granting permission to build proposed power plant in close proximity to Mall, in the District of Columbia, and selection of a site having the approval of Fine Arts Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Philanthropic Committee of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against any increase in the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Committee on Provision for the Feeble-Minded, Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of House bill 13666; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Union League Club, of Chicago, Ill., in favor of adequate preparedness of Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Baird Holberstadt, of Pottsville, Pa., in favor of House bill 10615; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the International Council for Patriotic Service, New York City, favoring constitutional amendment forbidding polygamy in the States and Territories of the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OAKEY: Memorial of Sons of Veterans of United States Army in encampment September, 1915, indorsed by the C. A. Stedman Camp, of Hartford, Conn., favoring adequate national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of District of Connecticut of the North American Gymnastic Union in annual convention, to preserve peace in United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petitions of 75 merchants of the thirteenth Ohio district, favoring bills taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of F. J. Trunnells and others, of White Hall, Ill., relative to migratory-bird law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Ellen L. Rupert and others, of Rockport, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of W. F. Broeker and others, of Beardstown, Ill., against the Taylor system; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Methodist Episcopal Church of Whittier, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of citizens of Texas, protesting against tendency to involve the United States in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMALL: Petition of 33 people of Washington, Presbyterian Church of Washington, Ladies' Aid Society of Washington, and 33 people of Washington, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany House bill 14902, to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Bonners Ferry, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 15148, granting an increase of pension to Nelson Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: Petition of Oliver & Leasure Lumber Co., H. W. Ross Lumber Co., Boyd Transfer & Storage Co., Morgan Gerrish Co., W. B. & W. G. Jordan Co., Hutchinson Dry Goods Co., S. G. Palmer Co., Northwestern Fur & Hide Co., and other leading business men, all of Minneapolis, Minn., urging equalization of postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Pomona Grange, of Washington County, R. I., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of German-American Alliance of Rhode Island, favoring resolutions to compel right to send Red Cross supplies to belligerents; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Pomona Grange, of Washington County, R. I., favoring Government ownership of telephone and radio means of communication; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of the board of education of New Haven, Conn., urging passage of House bill 11250, vocational education bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of citizens of Boulder County, Colo., against compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Boulder County, Colo., against certain bills pending before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *May 1, 1916.*

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

Almighty God, we come to Thee as seekers after truth in the midst of a struggle for the supremacy of the truth. Thou hast put this passion within us, and Thy sanction makes it dearer to us than life itself. No institutions shall tempt us from this path. No lure of this world, whether it is voiced by expediency or otherwise, shall rob us of that oneness of purpose that looks for the establishment of truth on earth.

Our Lord, who is the Prince of Peace, is the King of Truth. We come to pray that Thou wilt increase within us ever this passion so that we may follow after God's great plan, knowing that at the end if we are true to the revelations of Thy changeless will we shall establish order and happiness and bring blessing to our fellow men. Help us in our divine enterprise. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gallinger	Nelson	Smoot
Bankhead	Gronna	Norris	Sterling
Beckham	Harding	Oliver	Stone
Brady	Hollis	Overman	Sutherland
Brandegee	Husting	Page	Swanson
Broussard	James	Pittman	Taggart
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Poindexter	Tillman
Chilton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pomerene	Underwood
Clapp	Jones	Ransdell	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Robinson	Wadsworth
Colt	Kern	Saulsbury	Walsh
Culberson	La Follette	Shafroth	Warren
Cummins	Lane	Sheppard	Williams
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Sherman	Works
Dillingham	Lodge	Simmons	
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	
Fall	Myers	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to announce the necessary absence to-day of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. GOFF] on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence on public business of my colleague [Mr. HUGHES], and also to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. KERN. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence on official business of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], and also the unavoidable absence, on account of illness, of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. This announcement may stand for the day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4856) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15048) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 2290. An act authorizing the health officer of the District of Columbia to issue a permit for the removal of the remains of the late Elsie McCaulley from Glenwood Cemetery, District of Columbia, to Philadelphia, Pa.;

S. 3769. An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907;

S. 4876. An act to provide for an increase in the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy; and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on the public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial fountain to Alfred Noble.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 13, of Boston, Mass., praying for Government ownership of telephone and telegraph systems, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Hawaii, praying for the establishment of experimental stations in engineering and in other branches of mechanic arts in connection with the colleges established in the several States and Territories, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of the W. F. Assau Canning Co., of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against war talk, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have a petition here from the East Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Colorado Springs, Colo., which I ask to be read at the desk.

There being no objection, the petition was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Hon. JOHN F. SHAFROTH.

DEAR SIR: We, the women of the East Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Colorado Springs, Colo., ask you to have the following resolutions read into the records of the Senate:

"*Resolved*, That we, the East Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Colorado Springs, urge Congress to pass immediately on to the State legislatures for ratification the Sutherland-Mondell woman-suffrage amendment.

"We urge this as citizens who enjoy political freedom and who appreciate the value of being voting citizens in a Republic.

"We urge this because we have come to see that it is one of our first duties to rise above claims of partisanship and use all our political power to raise the women of our country to a plane of equality with ourselves."

Mrs. ANNA MITCHELL, *President*.
Mrs. HUGH SHILLADY, *Secretary*.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Elizabeth Reidell, of Manchester, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petitions of J. M. Johnston, of Rochester, N. Y., and the petition of Charles W. Whitcomb, of New York City, N. Y., praying for an investigation into the practice of vivisection, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of the Chiropody Society of Pennsylvania, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the practice of podiatry or chiropody in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of the Allegheny County Grand Army Association, of Pittsburgh, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide homes for Confederate veterans of the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of General Henry W. Lawton Post, No. 2, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and children of veterans of the Spanish-American War, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry granges of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry granges of Pennsylvania, praying for Government ownership of telephone and telegraph systems, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry patriotic societies of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

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

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mercer and Crawford Counties, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to found the Government on Christianity, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of the Merchants' Association of New York City, N. Y., praying for an appropriation for the maintenance and extension of the pneumatic-tube mail-delivery system, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HARDING presented a memorial of the Greater Dayton Association, of Dayton, Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed location of a power plant in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for an appropriation for the extension and development of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Harrington, Del., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JONES presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wapato, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

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

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of Captain Charles Young Camp, No. 6, Department of Columbia, United Spanish War Veterans, of Vallejo, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish-American War, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 144, Typographical Union, of Fresno, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Veterans' Home, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Pedic Society of the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the practice of podiatry and chiropody in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rochester, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sending of advertisements of intoxicating liquor through the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rochester, N. Y., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rochester, N. Y., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rochester, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit appropriations for sectarian purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rochester, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transportation of obsence motion-picture films, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rochester, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate transmission of race-track gambling odds and bets, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

THE DISTRICT JUVENILE COURT.

Mr. CULBERSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8348) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia," and for other purposes, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia; which was agreed to.

ASSIGNMENT OF RITTMAN PATENT.

Mr. JAMES. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Patents the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept assignment of patent for improvements in the manufacture of gasoline, and for other purposes, and I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The Secretary read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept as trustee for the use and benefit of the people of the United States assignment from Walter F. Rittman of his entire right and title, or of any lesser interest, in, to, and under any letters patent of the United States which may be granted to said Rittman under applications Nos. 29019 and 29020 for patents for certain improvements in the manufacture of gasoline, benzene, toluene, etc., in so far as said applications or the letters patent issued thereunder cover and embrace the manufacture of such products from materials produced and manufactured within the United States, and the said Secretary of the Interior, or his successors, is hereby authorized to grant such licenses and take such steps as may be necessary to make such processes available to the people of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall also be authorized to accept the assignment of any right, title, or interest in or to any patent issued upon any device, improvement, process, equipment, apparatus, or other matter or thing developed by any licensee in the use of the said Rittman processes.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry this resolution into effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. JAMES. I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as explanatory of the joint resolution a letter addressed to me from the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lane; also a letter addressed to me from the Commissioner of Patents, Mr. Thomas Ewing; together with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of Mines, Mr. Manning, giving an explanation of the application of the law and inclosing copies of the assignment of the patent by Dr. Rittman and of the license issued by the department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 21, 1916.

Hon. OLLIE M. JAMES,
Chairman Committee on Patents, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In accordance with your oral request to Mr. Manning, I am sending you herewith a proposed joint resolution which this department desires to have passed, and a justification therefor. The resolution is for the purpose of vesting in the Secretary of the Interior, as trustee for the people of the United States, all rights and interest in any patents which may be secured by Dr. Walter F. Rittman under applications Nos. 22019 and 22020, for patents for certain improvements in the manufacture of gasoline, benzene, and toluene, etc.

The Rittman processes for the production of gasoline, and of benzene and toluene, have been proven commercially practicable, but in the further commercial development of these processes improvements will undoubtedly be made. It is quite possible that some of these improvements may render still more successful and economical the operation of the processes, and if any concern making use of the processes is to be allowed to patent in its own name the improvements that may be developed the result may be the establishment of a virtual monopoly in the hands of the concern securing such patents.

Dr. Rittman, prior to his resignation from the service of the Bureau of Mines on March 31 last, assigned to the Secretary of the Interior all his patent rights in these processes. If Congress is willing, through the joint resolution referred to, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept this assignment of the Rittman processes patents, the public welfare can be adequately protected through a condition imposed upon licenses of the processes, requiring that all improvements developed in their operation shall be patented in the name of the Secretary of the Interior. Unless the authority asked for in this resolution is given to the Secretary of the Interior, he can not accept the assignment of the Rittman patent rights, and these rights may revert to Dr. Rittman or to the private parties or corporations to whom he may assign them.

In view of the serious situation in regard to gasoline and the promise in the Rittman processes of an increased production, it seems to me that early congressional action along the lines of this resolution is highly desirable.

Cordially, yours, FRANKLIN K. LANE, *Secretary.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1916.

Hon. OLLIE M. JAMES,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: Hon. Van. H. Manning, Director of the Bureau of Mines, has transmitted to me your request that I advise you as to my views on the proposed joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept assignment of patent for improvements in the manufacture of gasoline, and for other purposes, arising out of the question of proper handling of the Rittman patents.

I approve the resolution as submitted, and hope it may pass.

Respectfully,

THOMAS EWING, *Commissioner.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, April 29, 1916.

Hon. OLLIE M. JAMES,
Chairman Committee on Patents,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In connection with Senate joint resolution 125, "to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept assignment of patent for improvements in the manufacture of gasoline, and for other purposes," I am sending you herewith certain supplemental information. In order that the justification furnished you for the resolution and Secretary Lane's letter may not convey the impression that Dr. Rittman is to assign all right and title in his processes to the Secretary of the Interior, I am writing you to say that Dr. Rittman is to assign all right and title in his inventions in so far as the same may apply to oils produced in the United States, but will retain all foreign rights and the right to use his processes on oils imported into the United States. I am inclosing a substitute copy of the justification, which has been modified (p. 1, par. 2) in this particular; also copy of the assignment executed by Dr. Rittman.

As stated in the justification and in Secretary Lane's letter to you, the Rittman processes promise to be of great value to the people of the United States. For example, the gasoline process seems certain greatly to increase the gasoline yield of the oil supply of the United States. The crude oils produced in this country have a normal gasoline content of from 5 to 25 per cent with ordinary refining processes. The average gasoline yield of United States oils is somewhere in the neighborhood of 15 per cent. The Rittman cracking process will increase this yield to 45 per cent by running the residuum through the still once, and by taking the remaining products heavier than gasoline and running them back through the still until no more gasoline can be obtained the total gasoline yield can be increased to 75 per cent. The importance of thus increasing the gasoline yield of the average oil of the United States 400 per cent above the yield by ordinary refining processes can hardly be overstated.

The desire of the petroleum industry to use this gasoline process has been so great and so many applications have been received for permission to use the process without waiting for the issuance of a patent that the department has issued a number of licenses for such use pending the granting of the patent and the assignment of the patent rights to the Secretary. I inclose a license form similar to those which have been issued. The list of licensees is as follows:

1. Germania Refining Co., Oil City, Pa.
2. Pure Oil Co., Minneapolis, Minn.
3. Pittsburgh Oil Refining Co., Coraopolis, Pa.
4. Indian Refining Co., Lawrenceville, Ill.
5. Midwest Refining Co., Casper, Wyo.
6. American Oilfields Co. of California, I. W. Fuqua, Fellows, Cal.
7. J. C. McDowell, 1321 Farmers' Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
8. Associated Oil Co., San Francisco, Cal. (Sharon Building).
9. Benolite Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
10. Premier Oil Co., T. Spellacy, Los Angeles, Cal.

In addition to these, applications for licenses are pending and some further licenses are about to be issued.

If there is any further information which I can furnish you in connection with this matter, I should consider it a privilege to do so.

Very truly, yours,

VAN. H. MANNING, *Director.*

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED JOINT RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ACCEPT ASSIGNMENT OF PATENTS FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN THE MANUFACTURE OF GASOLINE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

Dr. Walter F. Rittman, an employee of the Bureau of Mines, invented processes for the production of gasoline, benzene, and toluene from crude or other oils. These processes, properly developed, seem certain to prove of immense value to the people of the United States. How shall the patents be handled in order to insure maximum benefit to the public? Shall they be held in the name of the public or in the name of some public officer acting as trustee for the public, with power to protect the public's interests?

Dr. Rittman desires that the benefit of his inventions, so far as they may be applied to oils produced in the United States, shall inure to the people of the United States, and, in general, discoveries made in the course of employment by the United States should be the property of the United States, except, perhaps, as to foreign rights.

The suggestion that the patents be held in the name of the general public is subject to a serious objection. It does not insure that improvements upon the processes shall also be the property of the public. Where a patentable process or device is of such a nature that improvements are not likely to be made upon it or apparatus need not be devised for its use, the patent may well be placed in the name of the public, and this course has been followed by the Bureau of Mines with regard to certain inventions by its employees. However, in a matter so complex as the refining of petroleum, the further development of a process or of an apparatus for its carrying on may be almost, if not quite, as important as the original invention itself. It is conceivable, for example, that if the Rittman processes were assigned to the general public some one might devise improvements upon them or upon the apparatus for their operation, and by patenting these improvements deprive the public of the major benefits which might otherwise flow from the Rittman inventions.

Thus it seems wisest to have the Rittman patents so held that some trustee for the people shall have authority to issue licenses for the use of the processes under terms which will give a maximum of protection to the public. For example, it is the plan with regard to these patents to authorize their use only upon condition that the details of the commercial working out of the processes shall be available to the Bureau of Mines for publication whenever desirable; that the bureau shall be informed of improvements in the processes or in plant or apparatus for their operation; and that all such improvements which are patentable shall be assigned to the trustee for the people in the same manner as the original processes.

The Secretary of the Interior, as the head of the department in which the processes were developed and in which the administration of the patents should be carried on, is the most logical trustee for the people. Dr. Rittman, who has resigned from the Bureau of Mines, has executed an assignment of his patents to the Secretary of the Interior, and the proposed joint resolution would authorize the Secretary to accept this assignment. It is important that the joint resolution be passed, since the assignment, by its own terms, becomes void if the Secretary of the Interior remains without legal authority to accept it. Thus, if the Secretary has not authority to accept an assignment of these patents, all rights in them will revert to Dr. Rittman, and the public will be deprived of the maximum benefits from these important inventions.

Whereas Walter F. Rittman, residing in the State, county, and city of New York, having invented certain improvements in the manufacture of gasoline, benzol, and toluene, and being desirous of obtaining full, exact, and scientific data, and data required for the adaptation of his improvement to commercial purposes, prior to carrying out his intention of dedicating to the people of the United States the enjoyment and use of said improvements, he entered the employment of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior; and

Whereas the said Walter F. Rittman has filed applications for letters patent of the United States as follows: For the manufacture of benzene, toluene, etc., filed May 18, 1915, Serial No. 29019; and for the manufacture of gasoline, filed May 18, 1915, Serial No. 29020; and is now desirous of carrying out his original intention of dedicating the improvements described in said applications to the people of the United States for their use and benefit except as hereinafter specified.

Now these presents witness, for and in consideration of the sum of $1, to him in hand paid, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, the said Walter F. Rittman has sold, assigned, and transferred, and does hereby sell, assign, and transfer to Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, and his successors in office, as trustee or trustees in trust for the use and benefit of the people of the United States, all his right, title, and interest in and to the invention described and claimed in said applications, Serial Nos. 29019 and 29020, and in, to, and under any letters patent of the United States which may be granted on said applications, except as hereinafter provided, to own and control said patents and to grant licenses under said patents when issued to such party or parties and upon such terms as said trustee or trustees may deem proper, save and except as to the use of the inventions aforesaid for the treatment of hydrocarbon materials imported into the United States, to prevent the use of the inventions described and claimed in said patents, or either of them, by parties other than the licensees, by bringing suit or suits for infringement against any and all unlicensed users of such inventions, and to do all acts that said trustee or trustees may deem proper in carrying out the intention of said Walter F. Rittman, to encourage the proper practice of the inventions described and claimed in said applications.

The said Walter F. Rittman expressly reserves to himself and to his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns the right to use the inventions described in said applications without liability in any manner whatsoever on his part, or on the part of his heirs, legal representatives, or assigns, for infringement of letters patent granted on said applications, and the right to prosecute said pending applications, Serial Nos. 29019 and 29020, to the issue of letters patent thereon, and the right to apply for, obtain, and control and own letters patent in countries other than the United States. And further, the said Walter F. Rittman, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall have the right to bring suit in the name of the trustee for infringement of patents granted on said applications, or either of them, against any party or parties employing the inventions described in said applications in the treatment of hydrocarbon materials imported into the United States, and the acceptance of this assignment by the said Franklin K. Lane as trustee shall confer upon the said Rittman, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, the right to use the name of the said Franklin K. Lane, and his successors in office, as trustee or trustees for such purpose.

In case the said Franklin K. Lane, or his successors in office, is not empowered to execute the trust herein provided, and the same shall lapse for lack of authority so to execute, this assignment shall become null and void, and the entire right, title, and interest in and to the inventions described in said applications, and in, to, and under any letters patent granted on said applications shall vest in the said Walter F. Rittman, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns.

In case licenses are granted under patents issued on said applications, or either of them, subject to the payment of royalties or other considerations, such royalties or considerations shall be payable to the said Walter F. Rittman or his assigns.

The Commissioner of Patents is hereby authorized and requested to issue letters patent on said applications, Serial Nos. 29019 and 29020, to the said Walter F. Rittman, in his name, the title to said patents to vest immediately on issue in said Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, and his successors, in trust for the benefit of the people of the United States, subject to terms and conditions hereinbefore specified.

In testimony whereof the said Walter F. Rittman has hereunto set his hand this 29th day of March, 1916.

WALTER F. RITTMAN.

Signed in the present of—
CLARENCE B. DUTTON,
DARWIN S. WOLCOTT.

STATE OF NEW YORK, *County of New York, ss:*

On this 30th day of March, 1916, before me personally appeared Walter F. Rittman, to me known and known to me to be the person described in and who executed the foregoing instrument, and he duly acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

[SEAL.] THOS. M. APPLEGARTH,
Notary Public No. 67, New York County,
New York Registered No. 7021.

My commission expires March 30, 1917.

LICENSE FOR USE OF THE RITTMAN PROCESS—NONEXCLUSIVE—WITHOUT ROYALTY.

This agreement, made and entered into in duplicate this — day of ——, A. D. 191—, between the Department of the Interior, acting in this behalf by Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter called the first party, and ——— ———, hereinafter called the second party, witnesseth that—

Whereas Walter F. Rittman, a chemical engineer in the employ of the first party, has discovered a new and valuable process for the manufacture of ——— from heavy liquid hydrocarbons (hereinafter referred to as the process); and

Whereas the second discovery is covered by pending application for letters patent; and

Whereas the second party is desirous of employing such process in advance of the issuance of a patent:

Now, therefore, the said first and second parties do hereby agree as follows:

1. The first party, in consideration of the covenants and agreements hereinafter contained to be observed and performed by the second party, hereby licenses and empowers the second party to use the said process, subject to the conditions hereinafter named, at ——— ——— factory in ——— ——— and in no other places.

2. The second party agrees that all devices, improvements, processes, equipment, apparatus, or development, or any matter or thing which may be necessary or desirable to be used in connection with the said process, originated by the second party, or by its agents or employees, during the life of this agreement shall be promptly and fully communicated to the first party, in order that letters patent thereon may be applied for in the discretion of the first party, the cost of obtaining such letters patent, including the Patent Office fees, to be paid by the second party.

3. The second party further agrees to transfer and assign, or cause to be transferred and assigned, to the Secretary of the Interior, as trustee for the public, all the right, title, and interest of said second party or its agents or employees in and to the aforesaid devices, improvements, processes, equipment, apparatus, development, matters, or things as regards the United States, and further agrees to assign and transfer, or cause to be transferred and assigned, all right, title, and interest, as aforesaid, as regards all countries or places outside of the United States to the said Walter F. Rittman, his heirs or assigns.

4. The second party further agrees not to make public in any way any details of the process which may be communicated to it or which it may learn by reason of the employment of such process without the prior obtained consent of the first party.

5. The second party further agrees to furnish the first party, upon request, with complete working plans and specifications of plant construction, equipment, apparatus, machinery, improvements, and devices of whatsoever nature or character used in the practice of or in connection with the aforesaid process, and furnish such party with such other pertinent information and records appertaining to the same as it may from time to time request.

6. The second party lastly agrees that the process aforesaid shall be used only in the treatment of liquid hydrocarbons produced in the United States of America: *Provided,* That the process may be employed in the treatment of foreign-produced oils in the United States upon payment to Walter F. Rittman, his heirs, or assigns, of a reasonable royalty to be mutually agreed upon between the said Rittman, his heirs, or assigns, and the second party.

7. The first party shall be at liberty to make public, from time to time, all such information concerning the development and use of the process in the aforesaid factory of the second party as it may consider of public benefit and essential to the working of the process by the people of the United States. No publication shall be made of any information acquired regarding the business and trade secrets of the second party other than as hereinabove provided.

8. The first party agrees to grant to the second party, upon the issuance of letters patents covering the aforesaid process, a license to employ such process in the treatment of petroleum oils or other liquid hydrocarbons produced in the United States, upon the same terms and conditions as the process may be permitted to be employed by any and all other persons in the United States.

9. It is further mutually understood and agreed that the first party, in its discretion, shall have the right to terminate this agreement for the use of said process upon violation of any of the substantial terms or conditions hereof or for nonuser for a period of not exceeding six calendar months. Waiver of any specific cause of forfeiture shall not be construed to prevent forfeiture for any other or like cause occurring thereafter.

In witness whereof, on the day and year first hereinbefore written, the parties hereto have subscribed their names and affixed their seals.

[SEAL.] ——— ———,
Secretary of the Interior.
[SEAL.] ——— ———.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 5800) to provide for the use of public-school buildings in the District of Columbia as community forums, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 5801) granting an increase of pension to Delia Buel Lydecker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 5802) to amend an act approved June 8, 1906, entitled "An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled 'An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia,' approved February 28, 1901"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 5803) for the relief of Albert E. Keily; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 5804) granting an increase of pension to John Unferfate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 5805) permitting the Riverview Ferry Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Yellowstone River, in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. RANSDELL (for Mr. SHIELDS):

A bill (S. 5806) granting a pension to Thomas Smith;

A bill (S. 5807) granting a pension to William D. Davis (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5808) granting a pension to Minta Jones (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 5809) granting an increase of pension to James D. Harris (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 5810) to regulate and control the manufacture, sale, and use of weights and measures, and to be known as the weights and measures act; to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. TAGGART:

A bill (S. 5811) granting a pension to Evalena Sharp;

A bill (S. 5812) granting an increase of pension to George R. Gibney;

A bill (S. 5813) granting an increase of pension to James Dunn;

A bill (S. 5814) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Clark;

A bill (S. 5815) granting an increase of pension to John W. Johnston;

A bill (S. 5816) granting an increase of pension to Richard Scanland;

A bill (S. 5817) granting an increase of pension to Levi A. Walkle;

A bill (S. 5818) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Martin; and

A bill (S. 5819) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Ferguson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 5820) granting a pension to Charles H. Clay (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 5821) granting an increase of pension to Emil Schincke (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5822) granting an increase of pension to John F. Nichols (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2986) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

GOOD ROADS.

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. VARDAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 12193), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

TABLE OF IMPORTS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I beg to present a document, being a very carefully prepared table showing the increase of imports under the Underwood-Simmons tariff law in war times as compared with the imports under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law in times of peace.

It is a significant showing, and absolutely sets at rest the contention that the industrial interests of the country are as safe in the hands of the Democratic Party as the Republican Party. The truth is that had not the war in Europe occurred the imports would have been even greater than they have been during the period of the European conflict. But as it is the increase has been great enough to alarm the business interests of the country, and to serve as a warning of what will doubtless take place when the European war comes to a close. From present indications when that time arrives the Republican Party will again be in power, and a revision of the tariff that will adequately protect the interests of all classes of our people will be among the first acts of the new administration. The figures that I give are taken from official sources and are absolutely correct in every particular, and I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products from Oct. 1, 1913, to Oct. 1, 1914, the first year under the operation of the Underwood tariff law, compared with the same period in 1912–13, under the Payne tariff law.

Products.	1913–14 values.	1912–13 values.	Increase.	Per cent.
Aluminum, manufactures of	$1,489,917	$916,183	$573,734	.....
Automobiles, parts of	947,749	289,236	658,513	.....
Cotton cloths	12,265,109	7,768,668	4,496,441	.....
Cutlery	2,910,555	2,011,690	898,865	.....
Clocks and parts of	1,086,366	982,409	103,957	.....
Enameled ware	796,749	692,211	104,538	.....
Films and plates	2,931,599	1,571,111	1,360,488	.....
Fruit and nuts	$52,411,642	$45,487,177	$6,924,465	.....
Glassware, less plate glass	7,183,660	6,321,399	862,261	.....
Glass (plate)	716,079	349,354	366,725	.....
Handkerchiefs (linen)	2,767,912	2,077,860	690,052	.....
Knit goods, less stockings	2,991,373	368,602	2,622,771	.....
Lace and lace articles	18,007,255	17,088,856	918,399	.....
Leather gloves	8,547,238	8,103,757	443,481	.....
Leather and tanned skins	15,068,735	8,667,888	6,400,847	.....
Nets and nettings	1,651,147	1,139,387	511,760	.....
Oilcloth and linoleum	2,048,318	1,690,002	358,316	.....
Paper and manufactures of	27,748,723	22,998,292	4,750,431	.....
Perfumery and toilet articles	2,357,285	1,923,856	433,429	.....
Shingles	2,613,360	1,297,841	1,315,519	.....
Silks, manufactures of	31,803,346	30,314,388	1,488,958	.....
Silk (artificial)	4,090,413	3,486,936	603,477	.....
Stockings	2,865,542	2,632,803	232,739	.....
Tin plate	1,321,802	1,202,408	119,394	.....
Watches and parts of	3,226,346	2,688,170	538,176	.....
Wood pulp	18,384,084	16,038,513	2,345,571	.....
Wool, classes 1, 2, 3	60,231,067	29,170,902	31,060,165	.....
Wool, manufactures of	39,499,194	16,460,797	23,038,397	.....
Yarns (linen)	928,524	708,383	220,141	.....
Breadstuffs	38,921,710	16,282,133	22,639,577	.....
Eggs	1,143,068	None.	1,143,068	.....
Fish	19,431,492	15,839,344	3,592,148	.....
Meat and dairy products	48,270,117	15,406,174	32,863,943	.....
Seeds	14,380,878	8,672,350	5,708,528	.....
Vegetables	15,141,106	10,667,371	4,473,735	.....
Total	466,179,460	301,316,451	164,863,009	54.7

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products from Oct. 1, 1913, to Oct. 1, 1914, etc.—Continued.

Imports of merchandise for month of October, 1914, compared with October, 1913, showing increase and decrease in amount and percentage, both months being under the Underwood law; also imports of the same products, giving the total, in October, 1912, under the Payne law.

Products.	1914 values.	1913 values.	Difference.	Per cent.
			Increase.	
Aluminum scrap	$448,704	$194,838	$253,866	130
Automobiles, parts of	85,564	50,595	34,969	69
Cotton cloths	610,646	526,414	84,232	16
Films and plates	238,663	194,947	43,716	22
Leather and tanned skins	1,144,376	885,753	258,623	29
Shingles	290,387	137,981	152,406	110
Silks, manufactures of	2,450,607	2,289,673	160,934	7
Silk, artificial	311,592	274,841	36,751	13
Tin plate	15,114	11,930	3,184	26
Wood pulp	2,125,163	1,267,090	858,073	67
Wool, classes 1, 2, 3	2,485,600	1,414,850	1,070,750	75
Wool, manufactures of	3,110,576	1,256,099	1,854,477	147
Yarns, linen	75,935	43,549	32,386	74
Eggs	20,454	5,322	15,132	284
Fish	2,365,875	2,100,589	265,286	12
Meat and dairy products	4,311,175	2,042,338	2,268,837	101
Seeds	2,192,898	1,695,352	497,546	29
Total, 17 products	22,283,329	14,392,161	7,891,168	54
			Decrease.	
Aluminum, manufactures of	52,614	106,780	54,166	50
Cutlery	216,365	373,726	157,361	42
Clocks and parts of	63,443	98,068	34,625	35
Enameled ware	44,238	65,677	21,439	32
Fruits and nuts	2,896,458	3,195,563	299,105	9
Glassware, less plate glass	300,227	647,222	346,995	53
Glass, plate	7,856	68,481	60,625	88
Handkerchiefs, linen	338,205	383,554	45,349	11
Knit goods, less stockings	172,979	177,355	4,376	2
Lace and lace articles	983,197	1,210,391	227,194	18
Leather gloves	945,914	1,132,707	186,793	16
Nets and nettings	59,797	123,819	64,022	51
Oilcloth and linoleum	143,162	182,900	39,738	21
Paper and manufactures of	2,277,128	2,409,481	132,353	5
Perfumery and toilet articles	213,321	232,329	19,008	8
Stockings, cotton	75,789	197,779	121,990	61
Watches and parts of	246,339	346,342	100,003	28
Vegetables	753,631	1,140,898	387,267	33
Total, 18 products	9,790,663	12,092,972	2,302,309	20

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in November, 1914, compared with November, 1913; both months under the Underwood law.

Products.	1914 values.	1913 values.	Difference.	Per cent.
			Increase.	
Clocks, and parts of	$84,232	$78,417	$5,815	.....
Knit goods, less stockings	400,097	207,748	192,349	.....
Leather gloves	1,025,326	938,759	86,567	.....
Leather and tan skins	1,162,543	1,100,716	61,827	.....
Oilcloth and linoleum	133,121	125,159	7,962	.....
Paper, and manufactures of	2,397,755	2,252,015	145,740	.....
Perfumery and toilet articles	286,791	209,912	76,879	.....
Tin plate	26,803	17,870	8,933	.....
Wood pulp	2,333,399	1,210,653	1,122,746	.....
Wool, manufactures of	2,386,441	989,020	1,397,421	.....
Eggs	38,340	36,500	1,840	.....
Meat and dairy products	3,609,888	2,977,861	632,027	.....
Total, 12 products	13,884,736	10,144,630	3,740,106	36.8

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in November, 1914, compared with November, 1913, etc.—Continued.

Products.	1914 values.	1913 values.	Difference.	Per cent.
			Decrease.	
Aluminum scrap	$139,836	$190,188	$50,352	.....
Aluminum, manufactures of	47,853	101,101	53,248	.....
Automobiles, parts of	62,809	67,420	4,611	.....
Cotton cloths	593,144	1,016,019	422,875	.....
Cuttlery	234,298	265,523	31,225	.....
Enameled ware	70,004	88,383	18,379	.....
Films and plates	152,566	184,583	32,017	.....
Fruits and nuts	5,072,560	6,072,957	1,000,397	.....
Glassware, less plate glass	426,340	598,029	171,689	.....
Plate glass	4,393	80,675	76,282	.....
Handkerchiefs (linen)	289,718	341,115	51,397	.....
Lace and lace articles	831,124	1,447,861	616,737	.....
Nets and nettings	23,524	130,186	106,662	.....
Shingles	219,687	228,424	8,737	.....
Silks, manufactures of	2,101,218	2,295,465	194,247	.....
Silk, artificial	297,647	330,526	32,879	.....
Stockings	137,022	205,979	68,957	.....
Watches, and parts of	252,238	314,258	62,020	.....
Wool, classes 1, 2, and 3	1,086,938	1,548,970	462,032	.....
Yarns, linen	49,805	56,265	6,460	.....
Breadstuffs	1,517,070	4,822,958	3,305,888	.....
Fish	2,172,005	2,516,623	344,618	.....
Seeds	1,677,091	2,152,925	475,834	.....
Vegetables	921,486	1,736,269	814,783	.....
Total, 24 products	18,380,376	26,792,702	8,412,326	35.1

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in December, 1914, compared with similar imports in December, 1913, under the Underwood law, and December, 1912, under the Payne law, showing increase and decrease in December, 1914, over 1913.

