that it does direct the President to enter into negotiations. That ought to be done. If it can be done in this way, what is the objection to it? I submit when I offered this as an amendment to the bill they made the point of order to that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. No point of order was made.

Mr. BURGESS. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. A point of order was made and it was overruled. Then, when it is offered to amend the preamble, it is said that there is no place for it in the bill. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill dealing with the Philippine question, and it deals broadly with it, and I think, although I am no parliamentarian and do not set myself up as such, it is clearly in order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I simply call the attention of the Chair, first, to the fact that the precise proposition which the gentleman now offers was offered as an amendment to the bill. The precise proposition in the precise language was voted down. It has therefore been disposed of, and the effort of the gentleman now is to get a vote upon that which has already been disposed of and settled. The second point of my parliamentary contention is that it is not germane to the preamble. A preamble, Mr. Chairman, is nothing but a recitation of facts or supposed facts. We do not put into a preamble a direction to anybody to do anything. See how this would read if the amendment of the gentleman from Texas were to prevail—to strike out the preamble and insert in lieu thereof

the resolution which he has sent to the Clerk's desk, and before the enacting clause. It contains no recitation of facts——

Mr. BURGESS. The gentleman is mistaken about that; it begins by declaring the purpose of the United States.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. All right; I admit that. It does contain a specific direction to the President that he shall do a particular thing. Is it possible for any gentleman to conceive of putting into the preamble of a bill, or even a resolution, before the enacting clause, a proposition directing the President or anybody else to take a certain course? The preamble recites the facts. Directions must be contained in the enacting or resolving clause of the bill or resolution, as the case may be. With all possible respect, Mr. Chairman, if the amendment of the gentleman from Texas were to prevail and this preamble were to be stricken out and the resolution which he has sent to the desk be substituted in its place, it would leave this bill in the most peculiar shape grammatically, legislatively, and rhetorically that any bill was ever left in in the history of any legislative body in the world. Upon these two points I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas care to be heard further?

Mr. BURGESS. No; I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that, in view of the fact that this identical proposition has already been presented to the committee and been disposed of in the form in which it is now offered, it would not be proper to offer it as a substitute for the preamble. Furthermore, the Chair does not believe it is germane to the preamble, and for these reasons the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BURGESS. The Chair will note that I take exception to the Chair's ruling.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I now renew my request.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Virginia what the status of amendments which some gentlemen may propose would be?

Mr. JONES. They would all have to be offered within the two hours.

Mr. MILLER. And then voted upon one after the other at the conclusion of general debate?

Mr. JONES. They would have to be voted upon during the two hours, I think. The request I made was that this preamble and all amendments that might be offered to it should be disposed of within two hours.

Mr. MILLER. Then, if I understand the gentleman, it is his intention that a Member who speaks in his time will offer such amendment or amendments as he desires, and at the conclusion of his remarks the amendment or amendments which he has offered will be voted upon.

Mr. JONES. That will be all right.

Mr. MILLER. I have no objection just so it is understood.

Mr. JONES. With the understanding, I have no objection; that they be voted upon at the conclusion of the debate.

Mr. MILLER. It is understood the time that may be occupied in voting upon an amendment will not be taken out of the two hours.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I do not presume much time will be occupied.

Mr. JONES. There will be two hours of general debate, and then the amendments will be voted on, but there will be no debate after the two hours.

Mr. MILLER. I understand.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from Minnesota will understand that all debate, so to speak, must be embraced within the two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the preamble close in two hours, one half of that time to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and at the end of that time the amendments offered shall be voted upon, and that the 30 minutes of general debate included in a former agreement shall be included in the two hours. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Virginia if he thinks two hours, one hour to a side, is enough for the discussion of a subject of such tremendous importance as this?

Mr. JONES. It would not be if we had not already devoted 7½ hours to discussion of this subject. As I stated a few moments ago, we are very anxious to get through with this matter this evening, and probably there will be an aye and no vote in the House that will run way after 6 o'clock.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from Virginia will remember that the issue was not made until the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] declared that he was opposed to the United States ever relinquishing control over the Philippine Islands, which injected a new issue, one unknown to the politics of this country, I think. I never heard of it being stated by one so prominent.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the debate went on for several hours after that, and I really think two hours' debate on the preamble is a very liberal allowance of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. Reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will permit, is it contemplated having a vote on the bill this evening?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. It is too late.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee (continuing). Do I understand the agreement was to close debate and then have the amendments voted on?

The CHAIRMAN. The agreement was to close all debate on the preamble and amendments thereto in two hours. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the hour on this side.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am emphatically opposed to the preamble, to every paragraph of it, and to every line in it; but I assume that there may be a desire upon the part of the majority, who have the preponderance of votes in the committee, to maintain the preamble in the bill, and therefore I have three amendments which I desire to offer. The first amendment is to insert after the word "stable" in the second paragraph of the preamble the word "representative." The second amendment is to insert in the same line after the word "established" the two words "and maintained."

The third amendment which I desire to offer is as follows, to follow the second paragraph:

Provided, That the people of the Philippine Islands shall desire their independence, expressed by a majority vote of the qualified electors at the general election held next after it shall be decided that suitable government can be established.

Directing our attention first to the preamble as a whole, I think this is one of the most remarkable features of any bill that has ever been presented for the consideration of the Congress. It is to be noted, as has been stated many times before, that this is not a part of the bill. It is simply a gratuitous statement. It is not a promise; it is not an assurance. It simply says it has always been the intention of the people of the United States to give to the Philippine Islands independence. When? When a suitable government can be established therein. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a provision aimed for the welfare of the people of those islands, but a provision in the nature of playing party politics within the United States. In the Democratic platform language something like this is used—but no more futile language touching a great matter was ever employed—"as soon as a stable government can be established."

Mr. Chairman, to-day there is a stable government in the islands. Nay, more; there has been a stable government in the islands at least during the past 13 years. If, therefore, our guide is to be when a stable government can be established, the time for their independence is now, and any bill short of that is pure buncombe and an attempt to mislead and hoodwink rather than an attempt to carry out a policy.

But, Mr. Chairman, if it be contended that it means as soon as a stable government can be established by the Filipinos, we still have a matter that needs further elucidation. The Philippine people can establish a stable government to-day. It would not be a representative government; it would not be a republican form of government, as we understand it, but it would be a stable government. I believe that they could establish tomorrow a limited monarchy, and that government would be reasonably efficient and reasonably well maintained. It, therefore, it is the intention of the people of the United States to give to these people independence as soon as they can establish a government, that certainly comprehends a limited monarchy. But if it is the intention only to give them their independence when a representative government can be established and maintained by them, then let us write it in the bill. But above all, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we should consider the people of the islands. It seems to me that we should be guided by considerations of their wishes and their welfare rather than attempt to play party politics within the United States.

Do the people of the Philippine Islands to-day want immediate independence? No; they do not. Will they want it 10 years from now? I do not know and you do not know. I do not believe they will. But above all things we should give

them the right to say whether they prefer to establish a government of their own by themselves or whether they prefer to remain beneath the American flag. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If it is the intent of Democracy to scuttle the ship, if it be the intent of Democracy to haul down the flag and withdraw our frontiers to our own shores, regardless of what may be the desire of that people or what may happen to them, then adopt the preamble. But if you are actuated by more humanitarian motives, if you have in your hearts altruistic designs, you will never adopt this preamble in its present form. I believe that in this bill and in this preamble there is an open confession of two things, namely, that the whole Democratic policy toward the Philippine Islands from 1900 until now has been wrong; that the whole policy of the Republican Party during that time has been right [applause on the Republican side]; that the Philippine people during that period of time at no moment have been capable of maintaining self-government and independence. Nay, more, that even after 14 years of the best instruction that a human soul ever had in government they are to-day still incapable of establishing and maintaining a government under independence. When will the time come? Nobody knows.

Therefore my second proposition is that this sounds the death knell of independence to the islands, at least during any period of time reasonable for us to consider. I am firmly of the opinion that the people of the Philippine Islands, having before their minds the historic events of the past 60 days, are trembling for fear you will haul down the American flag. Only on yesterday I received an account of an article in a native paper published in the islands that heretofore has been most extravagant in its requests for independence containing this remarkable confession:

> We now see after what has happened to Belgium, after what has happened to Luxemburg, after what we behold in various parts of the world, that the Philippine Islands need the United States now more than the United States needs the Philippine Islands.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

That sentiment is going to grow. I believe the political thought of the islands is bound to turn more and more away from independence to the industrial development of their resources.

While this bill and this preamble clearly indicate a new Democratic policy, one that in no sense contemplates independence of the islands for at least a great many years to come, yet in the passage of the preamble I can see a source of real trouble. To the Filipino mind the existence of this preamble will likely be taken to mean independence within a year or two, ever near at hand, and the scheming politician can easily foment agitation. As long as independence is not to be granted at any time possible now even to guess, it is the height of folly to place this preamble here.

It certainly is highly improper for a nation to say now what in the future it will do, especially in relation to its sovereignty. To do so is far from a statesmanlike course To do so is to create embarrassments and difficulties for the future. In years to come it may be preeminently desired, for a thousand reasons, both by the people of the islands and by the people of the United States, that the Philippine Archipelago remain a part of the United States. Why bind the future by unnecessary statements now? Why blindly declare the course of our conduct in the future without knowing what the future will bring forth? Will gentlemen insist at some future date to withdraw our sovereignty from the islands, even though the people of the islands beg and pray for it to remain? Are gentlemen so bent on partisanship that they are deaf alike to their Nation's honor and the call of humanity?

Mr. Chairman, the roll is soon to be called upon the passage of the bill. If this preamble be eliminated, I am inclined to vote for the measure, but if retained, I must oppose the whole.

While I say I would support the bill divested of the preamble, I do not wish it to be understood that I believe in all the features it contains. The best part of the bill—probably its largest part, as well—consists in its grant to the Filipinos of a complete legislature elected by them. I congratulate the framers of the measure for having adopted the one great recommendation I made, now almost a year ago, after my tour through the islands. I then said, as I have since many times repeated, that the Filipinos should have the full power to choose their own legislature, the full power to legislate for themselves, subject only to the check and restraint from an absolute veto. The absolute veto was at first criticized, but that principle has been made a part of the bill. I believe the people there will make reasonably wise use of this grant of legislative power, and, besides, its exercise will greatly train them in the business of government.

I am for the bill as a whole because it is up now for action, although I think its enactment now is premature. As long as the government in the islands is to be remodeled, let us do a good job of it—give to the Filipinos the fullest measure of power and see what use they make of it. Let them have a full and a fair chance to demonstrate what they can do. It would have been wise, in my opinion, if this complete reorganization of the government had been considerably postponed, but the intent is to reorganize now, and in the consideration of the bill I have sincerely tried to perfect it.

But let no one be deceived. In many ways this bill gives too suddenly power that should be acquired gradually. The enactment of this bill into law will inevitably decrease very materially the efficiency of the government in the islands. We have heard blind prejudice criticize and narrow partisanship malign the government hitherto maintained in the islands since they came beneath our flag, and yet the truth is, the truth a wiser world in the passage of time will recognize, is that in these far-away islands the Americans have established and maintained a better government than they have provided for themselves anywhere within the confines of the United States.

Under the provision extending the franchise, elections will likely present a sad and heartbreaking spectacle. But out of this slough the people will gradually climb. I hope they will rapidly overcome the election difficulties with which they will at first be embarrassed.

Then, too, the splendid work already well advanced among the non-Christian tribes will be materially halted. The method of handling the wild-tribe problem provided for in the bill will inevitably lead to many difficulties from which the wild man will surely suffer. A million of these people trustingly look to the United States as their great friend here on earth. I sincerely hope the Filipinos will measure up to the duty incumbent upon them, realize the responsibility now largely shifted to them, and by wise as well as generous conduct demonstrate that they are the brothers of these untutored savages.

I have great faith in the Filipino people. I want them to develop a distinct nationality and make their contribution to the advancement of human kind. The opportunity is before them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

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

[Mr. COOPER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further debate on this preamble——

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes' time to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that amendments ought to be offered or be considered pending, because we have to vote on them as soon as this debate is concluded.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] has offered his amendments.

Mr. MANN. No; he did not offer them.

Mr. JONES. I understood that he indicated that he would offer them.

Mr. MANN. That will be done right away.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, in the opening of the debate, or rather at the close of the opening debate on this bill, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] referred to the fact that most of the discussion had been not on the bill but on the preamble. That was not extraordinary, as the gentleman should have realized, and possibly did.

Whether this declaration in the form of a preamble is the fruit of the settled conviction of a great party or is simply a piece of cheap political buncombe, in any event it is the thunder in the prelude that overshadows and colors all that follows. These people over yonder are not children. They can recognize a good thing in a political gift without having it sugar-coated by something that we may not be able to live up to and that they may never desire that we shall live up to.

Many of the provisions of this bill are good. I think that I should be willing to vote for all of its provisions if it were not for this misleading, unwise, unnecessary preamble. We are not in the Philippines and we never have been there for any purpose of exploitation. There is not a man under the flag that has ever had any other notion, no matter what party he belongs to, except that we have a great duty to perform over there.

I do not think the American people believe, or will believe, that duty can be performed by any policy of scuttle and surrender of our responsibilities. I look forward to the time when the Filipino people, having advanced in their knowledge of

representative government, will realize how helpful it is to them, will realize how useful it is to them, aye, when they will take pride, as I think they now do, in the fact that they are politically united with the greatest Commonwealth of all time, as the eloquent representative of that people referred to the United States the other day.

Our relations with these people have been inspiring to us. They have been helpful to them. Never in history have any people advanced as these people have advanced with our aid and with our assistance and guidance. The future does not present to me any picture of our surrender of responsibility and the ultimate gobbling up of those islands by some oriental despotism. It presents to me an inspiring view of advancement, of enlightenment, of progress, under the guiding hand and strong protection of this great Republic, a view which in the days to come the people of the Philippine Islands will applaud as fully as our own people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Our acts and attitude toward these people must primarily be based on our opinion of what they desire and what is for their best interest. I would no more declare that it is our intention to hold the islands permanently than I would declare it is our intention to let them go. The future must decide that, and it will be decided in view of what those people may desire when the time arrives when they may be able to stand alone. For the present let us give them every particle of self-government they can wisely use and administer, and let the future decide what it is wise to do when the time for such a decision may arrive. Liberty and good government are what the people want. They can have it as well, and for the present at least better, united with us than as an independent government.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. HELM].

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, this preamble that has been so much criticized by gentlemen on the Republican side of the Chamber is the will and testament of the Democratic Party to the Philippine people.

Contrast the actions of the present Democratic Governor General, the policy of the Democratic Party as announced in the preamble, and the liberal provisions of this bill with the course pursued when the Republican Party was in power; when you, by inexcusable and unjustifiable war, subjugated these people, and now call it a blessing. As well should the Belgian people to-day return thanks and offer up their benedictions to the force, the overpowering force, that has desolated that country, as did the overpowering force of the United States subdue the Filipinos.

You made an unforgivable war on a people who had allied themselves with the American forces to drive out a people that were misgoverning these islands. You turned upon your allies and waged war upon them, and now take the position that you have conferred a blessing upon the people upon whom you have made an unpardonable war. The same subtle and promoting influences that were then at work reassert and disclose themselves here again when the leader of the Republican Party [Mr. MANN] but a few days ago said that we want to hold these islands on account of an inevitable war that he foresaw, and cited the fact that the colonies were coming to the assistance and aid of England; so would the Philippine Islands come to our rescue in time of like distress. Unwittingly he has raised the curtain and disclosed the real motive of the military party that was behind the McKinley administration which involved the United States in the Philippine Islands, and now insists on their retention.

Imperialism as against democracy! If we need these islands for war purpose, the argument of the gentleman from Illinois would say, "Give us other colonies for like uses and purposes as England has them." Imperialism in its worst form! Of what aid would England's colonies now be to her without her command of the sea? If we are going to embark in this war game and colonial policy, we need a Navy that will be as much greater than England as England and her allies now are to Germany; a standing Army stronger and more efficient than Germany's. How long will this Republic last after this warlike policy has been established? As between the two pictures, the Democratic Party presents this bill, working back as rapidly and as safely as it can to give these people the management and control of their own affairs, and in due season their independence.

This is the first time that a government that has by conquest acquired sovereignty over the territory of another nation or race of people declares by its official and only mouthpiece that it proposes to voluntarily surrender that sovereignty over the country that it had acquired by conquest. Search the annals of history and where will you find a nation or country that has acquired another territory, described, as are the Philippine Islands, as of boundless resources, of wonderful fertility—where can you show me a like instance that that Government has freely and voluntarily given back to the people the control of the government and the sovereignty that it took away by force? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I listened with some degree of emotion to the distinguished gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. HELM]. He calls this declaration in the preamble the Democratic will and testament to the Philippines. I was aware of the fact that the Democratic Party was sick, but I did not know that it had reached that stage where it thought it was necessary to make its will. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But it soon would be dead if the people of this country believed that the Democratic Party stood for the doctrine that was preached by the gentleman from Kentucky who has just taken his seat. In my judgment, that was a speech more to be condemned than any that I have heard made upon this question. When he rails against his own country for going into the Philippines, he is welcome to any credit that he can bring to himself or the Democratic Party. Such harangues will find no response from the American people.

My objection to this preamble is largely because of the fact that it does not state any position on account of its duplicity. It is drawn so as to make the Filipinos believe that we want to give them independence, and to make the American people believe that we do not. That part of the preamble in which it says—

> Whereas it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein—

I take issue with as to the fact.

What party declared for it except the Democratic Party, and when did the Democratic Party and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] become a majority of the people of the United States, or have a right to speak for a majority on questions of that character? The Republican Party never so declared, and the Progressive Party never so declared, and that other platform that was drawn at Chicago by the Roosevelt forces when they thought he was going to be nominated had this declaration in regard to the Philippines:

> We pledge the Republican Party to complete the work of preparing the Philippine Islands for self-government under the American flag.

No party except the Democratic Party has ever declared for independence. No party except the Democratic Party, and no man, so far as I know, except the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HELM], has ever thought that the Stars and Stripes brought an injury to any country. Only once before in the history of this Nation did we ever haul down the flag, and we have been ashamed of it ever since, and we should be. That act, under a former administration, a Democratic one, of course, forever discredited us in the eyes of the world.

I do not believe the Filipinos wish independence. Those who think they will govern do; those that will be governed do not. I believe that when the Filipinos are sufficiently intelligent to govern themselves they will be sufficiently intelligent to appreciate the advantages of remaining under our flag. Wherever the Stars and Stripes have gone they have brought good, and they will bring only good to the Philippine Islands. For one, I am opposed to the cowardly proposition to turn these islands loose, to become a prey of the other nations of the world. Such act would cause us forever to be despised by all right-thinking men. To give them independence and then agree to protect them from their own folly and the strong nations of the world would be dangerous to us and ruinous to them. If the time ever comes when we grant independence to the Philippines, then let it be complete and unconditional. We did not go in there of our own volition, but we would be untrue to our trust and untrue to civilization and untrue to ourselves to turn those islands loose under any conditions whatsoever. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that we should not think of granting independence to the Philippines at this time, and I do not believe the time will ever come when we could. I agree with him that our highest duty is to give them fullest liberty and make them our friends. Talk of independence now can only do harm and hold out hope to the Filipino people that will not be realized. The Democratic Party will talk independence for political purposes, but they will never vote it for the same reason. It is perfectly safe for the Democratic Party to promise that they will grant independence when "a stable government is established." Behind

that phrase the Democratic Party can dodge and hide as long as they will. Such promise is nothing but a delusion and a snare to the Filipino people. Such promise is intended to mislead the people of the Philippines. The youngest of those now in the islands will not live to see the fulfillment of that Democratic promise, nor any real attempt to fulfill it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, several years ago, in reading the debates in Congress, I observed the statement of one of those who spoke for the policy of benevolent assimilation in the Senate, and I well remember his words. He said there were mountains of gold in the Philippines, and that they were ours forever! I am glad that I have an opportunity to participate in erasing the stain of that declaration from this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, they tell us that we are holding the Philippines for their own good and not ours. This plea of benevolence for others is a subterfuge as old as history. Every man who has enslaved another man has enslaved him under the claim that it was for the benefit of the slave. Every nation that has conquered and subjugated a defenseless people has conquered them under the claim that it was for the benefit of the subjugated. Every burden and iniquity that has been heaped upon the weak by the strong has been under the claim that it was for the benefit of the weak. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And the claim made here is only a repetition in history, when they tell us now that the Filipinos do not desire independence. It is only following in line with a policy of justification as old as the rule of force and might, and it has ever been thus. The slaves have never desired their liberty if we are to take the word of the slaveholder. The conquered have never desired their freedom if we are to take the word of the conqueror. They have always asked for their own slavery and subjugation and a continuance of their thralldom and their captive state. Such has ever been the claim of the disciples of benevolent assimilation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is a matter of history that when we acquired the Philippine Islands the life of Washington and the history of the American Revolution were found scattered broadcast over those islands. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Following in our example, they, too, were dreaming of liberty and independence, but, alas, only to awake in the grasp of a phantom they were following for deliverance. I believe that liberty and self-government can be better taught by example than by conquest and subjugation; that men will follow with glad hearts where they will resent force and coercion. The mission of this Government is not conquest and subjugation. It is to preserve the principles of self-government at home and promote popular rule abroad. That is our mission, and it is a great and glorious mission.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that some men are wiser than other men; it is true that some men are more intelligent than other men; it is true that some men have a greater fund of information in store than other men; but no man is so much wiser, or so much more intelligent, or in possession of so much greater store of information than other men, that he is entitled to tell another man what that other man likes, or what is good for him, or how he should live or love or worship, or to govern him against his will and consent.

The eloquent pleas, the brilliant advocacy, and the tireless activity of the Commissioner from the Philippines [Mr. QUEZON] for the independence of those islands is a full, complete denial, a conclusive rejection and disproval of this subterfuge and transparent apology for holding these people against their will and consent on the ground that they are incapable of self-government and are not asking for a government of their own.

But our retention of these islands is not only in violation of inalienable human rights and in disregard of the fundamental principles of our institutions, but it is and will be a continuing drain upon our Treasury, a menace to our peace among the nations, and a jeopardy to our security and very national existence. In case of war, these far-away islands in the Tropics, 10,000 miles across the sea, could only be defended, if defense was possible, at an appalling cost in treasure and an awful sacrifice of the lives of our citizens.

And if it was justifiable for us to withhold liberty from these people on the ground of their own well-being, we are precluded from such denial to them by our solemn vows before the world in matters of human rights and by deeds of our forefathers, who consecrated their lives to the principle that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. We are precluded by our declaration of the rights of men, which we read in the indelible hues of the Stars and Stripes waving from every flagstaff on land and unfolding from every masthead on the sea, in the great Dome of this Capitol, lifting the symbol of our devotion heavenward, in the Mounment to Washington, standing out in its dizzy heights against the sky, and in the hearts of 90,000,000 of people, throbbing with the pride and honor of their own freedom and independence before the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, during this Congress I have taken great pleasure in voting on pretty nearly all of the great administration measures with the President of the United States, and I am glad I did so; and if I had the whole thing to do over again, I would vote the same way. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But I would not vote for this preamble to this Philippine bill. I would prefer to change my vote on any measure that I have voted on in this Congress than to vote favorably on this Philippine preamble. I think it is wrong in principle. I believe that it is violative of the very purposes that the Government should have in mind in developing its policy in the Pacific Ocean. Aside from the fact that it will disturb conditions over there and make those people uncertain, if it were binding upon us, it would commit us to a policy that is likely to be destructive of ourselves and of our own rights. Why was it that we took the Philippine Islands? The gentleman just spoke of history and what history said about it. I suppose you will accept Woodrow Wilson as a good authority on history, and you will accept his chronicles as those of an impartial historian. Here is what he said was the reason why President McKinley favored the taking of the Philippine Islands and why they were taken; I quote from his book on Epochs of American History, page 344:

> One of the principal reasons that President McKinley had in mind for demanding the Philippines was furnished by the fact that at this time the Empire of China seemed to be tottering to its fall and that the powers of Europe were even then parceling out the prospective spoils. We already had considerable trade interests with the Orient, and the President was persuaded that these might be largely increased if we could but acquire a vestibule thereto somewhat similar to that which England had had at Hongkong for years or that which Germany had just acquired at Kiaochow. But the Philippines once acquired, the very example which had suggested their acquisition seemed now of dangerous import for American interests For if, in addition to obtaining naval stations and ports of entry to the Chinese Empire, the powers of Europe should proceed to partition its whole vast area and population among themselves, the next step would naturally be the exclusion by each of all others from its respective allotment, and the upshot of the matter would be that the United States would find itself possessed of the Philippines, indeed, but, so far as Chinese trade was concerned, more entirely out in the cold than ever. In brief, the acquisition of the Philippines carried with it as a corollary American championship of the integrity of China and of the "open door" to Chinese trade.

The taking of the islands was popular. The American people backed it up, and, as all will remember, when the treaty came up for approval and it took two-thirds in the United States Senate to approve it, and they lacked two or three votes, Mr. William Jennings Bryan came across the country as the representative of Democracy at the time and urged the adoption of the treaty, and the treaty was adopted.

Mr. Chairman, there is a race issue in the Pacific Ocean beside which the race issue of the South pales into insignificance. The Japanese possess intelligence, they possess ingenuity, they possess ability in all lines that the Negro race never dreamed of and never will dream of if this world lasts for a million years. I want us to live at peace with Japan, and I believe we can do that very thing if we follow the chart that nature and destiny has marked out for us and refuse to falter and waver. If we let the world know that we have a policy and that we will live up to it, there will be no trouble. But those people on the Pacific Ocean are confronting us, they are confronting the white race on the Pacific Ocean, and we are compelled to maintain that we have the right to restrict their immigration into our country. We claim that we have the right to limit or exclude them, and at the same time we have the right to the trade of the Orient——

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

Mr. BRYAN. Make it short; I have only five minutes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. If we have the right to keep them from coming into this country, then have not they the equal moral right to keep us from going into their country?

Mr. BRYAN. If the gentleman believes that he would not be taken as a patriot on the Pacific coast. He would not be recognized as a patriot on the Pacific coast if he takes the position that we have not the right to shut the yellow race out from our country any more than they have the right to shut out our trade and ships of commerce. We let them come here to trade, but we can not attempt to amalgamate with them.

Harper's Weekly of June, 1913, tells in a dramatic way of a short speech of a farmer member of the California Legislature that silenced all opposition to the alien land bill and insured

its passage despite the protests and the pleas of the President and the Secretary of State.

My neighbor is a Jap—

Said the farmer member—

and he has an 80-acre fruit farm next to mine. He is smart and industrious, and I do not dislike him. He has a white woman living in his house. On that white woman's knee is a baby. Now, what is that baby? Is it white? Is it Japanese? I will tell you what it is. It is the beginning of the biggest race problem that the world has ever known.

The bureau of vital statistics of Sacramento, Col., in the year ending May, 1913, recorded 276 births of all nationalities. Of these 107 were Japanese, and half of that number were born of white mothers and Japanese fathers.

Lucile F. Dawson, who has resided in Japan for some years and made a close study of Japanese and oriental problems, writing for the Square Deal for October, has this to say:

In Tokyo, Yokohama, and Nagasaki, where the largest number of English-speaking people reside, there have been several of these international marriages, and in almost every instance the children of such unions have been degenerates. A Japanese teacher in an American school at Nagasaki is authority for this statement. She further said that upon investigation as to the cause of this degeneracy they found in every case both parents to be of the better class of Japanese and Occidental. Few of the European or American men intermarry with the Japanese women, but a great many white women marry Japanese men of the noble and Heimen classes. This latter class is between the classes we have in the United States and the nobility and are just as exclusive as the latter. It was this class whose courage, valor, and devotion to Japan were so admirably displayed during the Chinese and Russian wars. Yet, with some of the best blood of the Anglo-Saxon race and the healthiest and best of Japanese blood in their veins, American school statistics in Japan show these children to be not only backward but physically degenerate.

Another reason why the Japanese are so desirous of intermarrying with the better class of Caucasians is because of the physical inferiority of the Japanese people. Centuries of isolation, the exclusive use of vegetable food, climatic conditions, and intermarriage have had the effect of bringing about a lack of physical vigor and a race of small-statured people, a well-defined difference which characterizes the Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, and Teutonic races, a difference the ambitious Japanese is keenly cognizant of. And they are just as ambitious to remove this badge of inferiority from their race as they are to excel in warrior prowess.

Except England, there is no nation as aristocratic as Japan. From its first era there has been great distinction between the noble and ignoble classes, a condition which occidental influences have been unable to entirely eradicate, and which is as strong in the heart of the Yeta as it is in the heart of the great nobles. All classes point with pride to the fact that Japan is the only nation where the reigning imperial family has descended from time immemorial to the present, in one unbroken line of succession, the present Emperor being the one hundred and twenty-second of the imperial line.

They will tell you with pride what great statesmen they are and that as yet they have never been conquered by any other nation and, furthermore, they never will be. As we are the youngest nation in the world they will explain how impossible it is for Americans to be their superior, and how inferior our form of government is to theirs. The very lowest caste Japanese considers himself the superior of any American, and American customs, religions, and ideas of morality are far inferior to those of Japan, according to the Japanese lights.

It is to be hoped that we will never have war with Japan or China or with any other power concerning our Pacific interests. But our possessions in the Pacific exclusive of the Philippines have forced upon us certain obligations to which we must be faithful. The climax of our entire scheme in the Pacific is the open door in China. We stand for the territorial integrity of China and for the absolute freedom of all nations to trade in China on an equal basis. This policy is so fair and reasonable that we have been able to enforce it heretofore through diplomacy. Every step of history seems to accord with this policy. England is compelled to favor it, and it seems now that Germany is to be converted to it, and very likely Germany, after the termination of the present war, will be one of the strongest supporters of the policy. Japan may chafe some under the enforcement of the open door at times, but it almost seems that

That increasing purpose which through the ages runs

is with us in the enforcement of the open door in China. The Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, and the Dominion of Canada stand as controlling factors so far as the policy of England is concerned. These dependencies of England, which are practically free and independent Governments, will always support us in this open-door policy and in the maintenance of Caucasian authority in the Pacific. The instant that proposition is challenged by Japan, that instant the alliance between England and Japan must fall, or Canada, Australia, and New Zealand will turn against their mother country and stand with us. It seems that the God of Nations has willed it this way, has carved out this destiny for us, and put us in a position where we can stand for the highest ideals of altruism in our dealings with China and Japan and the Philippines, and yet can work out our own destiny and aid in fulfilling the most worthy and the sincerest ambitions and longings of the race, as well as promote stability and insure peace.

We are a peace-loving people. We do not care to emigrate to Japan or China, either, if they do not want us there. We do not want to own land in Japan. We do not want to crowd Japanese schools with American children and young men. We do not shut our doors to Japanese trade. We have a good friend in China, and our position as to the open-door policy and the preservation of the integrity of China insures a lasting friendship. By maintaining our position in the Philippines we can meet the falsehoods that may be circulated; we can demonstrate our American character to the orientals. I think it an awful mistake to throw hindrances in the way by lauding the Aguinaldos as the George Washingtons of the islands, by encouraging insurrection and discontent by titles to acts and by silly and vain preambles. Such procedure is little short of shameful.

JEALOUS NATIONS TRIED TO ELIMINATE US.

It has been said that we acquired the Philippines and paid $20,000,000 for them because Germany was negotiating with Spain for them. I do not know whether that is true or not, but if it was true, I think it was sufficient reason for us to close the bargain and not allow Germany to get that foothold in the Pacific under conditions that then existed. I am very much inclined to give credence to the report. Here is a statement that has an indirect bearing on the subject, made by Woodrow Wilson in Epochs of American History, page 344. After writing of European jealousies against us in the Spanish-American War, the author says:

It failed, but the jealousy that underlay it found expression now and then in more petty ways. In Manila Bay, for example, Admiral Diedrichs, of the German squadron, which had been dispatched thither after Dewey's victory for no adequate reason at all, became so officious that Dewey offered him "a fight if he wanted it," with the result of bringing such annoyances to an end.

Mr. Chairman, every man worthy of a seat in this House has his own individual views on the great economic, moral, and industrial questions of the day. I was brought up in the State of Louisiana and was taught Democracy as one of the fundamentals; yet as I came to manhood and paid closer attention to political arguments and party pretensions I observed that Democracy in Louisiana involved mainly a race issue and pride of southern history. I was not wanting in loyalty on either of these scores. But I also observed that on the great economic questions on which the parties differed the leading Louisiana Democrats were just as much Republican as they were Democrat. They were protectionists in so far as the tariff involved the customs rates on sugar, lumber, and rice. No Payne or Aldrich could put too much tariff on either of these products to suit these Louisiana Democrats. On labor issues, on money legislation, the Louisiana Senators and Members of Congress in that long-ago day were as standpat as Wall Street or the "infant industries" would have them.

After three years of Theodore Roosevelt as President I emigrated to the State of Washington. On the "paramount issue" of imperialism I had been dubbed Republican by one of my best friends, who is now one of the leaders of the party in the State of Louisiana, and when I landed on Puget Sound I was easily enthused on the destiny of America in the Pacific and the Orient. I gloried in the plans for extension of American influence in the Far East. Parker was running against Roosevelt, and the Democrats were holding their noses and voting for Parker. I at once became a Roosevelt supporter.

One of the main features that controlled my views at that time was the straightforward plans of Theodore Roosevelt and his advisers to take care of American interests and the interests of the Caucasian race in the Pacific. I had been brought up with a race issue dinning in my ears, and so I readily adapted my views to this new race issue. I believed in the expansion of trade and the extension of influence in the Pacific. The people of the country voted against a retreat from our position in the Pacific, and the people to-day are of the same opinion. Nobody knows any better than the Democratic leaders that the people of this country do not want this Nation committed to a policy of retreat and backdown in the Pacific, and so they come here in the face of the Democratic platform and are expecting to force through this House as a lame compliance with a platform pledge this title and preamble to their Philippine bill, which will be no part of the bill and will have no separate existence and will therefore be nothing.

The bill starts out with a falsehood and an attempt at deception when it is presented to Congress and to all who may read it hereafter with these words of introduction which compose its title:

A bill to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Yet there is not in the bill one word declaratory of "the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands."

If there were any doubt as to this proposition, the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], of the Committee on Insular Affairs, who has been aiding the chairman of that committee in presenting this bill, would clear all doubts. On October 2 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] offered an amendment to be incorporated in the act as a new section, attempting to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the islands, so as to take from the title of the act its falsehood and deceit by making it speak the truth. There was no question about the Democratic orthodoxy of the proposed amendment. The gentleman from Texas offered the following letter, written last January, on that point:

JANUARY 28, 1914.

MY DEAR BURGESS: I remember well your speech on the Philippine resolution in January, 1906, and was very favorably impressed then, and subsequent study has brought the fixed conviction that your resolution is the solution of the problem. It ought to be passed, as it not only accords with the last Democratic platform, but is based on the soundest and wisest principles.

Your friend, CHAMP CLARK.

But hear the distinguished Tennesseean [Mr. GARRETT]:

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the great thought which my friend from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] has given to this question. The amendment which he offers is an exact copy of a resolution introduced by him in 1904 originally and which has been reintroduced at each succeeding Congress and has been before the Committee on Insular Affairs ever since I have been a member of the committee. I am in a large measure in sympathy with part of the sentiment of the resolution; but I respectfully submit to the membership of the House that it has no place at this point or at any other point in this bill.

Speaker CLARK has a trait, rather unusual in some quarters, of standing up for and defending what he believes in, so he asked the gentleman from Tennessee this question:

Why is not this Burgess resolution just as pertinent to this bill as the preamble which is on it now?

To which question the gentleman from Tennessee replied:

Mr. Chairman, if it were in proper form offered as an amendment to the preamble, I would not undertake to say that it was not pertinent to that, although it contains a direction, while the preamble only contains a recitation; but it is offered as an independent section, section 1½, to the legislative part of the bill. You do not want to say by an enactment of law that it is the preference of the United States to do so and so.

Yet the title declares just precisely the opposite:

THE TITLE OF THE ACT.	MR. GARRETT OF TENNESSEE.
A bill to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the Philippine Islands and——	You do not want to say by an enactment of law that it is the preference of the United States to do so and so.