Products.	1914 values.	1913 values.	Difference.	1912 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Clocks, and parts of	$85,848	$84,464	$1,384	$62,387
Knit goods, less stockings	326,312	233,764	92,548	20,722
Wool, manufactures of	2,196,555	2,184,464	12,091	1,454,706
Meat and dairy products	4,032,112	3,574,835	457,277	1,343,148
Fruit and nuts	852,104	787,593	64,511	3,193,662
Shingles	209,151	193,171	15,980	146,701
Watches, and parts of	447,351	354,415	92,936	237,062
Yarns, linen	103,923	94,428	9,495	75,674
Total, 8 products	8,253,356	7,507,134	746,222	6,534,062
			Decrease.	
Leather gloves	738,455	786,345	47,890	531,543
Leather and tanned skins	714,887	1,095,271	380,384	818,096
Oil cloth and linoleum	96,572	197,146	100,574	132,455
Paper, and manufactures of	501,966	568,708	66,742	549,224
Perfumery, toilet articles	202,110	260,356	58,246	154,985
Tin plate	27,276	314,898	287,622	21,914
Wood pulp	249,570	308,949	59,379	343,530
Eggs	87,963	334,315	246,352	None.
Aluminum scrap	177,708	224,278	46,570	653,401
Aluminum, manufactures of	56,643	131,110	74,467	57,409
Automobiles, parts of	119,300	138,487	19,187	12,694
Cotton cloths	772,109	1,737,412	965,303	992,331
Cutlery	192,673	198,054	5,381	165,440
Enameled ware	47,497	68,446	20,949	41,283
Films and plates	87,690	285,080	197,390	119,340
Glass, less plate glass	428,154	719,863	291,709	485,043
Plate glass	1,472	91,285	89,813	27,445
Handkerchiefs, linen	138,563	176,699	38,136	142,497
Lace and lace articles	712,440	2,501,257	1,788,817	547,731
Net and nettings	29,381	181,974	152,593	88,339
Silks, manufactures of	1,599,691	3,415,901	1,816,210	2,237,378
Silk, artificial	316,899	343,956	27,057	333,309
Stockings	108,295	239,051	130,756	192,341
Wool, classes 1, 2, and 3	523,010	4,288,435	3,765,425	2,584,201
Breadstuffs	1,277,281	5,860,999	4,583,718	374,629
Fish	2,039,523	2,311,716	272,193	1,593,688
Seeds	1,790,061	3,234,089	1,444,028	1,557,636
Vegetables	773,175	2,780,390	2,007,215	1,194,836
Total, 28 products	13,810,364	32,794,470	18,984,106	15,952,718
Total, increase list	8,253,356	7,507,134	746,222	6,534,062
Total, 36 products	22,063,720	40,301,604	18,237,884	22,486,780

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in January, 1915, compared with January, 1914, under the Underwood law, and January, 1913, under the Payne law, showing increase and decrease in January, 1915, over 1914.

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1913 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Meat and dairy products	$4,517,468	$3,189,085	$1,328,383	$1,104,552
Clocks and parts	104,529	53,422	51,107	62,495
Knit goods	324,033	282,998	41,035	31,810
Shingles	157,951	99,845	58,106	67,097
Watches and parts	266,675	227,223	39,452	192,853
Gloves, leather	765,174	704,338	60,836	620,226

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in January, 1915, compared with January, 1914, under the Underwood law, etc.—Continued.

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1913 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Perfumery, etc	$165,904	$129,385	$36,519	$113,889
Wood pulp	2,346,982	1,418,792	928,190	1,269,774
Aluminum scrap	219,372	208,576	10,796	576,074
Autos, parts	69,149	42,192	26,957	37,668
Enameled ware	63,134	60,800	2,334	89,392
Stockings	302,865	261,385	41,480	209,010
Fish	1,592,067	1,518,635	73,432	1,233,800
Total, 13 products	10,895,303	8,196,676	2,698,627	5,599,631
			Decrease.	
Wool, manufactures of	2,188,832	4,668,349	2,479,517	1,468,228
Fruits and nuts	2,074,729	2,924,166	849,437	2,562,175
Yarns, linen	82,879	96,753	13,874	69,911
Leather, tanned skins	948,129	1,542,056	593,927	778,681
Oilcloth and linoleum	68,694	210,309	141,615	146,359
Paper, manufactures of	2,116,212	2,337,676	221,464	1,759,711
Tin plate	104,802	245,619	140,817	31,458
Eggs	67,990	236,662	168,672	None.
Aluminum, manufactures of	61,569	113,220	51,651	66,925
Cotton cloths	700,934	1,682,785	981,851	958,097
Cutlery	194,534	201,854	7,320	143,561
Films and plates	81,360	281,752	200,392	169,006
Glass, less plate glass	137,768	598,048	460,280	485,605
Plate glass	2,124	84,584	82,460	31,810
Handkerchiefs, linen	91,210	118,360	27,150	72,869
Lace and lace articles	1,024,494	2,268,911	1,244,417	2,304,873
Net and nettings	61,953	149,687	87,734	60,525
Silks, manufactures of	1,745,069	3,406,160	1,661,091	2,466,623
Silk, artificial	215,792	323,014	107,222	359,785
Wool, classes 1, 2, and 3	2,364,706	5,443,418	3,078,712	3,545,669
Breadstuffs	1,155,107	5,144,399	3,989,292	1,483,343
Seeds	1,560,854	2,119,972	559,118	2,084,481
Vegetables	802,806	1,577,764	774,958	1,066,035
Total, 23 products	17,852,547	35,775,518	17,922,971	22,105,700
Total, increase list	10,895,303	8,196,676	2,698,627	5,599,631
Total, 36 products	28,747,850	43,972,194	15,224,344	27,705,331

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in February, 1915, compared with February, 1914, under the Underwood law, and February, 1913, under the Payne law, showing increase and decrease in imports between February, 1915, and February, 1914, using for the comparison the same 36 products that have been used in our monthly comparisons since the Underwood law became operative in October, 1913.

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1913 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Clocks and parts	$57,020	$46,799	$10,221	$50,369
Watches and parts	263,065	250,018	13,047	182,237
Shingles	169,578	134,000	35,578	51,157
Perfumery, etc	160,284	127,737	32,547	112,563
Wood pulp	1,654,607	1,304,146	350,461	1,623,362
Seeds	2,011,966	1,727,942	284,024	1,569,228
Total, 6 products	4,316,520	3,590,642	725,878	3,588,907
			Decrease.	
Aluminum scrap	96,016	204,057	108,041	291,776
Aluminum manufactures	15,887	136,873	120,986	78,373
Breadstuffs	1,111,720	2,553,830	1,442,110	1,141,588
Automobile parts	29,958	42,018	12,060	17,483
Cotton cloths	619,771	1,454,439	834,668	727,121
Lace and lace articles	874,642	1,703,055	828,413	1,561,418
Nets and nettings	56,511	188,478	131,967	78,071
Stockings (cotton)	164,582	372,741	208,159	265,169
All other knit goods	226,266	340,637	114,371	43,825
Eggs	55,944	87,374	31,430	.....
Handkerchiefs (linen)	106,872	142,252	35,380	102,415
Fish	1,296,739	1,334,030	37,291	1,155,691
Fruits and nuts	2,233,639	3,265,583	1,031,944	2,523,651
Glass, less plate glass	292,182	503,852	211,670	444,344
Plate glass	2,115	57,568	55,453	19,603
Cutlery	172,411	212,356	39,945	157,658
Tin plate	20,922	209,938	189,016	27,979
Leather and tanned skins	775,529	1,357,428	581,899	755,549
Leather gloves	525,192	850,933	325,741	782,973
Oilcloth and linoleum	103,143	164,661	61,518	158,531
Meat and dairy products	2,104,431	2,970,416	865,985	933,065
Paper and manufactures	1,948,217	1,998,835	50,618	1,581,723
Films and plates	67,075	175,789	108,714	126,963
Silks, manufactures	1,657,688	2,810,532	1,152,844	2,009,108
Silk, artificial	309,844	315,560	5,716	248,156
Vegetables	757,556	1,222,778	465,222	848,235
Wool, classes 1, 2, and 3	4,590,629	6,779,801	2,189,172	3,651,823
Wool, manufactures	1,654,197	3,795,442	2,141,245	1,352,542
Enameled ware	44,059	90,546	46,447	63,353
Yarns (linen)	55,765	88,806	33,041	62,287
Total, 30 products	21,969,542	35,430,608	13,461,066	21,219,493
Total, increase list	4,316,520	3,590,642	725,878	3,588,907
Total, 36 products	26,286,062	39,021,250	12,735,188	24,799,400

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in March, 1915 and 1914, under the Underwood law, and March, 1913, under the Payne law, using for comparison products having severe foreign competition.

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1913 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Wool, classes 1, 2, and 3	$13,405,340	$7,936,087	$5,469,253	$4,262,694
Handkerchiefs	158,975	138,243	20,732	101,474
Shingles	244,100	195,987	48,113	60,732
Total, 3 products	13,808,415	8,270,317	5,538,098	4,424,900
			Decrease.	
Aluminum scrap	129,759	241,079	111,320	305,451
Aluminum manufactures	18,616	168,000	149,384	60,767
Breadstuffs	1,340,194	3,119,507	1,779,313	1,314,298
Automobiles and parts	101,407	106,795	5,388	119,950
Clocks and parts	56,639	73,769	17,130	55,827
Watches and parts	261,080	317,329	56,249	205,280
Cotton cloths	628,566	1,402,071	773,505	721,902
Lace and lace articles	860,407	1,858,184	997,777	1,370,713
Nets and nettings	88,638	171,855	83,217	104,091
Stockings	172,575	417,473	244,898	241,455
Other knit goods	348,865	366,251	17,386	44,675
Eggs	24,746	119,925	95,179	.....
Linen yarns	79,020	95,248	16,228	55,958
Fish	1,010,480	1,230,422	219,942	969,993
Fruits and nuts	3,215,664	4,012,244	796,580	3,088,108
Plate glass	1,476	92,996	91,520	27,735
Other glass	412,315	675,353	263,038	470,939
Cutlery	153,560	272,460	118,900	146,979
Enameled ware	46,232	80,058	33,826	64,362
Tin plate	8,575	185,130	176,555	28,298
Leather and tanned skins	831,969	1,556,342	724,373	635,669
Leather gloves	711,965	990,977	279,012	755,242
Meat and dairy products	2,931,545	4,384,545	1,453,000	1,121,931
Oilcloth and linoleum	100,879	181,293	80,414	187,430
Paper and manufactures	2,109,826	2,529,933	420,107	1,783,048
Perfumeries, etc	221,659	252,705	31,046	177,529
Films and plates	97,542	387,411	289,869	145,019
Seeds	1,775,208	2,222,801	447,593	1,194,231
Silk manufactures	2,332,822	3,294,046	961,224	2,437,253
Artificial silk	323,877	401,929	78,052	257,355
Vegetables	1,062,969	1,423,939	360,970	960,857
Wood pulp	1,519,121	1,749,791	230,670	1,268,567
Wool manufactures	2,020,791	3,884,796	1,864,005	1,127,488
Total, 33 products	24,998,987	38,266,657	13,267,670	21,443,400
Total, increase list	13,808,415	8,270,317	5,538,098	4,424,900
Total, 36 products	38,807,402	46,536,974	7,729,572	25,868,300

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in April, 1915 and 1914, under the Underwood law, and April, 1913, under the Payne law, using for the comparison the 36 products on which our monthly comparisons have been based since the Underwood law became operative in October, 1913.

[These are the latest complete import figures available.]

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1913 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Automobiles and parts	$123,549	$119,447	$1,102	$131,065
Handkerchiefs	123,176	108,018	15,158	76,532
Seeds	1,585,012	1,138,868	446,144	558,754
Shingles and laths	456,294	331,099	125,195	228,146
Wool, classes 1, 2, and 3	12,978,767	8,840,000	4,138,767	2,843,112
Total, 5 products	15,266,798	10,537,432	4,729,366	3,837,609
			Decrease.	
Aluminum scrap	50,139	227,153	177,014	586,857
Aluminum manufactures	8,317	120,981	112,664	102,472
Breadstuffs	2,105,526	2,340,099	234,573	1,443,851
Clocks and parts	20,421	73,552	53,131	62,601
Watches and parts	224,202	289,185	64,983	225,165
Cotton cloths	453,367	1,003,548	550,181	690,083
Lace and lace articles	833,225	1,178,332	345,107	1,027,188
Nets and nettings	85,874	117,666	31,792	97,793
Stockings (cotton)	70,999	353,825	282,826	239,674
Other knit goods (cotton)	144,335	340,434	196,099	41,690
Eggs	28,113	129,820	101,707	.....
Yarns (linen)	62,744	98,278	35,534	62,216
Fish	906,386	1,000,221	93,835	746,895
Fruits and nuts	3,567,753	4,726,536	1,158,783	3,851,220
Plate glass	538	60,940	60,402	33,865
All other glass manufactures	226,037	624,245	398,208	544,336
Cutlery	83,431	262,242	178,811	136,157
Enameled ware	23,566	92,067	68,501	60,731
Tin plate	5,947	13,719	7,772	30,092
Leather, tanned skins	764,075	1,632,597	868,522	759,737
Leather gloves	353,259	537,791	184,532	427,036
Meat and dairy products	2,594,047	4,691,562	2,097,515	1,179,020
Oilcloth and linoleum	82,761	216,729	133,968	138,871
Paper and manufactures	1,832,541	2,250,180	417,639	1,795,320
Perfumeries, etc	191,801	207,076	15,275	194,984
Films and plates	150,122	232,378	82,256	184,132
Silk, manufactures	1,783,979	2,425,989	642,010	2,008,567
Artificial silk	207,782	414,010	206,228	204,374
Vegetables	937,375	1,262,044	324,669	738,414
Wood pulp	833,004	1,378,652	545,648	1,189,688
Wool manufactures	1,367,136	3,333,527	1,966,391	991,382
Total, 31 products	19,998,802	31,635,378	11,636,576	19,794,411
Total, increase list	15,266,798	10,537,432	4,729,366	3,837,609
Total, 36 products	35,265,600	42,172,810	6,907,210	23,632,020

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in May, 1915 and 1914, under the Underwood law, and May, 1913, under the Payne law, using for the comparison the 36 products on which our monthly comparisons have been based since the Underwood law became operative in October, 1913.

[These are the latest complete import figures available.]

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1913 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Automobiles	$47,968	$18,912	$29,056	$113,737
Leather gloves	266,834	251,609	15,225	227,487
Nets and nettings	83,283	73,533	9,750	69,993
Perfumery, etc	254,308	214,202	40,106	125,936
Seeds	2,303,129	1,879,508	423,621	1,381,785
Shingles and laths	527,841	373,220	154,621	254,859
Wool, classes 1, 2, and 3	10,895,246	6,789,264	4,105,982	1,821,287
Total, 7 products	14,378,609	9,600,248	4,778,361	3,995,084
			Decrease.	
Aluminum scrap	71,062	195,768	124,706	397,424
Aluminum manufactures	19,981	150,056	130,075	92,641
Breadstuffs	1,613,897	3,170,499	1,556,602	1,306,279
Cotton cloths	482,656	749,032	266,378	532,028
Clocks and parts	30,200	78,273	48,073	61,039
Cutlery	156,277	242,444	86,167	126,008
Eggs	10,638	59,380	48,742	.....
Fish	741,953	1,018,839	276,886	910,080
Fruit and nuts	3,557,636	5,190,454	1,632,818	4,194,537
Handkerchiefs (linen)	104,543	122,151	17,608	73,101
Enameled ware	42,786	67,460	24,674	54,733
Films and plates	121,891	281,805	159,914	106,207
Lace and lace articles	719,776	990,626	270,850	751,357
Leather and tanned skins	590,881	1,485,372	894,491	718,931
Other knit goods	81,508	252,305	170,797	29,833
Oilcloth and linoleum	44,505	132,502	87,997	121,668
Meat and dairy products	1,771,523	5,152,643	3,381,120	1,250,143
Plate glass	658	49,704	49,046	33,203
All other glass manufactures	225,059	658,731	433,672	486,878
Paper and manufactures	1,936,656	2,384,166	447,510	1,849,434
Stockings (cotton)	81,396	301,968	220,572	223,739
Silk manufactures	2,067,404	2,080,764	13,360	1,831,976
Silk, artificial	287,927	326,166	38,239	192,485
Tin plate	3,687	173,717	170,030	194,966
Vegetables	557,309	990,637	433,328	578,498
Watches and parts	266,244	272,193	5,949	204,705
Wood pulp	927,892	1,373,856	445,964	1,367,794
Wool manufactures	1,136,224	3,434,637	2,298,413	1,045,014
Yarns, linen	56,584	76,063	19,479	51,094
Total, 29 products	17,708,753	31,462,211	13,753,458	18,785,795
Increase list	14,378,609	9,600,248	4,778,361	3,995,084
Total, 36 products	32,087,362	41,062,459	8,975,097	22,780,879

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in June, 1915 and 1914, under the Underwood law, and June, 1913, under the Payne law, using for comparison 36 products on which our monthly comparisons have been based since the Underwood law became operative in October, 1913.

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1913 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Aluminum, crude	$305,993	$178,804	$127,189	$296,766
Perfumeries, etc	238,260	187,877	50,383	128,981
Seeds	2,771,717	1,386,950	1,384,767	745,625
Laths and shingles	514,513	446,104	68,409	295,907
Wool, classes 1, 2, and 3	6,681,197	5,460,395	1,220,802	1,203,235
Total, 5 products	10,511,680	7,660,130	2,851,550	1,670,515
			Decrease.	
Aluminum manufactures	58,040	148,301	90,261	85,220
Breadstuffs	1,491,934	2,707,002	1,215,068	1,595,330
Automobiles and parts	115,579	128,485	12,906	117,512
Clocks and parts of	16,705	77,243	60,538	56,652
Watches and parts of	243,561	286,487	42,926	215,313
Cotton cloths	487,143	753,205	266,062	492,252
Lace and lace articles	707,550	964,063	256,513	711,846
Stockings (cotton)	57,225	189,308	132,083	189,230
Other knit goods (cotton)	81,110	242,740	161,630	22,000
Eggs	21,096	50,334	29,238	.....
Handkerchiefs (linen)	203,795	233,901	30,106	131,538
Nets and nettings	98,015	104,745	6,730	104,853
Yarns (linen)	55,417	73,143	17,726	50,615
Fish	1,198,254	1,327,434	129,180	1,288,981
Fruits and nuts	4,894,334	5,284,183	389,849	4,565,765
Plate glass	.....	52,307	52,307	35,052
All other glass manufactures	211,113	658,805	447,692	484,681
Cutlery	39,610	247,765	208,155	139,200
Tin plate	9,009	20,732	11,723	538,239
Enameled ware	36,835	77,799	40,964	55,189
Leather and tanned skins	705,026	1,175,893	470,867	583,196
Gloves (leather)	273,580	285,962	12,382	182,221
Meat and dairy products	3,340,120	5,453,291	2,113,171	1,307,876
Oilcloth and linoleum	70,551	105,553	35,002	127,992
Paper and manufactures	2,083,709	2,312,222	228,513	1,839,763
Films and plates	106,756	242,941	136,185	105,037
Silk manufactures	1,980,824	2,467,765	486,941	2,053,212
Silk, artificial	232,929	277,530	44,601	246,250
Vegetables	543,481	786,165	242,684	593,423
Wool manufactures	1,497,557	5,057,229	3,559,672	1,246,515
Wood pulp	1,058,444	1,644,927	586,483	1,063,158
Total, 31 products	21,919,302	33,437,460	11,518,158	20,222,313
Increase list	10,511,680	7,660,130	2,851,550	1,670,515
Total, 36 products	32,430,982	41,097,590	8,666,608	21,892,828

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products for fiscal years ending June 30, 1915 and 1914, under the Underwood tariff law, and 1913 under the Payne tariff law, using for comparison 36 products which we have used monthly since the Underwood law became operative, and as these 36 products are the ones exposed to the most severe foreign competition, they show the injury done to our home industries by the Underwood low-tariff law.

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1913 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Knit goods, less hose	$2,652,646	$2,527,218	$125,428	$385,567
Handkerchiefs (linen)	2,558,676	2,535,054	23,622	2,067,412
Meat and dairy products	43,046,850	38,760,989	4,285,861	14,596,017
Perfumery, etc	2,473,144	2,309,027	164,117	1,873,585
Seeds	23,054,820	20,084,184	2,970,636	17,425,533
Laths and shingles	5,020,912	3,803,756	1,217,156	3,305,005
Wool and angora hair	68,242,568	53,190,767	15,051,801	35,579,823
Wood pulp	19,881,111	17,023,338	2,857,773	16,165,316
Total, 8 products	166,930,727	140,234,333	26,696,394	91,398,258
			Decrease.	
Aluminum scrap	2,346,287	2,707,066	360,779	4,315,233
Aluminum manufactures	653,015	1,441,253	788,238	739,777
Breadstuffs	20,256,791	36,541,157	16,284,366	16,821,646
Automobiles and parts	1,372,412	1,432,576	60,164	2,023,207
Clocks and parts	705,555	905,421	199,866	809,715
Watches and parts	3,039,651	3,386,738	347,087	2,615,744
Cotton cloths	7,286,321	11,845,801	4,559,480	7,757,928
Lace and lace articles	11,431,428	18,667,616	7,236,188	16,981,019
Nets and nettings	996,180	1,659,387	663,207	900,532
Stockings (cotton)	1,496,781	3,144,645	1,647,864	2,703,844
Eggs	438,760	1,059,592	620,832	.....
Yarns (linen)	832,063	871,715	39,652	775,727
Fish	18,398,249	18,758,143	359,894	15,330,280
Fruits and nuts	43,901,195	53,421,258	9,520,063	42,622,653
Plate glass	98,171	727,889	629,718	321,605
Other glass	4,494,188	7,463,944	2,969,756	6,215,688
Cutlery	2,077,290	2,860,519	783,229	2,026,564
Enameled ware	523,904	872,690	348,786	667,486
Tin plate	353,474	1,481,458	1,127,984	971,820
Leather and tanned skins	10,874,722	13,810,347	2,935,625	8,908,237
Gloves (leather)	7,673,516	9,487,969	1,814,453	7,691,927
Oilcloth and linoleum	1,199,662	1,829,596	629,934	1,840,878
Paper and manufactures	25,818,920	27,563,840	1,744,920	21,538,645
Films and plates	1,768,488	2,626,268	857,780	1,663,336
Silk manufactures	25,042,670	35,454,786	10,412,116	27,590,478
Silk, artificial	3,587,170	4,081,830	494,660	3,277,784
Vegetables	9,329,732	15,133,535	5,803,803	11,358,761
Wool manufactures	29,791,356	34,294,204	4,502,848	16,318,141
Total, 28 products	235,787,951	313,531,243	77,743,292	224,788,655
Increase list	166,930,727	140,234,333	26,696,394	91,398,258
Total, 36 products	402,718,678	453,765,576	51,046,898	316,186,913

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in July, 1915 and 1914, under the Underwood law, and July, 1913, under the Payne law, using for the comparison 37 products on which our monthly comparisons have been based since the Underwood law became operative in October, 1913. These are the latest complete import figures available.

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1913 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Perfumeries, etc	$237,638	$187,539	$50,099	$149,043
Seeds	2,833,426	1,777,818	1,055,608	687,032
Wool and angora hair	7,041,722	4,822,334	2,219,388	1,175,664
Vegetables	1,062,674	839,796	222,878	687,032
Shingles	331,963	270,555	61,408	189,706
Nets and nettings	131,134	100,050	31,084	138,402
Total, 6 products	11,638,557	7,998,092	3,640,465	3,026,879
Aluminum scrap	126,925	243,940	117,015	446,830
Aluminum manufactures	18,877	120,652	101,775	80,037
Breadstuffs	1,156,881	2,519,364	1,362,483	1,246,376
Automobiles and parts	54,010	146,392	92,382	99,188
Clocks and parts	9,245	100,698	91,453	67,728
Watches and parts	254,061	278,921	24,860	217,757
Cotton cloths	322,862	571,650	248,788	464,482
Lace and lace articles	785,642	1,943,866	1,158,224	1,508,905
Stockings (cotton)	3,891	219,852	215,961	151,105
Other knit goods (cotton)	22,225	377,014	354,789	16,977
Eggs	21,220	30,349	9,129	.....
Handkerchiefs (linen)	197,333	275,255	77,922	193,308
Yarns (linen)	54,109	73,659	19,550	45,886
Fish	1,315,157	1,515,329	200,172	1,374,644
Fruits and nuts	3,490,511	4,638,733	1,148,222	4,244,691
Plate glass	288	28,149	27,861	18,454
Other glass	170,966	723,747	552,781	580,130
Cutlery	62,340	318,087	255,747	168,724
Enameled ware	4,048	63,869	59,821	69,432
Tin plate	11,608	24,619	13,011	249,410
Leather and tanned skins	554,000	1,268,073	714,073	638,345
Gloves (leather)	401,351	783,253	381,902	601,285
Meat and dairy products	1,208,901	6,108,936	4,900,035	1,378,740
Oilcloth and linoleum	74,187	129,169	54,982	89,510
Paper and manufactures	1,780,738	2,981,765	1,201,027	1,933,874
Films and plates	95,644	200,304	104,660	88,756
Silk manufactures	2,048,941	2,958,744	909,803	3,127,340
Silk manufactures (artificial)	201,779	347,921	146,142	339,243
Laths	218,672	222,212	3,540	189,706
Wool, manufactures	1,375,514	5,065,294	3,689,780	1,638,902
Wood pulp	1,203,593	2,025,938	822,345	1,261,860
Total, 31 products	17,245,519	36,305,754	19,060,235	22,534,624
Increase list	11,638,557	7,998,092	3,640,465	3,026,879
Total, 37 products	28,884,076	44,303,846	15,419,770	25,561,503

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in August, 1915, and 1914, under the Underwood law, and August, 1913, under the Payne law, using for comparison products which, in our opinion, are subject to the most severe foreign competition.

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1913 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Automobiles and parts	$63,088	$51,031	$12,057	$79,674
Watches and parts	255,432	160,694	94,738	210,846
Embroideries	565,631	298,378	267,253	790,018
Linen yarns	57,478	52,509	4,969	49,676
Enameled ware	31,550	21,956	9,594	47,874
Perfumery, etc	227,101	152,039	75,062	132,010
Seeds	2,114,803	1,481,435	633,368	770,950
Silk, manufactures	2,318,851	1,945,975	372,876	3,476,786
Vegetables	920,301	772,535	147,766	695,461
Shingles	303,148	274,706	28,442	134,520
Wool and Angora hair	4,643,373	3,956,163	687,210	1,485,247
Total, 11 products	11,501,356	9,167,421	2,333,935	7,873,062
			Decrease.	
Aluminum, crude	90,092	244,144	154,052	256,893
Aluminum manufactures	21,183	100,303	79,120	84,491
Breadstuffs	2,136,450	2,393,593	257,143	1,203,275
Clocks and parts	7,345	60,295	52,950	74,537
Cotton cloths	415,874	547,696	131,822	455,172
Lace and lace articles	740,342	917,884	177,542	1,529,115
Nets or nettings	109,237	140,260	31,023	121,122
Stockings, cotton	7,830	91,285	83,455	234,646
Other knit goods	44,784	149,442	104,658	32,454
Eggs	4,699	29,030	24,331	.....
Handkerchiefs, linen	186,215	239,471	53,256	222,572
Fish	1,366,021	1,500,152	134,131	1,320,605
Fruits and nuts	2,121,090	2,943,061	821,971	3,070,001
Plate glass	.....	27,263	27,263	27,130
Other glass	143,920	480,894	336,974	567,030
Cutlery	35,499	160,538	125,039	173,075
Tin plates	8,939	93,890	84,951	18,161
Leather and tanned skins	649,858	953,318	303,460	1,728,521
Gloves, leather	403,176	604,917	201,741	935,489
Meat and dairy products	1,796,815	4,191,136	2,394,321	1,256,240
Oilcloth and linoleum	53,449	112,045	58,596	93,596
Paper and manufactures	1,893,796	1,952,005	58,209	2,112,715
Films and plates	101,054	168,739	67,685	129,928
Silk, artificial	219,778	253,686	33,908	389,220
Laths	246,430	275,025	28,595	171,629
Wool, manufactures of	1,262,446	4,023,422	2,760,976	1,947,922
Total, 26 products	14,066,322	22,653,494	8,587,172	18,146,539
Increase list	11,501,356	9,167,421	2,333,935	7,873,062
Total, 37 products	25,567,678	31,820,915	6,253,237	26,019,601

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in September, 1915 and 1914, under the Underwood law, and September, 1913, under the Payne law, using for comparison products which, in our opinion, are subject to the most severe foreign competition.

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1913 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Breadstuffs	$2,096,567	$1,583,553	$513,014	$1,665,613
Watches and parts	229,459	129,281	100,178	300,685
Embroideries	516,224	474,216	42,008	971,030
Knit goods, less stockings	380,836	20,685	360,151	33,555
Yarns (linen)	86,995	79,823	7,172	53,620
Perfumery, etc	208,082	199,128	8,954	206,395
Seeds	2,242,181	2,127,631	114,550	1,067,795
Vegetables	667,262	607,613	59,649	925,686
Laths and shingles	643,726	569,143	74,583	343,146
Wool and Angora hair	4,651,247	3,230,165	1,421,082	1,469,111
Total, 10 products	11,722,579	9,021,238	2,701,341	7,036,636
			Decrease.	
Aluminum, crude	187,520	219,614	32,094	138,602
Aluminum manufactures	30,885	92,540	61,655	100,303
Automobiles and parts	37,081	159,743	122,662	109,184
Clocks and parts	15,448	25,525	10,077	99,149
Laces and lace articles	831,213	1,022,823	191,610	1,506,916
Nets and nettings	91,481	168,894	77,413	157,920
Cotton cloths	409,877	818,639	408,762	601,222
Stockings (cotton)	14,806	14,896	90	219,385
Eggs	8,285	24,097	15,812	.....
Handkerchiefs (linen)	233,719	488,893	255,174	354,881
Fish	1,684,308	2,059,486	375,178	1,704,385
Fruits and nuts	2,405,552	2,534,994	129,442	3,811,726
Plate glass	21	22,127	22,106	43,765
Other glass	138,495	296,265	157,770	632,636
Cutlery	42,704	155,506	112,802	242,296
Enameled ware	7,434	19,688	12,254	64,148
Tin plate	5,612	12,740	7,128	20,334
Leather and tanned skins	614,600	1,015,916	401,316	683,609
Gloves (leather)	563,439	679,647	116,208	1,471,775
Meat and dairy products	1,786,488	3,534,469	1,747,981	1,689,433
Oilcloth and linoleum	39,772	115,060	75,288	130,238
Paper and manufactures	1,889,903	1,906,250	16,347	2,608,548
Silk manufactures	2,180,072	2,418,649	238,577	4,364,365
Silk, artificial	236,288	481,274	244,986	345,835
Wood pulp	1,314,828	1,477,273	162,445	1,951,646
Wool manufactures	1,127,810	3,144,308	2,016,498	2,103,817
Films and plates	138,589	295,780	157,191	149,808
Total, 27 products	16,036,230	23,205,096	7,168,866	25,296,926
Increase list	11,722,579	9,021,238	2,701,341	7,036,636
Total, 37 products	27,758,809	32,226,334	4,467,525	32,333,562

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in October, 1915 and 1914, under the Underwood law, and October, 1912, under the Payne law, using for comparison products which are subject to the most severe competition.

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1912 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Breadstuffs	$3,848,777	$2,252,120	$1,596,657	$1,202,184
Clocks, and parts	63,842	63,443	399	92,088
Watches, and parts	277,896	246,339	31,557	253,691
Nets and nettings	101,386	59,797	41,589	46,250
Hides and skins	13,401,077	7,300,310	6,100,767	9,490,044
Perfumeries, etc	245,716	213,321	32,395	194,174
Seeds	2,273,330	2,192,898	80,432	895,785
Artificial silk	488,605	311,592	177,013	301,439
Vegetables	910,674	753,631	157,043	1,288,724
Laths and shingles	601,286	505,597	95,689	377,213
Wool and Angora hair	7,827,542	2,657,360	5,170,182	2,989,736
Total, 11 products	30,040,131	16,556,408	13,483,723	17,131,328
			Decrease.	
Aluminum scrap	37,295	448,704	411,409	302,899
Aluminum manufactures	40,589	52,614	12,025	61,527
Automobiles, and parts	59,349	165,040	105,691	188,938
Cotton cloths	586,822	610,646	23,824	535,820
Embroideries	339,491	595,174	255,683	1,235,294
Lace and lace articles	876,527	983,197	106,670	1,396,265
Stockings (cotton)	14,558	75,789	61,231	271,141
All other knit goods	118,690	172,979	54,289	36,663
Eggs	8,854	20,454	11,600	None.
Handkerchiefs (linen)	286,223	338,205	51,982	353,434
Yarns (linen)	41,181	75,935	34,754	77,830
Fish	1,964,846	2,365,875	401,029	1,722,639
Fruits and nuts	3,416,563	5,200,163	1,783,600	4,770,559
Plate glass	None.	7,856	7,856	20,966
Other glass	242,063	300,227	58,164	609,850
Cutlery	48,153	216,365	168,212	230,312
Enameled ware	25,251	44,238	18,987	46,405
Tin plate	2,606	15,114	12,508	32,472
Leather and tanned skins	849,750	1,144,376	294,626	842,678
Gloves (leather)	500,722	945,914	445,192	955,618
Meat and dairy products	2,423,374	4,311,175	1,887,801	1,388,641
Oilcloth and linoleum	45,993	143,162	97,169	192,628
Paper, and manufactures	2,274,220	2,277,128	2,908	1,985,514
Films and plates	112,977	238,663	125,686	140,222
Silk manufactures	2,033,456	2,450,607	417,151	2,271,533
Wood pulp	1,402,111	2,123,382	721,271	1,502,190
Wool manufactures	1,120,196	3,110,599	1,990,403	1,713,383
Total, 27 products	18,871,860	28,433,581	9,561,721	22,885,421
Increase list	30,040,131	16,556,408	13,483,723	17,131,328
Total, 38 products	48,911,991	44,989,989	3,922,002	40,016,749

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in November, 1915 and 1914, under the Underwood law, and November, 1912, under the Payne law, using for comparison products having severe foreign competition.

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1912 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Breadstuffs	$2,250,286	$1,517,070	$733,216	$1,192,221
Watches and parts	355,617	252,238	103,379	242,546
Cotton cloths	863,091	593,144	269,947	598,148
Embroideries	1,078,495	722,004	356,491	1,291,319
Lace and lace articles	967,285	831,124	136,161	1,378,170
Nets and nettings	134,912	23,524	111,388	72,018
Yarns (linen)	82,766	49,805	32,961	53,616
Fruits and nuts	5,091,779	5,072,560	19,219	5,610,082
Hides and skins	10,524,516	6,357,865	4,166,651	11,570,033
Perfumery, etc	318,770	286,791	31,979	233,376
Films and plates	179,620	152,566	27,054	124,693
Seeds	3,294,279	1,677,091	1,617,188	1,197,936
Silk manufactures	2,628,691	2,101,218	527,473	2,030,217
Artificial silk manufactures	341,298	297,647	43,651	269,485
Laths and shingles	579,494	354,917	224,577	329,036
Wool and angora hair	6,999,352	1,258,339	5,741,013	2,139,123
Total, 16 products	35,690,251	21,547,903	14,142,348	28,332,019
			Decrease.	
Aluminum scrap	39,661	139,836	100,175	608,906
Aluminum manufactures	5,976	47,853	41,877	46,009
Automobiles and parts	73,834	144,456	70,622	220,214
Clocks and parts	45,378	84,232	38,854	66,165
Stockings (cotton)	9,597	137,022	127,425	195,908
Other knit goods (cotton)	65,584	400,097	334,613	14,398
Eggs	8,899	38,340	29,441	.....
Handkerchiefs (linen)	183,900	289,718	105,818	253,239
Fish	2,033,559	2,172,005	138,446	1,817,943
Plate glass	85	4,393	4,308	30,326
Other glassware	180,932	426,340	245,408	529,938
Cutlery	68,284	234,298	166,014	182,190
Enameled ware	361	70,004	69,643	44,318
Tin plate	7,227	26,903	19,576	14,085
Leather and tanned skins	990,055	1,162,543	163,488	796,432
Gloves (leather)	598,182	1,025,326	427,144	612,860
Meat and dairy products	2,910,218	3,609,888	699,670	1,453,385
Oilcloth and linoleum	29,352	133,121	103,769	170,804
Paper and manufactures	2,375,488	2,397,755	22,267	2,038,353
Vegetables	869,628	921,486	51,858	1,185,708
Wood pulp	1,529,977	2,333,399	803,422	1,244,743
Wool manufactures	1,266,868	2,386,441	1,119,573	1,108,119
Total, 22 products	13,302,045	18,185,456	4,883,411	12,634,043
Increase list	35,690,251	21,547,903	14,142,348	28,332,019
Total, 38 products	48,992,296	39,733,359	9,258,937	40,966,062

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in December, 1915 and 1914, under the Underwood law, and December, 1912, under the Payne law, using for comparison products having severe foreign competition.

Products.	1915 values.	1914 values.	Difference.	1912 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Breadstuffs	$1,973,547	$1,277,681	$695,866	$1,487,775
Embroideries	794,282	725,714	68,568	1,441,117
Lace and lace articles	1,008,827	712,440	296,387	2,042,090
Nets and nettings	129,500	29,381	100,119	88,339
Handkerchiefs	220,121	138,563	81,558	142,497
Yarns (linen)	108,867	103,923	4,944	73,674
Fruits and nuts	4,366,214	3,979,370	386,844	3,193,662
Hides and skins	13,080,180	5,160,332	7,919,848	10,370,853
Leather and tanned skins	1,337,963	714,887	623,076	818,096
Perfumery	230,465	202,110	28,355	154,985
Films and plates	140,990	87,690	53,300	119,340
Seeds	2,795,869	1,790,061	1,005,808	1,558,106
Silk manufactures	2,362,046	1,599,691	762,355	2,237,378
Artificial silk	374,457	316,899	57,558	333,309
Vegetables	810,965	773,175	37,790	1,194,836
Laths and shingles	488,122	282,440	205,682	259,594
Wool and angora hair	12,199,856	638,658	11,561,198	2,584,201
Total, 17 products	42,422,271	18,533,015	23,889,256	28,101,832
			Decrease.	
Aluminum scrap	158,154	177,708	19,554	653,401
Aluminum manufactures	1,943	56,643	54,700	57,409
Automobiles and parts	64,386	157,872	93,486	240,346
Clocks and parts	27,710	85,848	58,138	62,387
Watches and parts	241,559	447,351	205,792	237,062
Cotton cloths	665,370	772,109	106,739	992,331
Stockings (cotton)	9,118	108,295	99,177	192,341
Other knit goods (cotton)	113,887	326,312	212,425	20,722
Eggs	9,586	87,963	78,377	.....
Fish	1,752,269	2,039,523	287,254	1,593,688
Plate glass	.....	1,472	1,472	27,445
Other glassware	182,774	428,154	245,380	485,043
Cutlery	99,324	192,673	93,349	165,440
Enameled ware	28,318	47,497	19,179	41,283
Tin plate	7,304	27,276	19,972	21,914
Gloves (leather)	382,999	738,455	355,456	531,543
Meat and dairy products	1,893,948	4,032,112	2,138,164	1,343,148
Oilcloth and linoleum	35,295	96,572	61,277	132,455
Paper and manufactures	2,224,388	2,276,856	52,468	549,224
Wood pulp	1,625,457	2,005,846	380,389	1,371,549
Wool manufactures	1,307,823	2,196,555	888,732	1,454,706
Total, 21 products	10,831,612	16,303,092	5,471,480	10,173,437
Increase list	42,422,271	18,533,015	23,889,256	28,101,832
Total, 38 products	53,253,883	34,836,107	18,417,776	38,275,269

Imports of merchandise and agricultural products in January, 1916 and 1915, under the Underwood law, and January, 1913, under the Payne law, using for comparison products having the most severe foreign competition.

Products.	1916 values.	1915 values.	Difference.	1913 Payne law.
			Increase.	
Breadstuffs	$1,683,097	$1,155,139	$527,958	$1,483,343
Automobiles and parts	235,714	96,162	139,552	37,668
Watches and parts	278,262	266,675	11,587	192,853
Cotton cloths	753,588	700,934	52,654	958,097
Lace and lace articles	1,053,537	1,024,494	29,043	2,304,873
Nets or nettings	159,914	51,953	97,961	60,525
Handkerchiefs (linen)	97,981	91,210	6,771	72,869
Yarns (linen)	84,099	82,879	1,220	69,911
Fruits and nuts	3,301,947	2,063,288	1,238,659	2,562,175
Hides and skins	12,347,851	8,965,090	3,382,761	1,003,232
Leather and tanned skins	1,372,335	948,129	424,206	778,681
Perfumery, etc	238,959	165,904	73,055	113,880
Seeds	2,486,646	1,560,854	925,792	2,084,481
Silk manufactures	2,460,161	1,745,069	715,092	2,466,623
Silk, artificial	263,409	215,792	47,617	309,785
Vegetables	1,225,280	802,806	422,474	1,066,005
Laths and shingles	263,718	206,357	57,361	142,191
Wool and angora hair	23,329,560	2,448,259	20,881,301	3,645,662
Total, 18 products	51,636,058	22,600,994	29,035,064	19,302,854
			Decrease.	
Aluminum, crude	163,270	219,372	56,102	576,074
Aluminum manufactures	5,958	61,569	55,611	66,925
Clocks and parts	17,643	104,529	86,886	62,493
Embroideries (cotton)	523,514	801,317	277,803	1,165,054
Stockings (cotton)	6,850	302,865	296,015	209,010
Other knit goods (cotton)	52,915	324,033	271,118	31,810
Eggs	3,357	67,990	64,633	.....
Fish	1,476,513	1,592,067	115,554	1,233,800
Plate glass	.....	2,124	2,124	31,810
Other glass	180,322	467,328	287,006	485,605
Cutlery	58,544	194,534	135,990	143,561
Enameled ware	16,463	63,134	46,671	80,392
Tin plate	10,242	104,802	94,560	31,458
Gloves (leather)	257,278	765,174	507,896	620,226
Meat and dairy products	2,480,228	4,517,468	2,037,240	1,104,552
Oil cloth and linoleum	31,771	68,694	36,923	146,359
Paper and manufactures	2,029,881	2,116,212	86,331	1,759,711
Films and plates	77,893	81,360	3,467	160,006
Wood pulp	1,414,883	2,346,982	932,099	1,269,774
Wool manufactures	1,378,803	2,188,832	810,029	1,468,228
Total, 20 products	10,186,328	16,390,386	6,204,058	10,646,850
Increase list	51,636,058	22,600,994	29,035,064	19,302,854
Total, 38 products	61,822,386	38,991,380	22,831,006	29,949,704

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 5415. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River at Geneva, Ill.; and

S. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of a representative of the United States Government to appear at the celebration of the landing of Sir Francis Drake on the coast of California.

POTOMAC RIVER BRIDGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. SWANSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 759.

Mr. OLIVER. What is the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 759) to provide for the removal of what is now known as the Aqueduct Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for the building of a bridge in place thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 7, after the word "cost," to insert "for the bridge and the necessary approaches thereto," so as make the section read:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be constructed a bridge across the Potomac River at or near what is now known as the Aqueduct Bridge, replacing said bridge with a substantial structure, at a cost for the bridge and the necessary approaches thereto of not more than $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of War is further authorized to make such contract for the removal of the present bridge and for the sale thereof as in his discretion may be proper, and to cover the proceeds of such sale, if any, into the Treasury of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, line 21, after the word "property," to insert "necessary in the construction of said bridge," so as to read:

SEC. 4. That the sum of $150,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of securing proper plans and for the payment of any lands, easements, rights, or property necessary in the construction of said bridge.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Commerce adopted an amendment to the bill which they failed to report. I now send the amendment to the desk and ask that it may be inserted in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Virginia on behalf of the Committee on Commerce will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 4, page 3, line 1, after the word "herein," it is proposed to insert:

The Secretary of War shall advise with the Commission of Fine Arts in regard to the location, plan, and specifications of said bridge and approaches.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, in section 5, page 3, line 9, after the word "cables," to insert "and interurban railroads," so as to read:

That the said bridge shall be used as a highway for traffic, and for gas and water mains, power, telegraph and telephone wires or cables, and interurban railroads, upon such conditions and for such compensation as may from time to time be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 4, line 4, after the word "bridge," to insert "and the double track above described," and in line 8, after the word "railways," to insert "including the Washington & Old Dominion Railway," so as to read:

And provided further, That any electric railway shall have the right to use said new bridge and the double track above described upon terms determined by the Secretary of War, who is hereby authorized and directed to hear the interested parties and to fix the terms of joint trackage. And all electric railways, including the Washington & Old Dominion Railway, using said new bridge shall, in addition to taxes and other charges, pay monthly into the Treasury of the United States the sum of one-half of 1 cent for each passenger transported each way over said new bridge, and just and reasonable rates or charges on all freight transported thereon, and of these sums, when paid into the Treasury, one-half shall be credited to the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, in section 2, page 2, line 5, after the words "as may be," I move to strike out the word "desired" and to insert in its place the word "necessary," so that it will read:

As may be necessary for the construction of said bridge and the approaches thereto.

Mr. SWANSON. I accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GOOD ROADS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7617, commonly called the good-roads bill.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, it had been my intention to ask that the rural-credits bill be taken up at the close of the routine morning business this morning. Several Senators have spoken to me about wishing to discuss the paragraph which deals with exemptions from taxation, but I find that one of the Senators on the other side is ill, and therefore can not discuss that matter to-day. While I had hoped to get a vote on the bill to-day, I have agreed that Senators may discuss the section of the bill to which I refer to-morrow, and I shall not attempt to get a vote to-day. I therefore do not insist upon taking up the rural-credits bill until 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is that offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, line 13, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by adding after the word "require," on line 13, the following:

Provided, however, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall approve only such projects as may be permanent in character, and the expenditure of funds hereby authorized shall be applied only to such improvements.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I very much hope that this amendment will not be adopted in the form in which it is submitted. This amendment, if adopted, in my judgment, would preclude the expenditure of any of the money intended to be appropriated to the building of post roads, because there can be no such thing, Mr. President, as a permanent road. There has never been a permanent road built, and there never can be. So, if the Secretary of Agriculture should literally construe the language included in the amendment, it would, in my opinion, absolutely preclude the building of any road under the provisions of this bill.

I am as anxious, Mr. President, as is the Senator from Ohio or any other Senator that this money shall be wisely and judiciously used and that we shall get value received for every dollar that is expended; I am just as anxious as is the Senator from Ohio or any other Senator that the money that we propose to appropriate for the building of post roads shall result in the building of good post roads and highways; and I should like to ask the Senator if he would not be satisfied and if he would not consent to an amendment such as this: Strike out in his amendment all after the word "may" and insert the words "call for the construction of good post roads and highways." It seems to me, Mr. President, that is as far as we can safely go.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator to restate his proposed amendment? I did not catch it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It might be that an amendment reading in this way would suit the Senator:

That the Secretary of Agriculture shall approve only such projects as may be good in character.

My original suggestion was to strike out all after the word "may" in his amendment and to add the words "call for the construction of good post roads and highways."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether or not, inasmuch as the States and localities must pass upon these matters, they are not better judges as to

what kind of a road ought to be built, and would it not be better to leave the discretion in them rather than to prescribe that authorities here in Washington, 2,000 miles away from my State and varying distances away from other States, shall prescribe the exact character of roads supposed to be suited to a particular locality?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Particularly when the States spend ten times as much on roads as the Government does.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And inasmuch, no doubt, as the States will put up fully as much as the National Government, and, I presume, much more than the National Government, it seems to me they ought to determine the character of the roads to be built, instead of prescribing absolutely here in Washington what shall be done.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Colorado. I have stated on the floor repeatedly that, in my opinion, this question should be left to the State highway commissions and the Secretary of Agriculture to work out such plans and to construct such roads as would in their judgment give value received and carry out the purpose of the act, that being to construct good post roads and highways. I made the suggestion with the hope that the Senator from Ohio might be willing to accede to it, inasmuch as I am informed by the best highway engineers in the country that to confine the Secretary of Agriculture to the construction of "permanent" roads is out of the question and impossible. I hope the Senator from Ohio will accept my suggestion. If not, then I must ask the Senate to reject the amendment.

Mr. POMERENE obtained the floor.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. POMERENE. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Would it be objectionable to the chairman of the committee to insert the word "durable" in place of the word "permanent"?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the highway commissions and the engineers all agree that the word "durable" means brick or concrete, or roads of similar character.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I did not know that the word had a technical meaning, and if the Senator from Alabama is correct in his understanding of the meaning of the word it would not be prudent to insert it.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator who are the engineers to whom he has referred?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, roads of that character are only needed where commerce and travel converge around the big cities; they are not needed in the country.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee who the engineers are that define "permanent" as meaning brick roads or concrete roads or macadam roads?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, Mr. President, I do not object to telling who my authority is on that subject, so far as that is concerned, because it is no secret. Mr. Logan Page, of the Good Roads Division of the Agricultural Department, states that positively.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will permit me——

Mr. POMERENE. I will.

Mr. GALLINGER. It occurs to me that there is one other word that would accomplish the purpose of the Senator and obviate the difficulty of defining the word "permanent," and that is the word "substantial"—that the road shall be substantial in character.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I will take up each of these suggestions as they have been made. I do not think that any one of them meets exactly what I had in mind when I used the word "permanent."

It was not meant, and this amendment does not say, that these roads must be permanent. The phrase is "permanent in character." The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] would substitute the words "good in character." I do not know how he is going to define a "good road" any more than I can define specifically a road "permanent in character"; and I have not attempted to define it. That phrase would be better, however, than the language of the bill as it was presented without any amendment.

My friend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] suggests the word "durable." That is better than the word "good," in my judgment; but it is not as good as the word "permanent."

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. POMERENE. Pardon me just a moment. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] suggests the word "substantial." I think that is better than the word "durable," and I would much prefer it to having no provision of this character in the bill.

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

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment until I have answered the suggestion made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], I will yield to him.

I do not think the Senator from Colorado fairly states this proposition. It is not a question of somebody here in Washington determining what shall be done. The bill itself provides that the projects, the plans, the specifications, the material, shall be first suggested by the State highway commission or by the governor. Afterwards, the projects, plans, specifications, and material shall be submitted to the Agricultural Department here; and, if approved by the Agricultural Department, then this expenditure can be made.

Let me suggest further while on this point, that it is said that the States, of their own volition, are expending for roads vastly more money through their own administrative authorities than is provided to be contributed by the Federal Government. That is true unquestionably.

Now let us see what the situation here is with regard to Colorado. Under the provisions of this bill Colorado would get out of the $5,000,000 appropriation $86,800. By the terms of this bill, before that State would be permitted to receive this amount of money, it must appropriate at least a like sum, namely, $86,800, out of its own treasury; in other words, it would require a total expenditure of twice $86,800 to be invested in the construction of permanent roads. I dare say that in the State of Colorado to-day there is more money expended for permanent roads which would meet the requirements of the language of my amendment, than can be built in any one year for twice $86,800. Assuming that to be so, then Colorado is in a position where she can get this Federal aid, and I want her to have it; but I do not want this money to be frittered away, as much of it will be, in my judgment, if there is no limitation whatsoever placed upon the road upon which this money may be expended.

Now, looking at it from the standpoint of the State, it is just as broad as it is long, because if this Federal money is put in what we might all agree was a permanent roadway, then she can divert her funds to making these temporary roadways, if I may use that term, and the State will lose nothing by it. My belief is that if we are going to take this money and expend it in each of the several States in mere temporary road building, a mere grading up of the earth and the clay into the center of the highway, it may be, and making a gutter along each side, we will have nothing at the end of the year to show for the expenditure of the Federal funds. This proposition is so enormous, so tremendous, with 2,300,000 miles of highway in the country, that if we are going to attempt in any degree to make these temporary highways in the way that I have indicated, it is going to discourage rather than to encourage permanent road building.

With all due respect to the commissioner of highways, when he attempts to make the statement that the word "permanent" includes only a brick road, a macadam road, or a concrete road, I am in a position where I have either to question his intelligence or to question my own.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. POMERENE. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The reference which I made as to prescribing here the kind of road that should be built in the States applies not to what the Secretary of Agriculture might do, but to the very thing that the Senator is prescribing in this amendment. When a State, as is the case in my State, has a highway commission, composed in my State of three members, a board of engineers, all of them of the highest degree of skill that can be had, and when those men are willing to put up the money—and they will put up not only half, but two-thirds to three-fourths of the amount—it seems to me that we ought to leave it to them.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator from Colorado a question?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. What kind of roadways does the Senator anticipate the State of Colorado will build under this appropriation, if it is made?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think the chances are that most of them will be roads with a rock surface—not a rock surface entirely, but disintegrated granite. That is something that is very good in our State, and that is what we build mostly.

Mr. POMERENE. Does not the Senator believe that a road of that character would meet the requirements of the language of my amendment?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know whether it will or not, because at times it washes—there is no doubt about that—and yet it is quite a durable road.

Mr. POMERENE. Certainly; and there might be an earthquake out there that would disturb any kind of a road that might be built.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no. The heavy storms will, to a certain extent, damage them; but unquestionably, when you compare the cost of that with the cost of a concrete road or a road that is built of brick, the latter is so much greater that, if it were insisted upon, you could not have any construction at all to speak of. You would not have a hundred miles of road a year constructed under this bill if that were the case.

Not only that, but so far as my State is concerned, we have a tax which raises $600,000 every year. That goes to the construction of roads. That is a State tax, and they require counties to put up and they require individuals to put up.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask to what class of roads that applies?

Mr. SHAFROTH. It applies generally to what are called the State roads.

Mr. POMERENE. But to what character of improvements?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Generally surfacing them with disintegrated granite or small rock. We have in the State of Colorado a great quantity of disintegrated granite. It is not exactly pulverized, but nearly so. It is a surface that wears splendidly, and it is the character of road that is most used and most built. I do not know whether that would come under this language or not.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I think there can be no question but that the construction which will be placed upon this language by the Agricultural Department will be practically final. It would have to be a gross abuse of discretion before any court would attempt to interfere in what was purely an administrative function. A mere difference of opinion as between man and man would not be regarded as sufficient justification for the court to disturb an administrative act.

The language here is that the Secretary of Agriculture shall approve only such projects as may be permanent in character. He is the judge—not a court, not any other official; and my belief is that there would be less abuse of the spirit of congressional action here by aiding the department in determining the character of roads which may be built under these appropriations than by leaving the matter wholly to his discretion; and my thought is this, too: If there be no limitation placed upon this appropriation, and the discretion of the department be abused, as I believe it will be, by attempting to make these temporary repairs, there will be a revulsion of feeling against legislation of this character that will, later on, defeat Federal aid, which I would very much regret.

Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. SWANSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and to whom?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Ohio wants to keep the record straight. I did not say, as he seems to think I said, that permanent roads were made out of brick or concrete. I said there was no such thing as a permanent road, and none could be built. I said that durable roads, under the definition of the engineers, were built out of brick, cement, and such material—durable roads, not permanent roads.

Mr. POMERENE. But, Mr. President, I think we must give a reasonable construction to all language, and I think Senators generally understand what we mean when we speak of a road that is permanent in character. We mean something in contradistinction to a road that is only temporary in character.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a moment?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I was just going to ask the Senator if the words "permanent" and "durable," as stated by the chairman of the committee, have a technical meaning in road building? For instance, if a durable road is a road built of such material as brick, concrete, and material of that character, the enactment of a law, with the use of those words, would leave no discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture in construing them. He would be compelled to give them the technical meaning, which is usual in treating the subject of road building. There is no room for question on that point.

I can not agree with the Senator from Ohio that there is any danger of the Secretary of Agriculture and the authorities of the State permitting an improper or worthless road to be constructed; but if the Senator wants to throw around it more safeguards than the bill already provides, I think the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] would meet all requirements by employing the word "substantial." It is not so strong a term as "durable," and it does not go so far as the word "permanent." It means a substantial, lasting construction.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will permit me, I will read three or four definitions of the word "substantial" in a very few words.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have nothing further to say, except to call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the fact that I do not think any probable or possible abuse would occur under the terms of the bill at all, but certainly not if his amendment should be adopted and the word "substantial" should be substituted for "permanent."

Now I yield the floor to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Among the definitions of the word "substantial" are these:

> Having an essential value; genuine; sound; sterling. Having firm or good material; strong; stout; solid; real; or true in the main or for the most part. Vital; important. That which has real practical value.

It seems to me that that is a word which covers the case very completely, without using a word that is very difficult of definition, unless we go to the extreme of good-road building.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am obliged to the Senator for giving us the benefit of that definition; but I have been furnished with a definition of the word "permanent" as contained in the Century Dictionary, and I want to read it:

> Lasting or intended to last indefinitely; fixed or enduring in character, condition, state, position, occupation, use, or the like; remaining or intended to remain unchanged or unremoved; not temporary or subject to change; abiding; as a permanent building; permanent colors, permanent employment; permanent possession.

And according to the able engineer who has been quoted here as authority by the chairman of this committee, there could be no permanent building, because a building does not last forever.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Under the definition "lasting indefinitely, not subject to change," would not the Senator hold that an asphalt road, which we know wears out in five or six years, would not be a permanent road?

Mr. POMERENE. No; I could not agree with the Senator upon that definition at all. It is permanent in character, just as much as this building is permanent in character, just as much as any house is permanent in character.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is not this building a building of indefinite permanency, that might last for many, many years, and we do not know when it would wear out, while we know that an asphalt road will give out in 10 years? I have never seen one last more than 5 or 6 years.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I recognize the fact that any character of road we may build is not going to be permanent, according to the engineer, Mr. Page; but if an asphalt pavement is temporary in character, how much less permanent in character and substantiality is a mere road which is graded up to the center with nothing but the ordinary earth in that vicinity!

I take it that any Secretary of Agriculture who may be in office is going to be a reasonable man and take notice of all of the facts connected with a given proposition. I take it that he is going to have in mind the kind of material that there may be in the several States or localities where this material could be used in economical road building. All those things will be borne in mind. But if you are going to have a road simply temporary in character, what is going to be the situation? You are going to have some gentleman constantly waiting upon the Department of Agriculture and upon the highway commissions to press this proposition, that proposition, or the other proposition. There is going to be, in my judgment, more laxness in the methods of road building, and there will be more extravagance in the expenditure of the money. It is that which I want to prevent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], I think, have each given pretty good suggestions. I would myself prefer the word "permanent"; but if that is not going to be accepted, I certainly do hope that one or the other of the suggested amendments will be accepted. I do not know of any road commissioner, State or

National, who should be given carte blanche to say to what jobs he shall devote the public funds.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move an amendment to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio to strike out the word "permanent" and insert "substantial."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I could not hear the Senator from New Hampshire. What does he propose to strike out?

Mr. GALLINGER. The Secretary will state it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated from the desk.

The SECRETARY. In the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] it is proposed to strike out the word "permanent" and in lieu thereof to insert the word "substantial."

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] will not be adopted. It would simply tend to bring about the expenditure of all this money around the large cities, where they will have macadam and permanent roads. One of the purposes of this bill is to aid the rural communities, where there are not sufficient funds to have permanent roads of the character that the Senator from Ohio wants constructed.

There is no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], but the Senator said that this bill permits waste of Federal money. Those of us who were on the subcommittee reporting this bill to the full committee considered this matter. There is no chance of the Federal money being thrown away under this bill. If it is a sand-clay road, or a gravel road, or even if it is a dirt road, it has to be, under this bill, put in good condition. After it is put in good condition then the Federal Government pays its half or third. Then the State must agree to keep the road substantially in the same condition that it was in when the Federal Government paid its money. Consequently, whatever the character of that road, for all time to come that road must be kept in that condition, so the money can not be wasted or lost. If it is not kept in that condition the State then fails to receive any money in the future.

We considered all that phase of the question, and no bill has been introduced here that provides more safely and completely against the waste of money by the Federal Government than this.

I have no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]; but if you put in the word "permanent," that word has been construed generally by State highway commissions not to include sand-clay roads or gravel roads. It is usually construed as a macadam or brick road, or a permanent road of that kind or character.

It seems to me there is no danger of having any trifling roads under this bill. You can not repair roads under the bill. You can rebuild them; you can construct them; but the temporary repairs that the Senator imagines will occur could not be made under the provisions of this bill. Consequently, I can not see why it would not be better to let the bill stand as it is; but I have no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, which would permit sand-clay roads, gravel roads, and roads of that character to be built under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS rose.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator from Kansas wish to interrupt me?

Mr. CURTIS. I was going to suggest that the substitution of the words "modern in construction" for "permanent in character" might answer the objection.

Mr. SWANSON. The State highway departments would differ as to what is a permanent road. If you want to spend this money to build roads around large cities, simply building a macadam road, and giving the rural district no benefit of it, put in the word "permanent." That is what it means. It means that the rural sections would have to pay half the expense ultimately in the construction of roads costing $15,000 or $20,000 a mile. I do not think that is right. I think that will destroy one great purpose of the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. Surely the Senator from Virginia does not mean to say that if this amendment is adopted permanent roads would only include those that would cost $15,000 or $20,000 a mile.

Mr. SWANSON. I mean this: If the department should construe this language to mean that only macadam, brick, or rock roads are included in permanent roads, a sand and clay road could not be built, a gravel road could not be built, and the effect would be that this money would be spent entirely around large cities. To the word "substantial" I do not believe the chairman of the committee will object, but I would prefer the language of the bill.

As I said before, there can be no waste of Federal money under the bill. Take the imagined case the Senator from Ohio put. They could put the dirt road in a good condition and pay $200 a mile to do it under the provisions of the bill. They could drag it and drain it and make a dirt road. What is the result? Under the provisions of the bill the State will have to agree for all time to come that that road shall be kept in substantially the condition that it was when it was completed, and if that is not done no money under the provisions of the bill shall accrue to the State. If you could get all the dirt roads kept for all time in that condition, it would be a great deal gained. The bill has been drawn carefully to prevent any waste of Federal money. I do not see how any waste of Federal money can accrue if the bill is honestly and fairly executed.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has said that we would never have a Secretary of Agriculture who would construe the word "permanent" to mean a brick or a macadam road, and that therefore there is no danger in putting in this amendment. If such a condition as he describes is bound to exist, why can you not trust the Secretary of Agriculture to determine under the general provisions of the bill? Why prescribe a limit on what he can do by the indefinite provision which is proposed here by the Senator from Ohio? The amendment reads as follows:

Provided, however, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall approve only such projects as may be permanent in character, and the expenditure of funds hereby authorized shall be applied only to such improvements.

Now, why is it necessary to curtail his power? If it means nothing, if the Secretary is going to have the leeway of determining what is permanent and what is not permanent in the kind of road to be used, what is the use of making that provision? Section 6 prescribes as follows:

SEC. 6. That any State desiring to avail itself of the benefits of this act shall, by its State highway department, submit to the Secretary of Agriculture project statements setting forth proposed construction of any rural post road or roads therein. If the Secretary of Agriculture approve a project, the State highway department shall furnish to him such surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates therefor as he may require.

Mr. President, it takes the approval of the Secretary. Why limit him and curb him by a distinct provision with respect to this particular matter?

The Senator thinks there will be a great waste of money. I deny that, Mr. President. I do not believe there will be. I do not believe it, because I believe that the expenditures which have been made in the last 8 or 10 years in various States of the Union have demonstrated that the State highway departments are as anxious for good roads as any Federal officer possibly can be. I know that in our State we are very careful. We are making splendid roads, and we are spending a great deal of money upon them. We spent $2,600,000 last year for this purpose. Here is a provision that is going to be availed of, I believe, by the States, so that the National Government will not have to put up more than one-fourth. It says not exceeding one-half. I am satisfied that will be the case, inasmuch as experience has shown in my State that the individuals and the counties are willing to put up the majority of the money in any case. You will find that they will do it with relation to the Federal fund and in order to make it build as much road as possible. Here is a proposition to curb and restrict by a direct command the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the character of roads, when, as a matter of fact, they will be putting up twice or three times as much money as the Federal Government.

I am opposed to any restriction. I am opposed to any limitation. I believe we can rely upon the general good character of the Secretary of Agriculture when the proposition comes up. If it is very bad he will condemn it; if it is not very bad he will find that the highway department of the State is going to be the one that will determine what is for the best interest of the community in which the road will be built.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, in determining this particular question it seems to me that it turns upon this proposition: Has the word "permanent" in the road-building art a fixed meaning? If the word "permanent" in this art has come by usage to mean a macadam road or a brick road, then in all probability if this word was before the court they would construe it according to its meaning in the art. This is a very familiar rule of construction in dealing with customs cases. We take the meaning of a word as used in the trades.

Further, if it is doubtful whether the word "permanent" has a fixed meaning or has not a fixed meaning, then it would

be well not to use that word, for fear that a court or the Secretary of Agriculture would construe it in its limited, technical sense.

I do not know, myself, whether the word "permanent" in the road-building art has come to have a fixed meaning such as has been indicated. If it has, then that word ought not to be left in the statute unless we desire that it shall be construed to be limited to roads of a certain class.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I do not understand the amendment. There are no permanent roads. No permanent roads have ever been built. There must be repairs to all roads. What makes a good road in one country makes an inferior one in another. In California by rolling and draining and covering dirt roads with oil and keeping it in repair they have good roads, suitable for ordinary traffic, but they will not stand heavy traffic without cutting. There is no road except one made of basaltic Belgian blocks that will last 15 years without repairs or rebuilding. The life of an asphaltum road is from 10 to 12 years. If you do not travel at all on such a road it rots out in most countries and loses its binding quality of holding the road material together in that length of time. Any bitumen will make a good road when faced with a rock surface, or "metal," as it is called. Its life, however, is but about 12 years under ordinary weather and traffic if well laid, and it is too expensive.

The so-called crushed rock or macadam road wears away rapidly and has to be resurfaced often. If you keep after it all the time, a well-made clay road, well rolled and well drained, will keep up for many years with the light traffic of the country such as farmers driving over it with their produce if kept in repair.

There is no road which is permanent and there is no particular road that is suited for all and differing localities. The term that they must construct a permanent road means that they shall do something which nobody has approached yet except the Romans. The Romans built a road that had a fairly permanent foundation, and in France and all through Europe they are resurfacing the old Roman roads and using them to-day. They stand upon a foundation that you can call permanent for a road, but it is constructed at a heavy first cost. It must be properly drained; it must have large culverts; draining is the secret of such a road if it is in a watered country. Water destroys a road. Attrition also destroys its surface. The surface should be of hard stone or metal, as it is called, well laid, and the day will come in this country when they will use steel for "tracking" the vehicles, and when we do that we will have a road that will last for years, but not until we do so. Nothing is "permanent" but the Almighty; not even the mountains, for they are being leveled by attrition.

The bill should be so drawn that it will meet differing conditions in keeping up the roads of different sections and compelling repairs to be made, building roads suitable to the traffic in the community in which the road is constructed. You can not go farther than that.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I sincerely hope the proposed amendment of the Senator from Ohio will not prevail, for this reason: The words "permanent in character" might be so construed by the Secretary of Agriculture as to preclude my own State especially, and I may say I speak with some special knowledge, and I think other States as well somewhat similarly situated, from sharing in the benefits of the bill. In South Dakota we could not build roads with crushed rock or stone as a basis with concrete or asphalt upon the top of that. We could not think of doing a thing of that kind. We could not build a macadamized road of any length in South Dakota because of the tremendous expense it would be to us. We could not build a brick road, if a brick road is to be construed as a permanent road under the language of this amendment.

With this Government aid, however, we might be able to do this. We could construct with care and with some attention to scientific construction a good dirt road and we could surface that road, perhaps, with gravel or in certain sections of the State of South Dakota, and it is true likewise in North Dakota, we could surface such a road so constructed with lignite, which may be obtained in large quantities in certain parts of the State.

Mr. President, I appreciate what was said by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] in regard to the meaning that may be given by usage or custom to the word "permanent." Perhaps the term has been used too long in connection with macadamized roads or with rock-built roads or with brick roads to mean in the mind of the Secretary of Agriculture anything else than roads of that kind, and he would say, "Your proposed dirt road, constructed in a State where you have not this material or where it was too costly for you to procure it, does not come within the meaning of the term 'permanent in character' as used in the bill."

Mr. President, we can not build roads that cost so much in their construction as they do in certain parts of the United States, but we shall construct under the bill more miles of reasonably good, substantial roads, and the provisions of the bill will be of great benefit to us because it will enable us to do that. Here is our great State, much of it—that portion west of the Missouri River sparsely settled, but in which good roads are needed nevertheless—in which the settlers are new and who feel too much the burden of constructing such roads as could be constructed with the aid of the Government under the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, we all appreciate the difficulties that certain sections of the country have in the construction of so-called good roads. I have listened to the Senator's explanation of what may be expected in South Dakota. The Senator says they can construct good, substantial roads. I have offered an amendment to strike out "permanent in character" and insert "substantial in character." Would the Senator object to that? Could not his State meet that requirement?