Of course, nearly every Member of this House agrees with the gentleman from Tennessee, that we ought not to put into this bill such an enactment, yet when the motion is made, as it will be, to amend the title by striking out of it that portion which contains the false statement that the bill is to "declare the purpose of the United States to do so and so," the committee will oppose the amendment. They want that false pretense in the title and want to vaguely incorporate it in a series of whereases, entirely outside of and not a part of the bill. If it is not a part of the bill and is not fit for enactment in the bill, why put it in the title? And why oppose amending the title so as to make it obey that commandment which reads after this fashion, "Thou shalt not pattern the words of thy mouth after the words of Ananias"?

In the effort of this committee to placate and please the followers of Aguinaldo and a number of good men in the Philippines, who are ambitious to establish a petty kingdom or a republic in the Far East and to fool themselves and the people of the United States into believing that they are keeping their platform pledge, they put this "recitation," as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee calls it, in the title and before the enacting clause of this bill. If they were to put it where it would have to be signed by the President, the Secretary of the Navy would beg, the Secretary of War would plead, and the Secretary of Commerce would urge, and the President would say to the members of the Cabinet, "Do you suppose I would be silly enough to sign such an enactment as that?"

It would be the very acme of absurdity to make such a declaration. If when I first went to the State of Washington I felt deeply on this subject, that feeling has been intensified by residence on the Pacific coast.

There is plenty of room on the Pacific for the yellow race and the white race, but we are sure to have trouble if we dilly-dally and fail to let our purpose be known. I would not deprive Japan of any credit due her for her marvelous development. We want to keep her friendship and we want to adopt a fair and friendly course with Japan. But we must have a fleet in the Pacific to guarantee the open door in China and to protect American interests.

Is the open-door policy less important now? Are the interests of the Caucasian race less important at this juncture? Is our duty to maintain an equilibrium in the Far East and to preserve peace any less pronounced now?

Are we a nation of quitters? Are we going to flee for our lives? When we get out of the Philippines, are we going to get out of the other islands and out of Alaska? The whole propaganda is absurd. I do not blame the Democrats for keeping such a disgraceful policy out from under the enacting clause of any bill, leaving it where it is vain and void; but the manly, decent thing to do would be to stand firm for American sovereignty in the Philippines, for the open door in China, and for the white man on the Pacific.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON].

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, it would be foolish, were it not so pathetic, to say, as does the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], who preceded me on the floor, that the Filipino people do not want independence to-day and that they would not even desire it in the future when they really become capable of self-government. That, however, is not a new statement. It has been heard before now in every country and it has been availed of by every tyrant. No ruler can ever be made by any evidence to believe that his subjects want to be free from his yoke. The speech of the gentleman from Washington has been delivered before in more or less the same words before the House of Commons in England, the difference being that his people, not mine, were at that time struggling to be independent, while the British lawmakers were there asserting that those people did not want independence. The American colonies were then said to be, as the Filipino people are now said to be, led astray by unscrupulous, selfish politicians, who were wont to exploit and enslave their own people. Why, Mr. Chairman, how any man can say that the Filipino people, having defied, because they wanted to be independent, the greatest and most powerful Republic upon this earth, knowing when they did so that they would unavoidably be crushed in that unequal struggle, do not now want to be free is beyond my comprehension.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman two minutes additional.

Mr. QUEZON. Is the committee unaware that thousands upon thousands of men drawn from all walks of life died in that destructive war while their wives, daughters, mothers, and sisters continued to urge the survivors to persevere until the whole nation was very nearly annihilated? Does the gentleman from Washington believe that that war was a joke, and that we went into it as a matter of amusement? How can he say that Filipinos will not want independence when they are capable of self-government? What an amazing theory, and yet it seems to be believed in and proclaimed by many statesmen as almost self-evidently true. If people do not want independence when they become capable of self-government, it must follow that no independent nation is capable of self-government. Indeed, I am almost inclined to accept that idea, and so to accept the view of the gentleman from Washington, when I see some of the most enlightened nations engaged in war, each killing the citizens of the other by scores of thousands, and each destroying wealth belonging to the others, thereby inflicting upon humankind more injury during a few months of their gigantic struggle than all the harm and destruction that the so-called incapable countries, with their petty revolutions, could cause in a century. But, Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the committee in the closing hour of this debate by entering upon discussions of this sort. The arguments which proceed from such premises as those I have cited are outworn, obsolete, and completely out of date. Every boy in school knows how to answer them. I shall, in discussing the preamble of this bill, address myself exclusively to the views expressed by the distinguished leader of the minority, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois takes the position that the preamble of this bill should be voted down, and that the legislative provisions of this bill should be amended so as to give the people of the Philippine Islands a government still more autonomous than is provided for in the bill. The gentleman's opposition to the preamble is placed squarely on the ground that the United States should forever retain the Philippine Islands, because such retention will provide this country with an important resource in a supposedly forthcoming struggle—commercial and perhaps military and naval—between the East and the West, while such retention would also prove beneficial to the Filipino people themselves. The gentleman is

convinced that with the granting of such an autonomous government as he suggests the Filipino people will grow more friendly to the United States and will be content to remain under American control.

Mr. Chairman, opposition to the preamble based upon the considerations stated by the gentleman from Illinois is worthy of serious attention and deserves to be met on its own ground. Let me say, before I reply to the gentleman from Illinois, that I have been particularly pleased with his remarks. His views and mine are, of course, widely and completely apart; but I give him credit, and I feel under obligation to him for not following the old line of insincere argumentation that has heretofore caused such shame and anger in the minds of the Filipino people, and that starts with the assumption that we are wholly incapable of governing ourselves or that we are an unpatriotic people, whose favored classes are eagerly watching for and taking advantage of every opportunity to abuse, mistreat, and exploit our fellow citizens, so that we must be ruled by more intelligent and more public-spirited foreigners. I am grateful to the gentleman from Illinois for his candor and openness, and I am sure my people join me in the sentiment. I know that his remarks will not be indorsed by a single Filipino; but, on the other hand, they will certainly not be resented by my countrymen. It was a businesslike presentation, composed of great thoughts elegantly clothed with apt expressions—this speech of the gentleman from Illinois. Yet I fear that the basic premise of his position is false, and that therefore the whole structure of his Philippine policy must fail to endure the test of time and of past experience.

I have noticed, Mr. Chairman, that, comprehensive as the speech of the gentleman from Illinois was, he failed to discuss—indeed, he apparently never gave a thought to—the one question which must be answered before his views can be accepted by analytical minds. That question is this: What would the United States do should the Filipino people, after they have been granted autonomy—complete domestic autonomy, if you please—still demand independence? Would the United States still insist, in such a case, upon keeping the islands, against the will of their inhabitants, under the sovereignty of this Nation? Would the United States, if necessary, resort to force to compel the Filipino people, under those circumstances, to continue subject to the American flag? Would the retention of the Philippines under such circumstances be an aid to the United States in such a forthcoming struggle as is predicted by the gentleman? The gentleman from Illinois did not deem it necessary to ask himself this question, because he took it for granted, as he stated it on this floor, that after you have given the people of the Philippine Islands complete autonomy, larger and greater autonomy than this bill confers, as he would gladly have you do, the Filipino people would become your good friends and would therefore no longer desire independence.

Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt, in fact I am sure, that the Filipino people will become your friends, your very good friends, after this bill is enacted. They would, however, be still more friendly to you if a measure providing for more autonomy, such as the gentleman from Illinois has suggested, should be passed. But I fear that the gentleman from Illinois is mistaken when he thinks that the Filipino people after the enactment of such a bill would prefer to remain forever a self-governing colony of this country. The gentleman seems to forget that the enjoyment of liberty makes people crave for more liberty still, and that the progress of nations toward freedom when once the first step has been taken does not cease until complete sovereignty has been attained. I do not pretend to be a prophet or even a statesman, and I shall not ask that my prediction—which after all is but a prediction that, like others, may prove to be mistaken—I shall not ask that my prediction be given more weight than the prediction to the contrary which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois. Of one thing, however, I am sure, as sure as I am that I am alive and standing upon this floor now. That is, that if the Filipino people should ever surrender their ardent desire to be free from the United States, it would not be after the enactment of the bill that the gentleman from Illinois proposes and the defeat of the preamble of this bill as he suggests. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois makes the realization of his hope an impossibility when he asks that the preamble of this bill be voted down—that preamble which confirms through a congressional declaration the promises heretofore made by the Executives of this Nation and by other representative American statesmen. If you defeat this preamble, in spite of the existence of such an autonomous government as you may confer upon the Filipino people, you will not make them your friends. If you defeat this preamble you will thereby at once lose the confidence of the people of the Philippines, and perhaps even their respect. Friendship and respect can only exist among nations as among men when the conduct of those who have entered into relations with one another is free from all suggestion of bad faith. The breaking of a promise, the disregard of past pledges, is a sure cause of distrust and of disrespect.

Mr. Chairman, again and again the people of the Philippine Islands since the first American commander landed at the city of Manila have been told by the representatives of this Government in those islands that the United States was in the Philippines for the sole purpose of helping the Filipinos to establish the foundations of their independent national life. Those promises have been reiterated by the Chief Executives of this Nation in their messages both to the Filipino people and to the American Congress. Mr. Taft, Mr. Roosevelt, and Mr. Wilson in official documents that are recorded in the archives of this Government have each and all made such declarations. The Filipino people have taken the words of those officials at face value, regarding them as the words of the American people themselves, whom the Presidents I have enumerated represented when they made these declarations. To-day the American Congress is asked not to ratify but to repudiate those words and those declarations. And on what ground? On the ground that you need the aid of the Philippines that you may emerge victorious from a supposedly forthcoming conflict—commercial or armed—for the control of the Pacific. What effect, Mr. Chairman, would the action of this Congress exert upon the Filipinos should the advice of the gentleman from Illinois be heeded? The Filipino people would at once take the defeat of the preamble of the bill as a convincing proof that this Nation would repudiate the promises it early made whenever it might be to her interest to do so. After such a repudiation had occurred, how could any man ever expect the Filipino people again to have confidence in the American Nation? What would be the advantage to be gained by the enactment of a law establishing an autonomous government in the Philippine Islands if the Filipino people could not feel secure in the free and everlasting enjoyment of that autonomy, or if they must forever fear that, inasmuch as you repudiated your promise of independence made when you did not think the Philippines a commercial or strategic asset but changed your opinion on this subject when conditions made it convenient, you might in like manner establish another kind of government whenever you thought it best for your purposes to do so? Ah, Mr. Chairman, without confidence, without faith, always fearful of what might happen in the future, how could anyone expect the Filipino people to be contented and thus ask it to remain under the American flag?

There is another consideration so obvious that I note with surprise that so learned a student of human nature as is the gentleman from Illinois could have forgotten or overlooked it. Does the gentleman forget that the one fact whose invariable truth has been repeatedly demonstrated since God created the first man is that human kind always prefers forbidden fruit? So long as you tell the people of the Philippines that they can never be independent, so long will you be adding fuel to their already burning desire to be independent.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the gentleman from Illinois, with his farsightedness, with his statesmanship, with his ability to look clearly into the dim and cloudy days of the far-distant future—qualities that fortune has not given me—is right in his expectations and his hope that the day will some time come when the Filipino people, after having been granted control of their domestic affairs and after having thus lived for so many years under the American flag—that would then mean to them the sovereignty of a strong and friendly nation, not the despotic rule of a tyrant master—may prefer to be permanently a self-governing colony of this empire rather than a free and independent republic born by this mother of republics. But should that ever happen, it would be only after the preamble of this bill had received congressional approbation; only after the Filipino people had been told by the American people through its constitutional representative—the Congress—that they may if they so desire be some day an independent and sovereign nation. Then, and only then, the Filipino people, reassured as to your good faith, convinced that whatever you may pledge yourself to do is assured of fulfillment when once the pledge is given, no matter whether your selfish interests do or do not dictate otherwise—then, and only then, may the Filipino people of their own free will and spontaneous volition decide that they prefer to maintain a permanent political relationship with the United States. And then, and only then, can that relationship be beneficial to both peoples, a real protection to the Philippines and a source of strength to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] cited the present relations between Canada and Great Britain as an illustration of what would surely come to pass were the Philippines to be granted full autonomy in the administration of their

domestic affairs and were this preamble to be defeated. He called the attention of the committee to the spectacle offered by that self-governing colony in hastening to the aid of her mother country in the great war now raging in Europe.

In the first place, I can tell the gentleman that it is too premature to assert now that the political ties between Canada and Great Britain will never be severed. Who is wise enough to predict that when Canada shall have increased sufficiently in population and wealth she will still prefer to be a colony rather than a sovereign nation? But whatever may be the permanence or the character of the relations between England and Canada, they would offer no evidence as to what will be the course of future relations between the United States and the Philippines. Two very essential circumstances in the relationship between England and Canada are absent in the case of the United States and the Philippines. In the former case there exists a community of race and of origin. Second, and perhaps more important still, England has never felt called upon to violate the pledge of her Government or any of her premiers in order to proceed with her colonial policy toward Canada. No promise of independence was ever made to the Canadian people, and therefore the element of international distrust has never disturbed the mind of the Canadian people. The present connection of Canada with England has been the natural outgrowth of a political tie whose severing never was thought of or announced.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I intend to say in connection with the speech of the gentleman from Illinois. I believe I have demonstrated for his benefit and for that of those who think with him that the only way to accomplish their purpose, if it could ever be accomplished, is by voting for this preamble and trusting to the future the development and determination of the final relationship between the United States and the Philippines. The retention of this preamble does not necessarily mean that you must grant the Philippines their independence, since, without being faithless, you could still retain your sovereignty over the islands should the Filipino people themselves, by common understanding with you, so desire, as the gentleman from Illinois thinks they might some day do. To those who assert that they do not want to retain the Philippines forever under the sovereignty of the United States, but that they would not vote for this preamble now because they do not believe that the day has yet arrived when independence should be granted, I say, if they are sincere in their protestations, they should vote for this preamble, because its language does not grant independence now, but simply states what they themselves admit to be their desire and their purpose. To those who believe in immediate independence I say that they should vote for this preamble because, while it does not grant immediate independence to the islands, it nevertheless does promise independence, and it is a long and decisive step toward actual independence.

Mr. Chairman, I shall now pass to another topic. Within a moment the committee will vote upon the bill, and I wish to say a word of sincere and deep-felt appreciation of the manner in which the membership of the committee on both sides of the House have acted in the consideration of this measure. I am personally obliged to them all for the unfailing courtesy and kindly consideration with which they have listened to my words and have received my suggestions. My people are likewise indebted to you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee. They owe you a debt of gratitude that will last during all the years to come as long as the Filipino people live, because, no matter what they do and how hard they try, they will never be able to discharge that immense obligation. For, after all is said, we are only an episode to you; you have lived and developed into what you are—a rich, enlightened, powerful commonwealth—without us; nay, without even knowing of us. Those ties that cause and explain the existence of sympathetic interest between peoples of different nationalities do not bind you to us—the ties of race, of common origin, of kinship. Whatever may be said as to whether we need you or not—whether we need you always or temporarily—there can be no question that you will be and continue to be what you are, occupying either with or without us the same leading place among the powers of the world you now do and doubtless advancing faster without us. The salaries that a handful of American employees draw from the Philippine Government are of no concern to you as a Nation. What part you may now or in the future take in the development of our trade you may as well enjoy it without responsibility for us. And yet, I have had one more occasion to see during the debate of this bill the true regard that you feel for the Filipino people. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I have had confirmation during the consideration of this bill for what I said at the opening of the debate. Referring to the remark of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] that the Democratic Party had not kept faith with me, I said that not only had the Democratic Party kept faith with me, but that all parties—yes, every party in the United States—seem to be trying to do what they can for the Filipino people.

Mr. Chairman, the plane on which the members of the Republican side of this House have pitched their opposition to this bill has been a high one. Save some rather unedifying political maneuvers of a kind that seems to be unavoidable in every legislative body, and save certain unpleasant allusions to a past happily ended or that never existed except in the imagination of a few people, the whole trend of the debate, the remarks that have been made on both sides, the feeling among the Members which I have closely watched, all went to show conclusively that those who are for the bill and those who are against the bill have alike been prompted by the honest belief, by the upright motive, that their attitude was demanded by the best interests of the Filipino people themselves.

I wish, therefore, Mr. Chairman, to offer the most cordial thanks not only to those who have the credit for bringing forward this bill, but also to those who opposed it on so noble a ground. I wish to thank Democrats, Republicans, and Progressives alike. I wish to express to the American people my strong gratification that through the consideration of this measure, important as it is for the welfare of my people and so decisive for their future, the good will of this Nation toward us has been once more manifested through all its representatives, irrespective of party politics.

Mr. Chairman, when I return home it will be my pleasure, as well as my duty, to tell my people that you are really our best friends—every one of you. There is only one difference, so far as I have been able to see, between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party—I say nothing of the Progressive Party, because it has not in its own capacity as a political body had opportunity to deal with us—and that difference is this, that the Democratic Party in trying to do by us what it thinks is the best is more precisely in accord with our wishes, while the Republican Party in trying to do by us what it thinks is best is disregarding our wishes. Since, in my opinion, every nation, like every individual, knows better than their neighbor what is best for them, it would seem that the Democratic Party is in all probability the one that will do precisely what is best for us.

The Republican Party was in power during the first 14 years following American occupation of the Philippines. During that time Republican Congresses were able to enact without being obstructed by the then existing minority legislation that accomplished some good things for us. The organic act which gave us the assembly, and the Payne-Aldrich bill which increased the opportunities of our farmers and our merchants, are the two most important elements in this legislation. It is proper, Mr. Chairman, that the minority should now cooperate with the majority. I hope, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the minority will find it convenient and wise, although withdrawing their approval if they so prefer, to let this measure pass unhindered, and also allow it speedily to become a law. And should it become a law we shall write with the fervor of gratitude in the annals of our country a glorious page bearing the names of the Members of the Sixty-third Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes of time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment, which I desire to have read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preamble, second paragraph, third line, after the word "islands," insert: "ceded to the United States Government by the treaty of peace concluded between the United States and Spain on the 11th day of April, 1899, the boundaries of which are set forth in article 3 of said treaty."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, while section 1 was under consideration I made some remarks upon the desirability and importance of limiting the declared purpose of the United States to the territory ceded in the treaty referred to in the proposed amendment just read by the Clerk, thus leaving for future determination the disposition of the small islands of Cagayan Sulu, Sibutu, and others obtained from Spain by separate negotiation and purchase in 1900. I attempted at that time to show why it would be unwise to destroy at this time our freedom to legislate in the future with respect to these small islands, located hundreds of miles away from the Philippine Islands, which are in no proper sense a part of the Philippine Islands. I shall therefore not pursue that subject further now.