Mr. STERLING. I will say in answer to the Senator from New Hampshire that I think it probably could if there be a reasonable construction put upon the word "substantial" by the Secretary of Agriculture; but I can hardly see the necessity of even that word under the safeguards provided in the bill. Is it likely that the State highway commission will present to the Secretary of Agriculture an unreasonable project in regard to the building of a road in any particular State? I do not believe it will.

Then, again, Mr. President, after the care and attention that the highway commission will give to the subject in presenting any project to the Secretary of Agriculture, there will be the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture himself through his inspection and study of the proposed project.

It seems to me that there is every possible safeguard thrown around the bill against any wasteful expenditure of Government appropriations. I hope the bill will stand as it is written without this amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question. Does the Senator believe that the word "permanent" would exclude the kind of road that he describes in his State?

Mr. STERLING. I was just indicating, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska, my theory in that regard. I say that roads built of brick, of macadam, or of concrete, with ground rock as the basis, and so forth, would probably be deemed as being permanent roads—they have always been so considered—and the Secretary of Agriculture might say, in view of this, that no other road is a permanent road under the meaning of this amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, technically, as has already been said, there never has been a road built that is permanent, if you are going to use that technical definition of it. I would not want to cut out the kind of roads the Senator has described. At the same time, it seems to me that this word "permanent" would not do that. If it would cut out that kind of a road because it would not last long enough, then for the same identical reason it seems to me it would cut out a brick road, because that will not last forever. The word ought to be in the bill, it seems to me, in order to distinguish the road from a temporary affair, from a makeshift. It ought to be a real road.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from Ohio has frequently used the word "temporary." I do not know what he means by "temporary," unless he means a road that would have to be built under conditions as they exist in my own State and in many other States. That is what I think he must mean by a temporary road; and his idea of a permanent road is a road constructed of other material than dirt.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I think it is perfectly easy to state what is meant by temporary. In all parts of the country a large part of the roads are of that character. They are roads which are repaired in the spring, and after the winter is past they are repaired again in the spring.

As I understand the object of the bill as it now is, it is to allow the Government money to be spent on repairs of precisely that character. I do not want to do anything to stop the easy flow of the appropriation to needy places, but I do not think we ought to spend the Government money on temporary repairs of that kind.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Massachusetts labors under a misapprehension in that regard. The work of which he speaks is not road construction.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; it is.

Mr. STERLING. That is maintenance of the road. The road having once been built, although it be a dirt road, graded up, and graded up scientifically, as it should be done, the matter of keeping it maintained or in repair thereafter will rest with the State authorities, the local authorities. It is the construction of roads, miles and miles in length, in the first place, that makes the hardship in my State and in many other States similarly situated. Then, with a road like that, comes the somewhat burdensome task, too, of afterwards keeping it in repair by the local authorities, and the local authorities are required, under the provisions of the bill, to keep it in repair.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, there may be some doubt about the proposition that the Federal Government should engage in aid of constructing State roads; there may be some ground for debate on the question as to how much aid the Government should furnish the State; there may be some question as to whether now is the time to furnish such aid; those are debatable questions; but, I submit, Mr. President, that the provision for good roads, as contained in this bill, is not or cannot be one for serious debate.

The bill provides for good roads for all of the States in the Union to the extent of the Federal aid provided therein. It recognizes the fact that in some places it is, perhaps, better to use cement, concrete, or brick, and that in other places that is impracticable and can not be done. We safeguard the Government appropriation with every means that is reasonable or that could be required in safely investing the Federal funds. Each State has to contribute the peoples' money of that State for building every rod of road that is aided by the Federal Government, and in most of the States the construction of good roads has come to be almost an exact science. The State officials are not going to waste their peoples' money in the construction of dirt roads that are only temporary in character. If they did so, they could never draw another dollar of Federal money in the construction of roads thereafter.

Mr. LODGE. Let me ask the Senator there, why not?

Mr. TOWNSEND. If the Senator from Massachusetts will wait, I will tell him. I was just coming to the discussion of that point. The bill provides that the roads and the plan for their construction shall be first presented to the Secretary of Agriculture by the State, and that he shall approve them; that they shall be roads which shall be maintained in the condition in which they were built for at least 10 years, according to an amendment that has been introduced, but without the amendment they must be maintained in good condition for all time or else no further money can be drawn from the Federal Treasury. That is the provision of the bill.

Mr. LODGE. I know that that is the provision of the bill; but what protection have you as to the original character of the roads, which is the standard?

Mr. TOWNSEND. We have the protection, first, of the common sense and patriotism of the various officials of the States, who will not spend money out of the Federal Treasury for building bad roads. The States are interested not alone in the first year's appropriation, but are even more interested in subsequent years.

Mr. LODGE. I am not troubled about the officials of the States.

Mr. TOWNSEND. We have the further protection that the Secretary of Agriculture, knowing that this is a bill passed for the purpose of constructing good roads, will not spend a dollar or allow a dollar to be spent for bad roads.

Mr. LODGE. Not even on the eve of an election?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not think so. I have no fear of that.

Mr. President, I think we have surrounded this bill with every safeguard that could be reasonably required. I realize, of course, that Senators who represent States which have stone roads, and a large number of them, which have built their roads to a great extent, and are to be commended for having done so, that these Senators understand good roads to mean such as those States have built, and do not understand that equally satisfactory roads can be built of other material in other States. These States are to be commended on what they have done. They have had the money and they have used it for good purposes. But they should not set up their standard for the rest of the States to follow, for it might not be possible to follow it in other States.

I can see no possible objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. I think that what his amendment provides is the intention of the bill. I do not think any other kind of roads should be constructed. I also claim that the roads will be properly constructed if that amendment does not obtain. The States are as greatly and as intelligently interested in good roads as the Congress. The roads must be built as nearly permanent as possible, considering the material and the conditions of the country of the locality where the roads are to be constructed. That is to be the standard; that is to be the guide. The committee which framed this bill has tried to safeguard the Federal appropriation against misappropriation, and I believe this bill does it in a proper and practicable manner.

This bill, it seems to me, is very much better than the bill that came over to us from the other House. It certainly means more to me along the line of permanent good roads than does that bill; and I am, therefore, very anxious that it should be passed. I do not want any provision inserted in the bill which will make it impossible to spend money in States where the material is such that, under the possible standardized definition of permanent roads, they can not build roads at all. In other words, I want it applicable to every State in the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if we take the definition of the word "permanent," as given us by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], there could be practically no roads built except those built of Belgian blocks and brick. The Senator read from the dictionary the definition "lasting, or intended to last indefinitely; not subject to change"; that is to say, a character of road which, when built, lasts so indefinitely into the future that you have not any conception of the period of time when it will wear out. That is the meaning of the word "permanent," as defined by the dictionary.

I do not understand that the term has so gone into road building as to give it a definite status; I do not understand that the term has been extended clearly and unmistakably to macadam roads and to asphalt roads. I know in my section how long a macadam roads lasts; I know how long an asphalt road lasts. In my section the only two roads that we have built that have not a recognized definite limitation of their life are the heavy granite blocks, Belgian blocks we call them, and brick. None of us desire any such limitation. The bill would be objectionable if it were so. Those are not the kind of roads of which we are thinking or that we want.

There are some parts of the southeastern section with which I am especially familiar where the best road is made from macadam. There is another part of that section where the best road is not made from macadam, but where a splendid road is built by taking clay and a peculiar phosphate gravel, which binds and makes a beautiful road. Well drained and reasonably cared for, such a road can be used for automobiles and gives splendid service. It would not stand very heavy wagon hauling continuously, such as the heavy hauling in our streets, but for the hauling to which those sections are subjected, it makes a perfect road.

There are sections in which I have seen a road built from a peculiar top soil and a clay base. I have seen such a road connected with a macadam road and subjected to the same wear, and I have seen it outlast the macadam road. So, Mr. President, we can not for a moment think, it seems to me, of using the word "permanent."

What is the plan of this bill? It is that the representatives of the States interested in the development of good roads shall prepare a list of roads and the plans for their improvement. They are interested, deeply interested, in what they are doing, and the State authorities are to put up at least half the money. Surely we can feel that they would not be engaged in wasting the money of their own people. Then the Secretary of Agriculture by his officers goes over the project, and it must meet his approval before the project is accepted.

I think that the bill, as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] has said, is very much the best proposition that has been submitted to us, and that it is properly safeguarded. I think it would be a serious injury to the bill and a handicap to the purposes we have if such language as that suggested by the amendment of the Senator from Ohio were adopted. It would eliminate from the benefits of the legislation one-half of the State in which I live, for in half of the State we make no macadam roads, and yet we have beautiful roads. We build them with clay and the prosphate gravel to which I have referred, and they bind together. Nobody has yet analyzed that particular gravel and explained why it does so well. Our State chemist has not been able to give a definite description of the material contained in the gravel to enable him to account for its binding force and its resistance to autos and its substantial value. Still the great value exists.

The conditions vary all over the country, and I think the bill is in just about as good shape, so far as its language is concerned, as we can make it, and it would almost destroy its value in many sections if the language proposed by the Senator from Ohio were used.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should regret very much to see the word "permanent" incorporated in the bill. To my mind it is a misnomer; there is in reality no such thing as a permanent roadway. A brick road would be considered in ordinary parlance a permanent road; yet it is a fact that I have seen bricks of the finest character brought from Akron, Ohio, laid in New Jersey on a prepared base, worn into ruts, so that they had to be removed and other brick pavements laid down. Within the short span of my own life I have seen so-called permanent roadways ground into ruts. What I want, and what I believe we all want, is good roads, and I believe that insistence upon the incorporation in the bill of the language proposed by the Senator from Ohio will make it practically impossible to have good roads as a result of this proposed legislation.

In my own State we have constructed many macadam roads; we have constructed many brick roads; and we have constructed many of what are called Amesite roads, which consist of ground rock, with asphaltum, laid in different layers and firmly rolled. By that process there is obtained a fine, splendid, and reasonably permanent surface; but so far as actual permanency is concerned, it is a physical impossibility to attain it. There are miles of road in the State of New Jersey, particularly in the southern portion of the State, where the climate is very much milder than it is in the northern portion, where the frost does not disintegrate and tear up the road. That is one of the great destroyers of roads—the disintegration and tearing up of the road by frost—and in the southern part of the State that difficulty is reduced to a minimum. So that it would be really a waste of money in the great stretches, running through Atlantic and Cumberland Counties along the sea, to lay brick roads or to lay Telford pavements or to lay macadam. It would be necessary to carry the cracked stone across from the spurs of the Blue Ridge Mountains, which traverse the State in its more northerly and westerly portions, and all this would involve an expense and an extravagance, if not, indeed, a waste of the public money. When a reasonably fine road can be made in that section of the State by using the native clay foundation, with the shore pebbles, which are close at hand and which bind quite well, provided the road is shaped up and well drained. As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] has said, the drainage factor is very important. It is necessary to shape up the road well, so that there may be good drainage, so that there may be a "dry footing," as the engineers say. When the road is thus shaped and drained, it is rolled with heavy steam rollers until there is a compact and firm foundation upon which is put the dressing of 4 or 6 or 8 inches, as the case may be, of clay and then gravel. By this process a superb road is obtained. Then, if possible—and, of course, in practically all sections it is quite possible—the roads should be oiled.

I have laid across a section of my farm, three-quarters of a mile in length, a Telford paving road, consisting of big rocks, then topped with finer grades of stone, which is gradually worked in, and then a layer of crushed stone put on. I have seen the surface of that road disintegrate in time, and in most sections such a road will disintegrate under heavy wear and great travel, so that it has to be taken up and resurfaced. If, however, such a road can be covered with heavy oil the road will be saved from disintegration, the water will be kept out of it, and it will last almost forever. The oiling twice a year of a macadamized road with heavy oil will keep the road in fairly good condition.

Under the provisions of the bill as it now is, in my State—and I believe the conditions in my State are no different from the conditions in parts of New York State and parts of Pennsylvania and other States which I have seen, such as Georgia and South Carolina—you will have roads of infinitely good quality and roads which will be lasting, but without the thought of permanency. To burden the measure by adding the word "permanent" will make it a practical impossibility for the bill to have any effect in the suburbs and in the outskirts of the cities and populous centers, and will practically shut out good roads for all time. I think the word "substantial" would be a reasonably safe term.

Mr. BANKHEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I will only take a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me to ask a question?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I will only take a moment.

Mr. POMERENE. I thought I possibly might shorten the discussion somewhat, but I will not insist.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I have not said a word on the good-roads bill, much as I am interested in it; but I can say one thing as to permanency, and that is, if any roads proposed to be constructed under this bill will last as long as the debate on it seems destined to last there will be no use splitting hairs as to what the word "permanent" means. We seem to take up one word and discuss it here for days at a time, when we all know that the character of roads in one section of the country, although they are the best that can be made for that particular section, may not be at all appropriate in another section.

Take Oregon, with its enormous rainfall, and the State of the honored Senator [Mr. WALSH] who now occupies the chair, and the condition in the two States are just as different as though one were at the North Pole and the other in a torrid region. So it is simply a question of good roads for the various localities. However, I arose to resent particularly the assumption that Congress is honest and the people dishonest, and so anxious are the people to throw away the public money that they will throw away $10 of their own to $1 of the Government in order to accomplish this beneficent purpose; that the State that spends $10 will throw it away in order to get the beautiful opportunity of throwing away $1 of public money with it.

The safest way to leave it is with the communities that have to use it. That is not only the safest place but that is the most sensible place to leave it. To tell me that the Secretary of Agriculture, 2,000 miles from my home and more, will know more about it than the engineers and the people who are attempting to construct this road strikes me as simply ridiculous.

I have nothing more to say. I shall say nothing more on the bill, for I am afraid that I myself have already added too much to a tireless and endless debate.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee for a moment, do I understand that the Senator from Alabama would be willing to accept my amendment with the word "permanent" changed to "substantial"?

Mr. BANKHEAD. After consulting with different members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, while we feel that the amendment is entirely unnecessary, at the same time, to satisfy the Senator from Ohio and to help the bill along toward a vote, we will accept that amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I want to be perfectly frank about this. I am not satisfied with that amendment at all, but I should very much prefer it to the bill as it was originally drawn. I recognize that these are largely matters of compromise, and I am not questioning the good faith of anyone else. I would much prefer to have the amendment as I originally presented it, but I also feel that in the present mood of the Senate perhaps they would not accept the amendment with the word "permanent" in it. Therefore, if the chairman and the members of the committee are willing to accept the amendment with the word "substantial" substituted for the word "permanent," I am willing to let the matter rest there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Ohio modifies his amendment to the amendment of the committee by substituting the word "substantial" for the word "permanent."

Mr. TOWNSEND. He accepts the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is upon the amendment to the amendment as thus modified.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be stated as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, line 13, after the word "require," it is proposed to insert:

Provided, however, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall approve only such projects as may be substantial in character, and the expenditure of funds hereby authorized shall be applied only to such improvements.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I understand now that the situation really is this: The Senator from Ohio accepts the amendment to his amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire substituting the word "substantial" for the word "permanent."

Mr. POMERENE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio adopts the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, and it thus becomes his own amendment, and he has a right, without any action of the Senate, thus to modify his amendment. The question is upon the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, as modified, to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if it is to be laid aside at 2 o'clock and the rural-credits bill taken up?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the necessity of the case, I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood it was.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I was wondering, in view of the statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire that he was not going to press for any vote to-day, but would do so to-morrow, why we could not go on with the good-roads bill this afternoon.

Mr. HOLLIS. Because there are so many amendments to be presented to the rural-credits bill that I wanted very much to get it in shape for voting to-morrow. That is the reason.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment. After the amendment adopted at the close of section 1, I move to insert the matter which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 1, and following the amendment already agreed to at that place, it is proposed to insert:

Nor shall any road constructed under this act be connected directly with any toll road.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no objection to that. What does the Senator mean by "toll road," though? We already have a provision in the bill that none of these roads shall charge tolls.

Mr. JONES. Yes; I understand that; but there are toll roads out here in some of the States, and you might build a road directly connected with that, leading off somewhere. I do not want to have that done. I do not want to have any road constructed with Government funds that is directly connected with a toll road.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It seems to me that is a very unusual and unnatural amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES. It may be true that it is very unusual; but it is very unusual that there should be these toll roads in some of the States. In many of the States there are no toll roads at all, and they ought to be done away with.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true.

Mr. JONES. And we ought not to use the Government money in the construction of a road connecting directly with a toll road in any State in the country.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Senator mean crossing a toll road? What does he mean by "connected with a toll road"?

Mr. JONES. I mean going out from it directly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator mean an extension?

Mr. JONES. Yes; a feeder, or an extension of it. That is what I mean. Of course, if it runs across it, I do not mean that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Suppose one of these roads that carries the rural mails goes out from a little town that has a toll road running through it?

Mr. JONES. It would not connect with the toll road, would it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is no connection.

Mr. JONES. If there is not any connection, this amendment would not apply.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What does the Senator mean by "connected"?

Mr. JONES. Going out from it or being an extension of it—a branch or feeder or something of that sort. That is what I mean by "connected directly with it."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question.

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

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Suppose there is a toll road already in existence, and it goes on to a main road, and the investment has been made, and the people who constructed it are trying to get a return there, is it possible that you would not build the main road at all, under this act, in order to prevent a connection with the toll road?

Mr. JONES. If the main road is already there, it does not need to be constructed under this bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but it may be that it is not improved; it is not constructed as it should be.

Mr. JONES. I would not construct such a road with Government money. The State can construct it if it wants to; but I would not construct, with the money of the United States, a road making connections with or an extension of a toll road.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think the object is good, to do away with toll roads; but to say that we will not build a road because there happens to be a cross road coming in there which already collects toll, and which probably has its investment there solely and purely by virtue of the fact that it does collect tolls, it seems to me would not be fair.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator think it will be very difficult to find, in any State of the Union, desirable road building to the extent of the amount of money that the National Government will provide under this bill, without connecting the roads so constructed in any way with toll roads? This is only a drop in the bucket.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But it may be an important road. It may be one of the best roads there are. We have very few toll roads in the State of Colorado, and yet we have some up in the mountains where road building costs a very large amount of money. The county probably would not put up the money, and individuals undertook it, and it was a great benefit to the people who used it, and they were willing to pay the toll. Of course we would like to have those toll roads taken over by the public in some way; but to say that simply because a toll road is collecting money, where the investment is already made, a road connecting with it shall not be built by the Government, seems to me to be going pretty far.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator think that where road construction must be carried on under the circumstances and difficulties he has just suggested we are going to go into that territory under this bill for the construction of roads?

Mr. SHAFROTH. But the toll road may be the difficult part of the country to go through, while the other may be the road that could be constructed at very reasonable expense.

Mr. JONES. The sole purpose of this amendment is to prevent the use of Federal money in the construction of roads that will connect with or be extensions of these toll roads. I am not in favor of connecting with these roads, or extending them, with the Government money. If the Senator is in favor of doing that, of course he will vote against the amendment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; if you are going to build a road, under this bill, for the very purpose of having a new toll road constructed beyond it, I think probably that would be bad, although I believe in State control of these matters. I believe the State authorities are the persons who will best solve the individual problems, and for that reason I believe it is best to leave the matter to them. As the Senator knows, there is a provision in the bill that all roads constructed under its provisions shall be free from tolls of all kinds.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Now, that is good; and probably if the road we construct is to be a part of the main road, a feeder to it, as it were, there might be a limitation of that kind; but to say they can not connect with a toll road when they have made their investment is going to deprive that part of the State of any benefit under this act.

Mr. JONES. Why, Mr. President, the amount provided in this bill is a mere drop in the bucket. So far as the money is concerned that will be invested in the building of roads, the amount of road that is built under this bill will be a mere drop in the bucket. I have here a statement showing that in 1914 the amount of money spent in the different States for road building was over $249,000,000. If there are roads needed that may go out from a toll road, or connect with a toll road, the States can take care of that without any trouble at all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They would not get any of the Government money, however.

Mr. JONES. Why, certainly not; but they could do it without Government money. We are not providing this Government money for the building of all roads that are needed anywhere and everywhere in the States. As I said before, what will be done under this bill will be a mere drop in the bucket; and, as has been said many times in this debate, the States and counties and townships will do most of the road building.

There are over 2,000,000 miles of road in the different States now. We are not going either to reconstruct them or to construct anything like that amount of road. There are toll roads in the different States. I do not say they are not a good thing, for they probably are; but it certainly is very desirable that these roads should be gotten rid of as soon as possible. At any rate, in my judgment, the National Government ought not to use its money in the construction of these roads to connect with or be extensions of toll roads.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. I was just going to ask the Senator if it might not be that a road within a State for which there was the greatest demand and the greatest necessity would connect with a toll road?

Mr. JONES. Why, you can imagine all sorts of extreme things.

Mr. STERLING. In such a case, under the Senator's amendment, the Government would be precluded from aiding in building that necessary road, for which there was such great demand, simply because it connected with a toll road.

Mr. JONES. Well, it would not do any very great harm to get rid of that toll road. Furthermore, the State might use part of the money that it is going to expend on independent roads to put the necessary road in there.

Take the State of Washington, for instance. We are going to appropriate lots of money for the building of roads that will not get one dollar of this Federal money. If a situation should develop such as the Senator has suggested, we would use our money in the building of that necessary road, and we would put this other road where it was desirable and necessary. Nobody will assume that we are going to use this money in the building of unnecessary or undesirable roads; and we certainly will be able to find necessary and desirable roads that have no toll roads connected with them.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel very much in sympathy with the object and purpose of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. I do not want to aid in any possible way the perpetuation of toll roads. They seem to me to be a relic of barbarism, and they ought to be dispensed with as rapidly as possible.

I fear, however, that if the Senator's amendment were added to this bill we would be punishing great sections of the country that really have no control over or authorship of these toll roads. I should like some method—I do not know just what to suggest—whereby we could get around it without penalizing the communities that happen to be so unfortunate as to have these toll roads. They have been entirely abolished in our State, and I presume in most other States. I did not suppose there were half a dozen toll roads left in the United States.

I am in sympathy with the object of the Senator's amendment, and yet I do not want to interfere with or penalize the communities that are unfortunate enough to have these roads, and prevent them from securing the great blessings and benefits that will accrue from the passage of this road bill.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LANE. I do not understand the viewpoint of the Senator from New Jersey. It would not be penalizing them. On the other hand, it would be the prevention of paying them a premium and giving them an inducement to continue these toll roads. If we bring a good road to them we add to their business, and the tendency would be to make these toll roads permanent. If you do not render them that aid, they themselves must help to keep up their approaches; and the sooner they quit doing that the sooner the people will take over the toll roads.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. But the Senator can imagine a situation where there was a toll road, and the State authorities might deem it wise to tap that toll road.

Mr. LANE. Yes.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The amendment of the Senator from Washington would make it impossible to tap that road, so that the community would be deprived of the advantages and blessings of this great good-roads movement.

Mr. LANE. If the Senator will permit me, last summer I was over a road, the mountainous part of which was in a remote region and had been a toll road, and the lower part of the road, the approach to it, was through a boggy country where it was very expensive to maintain roads. The county had maintained that part of it for years at an enormous expense, while the easily kept up portion of the road had been in the hands of a private owner who made the larger profit, the expense of keeping up the approaches being borne by the counties.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I wish the Senator from Washington might devise some way whereby I could vote for his amendment, for I am in sympathy with the idea, but I fear that in its operation it would be a detriment to the great communities that may be afflicted with the toll-road system.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him what reason exists that would prevent the State from putting in such a road as the Senator refers to?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Does the Senator mean appropriating enough to buy up the toll road?

Mr. JONES. No. If a road were needed in connection with this toll road, what would prevent the State from putting one in?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. There would be no objection. It would cost a little more money perhaps and necessitate a little larger appropriation, but still, on general principles, I am so much opposed to that old relic of barbarism in the United States that I think I shall vote for the amendment. I do not care for toll roads.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, I think the objection to this amendment is the indefiniteness of the meaning of the word "connected." It does not seem to me that we ought to embarrass the Secretary of Agriculture with the insertion of any amendment of this character. This bill may contemplate the building of national roads several hundred miles in length. At the end of 100 miles such a road might connect with a toll road. There is nothing which would so embarrass a court or the Secretary of Agriculture as the insertion of an indefinite word like this in this bill.

In the body of the bill there is an expression of the policy of Congress against toll roads. To my mind it should be left there, and I would not overload the bill with an indefinite and ambiguous expression which would very much embarrass any governmental department which had charge of the enforcement of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2986.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I know there are a number of Senators who expect to offer amendments who are not in the Chamber; and in order that they reach here in time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gore	Nelson	Smoot
Bankhead	Gronna	Norris	Stone
Borah	Harding	Oliver	Sutherland
Brady	Hollis	Overman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Husting	Page	Taggart
Chilton	Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Tillman
Clapp	Jones	Poindexter	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Ransdell	Vardaman
Colt	La Follette	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lane	Shafroth	Walsh
Dillingham	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Warren
du Pont	Lodge	Sherman	Williams
Fall	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	
Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber on account of illness in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VARDAMAN in the chair). Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4856) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments and request a conference with the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. HOLLIS. I ask that the unfinished business be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2986) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD in connection with the consideration of the rural-credits bill a memorandum which I have had prepared in regard to the savings-bank features of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

The memorandum referred to is as follows:

GOVERNMENT SAVINGS-BANK FEATURES OF THE HOLLIS BILL.

The capital stock of each Federal land bank shall be divided into shares of $5, and may be subscribed for and held by any individual, firm, or corporation, or by the Government of any State or of the United States. (Sec. 5, par. 2.)

The Federal farm-loan board is authorized to prescribe the times and conditions of the payment of subscriptions to capital stock. (Sec. 5, par. 1.)

Each farm-loan association and the Government of the United States shall be entitled to one vote for each share of stock held by it * * * and no other shareholder shall be permitted to vote. (Sec. 5, par. 2.)

Any shares except those held by national farm-loan associations, may be transferred or hypothecated. (Sec. 5.)

All stock of a Federal land bank held by the United States is subject to withdrawal. (Sec. 5, p. 16, line 17.)

Stock held by national farm-loan associations may be withdrawn, but only at discretion of the Federal land bank's directors. (Sec. 7, p. 23, line 17.)

Withdrawal may be allowed to other shareholders of a Federal land bank. This results from a fair interpretation of the powers of the Federal farm-loan board (secs. 3 and 20) and of the Federal land banks. (Secs. 4 and 5.)

Any number of shares may be held by the same shareholder of a Federal land bank. (Sec. 5, par. 2.)

Every Federal land bank may accept deposits of current funds from any holder of one of its shares. If the shareholder be not a national farm-loan association, the deposits may be payable upon demand. (Sec. 14, par. 1.)

Interest at any rate may be allowed by a Federal land bank, except interest shall not be paid on deposits from national farm-loan associations. (Sec. 13, p. 36, line 8.) The reason for this exception is that the Federal land bank is to act as bailee of the associations.

Shares issued by the national farm-loan associations shall be withdrawable and only $5 apiece. Any number may be issued to the same member. (Sec. 8, p. 24.)

Every national farm-loan association may accept deposits of current funds in any amount from either members or outsiders. Nothing prevents the Federal farm-loan board from authorizing or directing national farm-loan associations to pay interest. If an association wishes, it may issue 4 per cent certificates against the deposits. (Sec. 11, p. 28, line 24.)

All deposits, whether representing certificates or not, must be forthwith transmitted by the associations to their Federal land bank. (Sec. 11, p. 29, line 4.)

National farm-loan associations must invest in the stock of their Federal land bank all the proceeds of obligatory shares of borrowers. (Sec. 7, p. 23, line 9.) But such investment may be withdrawn only at the discretion of such land bank's directors. (Id., line 17.)

All receipts from loans must be transmitted by an association to its Federal land bank. (Sec. 25, p. 62, line 1.) As a stockholder, the association may also deposit all other funds in such bank. The Federal farm-loan board may direct this. (Sec. 20, g and h; also sec. 3, line 5.)

The Federal land banks may use any of their funds for buying "qualified" mortgages from joint-stock banks or from other agents authorized by the Federal farm-loan board. (Sec. 14, p. 37, line 6.) Consequently the free or cheap money supplied by the Secretary of the Treasury, the proceeds of the sale of bonds issued through public functionaries, and all other funds of the Federal land banks may be used for financing institutions conducted solely for gain.

Farm mortgages are not required as a security for farm-loan bonds. The registrar may accept United States bonds as collateral. (Sec. 21, p. 51, line 19.)

Farm mortgages are not an obligatory investment for any funds of the Federal land banks. Amortization or other payments on loans may be used for purchasing bonds of the United States Government or converted into money. (Sec. 25, p. 62, d, e.)

The terms "equipment" and "improvement" are to be defined by the Federal farm-loan board. (Sec. 12, p. 31, line 15.) Consequently it would be possible for loans to be made for any short or long term purpose, and the board may define the term "first mortgage." (Sec. 2.)

All current funds may be deposited at interest and subject to check in member banks of the Federal reserve system. (Sec. 13, p. 36, line 4.)

Federal land banks may devote all their funds, resources, and business to buying and selling United States bonds. (Id., line 15.)

Federal land banks may borrow money, give security, and pay interest thereon, and use this power for dealing in bonds of the United States Government. (Id., line 11.)

Joint-stock land banks may use all resources in dealing in bonds of the United States Government. (Sec. 18, p. 45, line 11.)

The issuance of certificates, convertible into bonds of the Federal land banks, and the redemption in cash of such bonds upon cancellation of the certificates permit the current funds and credit of national farm-loan associations to be used in buying United States bonds. (Sec. 11, pp. 28 and 29.)

The effect of these clauses, fairly construed, is to give general powers to the Federal land banks to accept savings and ordinary deposits from any source, public or private, without regard to amount. Another effect also is to permit the Federal land banks to abandon farm mortgaging, and devote all their credit, resources, and activities in finding money for any undertaking upon which the United States Government might decide to embark.

The proposed system would be a Government system. The clauses from which this results are:

The system shall be established and directed by the Secretary of the Treasury and four other appointees of the President and Senate of the United States. Secs. 3, 4, and 20.)

This Federal farm-loan board shall select the first directors of all Federal land banks. (Sec. 4, p. 8, line 23.) Two-fifths of the board of each Federal land bank shall always consist of representatives of the United States. (Id., p. 12, line 1.)

The three-fifths of each such board shall be elected by national farm-loan associations, if any are formed. (Id., p. 11, line 23.) But such associations can be formed only by a Federal land bank and with the consent of the Federal farm-loan board. (Sec. 7, p. 22, line 14.)

Such national farm-loan associations can not exercise any of their functions except under regulations prescribed by the Federal farm-loan board (secs. 2, 3, and 20), nor make any loans except those approved by Federal appraisers and by their Federal land bank. (Sec. 19, pp. 47–49.)

The Federal land banks shall be depositaries and financial agents of the United States Government. (Sec. 6.) Their bonds and collateral shall be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States. (Sec. 29.)

Total tax exemption is to be accorded to the bonds and mortgages of both Federal land banks and joint-stock land banks and in every other respect to the Federal land banks and national farm-loan associations. (Id.)

In view of these clauses, the Federal land banks would be Government banks for savings and deposits, while their entire resources may be used in financing Government projects instead of in farm mortgaging.

The total tax exemptions, together with the free or cheap money supplied in cash by the Secretary of the Treasury or through the issue of 5-per cent bonds or any other kind of credit instrument would place building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, life insurance companies, and every other kind of existing lending, savings, or thrift association and all other moneyed corporations at a disadvantage with the new institutions to be formed, unless the States also should enact laws exempting all money and credits from taxation.

Mr. LODGE. I also present a resolution adopted by the American Federation of Labor in convention at San Francisco, which I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested. The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolution on rural credits adopted by the American Federation of Labor in convention at San Francisco.

We believe that national conditions vary so widely with the several sections of the country that it would be unfair, if not actually dangerous, to undertake to prescribe one system or plan for the guidance and control of all.

We would, therefore, recommend that the matter of rural credits, aside from the enactment of a general law to govern the fundamentals, be left to the determination of the different sections or States for the carrying out of the matter in detail, until such time as experience shall have determined what, if any, is the better course to pursue to insure the rights and properly safeguard the interests of all.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I believe the pending amendment is one offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], but he is absent from the Senate at this moment. He will be in a little later. I ask that that amendment may be temporarily passed over.

There have been several committee amendments passed over for one reason and another. One of them is the provision as to exemption from taxation. I shall ask to have that disposed of to-morrow when the senior Senator from Iowa will be present to discuss it.

I should like at this time to have the Senate deal with the postal-savings amendment, which is found on page 67. It has not been read, so the Secretary may read it now, and I ask for action upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VARDAMAN in the chair). The amendment will be read:

The SECRETARY. On page 67, after line 18, the Committee on Banking and Currency proposes to insert:

Section 9 of the act of June 25, 1910, entitled "An act to establish postal-savings depositaries for depositing savings at interest, with the security of the Government for repayment thereof, and for other purposes" (36 U. S. Stat. L., 814), shall be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding a new paragraph at the close of said section, to read as follows:

"Federal farm-loan bonds authorized by the Federal farm-loan board and issued by any Federal land bank may be purchased by the trustees, in lieu of United States bonds or other securities, for the purpose of investing postal-savings deposits under the provisions of this section. Whenever funds shall be withdrawn from postal-savings depositaries for investment, the trustees are hereby authorized to purchase Federal farm-loan bonds in the open market or from any Federal land bank authorized to issue the same: *Provided*, That in no case shall such farm-loan bonds be purchased at more than par nor shall more than 30 per cent of the postal-savings deposits be invested at any one time in farm-loan bonds as herein provided."

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I will state for the information of the Senate the position that is taken on the two sides of this question. No suggestion has been more strongly urged from various parts of the country than the one that the postal-savings fund should form a very natural source from which to obtain farm loans for farmers, and that would be a very natural thing to do. The objections to it are these: In the first place, the Post Office Department is strongly opposed to it. It says that the postal savings are made in nearly all cases, at least in the larger amounts in the larger cities, so that they are not funds that come from the farming communities and therefore they ought not to be invested in farming communities. The Post Office Department says, further, that these postal savings are on deposit on demand, so that they are likely to be called for at any time, and that the average period for which a savings deposit is made in postal-savings banks is something like three years—I think the department makes the statement that they are all withdrawn once in three years—so that they ought not to be invested in long-term loans or bonds.

The other side of it is this, that although each individual deposit may be withdrawn from the postal-savings department in three years, the aggregate of the postal savings steadily and constantly increases, so that there has never been a time when they have actually diminished, and when a crisis or panic comes

for any reason the postal savings instead of decreasing, as they do in some banks, actually increase. The tendency is for foreigners or men who are rather ignorant in financial matters to take their savings out of State institutions and put them in the hands of the Government in a time of panic, so that really the aggregate of postal savings is not diminished, and if the savings were invested in bonds they would not be called upon for quick realization.

The chief reason why I wanted this clause in the act is a constitutional one. I have felt that if the constitutionality of the act were attacked and there were nothing else on which to base it, it might be based on this section, because this would be an instrumentality for carrying out the postal system, offering through the postal-savings banks an instrumentality of the Government for a safe form of investment.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this section is not obligatory at all; it is merely permissive. The trustees of the postal-savings fund are allowed to invest not more than 30 per cent of the postal-savings deposits in farm-loan bonds. On the whole I am inclined to think the section ought to be retained on the ground that it may be vital to the constitutionality of the act, and it certainly can do no harm.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, at the time Congress established the Postal Savings Bank System and entered into that line of business—for I call it a business—every precaution was taken to preserve the money so deposited against any possible loss. I suppose no Senator will doubt the statement that where long-time loans are made the money so loaned should not be upon call. The greatest difficulty that banks have experienced in the past, and some of the greatest losses that the banks have sustained, and many of the greatest failures of the banks of the country come by lending money for long periods upon real estate. The loans were amply secured and perfectly good, providing the bank making such loans had not been called upon for unforeseen demands requiring ready money, but it is well understood in banking circles that real estate loans can not be called like other loans made upon securities that can be sold readily in all parts of the country and in all money markets. Of late, when a real estate loan is made by a bank it is usually made by savings banks and trust companies, such banks having little demand made upon them by their depositors, and their deposits generally are increasing every year rather than decreasing.

Mr. President, conditions could arise in this country where the Government of the United States would be called upon for the postal savings funds deposited in the different parts of the country, and I doubt the wisdom of extending the power to the postal savings bank to use the postal funds to purchase long-time mortgage loans on real estate. Yet I recognize that what the Senator from New Hampshire says there is some ground for. We are in hopes that the postal savings fund will increase year by year, but if the bill as it passed the Senate increasing the amount of deposits allowed by one individual becomes a law, it is very doubtful in my mind whether that will be the case; and if it is the case, then there is the greater danger from the withdrawal of postal funds than there is under the law to-day.

If we allow an individual to deposit $2,000, as the bill provided as it passed the Senate, it seems to me that the individual who would have that amount of money on deposit would simply put it there temporarily and for safety, and the first good chance he had for investment he would withdraw his deposit and invest the money at a higher rate of interest. That is natural. We need expect nothing else. If the postal fund is built up with that kind of deposits and the demands made upon the Government of $2,000 at a time from all parts of the country, I am fearful that there might or could arise conditions that would bring trouble to the Government.

There are many securities that can be purchased by the postal savings fund. There is no necessity at all for extending the list so as to allow the fund to be invested in mortgage bonds. If there was any lack of ability upon the part of the officials of our Government to invest the postal savings fund in first-class securities, where there can be no loss, and in securities that the Congress of the United States specifically provided for when the system was created, then I can see plainly why this amendment should be adopted and become a part of the bill.

But, Mr. President, I myself think this is going too far. I do not believe the acceptance of the amendment is going to assist the bill as far as any question of constitutionality is concerned. I do not believe that the constitutionality of the bill is going to rest upon this amendment. If I did, I would be fearful indeed of the whole bill failing.

Mr. President, we are entering here upon a new endeavor on the part of our Government to extend aid to the farmers of the country. Let us confine ourselves in this bill to that end, and that only. This amendment is not going to help or increase any advantage that may come to the farmer. This amendment is not going to make the mortgage on the farmer's land sell any more readily or at any greater price, and it should not be so.

I believe the postal-savings fund should be invested in such security as can be realized upon at the very shortest possible notice. In creating the Postal Savings System I think Congress went just as far as it ought to go in providing what class of securities should be invested in. If Senators were present, and if we would go into this question thoroughly and the Senators were interested enough to look up the question carefully and to know really what it meant, I believe the Senate would not vote for this amendment. I believe that the bill would be better without it.

In saying that I do not want in any way to cast doubt upon the act or upon the good that it would bring to the farmers of the country if it is passed in a proper form, but I do not want to interfere with the funds of the people that are deposited in the postal savings banks and bring about any sort of condition that would in any way make it impossible for the depositors of postal-savings funds to get their money when they made application for it.

This amendment is contrary to good banking principles. Mr. President, a commercial bank that has large deposits doing an active commercial business must keep on hand a greater percentage of its deposits than a savings bank with the same amount of deposits; and every State law recognizes this principle. Our national laws recognize it. Scarcely any commercial bank loans for longer than 90 days. It is true that some loans are made for six months, but taking the most of the loans the limit is 90 days. There will be no loans under this bill unless the loan is made for years, not months. If it was otherwise, the measure would not benefit the farmers of the country.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not agree to this amendment, because I believe there is no good in it and a great deal of harm can come from it.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has announced some very sound banking principles, and with nearly all of them I heartily concur. I wish to call his attention, first, to the fact that the trustees of the postal-savings fund are not permitted to invest any of the funds in mortgages on real estate. There would not be anything unusual about that. The Senator has himself directed attention to the fact that the savings banks are the proper institutions to make loans on real estate. Nearly every savings bank in the country loans more than 30 per cent of its funds on mortgages, and we provide that not more than 30 per cent of this fund can be invested, not in mortgage loans but in farm-loan bonds.

It is the very purpose of this bill to make the security of the farms mobile, to get them in a shape where they will pass current, where they will be quickly salable on the market. Therefore we authorize the trustees of the postal savings bank to invest in long-term mortgages and in a bond which is quickly salable on the market.

No matter what happens to these farm-loan bonds, no depositor in a postal savings bank is going to suffer. He is not obliged to have recourse to the security. The Government pays him. Of course if the Government makes a bad investment the Government will lose it, but it is not the idea of the Government to be permitted to make a bad investment; it is the idea of the Government to be permitted to make an absolutely safe investment, and one much more profitable. At present postal-bank funds are deposited in the local banks, bearing 2 per cent interest. Under this bill the deposit will carry 4 per cent, and the Government can afford to run a little risk for the sake of getting that additional income. They would very soon, out of the increased income they would get on this investment, have a reserve fund there that would make them absolutely safe.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire what per cent of savings deposits in his State are permitted under the laws of the State to be invested in farm mortgages?

Mr. HOLLIS. There is no limit; that is left to the judgment of the bank. They are authorized to invest their funds in certain securities, among them being farm mortgages, and it is left to them to say what the percentage shall be.

Mr. NORRIS. What has been the practice?

Mr. HOLLIS. The practice is to loan about 30 per cent, I think. I have a statement here of one of the largest savings banks in New Hampshire, with which I was connected as trustee for 15 years. Their statement shows that, out of total assets of $14,493,000, they have loaned on New Hampshire real estate

$1,800,000, which would be about 12 per cent. Their loans on other real estate have been $2,981,000, which would be about 15 per cent. The total amount they have loaned on real estate mortgages is $4,800,000 out of $14,493,000. So it appears to be about that ratio which is considered a perfectly safe amount to have invested in real estate loans. If I thought that a man who deposited in a postal savings bank would run the slightest risk of losing his funds, I would not advocate this measure.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator, I hope, does not think that I made the statement that the depositor would lose his funds?

Mr. HOLLIS. The Senator from Utah expressed grave concern for the poor man who deposited his money in postal-savings banks and could not get it. There is not any such man as that.

Mr. SMOOT. No. I think, if the Senator will pardon me, I said I never wanted to see the time come when a depositor could not get his money upon demand; but if this provision were put into the law, it might bring about a condition where he could not do so. I am fully aware that the depositor ultimately will not lose his money. I hope the Senator does not think that I entertained such an idea for a moment. It is only a question of compelling the depositor to wait for a longer period for what he expected, and had a right to expect, he could get upon a certain day. That is all I wanted to call the Senator's attention to.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. CLAPP. If the Senator from New Hampshire will pardon me, I do not think the Senator from Utah now quite means what he says, because the depositor would not look to the use the Government might make of the deposits, but would look directly to the Government for the deposits.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I am aware of that, Mr. President; but if the Government, as to the particular fund, has put all of the money into mortgage bonds and has not the money to pay the depositor from that particular fund, then the depositor could not get his money on demand.

Mr. CLAPP. Not at all, Mr. President, unless the Government has put itself in such a position, without reference to this particular fund, that it has not money on hand, and can not get it promptly enough from any source to pay the depositor. The Government would never take the position that it should not pay the postal-bank depositors, simply because the money from that particular fund was not promptly available.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no law, Mr. President, under which the Government of the United States or any official of the Government of the United States can take money from one fund to reimburse another fund, and so money could not be taken from another fund to pay the depositors in the postal-savings banks. If they have not the money, they can not pay it until Congress acts or securities are sold. I know, of course, that the depositors would ultimately get their money. The only question is as to whether they will get it under the provisions of the law according to the arrangements made when they made the deposit.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, according to that theory, no matter what the Government does with the money received from the postal-savings deposits, the depositor must wait until the Government realizes from those deposits. It may have placed the money in banks supposedly perfectly good and ultimately absolutely solvent, and yet it might not be able to immediately respond to a demand for the money. It would be a strange position for the Government to assume, after taking a man's money, as the recipient of a deposit, to say to that man, "Well, we can not pay you until we have traced this fund through its devious course, and get this particular fund back." If that is the law—I do not so understand it—then the postal-savings law should be amended at once. This Government receiving the deposit of a washerwoman ought not to be obliged to say to that woman "We put your money with so and so, and when we get your money back we will return you your deposit." It has been some years since we passed that law, and I am not sufficiently familiar with its terms to either challenge or to accede to the statement of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HOLLIS. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to cut the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] off from what he was going to say.

Mr. CLAPP. No.

Mr. SMOOT. I was simply going to say to the Senator from Minnesota that under ordinary circumstances the Government of the United States always keeps postal-savings funds enough on hand to meet all demands made upon it, precisely the same as does a successful bank.

Mr. CLAPP. Of course.

Mr. SMOOT. But as to the fund that is invested in bonds provided for in this bill, it would take time to convert them; and if the demand were made upon the postal-savings funds for deposits invested in these bonds, it would be impossible for the Government to meet the demand, not being convertible into ready cash at once.

This bill extends the right of investing the money in mortgage bonds. That was not provided for in the act creating the Postal Savings System. If 30 per cent of all of the money of the savings banks should be invested in this class of bonds, unless there was a ready market for those bonds, or if it should happen that a failure resulted, the money could not be secured if the demand were made upon the Government for payment. It may never happen; and I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire and to the Senator from Minnesota that I hope a condition in this country never will arise where such an occurrence could happen; but I want to say it might happen; and this is only extending, as I say, the authority of investing the postal-savings funds in another class of securities.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes; but, Mr. President, I do not think the Senator is yet correct. It would require an absolute provision of law to permit the recipient of a deposit or of funds in its possession from any source, unless they were trust funds, to say to the depositor, "We will not pay you until we realize out of this particular fund." Unless there is some such provision in the law it would be the declared duty of the Government, as it would be the duty of the recipient of any deposit, to make good the deposit without reference to what the recipient had done with the proceeds of that particular deposit.

I do not now recall the language of the law. If the Senator from Utah, with his care, says there is any such express provision in the law, I will yield to his recollection.

Mr. SMOOT. I assure the Senator that that is the only way that postal-fund deposits can be paid—by the money belonging to that fund that the Government has on hand, or the money that the Government receives from the sale of the securities that it has purchased with money belonging to the fund.

Mr. CLAPP. Then it must be because of the provisions of the law itself.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly it is.

Mr. CLAPP. And if that be true, it is misleading to the people of this country, because they believe that when they put a dollar into a postal-savings bank the United States is there to respond to a call for it.

Mr. SMOOT. And it is.

Mr. CLAPP. Not if the United States can say to the individual, "You must wait until we realize out of the proceeds of that deposit."

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question but that the United States will have to do that.

Mr. CLAPP. Then, the sooner that law is amended the better.

Mr. SMOOT. This provision of the bill, if it becomes a law, only takes another step and grants to the postal officials the right to purchase additional securities, a right that was not provided for in the original act; or, in other words, if this amendment is adopted, then the postal-savings department can invest in these land-mortgage bonds.

Mr. CLAPP. Undoubtedly; but authorizing a representative of the Government to invest in a particular security the surplus funds of the Government would not relieve the Government from its ordinary liability to respond to a claim upon it.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a Government fund; it is the postal-savings fund, and that fund belongs to the people who deposit the money. The Government only acts, as it were, like a banker. The Government handles the funds which Congress has authorized it to do.

Mr. CLAPP. Does the Senator from Utah mean to say that we have passed a law under which the Government may take the money of a depositor in a postal-savings bank, turn that money over to a national bank, and that bank finally and irretrievably becoming insolvent, the Government does not still owe those depositors?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. CLAPP. That is the whole thing.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator from Minnesota is mistaken as to what I have said.

Mr. CLAPP. It is either one alternative or the other; it has got to be.

Mr. SMOOT. No; what I said was that the savings-deposit fund is not the Government's money; that it is the money of the people who deposit the fund with the Government, but that Congress had passed a law authorizing that particular fund to be invested in certain securities.

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly. As I said before, if that is the extent of the provision upon which the Senator from Utah hinges his argument then his argument falls, because merely authorizing a Government official to place funds in a certain position would not relieve the Government from its responsibility to pay over the fund.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator from Minnesota does not think that I for one moment intimated that the Government would be relieved of the responsibility of paying such depositors. It is impossible for the Government to be relieved of that responsibility.

Mr. CLAPP. That is what I have been contending for, that no matter what becomes of the deposits or the investment the Government is still liable.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt of that, but that is not what this amendment provides.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HOLLIS. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. Now, having settled that it is a question between the Government and the depositor, I want to suggest that the only question left is as to the wisdom of the Government, which bears the relation of being the recipient of the deposit, and is ultimately liable for it, investing any of that money in these bonds. It strikes me that, outside of a Government bond, it would be difficult to get a better security than these bonds; and, so far as the Government being embarrassed by a demand on the part of the depositors in the postal savings banks is concerned, if there ever comes a time when this country is embarrassed and there should be a financial panic the one place to which the citizen of this country will go with his funds, the one place from which he will not withdraw his funds, the one place where he will want his funds kept, will be with the Government of the United States through the Postal Savings System. It seems to me it relieves the situation of that contingency. The banks in a community in which postal savings funds may have been deposited might be embarrassed, and the people in that community might want their money; but the one recipient of deposits that never will be called upon in the time of the greatest panic and stringency is the Government itself.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very clear——

Mr. CLAPP. I want to thank the Senator for his patience in permitting the interruption.

Mr. HOLLIS. I want to thank the Senator for his very clear presentation of the subject. What the Senator says is borne out by the experience of the State savings banks. The State savings banks opposed increasing the amount that any individual might deposit in a postal savings bank, for the very reason, as they said, that "when the time comes when there is a panic the people want to draw their money out of our institutions and put it in the Government savings bank, and that will cripple us. Therefore limit the deposits to $500."

Now, I wish to apply the principles of sound banking to this proposition. There is no doubt that when the Government undertook to accept postal savings it went into the savings-bank business. No banker can do business if he keeps all of his deposits on hand all the time. The commercial banks have ordinarily to keep 15 per cent of their deposits in cash on hand. A savings bank has not the need to keep as much on hand as the commercial bank, and 30 per cent is a very reasonable amount to allow them to invest, even if it were permanently invested; and the Government of the United States can run that risk better than can any financial institution, because they have greater resources back of them; and, therefore, it seems to me entirely reasonable that, in accordance with sound banking principles, this investment should be permitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLIS. Now, Mr. President, I should like to direct attention to page 33. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] on Saturday last wanted inserted, in line 15, on page 33, if I recall aright, the words "liens, judgments," so that it would read "taxes, liens, judgments, or assessments."

Mr. CLAPP. On what line is that?

Mr. HOLLIS. Line 15, page 33. I offer that amendment, and hope it will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 33, line 15, after the word "taxes," it is proposed to insert "liens, judgments," so that it will read "taxes, liens, judgments, or assessments."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLIS. In line 17, I move the same amendment, after the word "taxes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 33, line 17, after the word "taxes," it is proposed to insert "liens, judgments."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, on page 35, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] questioned the accuracy of the language to express the thought; and, in order to make that entirely clear, I suggest this amendment: On page 35, line 22, after the word "security," insert "where default has occurred and" and then strike out "(c)," so that it will read:

Parcels of land mortgaged to it as security where default has occurred, and parcels of land acquired in satisfaction of debts or purchased at sales under judgments, decrees, or mortgages held by it. But no such bank shall hold title and possession of any real estate—

Here insert "mortgaged," so as to read—

mortgaged, purchased, or acquired to secure any debt due to it, for a longer period than five years.

I think that will require all land taken in satisfaction of debt to be sold within five years, and that it will cover the point the Senator from Montana raised. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Montana whether, in his judgment, that will be satisfactory?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I shall not make any objection to the proposed amendment; but I am very sure that the Senator will agree with me, if he reflects on the matter, that that is an unwise provision, and gives every bank an opportunity to speculate in the land upon which it holds mortgages. It is a most unwise power, it seems to me, to repose in the bank. I see no reason whatever for subdivision (b), because under subdivision (c) the bank is entitled to acquire land in "satisfaction of debts or purchased at sales under judgments, decrees, or mortgages held by it."

You will observe the provision says:

Parcels of land acquired in satisfaction of debt or purchased at sales under judgments, decrees, or mortgages—

And so on.

Now, in addition to all that, in addition to land acquired in satisfaction of debts, or land purchased or acquired under judgments, executions, decrees, and that kind of thing, there is still the power given the land bank to purchase land upon which it holds a mortgage. Of course, if the mortgagor wants to sell to the bank and the bank wants to buy, it is a very easy thing to allow the interest to lapse, and then the bank may purchase and stimulate speculation in land with the moneys of the bank.

Mr. HOLLIS. Let me suggest this to the Senator: Assume a case where the owner of the land wants to get rid of it to the bank, all he has to do is to default on an interest payment, and the bank at once may foreclose. All we do here is to say that in such a case as that, when there is default, the bank may acquire the property without foreclosure proceedings, as a great many mortgages permit.

Mr. WALSH. We do say that, I will say to the Senator, by the provisions of subdivision (c), because there it is provided that the bank may acquire parcels of land in satisfaction of debts.

Mr. HOLLIS. But, I ask the Senator, what possible case should be covered, in his judgment, that subdivision (c) does not cover?

Mr. WALSH. There is not any; that is the point I make.

Mr. HOLLIS. Then subdivision (b) does not do any harm, and satisfies those who think that the provision in subdivision (b) is necessary to cover the situation existing in their States, where title passes to the mortgagee, subject to having the conditions of the mortgage fulfilled.

Mr. WALSH. I suggest to the Senator that if that is the case, and if that is the case intended to be covered, some appropriate language ought to be used, and to that I will not object at all.

Mr. HOLLIS. Why is not this language appropriate?—

Parcels of land mortgaged to it as security where default has occurred.

The bank would certainly have a right to foreclose where default has occurred, and why should it not be allowed to acquire in some other way than by foreclosure if it is allowed to take peaceable possession?

Mr. WALSH. I will say to the Senator that I think very clearly under subdivision (c) the land mortgaged may be acquired in satisfaction of the debt; that is, the mortgagor may say to the land bank "I will give you a deed to the land and you give me back my note and mortgage." They acquire the land then in satisfaction of the debt; but under the provisions of subdivision (b) they are entitled to buy the land upon any terms that they agree upon, and the bank may not only satisfy the mortgage and discharge the obligation, but may likewise agree to pay $1,000, $2,000, or $10,000 for the property. The language of subdivision (b), it seems to me, is not appropriate at all to the case that the Senator from New Hampshire has in mind.

I appreciate the situation. The title passes under some statutes by the mere occasion of the default; but it does not seem to me that you need to make any provision in this bill at all for that kind of a case, because the land may be acquired in satisfaction of the debt under the provisions of subdivision (b) without any other steps whatever.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HOLLIS. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I believe the Senator from Montana is correct in the position which he has taken. I can not see why subsection (b) should be in the bill at all. It certainly will allow officials of the bank, if they so desire, to speculate in real estate, and there may be other abuses that might arise under the provisions of the subsection. I believe that subsection (c) gives all the authority, all the right, and all the power that the bank ought to have in acquiring real estate.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, it would be a very unreasonable man who would not agree with the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Utah when they agree; and I am going to set a good example to the Senate by trying to make it unanimous.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that line 22 be stricken out, and that the letter "(c)" in line 23 be changed to "(b)."

It is fair for me to say that the exact situation which the Senator from Montana has presented had not occurred to me, that the bank might pay more than the mortgage debt, and I do not think that would be desirable.

Mr. WALSH. I was going to say that if the Senator felt that the apprehensions of those gentlemen who insisted upon the language going in to meet the condition of which the Senator has spoken might operate in any way to retard or defeat the bill, I would suggest language such as this:

Parcels of land falling to it upon default in the mortgage thereon held by the bank.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I think it would answer every purpose to strike out line 22. I am convinced of that, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that that be done, and I withdraw the amendment which I first offered changing the language in line 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire is withdrawn. The Secretary will state the amendment now offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The SECRETARY. On page 35, line 22, it is proposed to strike out:

(b) Parcels of land mortgaged to it as security where default has occurred.

And change the letter in parentheses in line 23 from "(c)" to "(b)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HOLLIS. On page 32, the Secretary informs me that the word "shortly" has not been eliminated from the bill, as was intended by an amendment made last week. The intention was that paragraph 8 as amended should read:

No such loan shall be made to any person who is not at the time, or who does not in his application state his intention to become within six months, engaged in the cultivation of the farm mortgaged.

I ask which word was not stricken out the other day? Was it the word "promise" or the word "shortly"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The word "shortly" was not stricken out, the Chair is informed.

Mr. HOLLIS. Then, I ask that the word "shortly" be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 32, line 16, it is proposed to strike out the word "shortly," so as to read:

In his application stated his intention to become engaged in the cultivation, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the sentence now be read as it stands.

The Secretary read as follows:

No such loan shall be made to any person who is not at the time, or who does not in his application state his intention to become, engaged in the cultivation of the farm mortgaged.

Mr. HOLLIS. The words "within six months" should follow the word "become." That was amended the other day. After the word "become" insert the words "within six months."

Mr. SMOOT. That was agreed to the other day.

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes; but if there is any doubt about it, I will make that motion now in order to be sure.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think there is any doubt about it.

Mr. HOLLIS. I do not think there is. I have it so marked in my copy of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 32, line 16, after the word "become," insert the words "within six months."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the only other amendments passed over and not acted upon are one relating to exemption from taxation, which I am willing to have go over until to-morrow, and one on page 3, as to the constitution of the Federal board. I should like to have that one disposed of this afternoon.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senator's attention to the second paragraph on page 59, lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, which provide:

Every Federal land bank shall by appropriate action of its board of directors, duly recorded in its minutes, obligate itself to become liable on farm-loan bonds as provided in this section.

Mr. President, does not the Senator think that the language preceding that in the section is sufficient in itself? They are made liable under the law, and might it not lead to some complication to provide in the bill that they shall obligate themselves in their minutes? Suppose, for example, that they did not so obligate themselves; might not a question then arise as to whether or not they were under any obligation under the law?

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the provision to which the Senator directs attention was adopted on the earnest recommendation of men who were accustomed to investment bonds. They said it was usual, in a statute of this kind, not only to provide by statute that the company guaranteeing shall be liable, but that they shall be required to state that in writing, and to take appropriate action on it, so that they will have voluntarily agreed to it. Certainly it can do no harm, and it might get around the point that these bond men suggested. I do not see how it could do any harm, and it might be of value in certain sorts of proceedings to have a contract as well as to have the law so provide.

Mr. STERLING. I appreciate the suggestion made by the Senator as a reason for this language; but it simply occurred to me that liability under the terms of the law was sufficient, without trying to have them obligate themselves by statements in the minutes of the board.

Mr. HOLLIS. I should like to amplify that a little. As the Senator knows, the capital of each of these 12 land banks is distinct from that of all the other banks. Some one might raise the question that we have not the right to impose by law on 11 other institutions the requirement that they shall be primarily liable with the twelfth institution. I think, under the first part of this section, they would not be allowed to interpose that defense; but if it is drawn to their attention—if they do, when they start out in business, put that in their minutes—they never could be heard to say that they did not understand it that way; and I feel myself that it strengthens the section. I do not feel that the results of the section would be necessarily defeated if it were not here, but I should like to have it remain.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from South Dakota, in addition to what has been suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, that by the language immediately following it is provided that certain things shall be recited in the bonds, namely, that they are issued under the authority of the Federal farm-loan act, that they have the approval of the Federal farm-loan board, that they are not taxable by national, State, or municipal authority, and so on.

None of those things need be put in the bond, and it does not really help anybody to have them there; but they help to draw attention to the fact and thus make the bonds more salable.

I apprehend that the provision to which the Senator has directed our attention is inserted in the bill, not because it adds any strength at all to it or increases the liability or makes it more certain, but simply for the purpose of making the bonds more salable.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I ask now that the amendment passed over, beginning on page 2, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. The committee amendment proposes to strike out lines 9 to 21, both inclusive, on page 2, and in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 3. That there shall be established at the seat of government in the Department of the Treasury a bureau charged with the execution of this act and of all acts amendatory thereof, to be known as the Federal farm-loan bureau, under the general supervision of a Federal farm-loan board.

Said Federal farm-loan board shall consist of five members, including the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall be a member ex officio, and four members to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the four members to be appointed by the President, not more than two shall be appointed from one political party, and all four of said members shall be citizens of the United States and shall devote their entire time to the business of the Federal farm-loan board; they shall receive an annual salary of $10,000, payable monthly, together with actual necessary traveling expenses.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is almost useless to take up the time of the Senate in discussing a proposition with so very few Senators present; but I am going to offer an amendment on page 3, line 3, to strike out the last word in the line, "five," and to insert "three"; and I will follow that with other amendments, to make not only the paragraph just read conform to the first amendment but also the following paragraph.

In order that the Senators who are present may know just how it would read if amended, I will now read the two paragraphs as they will ultimately be if the amendments are adopted:

Said Federal farm loan board shall consist of three members, including the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall be a member ex officio, and two members to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the two members to be appointed by the President not more than one shall be appointed from one political party, and the two of said members shall be citizens of the United States and shall devote their entire time to the business of the Federal farm loan board; they shall receive an annual salary of $7,500, payable monthly, together with actual necessary traveling expenses.

One of the members to be appointed by the President shall be designated by him to serve for four years, one for six years, and thereafter each member so appointed shall serve for the term of six years, unless sooner removed for cause by the President. One of the members shall be designated by the President as the farm loan commissioner, who shall be the chairman and the active executive officer of said board. Each member of the Federal farm loan board shall within 15 days after notice of his appointment take and subscribe to the oath of office.

If the amendment that I have just offered, reducing the number of members of the board from five to three, should be adopted, I shall then offer all of the other amendments en bloc, with the exception of the one as to the annual salary, and then both paragraphs would conform to the first amendment that I have offered.

Mr. President, I suppose this question has been carefully considered by the members of the committee; I take it for granted that it has been, but as I study the bill it seems to me that if enacted into law there is going to be too much expense attached to the operation and enforcement of the same. It is top-heavy. I believe the board should consist of three good men—two besides the Secretary of the Treasury—and, with the Secretary, they can attend to all of the business that there will be for years to come. I have no doubt, either, that you can get men to serve as members of the board for $7,500 per annum.

The other day I called attention to the fact that some of the best servants the Government has, the commissioners of many of the great departments of the Government, are getting only $5,000 per annum. Some of the men serving in those positions, I am quite sure, could make each year two or three times the amount they are receiving. They consider the position one of honor. They consider that they are doing special service for their country; and I believe that a member of the proposed board will be willing to so serve, and if he fills the position with credit to himself and credit to the Government he, too, will be given great credit by the people.

I believe the time has come when we ought at least to avoid paying unnecessary salaries to Government officials. Under my proposed amendment members of the board will receive the salary that a Senator of the United States receives. I do not think any person acting as a member of the proposed board should receive any more salary than a Senator of the United States. I do not think he will be of a higher type or class of man. Furthermore, I find that it is very easy to increase salaries, but it is next to impossible to decrease them. Whenever a salary is established by law or a position is created in an appropriation bill, it is scarcely ever eliminated. The amount paid is never decreased. The members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations are always fighting to keep salaries reasonable. There is not one department of the Government—and I say this advisedly—whose representatives do not appear before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate begging for an increased number of employees and increased salaries for a percentage of the employees already in the service.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I will ask the Senator if it is not a fact that most of these requests for increases are based upon the fact that in some particular case of legislation, like that pending, we go far above the average salary, and then, quite naturally, these other people come before the Senator's committee and insist on the increase, not so much because of the necessity of the increase, but more as a matter of justice?

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to the Senator from Minnesota I am going to say something that I would not have said if he had not asked the question.

Mr. CLAPP. Then, I am glad I asked the question.

Mr. SMOOT. I am going to state that not only what the Senator has intimated is true, but an increase can not be made in the salary of any employee of this Government in any department without every employee occupying a similar position in every other department immediately becoming dissatisfied, and Members of Congress are asked to see that the injustice is corrected and that his salary is increased accordingly, basing his demand upon the fact that that one particular salary was increased by the committee the preceding year.

Again, it too often happens that some Member of Congress, through constant importuning, becomes interested in the increase of salary of some particular friend, and he pleads with the committees of the House or the Senate for the increase asked for, and in some cases insists that it be made; and if the committee yields and the increase is made it opens the door for every other person with similar duties in every department of the Government service to make a similar demand.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further——

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I think a great many of the employees of the Government are working at salaries far less than they are entitled to receive; and I think in some cases it is hard, perhaps, for Congress, in the tribunal of a just conscience, to avoid the criticism that it is contributing at least to temptation in the meager salaries that are paid to those holding many of the subordinate positions. If we would try to equalize those salaries and give more heed to them and give less increases to these officers that we are creating, we would not only be fairer and more just, but I believe we would escape what sometimes almost seems like responsibility for temptation on account of the very meager salaries which we do pay in many instances.

Mr. SMOOT. There is altogether too much truth in what the Senator has just stated. I agree with him that many of the salaries that are paid the employees of the Government are ridiculously low; and it seems that every year increases the difference between the employees getting a low compensation and the employees that get the exceedingly high salaries. The difference is becoming greater and greater as the years go by.

I do not know how it is with other Senators, but I am constantly importuned—not so much by people from my own State, although I have had a few requests from them—for positions in the Government service. I never hesitate to write to a person in my State making application for a position in the Government service that if he simply wants employment it would be better for him to remain where he is and enter one of the many fields of labor opened to the energetic men of the West.

I find in the service of the United States to-day bright men direct from college and entering into the service because they feel that they want to get a little money ahead before they undertake to launch out into their life profession, and my observation leads me to believe that every year they remain in the Government service they become less inclined to rely on their own resources and ability to make a living. To the young men that I bring to Washington to work in my office I always say, "Just as soon as you secure your college education I want you to leave Washington. I want you to begin at once the practice of your chosen profession, and the earlier you begin the

better it will be for you. Never mind the starvation period; meet it like a man."

I have no doubt there are many men in the departments who have been working for 10, 15, or some 30 years at an annual salary just large enough to comfortably provide for themselves and family and who if they had at first entered upon the practice of their profession would have been a hundred times better off than they are to-day.

So, Mr. President, I think that whenever we are considering the creation of another bureau, or creating more positions in the Government service, we ought to take these things into consideration; and I believe that now is just as good a time as we shall ever have to begin to consider what is best for the interest of the Government.

In offering these amendments I do not want it understood that I am doing so in hostility to the bill. If I thought that three members of the board were not sufficient, or that having only three would jeopardize in any way the successful carrying out of the provisions of this bill, if it becomes a law, I would not offer the amendments. I believe, however, that three members are sufficient, and I know that an annual salary of $7,500 is ample.

As I say, Mr. President, if the first amendment is agreed to I will then offer en bloc all of the balance of the amendments, so as to make the two paragraphs conform to the amendment under consideration, and I will ask for one vote upon them all.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I am not sure that I understood the Senator. Does he mean three members, including the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. SMOOT. Including the Secretary of the Treasury, making the membership of the board three instead of five. I do not know whether or not the Senator was in the Chamber when I stated just how this provision of the bill would read if the amendments that I shall offer were agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. Possibly I was here, but my attention was otherwise engaged.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall not, however, take the time to read it again; but if this amendment is agreed to, then, as I say, I will offer all the other amendments en bloc and read the paragraphs as they will be.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the amendment suggested by the Senator from Utah, but I would a great deal rather vote for an amendment to place this measure and its operation in the hands of a bureau in the department.

I agree with the Senator from Utah that the difficulty with this bill is that it is topheavy. There are too many people already employed under it. I think in its operation it will be found, if it should become a law as it is now written, that there is so much red tape that very few farmers will take advantage of it.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, it is a pretty poor plan to allow an important bill to be amended by its enemies. This bill has been prepared by men who are friends of the measure. They are very anxious to see it succeed. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is quite frankly opposed to the measure. He has given his reasons, and they are reasons that are apparently satisfactory to him. He has made a very eloquent argument here for keeping good men out of the employment of the Government, and that is his purpose under his amendment. He says that he advises bright young men not to work for the Government, but to go out and practice their professions. Evidently he does not want the Government to have the services of first-class men. He wants it to be served by the broken-down and unsuccessful men, who have to be supported at Government expense in some way, and therefore he proposes to bring them in here and give them small salaries.