Mr. Chairman, while legislation for the Philippine Islands is important and is well worth while, still there has been no very great pressure or demand for it. We have spent enough time upon this measure to have considered and passed a rural credits bill. The call of the banks was heeded, and the banking and currency bill was passed, and they have passed back the plate for a couple of helpings since, and are again knocking at the doors of Congress for additional legislation. During all this time the farmers have been waiting—patiently, I was going to say—but that is hardly the word. They are waiting with great impatience for Congress to strike from them the shackles of excessive interest charges upon farm mortgages.

This anxiety and unrest upon the part of the farmers is forcibly set forth in a letter by Hon. David Lubin, the well-known representative of the United States at the International Institute of Agriculture, Rome, Italy, where he has rendered incalculable service to American agriculture. Mr. Lubin writes, under date of September 28, 1914, to a Member of this House, as follows:

Commenting on your several communications, I wish to say that you should have a serious talk with the Democratic leaders of the House, so that if they see their way clear they may exert proper effort in having House Joint Resolution 344 immediately passed by the House and by the Senate.

Apart from anything that has been said in the hearings, I would add the following:

1. The strength of Germany is directly due to the "Landwirtschaftsrat."
2. It can be easily adapted and adopted in the United States.
3. It would eliminate the trusts.

Please remember that I did not invent this "Landwirtschaftsrat"; it is no brilliant inspiration of mine; I am simply a reporter, and as such I tagged after the administrations of Roosevelt and Taft to take this up. They did take up something, but it was a faint shadow with no substance. So I sent out thousands of documents written so that the farmer "with mud on his boots" could understand.

And when the farmer began to squirm Mr. Taft, toward the end of his term, began to "get busy," but his cry was in an incomplete shape and went out entirely too late.

Then the Democratic Party came along and took hold of the lines and promised to give the farmer rural credits. The promise was given on the "give-me-liberty or give-me-death" style. The farmers were to have rural credits immediately, if not sooner. The farmer was to have the best and first place in the legislative trough, a trough to be supplied with good and rich legislative slops. He was to have it sure, right then and there; and the first installment was to be rural credits. "Sink or swim," "live or die," the farmer was to have it sure. Rural credits was his. The Democratic Party affirmed this over and over and over again. And a Democratic majority has now been in session for a longer period than any session ever in the history of the United States. So there was plenty of time for the Democratic Party to deliver the goods to the farmer. But, let me ask, what has the farmer got from this same Democratic Party up to this minute? What has be got in the form of rural credits? Do you know? Does anyone know? But perhaps this party has something practical up its sleeve for the next session in November. Well, if it is in the form of the Bulkley-Hollis bill, then it will all end in smoke.

There is a rural credit plan that can be adapted which is practical—the Landschaft. If we could make inquiries at this minute in Germany, we would find all other rural credit systems smashed; we would find the Government bonds depreciated, but we would find the Landschaft bonds just as they were before the war. The Democratic Party should have worked on the Landschaft, but it has not even caught onto a faint knowledge of what it is.

And now, to return to House joint resolution 344, if the Democratic Party allows this resolution to go into innocuous desuetude, it will prove itself truly to be the possessor of the long ears that we frequently see it pictured, for just as sure as the Democratic Party allows this "Landwirtschaftsrat" matter to go by default, it will be picked up and taken up by the Republican Party. What effective use this can be made of in practical politics will be evident to you if you will read over the hearings, and read it quietly, and pick out point 1, point 2, say, up to all the points that will count, and you will have a respectable number of counts, invaluable on the stump, invaluable in the papers, and damaging to the party who had the opportunity of handling this matter, but who either overlooked it by reason of a sluggish brain or, worse yet, for fear of offending the trusts; for, mark you, this proposal gives a death blow to the trusts, as you know, and as nothing else can do.

I presume that you have been informed that Creasy and his executive committee are now applying to the farmers generally for funds. Now, the greater part of these funds will, no doubt, be used in informing the farmers on this matter, in sending them, if you please, the hearings and other similar documents. In fact, a copy of this very letter is going to be sent to them, which they may send broadcast.

And now, and for all these reasons, as there is a short period yet of the session of this present Congress, there is ample opportunity to rush House joint resolution 344 through both Houses, provided, of course, that it is the will of the powers that be that this should be done.

Will you be good enough to inform me just what you propose to do in the matter; or, better yet, what you have done and what others have done, and what they have not done and what they would not do?

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, is the time to read the amendment taken from the time on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. One minute.

Mr. TOWNER. That was merely to read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but the gentleman asked to have it read in his time.

Mr. MANN. He offered it as an amendment.

Mr. SLAYDEN. But time was yielded to him.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Time was first yielded to him.

Mr. TOWNER. Very well. I now yield one minute of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY].

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, this bill, among other things, proposes to provide a better system of government for the Philippine Islands; and, so far as that feature is concerned, it is an improvement on the present system. The objectionable part of the bill is the preamble, which is skillfully worded and misleading. If adopted, it will be understood by the oriental Filipino mind and by other oriental peoples as a positive promise of speedy independence. The qualifying sentence of when "they may be better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence" will not be construed by them as postponing indefinitely their independence. They are capable of instituting an independent government now, although they may not be strong enough to maintain their independence and protect the islands against foreign aggression and annexation.

Their capacity for self-government may not be according to the American standards, but they could institute a government suited to their own lights and needs and degree of civilization. They would adapt their government to the conditions of life, habits of thought, and occupations of their people as affected by the climate, soil, and products of the islands, and their commercial and political intercourse with foreign States.

The adoption of the preamble to this bill will invite trouble, for if it should be adopted and the Philippines be not granted their independence within the next four or five years political agitators in the islands could easily incite an insurrection, which might have at least the moral support of the Orient behind it.

I will vote for the bill if you will strike out the preamble, or I will vote to grant the islands immediate independence if their people want it, provided the United States Government makes it plain that when once we withdraw from the islands we will not be drawn into a war on their account, that we will not protect them with force of arms against foreign aggression or annexation or domestic insurrection. Or I will vote to grant the Philippines independence under an international agreement entered into by the United States and other great powers—if it is possible to arrange such an agreement—guaranteeing in perpetuity the status of the islands as a free and independent state.

If the Philippine Islands were contiguous to the North American Continent, I would never vote for their separation from the United States. But they are located about 8,000 miles from us across the broad Pacific Ocean. They are peopled by an alien and nonassimilable race, with different habits of thought and mode of living. The climate is humid, hot, and to the Caucasian is enervating and unhealthful.

The possession of the islands is a source of weakness and danger, and they are of no material benefit to us as a dependency. Our trade relations with them could be made as advantageous if they were an independent nation as they are as a colonial possession.

I conceive that governing people as subjects and holding lands as colonial possessions is contrary to the genius of our free institutions.

We should strike out the preamble to this bill and, now that the question is before Congress, fix a definite time for Philippine independence or provide for their ultimate assimilation into the Union, first as Territories and then as States.

The Philippines as a whole is not a sparsely settled backwoods country. They number about 3,141 islands, ranging in size from 1 square mile to 40,969 square miles, which latter is the size of the island of Luzon. The actual land area of the islands is 115,026 square miles, or equal to that of the New England States added to that of New York and New Jersey.

The United States census of the islands in 1903 gave them a population of 7,635,426, mostly Malays; 7,000,000 are to a degree civilized, some of them highly civilized, and a few of the highest degree of culture. The wild tribes and non-Christian people numbered 647,740. Foreigners numbered about 50,000, of whom three-fourths were southern Chinese. There is no restriction on immigration into the Philippines, but there are very few Japanese in the islands, as its climate is as unadapted and unhealthful to the Japanese as it is to Americans.

Exclusive of the Army there were 8,135 Americans in the islands, nearly one-half of them being located in the city of Manila. The United States Census Bureau estimated the population of the islands in 1912 at 8,460,052. The density of population is about 76 per square mile. In continental United States it averages 26 per square mile. The population is made up of 25 different tribes, speaking 16 different native dialects.

Nearly all educated natives speak English or Spanish, or both, in addition to the language or dialect of their tribe. Seventy newspapers are published in the islands. The United States Government instituted the American system of public schools.

About 450,000 scholars are enrolled, and 7,671 teachers are employed, of whom 658 are Americans and the balance Filipinos.

During the year ending June 30, 1913, the Philippines imported from the United States merchandise amounting in value to $25,360,646 and exported to the United States $21,010,248 worth of merchandise. During the same period the total exports of the islands amounted to $33,834,438 and the total imports amounted to $30,948,498.

America has done much for the Filipino people. She freed them from the Spanish yoke by force of arms, and then paid Spain $20,100,000 for them. Under American rule the inhabitants of those islands for the first time in their history are safe in the enjoyment of their life, individual liberty, and property, and are protected from exploitation; and common schools are maintained for the education of their children, notwithstanding which they seem not to be satisfied with our government and desire to set up a government of their own, which I am perfectly willing they shall do with the understanding that when we withdraw from the islands our Army and Navy will not be used to protect them from foreign aggression or domestic insurrection.

Now, that the question is before Congress, we should in plain language declare the status of the islands and our intentions toward them, and not try to fool the people by the adoption of the preamble to this bill, which is only a string of whereases of glittering generalities couched in diplomatic language and, so far as the independence of the Philippines is concerned, may be construed in the light of future events to mean anything or nothing.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I admire the frankness with which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] goes to the very meat of this matter.

He frankly admits the commercial appeal. He does not disguise the fact that the interest which he and his people have in the retention of the Philippine Islands is the possibility of gain from the connection. He is not like other gentlemen who have indulged in speech on this question and who get up here with nauseating cant and humbuggery, plain to everybody, which ought not to deceive a child, and tell us they want to retain the Philippine Islands and govern the Filipinos for the good of the Filipinos themselves. Surely, Mr. Chairman, no intelligent man can believe any such stuff as that. I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] for having spoken so very plainly on that question.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield just a moment? You come from the South. The race proposition is not purely commercial, is it, there?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen from the Pacific coast are playing with fire. They are frightened by the prospect of a remote and improbable assault from a people who are hardly more than half our numbers and 6,000 miles away. They compare what they conceive to be theirs with the importance of other race problems, which I could but have not time to discuss. I have sympathized with them in their race problems, and I want to build up a barrier between the people of this country and alien races, when the association may lead to domestic or international trouble. I am in sympathy with them, but, sir, I shall not indulge in the humbuggery of saying that I do not want to sever the tie that binds that country to this, and which was not brought about by a mutual agreement at all, but put upon the Filipinos by force of arms, by saying that I am acting in their behalf.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington wants—and he states it frankly, for which I am obliged to him—to prevent Asiatics from coming into this country, but he wants to keep open the door swinging in that direction. He wants the privilege of going to the Philippine Islands and other Asiatic countries, no doubt including Japan, if he framed the thought that was in his mind, for the purpose of exploiting those people and those countries, and at the same time he wants to shut them out of this. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have always believed that there must be reciprocity in international affairs if we are to go along in comfort and in pleasant relations with the other peoples of the world. The Lord has given us a large portion of this globe, the fairest and best of it, I believe—in the Temperate Zone—suited to the people of our race and suited to our genius, and we should stay here and cultivate our own vineyard rather than precipitate troubles by trying to trespass on the rights of other people who are also created by the same Lord and given their share of inheritance in the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, any child ought to see that by going into Asiatic exploitation, by undertaking to exercise the rights of government in those far-away parts of the earth, we are inviting trouble.

It is amazingly inconsistent, Mr. Chairman, and sure to bring disaster for us to demand privileges for Americans which we do not accord other people. It is morally wrong and the height of political folly.

The gentleman from Washington says that the people on the Pacific coast have a race problem compared to which that of the Southern States pales into insignificance. The gentleman also says that he was brought up in the State of Louisiana and taught the fundamentals of democracy there. When I realize the opportunities of his youth and see how far he has gone astray in his maturity, I begin to doubt that the tree inclines as the twig is bent.

He says that the people of Japan are intelligent, that they possess ingenuity and ability in all lines, that they are proud, that they have an ancient aristocracy, and he gives us to understand that they are quick to resent an affront.

If the people of Japan are intelligent, and they certainly are, they can see and appreciate an act of injustice, and I believe they would regard the application of the political views of the gentleman as a gross act of injustice. What right have we to demand from them what we are unwilling to concede to them?

I repeat now what I said to the gentleman from Washington, what I said when I interrupted his speech. We have no right to demand admission to Japan, except upon precisely the same conditions on which we are willing to admit them to our country. That is a plan of operation which ought to appeal to the spirit of fairness of everybody.

And in that spirit of fair play I hope to see this Philippine question considered. It is not inconsistent with trade development. Indeed, I think the exact reverse is true. Real commercial expansion, the only sort with which, in my opinion, we should be concerning ourselves, is based on a mutually beneficial trade. Americans ought to be the last people to take any other view. Our ancestors resented the efforts of a British Government to govern the American Colonies for the sole benefit of the British people, and out of that resistance grew the Republic of the United States. A hateful overlordship did not conduce to trade then on this continent, and it will not do it now in Asia or elsewhere. We ought to have learned a lesson from our experience in South and Central America, where, in spite of proximity and similar political institutions, we have not very successfully competed with Europe. That failure has been largely due to suspicion of our political designs. Distrust and dislike do not make a good start for trade.

This bill does not go as far as I would like. It does give the Filipinos a scheme of government which is good, if ours is, for it is largely a duplicate, but above and beyond that it promises them in the preamble, which so disturbs Republicans and the hybrid offshoot from that organization, liberty and independence.

It is to the credit of the Filipinos that in the presence of superior armed forces and under the weight of government imposed by remote and alien people they have never ceased to declare their hope of ultimate independence.

I rejoice in the fact that there are in this country still an impressive number of people who clamor for liberty, justice, and fair play. I hope that clamor may never be hushed, for when the voice of protest against the violation of American fundamentals like those found in the Declaration of Independence is stilled, our own liberties will not merely be in peril, they will be lost.

As I have said several times in the course of this debate, this bill is merely the first step in a program of justice, a program which will end in the complete independence of the Filipinos. The establishment of a Philippine government will open to us an opportunity of retiring from adventures which are not pleasing to our own people, which are repugnant to the Filipinos, and which needlessly took us into the range of possible oriental conflict.

I see the Chairman has the gavel in the air, and I will close by saying that in my judgment the way to teach people to be independent is to give them independence. Liberty is not promoted by locking people in prisons. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the cavalier statesman of Texas—and that term is meant as complimentary—a moment ago stated that he was glad that certain Members did not deal with humbuggery, and he insinuated that the men who have claimed that the United States is maintaining an American occupation in the Philippines for the benefit of the Filipino are talking humbug. Now, I do not believe that this gentleman, who I do not think

is inclined to impugn motives of men, has any ground for stating that those who insist that the American occupation there shall continue on the basis of the good to the Filipino as well as to the benefit of the world at large are talking humbuggery. I do not believe that that is a fair statement. In 1898 we received the Philippines as the result of a war which was not our own choice, the results of which were not of our own choosing; but when we received those islands we received an obligation with the islands, and there was no possibility of our performing that obligation by setting the islands free, and thus guaranteeing them what some persons might think they ought to have. Our duty compels us to fulfill the obligation, stay there as we have thus far done, and do a work the like of which the world has never seen before, and I am sure not since.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I believe if there is a man on the floor of this House who is sincere in wanting to retain the Philippine Islands for the benefit of the Filipinos, it is the gentleman from Ohio. I think he is deceived. But with reference to the obligation which he says we inherited as a consequence of that war, does he not believe we have cherished that obligation as an opportunity for exploitation?

Mr. FESS. I do not.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do.

Mr. FESS. I do not only say "no," but I say you do an injustice to the American people when you thus criticize our people after they have done the most remarkable piece of work, from the standpoint of cosmopolitan philanthropy, that the world has ever seen. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is no other case in the history of the world where a great Republic, with a people within its grasp, devoted its energy, its talent of brain and of heart, and its economic policies, to the good of the people, as in the case of the Government of the United States in its dealings with the Filipinos.

I have learned why the preamble is insisted upon; several Members have stated it. But I think it ought to go out of the bill, first, because it is totally unnecessary. The lawyer from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] who will speak later, will say the preamble can not be a part of any law. That being the case, in the name of goodness, why is it made a part of this bill? No other constructive measure, whether Federal or State, neither the Federal Constitution nor any State constitution, has a preamble in it, for the simple reason that the preamble is no part of the instrument. If it is no part of the instrument, then why put it in? I am opposed to it, first, because it is no part of the instrument, and as such can have no legal significance; and then, secondly, I am opposed to it because its results will be vicious. It will raise false hopes in the ambitious. It is misleading. And I am opposed to it, in the third place, for the reason that my friend from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] says they put it in because it is the will and testament of the Democratic Party to these people. My friend from Kentucky used harsh words in his reference to our treatment of the people of these islands. I can not understand the viewpoint of a Member who in reference to the American occupation and its results would employ the metaphor he used. His statement would indicate the American policy should be condemned at the very moment it is receiving the plaudits of all the world except the members of the majority party. The position he has taken to make this measure a Democratic will to the Filipinos deserves scrutiny.

Members of this House, can you justify writing a partisan platform into the terms of a measure designed to govern these people? That is what you intend to do. You have so stated in giving your reasons for the bill at this time. You have put in the beginning of the bill a preamble which you admit is no part of it, but is meant to maintain your pledge. It is the Democratic platform written into it. It is putting the legislation on the low plane of partisan affiliation. This legislation ought to be above that level. Both sides of this Chamber ought to be free from that charge. The Republican policy is to free this legislation and all insular legislation from partisan politics. This preamble, on the other hand, intending to write the Democratic platform in the bill, does not keep your promise as made. It is misleading as a Democratic promise, because whatever your purpose may be this preamble does not keep your promise. In 1900 you promised not what is in this preamble. You promised three things: First, to guarantee a stable government; and, secondly, independence; and, thirdly, to extend the Monroe doctrine over those islands. Those promises are not in the preamble.

I wonder whether anybody has noted the significance of attempting to extend the Monroe doctrine into the Asiatic islands? It would be the most serious single step that this Nation could take. If you say to Europe, "You must stay out of Central America and South America," how can we extend to the Asiatic islands the same protection, exemption from European colonization, unless we do it in agreement with other countries?

That is the promise you made in 1900. You repeated it in 1904, only changing the phraseology, saying that we ought to do with the Philippines what we did with Cuba. You repeated it again in 1908, and you have virtually repeated it in 1912, only two years ago.

But, Democratic Members, hear me. That platform that promised three specific things—stable government, independence, and guaranty of neutrality—you refused to write into this law, for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] introduced that very plank, and you voted it down in this House 4 to 1 the other day; and you raised the point of order to-day, and refused to allow it to come in. The Democratic policy has been specifically stated to do three things, all of which you rejected the other day and refused to accept to-day.

The Republican policy, on the other hand, has been not to promise, but simply to go on and do the work and fulfill the national obligation that came to us as the guardians of the islands.

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

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes' more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. FESS. Some one suggested a few moments ago that these people yearned for liberty. I rather think that that statement is true. Certain people yearn for liberty. But, my friends, you confuse liberty and independence. The two are not the same. Liberty can only come from regulation. There is no such thing as liberty without law. Liberty under law is real liberty. Liberty not under law is license. Mexico has no liberty, has she? I think my friend from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] would admit this, and he will also admit that Mexico has independence, and with the kind of independence she exercises she has lost her liberty; and in the degree that the independence of the Mexicans has been recognized they have forfeited their liberty.

I want to cite to you some striking examples: Australia has liberty, but not independence. New Zealand has liberty, but not independence. Canada has liberty, but not independence. Mexico has independence, but what can you say about her liberty? The Filipino has at this moment greater liberty in his participation in local government in over 700 towns than he would have if there was independence there.

Some one rose a while ago and said it is not a matter of what we think that we ought to fasten upon the people of the Philippines, but it is what they want. Now, my friends, that is a proposition that I resist. I say that it is a foolish statement, that the ward must control the action of his principal by his own wishes, his caprices, as it may be. The principal is acting in the interest of his ward, and what the action of the principal is is not to be determined by the mere wish or caprice of his ward. The principal ought to do what, in his judgment, the interest of his ward would command, and not the caprice of the ward. These 8,000,000 Filipinos now under the American Government, having seen in 16 years the most marvelous progress of any nation in the world, when viewed then and now, are at this moment enjoying such a participation in local self-government as other countries with independence do not enjoy. And as long as the American system will stay there in the interest of the Filipino, he will be secure in his enjoyment of liberty.

I want to repeat again: When I vote against this preamble I will vote against it, not because it was proposed by this Congress, and not because it has not been proposed by a Republican Congress, but because, first, it is useless; second, it is unnecessary; third, it is ill advised; and, fourth, it is vicious in holding out false hopes to the Filipino, stirring him, making him think that he has independence, and you here stating that he has not. My friends, I must vote against it, and my vote will be directed by my view of duty to the Filipino, and not by any other reason. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If the preamble were omitted, I should not withhold my support of the measure. The body of the bill is an attempt to increase participation in government, and is a step nearer to that goal. But any attempt to hold out to either the Filipino or the world that the United States will abandon these islands is too preposterous a proposition for me to support. Under the circumstances under which we assumed the obligation the

Republican Party could not indorse this piece of Democratic jugglery.

Mr. Chairman, the Philippine Islands came to us as a result of war. Their possession by us was the least of our intentions when we took up arms against Spain in behalf of humanity. The irony of the situation is revealed by the inconsistency of mankind. When the Republican President of the country was doing his utmost to hold at bay the dogs of war, Democratic leaders, in and out of Congress, were loud in their condemnation of the lack of backbone of McKinley. When at last the war was on, and Spain was driven from Cuba and the Philippines, these same leaders, or many of them, denounced the President for accepting the results of war.

Before the war began they denounced the head of the Government for his inaction. When the war ended they denounced him for his action. Even to-day we hear from irresponsible babblers the Philippine policy referred to as "horrible carpetbag government."

The Republican Party showed the courage necessary to complete a work that was once begun. After having driven Spain from the islands, it did not sulk behind the flimsy excuse of irresponsibility to withdraw the majesty of the Republic and leave those islands as rich prizes to be exploited by whatever government that might set up a claim to them.

The Republican Party looked upon the situation as a national obligation to the Filipino created by our arms. That obligation the party has steadily fulfilled. The fulfillment has up to date occupied 16 years of constructive nation building. These years offer a challenge to the world. They will record the most advanced methods of modern civilization exemplified in any section of the world. These years will reveal a consecration of talent of brain and heart and sound business methods never before displayed by a superior toward an inferior people. The record thus far is made up. The past at least is secure. The future is dependent upon the contingency of a Democratic administration now tampering with the welfare of those people.

What has been the attitude of the party now in power toward the Philippine problem?

As I said before, two years after those people became our wards the Democratic Party declared against the Republican policy and demanded three specific things: The United States must guarantee a stable government, Philippine independence, and extend the Monroe doctrine over the islands.

It goes without saying that so long as the United States remained in control all of these features were assured. But the Democrats demanded our withdrawal, and at the same time our guaranty of conditions which would not permit our withdrawal, a most glaring inconsistency not only in fact, but in terms as well.

In 1904 the party in convention assembled virtually repeated its declaration of four years before.

In 1908 it reaffirmed its former position, and in 1912 repeated it.

Four times in national conventions the party now in power denounced the Republican policy in the Philippines, which, outside of the Democratic junta, has won the admiration of all the world, and as often has declared for independence and neutralization of the islands.

To-day the party controls all the lawmaking machinery of the Government.

It has a majority in this House equal to the entire minority, and is capable of steam-rolling any sort of a measure it sees fit to propose. It controls the Senate with less ruthless methods. It has the Executive, or rather it better be said, the Executive has it, for to an onlooker the Congress is little more than a Punch and Judy performance. Its performance under the new rôle is a splendid exhibition of "Babes in Toyland."

Now, with the entire machinery within complete control of the party which for 16 years has denounced Republican rule, and which has demanded independence and neutralization, in platform and on the stump, what does it propose?

This bill, which, outside of the preamble, is but a copy of the organic act of 1902. Aside from a few minor items, the bill is the Republican organic act of a dozen years ago. The only Democratic feature of it is found in the preamble, which is the one mischievous item in the entire work.

The bill proper does not have a single item of independence or neutralization in it.

It does not only avoid these items, but, as I before stated, when the Member from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] offered his amendment looking to fulfilling the various promises made in at least four national campaigns the Democratic House voted down the amendment 4 to 1.

What has become of these promises made when the party was out of power? Then its function was denunciation. Now, when all power is in its hands, what does it offer? It falls back in this case, as in most others, upon Republican laws as a basis for operation, and offers the empty promise in the form of a preamble which can not be a part of the law.

Here we have the striking example of the incompetency of this Congress. For the first and only time, so far as is known in history, we are offered an organic act for the government of a people with the platform of a political party affixed as a preamble.

To say nothing about the mischievous results of attempting to stamp a partisan significance upon a plan of government of eight millions of people by adding a party platform to the law, and the equally dangerous step which places a new weapon into the hands of ambitious politicians to be employed in their efforts of propaganda, what should be said of a Congress which is willing to write a promise as a part of the law which it concedes can not be any part of the law, and thus deceive millions of people as to the significance of the promise?

No man will deny that a preamble has no legal effect. It is no part of the law to which it is affixed. If it can not be effective, what is the purpose of affixing it? Whatever be the purpose, it can have but one effect, namely, mislead the people for whom the law is written. On the face of the law it appears as a part of it, to become effective. In reality it can not be a part of it and can have no legal effect. To the Filipino it says independence is granted when stable government is established. He asks, When is that? If not now, then you give us nothing we have not had before. The one difference between Republican and Democratic policies is, Republicans seek performance and Democrats are satisfied with promises.

Mr. Chairman, I look upon this preamble as a most vicious innovation in legislation. As before stated, it is the only case of its kind in legislation of this sort, so far as I know.

From the Federal Constitution of 1787 down to the last State constitution—of Ohio, in 1912—numbering more than 60 documents, all told, so far as I can ascertain not a single one contained a preamble. This is not confined to the State constitutions, but extends to the territorial governments of the various States, to Alaska, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines. True it is that the Articles of Confederation of 1781–1787 did have a preamble, but all students of political science agree that this instrument was so weak and ineffective that it broke down immediately and had to be superseded within six years of its adoption. The pitiable situation is disclosed in the willingness of this House to inject an unwise, ill-advised deception as the very first act of this Congress in its legislation touching the Filipinos, not to give any legal status, which a preamble can not do, but to write a Democratic plank in the law, which can have but one effect—to hold out to the Filipino a false promise which can not be effective and can only work mischief in the islands. The Republican policy is the only wise procedure. The administration since American occupation speaks for itself. The eating of the pudding is the best proof. We have gone step by step, testing the capacity of these people for self-government. We have extended that principle as fast as men trained in that art say we can go. In 16 years wonders have been accomplished. This has been carried on without raising false issues or holding out false promises. The Republican policy is one of doing, not of promising. I here and now warn the Democratic Members of this Congress against inaugurating false pretensions, which can have no good results either for Filipinos or Americans.

If you are able to continue the wonderful work accomplished since American occupation you will be fortunate. Otherwise the future holds for you its severest condemnation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, this bill is, in my opinion, a distinct contribution to the ultimate solution of the Filipino problem. That solution, sooner or later, must eventuate in the form of an independent and autonomous government for the people of those islands.

I say "independent," because eventually the Filipino people will have this independence, whether by voluntary action on our part or by the exercise of force on their part. In other words, sooner or later, and in one way or another, the tide of freedom in those islands will rise to the level of independence.

And on our part, Mr. Chairman, we are in no position to withhold from these people their ultimate independence. There is no place under our system of government for colonial de-

pendencies. The Constitution gives us no authority to hold territory unless for temporary purposes and for final dedication to statehood. If these islands are retained by us as colonial dependencies, then we violate our whole system of government. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, if we were right in our policy as respects Cuba, we are wrong in the contrary policy to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Chairman, I am not for hurrying the Filipino people to independence or self-government. I would concede an abundance of time to these islanders to test their capacity for self-government. I do not think that you can fit government upon these people as you can fit a suit of clothes upon a man. I realize, as every student of history must, that governments of the same name differ widely in powers and practices. For example, the Republic of Venice was not the Republic of Florence. The Republic of Switzerland, after throwing off the yoke of Austria, was quite different from the Republic of Holland after emerging from the oppression of Spain. Indeed, the present French Republic differs from the second, and the second differed from the first, and all of these Republics differ from that of the United States.

But, Mr. Chairman, the expressions of Presidents McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft, as well as the great current of American thought, have all been to the end that the Filipino people should have their own government, after sufficient training and opportunity to absorb American ideals and systems. President McKinley eloquently declared that forcible annexation was criminal aggression. The argument to be drawn from this aphorism is that we should assume for a time the great trust of helping these people to appreciate and understand the genius and working of self-governing institutions. If this be not so, why have we toiled and sacrificed and fought to give the Filipinos an adequate appreciation of the benefits of the Government which we have adopted and which we so devoutedly revere?

Many of the arguments, Mr. Chairman, made here today by gentlemen on the other side of this House are quite contradictory and irreconcilable. The motives underlying these arguments I do not question, though the partisanship which imputes only the base method of party supremacy or immediate party victory to this side of the House is neither creditable nor convincing in discussing a measure of this magnitude. I have great respect and good will for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] who has just spoken; yet if his argument be sound, we have been blind leaders of the blind in that far eastern archipelago. This distinguished gentleman enumerates with zeal the contributions made by America to the education and development of the Filipino people. He seems to forget that we can not stir the passions of liberty among these people or educate them to appreciation of self-government and then restrain the influences and forces that grow out of liberty and intelligence. We can not give these people education, imbue them with the blessings of liberty, and then make no reply to their insistent and ardent inquiry as to how or when we will give them the right to stand alone among the Governments of the earth.

The policy, Mr. Chairman, disclosed on the other side of the House, consists alone in counseling delay or the suppression of any declaration of purpose or policy save an implied assent to a continuance of the existing status. When the Filipino people ask when they may expect any change, the answer on the other side of the aisle is, "Not now; wait."

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have but five minutes, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I was just going to ask the gentleman whether this bill fixes the time?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will soon come to that, but the gentleman from Ohio has just gone into refined disquisitions as to the distinction between liberty and independence. Does the gentleman think that in 1776 the American Colonies would have been satisfied with a promise of liberty from Great Britain, but a withholding of our independence at the same time? If so, there would have been no Declaration of Independence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I care very little for the details of this bill, except for the preamble containing the declaration of the purpose of the American people, and the torch to light the hopes and aspirations of the Filipino people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I regard the preamble as declaring a probationary state into which the Filipino people will enter in order to demonstrate their fitness for free institutions. I construe the preamble as a substantive assurance of independence, as I construe in turn the text of the bill to lay down certain tests to determine the extent of our promise and the fitness of the Filipino people to assume that independence In other words, the preamble of the bill is an American declaration of opportunity to the Filipino people, just as the text of the bill itself gives to the Filipino people liberty, power, and opportunity to test the declaration and purposes embraced in the declaration. We declare that we will give them independence when they deserve it, and to this end we furthermore lay down certain governmental functions which we ask the Filipino people to assume and perform, and when done then the extension of free government or independence will be given them.

It was never the purpose, as it can not be the right, of the United States to withhold from the Filipino people a declaration of our purpose respecting their ultimate independence. We can not continuously say in answer to their prayers for independence, "Not to-day, not to-morrow," and so on.

Mr. COOPER. Suppose the reply is "never."

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I hope to reach his suggestion in a moment. I was about to say that I agree with the statement made on the opposite side of the House awhile ago that the promise contained in the preamble is dependent upon certain exigencies hereafter to happen. I do not shrink from that argument. I embrace it gladly. For, I repeat, the essence of the declaration contained in the preamble is not as to time, but as to substance. This declaration to the Filipino people is, to use the language of the street, when you "make good" of the liberties and opportunities given you, then we will keep our promise as to independence.

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

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The distinguished leader of the Republican Party [Mr. MANN] seems to voice the present attitude of his party when he declares that the Filipinos are never to have independence, but must remain always under the guardianship of the United States. He declares it is "our duty, first, to keep the Filipinos under the flag of the United States, and, second, to make them our friends." With all respect to the gentleman, his propositions are irreconcilable. You can "never keep the Filipinos" and at the same time make them your friends. [Applause on the Democratic side.] To hold people against their will and to have their friendship at the same time belong to those irrepressible conflicts ever existent in human nature.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. MANN. We kept the South, and they are still our friends, I believe, which is a very good illustration.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman can not lead me into an argument of that kind, because the analogies are so wide apart.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman will admit that the statement is true.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman admit that the people of the same flesh and blood, and existing on the same soil and under the same Government, are analogous to the Philippine situation?

Mr. MANN. We made them our friends, did we not?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I fear the gentleman's prejudices have confused his logic. I prefer not at this time to discuss the analogies involved in the gentleman's question.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. The South has been far better to the Union than the gentleman from Illinois has been to the South.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, alluding to the argument of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], I would emphasize his assertions as to what the American Government has done for the Filipinos. We have endeavored to give them American institutions, American ideals and standards, American civilization. What does this mean? It means aspirations for liberty; hopes for independence. It means public free schools; and I beg you to observe every time a book is put into one hand of a Filipino boy, sooner or later, if you withhold his independence, there will be a sword in the other hand. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Endow liberty with intelligence, and the people will soon have a passionate glory that will eventuate in independence, even though the sword be necessary to this end.

Mr. Chairman, some rather strange arguments have been submitted during this debate. I call attention to only one at this time. It is contended that the permanent retention of the Philippine Islands under our flag is necessary as a great peace measure. That these islands, 10,000 miles from our western shores, are the sentries and the fortresses to exhibit and protect American liberty in the Pacific. Aye, that war is as certain to come between the far eastern or Asiatic races and ourselves as "the sun rises and sets," and for the necessities of our Government, for the peace and civilization of America, we must hold these islands. They are our rock and our defense in the hour of certain conflict. The answers to these arguments are

many and conclusive, but I only wish at this time to submit that distance and separation diminish as proximity and propinquity increase the causes of war. It is not, Mr. Chairman, our western continental boundary, washed by the Pacific, but our far eastern islands, close to the shores of China and Japan, that must give occasion for apprehension.

I further submit that a continuance of our possession and government of these islands will inexorably result in the establishment and maintenance of militarism of prodigious proportions, imposing immense burdens upon our people and necessarily provoking the suspicion and ill will of the contiguous nations in this archipelago.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, basing our policy of retention upon material considerations, I submit that our commerce will be greater, our relations will be happier, when we have opportunely and wisely relaxed our hand and our guidance and given to these islands our good will and affectionate sympathies. When this fortunate day comes the altruism and majesty of America will command the respect and admiration of the civilized world. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that we have only one speech on this side.

Mr. JONES. Only one speech on that side? Will the Chair kindly inform me how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. TOWNER. And how much on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, in opening the discussion upon this bill, now more than two weeks ago, I said all I cared to say in respect to this preamble. I showed, I think, that it does not go further in promising the Filipinos their independence than McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft repeatedly went in declarations made by them. The only difference is that those were declarations which are not now regarded as binding upon the Republican Party, although those distinguished gentlemen were when they made them the recognized leaders and spokesmen of that party.

The gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has just informed us that the Democratic Party was the only party that had ever declared for Philippine independence, and he evidently seemed to think that that fact was a reproach to it.

Mr. Chairman, the only reason why, in my opinion, the Republican Party has never authoritatively and definitely—never in any national platform—declared its position upon this transcendently important question is that it lacked either the honesty or the courage to do so. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, there are no brighter pages in the glorious history of the Democratic Party than those upon which are written the declarations of that party in favor of Philippine independence, and none that gives me more pride, for it is a source of infinite joy and pride to me that there is at least one party in this land of liberty and freedom that still believes in the principles enunciated by the greatest apostle of human liberty the world has ever produced, the ablest as well as the most courageous champion of free popular government known to ancient or modern history.

Mr. Chairman, it is enough for me to know that in favoring a declaration promising Philippine independence I am following the teachings of Thomas Jefferson and obeying the mandates of the party founded by him, which alone of all the parties in this Nation has the courage of its honest convictions. It should never be forgotten, by any Democrat at least, that it was Thomas Jefferson who gave voice to the imperishable truth that "every man and every body of men on earth possesses the right of self-government." Said he: "They receive it with their being from the hand of nature."