I do not want the administration of this bill to be put in the hands of incompetent and broken-down and discouraged men. I want the salaries to be high enough so that they will be attractive. I want enough men, so that the work will be well performed.

I agree with the Senator's economy program, but I do not agree that the economy should start with this farmers' measure. It is a matter that will involve billions of money, a matter that requires the very best talent the Government can command. Now, we have any quantity of commissions and boards that do not do any work, but that get high pay. There is the International Boundary Commission, whose members receive $10,000 a year, and have practically nothing to do. Those men do not spend a month in the year on their jobs.

The Senator says he would not pay these men more than Senators are paid—$7,500 a year. The Senator knows that if the Senate had that to handle the salaries of the Senators would be higher than $7,500. It is because if they are increased the salaries of the Members of the House will have to be increased, and it will involve a very large expense.

But there is another difference. The men who serve on the farm-loan board are not allowed to do any other work. They have to devote all their time to it. Senators are free a large part of the time. They used to be freer than they are now; but any Senator can carry on his law business in conjunction with his duties here, or he can carry on his banking business, or whatever other business he has; and most Senators do have some other income besides their salaries.

The functions of the farm-loan board will be tremendously important, and there should be enough men so that diverse elements may be represented. In the first place, there should be on the farm-loan board one actual farmer who understands farm needs. Then there should be a man who has studied rural credits—I should think one of the men who went abroad with the United States and American commissions and who studied this whole question in Europe. Then there should be at least two men—one from the vicinity of New York and the other from the vicinity of Chicago—in whom financial men have confidence, so that the bonds can be floated. The success of this whole system depends upon the ability of the farm-loan board to get these bonds marketed at a low rate; and two men who might be selected out of the departments, as has been suggested, to be on this farm-loan board with the Secretary of the Treasury, are not the sort of men we need. We must have the salary high enough to attract at least two first-class financial men in whom the moneyed institutions of the country have confidence.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. Does not the Senator believe that a bond issued by the Secretary of the Treasury or a bureau officer of his department would not meet with favor?

Mr. HOLLIS. No; I do not, because if the Secretary of the Treasury does his duty he has to fight the financial interests all the time. It is fight, fight, fight with the Treasury Department unless the Treasury Department is subservient to the financial interests.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator will admit, will he not, that bonds issued by the Government have no trouble in finding a market?

Mr. HOLLIS. I do, but that is because the bonds have already a settled market. Everyone knows what the bond is. The trouble with floating farm-loan bonds is that the people are not used to them; they must have them explained to them; and the only way to float them in the first instance is to get heavy financiers interested and float a large block of them and distribute them to commercial men. There will not be any trouble after the people get used to them; then they can be sold.

We have established two systems comparable to this since I have been in the Senate. The first was a Federal Reserve Board. No one suggested that those gentlemen should serve for the salary of a United States Senator. No one suggested that they should have less than $12,000 a year, and they receive that amount. There are five of them besides the Comptroller of the Currency and the Secretary of the Treasury. The Federal Trade Commission consists of five men at $10,000 each, and that sum was given to them without any criticism. But when it comes to the farming measure, the farm-loan act of the country, for the purpose of helping the farmers, where the very best financial talent is needed on the board, then is the time to economize and to give the farmers a peanut. I do not believe the farming interests of the country will approve of this. They do not want to pay large salaries, but they do want to pay salaries that are commensurate with other boards that have to handle similar matters.

I wish to draw attention to the fact that a joint committee, made up of the members of the Banking and Currency Committees of the two Houses and the Agricultural Committees of the two Houses, reported in favor of five members at a salary of $12,000 a year. That would carry $60,000 a year. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee cut that down to four members at an annual salary of $10,000 a year; that is, it cut it down one-third. I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will not be adopted.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I had nothing to do with the law creating the Federal reserve bank except to submit to it. I felt then that it was in many respects a mistake, and I believe the time will come when we will find that those fears were well grounded. I did think the salary of the members of the board was too high.

I was a member of the conference on the Trade Commission bill and I think those salaries were too high. I tried to get

them reduced, but I failed to do so. I fear it will be equally futile in this instance.

In this particular instance the principal work that requires a coordination of mentalities fairly in an equation will be the division of the country into the districts. The real work will be done by subordinates entirely with that exception. All the work of looking after the securities, passing upon titles, verifying accounts, keeping accounts, will not be done by these commissioners, but it will be done by subordinates.

It does seem to me that it is absolutely unnecessary to have five commissioners, and I do not believe because we have made salaries too high in the past that that should be any reason for making them too high now. Nor do I exactly believe in the justice of the Senator's suggestion that while we permitted these other institutions to become top-heavy in numbers sometimes and with excessive salaries, it is any reflection upon or any spirit of hostility to the farmers if we seek to keep this matter down to a reasonable limit.

The farmers are vitally interested in this bill. They are interested in the reception of the measure; they are interested in the working of the measure; and the more complete the commission, the more we can make it in harmony with the spirit of the country as to its reception—the more we will serve the farmers. I do not believe the farmer will feel that he is particularly the subject of extraordinary solicitude because we put unnecessary salaries in the bill. I believe $7,500 is an ample salary for anyone who may be selected as a member of this board. If I could have my way I would make it about $6,000 a year, and I would take the difference, small as it is, as the basis of an equitable distribution of salaries for those who are employed by the Government.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, when this amendment came up the other day I asked that it might go over, and I also offered an amendment striking out the word "five" and inserting "one," but the bill is framed, of course, with the idea of having the whole number, and an amendment of that character, if it should be adopted, would require practically the entire overhauling of the bill. So I see there is no chance at all to get an amendment of that sort agreed to, not only because of the opposition to having a chief of bureau control this matter but also because of the fact that it would require almost a rearrangement of the entire bill. So I withdraw that amendment. I shall not press it.

I shall support the amendment, however, of the Senator from Utah. I am going to support that amendment not as an enemy of the bill. I think I shall vote for the bill when it comes to its final passage. I shall probably vote for some amendments to it. I do not think that the bill will meet with the sentiment of the country that it is intended to meet. So far as I have heard from the farmers of my State they are strongly against the bill. They do not believe that it will serve them very well. They express themselves as being in favor of another bill that has been introduced in Congress, but they have been advised by different Members of Congress that there is no chance for the passage of that measure, and so they have suggested some very important amendments to this bill, expressly stating that they do not give up their opposition to the measure but being impressed with the fact that there is no chance for the passage of the other measure they want this bill amended in certain lines.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator to what bill he refers?

Mr. JONES. They call it the Morgan bill. I think it is a bill introduced by Representative MORGAN, of Oklahoma, in the House of Representatives.

As I said, Mr. President, I am not favoring the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] as an enemy of the bill. I shall probably vote for the bill in the hope that some good will come from it, and that probably with the experience we will gain in a short while we will make whatever amendments experience may show to be necessary in order to make it accomplish what all of us would like to have it accomplish.

Right here I want to say that I do not think too much credit can be given to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS], who has had charge of this measure. I have been myself very greatly impressed with the splendid manner in which he has handled the measure and the breadth of the information that he has evidently acquired in studying this question. It seems to me that no man has demonstrated more his industry and breadth of knowledge, with reference to this subject, than the Senator from New Hampshire, and that he is entitled to very great credit for not only the preparation of the measure but the splendid way in which he has handled it here on the floor of the Senate, and he is entitled to that credit, no matter what we may think as to what the ultimate effect of the measure may be. I am in hopes that much more good will come from it than I really look for, but I believe that some good will come from it.

As I said a while ago, experience will show what we need and we can amend it in the necessary particulars. I am glad that it has been treated in an entirely nonpartisan way. Of course, the Senator from New Hampshire, being in the majority, naturally is in charge of it, but it has been treated, I think, not only in the committee but upon the floor of the Senate absolutely free from partisanship, and I am glad of it.

I remember when the parcel-post measure was pending in the Senate that all sorts of predictions were made and all sorts of prophecies uttered as to the inefficiency of that measure. There were predictions that it would not accomplish what those who pressed it hoped that it would accomplish. All sorts of legal and technical objections were presented to it. Now, no one seems to be inclined in any way to repeal that measure and very few changes even are suggested to it. I am in hopes that we will have about the same result from the operation of this bill, that those of us even on this side who have seen so many objections to it and who fear that it will accomplish so little will be agreeably disappointed in its operation, and that as those prophecies were shown to be false so the prophecies made with reference to this measure will also be shown to be false.

Now, with reference to this particular amendment, I think that a board of three good men is amply sufficient. I believe that the salaries are higher than they ought to be. Like the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], I thought that the salaries of the members of the Federal Reserve Board and of the Federal Trade Commission were too high. I do not remember now whether an amendment was offered on the floor of the Senate to diminish those salaries; but whether that was done or not, I do know that I thought they were too high.

Just what the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] suggested a moment ago occurs here. Whenever we pass a proposition of this kind it becomes a precedent for another. So while the salaries of the members of the other boards are high and while those of us who are opposed to these high salaries here were opposed to it then, the action of Congress in fixing those salaries is now urged as a precedent for these salaries. However, I can see much force in the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire with reference to the character of the men and the training that may be required of them to take charge of this measure. I think his judgment in that respect is better than my own. Yet I am still unconvinced of the necessity of having a board of five and paying them this large salary. As the Senator from Minnesota stated, I do not think that the farmers would feel offended in the least.

The farmers, I think, in my section do not expect very much from this measure. They do not think that it will accomplish what they hoped to have accomplished, and they are not worried about the salaries that these men get. I do not think that they are especially objecting even to the high salaries paid here. So far as I am concerned, I am not basing my opposition upon any suggestions that have come to me from the farmers of my State with reference to these salaries. I am simply basing my opposition on my idea that this large board is not necessary, and that these salaries are too high for the duties these men will have to perform.

As the Senator from Minnesota suggested, there are no important judicial functions to be performed by the members of this board. After the organizations are perfected their duties and responsibilities will be largely perfunctory. The real substantial work will be done by the local organizations. What these men here in Washington City will have to do will be largely of a supervisory character.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote for the smaller board with the smaller salary.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I do not think there can be very much difference of opinion among Senators when it comes to a question of economy. We would all like to be as economical in the administration of public affairs as possible, but economy should not control efficiency. This is a new system which is being adopted, and I am sure that both the friends and the opponents of the bill, if it be adopted, will be extremely anxious to make it a success. That we want above everything.

There are very few people outside of some specialists in this country who have given a vast deal of attention to the working of this system. This great country is to be divided into districts and these various banks are to be organized. Various national farm-loan associations, scattered throughout 48 different States, are to be organized to accommodate the farmers of this country. Necessarily up to the time they will be put upon a permanent

working basis there is going to be a tremendous amount of detail work to be done. Under the amendment of the Senator from Utah this work would be substantially confined to the two members of the board, the Secretary of the Treasury being only an ex officio member, and we know how much he is engrossed with the affairs of his own office.

While I am very much delighted with the bill, I recognize the fact that it is pioneer legislation in this country. The general farm-loan systems have proven a very great success in nearly all the countries of Europe and in some of the South American countries. I marvel sometimes that we have not had heretofore something similar to this system in this country, but here it is pioneer legislation.

No doubt after the board has had an opportunity to thoroughly investigate the subject suggested amendments will be offered which may improve the measure. If it can be improved, we all hope it will be improved. I would much prefer to have the combined judgment of four capable, efficient men—and I do not think anyone else will be named on this board—for the first few years. If our experience during those few years demonstrates that it is not necessary to have four members, and that two members can do the work as thoroughly, as efficiently, and as progressively as four, we can change the law then; but I believe it would be very much better to leave the bill as it has been framed by the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word. I wish, in the first place, to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I am not antagonistic to legislation of this kind, and I frankly say that if section 29 of the bill were eliminated I would be glad to vote for it. So what I have said was never said in any spirit of antagonism to the principle of the bill, although, of course, I myself believe that it could be drawn so that it would not be so expensive in its operation.

The two members of the board, other than the Secretary of the Treasury, will not be called upon to do the work of districting the country nor will they plan the working details of the legislation. There will be hundreds of employees under the bill. I do not believe that the two members who will be appointed, if my amendment is agreed to making the board to consist of but three, will work out even the details of the organization. The men who will be appointed will no doubt be business men who have had a great deal of business experience, and particularly administrative experience. The man who will work out the detail workings of the bill is already more than likely an employee of the Government, and no doubt has been interested in the framing of it, just the same as we find public men interested in the detail work of almost every important piece of legislation presented to Congress.

So, Mr. President, I do not think it will make any difference whatever as to the working of the bill whether there be three or whether there be five members of the board. The only difference will be that there will be less expense to the Government, less offices to maintain, less employees all around, if the board is limited to three; and I think that ought to be taken into consideration.

Of course I believe it would be an improvement if the amendment were adopted. If I were responsible for the successful working of it, I would very much prefer to have two first-class business men at its head who had had experience in the administration of business, and, with their labor given to this work, an organization formed under their supervision, if you please, would be more likely to make a success of the measure than if we began to pick a man from this part of the country and a man from another part of the country or a man who has been interested in this class of work and a man interested in another class of work. This is a banking proposition, a business proposition.

It seems to me, Mr. President, with the Secretary of the Treasury—and I admit that he will have very little to do with the detail working of the measure—and such men as I have named, if the bill can possibly be made a success it will be brought about through the appointment of such men as I have named, and two of such are enough.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. May we have the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to take this opportunity to state that my colleague [Mr. WEEKS] is unavoidably absent from the city. He has a pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I desire to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. HARDWICK] and to state that he is paired with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON], I vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I desire to inquire whether the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio. He being absent, I transfer the pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I desire to inquire if the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with that Senator, but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] and vote "nay."

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to ask if the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], and vote "yea."

Mr. CLAPP (after having voted in the affirmative). I have voted. I now observe the absence of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], with whom I have a pair. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. FALL. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], but I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. HUGHES] on official business. As to how he would vote on this question, I do not know.

Mr. FALL. In the absence of my pair, I desire to make a transfer to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] and to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], with whom I am paired, having returned to the Chamber and voted, I withdraw the exchange of pairs.

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

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK];

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

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

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

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

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—22.

Borah	Fall	Lodge	Smoot
Brandegee	Gore	Norris	Townsend
Clapp	Gronna	Oliver	Wadsworth
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Page	Warren
Curtis	Kenyon	Poindexter	
du Pont	Lane	Sherman	

NAYS—29.

Ashurst	Kern	Pomerene	Taggart
Bankhead	La Follette	Reed	Tillman
Beckham	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Underwood
Broussard	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Vardaman
Chamberlain	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Hollis	Newlands	Smith, Ga.	
Husting	Phelan	Stone	
Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—45.

Brady	Goff	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.
Bryan	Harding	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Hardwick	O'Gorman	Sterling
Catron	Hitchcock	Overman	Sutherland
Chilton	Hughes	Owen	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	James	Penrose	Thompson
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ransdell	Walsh
Culberson	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Weeks
Cummins	Lewis	Shafroth	Works
Dillingham	Lippitt	Shields	
Fletcher	McCumber	Simmons	
Gallinger	McLean	Smith, Md.	

So Mr. SMOOT's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to the amendment of the committee: On page 3, line 12, I move to strike out "$10,000" and to insert "$7,500," so that it will read:

They shall receive an annual salary of $7,500, payable monthly, together with actual necessary traveling expenses.

Upon that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to the transfer of my pair to the senior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS], I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). Announcing the same transfer of pairs that I announced on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as to my pair and transfer as before and vote "nay."

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

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan], who is absent, is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. Announcing my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (when the name of Mr. WEEKS was called). I desire to make the same announcement in regard to my colleague [Mr. WEEKS] that I made on the former roll call. He is unavoidably absent. He stands paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the same announcement which I made a moment ago as to the transfer of my pair, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLAPP (after having voted in the affirmative). The senior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] having entered the Chamber and voted, I shall have to withdraw the transfer which I made and also withdraw my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the affirmative). I now learn that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], with whom I have a pair, has not voted. For that reason I withdraw my vote.

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

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK];

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

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN];

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

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. WALSH. Having a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], I transfer that pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Beckham	Gronna	Norris	Townsend
Borah	Harding	Oliver	Vardaman
Brandegee	Jones	Overman	Wadsworth
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Page	Warren
Curtis	Kern	Poindexter	Works
du Pont	Lane	Sherman	
Fall	Lodge	Smoot	

NAYS—25.

Ashurst	Johnson, Me.	Reed	Taggart
Bankhead	La Follette	Saulsbury	Underwood
Broussard	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Walsh
Chamberlain	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Gore	Myers	Smith, Ga.	
Hollis	Phelan	Stone	
Husting	Pittman	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—45.

Brady	Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Goff	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Hardwick	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Catron	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Sterling
Chilton	Hughes	Owen	Sutherland
Clapp	James	Penrose	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pomerene	Thompson
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Tillman
Culberson	Lewis	Robinson	Weeks
Cummins	Lippitt	Shafroth	
Dillingham	McCumber	Shields	
Fletcher	McLean	Simmons	

So Mr. SMOOT's amendment to the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. On page 3, line 7, after the word "Senate," in the committee amendment, I move to strike out "of the four members to be appointed by the President not more than two shall be appointed from one political party."

Mr. President, if that amendment is adopted, it will necessitate another formal amendment to make the other language conform to the amendment.

I confess that I have but little hope of seeing the amendment adopted. I confess also that those who favor this kind of a provision in the law are moved by the very highest motives and the best of faith; but if I believed that such a provision would work out in the way that those who favor it believe it will work out, instead of being opposed to the language I would favor it.

I am moved to offer the amendment, even though it is apparent that it can not be adopted, from the fact that in the discussion on the amendment in regard to the salaries which has just been adopted, Senators reminded the Senate of other cases and other bills which have been pending, which provided for large salaries, where no Senator made a motion to strike them out; the salaries, for instance, of the members of the Federal Reserve Board, which were fixed at $12,000 per annum, as I now remember, and also the salaries of the Federal Trade Commission, which were fixed at $10,000 per annum. Particularly with reference to the salaries of the members of the Trade Commission, I felt at the time that those salaries ought to have been cut down. I offered no amendment, or, if I did, I have forgotten now that I did so, because I knew that it would be defeated, and there were so many other amendments in which I was deeply interested, most of which were defeated, that it became quite apparent that it was useless to offer such an amendment.

I want to offer this amendment now, so that if at any time in the future, under different conditions, the same amendment should be offered or supported by me, I shall be able to show in my own defense that I stood for this amendment, and believed in it at a time when the party opposing the one to which I give allegiance was in power and would name all of the officials provided for in the proposed law.

The object of the language is to create a board that is nonpartisan. If that language brought about that object, I would be the last one to move that it be stricken out, and would be one of the first to support keeping it in. As a matter of fact, it never brings about anything of the kind.

I remember that early in the present administration, a question came up in the Senate in regard to the Civil Service Commission, complaint having been made that the law was not being properly enforced, when the charge was made that under the preceding administration the law had not been enforced. To the statement that the law provided that the members of the Civil Service Commission must belong to different political parties and that not more than two could be taken from one party, the answer came—and I am not sure but that it was perfectly well founded—that the man who was appointed to rep-

resent the Democrats by a Republican President did not represent the Democrats; that he was a bolter from the Democratic Party; and that he was appointed as a reward for his support of Palmer and Buckner. I am not sure but that that was right, and, without criticizing the man who was appointed, because, so far as I know, he performed his duties absolutely without regard to party and in the best of faith, at the same time naturally he could not be above suspicion on the part of members of the Democratic Party, for the reason that just before he was appointed he took part in a political campaign, where his energies and his efforts, no matter what he might believe in, could have had but one effect, and that was to assist in bringing about the defeat of the Democratic Party. Such charges are frequently made, and we know that oftentimes they are true; that the man appointed to represent one party in reality supported another party. So we do not have nonpartisan boards; but, if the officials are appointed in good faith, instead of having nonpartisan boards, we have bipartisan boards, which are worse than partisan boards. If the man appointed a member of a board is a Democrat, he feels as though he was appointed because of being a Democrat and that in his official position he represents the Democratic Party; and, on the other hand, the man who is appointed because he is a Republican, feels the same in relation to the Republican Party. So you have, evening it up with both parties represented, an absolutely partisan board.

If the same men were appointed and the law did not provide that they must be appointed from a party, they would feel a different obligation; the party obligation would disappear, and they would come nearer being nonpartisan than though they were appointed to represent a political party.

So far as I am concerned, if this bill becomes a law, and the President wants to do so, I would not criticize him if he should appoint all the members of the Federal farm-loan board from one political party. If they are good men, if they will perform their duties properly, without regard to politics, the President can appoint all Democrats, if he so desires, or he can appoint all Republicans, all Progressive, or all Socialists, or divide them up as he pleases; but I am opposed to saying to the President, "You must appoint so many Republicans and so many Democrats, in order that when they are assembled together they will constitute a nonpartisan board." That is inconsistent, and in practice it has never worked out well.

The board provided for in this bill ought to be nonpartisan; there is no doubt about that. Every board ought to be. I can not conceive of any board that ought to be partisan; but just as soon as we say to the appointing power, "You must divide this board up between the political parties," you make a partisan board of it; and if the President in good faith appoints as members of the board men who belong to the opposite party to which he owes allegiance, he immediately casts suspicion, in some quarters at least, as to those men, because in times past Presidents and other appointing powers have taken advantage of a provision of this kind to appoint men of the opposite party, who at least are not politically in good standing, although it may be that the very best men who could be selected in the country would be men who were not politically in good standing.

I am not saying that such men might not be absolutely the best. Take, as an illustration, the Trade Commission or the Federal Reserve Board. Criticism was made of some of the appointees on the Federal Trade Commission because they did not fairly represent the party from which, under the law, they should be chosen. Criticism was made of the President as to at least one of those appointees, because it was said "This man does not fairly represent the party from which, as the law provides, he should be taken." I am not saying that that criticism was wrong, but I do believe that in that particular case—and it is likely to happen in any case—the man who did not fairly represent the party was the best man that could be selected for the particular office. If, however, you leave this kind of a provision in the law, the President, if he wants to escape criticism in making the appointments, must select partisans, men who are such partisans that nobody will doubt that they will have uppermost on all occasions the welfare of their party. He will be criticized if he does not do that, and perhaps that is the spirit of the law, but I think we ought to avoid it in this instance, particularly in view of the character of work to be performed by the farm-loan board.

Under the bill before us the members of the board will have no more to do with party, if they do their duty, than the flowers that bloom in the springtime. Therefore we ought to make it possible for the President to appoint, without criticism, the best men possible, irrespective of party. I do not believe that this language ought to go into a law of any kind.

I believe, first, that it is recognized by the Senate and the House of Representatives that the work of this board will be nonpartisan. If we start with that as a fact, then we ought to say nothing about the political qualifications of the men who will compose the board, as to what political party they shall give allegiance, or from what political party they shall be selected.

If the work of the board is nonpartisan, as the work of all such bodies ought to be, then why should it not be possible to appoint a man who perhaps gives allegiance to no political party, but who may have made a life study of this subject? Under this bill if you appoint such a man he will have to be charged against some political party, but no political party will be willing to take him, and he will be unwilling to be classified as a member of a political party. Some of the best students along the lines of the work that will have to be done, for instance, by the Federal Trade Commission do not care anything about political parties; they have never taken any part in political contests, and yet they may have spent years of their lives in careful and calm study of the questions over which that board will have control. I can easily see that in the particular case before us the same thing might be possible, but the President is practically by this provision of the bill precluded from appointing such a man. It will be no answer, so far as he is concerned, to say that if you strike out that provision the President will appoint all the members of the board from one party. If the President wants to do that, he can practically do it. He can get enough Republicans who supported the Democratic candidates in the last election and reward them with this kind of an office.

So you will not accomplish anything if you want to prevent that being done. It can not be prevented if the President wants to do it. On the other hand, if the President wants to act in good faith, and appoint the best men he can select for the positions, he will not consider politics. If you leave in this provision, you compel him to consider politics. Therefore it seems to me it ought to be eliminated.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. FALL. Does not the Senator think that this entire Government is at the present time a Government by party, except where it may have become in recent years a Government by one individual? Is not the Government itself a party Government?

Mr. NORRIS. A great deal so; yes.

Mr. FALL. Then, where the legislative department creates a board or a commission, does not the Senator think it would be well enough to provide that both parties shall be represented upon that board or commission, and then if the President wants to violate the law leave it to him to violate it?

Mr. NORRIS. No. In answer to the question I will say that I do not think the Legislature ought to do that. The fact that we have political parties in this country is no sufficient reason, in my judgment, why the members of a board of this kind should be selected because of their party qualifications any more than we would select a judge on account of his political qualifications.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

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

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment I will yield to the Senator. Why should we not say when two judges are to be appointed, whom everybody concedes ought to be nonpartisan, that not more than one of them shall belong to any one political party, and thus put upon the bench a representative of a party?

It is true that we have parties, and to a great extent the country is governed by parties; but every day we are trying, State legislatures are trying, and municipal governments are trying, to get away from the evil of partisanship. There is no official duty for this board to perform—there can be none—that in any way is partisan. If you want to make it nonpartisan, then do not provide by law that one of the qualifications of a member shall be that he is a partisan.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, the Senator is anxious to have this board made nonpartisan. Does the Senator believe that appointing all the members of the board from one political party tends to make the board nonpartisan? Or would it not be more apt to be nonpartisan if both or all parties were represented on the board?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I have gone over that to some extent. I will say, in answer to the Senator from Wyoming, that when you appoint members of a board of this kind under a law that says there shall be so many members of one party—that is practically

what we say—and so many members of another party on the board, you thereby, by the law, make it a partisan board.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I suppose it would be almost impossible, notwithstanding the view of the Senator, formerly expressed, to appoint any member upon this board or any like board who is not a partisan in the sense that he is a member of some political party; that is, that he votes, or has voted, with some particular political party. He need not be a partisan in the sense of being an active party worker or organizer; but I imagine that any man who was sufficiently well qualified, or qualified at all, to sit upon this board, would be a man who would have some views upon political questions, and would have expressed by his vote his notion as to which views were best. In that sense he would be a partisan; but I do not understand that that is what the Senator means.

Mr. NORRIS. In what sense?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I do not suppose the Senator meant to imply that we would be likely to get a man upon this board who did not have some political affiliations.

Mr. NORRIS. We probably would not; but we might. If we leave in this language, and the President wants to escape criticism, then it is certain that we will not get anybody on the board who is not the strongest kind of a partisan.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Well, possibly the Senator is correct. I wanted to get his view.

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

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment. I should like to refer first to what the Senator from Wyoming has said.

There are four members to be appointed. The language that I seek to strike out by my amendment provides that not more than two of them shall be members of any one party. That will mean that there will be two Democrats, let us say. Suppose the President went out into Wyoming and found there a prominent Democrat who had been supporting the Senator from Wyoming in all the contests he had ever had. There are Democrats like that in Wyoming—pretty good fellows, too.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. There are not enough of them.

Mr. NORRIS. Suppose the President appointed one of them as representing the Democratic Party, what would Senators over here say? Why, they would say, "That man does not represent the Democratic Party." The Senator from Wyoming could answer and say, "Why, he is a qualified man. He has made a life study of this subject and knows more about it than anybody else." "That does not make any difference; he is not a good Democrat. We do not care about his qualifications. He is not a Democrat, and the law provided that he should be a Democrat."

Suppose, on the other hand, instead of doing that—and this is more probable than what I have suggested—the President, in selecting a Republican, should go into New Hampshire and he should find there a Republican, registered as a Republican, who could prove by the records that he was a Republican, and who perhaps had been running for office on the Republican ticket, but who had supported the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS]. There are such Republicans up there; otherwise, the Senator would not be here. He had to have the votes of a good many of them to get here. Suppose he should appoint one of those, what would happen over here? Republicans would say, "Why, here, the President is not carrying out this law in good faith. He has appointed a man who has not been true to the Republican Party. He has appointed a man who bolted the Republican Party and supported the Democratic candidate for Senator." He would be criticized for it; and it would not be any answer if the President or those who supported him in his action could say and could prove: "Why, this man whom the President has appointed as representing the Republican Party in New Hampshire is the best man in the country for this position. He knows more about the duties of the position than the men who passed the bill and the President who signed it. He is peculiarly adapted to carry out the provisions of this law." The Republicans would answer and say, "Why did you not appoint him as a Democrat?" But the man himself claimed to be a Republican. He had supported one Democrat, maybe two, maybe a whole ticket at one election.

This language makes it impossible for the President, unless he is subject to severe criticism, and perhaps violates the law, to appoint any such man to this board. He could not do it. What would the President have to do if he wanted to escape criticism? He would have to get some two Democrats who were able to show that from the time they were old enough to vote they had never scratched a ticket; they had always voted for the Democrat, yellow dog and all; and then he would have to come over on the Republican side, to prevent being criticized there, and appoint a man who had always been a bitter partisan in favor of the Republican Party, who had never supported anybody but a Republican, who felt himself bound to support a candidate for road overseer even if he had just gotten out of the penitentiary, provided he was on the Republican ticket, in preference to the best man in the county running against him on the Democratic ticket. To demonstrate his fitness for this position he would have to have a record as being the bitterest kind of a partisan. That is what the President would have to do.

If this language is stricken out, as proposed by my amendment, the President will have absolutely no limitation. He can pick the best men he can get regardless of their politics. If he does his duty, he will do it.

I now yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. COLT. I was simply going to ask the Senator if he does not think that the reason for this provision is that the two parties represent certain tendencies with respect to the government of the country, and that it is deemed a little better on that account that the members composing that board should be men who belong to both of those parties? Might I ask the Senator, further, if he does not recall that when the circuit court of appeals was established there was an agreement that a certain number of Democratic judges should be appointed, there being a large number of judges to be appointed?

The underlying reason is simply this: There always will be two parties; and in order to avoid crticism, it is believed to be a little better to have representatives of both parties upon any board.

I might say further that I think this whole question of partisanship is a great deal overestimated and exaggerated, for the reason that any man when he has taken his position upon this board will, I believe, be entirely free from such partisanship.

Mr. NORRIS. With the last statement made by the Senator I most fully agree—that any man who takes such a position, unless you inject politics into it and give him a political obligation as well as an official obligation, will be absolutely free from political influence of every kind, and will so act; and that is what we ought to have.

I can see how, if we were passing a law here, we might say that a certain position, that of a judge, was established and the President was authorized to appoint some one to the position, and then say in the law, "The President must appoint a Republican." Suppose the President appointed the Senator from Rhode Island. The Senator from Rhode Island would feel—and it is perfectly natural that he should—that he had a double obligation, because the law said he must be a Republican, and the President in good faith in trying to carry out that law, before he appointed him, called in the Republicans, the leading Republicans—whatever that may mean, and it means a good deal sometimes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The most conspicuous ones.

Mr. NORRIS. And suppose he got advice from those Republicans, and they advised him to appoint the Senator from Rhode Island, and he appointed him not because he wanted the Senator from Rhode Island but because the members of the political party whom he consulted wanted him. Would you say that the Senator from Rhode Island, when he took the office, would be entirely free from political obligation? Why, he would owe his very official existence, under the circumstances, to members of a political party, because of his political affiliations and not because of his qualifications; and he would not be as nonpartisan then as he would be if he had been appointed under a law that said nothing about politics.

Why, Mr. President, the theory is just as the Senator from Rhode Island says it is. The theory is that, there being political parties, we ought to divide this up, and then we will not be so apt to have a partisan board. The practice, when you come to carry it into practice, is just the reverse. If we want to get a nonpartisan board, we want to let the appointing power be absolutely free to select men who are not partisans, but who are nonpartisans, and not put an obligation on him that he must go into his particular party to select the men. It would be just as unreasonable, to my mind, to say that he should appoint on this board two men who were bald headed. He might get just as good men, but the danger would be that they would be prejudiced in favor of bald-headed men; and the danger here is that if he must appoint a man because he is a Republican, feeling that he is on that board representing not only the country but the Republican Party, he will be inclined to be partisan; and that is true of the Democrat who is put on there. In this case, if the President did not want to honor any member of the Republican Party with the appointment, he could appoint two Democrats and one Socialist and somebody belonging to the

Progressive Party. He could leave the Republican Party out, if he wanted to do so. I am in favor of giving the President the power to leave it out if he wanted to; but wherever he went, under this provision, he would go there on account of partisanship. Under the law he could not help it. So, by the very curtailment that we put upon the power of the President we make it impracticable to bring about the real thing we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I have much sympathy with the views expressed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. I think it frequently works out in the way he says.

Take the Federal Reserve Board, for instance. There were five members upon it. One of them had been an organization Democrat for many years. The other four had never taken any part in politics. Nobody knew what their qualifications were. Later it was charged that they were all Democrats. I do not think there was one of the four that any of us in this Chamber would call a Democrat. He had not been prominent enough so that anybody really knew what his politics were.

This provision, however, was inserted out of deference to the Republicans in Congress, with the idea that they would like it better if it were a nonpartisan board, and for the purpose of making it as nearly a nonpartisan board as we can. I do not know how the Senate will vote on it. So far as I am personally concerned, it does not make much difference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. BRADY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. As he is absent from the Chamber, I withhold my vote.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement that I made on the former roll call, I vote "nay."

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as before and vote "nay."

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). On account of my pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. Not being able to transfer that pair, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made on the last roll call, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TAGGART. My colleague [Mr. KERN] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. LIPPITT. I wish to inquire if the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. LIPPITT. Then I withhold my vote, he being absent.

Mr. MYERS. Announcing the same transfer of my pair that I announced on the last roll call, I vote "nay."

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

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK];

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

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]; and

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

The result was announced—yeas 5, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—5.

Borah	Jones	Kenyon	Norris
Clapp			

NAYS—45.

Ashurst	Harding	Overman	Swanson
Bankhead	Hollis	Page	Taggart
Beckham	Husting	Poindexter	Tillman
Brandegee	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	Underwood
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Colt	Lane	Sherman	Warren
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Simmons	Williams
du Pont	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	Works
Fall	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	
Gore	Myers	Smoot	
Gronna	Nelson	Stone	

NOT VOTING—46.