Mr. Chairman, the preamble to this bill but states in different words the utterance of the father of the Democratic Party that "the people of every country are the only safe guardians of their own rights." Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a copy of a letter received by a Member of Congress from the Hon. Francis Burton Harrison, the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, and written as recently as the latter part of August, in which he comments at considerable length upon this bill. I now desire to read one or two extracts from this letter. He writes of it:

> I believe the solid and substantial people in the islands, among both Americans and Filipinos, are generally in favor of the bill, and that it will prove satisfactory here.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> To my mind the most important feature of the whole bill is the recital in the preamble of the intention of the United States to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein. Without that feature the bill would be received with very, very great disappointment in the islands. It would also be a very serious disappointment to me. Ever since our acquisition of the Philippines, each administration has given to the Filipinos assurances in that general direction. To omit from the bill a statement of that sort now would seem to the Filipinos a reversal of what they have understood to be the American policy, and a failure to perform what they believed to be our promises. The result would be most unsatisfactory, indeed, and would infinitely aggravate the difficulties of the United States in governing these 9,000,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, this is what the Governor General of the Philippine Islands has to say of this bill. In his deliberate opinion, to omit such a declaration of the Nation's purpose as to the future political status of the Philippine Islands as is contained in the preamble to this bill would be a serious disappointment to him, and, moreover, would infinitely aggravate the difficulties of the United States in governing the 9,000,000 of Filipino people. Shall we then heed the words of Gov. Gen. Harrison when he tells us that the solid and substantial people in the islands, both American and Filipinos, favor this bill or listen to and be misled by the uninformed and irresponsible asseverations of those who, lacking in sympathy with the aspirations of the Filipino people for freedom, would deny to them their independence?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the statements that have been made here upon the floor of the House abundantly prove the truth of what I said at the commencement of this discussion and the consideration of this bill. It is a political bill, pure and simple. In its inception it is political. It was reported here for a political purpose, and it is considered here for a political purpose, and is kept here for a certain length of time for a political purpose. The gentleman who has just left the floor tells us that the Governor General, representing his party in the Philippine Islands, says that the principal thing in the bill is its preamble. It would be a great disappointment, he says, to the people of the Philippine Islands if this preamble is not passed. I wonder if that kind of statement satisfies the Filipino people? They are demanding immediate independence, and have been demanding it for years. Two years ago the chairman of this committee and the majority of this committee reported a bill which was considered to be the exposition of the Democratic position at that time—a bill in which they granted to the Filipinos independence, at least qualified independence. During a period of eight years the United States was to exercise supervisory control over them, but there was a Republic instituted. It was called the Philippine Republic. It had the form and insignia of an independent government with very few exceptions, indeed. It promised that absolute independence at the expiration of the period of eight years should be given the Philippine Government. What has become of that bill? It is not here before us to-day. There is no such bill under consideration now. There is no promise to the Filipino people of independence now, unless we are expected to take seriously the language used in the bill—that they will grant the people of the Philippine Islands independence when a stable government is established.

There is a stable government established there now, and they are not given independence. If the one established is not "stable," what kind of a government would be stable, and how can it be secured? What is the standard by which we can know when independence may be given? Gentlemen contend there is a stable government, a good government, there now. They contend that these people are able to maintain it, and yet they say, "No; we will not give it to them until they establish a stable government." But how can they establish a stable government unless you give them a chance to try, unless you give them immediate independence. That you should have the courage to do if you believe in it. If you do not, you are violating not only your promises made to them through your leaders from year to year for the last 10 or 12 years, but you are violating the promises you made to them when you drew and introduced the former Jones bill and said you intended to pass it just as soon as you had control of the Government. And you are violating your promises to them now when you say this leads to independence.

It is suggested here that the passage of this bill with its preamble will give a great satisfaction to the Filipino people. Let us see whether or not it will, and the testimony which I offer will not be impeached from the Democratic side of the House. I have in my hand the organ of the Filipino people in the United States, edited by my brilliant friend the representative from the Philippines, MANUEL QUEZON. In this, speaking to the Filipino people regarding the bill, under as late a date as July of this year, he says in the leading editorial regarding the new Jones bill:

We have thus set forth in colorless terms the significance of the new bill. That it will be a disappointment to many who had hoped that the present administration of the United States intended to effect the immediate separation of the Philippines from the domination of America, we have no doubt.

That is the good news that will be carried to the Filipino people when you pass this bill. That is the good news that will be carried to all those people in the Philippines longing for immediate independence, and believing that they ought to have it. And if in connection with that story they are told that each succeeding two years of time a new bill is introduced which grants to the Filipinos less power than its successor, the Philippine people will understand what is meant by the promises that the Democratic Party are giving to them. My distinguished friend from Virginia made a very significant statement when he was on the floor this afternoon. I allude to my friend, Gov. MONTAGUE, when he used this language:

I care very little for this bill except the preamble.

I wonder if people understand really the significance of that? The preamble is purely political, made for political purposes. It can not help the Filipino people one particle. It is not even a promise on which anybody under any circumstances can rely for anything, and yet my friend from Virginia says, "I care very little for this bill except the preamble."

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman will note that I was speaking very rapidly. What I meant to state was that in the sense of proportion the preamble was far more important than the items of the bill itself, and not that I do not think highly of the text or the subject matter of the bill. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me further, he has just said, "Suppose you take less and less from the Philippines each succeeding Congress." I reply, "Suppose, more and more of the rights of free government are given by each succeeding Congress to the Philippines." What then will be the result? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. My good friend spoke, probably instinctively, just what his party believes and always has believed. They do not care for the Filipino people; they never did. They do not now care for the islands, and never did.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I hope the gentleman will not put me in that category.

Mr. TOWNER. No; I am not. I am speaking of the gentleman's party now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have not spoken of this as a party question.

Mr. TOWNER. It makes no difference whether the gentleman has or not, he has voiced his party's position, and that is what Democrats now believe. They only desire to get rid of the islands on any terms and as soon as possible. It makes no difference to them about the terms of this bill, whether it gives better government or larger liberty or greater privileges or a better chance in the world. It makes no difference to them whether they receive more education, whether they secure a greater opportunity to really enjoy liberty under the terms of the bill.

But they really enjoy playing politics with it. It is very amusing and affords opportunity for saying such fine things about "liberty" and the "consent of the governed."

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly; I will.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman has made a strong indictment against the party of which I am a humble member. Does he remember the Scripture text, "By their fruits ye shall know them"?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; I do. I remember that text well, and I want to know whether or not the Democratic Party has ever given the Philippine Islands or any man there anything that has not been under Republican laws and an adoption of Republican policies from the beginning?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TOWNER. I can not yield further.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that this whole system of government that is now instituted and under which the Philippines have made this marvelous progress was formulated and instituted by the Republican Party. There has not been one single law placed upon the statute books by any Democrat at any time.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman let me ask him just one question?

Mr. TOWNER. I will yield for one question.

Mr. JONES. I would like to ask the gentleman if it was not the Democratic Party that gave the Filipinos the control of both branches of their legislature?

Mr. TOWNER. The Democratic Party? No. Your President merely appointed one more man on the Philippine Commission, belonging to the Filipino people, than had been there before.

Mr. JONES. Did not that give them control?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly, it gave them control, and the control is exercised, and there has been no change in the policy of the party in the Philippine Islands. It is exercised under the laws that were placed upon the statute books by the Republicans.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party has been the only friend that the Filipino people have ever had. It has stood by them through all these years, giving them a continual and larger measure of liberty. It has given to them education; it has given them a real understanding of what liberty means. Under their direction the Filipino people have been enabled to make their strongest showing that they are capable of independence. I do not object to their ambition. I think it is a splendid tribute to them that they are capable of indulging in this dream, nay, this expectation, if you choose to call it such, of independence. I hope they may attain it in the future, if that is then their wish; but I hope still more that when the time comes, when they are capable of exercising the right of self-government and entire independence, they will believe that it will be better for them, as I believe it will be better for us, if they shall keep at least a measure of association with the United States. I believe that the time will come when the Filipino people will themselves realize that.

Mr. Chairman, the belief seems to exist in many minds that we can easily secure the neutralization of the islands, and that will settle the whole difficulty. I think, gentlemen can hardly understand what is meant by neutralizing the islands. Every nation in the world is perfectly willing to recognize the neutrality of the islands, but that will be of no benefit to the Philippine Islands. In order to be any protection to them you must secure a treaty guaranteeing neutrality to the Philippine Islands. But what nation will do that? Any nation perhaps that may be allowed to exploit the islands. We have never exploited the islands and we will never agree that any other nation shall exploit them. No nation will undertake to guarantee the neutrality of the Philippine Islands unless it will be to their advantage to do so. You can not expect that. Do you believe that Great Britain, or Germany, or France will assume the responsibility of guaranteeing the neutrality of the Philippine Islands unless it shall be of some benefit to them? Will they accept such a burden merely for altruistic purposes, merely for the purpose of helping the Philippine Islands? No, they will say to the United States, "You are doing that; you are taking care of the Philippine Islands; that is your responsibility; you have to guarantee their integrity and protect them. Why should we do so? That is your responsibility and not ours." They will say to us, "If there are any particular inducements you can offer, if you have any special concessions to make, if you can make it of interest to us, we may consider your proposition," and that is what it will be impossible for us ever to do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if all amendments that are to be voted upon have been offered? They should be before the closing speech is made. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] if there are any other amendments to be offered?

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman that I know of none.

Mr. JONES. They ought to be offered now, as the gentleman will understand.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. JONES. I yield that much time to my colleague on the committee, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we are about to do a great thing. The distinguished but very partisan philosopher from Ohio [Mr. FESS], in company with a number of other gentlemen, has declared against the preamble to this bill. They say in one breath that they are against it because it means nothing, and say in the next breath they are against it because it means so much. Measuring their utterances in the light of the speech delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] a few days ago, I am constrained to believe that the expression in the latter breath presents the reason for their opposition.

Gentlemen know that the passage of this bill, with its preamble, means the taking of a decisive and definite step toward the consummation of an event which will be not only epochal, but unprecedented in the history of human kind—the voluntary and willing withdrawal of sovereignty by one people from over another people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Strange as it may seem and is, every step which has been taken toward human liberty, the natural state of man, has been taken across the forms of battle-slain dead, and blood-stained flags are the only emblems that signal across the centuries the accomplishment of fundamental governmental things. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Not from fear, but because we are just, we are ready to take this step toward the reversal of that age-old rule of cruelty and barbarism and selfishness. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The issue has been clearly drawn here, if it had not been drawn before, by the utterances of the minority leader [Mr. MANN] in his terse but comprehensive speech made upon this floor, and it has been suggested again and again throughout the course of this debate that his speech has not been answered save by a sneer. Mr. Chairman, I shall not undertake to answer it with a sneer. I noticed that while the gentleman from Illinois was delivering that speech he looked not once upon that portrait of Washington yonder, or upon that portrait of La Fayette there. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The central thought of the gentleman's speech was that we must hold these islands forever, because a great contest, either military or commercial, is to come. If, sir, it is to be a military contest, who does not know that those islands present our one source of military weakness? [Applause on the Democratic side.] If it is to be a commercial contest, what then?

Mr. Chairman, I know something of commercial life. I have known men in the commercial world, from the smallest merchant up to those somewhat euphemistically termed "great captains of industry," and my observation has been that that merchant, whether great or small, that commercial man, whether large or little, was the most successful, was the most honored in life and in death, who acted upon principles of justice and kept his plighted faith. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Nations are made up of individuals. The type is as the person. And I say now to the gentleman from Illinois that that nation will have the fairest chance in the future contest for commercial supremacy which lives by the principles of justice and acts in the light of superb and splendid ideals. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But I need not in my poor way attempt to answer the gentleman from Illinois. That speech was answered long before it was ever uttered. It is not necessary to go back through the misty ages that are gone and read the philosophy of the ancients; you need go no further back than the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, wherein it was declared that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." [Applause on the Democratic side.] The speech of the gentleman from Illinois was answered by every sword ring in the hand of an American soldier in every battle of the American Revolution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The darkness has not yet fallen. The roll call will begin in a few moments. When it begins and before you vote suppose you gentlemen walk out upon the portico which adorns the south end of this magnificent Capitol building wherein we sit, turn your eyes to the west, and look there upon the massive Washington Monument, its peak tinted now by the evening October sun, builded to the memory of a man who stood for the principle that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and you will find there an answer to the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I walked on Sunday last out through beautiful Arlington, under the trees all saturated and shot through with sunshine, looked upon the graves of men who died for their respective countries, and I said to myself, "Why, here is an answer to the speech of the gentleman from Illinois."

Must I go further? In the capital city of the gentleman's own State there is a mausoleum. I have never seen it, but I am told that it is simple and splendid, as befits the memory of the man whose ashes rest within it. Abraham Lincoln was the first great leader of the Republican Party. He anticipated and answered the speech of the present leader of the Republican Party when he said, "No man is good enough to govern another man without that man's consent." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I wish, sir, that it were possible at this time, in this solemn and sacred hour, to lay aside the prejudices of the past and determine that we shall not "stain the virtuous character of our enterprise" by partisanship or factional differences. We are preparing now to tread the mountain range of human life. I wish you gentlemen on the Republican side might come up out of the murk and the fog and walk with us in the sunlight. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Idealistic, you say? Let us grant that it is even so. I am not ashamed to support the ideals for which my fathers stood. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We shall do a great thing when we take this step; we shall do a great thing when we maintain in its purity that ideal which has been the guiding star of our own national life. We shall do a great thing, and this shall be a historic day. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. CANTOR. Can we have it reported, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. There are three amendments.

Mr. MILLER. I have offered three amendments.

Mr. JONES. Can we have them reported, Mr. Chairman, in the order in which they were offered?

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after the word "stable," in line 4 of the second paragraph, insert the word "representative," so that the line will read, as amended, "to recognize their independence as soon as a stable representative government can be established therein."

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after the word "established," in line 4 of the second paragraph, insert the words "and maintained."

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after the word "therein," in line 4 of the second paragraph, insert the following: "*Provided*, That the people of the Philippine Islands shall desire their independence expressed by a majority vote of the qualified electors at the general election held next after it shall be decided that a stable government can be established."

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER) there were—ayes 33, noes 100.

So the amendment was lost.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The Clerk read as follows:

In the preamble, second paragraph, third line, after the word "islands," insert the following: "ceded to the United States Government by the treaty of peace concluded between the United States and Spain on the 11th day of April, 1899, the boundaries of which are set forth in article 4 of said treaty.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, under the rule I think the committee rises without any motion.

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ADAIR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to with the preamble, and that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I take it that under the practice laid down in the Manual the question now comes on the preamble. The Manual says in a note:

In the practice of the House of Representatives the preamble of a bill or joint resolution is agreed to most conveniently after the engrossment and before the third reading.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the preamble.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on that.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 62, answered "present" 4, not voting 149, as follows:

YEAS—214.

Abercrombie	Davis	Hensley	Riordan
Adair	Decker	Holland	Rogers
Adamson	Deitrick	Houston	Rothermel
Aiken	Dent	Howard	Rouse
Alexander	Dershem	Hughes, Ga.	Rubey
Ashbrook	Dickinson	Hull	Rucker
Aswell	Dies	Humphreys, Miss.	Rupley
Bailey	Difenderfer	Igoe	Russell
Baker	Dillon	Jacoway	Saunders
Barkley	Dixon	Johnson, Ky.	Shackleford
Barnhart	Donohoe	Johnson, S. C.	Sherley
Bartlett	Donovan	Jones	Sherwood
Barton	Dooling	Keating	Sims
Bathrick	Doolittle	Kennedy, Conn.	Sisson
Beall, Tex.	Doremus	Kettner	Slayden
Bell, Ga.	Doughton	Key, Ohio	Small
Blackmon	Driscoll	Kinkead, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Borchers	Dupré	Kirkpatrick	Smith, Tex.
Borland	Eagan	Lafferty	Stanley
Brockson	Eagle	Lazaro	Stedman
Brodbeck	Edwards	Lesher	Stephens, Miss.
Broussard	Evans	Lever	Stephens, Nebr.
Brown, W. Va.	Falconer	Lieb	Stephens, Tex.
Bruckner	Fergusson	Lloyd	Stone
Brumbaugh	Ferris	Lobeck	Stout
Buchanan, Tex.	Finley	Logue	Taggart
Bulkley	FitzHenry	Lonergan	Talcott, N. Y.
Burgess	Floyd, Ark.	McClellan	Tavenner
Burnett	Gallivan	McGillicuddy	Taylor, Ark.
Byrnes, S. C.	Garner	McKellar	Taylor, Colo.
Byrns, Tenn.	Garrett, Tenn.	Maguire, Nebr.	Taylor, N. Y.
Candler, Miss.	Garrett, Tex.	Mitchell	Ten Eyck
Cantor	George	Montague	Thomas
Cantrill	Gill	Moon	Thompson, Okla.
Caraway	Gillett	Morgan, La.	Townsend
Carew	Gilmore	Morrison	Tribble
Carlin	Goeke	Moss, Ind.	Underhill
Carter	Goodwin, Ark.	Murray	Underwood
Cary	Gordon	O'Brien	Vaughan
Casey	Goulden	Oldfield	Vollmer
Chandler, N. Y.	Gray	Padgett	Walker
Clancy	Griest	Page, N. C.	Weaver
Clark, Fla.	Griffin	Park	Webb
Claypool	Hamill	Peterson	Whaley
Cline	Hamlin	Phelan	Whitacre
Coady	Hardwick	Post	White
Connelly, Kans.	Hardy	Pou	Williams
Cooper	Harrison	Quin	Wilson, Fla.
Cox	Hart	Rainey	Wingo
Crisp	Hay	Raker	Witherspoon
Crosser	Hayden	Rauch	Young, Tex.
Cullop	Heflin	Rayburn	The Speaker
Dale	Helm	Reilly, Conn.	
Davenport	Helvering	Reilly, Wis.	

NAYS—62.

Ainey	Fess	Kiess, Pa.	Plumley
Avis	Frear	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Scott
Barchfeld	Gardner	Kreider	Sells
Beakes	Good	La Follette	Sloan
Browne, Wis.	Green, Iowa	Langham	Smith, Idaho
Bryan	Greene, Mass.	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, J. M. C.
Butler	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin	Stafford
Campbell	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mann	Steenerson
Cramton	Hawley	Miller	Sutherland
Curry	Hayes	Mondell	Thomson, Ill.
Danforth	Helgesen	Moore	Towner
Drukker	Hinds	Morgan, Okla.	Vare
Dunn	Humphrey, Wash.	Parker	Volstead
Esch	Johnson, Utah.	Patton, Pa.	Young, N. Dak.
Fairchild	Johnson, Wash.	Payne	
Farr	Kennedy, Iowa	Platt	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Fields	Hammond	Smith, Saml. W.	Taylor, Ala.

NOT VOTING—149.

Allen	Fowler	Kindel	Neeley, Kans.
Anderson	Francis	Kitchin	Neely, W. Va.
Ansberry	French	Knowland, J. R.	Nelson
Anthony	Gallagher	Konop	Nolan, J. I.
Austin	Gard	Korbly	Norton
Baltz	Gerry	Langley	Oglesby
Bartholdt	Gittins	Lee, Ga.	O'Hair
Bell, Cal.	Glass	Lee, Pa.	O'Leary
Booher	Godwin, N. C.	L'Engle	O'Shaunessy
Bowdle	Goldfogle	Lenroot	Paige, Mass.
Britten	Gorman	Levy	Palmer
Brown, N. Y.	Graham, Ill.	Lewis, Md.	Patten, N. Y.
Browning	Graham, Pa.	Lewis, Pa.	Peters
Buchanan, Ill.	Gregg	Lindbergh	Porter
Burke, Pa.	Gudger	Lindquist	Powers
Burke, S. Dak.	Guernsey	Linthicum	Prouty
Burke, Wis.	Hamilton, Mich.	Loft	Ragsdale
Calder	Harris	McAndrews	Reed
Callaway	Haugen	McKenzie	Roberts, Mass.
Carr	Henry	MacDonald	Roberts, Nev.
Church	Hill	Madden	Sabath
Collier	Hinebaugh	Mahan	Scully
Connolly, Iowa	Hobson	Maher	Seldomridge
Conry	Howell	Manahan	Shreve
Copley	Hoxworth	Mapes	Sinnott
Edmonds	Hughes, W. Va.	Martin	Slemp
Elder	Hulings	Merritt	Smith, Minn.
Estopinal	Kahn	Metz	Smith, N. Y.
Faison	Keister	Morin	Sparkman
Fitzgerald	Kelley, Mich.	Moss, W. Va.	Stephens, Cal.
Flood, Va.	Kelly, Pa.	Mott	Stevens, Minn.
Fordney	Kennedy, R. I.	Mulkey	Stevens, N. H.
Foster	Kent	Murdock	Stringer
Sumners	Treadway	Watkins	Woodruff
Switzer	Tuttle	Watson	Woods
Talbott, Md.	Wallin	Willis	
Temple	Walsh	Wilson, N. Y.	
Thacher	Walters	Winslow	

So the preamble was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. ANSBERRY with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. CARR with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. COLLIER with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. ELDER with Mr. HAUGEN.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. HINEBAUGH.

Mr. FAISON with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. HULINGS.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. FOSTER with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.

Mr. FRANCIS with Mr. SHREVE.

Mr. REED with Mr. SINNOTT.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE with Mr. STEPHENS of California.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. THACHER with Mr. WALTERS.

Mr. TUTTLE with Mr. WOODRUFF.

Mr. WALSH with Mr. WOODS.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. GARD with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GERRY with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. MCKENZIE.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. MAPES.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. GUDGER with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. KONOP with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. NELSON.

Mr. MCANDREWS with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. NEELY of West Virginia with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada (commencing Wednesday, October 14, 1914, except on war-tax bill or conference report).

Mr. LEVY with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. GORMAN with Mr. FRENCH.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. CHURCH with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. LOFT with Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland with Mr. TEMPLE.

Mr. MANAHAN with Mr. GREGG.

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.

Mr. WATKINS with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. BROWN of New York with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

On the vote:

Mr. BOOHER (for Philippine bill) with Mr. KAHN (against).

For the session:

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. HAMMOND with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota.

Mr. METZ with Mr. WALLIN.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether the gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. BURKE, voted on this preamble?

The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota and I voted "aye." I would like to change my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. HAMMOND was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire if my colleague, Mr. LANGLEY, voted on this question?

The SPEAKER. He did not vote.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with my colleague, Mr. LANGLEY. I voted "aye." I desire to withdraw that vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. FIELDS was called, and he answered "Present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri was called, and he answered "Aye." [Applause.]

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and on that motion I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] moves to recommit the bill, and on that motion he moves the previous question.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington rise?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a motion for a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do that with the previous question pending.

Mr. BRYAN. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa this is the prohibition amendment, and I hope he will not stand in the way of it.

The SPEAKER. The question can not be debated.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 212, nays 60, answered "present" 4, not voting 153, as follows:

YEAS—212.

Abercrombie	Davenport	Helm	Reilly, Wis.
Adair	Davis	Helvering	Riordan
Adamson	Decker	Hensley	Rogers
Aiken	Deitrick	Holland	Rothermel
Alexander	Dent	Houston	Rouse
Ashbrook	Dershem	Howard	Rubey
Aswell	Dickinson	Hughes, Ga.	Rucker
Bailey	Dies	Hull	Rupley
Baker	Difenderfer	Humphreys, Miss.	Russell
Baltz	Dillon	Igoe	Saunders
Barkley	Dixon	Johnson, Ky.	Shackleford
Barnhart	Donohoe	Johnson, S. C.	Sherley
Bartlett	Donovan	Jones	Sherwood
Barton	Dooling	Keating	Sims
Bathrick	Doolittle	Kennedy, Conn.	Sisson
Beall, Tex.	Doremus	Kettner	Slayden
Bell, Ga.	Doughton	Key, Ohio	Small
Blackmon	Driscoll	Kinkead, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Borchers	Dupré	Kirkpatrick	Smith, Tex.
Borland	Eagan	Kitchin	Sparkman
Brockson	Eagle	Lazaro	Stanley
Brodbeck	Edwards	Lesher	Stedman
Broussard	Evans	Lever	Stephens, Miss.
Brown, W. Va.	Falconer	Lieb	Stephens, Nebr.
Bruckner	Farr	Lloyd	Stephens, Tex.
Brumbaugh	Fergusson	Lobeck	Stone
Buchanan, Tex.	Ferris	Logue	Stout
Bulkley	Finley	Lonergan	Taggart
Burgess	FitzHenry	McClellan	Talcott, N. Y.
Burnett	Floyd, Ark.	McGillicuddy	Tavenner
Byrnes, S. C.	Gallivan	McKellar	Taylor, Ark.
Byrns, Tenn.	Garner	Maguire, Nebr.	Taylor, Colo.
Candler, Miss.	Garrett, Tenn.	Mitchell	Taylor, N. Y.
Cantor	Garrett, Tex.	Montague	Thomas
Cantrill	George	Moon	Thompson, Okla.
Caraway	Gill	Morgan, La.	Thomson, Ill.
Carew	Gilmore	Morrison	Townsend
Carlin	Goeke	Moss, Ind.	Tribble
Carter	Goodwin, Ark.	Murray	Underhill
Cary	Gordon	Neely, W. Va.	Underwood
Casey	Goulden	O'Brien	Vaughan
Chandler, N. Y.	Gray	Oldfield	Vollmer
Clancy	Griest	Padgett	Walker
Clark, Fla.	Griffin	Page, N. C.	Weaver
Claypool	Hamill	Park	Webb
Cline	Hamlin	Peterson	Whaley
Coady	Hardwick	Phelan	Whitacre
Cooper	Hardy	Quin	White
Cox	Harrison	Rainey	Williams
Crisp	Hart	Raker	Wingo
Crosser	Hay	Rauch	Witherspoon
Cullop	Hayden	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
Dale	Heflin	Reilly, Conn.	The Speaker

NAYS—60.

Ainey	Bryan	Curry	Fairchild
Avis	Butler	Danforth	Fess
Barchfeld	Campbell	Dunn	Frear
Browne, Wis.	Cramton	Esch	Gardner
Gillett	Johnson, Utah	Miller	Sinnott
Good	Johnson, Wash.	Mondell	Sloan
Green, Iowa	Kennedy, Iowa	Moore	Smith, Idaho
Greene, Mass.	Kiess, Pa.	Morgan, Okla.	Smith, J. M. C.
Greene, Vt.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Parker	Stafford
Hamilton, N. Y.	Kreider	Patton, Pa.	Steenerson
Hawley	La Follette	Payne	Sutherland
Hayes	Langham	Platt	Towner
Helgesen	McGuire, Okla.	Plumley	Vare
Hinds	McLaughlin	Scott	Volstead
Humphrey, Wash.	Mann	Sells	Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Beakes	Fields	Hammond	Smith, Saml. W.

NOT VOTING—153.

Allen	Gerry	Levy	Prouty
Anderson	Gittins	Lewis, Md.	Ragsdale
Ansberry	Glass	Lewis, Pa.	Reed
Anthony	Godwin, N. C.	Lindbergh	Roberts, Mass.
Austin	Goldfogle	Lindquist	Roberts, Nev.
Bartholdt	Gorman	Linthicum	Sabath
Bell, Cal.	Graham, Ill.	Loft	Scully
Booher	Graham, Pa.	McAndrews	Seldomridge
Bowdle	Gregg	McKenzie	Shreve
Britten	Gudger	MacDonald	Slemp
Brown, N. Y.	Guernsey	Madden	Smith, Minn.
Browning	Hamilton, Mich.	Mahan	Smith, N. Y.
Buchanan, Ill.	Harris	Maher	Stephens, Cal.
Burke, Pa.	Haugen	Manahan	Stevens, Minn.
Burke, S. Dak.	Henry	Mapes	Stevens, N. H.
Burke, Wis.	Hill	Martin	Stringer
Calder	Hinebaugh	Merritt	Sumners
Callaway	Hobson	Metz	Switzer
Carr	Howell	Morin	Talbott, Md.
Church	Hoxworth	Moss, W. Va.	Taylor, Ala.
Collier	Hughes, W. Va.	Mott	Temple
Connelly, Kans.	Hulings	Mulkey	Ten Eyck
Connolly, Iowa	Jacoway	Murdock	Thacher
Conry	Kahn	Neeley, Kans.	Treadway
Copley	Keister	Nelson	Tuttle
Drukker	Kelley, Mich.	Nolan, J. I.	Wallin
Edmonds	Kelly, Pa.	Norton	Walsh
Elder	Kennedy, R. I.	Oglesby	Walters
Estopinal	Kent	O'Hair	Watkins
Faison	Kindel	O'Leary	Watson
Fitzgerald	Knowland, J. R.	O'Shaunessy	Willis
Flood, Va.	Konop	Paige, Mass.	Wilson, Fla.
Fordney	Korbly	Palmer	Wilson, N. Y.
Foster	Lafferty	Patten, N. Y.	Winslow
Fowler	Langley	Peters	Woodruff
Francis	Lee, Ga.	Porter	Woods
French	Lee, Pa.	Post	
Gallagher	L'Engle	Pou	
Gard	Lenroot	Powers	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. LEVY (for) with Mr. GERRY (against).

Mr. SCULLY (for) with Mr. BROWNING (against).

Mr. J. I. NOLAN (for) with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (against).

Mr. SABATH (for) with Mr. GUERNSEY (against).

Mr. FITZHENRY (for) with Mr. MCKENZIE (against).

Mr. MITCHELL (for) with Mr. MADDEN (against).

Mr. FIELDS (for) with Mr. LANGLEY (against).

Mr. LINTHICUM (for) with Mr. WILLIS (against).

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois (for) with Mr. ANTHONY (against).

Mr. GORMAN (for) with Mr. FRENCH (against).

Mr. DIFENDERFER (for) with Mr. ANTHONY (against).

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland (for) with Mr. TEMPLE (against).

Mr. WATSON (for) with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan (against).

Mr. WILSON of Florida (for) with Mr. STEPHENS of California (against).

Mr. WALSH (for) with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia (against).

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas (for) with Mr. MERRITT (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GOOD, recorded?

The SPEAKER. He is not.

Mr. MANN. I will not ask to have him recorded. He answered to his name; but he can correct it himself in the morning.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea," but I find that I am paired with my colleague, Mr. LANGLEY, and I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. FIELDS was called, and he answered "Present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri was called, and he voted "yea," as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] if he asked that the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GOOD, be recorded?

Mr. MANN. I did not; but he voted "nay."

Mr. HAYES. He stood right behind me, and voted "nay."

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Illinois asks that it be done, the Chair will have him recorded.

Mr. MANN. Well, he can correct it in the morning without objection, I take it.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. JONES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the preamble was adopted and the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MULKEY, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for the day, on account of illness.

COTTON WAREHOUSES.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, in a recent Washington dispatch to a Georgia paper announcing my introduction of a bill to relieve the cotton producers the correspondent added:

The Georgia Congressman has assurances from his colleagues of support which he believes will assure the passage of the bill.

That is a solid, honest paper, with a conscientious management. The sentence added in the dispatch is a pardonable gratuity. The optimistic correspondent, with a good heart, wished to say something pleasant, if not sensational, so he added the cheerful fabrication as to assurance of support and belief in passage. Newspaper statements attributing to Congressmen hope of securing this sort of legislation and reckless statements of politicians not in Congress have resulted in unfortunate misapprehension on the part of the people and aroused in them hope of Federal legislation. Then an effort has been made by the same newspapers and politicians to prejudice the minds of the people by alleging that Congressmen have promised to secure specific Federal legislation with definite results.

The appalling disaster visited upon the South is lamentable enough without being aggravated by the play of cheap politics and unjust charges against Congressmen, producing distrust among the people. The newspapers and politicians do not even specify any particular Congressmen as guilty of making such promises, but with a general sweep of indiscriminate denunciation charge Congress in general with being recreant in failing to provide relief for emergency conditions in the South, as though Congress, forsooth, had promised to do so. Some men assert in the papers that apathy or opposition of some southern Congressmen, without specifying which, is responsible for failure to secure relief.

On their face these statements appear ridiculous. I doubt not that every Member of Congress sympathizes with the South in suffering the irreparable blow which has fallen upon her without her fault and without warning. I believe every Representative here will agree that Members from the Southern States have been earnest and active, in season and out of season, to find some way to meet the demands of the situation. When the universal war began it peremptorily stopped the mills and closed the markets which usually take two-thirds of our cotton crop. No matter how short the war might be it came at a time when the cotton crop was ready to be placed on the market. That crop not only represented the labor of the producers but also all their credit. To supply them credit to produce that crop required all the capacity of the landlords, the supply merchants, and the local banks, and the banks strained their credit in the money centers to supply credit to the merchants and landlords. That crop, with by-products, the day before hostilities began represented considerably more than a billion dollars. The crop is not too large under normal conditions. The world needs every bit of it. On the average the people who produced it have not nor ever had one-third as much cotton goods as they really need.

If normal conditions had permitted them to realize the value of their cotton, the profit of the crops would have enabled them to supply their needs and thereby utilize every bit of the artificial surplus we hear so much about the necessity of retiring. If they were allowed enough profit to enable them to use what cotton goods they need themselves, their own demands would furnish a better market than all the East, and consume one-third of the entire crop. The foreign markets having entirely closed, the domestic mills, never having furnished a market for more than one-third, were unable to meet the emergency and supply a market for the entire crop, and conditions being so uncertain that they did not know what to depend on in the general confusion and calamity, they decided they were afraid to buy at all, so they virtually destroyed the market for the other third, declining to buy cotton except in dribbles as they could consume it. Then, the entire demand being removed and all markets closed, the law of supply and demand was completely suspended, there being a bountiful supply and absolutely no demand. There was no place to send the cotton, therefore it would be foolish to start to move it. There being no one to receive it, there was no place for it to go. Under such circumstances it was cruel mockery for people to talk of moving the cotton crop, except to move from the cotton field into the cotton house or warehouse. It was obvious that the cotton must be held by somebody, if gathered at all, to wait until the market should be opened. The question was, who should hold it? Should the producer suffer confiscation wholly or in part by parting with it for a trifle, not only forfeiting the profit of his labor, but failing to pay half of his debts, and leaving himself and family without the means to live, without credit for another year, and without the heart to produce another crop if he should unexpectedly be credited with the means? Such conditions render unnecessary the discussion of curtailing the next crop.

The impoverished condition of the toilers will curtail that, for unless some means are found to save them from ruin now they will not be able to produce another crop. If money were advanced to producers on their cotton in moderate amounts, something like as much as they would have to take for it if they sacrificed it, they could use the cotton as collateral, and holding it until conditions improve would reap the benefits of the inevitable advance when the markets reopen. If they are not aided in some way to hold it themselves so as to enjoy the benefit of restored prices, the cotton buyers and speculators will take it on their own terms and hold it until, by reopening of the markets, the price advances to a normal and honest rate, thereby making for themselves great gain. If they were all southerners and made the deal in their own right the wealth would remain in the South, although the producers would be robbed of the value of their cotton; if the buyers were all Americans trading in their own right people in the United States would still retain all the profit and our balance of trade would be maintained, though the South lost half the value of the cotton, and although the producers were financially ruined and carried down with them the merchants whom they owed, because not realizing on their cotton enough to pay them, and the merchants in turn not being able to discharge their obligations. But, unfortunately, these deals are not all made on American account. When the markets shall be reopened it will be found that most of this cotton bought by the factors at a sacrificial figure has been bought with foreign capital, and when it is shipped abroad the difference between 12 cents and 6 cents paid by the foreigners for our cotton will entirely wipe out the balance of trade and leave us a debtor nation, with the producers of cotton impoverished and helpless, and the southern supply merchants either bankrupt or so crippled as not to be able to help the producers to make another crop.

True, some people deny the extent of the disaster and even question the emergency itself, saying that in previous years the farmers have without ruin sold their cotton for lower prices than now prevail. Such persons forget that prices mean nothing except by comparison. The 5-cent cotton of past years was produced for somewhere about 5 cents; supplies to make the crop and to buy with the crop cost less than half they now cost; the debts contracted were less than half the debts due for producing the present crop. The producers really received more, by comparison with cost and debts, when the price was 5 cents than is possible now. The net result at the present confiscatory prices is on the minus side. The value of money can only be ascertained by what it will buy. Compared with cost of production or the debts of the producers owed therefor, this crop ought to bring 12 or 14 cents, while compared with current prices of cotton goods cotton ought to bring 18 or 20 cents.