Brady	Goff	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Hardwick	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Hitchcock	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Catron	Hughes	Owen	Sterling
Chamberlain	James	Penrose	Sutherland
Chilton	Kern	Phelan	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Lea, Tenn.	Pittman	Thompson
Culberson	Lewis	Ransdell	Townsend
Cummins	Lippitt	Reed	Walsh
Dillingham	McCumber	Robinson	Weeks
Fletcher	McLean	Shafroth	
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Shields	

So Mr. NORRIS's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, it has been brought to my attention that on the vote on the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to reduce the salaries of the members of the farm-loan board from $10,000 to $7,500 the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] voted "nay," and his vote was not recorded. If his vote had been recorded, the result would have been a tie.

Without troubling the Senate to go through the necessary parliamentary stages to have this set right, I merely reserve the right, when the bill gets in the Senate, to have a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah in that respect. I reserve the right to have a vote on that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the attention of the chairman of the committee to section 35 of the bill. I desire to know whether a change has been made in that section. I see that it provides:

> That upon becoming satisfied that any national farm-loan association has refused to make good defaulted mortgages, as required by section 28 of this act, or upon receiving satisfactory evidence that any such association has failed to meet its outstanding obligations of any description whatever when due, and is in default, the Federal farm-loan board may forthwith declare such association insolvent and appoint a receiver—

And so forth. Is not that an extraordinary power to give to the board—to appoint a receiver for an institution of this kind? Ought not that to be done by the courts?

Mr. HOLLIS. I can not tell the Senator whether there is any precedent for that or not. Does the Senator care to offer an amendment to cover that point?

Mr. CURTIS. I think it is so important that it would pay to take it up to-morrow and have an amendment to the effect that they may go into court and ask for a receiver. I doubt very much our power to give to a board the authority to appoint a receiver. Of course we could provide that upon default they might ask for a receiver at the hands of the court.

Mr. HOLLIS. I will consider that and will be able to give the Senator an answer in the morning.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there was such an enormous vote obtained in favor of my amendment seeking to make this law nonpartisan and keep this board out of politics, and feeling encouraged by reason of such an enormous vote, I offer another amendment along the same line.

On page 5, line 21, I move to strike out, beginning after the period, all the balance of that page and the first five lines on page 6. The language I seek to strike out reads as follows:

> All such attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees, and all registrars and appraisers, shall be appointed without regard to the provisions of the act of January 16, 1883 (vol. 22, U. S. Stats. L., p. 403), and amendments thereto, or any rule or regulation made in pursuance thereof: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the President from placing said employees in the classified service.

Mr. President, the language which I have read and which I seek to strike out by this amendment provides, in substance, that the appointments to be made by this board shall be made without regard to the civil-service law. In other words, it is a provision in the bill which if retained will take the appointments entirely out from under the protection of the civil-service law. The law referred to in this language is the one which provides for the civil service and the appointment of clerks and officials in accordance with the provisions of that law.

It sems to me that there will be necessarily a very large number of these appointments, and that they ought to be made in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service law. In other words, since you have now decided that the board itself shall be partisan and that a part of its membership shall represent the Democratic Party, and a part of its membership shall represent the Republican Party or some other party, you ought at least to provide that when they come to make the hundreds, perhaps the thousands, of appointments that they will make they shall do so in accordance with the law passed by Congress providing for the Civil Service Commission. If you do not, it is a partisan board that we have provided for, and it will do as perhaps it will be justified in doing, it will divide them up according to political parties, and after dividing up the offices according to political parties and going off into separate caucuses and deciding what political appointees shall be made to represent that political party, immediately when the appointments are made the proviso that I also seek to strike out will make it possible for the President by an order to put all of these partisan employees under the civil service, so that although they will be appointed because of partisanship as soon as they are appointed, if the President acts on this proviso, they can not be removed. In other words, the partisanship with which we have started, commencing with the board, will run clear down to and include the janitor.

It is provided "that nothing herein shall prevent the President from placing said employees in the classified service." So you take them for partisan reasons and give them these offices in disregard of the law, in disregard of the Civil Service Commission and the work that it was intended to perform, and as soon as these partisan political appointments are made the President by an order can put them under the protection of the law and they are there during the balance of their lives.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

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

Mr. JONES. While we have provided in the law that the President can not appoint more than three from any one political party, and, of course, the other is a Cabinet officer and belongs to the party of the President, does not the Senator think, as a matter of fact, the majority of the board will fill from their own party at least all the substantial offices?

Mr. NORRIS. They could do that under this law, no doubt.

Mr. JONES. Does not the Senator think they are very likely to do it?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know. In view of the fact that the Senate has decided they shall divide up the important offices, practically giving the Democrats the major part, and saying we will give you a few from these other parties——

Mr. JONES. We have not put any limit on their action. We have not said that they shall act in a nonpartisan way.

Mr. NORRIS. No; we have not said that.

Mr. JONES. Has it not been the Senator's observation that such a board will do that after they are appointed?

Mr. NORRIS. Personally, I may say that I have known instances where such commissions have divided them up, and in other cases where they have taken them all out of one party.

But, Senators, the real point is that a whole lot of clerks and a whole lot of appointments can be made by a board, the jurisdiction of which extends all over the United States. Thousands of positions are to be filled, in my judgment, and the board even decides whether there shall be positions or not, and then decides who shall fill them by appointment without regard to the civil-service law. If our civil-service law means anything, then it ought to begin at the inception. What use have you for the civil-service law if you have this kind of a provision in the law? You say to a political party in power, get your henchmen into office and after they are in we will through this authority granted to the President protect them for life. The theory of the civil-service law is that men will be appointed without regard to politics; and by the way, that law was in accordance with the argument I made a while ago. It does not provide that one man shall be a Democrat, and the next a Republican, and the next a Socialist, and the next what not, and then go through again and enforce it in good faith, but it means that political and party considerations shall have no place in the selection of officials. It means that they shall be appointed absolutely without regard to their political affiliations.

But what are we seeking to do here? We are providing that that law shall not apply to these appointments, and then we say in the same breath, as soon as you have selected these partisan appointees we will have the President issue an order that will put them under the classified service. Men who get into the classified service on merit because of their qualifications will be put side by side with these appointees, appointed because of their political qualifications. Yet the tenure of office, if the President exercises the authority given him in this proviso, will be the same in both cases. It is a nullification of the civil-service law on its face. It is contrary to its letter and it is contrary to its spirit.

Mr. President, when President Taft issued an order putting the fourth-class postmasters under civil service, something he had the legal right to do, a great cry went up that he had put into permanent office a whole lot of fellows who were appointed because of their political qualifications, and I always felt that there was some justification for that charge. Then, as I remember, when President Wilson came in he rescinded that order and provided that they should be examined first, and I thought that that was a good thing. It seemed to me that that ought to have been in the first order, although I know that Presidents from the beginning of the enactment of the civil-service law have made that kind of an order putting under the civil service a large number of employees. The effect of it has been to gradually extend the civil service further, and perhaps often justifiably, without taking the politics of the men into consideration. President Taft simply extended it. It may not be the best way to extend it, but it is the way the law provided it could be extended; and I would not blame the President if after all these fellows were put into office he would issue such an order. I think it is intended he should. Then he would include these men in the civil service.

But why do not the Democrats say now what they said about fourth-class postmasters, that it is not right to put them all in the classified service by a blanket order, because they were selected for political partisan reasons? Why not now practice what you preached? Why do you not do now what you claimed the Republican President ought to have done when he made that order? It seems to me that here is the opportunity to put into practice the very claim that you made then that that was not fair.

Mr. President, I am not making this motion, and I do not believe that any man who knows me will charge it, because we happen to have a Democratic President who will appoint a majority of Democrats on this board. I do not care, so far as I am concerned, if every one he appoints is a Democrat, provided he gets good men; but I do not want this board, being Democratic, as it will be very likely, to go all over the country and put this great system into operation by the use of political methods. How will these men get their jobs? They will get them because Senators and Representatives and committeemen will make recommendations to a board that, in the first place, is partisan. Does any member, at least, of the Democratic Party who is a Member of the Senate or of the House or is a member of the Democratic committee, think that he will not be importuned by friends to get them positions under this board, and does any man doubt but that this board, a partisan board to begin with, will not give heed to that kind of recommendation?

If you strike it out, what will happen? If my motion prevails, in the first place, you will be relieved of that duty; and you have had experience enough now since President Wilson has been in office and the Democratic Party has been in power to know that it is not a very pleasant duty. I have had too many Members of the Senate and House say to me in conversation, and I have heard them say even in public, that it is an unpleasant duty. It is an unpleasant duty, a duty that you can not perform even to the satisfaction of your own conscience. I know that from experience. Yet the obligation will be yours. You can not get away from it. If the law is passed in this form, no one will expect you to get away from it, and you will not try to get away from it. It ought not to take up your time to investigate, if you want to be fair with the board, and see whether these men are properly qualified or not. You ought not to be compelled to shoulder that responsibility. It is not just to you and it is not fair to the country. If it is made a party obligation, the first thing that will be necessary for every applicant will be to show that he is a good Democrat, and sometimes in showing that they will forget all his other qualifications. I would do just the same. I do not say it because he is a Democrat; it would be just the same if the Republican Party or any other party was in power.

If you make a party obligation of it, if you make a party machine of it, then no man can get an appointment as a janitor or as a clerk unless he establishes to the satisfaction of the political machine in control that he gives strict allegiance to that party and is faithful always to the party demands. That will be the first qualification, and if it happens after that that he

has other qualifications to fulfill the office, and that he can perform his duty properly, well and good. If he does not it will be a bad precedent.

Now, what will happen if my amendment prevails? Then these appointments would be made for this board from lists certified to them under the civil-service law by the Civil Service Commission. Is not that fair? If it is not fair then we ought to repeal the civil-service law. If we are going to create new offices and provide in the law where we create them that they shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service law and then after they get in that they shall be put under the saving influences and control of the civil-service law, then we are going back to the old rule that "to the victor belongs the spoils," and going to it with a vengeance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that it is worse than that rule. The old rule never protected the spoilsmen.

Mr. NORRIS. I was going to say that. I thank the Senator for the suggestion. If we had no civil-service law, and these men were appointed as a reward for partisanship or political work, when their party went out and the other party came in they would go out. But here you have a provision contained in the bill that notwithstanding the fact that they are going to be appointed on account of partisanship they shall retain their positions for life. In common justice it seems to me we ought not to do that. President Wilson revoked the order of President Taft putting the fourth-class postmasters under the civil service, and I thought he improved the order. It struck me as being fair. All the Democrats at least claimed that was fair. Now, if you are true to that faith, if you believe what you said, it seems to me that you must then vote for this amendment to put these appointments on the same basis and on the same plane that you demanded fourth-class postmasters should be put on.

Mr. President, it all reduces itself down, it seems to me, as to whether we are going to uphold the civil-service law, and in offering this amendment and in saying what I have said I cast no reflection upon the committee. I know it is said that when you begin a great institution of this kind you can get along better by giving everybody a free hand and let the appointments be made without regard to the Civil Service Commission, and that it is difficult sometimes to get the Civil Service Commission to furnish a list for some offices. But, Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission, in my judgment, are better qualified to select any officer, any attorney, and any judicial officer, however high, than the chairmen of political committees or bosses of political machines through the instrumentalities of Members of the Senate and Members of the House, who necessarily, if they often made recommendations, would not and could not under the very condition of things know personally all of the things that anyone ought to know in passing on an applicant for some of the more important positions that will be included in this law.

Therefore, Mr. President, in the very best faith and in the belief that it is only common ordinary justice and a square deal that this should be eliminated, I have offered this amendment, and I hope the Senate will vote in favor of it and that this language may be stricken from the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I am certainly in favor of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska or, at least, of some modification of the section as it now appears, because I can see no justification whatever for the section as written. I can see where some of these officials probably ought not in their selection to be limited to the civil-service list. I can see where, perhaps, in the case of attorneys and experts they should be allowed a free hand to go out and search the field over and get the best they can, but why the merest laborer or clerk or typewriter or any of the minor employees should not come from the civil-service list I am unable to comprehend.

But that is not the worst feature of the bill as it stands. The bill as it stands provides an avenue or a channel by the use of all these minor appointments by which the work of the Civil Service Commission may be absolutely overthrown.

These people once under the civil service, as I understand the law, may be exchanged to do other kinds of governmental service. For instance, under the civil service, employees of the Treasury Department, if I understand the operation of the law aright, are eligible to be exchanged to the Post Office Department or to other departments of the Government. This bill, by this very section, provides an avenue by which every clerk to be hereafter selected and put into the service of the Government, or every laborer or janitor or elevator man or any employee in those classes, may be passed through this avenue into the civil service of any one of the departments without the necessity of civil-service examination or of a civil-service rating.

I have not been very will satisfied of late years as to the virtue of the Civil Service Bureau, because I have seen how easy it is to avoid the law. It has become a byword. Nobody needs to flatter himself, because he is an eligible on the civil-service list that that gives him any advantage whatever in securing a governmental appointment.

The Senator from Nebraska speaks of the new rule which has been inaugurated in regard to the appointment of fourth-class postmasters. Under the present administration fourth-class postmasters are selected from the civil-service list; but if there has been a fourth-class Republican postmaster appointed under this administration it has been a mighty rare case.

Mr. HOLLIS. I know of a great many such appointments in my State, where there have been more Republicans appointed fourth-class postmasters under this administration than there have been Democrats—a great many more of them.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I am glad to get that testimonial from the Senator from New Hampshire. It is indeed a relief, but I venture to say what I personally know is true in many instances, and that is, that a civil-service appointment is not given to the man or the woman who from the examination shows best upon the list. I do not think that at least will be disputed. The one best qualified, according to the records of the civil service, is seldom the one to get the appointment; and is never the one to get the appointment if he or she belongs to the opposite political party.

It does not, however, do any good to enter into that discussion here; it is not relevant to the matter; but I do not believe it is right to make this section of the bill an avenue or a channel through which there can be filtered into the Treasury Department or the Post Office Department or the Interior Department clerks, laborers, and others who but for the operation of this bill would have to be chosen from the civil-service list. I want to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if there was any particular purpose in that part of the section which provides that "nothing herein shall prevent the President from placing said employees in the classified service"?

Mr. HOLLIS. I will explain that at length when I get the floor. I had rather not answer the question in the Senator's time.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Of course I can understand, as I said in starting, how experts and attorneys, perhaps, and the higher officers who may be employed ought not to be dependent upon the certified list of the Civil Service Commission; but I am absolutely unable to comprehend why the others should not be subject to civil-service examination. I am still less able to comprehend why it is that, having been once appointed without the civil-service examination, they should be immediately transferred into the civil service and be eligible to appointment under any other branch of the Government where the civil service prevails.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, answering the last proposition of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming first, I will say that it is not a fact that men can be appointed from the unclassified service into the classified service. I know that to be the operation of the law.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLIS. I will explain that to the Senator. Under the appointments which were made in the Internal-Revenue Service under recent legislation, deputy internal-revenue collectors were appointed outside the civil-service law under provisions similar to the one now pending. None of those men has been transferred into the classified service of any of the departments of the Government. The departments have repeatedly refused to make such transfers. Some of the men who were appointed in New Hampshire wanted to be so transferred, but, on inquiry, I found that they could not be, and they have not been.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Let me ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. He is entirely conversant with the operations of the civil-service law——

Mr. HOLLIS. I tried very earnestly to get some of those men into the classified service, and I could not do it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Suppose this circumstance should occur: A clerk is appointed or a laborer is appointed who otherwise would have to be taken from the civil-service list, and his appointment should carry him in without examination. Having been passed under the civil service, could he not be transferred to a like office or like employment in other departments of the Government?

Mr. HOLLIS. My understanding is that he could not, unless he was in the classified service in one of the departments. If

he got into the classified service in one of the departments, then he might be transferred; but otherwise he could not be.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Of course, but he gets into the classified service by appointment?

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. By appointment under this act. Then, being in the classified service, he could at once be transferred to another department?

Mr. HOLLIS. That is exactly so.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. And in his place a man could be appointed without the classified service, and could take his place in that service?

Mr. HOLLIS. Not at all; because he could not be put under the classified service, for all future appointments would have to be made under the civil service.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I am glad to learn of that situation.

Mr. HOLLIS. That is perfectly straight and perfectly right, because you take 90 per cent of the classified places under the Government now, and they have all been through exactly this process; we have created a department and we have created its force at the same time, and then the employees were put into the classified service. You can not do it properly in any other way. There is nothing original in it. We went through the whole thing in the Federal reserve act for the very same reason. Surely the Senator from Wyoming has not forgotten that?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator from Wyoming has not forgotten a great many things that he did not approve of that are now law.

Mr. HOLLIS. That is true; but every time we put a bill through we go all over these different things again.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I would be glad if the Senator, or some other Senator, in bringing these great bills into the Senate, would present them in such a way that in doing it they would not violate the civil-service act, if Senators profess any loyalty to the civil-service cause; but I have known what the Senator says, that there is a precedent for this. I had hoped, however, that the practice would be finally abandoned.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is now addressing his remarks to one Democratic Senator who believes thoroughly in civil service, who has always supported it, who has never asked to have any of its rules violated, and who always votes for it in proper cases. Now, there is a most excellent reason why these places should not be filled under the civil-service regulations; and I am coming to that.

The matter that has been called before the Senate by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is one of the things as to which we do not have to rely on speculation or prophecy. We know just what will happen, because we know just what has happened within the past two years under the Federal reserve act; and I will tell the Senate just what happened under that act. Take the first one appointed, the secretary of the board. He is a man who has always been a Republican; he was secretary of the Aldrich Monetary Commission. Take the lawyers who were appointed. I have not the slightest idea as to their politics; but no one would ask to have the Civil Service Commission recommend lawyers to serve on this board or any other board. Take the experts to whom the Senator has referred. When they are all appointed, there will not be many of them; there will be a few assistants and stenographers here in Washington under the farm-loan board. The only others who will be appointed by them will be the farm-loan registrars, one for each district, who should be men of the highest financial standing, and who ought not to be appointed under civil-service rules. Then there are the examiners and land appraisers. Those examiners and land appraisers should be appointed exactly as the bank examiners are appointed now, and not under civil-service rules. You do not want to select men of that type from a list that is furnished by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Exactly so. Then, while appointing as many land-bank appraisers as may be thought necessary—there is no limit to the number—why should they be put under the civil service?

Mr. HOLLIS. They would not be put under the civil service.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But authority is given to put them under the civil service.

Mr. HOLLIS. Certainly, and there is authority now to put bank examiners and everybody else under the civil service.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. If that authority now exists, why is it necessary to reiterate that authority under this bill? Simply to offend somebody's sensibilities?

Mr. HOLLIS. Not in the slightest, but because it has been found necessary to do so. Whenever a new department has been created the President has had to have authority to put the officers of a certain class in that particular department under the civil service. In the first place, a general law would pass permitting him to put certain employees under civil service. That would apply all right to the departments then in existence, but when you create a new board, a new department, you must have additional legislation in order to permit that to be done.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator's reasoning is not entirely convincing.

Mr. HOLLIS. I am not reasoning; I am stating facts, as I understand them. If I am wrong I should be delighted to have some Senator correct me.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator is a lawyer, and a good one, and he is an expert in the writing of statute law, but does the Senator think it is good legislation to write into a law a thing that is unnecessary?

Mr. HOLLIS. I think it is necessary; otherwise I should not favor putting it in here. When you create a new department, in regard to which existing law can not act because the department was not in existence at the time the law was passed, then you have to apply the law to it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But the Senator does not understand the point to which I am referring. Suppose the employees provided for by this bill are appointed. The Senator says there is no need of further legislation, because the President already has the power to put those employees under the civil service.

Mr. HOLLIS. I say he has not such power without this authority.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Does the Senator think this authority is necessary for the minor employees?

Mr. HOLLIS. Certainly; otherwise I should not have put the provision in the bill.

Let me tell the Senator what has happened under the Federal reserve act. After they had organized and filled the important places, such as attorneys and experts, then they applied to the Civil Service Commission to give them lists of stenographers, clerks, and assistants, and they appointed such employees from the civil-service list furnished by the commission. There has been absolutely no complaint of any political appointments made by the Federal Reserve Board—not the slightest. No member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee was able to get anyone appointed under that board. Some of the members of the committee tried to do so, and some of them complained because they failed. That is the way the Federal Reserve Board acted, and I should expect that the President would, when the farm-loan board is working fully and completely, cover into the civil service all proper employees; but we can not state in advance which ones should be so covered in. We can not tell who they will be; no one can until experience has been had.

The Federal reserve act has worked perfectly under an identical provision. The provision in this bill is copied directly from the Federal reserve act, as found in section 11. No one has criticized it; neither the Senator from Nebraska nor the Senator from Wisconsin, nor anyone who is a friend of the civil service will criticize the manner in which that has worked. So I say that, whatever else our critics may say about this bill, here is one part of it that has been worked out under exactly this language to the utmost satisfaction of Democrats and Republicans alike, with no criticism. I wish the other provisions of the bill had such good precedents and such good authority.

Mr. CURTIS rose.

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. HOLLIS. The Senator looked as if he wanted to express some objection, or perhaps he is convinced and is ready to vote my way.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Kansas is ready to adjourn.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that some Senators have gone who have expressed a desire to speak on this matter, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. The Chair lays before the Senate a House bill for reference.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 15048. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOLLIS. I renew my motion that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 2, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *May 1, 1916.*

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

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

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, help us to realize that Thou art the supremest truth, the profoundest fact, in all the universe; that Thy will is good will, and therefore inflexible; that though we may deceive our fellow men, our hearts are as an open book to Thee. Help us to keep them free from guile; and though Thou dost lay upon us heavy burdens grievous to be borne, may we be able in the spirit of the Master to say, "Nevertheless, not my will but Thine be done," that we may be strong, courageous, and full of good works. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 29, 1916, was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RAKER, for one day, on account of illness.

To Mr. HAWLEY, for one day, on account of illness.

To Mr. CONRY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. PORTER, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

G. B. DICKSON.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 8067, to quiet the title to certain lands in the possession of G. B. Dickson, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 10750. An act permitting the Mondak Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River in the State of Montana.

CONTESTED ELECTION—GAYLORD V. CARY.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Elections No. 3, I present a unanimous report of that committee in the case of Winfield R. Gaylord against William J. Cary.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, as this is a unanimous report I suggest that we dispose of it at this time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to dispose of it now?

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana. Yes; I would like to call it up now.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 220 (H. Rept. 619).

Resolved, That Winfield R. Gaylord was not elected a Representative to the Sixty-fourth Congress from the fourth congressional district of Wisconsin and is not entitled to a seat therein.

Resolved, That WILLIAM J. CARY was elected a Representative to the Sixty-fourth Congress from the fourth congressional district of Wisconsin and is entitled to retain his seat therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The resolutions were agreed to.

THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (S. 381) 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 pending that motion I desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], who is the ranking member of the minority of the committee that reported the bill, what time he thinks we ought to have for general debate?

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that I have had a great many requests for time from this side of the House. I think we could use 5 hours on this side. Let me suggest to the gentleman also that that was the time we used when the bill was up for discussion before. We had an agreement at that time for 2 hours on the rule and 8 hours for general discussion, which made 10 hours of general debate upon the bill. It seems to me that we ought to have at least that much time now for the discussion of the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, that would mean, of course, that we would not complete the consideration of the bill to-day. I am told that the disposition of certain members of the House is to get through with the consideration of this bill to-day. I realize that there are a great many gentlemen on both sides of the House who desire to speak on the bill, and it is not my disposition to so limit the time as to prevent anybody who really desires to speak on the bill from speaking on it, but I do not believe that we will be able to get unanimous consent for as long debate as 10 hours.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make this suggestion: I know that there are some gentlemen who are very impatient to dispose of this bill peremptorily. Let me suggest to those gentlemen that it seems to me that the House can not justify itself in passing or jamming through this bill under any such program as that suggested. This bill, when it was before the House last year, was considered for about 3 or 4 weeks. After general debate, including the various sessions, I think there were 11 or 12 different sessions of the Congress devoted to the consideration of the bill.

This very bill was considered in the Senate for nearly two months and thoroughly discussed, and now when gentlemen suggest that this House ought to take up this great and important measure and dispose of it in one day's time it occurs to me that is asking altogether too much. I do not think it could be justified before the country.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, would not the gentleman think that three hours on a side devoted to general debate would be sufficient, and then when we get down to the portions of the bill that are in contention we could agree on time for the discussion of that under the five-minute rule?

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman that while, of course, I do not think that would be enough time to satisfy our people, if the gentleman modifies the suggestion to four hours on a side I will accept it.

Mr. KITCHIN. How about it under the five-minute rule? Would that cover the five-minute rule; that is, would we then hold strictly to the five-minute rule when we get down to the reading of the bill?

Mr. TOWNER. I understand it is now asked to limit general debate only, without consideration of what may follow.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question. Is it the purpose of the gentleman in making this request which he now suggests to so arrange matters as to finish the bill before we adjourn to-day?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think we can do it, as I understand there is no real opposition except to two portions of the bill—the prohibition and the Clarke amendment portion—and a great many gentlemen on this side and on your side would like to finish it to-night if they could. But we can not jam it through.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Could it not be that unanimous consent be arranged on those features to-day and not try to pass the entire bill?

Mr. JONES. I think we can arrange that when we get to it. I am going to ask, Mr. Speaker, that eight hours' general debate be permitted on the bill, the debate to be confined to the bill, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] and one-half by myself.

Mr. MANN. I would like to make one suggestion to the gentleman from Virginia, and that is that we give general leave to print for 10 days.

Mr. JONES. I shall be glad to add to that request, Mr. Speaker, that all gentlemen who speak on the bill——

Mr. MANN. All gentlemen.

Mr. JONES. That everybody who desires to do so shall have leave to print within 10 days on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to eight hours, four hours to be controlled by himself and four hours by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and the debate shall be on the bill itself, and that all Members shall be permitted to print remarks for 10 legislative days on the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Virginia if it is his purpose to hold a night session so that we can dispose of this bill to-night?

Mr. JONES. It is the desire to conclude the bill to-night. I do not know whether we will be able to do it or not. I hope so, but we would not like to enter into a hard-and-fast agreement that we would conclude the bill to-night, because nobody

can say in advance how much time will be taken up under the five-minute rule.

Mr. AUSTIN. We will be here a week on this bill if we have the five-minute rule.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we are now about to consider one of the most important bills that has been before this body in the last 25 or 50 years; a bill that affects the future of eight and one-half million people; a bill that likewise affects the future Government of the United States very materially. It does not seem to me, gentlemen, that it is in keeping with the great amount of time that we have given to other measures in this House that we try to dispose of a bill of such immense magnitude, not only to the Philippine people but to the people of the United States, as this great measure, in one day.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that I think upon this side of the House we are largely ready to vote, and on that side you debated it a good many hours in caucus, and it seems to me you have about thrashed it out, and why can we not vote?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Very well. If the leaders on both sides of this Chamber have some sort of an agreement whereby some other bill is to be substituted for the bill now under consideration, then we might as well take the vote immediately; but if we are to have a straight-out fight to the finish and register the sentiment of this Congress upon this bill, then we need more time than one day to consider such a bill as a bill dealing with the independence of the Philippine people. We can not properly present the argument and discussion on this bill in one day. If the gentlemen simply want to vote on certain provisions, we might as well take the vote at once upon those propositions, and then take a reasonable amount of time to properly consider a bill of such magnitude as the bill now before the House.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I hope my friend from Ohio will not object to this request. I desire to remind him that when this bill, or a similar bill, for Philippine independence was before the House two years ago eight hours was all that was used in general debate, and I think I can also assure the gentleman that when we reach the last section of the bill, which is the one to which there is so much controversy, the five-minute rule will not be strictly enforced, and gentlemen who have no opportunity to speak in the general debate will have some opportunity then to speak upon that section. I hope my friend will not insist upon his objection.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object, and neither am I asking for any special time, but I want this bill to have the proper amount of time if we intend to discuss it in a way that its importance demands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia whether he intends to press for a vote to-night? If you give eight hours for general debate, that means 7 o'clock this evening.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, all I can say in reply to that is that if we reach the end of the bill at a reasonable hour this evening, I shall ask for a vote; but if we find when we get under the five-minute rule that is impossible, then, of course, I shall not ask that the bill be disposed of to-day.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of the House, it is very evident to me that if that length of time is agreed upon for general debate, you will get to no final vote to-night. I think everybody in the House wants to have an opportunity to vote on this bill. It may be practicable during the day at least to make some arrangement as to when the vote shall be taken.

Mr. JONES. I will give the gentlemen notice so that they will be here.

Mr. MANN. So that everybody will be informed.

Mr. JONES. I think that is a good idea, and I shall be very glad to further any such proposition as that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the leaders upon both sides that it is fair to the Members of this House not to keep them here until 7, or 8, or 9 o'clock to-night on an indefinite proposition.

If they knew that they were going to have an opportunity to vote they would wait. If they know they are not going to vote to-night you might have a very slim attendance when the time comes to vote.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman through?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am through. I have submitted it to the leaders that we ought to have a time fixed for a vote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs if the time is already parceled out on this side of the House?

Mr. JONES. It is not on this side. I can not say for the other side. There have already been a great many requests for time from more gentlemen, I am sorry to say, than I am able to oblige.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Another inquiry: I would like to know if the people who are opposed to the Clarke amendment can get time from the other side?

Mr. JONES. It seems to me that is reasonable and just.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I want the House to know the way the matter is handled.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this suggestion, that we proceed now under the agreement for eight hours' general debate, so that if we can in the next two or three hours reach an agreement as to how much time there will be under the five-minute rule, the committee can rise in a moment and enter into that agreement, so that perhaps, if we see we can reach a vote by 9 or 10 o'clock to-night, it can be announced by the middle of the afternoon. I happen to know that there are gentlemen on that side of the House, as well as on this, who are anxious that a vote should be reached to-night.

Mr. MANN. It is perfectly evident that we can not reach a vote to-night.

Mr. GARRETT. It was my suggestion that we proceed with the general debate, under the agreement, for eight hours, with the understanding that later on, if we can reach an agreement as to a time for voting, the committee can then rise and ratify that agreement, if we choose to do so, and announce by the middle of the afternoon whether we can reach the vote to-night.

Mr. MANN. I think we could do that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, these agreements about fixing time ought to be made now. It will not be convenient for Members to be in the House every minute watching to find out if a request is to be made to guarantee in some way the rights of Members under the five-minute rule. I think it is very apparent, with a bill of 34 pages, if we are to have eight hours' general debate, you can not suppress the Members under the five-minute rule sufficient to vote at once, to get through by the time indicated. Gentlemen might as well understand that.

Mr. MANN. There is no reason that I can see why we should not proceed and complete this bill in Committee of the Whole clear through, or at least up to the last section, and possibly have the previous question ordered on the bill, and have an arrangement made as to when the final vote shall be had on the bill and a motion to recommit, possibly fixing it in advance so as to accommodate all the Members of the House.

Mr. KITCHIN. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we can do that a little later.

Mr. MANN. I think we can do that later in the afternoon.

Mr. KITCHIN. A little later, when we find out how the matter progresses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, why can not the time be fixed now for a vote? I was asking the question, Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why we could not fix the time to vote, while the Members are here. We would like to know.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] give heed to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Why can we not fix the time to vote now, so that Members can know?

Mr. JONES. I do not think it is possible, Mr. Speaker, to say now when we will close the consideration of this bill and take a vote. The amendment which will be more earnestly debated than any other is the last provision in the bill, and an arrangement of that sort might cut out absolutely every consideration of that amendment. The time might be taken up on the unimportant amendments, and when you reached that amendment under a hard-and-fast understanding there would not be an opportunity to say a word on the provision of the bill that gentlemen on both sides regard as the vital and most important proposition in the bill.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, what does the gentleman say to this proposition: Of course everybody understands that the critically contested point in the bill is the thirty-fourth section of the Senate act, which is the Clarke amendment. What does the gentleman say to taking that matter up first and disposing of it?

Mr. JONES. Well, so far as I am concerned, if the gentleman will ask unanimous consent that when the bill is read under the five-minute rule the first section to be considered shall be the thirty-fourth section, I will make no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. I will make that request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MADDEN. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if I may, that we agree to vote upon this bill immediately after the reading of the Journal next Thursday.

Mr. JONES. That suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa would mean, Mr. Speaker, that we will vote on the bill this evening, certain.

Mr. MADDEN. Does it mean that?

Mr. JONES. I think we will vote on the bill this evening, if that request is granted.

Mr. KITCHIN. And I should think, too, that in the general debate most of the debate will be on the thirty-fourth section, anyway. The whole general debate will turn around that section, and if we vote on that first it will not take any time on that under the five-minute rule, because we are going to debate that under the general debate.

Mr. JONES. That will unquestionably prolong the general debate, which follows immediately.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] suggests adding to this request the further request that when the bill is read under the five-minute rule to begin at the end of it instead of at the top of it, and discuss section 34 first.

Mr. KITCHIN. And vote on that first?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Consider it.

The SPEAKER. Vote on it and discuss it, too. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES], as modified by the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. May I ask whether that includes the right of the committee to rise and take a vote in the House on the Clarke amendment the moment that is determined, so that we can get through with this business?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

The SPEAKER. The way to get a vote on the Clarke amendment is to move to strike it out in the committee.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is a new feature introduced in this bill which has never been discussed in the House, and the suggestion of eight hours seems to me astonishingly short for a modification of such policy. My experience is that when we have general debate nobody stays here, and there is no chance to change anybody's opinion. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to stay here from now until we vote. However, I think it is exceedingly important that there be a full discussion, but not to empty seats.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, we on this side can not hear the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. And nobody else can. All gentlemen will refrain from conversation. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] asks unanimous consent, pending his motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, that general debate on this bill be limited to eight hours, four hours to be controlled by himself and four hours by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]; that the debate shall be on the bill itself——

Mr. MANN. With general leave to print for 10 days.

The SPEAKER. And that everybody shall have the right to print a speech in the RECORD for 10 legislative days; and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] adds to that the suggestion that when the bill is read for amendment section 34, the last section, be considered and voted on first. Is there objection?

Mr. FESS. Reserving the right to object——

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection?