With such horrible conditions harrowing our minds, it is not surprising that southern Congressmen were quick to comprehend the gravity of the situation and begin to exercise their wits and work night and day to discover and invoke means to prevent or mitigate impending calamity. The only thing more surprising than that is that the aforesaid newspapers and politicians were either too careless to discover or too reckless to acknowledge that the southern Congressmen, although not all agreeing as to method to secure relief, were feeling, talking, and acting just as I have described, bent on thrashing out the question and finding and applying relief if possible.

We knew, and the aforesaid newspapers and politicians knew, that the southern Members constituted but a small minority in the House and also a minority in the Senate. But we Members from the South had faith in the patriotism and liberality of our colleagues of the other sections. While the prospect of success was not bright, the situation was so desperate that we continued to work, hoping that light might break on the situation and that mayhap we might fall upon a plan which would commend itself to Congress and the administration. Some few

of our colleagues, inconsiderately, we think, declined to support any of our plans and denounced as dishonest demagogues zealous Congressmen who, with whatever degree of hope, small or great, were earnestly striving to find some safe road to relief. But we began to hold meetings innumerable in the Senate Building, in the House Building, in committee rooms, in the Treasury, and at the White House. The farmers came here and pictured their desperate condition. We met with them and heard them repeat their true and terrible tale of woe, horrible now, and more terrible in prospect, to the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Reserve Board, all of whom heard with interest and sympathy, but declared they must act in this matter with their heads, not with their hearts. It may not be necessary, however, simply because they failed to give us encouragement, for us to conclude that their heads are weaker than their hearts. Numerous bills have been introduced, but no one of them has had the unanimous approval of even the southern Congressmen up to this time, neither has a single one of them met with the unanimous approval of the critics in the newspapers, political and otherwise, nor have all of them agreed on any practical suggestions which they could advise Congress to put through, although denouncing Congress for not acting and accusing Congressmen of violated promises to act.

In fact, long before any person outside of Congress suggested the possibility of Federal interference to avert disaster we had promptly taken up the subject. Although the exchange system was broken up, we thought if commodities could move from where they are to where they are not, and therefore needed worse, gold could also be transported in compensation, and we knew wherever gold could pass the possibility would soon be followed by a representative or substitute. All ships of belligerents having withdrawn from the traffic, we, believing that neutral ships could carry our supplies to all the ports of the Old World, promptly provided for a sufficient number of ships under the American flag to carry all of our products to Europe. The war-risk insurance being too great for private companies to handle, we provided for the Government to insure cargoes on all ships flying the American flag. While these measures will rapidly afford relief, it can not be done rapidly enough to save from ruin the producers of the cotton. It is impossible to meet and curb the exact difficulties of the case under our present system of finance. If the banks were disposed to vary their custom, which is not probable, and carry the cotton on loans to the farmers, who are not their direct customers, instead of the commercial people, who are their regular customers and need all the money they can get, and always get it, to buy the cotton while it is cheap—even then they would be unable to take care of the entire situation. So we were compelled to recognize that unless the Government, either through the banks or directly to the producers, advanced money, disaster could not be averted.

The bill referred to in the outset of my remarks reads as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19113) to enable owners of cotton produced by them or on their land to borrow money by depositing as security warehouse receipts issued for the period of the loan.

Be it enacted, etc., That any solvent national bank or State bank which shall, within 60 days from and after the passage of this act, lend to the owner of any cotton produced by himself or on his land by his cropper or tenant not more than three-fourths of the market value of said cotton at the time and place of the transaction, taking the borrower's note therefor, secured by the deposit of warehouse receipts for such cotton, with an insurance policy covering the value of the cotton for the period of the loan such note to mature one year after date and bear interest at the legal rate in the State in which the loan is made, may at any time before the maturity of such note deposit the note, cotton receipts, and insurance policy with the Treasury or any subtreasury of the United States and be refunded, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amount of the money loaned: *Provided*, That when such note is finally paid the said bank shall receive as compensation for its services one-third of the interest collected, and the said bank shall indorse on such note and collateral its warranty that the papers are genuine and that the loan did not exceed three-fourths of the market price at the time and place of the loan. Beyond that the bank shall be held for no further liability, except to render the Treasury such assistance as may be called for in collecting and remitting when the note matures.

I never did tell anybody I could pass it, nor did I try to deceive anybody about it. I introduced it for the consideration of my colleagues. Nor did I even ask anybody to put it in a newspaper. I wrote it with a view of obviating objections urged against our plan in our conferences. The Secretary of the Treasury and the President had satisfied me that however good their disposition they were unable to afford adequate relief without legislation. They had opposed issuing bonds, and expressly to avoid issuing bonds had recommended the war-revenue bill. Many Congressmen had objected to a deposit of hundreds of millions of dollars, while others object to an additional note issue without increasing the gold reserve.

All the local business interests, including the banks, objected to unsettling business by lowering the rates of interest on loans made in the various States. And it seems to me that almost everybody objected to the valorization plan. If it were fixed too high, the Government would have to take it all; if fixed too low, it would result in holding down the price. So I conceived a plan of enabling the banks to do the business on certain specified conditions:

First. For a limited period of time lend to producers only.

Second. Observe the legal rate of interest at the place of the transaction.

Third. My bill would render necessary no sale of bonds nor issue of additional currency. If it were passed, we would find there was sufficient money afloat to meet all the demands, and that is a great advantage of my bill which does not seem to have been recognized by my colleagues. The truth is that when the system is started whereby money will be loaned on distress cotton the effect would be magical; confidence of the producers would be restored and the purchasers would recover from their panic, the price would rise, sales would occur, and the money loaned would be paid out on debts and returned to the bank and loaned on other cotton—so a much smaller amount would be required in the end than our people in their distress seem now to deem necessary.

Fourth. That they lend not exceeding three-fourths of the market value at the time and place of the transaction. Lending with regard to market value does not arbitrarily fix prices; but when it is known that three-fourths of the price can be borrowed on a bale of cotton many of the producers will refuse to sell, but prefer to borrow a portion of the price and hold their cotton for better prices. The effect would be that the purchasers would begin to compete for cotton and the price would advance. It would certainly never go any lower when it was known that the Government was prepared to lend to the producers so as to save them the necessity of selling at a sacrifice. The loan for 12 months would give the borrower a chance, and he could sell his cotton if the price advanced and pay off the loan before it was due. The banker making the loan could at any time before maturity of the note send his paper to the Treasury and be refunded his advance. It is analogous to the regional-bank system, and is the regular and natural way of doing business. The member bank carries his note with commercial collaterals to the regional bank and, less the discount, is refunded the money advanced. Under my bill the bank would use the Treasury instead of the regional bank. Under the regional-bank system the member bank would indorse the note; under my bill he would indorse the note only as far as necessary. The cotton ticket, being the best security in the world when the cotton is insured against loss, needs no further indorsement to make it the best gilt-edge security in the world than the guaranty that the deal is genuine and bona fide. But, in the face of a great crisis already upon us, I do not care to stickle for a particular bill.

I went into conference with the other representatives of the cotton States, and we agreed upon a bill, and I am bound by it—I always stand hitched. No man can win alone; only by united action can we hope to succeed. The revised Henry bill is entirely constitutional; there is nothing revolutionary about it; there is nothing unusual about it except the amount of money involved. The Government has in many instances before extended aid in cases no more meritorious, but smaller amounts were furnished. But, even if our scheme is a large one and the proposition unusual, Members should recollect that this is not an ordinary occasion; there is the greatest emergency upon us that has fallen upon the South, and through the South the entire country, except the Civil War, in the history of our Republic. Words can not exaggerate the existing suffering and the danger of greater calamity in the immediate future. When the producers are stricken down, all the superstructure of our system trembles if it does not fall. Members should abate some of their squeamishness in the face of this great disaster. There can be no danger to the Treasury, and Members are unnecessarily alarmed about the soundness of money and the credit of the country. If this Government never goes bankrupt until it does so by protecting the cotton producers, it will live to flourish for ages to come. The rock of its salvation financially is to take care of them.

There is so much paper money resting on so small a gold reserve nobody need "tear passion to tatters" about this proposition. The necessity and wisdom of a proper ratio of gold reserve to the paper money I do not care to discuss, but men are going a long way out of the sane and orderly path when they lie awake at night questioning the validity of any money now issued or hereafter ever to be issued by authority of the United States. There is another matter I wish to call attention

to—the demand of the commercial side of the issue, curtailment of the next cotton crop—and some people responding to that demand have insisted that Congress by a prohibitive tax prevent overproduction of cotton next year.

I have always advocated and practiced that farmers should first provide for their own household by planting supply crops and raising live stock and devoting the remainder of their land and labor to raising cotton as a surplus crop, but I have never believed that it would operate permanently to reduce the crop. Intensive farming has satisfied us that our farmers could make just as much cotton on half the land they now plant and leave some margin of labor, fertilizer, and other expense to devote to supply crops. Our people during the Confederacy needed supplies, but they did not need cotton, as they could neither spin nor export it, and it might fall into the hands of the enemy and enable them to fight us more fiercely. If the Confederacy could have turned a large cotton crop into gold, they would have been glad to do so; but by legislation they curtailed the acreage so that the armies and the people could be supported and that the people would not waste time cultivating cotton for the enemy to capture.

At this time the farmers have not asked us for advice nor for the imposition of further burdens of taxation. If they wish to curtail the cotton acreage, they will find a way to do so. The State legislatures can do so, if they wish, under their police powers.

The cotton growers have asked us to provide money to take care of the distress cotton of this crop, not to manage their future business for them. Those who urge the excise tax to limit the production of cotton cite what they call several precedents. All are agreed that we may levy such a tax for the purpose of raising revenue, and the Constitution authorizes that only, but they say Congress imposed a tax on cotton once. That is true, but it was really for the purpose of raising revenue, but it was never sustained by a full bench, and was repealed because it was so odious. They further cite the tax on notes of State banks and oleomargarine. Those are unfortunate citations, and they are both abominable outrages, and I would rather repeal them than to commit another outrage. The first was passed to put State banks out of business and help the national-bank monopoly; the second was passed to put oleomargarine out of business and raise the price of dairy products.

As I understand the attitude of the courts, they leave Congress to say what the character of a bill is. If Congress deliberately promulgates a bill declared to be a revenue bill, the courts will take it for granted that Congress is telling the truth about it and hold it constitutional without interrogating the tax collectors as to the revenue produced or cross-examining Congressmen as to the integrity of their purpose in enacting it as a revenue bill. But if Congress should pass a bill levying a prohibitive tax on cotton with the purpose declared in the law that it was not to raise revenue and not expected to raise revenue, but to prevent the overproduction of cotton, no lawyer would contend that the Supreme Court would sustain such a bill as constitutional.

The proposition up to us now is to try to fool our consciences, fool the Supreme Court, and fool the people under the guise of a revenue bill by levying such a high tax on cotton that it would reduce production and raise no revenue. The majority in the Congresses which passed the oleomargarine law and the tax on State banks may or may not have known what the truth was, but it is certain they did not tell the truth, and the Supreme Court has never passed on the facts, but accepted the two acts as bona fide revenue measures. In this case, when we know that the purpose of a tax on cotton would not be for revenue, but to prevent overproduction, knowing that the Constitution prevents our voting for a tax bill not intended for revenue, we could hardly be expected to vote for such a bill. The newspapers and politicians who have criticized us are not even united in demanding that. In fact, many of them admit that it is not competent for us so to vote.

In a recent meeting of the governors of the cotton States here, several of the governors agreed with us, my own among the number, and my own governor favored curtailing the acreage, but not by Federal taxation. He favored the Henry bill, with proviso that borrowers should contract to reduce acreage. Very few of the Members of the House and Senate at this time would agree that under the Constitution they could honestly vote for such a tax bill. A few of them so believe, and I believe they are as honest as I am; they are just mistaken in their discrimination. They are as anxious to afford relief as I am, and this reference is not made to criticize them at all, but to set right before the country the true issue in that respect.

There is one thing that all Members representing the cotton States have practically united on, and we have tried now, and often before, to secure action on it—that is, the repeal or suspension of tax on State banks. If the State banks were free to issue their currency this crisis could have been easily met and disaster averted. That tax ought to be repealed regardless of other action in this crisis, but I appeal to all to sink all rigid notions of policy and eschew differences and criminations and recriminations. The bill agreed on in our conference of representatives of the cotton States has more support than any other proposition brought in; it would bring immediate relief if passed. It can be made to appl, the remedy immediately to the disease with instant effect. It is constitutional; it is rational; it is practical; it is the only thing the farmers have demanded, and I appeal to you, my colleagues, that we support that bill, and failing to pass that, then try some other. I for one decline to vote for adjournment or consent to a recess until we shall have either secured relief legislation or, by a fair opportunity to present the case and secure a vote on it, been finally and fairly defeated in our efforts. The cause is just, and I insist on consideration in this House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on a subject of interest to my people in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on some subject which will interest the people of Oklahoma. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUPLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to secure unanimous consent for the purpose of extending in the RECORD some comment upon the principles of the Progressive Party.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RUPLEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the principles of the Progressive Party. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, October 15, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture asking Congress for authority and funds to initiate the work of exterminating the pink boll worm of cotton that has made its appearance in Florida (H. Doc. 1175) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

By Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 241) for the appointment of four members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1190), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BEALL of Texas, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 446) directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire and report whether the action of this House is necessary concerning the alleged official misconduct of Daniel Thew Wright, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1191), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19092) granting a pension to Frank Stires, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 19281) to provide for the issue and sale of the Panama Canal bonds and for the deposit of

their proceeds in certain banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 19282) for the relief of the cotton situation in certain Southern States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19283) authorizing a per capita payment to Choctaws and Chickasaws; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 19284) to appropriate $15,000, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture, for preventing the spread of the pink boll worm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAY: Resolution (H. Res. 646) to provide for the consideration of House joint resolution 241; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 647) requesting the President and the Secretary of the Navy to inform the House on certain matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Resolution (H. Res. 648) to pay John J. Cameron $500 for extra services during the first and second sessions of the Sixty-third Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 19285) granting an increase of pension to John T. Harnish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 19286) granting a pension to David F. Boddie; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19287) granting an increase of pension to Jane Amanda Putnam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 19288) granting an increase of pension to Junius R. Clift; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19289) granting an increase of pension to Martin Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 19290) granting a pension to Levi B. Roseberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIEB: A bill (H. R. 19291) granting an increase of pension to Dixon Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19292) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah W. Pickering; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 19293) granting an increase of pension to Ida E. Thorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 19294) granting an increase of pension to Deitrick Bruns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 19295) granting an increase of pension to George S. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 19296) for the relief of John R. McClain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19297) granting a pension to Sarah L. Moredock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 19298) granting a pension to Rose Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of William B. Klahre, of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against tax on motion-picture theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Twentieth Century Manufacturing Co., of Boynton, Pa.; the Moxham Lumber Co., the Penn Traffic Co., and R. G. Morgart, all of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against tax on automobiles and auto factories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petitions of D. K. Webster, B. Wilkins, George Altgoever, P. Mesiani, J. Ellner, F. Delucia, Abr. Ackerman, Joseph Altman, E. Gordeso, S. Berkowitz, J. Jannis, William Hammer, S. Aronsontom, G. Max Wornon, A. Allison, James Wilson, W. S. Gennis, H. Goldfarb, and V. Gayda, all of New York, N. Y., against tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Daniel R. Jones Co., of Milwaukee Wis. against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of the board of directors of the Milwaukee (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against a tax on sales of grain, etc., when made in exchanges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of 15 business firms of Vallejo, Cal., in favor of House bill 13305, the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of G. W. Blass, of Port Byron, N. Y., and Neeskin Co. and J. L. Hopkins & Co., of New York City, protesting against tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petitions of G. Morillo and others, retail druggists of New York City, protesting against tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petitions of F. C. Judevine, of Bellwood, and others, together with petitions from Gresham, Cordova, Beaver Crossing, Abie, Morse Bluff, Adams, Linwood, Prague, Malmo, Utica, Waco, Germantown, Goehner, Crete, Thayer, Seward, Surprise, Osceola, Rising City, David City, Shelby, and Brainard, all in the State of Nebraska, in favor of House bill 5308, to compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULINGS: Petitions of J. C. Koch, of St. Marys; A. M. Lowentritt, of Oil City; and H. M. Silman, of St. Marys, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the proposed taxation of automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of John C. Owsley, secretary and treasurer of the Sharon Retail Drug Association, of Sharon; G. G. Curry, of Greenville; Ross Drug Co., of Ridgway; John M. Siegfried, of Warren; W. A. Talbott, secretary and treasurer of the Piso Co.; C. Kembel & Son, of Tidioute; and J. W. Agrelius, of Youngsville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the proposed taxation of proprietary medicines and other drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of western Washington, protesting against war tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINDEL: Petition of 21 citizens of Westminster, Colo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of William H. Fogas, Charles Dawson, and D. & R. Rosenbaum, all of Mount Vernon, Ind., protesting against tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolutions of Branch No. 1, Local Barre of the Socialist Party of Vermont, in regard to the increase of the cost of living, and praying that the Government take over railroads, mills, mines, stores, and warehouses for the benefit of all people, and protesting against a tax on the necessities of life; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Bayden Grange, of Westminster, Vt., favoring acquisition of the telephone service by the Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REED: Petitions of the Nashua Auto Club, of Nashua; W. C. Spear, of Manchester; and H. C. Lintott, of Nashua, all in the State of New Hampshire, against proposed Government tax based on horsepower of motor cars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petitions of the First Presbyterian Church and Sunday School and sundry citizens of Palmyra, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *October 15, 1914.*

(*Legislative day of Thursday, October 8, 1914.*)

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

THE COTTON SITUATION IN THE SOUTH.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I present a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from the Texas State Senate, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., *October 14, 1914.*

Hon. CHARLES A. CULBERSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following simple resolution, by Senators Henderson and Gibson, was to-day adopted by the Senate of Texas

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas*, That we hereby indorse the amendment as proposed by the southern Senators and offered as an amendment to war-tax bill, wherein it is proposed that the National Government issue $250,000,000 of 4 per cent three-year bonds, and that said bonds shall be used to purchase 5,000,000 bales of this year's cotton at 10 cents per pound, and providing that said cotton