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. JONES, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 381) 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 Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule adopted by the House the general debate is limited to eight hours. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] is recognized for four hours.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, it is just 18 years ago to-day since Admiral Dewey, at the head of an American squadron, triumphantly entered Manila Bay, destroyed the fleet under the command of Admiral Montejo, and sounded forever the death knell of Spanish dominion in the Philippine Islands. [Applause.]

It will be just 14 years on the 1st day of July next since President Roosevelt affixed his signature to the act of Congress under which the Philippine Islands have been governed from that day to this.

That act, described in its title as a temporary measure, was designed as a substitute for the autocratic military government under which the Filipinos had been theretofore governed. It was never intended by its sponsors to serve as a permanent form of government, and it has long since outlived its usefulness.

The bill now under consideration by this House has a twofold purpose. It gives the Filipino people a more liberal and autonomous government, thus conferring upon them larger control of their public and political affairs than they are now permitted to exercise. The life of this government, however, is to expire so soon as American sovereignty shall cease to exist over the islands, which, the bill declares, shall occur in not less than two nor more than four years after its passage, provided that the President, by proclamation, may extend the time to the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years, in the event that the condition in respect to the stability or efficiency of the external or internal affairs of the Philippines shall warrant him in so doing.

The necessity for the enactment by Congress of a new organic law for the Philippines is not questioned by anybody. It is stated in the views of the minority members of the Committee on Insular Affairs that—

> The minority entirely agree with the majority that the Philippines should be given a new fundamental law, granting to the people a larger measure of self-government.

And the fact that the only section of this bill to which any reference is made by the minority is that which relates to the independence of the islands amply justifies the conclusion that the provisional government provided for is not unsatisfactory to them.

The justice for the demand that the Filipino people be immediately given a larger measure of self-government being conceded, and no objection having been raised to the governmental features of the bill, it would be a waste of the time of this House to enter upon any detailed discussion of the changes which it effects in the present organic law. I shall therefore only direct the attention of the House to one or two of the more important changes. The most important of these is that which establishes a Philippine legislature to be composed of two houses, one the senate and the other the house of representatives.

The senate is designed to take the place of the present Philippine Commission, an appointive body composed of nine members. As is well known, this commission now constitutes the upper branch of the Philippine Legislature, and also exercises exclusive legislative and other jurisdiction over all the non-Christian and noncivilized peoples of the islands. The archipelago is divided into 12 senatorial districts, each of which is to be represented by two senators. One of these districts embraces the territory inhabited by the non-Christian and noncivilized tribes, and its two senators are to be appointed by the Governor General. The representatives of the other 11 senatorial districts are to be elected by the qualified voters of those districts.

The house of representatives is to be composed of 90 members, 81 of whom shall be elected in the districts now provided by law; the remaining 9 are to be appointed by the Governor General, and they will represent the noncivilized and non-Christianized territory.

The President of the United States is authorized to appoint a Governor General, a vice governor, an auditor and a deputy auditor, a director of civil service, and the chief justice and associate justices of the supreme court. All other officers are to be appointed by the Governor General with the approval of the Philippine Senate. The Governor General is given a qualified veto power.

One other important change which this bill makes in the present organic law is that which relates to the suffrage. The present educational qualification requires that all voters must be able to read and write either Spanish or English. This bill provides that they must be able to read and write either Spanish, English, or a native language. This will necessarily greatly enlarge the present electorate. Its justice is so obvious as to leave no room for discussion. There are many thousand literate Filipinos who speak neither English nor Spanish. Many of these are at least as well qualified to exercise the right of suffrage as the nonnative inhabitants who only speak a foreign language.

When the bill is read for amendment under the five-minute rule, I shall take pleasure in explaining the provisions of the bill more in detail, in the event that explanation is desired. I shall now proceed to discuss, as briefly as I may, that section which withdraws the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippines and confers upon them full and complete independence after a specified period.

This section is known as the Clarke amendment. It is the only section over which there has been any controversy, the only one that has proven a stumbling block to our friends of the minority.

Some misapprehension seems to exist as to the history as well as the scope and meaning of the Clarke amendment. The impression seems to prevail in some quarters that the Clarke amendment was substituted in the Senate for the preamble to the bill which passed this House by an overwhelming majority in the Sixty-third Congress. Senate bill 381, now the subject of consideration, as introduced in that body did not contain the House bill preamble, which declared that the Philippines should be granted their independence as soon as a stable government was established therein. The preamble of the Senate bill, as introduced, declared it to be the purpose of the United States to grant independence to the people of the Philippine Islands when, in the judgment of the United States, they "shall have shown themselves to be fitted therefor." As reported to the Senate, this language was so changed as to read that independence should be granted when "it will be to the permanent interest of the people of the Philippine Islands." To say to the Philippine people that they shall be granted their independence when they have shown themselves to be fitted therefor would be to offer a gratuitous insult to an intelligent, brave, and sensitive people. To tell them that independence shall be theirs when, in the judgment of the United States, it will be to their permanent interest would be a cruel mockery. Such a declaration of purpose ignores completely the interest of the American people. It might result—and, in the opinion of many people, would result—in compelling the United States to retain possession of the Philippine Islands forever. No matter what the cost in blood or in treasure, it would bind the United States to hold and protect them through all time. It would destroy the dearest hope and the loftiest aspirations of the Filipino people and plunge them into blackest gloom and despair. It would add immeasurably to the difficulties of American administration of their affairs, and if it did not eventually lead to revolution it would at least kindle the fires of distrust and hatred of the American people in the heart of every patriotic Filipino.

It was this declaration of purpose in the bill which we are now considering for which the Clarke amendment was substituted. It was not a question between the promise of independence so soon as a stable government should be established in the Philippine Islands, as contained in the House preamble, and the promise of independence at a specified period, as set forth in the Clarke amendment, that the Senate was called upon to vote. The choice presented to the Senate was between a vague, indefinite, meaningless, and almost inconceivable proposition and an honest effort to redeem the solemn promises which the Democratic Party, at least, have been making the Philippine people for the past decade and a half.

The Clarke amendment is much broader in scope and more comprehensive in meaning than is admitted by its critics. A systematic, well-organized, and persistent effort has been made to create the impression that it ignores American and other foreign interests in the Philippines. On the contrary, it specifically clothes the President of the United States with the power and authority to make such orders and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of the Philippines as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the Philippines, to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States and of other countries resident or engaged in business in the islands or having property interests therein.

The President is thus invested with full power to take every step that is possible to protect and safeguard every American or other foreign interest in the islands; and, to my mind, it would be difficult to make the language which is employed in the bill more binding upon the Chief Executive of the United States or more comprehensive in its scope.

But our friends of the minority insist that the authority thus conferred upon the President to settle and adjust personal and property rights between citizens of the United States and the Philippines is not broad enough to cover certain Philippine bonds issued under authority of Congress. They argue that any promise or guaranty given by the Philippine government either as to property rights or the rights of the holders of Philippine bonds, which they distinguish from property rights, would be worthless. My reply to this is that no President of the United States would ever draw so nice a distinction as this, thus discriminating between different classes of American investors in the Philippines. I may say further, however, for the benefit of holders of Philippine bonds who honestly hold this opinion, that I have assurances that the administration will ask Congress to remove all doubt that could possibly exist upon this subject by specifically clothing the President with the power and authority to safeguard, as far as it is possible to do so, the interests of every holder of Philippine bonds. That it would not be possible for the President to do this, I do not believe for one moment, and therefore I feel that every American investment in the islands will be as safe under Philippine sovereignty as under the sovereignty of this country.

It is not contended that the United States is in any way legally responsible for the payment of these Philippine bonds, which amount, in the aggregate, to $16,125,000. It is claimed, because they were issued and sold under authority conferred by Congress upon the Philippine government, that some moral obligation rests on the United States to see to their payment. It is true that the average price at which they sold was something over 6 per cent above par. They all bear 4 per cent interest, and are exempt from all taxation in the United States as well as in the Philippines, and had they been guaranteed by the United States they would probably have sold for 20 per cent, or even more, above par. They are now selling for less than par; but if Congress were to guarantee their payment, their price would at once advance to something like 12 per cent above par. However, I have assurances from representatives of the American Banking Association that if Congress will specifically authorize the President to take such steps as may be possible to safeguard the payment of these bonds, such action will be satisfactory. I feel sure, as I have indicated, that this will be done, and I trust that when it is done it will put at ease all holders of Philippine bonds.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Just for a question.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to know whether, if the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands was turned over to the Philippine people, they would not be able to repudiate the bonds which were issued, and which are guaranteed by the Philippine government as it stands to-day, for the construction of that railroad.

Mr. JONES. No; I think not, if the President of the United States carries out in good faith—as I believe will be done—the authority conferred upon him in this bill. [Applause.] However, I will say again that I have assurances from representatives of the American Banking Association that if Congress will specifically authorize the President to take such steps as may be possible to safeguard the payment of these bonds, such action will be satisfactory. I feel sure, as I have indicated, that this will be done, and I trust that when it is done it will put at ease all holders of Philippine bonds.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield just for a question.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the bankers accept the security of the Philippine government and their guaranty or the guaranty of our Government?

Mr. JONES. I am assured by representatives of the American Banking Association that if specific authority is conferred upon the President of the United States to make such arrangements with the Philippine government that is to be set up in the islands in the event of independence, as it is possible for him to make, it will be satisfactory to that important association.

Mr. AUSTIN. Suppose the Government should fail——

Mr. JONES. I can not enter into a discussion of that supposition with the gentleman. He starts out with suppose this and suppose that.

The Philippine government has also guaranteed the payment of interest for a limited term of years upon certain railway bonds, the proceeds of which may have been used in constructing railroads in the islands. The holders of the interest-guaranteed bonds of the Manila Railway Co. do not appear to be disturbed over the Clarke amendment. That corporation, for reasons upon which I do not care to enter at this time, appears to be in a bad way financially, and negotiations are pending by which the Philippine government will in all probability take over its property. The President of the Philippine Railway Co., however, appears to be greatly perturbed in mind lest Philippine independence may result in loss to the holders of the interest-guaranteed bonds of his corporation; and, in response to a circular letter sent out by him to the holders of these bonds, Mem-

bers of Congress are being deluged with letters calling upon them to vote against the Clarke amendment unless some provision is made by which these bonds shall be protected. It is not claimed that the moral obligation of the United States to meet the interest and provide for the ultimate redemption of these bonds is quite so strong as that which exists in the case of the Philippine bonds; but it is stated in the views of the minority that subscriptions for these bonds were received by the Bureau of Insular Affairs. I do not know upon what authority this statement is made, but I do know that it is absolutely groundless. It is true that in an advertisement of an issue of these bonds in 1908 it was stated that the subscription would be opened simultaneously by certain financial institutions and the Bureau of Insular Affairs; but no subscriptions were ever received by that bureau, and such communications as were received were at once transmitted to William Salomon & Co., bankers, of New York City, who signed this advertisement. The first advertisement of these bonds did not name the Bureau of Insular Affairs as one of the places where subscriptions would be received, but inasmuch as the bids received were disappointing to the syndicate underwiting these railroad obligations its purpose in including the Bureau of Insular Affairs in the subsequent advertisement was evidently to induce the public to pay a higher price for them. These bonds were publicly sold as low at 86 cents on the dollar, and I am informed that at private sales they sold for as low as 60 cents on the dollar. They are now selling for something like 46 cents on the dollar. Should the Government of the United States guarantee their payment, their present value would be more than doubled, and their holders would thus pocket several million dollars. It is only necessary to state these facts in order to make it plain that no Member of this House would have the temerity, if he had the desire, to vote to make the United States responsible for these railroad bonds, which the act of Congress which authorized the Philippine government to guarantee their interest expressly declared should not be sold for less than par. By what legerdemain they were actually sold for less than par is another story. So much for the argument that the Philippines should not be granted their independence so long as their bonded indebtedness is not in some way guaranteed by the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. HILL. The Philippine bonds are exempted from taxation in the United States. What becomes of that exemption if we surrender sovereignty in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. JONES. That exemption stands, and these bonds will never be subject to taxation in the United States.

Mr. HILL. They will be in the position of bonds of a foreign country exempted from taxation by our own people.

Mr. JONES. That is true; but it will have been done under very peculiar circumstances, and inasmuch as these bonds are held for the most part by American citizens I do not think the gentleman would vote to remove that exemption.

Mr. HILL. I do not know. I want to find out what the result of this bill is.

Mr. COADY. At what price did the gentleman say these bonds sold?

Mr. JONES. They sold on the market for as low as 86 cents on the dollar, and I understand they are selling now for about 45 cents on the dollar.

Mr. COADY. I would like to correct the gentleman, if he will permit me.

Mr. JONES. I hope the gentleman will do it in his own time, because these figures are absolutely correct. I have them from the War Department. [Applause.]

Mr. COADY. I have documents here from one of the savings banks of Baltimore city, which shows that they were bought at 95.

Mr. JONES. Some of them were sold at 95, but I said in my remarks that others were sold at public auction for as low as 86. I did not undertake to say what the highest price was, but none ever sold as high as par, and Congress provided in the act which authorized their issue that not one dollar should be sold for less than par. [Applause.]

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

Mr. JONES. With pleasure.

Mr. CANNON. Assuming that the bill passes and four years elapse; you have that independence on paper in the Philippines and the 4 per cent bonds—I am not speaking of the railway bonds—are exempt from taxation in the United States and have not been paid, and that we have in the Philippines the conditions that we have substantially now in Mexico, what would be the attitude of the Government of the United States? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JONES. In the first place I shall not assume that we will ever have in the Philippines such conditions as prevail in the Republic of Mexico to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not think that any gentleman who understands the difference between the character of the inhabitants of Mexico and that of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands would for one moment suggest a comparison between the two. [Applause.]

The manufacturers of certain American products, for which they have been finding a market in the Philippines, have also been busy in urging Members of Congress to vote against the Clarke amendment upon the ground that the alienation of the Philippines would mean to them the loss of that market. A manufacturer of cotton goods, claiming to represent 13 such concerns, recently strove to convince me that the Clarke amendment should not be adopted because it would mean an annual loss to the cotton manufacturers of a trade approximating $5,000,000 in value. He made the astounding statement, too, that the manufacturers' profit on these goods did not exceed 5 per cent of their value. In other words, according to this manufacturer of cotton goods, it is the duty of the United States to retain possession of the Philippines indefinitely in order that he and his associates may put into their pockets the sum of $250,000 annually. Thus the altruistic arguments for retaining possession of the Philippines, so eloquently voiced by McKinley, Taft, and other Republican leaders, are now giving place to those of commercialism. The mask of altruism, heretofore concealing the real purposes and designs of the imperialistic advocates of colonialism, has at last been cast aside, and we are now given to see that the real, animating purpose of those who would retain possession of the Philippines forever, in utter disregard of the cost and danger involved in such a course to the United States, and in cruel indifference to the God-given rights of the Filipino people, is based in commercial greed. [Applause.] Precious little, if anything, is now heard of the high-sounding doctrine "The Philippines for the Filipinos." It has ceased to be the party cry of those who oppose Philippine independence. They are now openly and shamelessly appealing to the forces of selfishness and greed, heedless of the fact that it was President McKinley who said, "The Philippines are not ours to exploit, but to develop, to civilize, to educate, to train in the science of self-government." [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. No; not just now, if the gentleman will excuse me.

The minority ask, "If we 'Mexicanize' the Philippines, what will become of the property and lives of the Americans there." They would create the impression that if the Philippines are granted independence the lives and property of American residents of those islands would be as unsafe as they are in Mexico. This is a baseless and wholly unwarranted assumption. There is not the slightest similitude between the character, temperament, and disposition of the inhabitants of the Philippines and those of Mexico. Their peoples are so totally dissimilar in every important particular that no comparison between them is possible. The contrast is as light to darkness.

The Mexicans number 15,000,000, 80 per cent of whom are peons or savages, and of those only 2 per cent can read and write. So densely ignorant are the masses in Mexico and so utterly devoid of civic virtue that there were less than 20,000 votes cast when Madero was chosen President of the Republic. The great bulk of the Mexicans are turbulent, lawless, vengeful, treacherous, cruel, without respect for constituted authority, and utterly callous to all human rights. They entertain no regard for law and order and are amenable only to superior force. How about the Filipino people? More than half of them are literate and more than 90 per cent civilized and christianized. Although the Mexicans outnumber them as two to one and despite the fact that under the educational qualification which obtains in the Philippines and which limits that class of the electorate to those who can read and write either English or Spanish, considerably more than 200,000 votes are polled at their elections. The Moros, who constitute the only disturbing element in the whole Archipelago, number less than 4 per cent of the entire population, whilst in Mexico 40 per cent, or 6,000,000, of its population are pure-blood Indian savages. The Filipinos are an intelligent, docile, kindly, generous, peace-loving, Christian, law-abiding people, and their whole history belies the unjust imputation that they are to be compared to the desperadoes who infest Mexico and render property rights and even human life insecure. Nowhere is there to be found a higher type of the educated, refined, and cultured citizen than is to be found in the Philippines, and nothing is farther from the truth than the statement so often upon the lips of those who would hold the Filipinos in perpetual bondage that they are an illiterate and

densely ignorant people. There are those among them who have won distinction in every branch of higher learning—in medicine and in law, in literature and in philosophy, in science and in art. And there are about 500,000 Filipino children attending public schools and being taught in English. It is true that this does not embrace all the Filipino children of school age, but let us not forget that there are a number of States in our American Union where from 35 to 45 per cent of children of school age have never entered a schoolhouse.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can the gentleman cite those States?

Mr. JONES. I will furnish the gentleman with their names, but I can not do it offhand. I have examined the United States census and these figures are absolutely correct. I might feel some delicacy in giving the names of these States out of regard for my friend from Minnesota, for it may be that his is one of those States.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will state that 98 per cent of the people in Minnesota above the age of 8 years can read and write. I will ask the gentleman if the States that he mentions are not south of Mason and Dixon's line?

Mr. JONES. No; that is not true.

Even in the department of Mindanao and Sulu, where civil authority has with such marked success been substituted for military, many primary schools are now in successful operation, where Moros and Filipinos are being instructed side by side in the English language. These schools are not locally maintained, the funds therefor being largely provided out of the insular treasury, thus annihilating the oft-repeated slander that such a feeling of hatred exists between the Filipinos and the Moros that the former can not be intrusted with the government of the latter.

If the question of the future political status of the Philippine people is to be determined upon the basis of dollars and cents rather than that of justice and right, the sooner they are granted independence the better it will be for the American taxpayer. [Applause.]

The Philippines are costing the United States annually a larger sum than their total bonded obligations added to the total value of the cotton manufactures imported from the United States, about which Members of Congress are hearing so much these days. As a purely financial proposition, therefore, the American people could well afford, if relieved from the cost of holding the Philippines, to pay off every bond for which the Philippine Government is responsible, and to make the cotton manufacturers the gift of a sum equal to the total value of their exports to the Philippines. [Applause.]

It has not until recently been seriously claimed by any one familiar with the situation that the Philippines would ever prove commercially valuable to the United States. Mr. Taft and others have repeatedly admitted they never would, but the advocates of retention point to the fact that since the beginning of the European war the trade between the United States and the Philippines has greatly increased, and they argue therefrom that if it continues to increase in the same proportion it will, in a few years, justify from a commercial standpoint the indefinite retention of the islands. They apparently forget that the European war can not last forever, and they utterly ignore the fact that if it shall be decided to hold the Filipinos indefinitely they must be included in any program for national defense which Congress may adopt.

There may be room for difference of opinion as to what constitutes ample provision for national defense, but there can be none as to the obligation of the United States to defend every foot of territory over which the American flag floats, and the obligation to defend the Philippines against foreign attack, if they are to be held indefinitely, will be all the stronger, since they are held against the will of their people.

Many of those who favor the retention of the Philippines are among the most extreme advocates of what is called national preparedness. Do they realize what it would mean to the taxpayers of America to fortify and defend the Philippines on land and on sea? Already more than $10,000,000 have been expended in fortifying the entrance to the Bay of Manila. Who can say what it will cost to fortify all of the important ports of the entire Archipelago? There are now only 12,000 American soldiers in the islands. Who believes that 200,000 will be sufficient to garrison the forts that must be constructed and to defend the islands in the event of attack by some powerful nation? But it will require more than strong fortifications and large armies to successfully defend the Philippines against foreign invasion. To do so with any hope of success will necessitate the constant presence in the Orient of an American fleet at least equal in strength to that of any naval power which may attempt to seize the islands; and yet, whatever may be the cost in blood and in treasure of defending them, we shall be bound by every consideration of justice, honor, and national pride to undertake to do so, if it shall be determined to hold them permanently. I do not hesitate to express the opinion that it would be impossible to successfully defend them against any first-class military and naval power. Without the loyal and united support and cooperation of the Philippine people it would not be possible, in my judgment, for the United States to hold and defend the islands against foreign aggression. Notwithstanding that Spain conferred upon the Philippines the inestimable blessing of the Christian religion, so deep was the desire for liberty implanted in the hearts of the Filipino that they hailed with delight the advent of the soldiers of America, and eagerly joined with them in driving out the Spaniards; and if whilst holding them in subjection we shall become involved in some great conflict, may we not, with reason, expect that history will repeat itself?

I dismiss as unworthy of serious consideration the absurd and utterly untenable argument so frequently advanced that the Philippine people are incapable of maintaining their independence, and, if given it, must sooner or later become the prey of some stronger power, for this may be truthfully said of most of the nations of the earth. It is true as to Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland, and other countries of Europe. It is true of each and all of the Republics of South and Central America, and the halls of this Chamber have echoed for months with dismal forebodings as to the present ability of our own great Nation to successfully maintain itself against foreign attack. Even an international guaranty of the independence of poor, stricken Belgium did not save that gallant little nation from the horrible fate which has overtaken it. If, therefore, the Philippines are not to be given their independence until they are capable of maintaining it in arms, then they are doomed to everlasting political servitude.

Another of the stock arguments of the opponents of Philippine independence is that the Filipinos lack a common language. When the real facts are considered in the light of the history of the world, it will be seen that this argument, too, is entitled to little respect.

Half of the Philippine people speak either Visayan or Tagalog, and more speak English than any other tongue; so that with more than half a million children being daily taught in English, the day is not far distant when English will be the common medium of intercommunication throughout the archipelago.

But, Mr. Chairman, is it true that national spirit and national unity can not exist in the absence of a common language? Within the narrow limits of the British Isles Welsh, Cornish, Gaelic, and Scotch are spoken, and the names of the different languages spoken throughout the British colonies are legion. In Quebec, for instance, although for more than a hundred years under British dominion, French is universally spoken. There are four different languages spoken in Switzerland, and I shall not venture to give the number of those in Austria-Hungary. It has recently been ascertained that there are 41 languages and 51 dialects spoken in Mexico, and yet the wretched condition into which the unhappy country has sunk has never, I think, been attributed to the multiplicity of its languages.

Of the many indefensible arguments advanced by the imperialists against granting Philippine independence about the most absurd and groundless is that the Filipinos themselves do not desire it. I shall not be surprised if, during the course of this debate, some one does not have the temerity to make this claim and even to undertake to establish it by the production of a petition signed by a score or more Filipinos protesting against the passage of this bill. Then, too, it is highly probable that we shall be told that the Democratic Party in the Philippines has adopted resolutions protesting against the passage of this bill.

It may be true that there are a few Filipinos who are willing to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage, but there is no Democratic Party in the Philippines. Four years ago, as now, a few Americans domiciled in Manila got together and adopted a set of resolutions, and actually undertook to accredit delegates to the Baltimore convention, but that convention very promptly, and very properly, refused to accept their credentials or to permit them to participate in its deliberations.

It ought not to be denied by anybody that the Filipinos as a whole desire independence. This is abundantly testified to by the sacrifices they have made and the blood they have shed in their efforts to secure it. The desire for freedom is universal. It is confined to no class or condition of men, and it pervades every part of the civilized and Christianized portions of the islands.

The fires of liberty, kindled in the hearts of the Filipinos by such patriots as the martyred Rizal, have never died out and they will never cease to burn so long as the spirit of freedom shall continue to animate mankind.

The minority undertake to support their contention that it is unwise to fix a definite date for Philippine independence by quoting the opinions upon this subject expressed years ago by ex-Presidents Roosevelt and Taft. Instead of informing us as to the views held in the past by former President Roosevelt it would have been more to the point to have been told what are the present views of that Republican statesman. In his book entitled "Fear God and Take Your Own Part," recently published, Mr. Roosevelt comes out squarely and unequivocally for Philippine independence. He says:

> We have promised the Filipinos independence in terms which were inevitably understood to be independence in the immediate future.

And he adds:

> Let us, then, as speedily as possible, leave the Philippines; and as the Philippines desire us to leave we would be quit of all moral obligations for them, and would under no circumstances be obliged to defend them from other nations.

Realizing, as every other intelligent American must, the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of defending a group of islands extending over a wide area and 7,000 miles distant from our shores, Mr. Roosevelt declares that "Alaska, Hawaii, our own coasts, and the Panama Canal and its approaches" constitute "the military problem with which we should grapple." In view of the fact that Mr. Roosevelt will in likelihood be the next presidential candidate of the Republican Party, I commend his latest and most unequivocal utterances in respect to the future political status of the Philippines to my Republican friends who may be contemplating voting against this bill, and who yet feel a lively interest in the outcome of the approaching Chicago convention.

I may add that if Mr. Roosevelt succeeds in making himself the Republican candidate and in having himself elected, he may not wait for a Republican Congress to set the Philippines free, but may, of his own volition, withdraw the American troops, pull down the American flag, and grant the Filipinos their freedom. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Why does not the Democratic President pull down the flag and withdraw the troops?

Mr. JONES. Because there is no authority under the Constitution for such action. It was Mr. Roosevelt, who, in the absence of constitutional authority, took the Isthmus of Panama. No Democratic President ever did such a thing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SNYDER. He did not pull down the United States flag.

Mr. JONES. No; he did not pull down the United States flag, but he pulled down the flag of a friendly nation—the flag of Colombia.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman state what Democratic President it was that pulled down the flag of Hawaii?

Mr. JONES. It is preposterous to say that the Filipinos are ignorant as to the provisions of this bill. It has been published in full in the Philippines in both English and Spanish and in at least one of the principal native languages of the islands. It has been published too in pamphlet form in Tagalog, and I am informed by an American friend in Manila that one native bookstore sold within a short period more than 100,000 copies of this publication. It has the support of all the political parties in the Philippines, and Gov. Gen. Harrison has cabled his approval and expressed the earnest hope that it may be speedily enacted into law. In the face of such testimony as this how vain it is for Members to assert upon this floor that the Filipinos do not desire their freedom.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Does the gentleman refer to Senate bill 381?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Senate bill 381 has ever been published in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. JONES. I do.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I think the gentleman is the only man in the world who thinks so.

Mr. JONES. I am so informed, and I have in my possession a pamphlet in which this bill is translated into Tagalog, and I shall be glad to hand it to the gentleman for his enlightenment. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is it not a fact that all political parties have approved the Jones bill for two years?

Mr. JONES. Yes; and it is also a fact that they all approved the Senate bill.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Do they approve any kind of a bill?

Mr. JONES. Any bill that is an advance over the previous bill; any bill that will give them their freedom and independence a year sooner than another bill will do it.

Mr. Chairman, that great Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, is best known to the world as the author of the Declaration of Independence, and yet it may be truthfully affirmed of him that his highest title to fame rests upon a broader and firmer foundation than even the authorship of that immortal document.

He was the greatest apostle of human liberty that the world has ever produced—the most courageous as he was the ablest champion of free popular government known to ancient or modern history. The political aphorisms of Thomas Jefferson are so universally true as to be applicable to all the peoples of the earth, to the inhabitants of the Eastern as well as those of the Western Hemisphere. If they could be read and understood by every patriotic American citizen there would be no Philippine problem to vex our minds and disturb our peace.

When Thomas Jefferson asserted that "Every man and every body of men on earth possesses the right to self-government," he did not intend to be understood as limiting that axiomatic declaration to the people who constituted the American colonists then struggling for their independence.

In his first inaugural address, that great document in which are formulated with matchless perspicuity and force the essential principles of democracy, these words are to be found:

> Sometimes it is said that man can not be trusted with the government of himself. Can he then be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

But nowhere, and at no time, has the imperishable truth that self-government is a right inherent in all men been so clearly and so strikingly set forth as in these words of the Declaration of Independence:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the principles enunciated by Thomas Jefferson have never been repudiated by the party which he founded. The Democratic Party stands to-day precisely were it stood a century ago. In one form or another it has reaffirmed its fealty to the principles laid down by its great founder in every platform which it has ever adopted. In every national platform which it has promulgated since the Philippine Islands were ceded to the United States it has solemnly declared itself in favor of the independence of those islands, and my faith in the integrity of the party to which I have given the adherence of a lifetime is so unfaltering that I can never believe it will be guilty of the political perfidy and cowardice of proclaiming itself as favoring a policy which it is not willing to defend and enforce. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It has seemed to me, Mr. Chairman, that in discussing a measure designed to carry into effect Democratic promises of independence for the Philippines, it was not inappropriate that I should invoke the power and authority of the mighty name of the greatest of all Democrats to the end that the Democratic Party, now that it is clothed with full legislative and executive power, shall not falter in what I hold to be its highest duty. For I can not if I would disguise the fact that there are those who, professing to believe in its principles, are nevertheless endeavoring to prevent the consummation of the lofty and patriotic purposes to which it is so solmenly committed. They would, upon one pretext or another, have the Democratic Party, now that it has been given the opportunity to redeem its promises, abandon its position in respect to the Philippines and cravenly acquiesce in a policy which Democrats for a decade and a half have denounced with one accord as prompted by commercial greed, as unconstitutional, unpatriotic, and cruelly unjust both to the American and Filipino people—a disgraceful policy of criminal aggression which, if persisted in, must result in the destruction of the free principles upon which this Republic was founded. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I would not, of course, be understood as intimating that all who hold that the time has not come when the Filipinos can be safely intrusted with their freedom are inspired by commercial greed or any other unworthy motive; but, whatever may be their incentives, Democrats at least are strangely unmindful of the teachings of Jefferson, and either ignorant of or indifferent to their party's position upon this great, burning, living issue.

I do not minimize in the least the influences of a commercial and business character that are being exerted to defeat Philippine independence, and I know, too, that there are still other powerful influences at work with the same end in view, but my faith in the patriotism and sense of justice and fair dealing of the membership of this body is such that I do not permit myself to doubt what the issue will be.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to say, in conclusion, that fervently believing with that great apostle of human liberty, Thomas Jefferson, "that the people of every country are the only safe guardians of their own rights," my prayer is that the day is not far distant when we shall see arise in the Far East a free and independent Christian nation, to be known throughout the world as the "Republic of the Philippine Islands." [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for four hours. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, this is a great anniversary. On this date, May 1, 1898, occurred the battle and victory of Manila Bay, one of the honor days, one of the heroic days, one of the immortal days, of American history. As long as the Republic lives and her children gather to read the story of her birth and growth so long will they thrill with pride as they read the story of Dewey's victory on that day. [Applause on the Republican side.] With the *Olympia* leading, in the obscurity of the early dawn, past the frowning fortress of Corregidor, past the belching batteries of El Fraile, past the bursting mines strewn in the uncharted channel, out into the unknown waters of Manila Bay steamed the American fleet. To meet the little squadron there were drawn up in a long crescent-shaped line of battle seven Spanish ships of war, supported by the land batteries of Cavite. A few minutes after 5 there floated from the signal mast of the *Olympia* the order, "Prepare for general action," and instantly in response on all the American ships the Stars and Stripes floated on the breeze. The Spaniards at once opened fire from ship and shore. Steaming slowly ahead Commodore Dewey and his flag officer, Capt. Gridley, stood on the bridge of the *Olympia*, tranquilly observing the shell fire of the enemy, which lashed the waters about them into yellow foam Presently the commodore, turning quietly to his companion, remarked in a casual tone, "You may fire when you are ready, Gridley." In seven hours time, the Spanish fleet was annihilated, the Battle of Manila Bay had been fought and won, and the United States became a world power.

In this country popular enthusiasm was unbounded. No victory ever achieved by American valor had so stirred the patriotic fervor of the Nation. Nor was praise and admiration confined to the United States. The London Times declared:

> The destruction of the Spanish fleet was as complete as any achievement in naval annals. Dewey showed himself worthy alike of the finest traditions of the United States Navy and of his kinship with the race which produced Nelson.

The Kaiser, when the news was reported to him, said:

> There is evidently something besides smartness and commercialism in the Yankee blood! Those fellows at Cavite fought like veterans.

It was a proud day for America. It will ever remain a "red-letter" day in our history.

As a celebration of that great event it is proposed on this eighteenth anniversary to say to the historians, "Wipe out that chapter of our history, it was a mistake"; to say to our own people, "We need the money for other things, the Philippines are costing us too much"; to say to the nations of the world, "We are afraid to try to keep the islands our sailors and soldiers fought for. If any of you want them, take them; we are too proud to fight." [Applause on the Republican side.]

ARE THE ISLANDS A SOURCE OF WEAKNESS?

Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the gentleman from Virginia that the Philippines are a source of weakness and that we ought to get rid of them. That argument is strained and weak and is based on a singlar inconsistency. On the one hand, it is urged that the Filipinos are amply able to take care of themselves and should be given their independence. On the other hand, it is urged that with the assistance of the United States they would be defenseless and easy victims of any predatory nation. The Filipinos alone would be invincible, but with the assistance of the American Army and Navy they would be helpless! That implies the utter incapacity of American arms. The argument then proceeds to claim that the United States would be stronger without the help of nine or ten million of Filipinos fighting with us to protect their homes than it would be with such help. That assumes the utter worthlessness of the Filipinos.

Neither of these assumptions are justified. The Filipinos are a brave, courageous people and make good soldiers. Gen. "Chinese" Gordon, as he is called, was one of the most illustrious officers who ever led English soldiers. He said of the Philippine troops who formed part of his forces in the China war:

> They are a fine, sturdy body of fellows, faithful and long-suffering, bearing hardships without murmurs, plucky, and never losing heart in defeat, and considerably superior to the Japanese.

We have more than 5,000 Philippine Scouts now in the islands, and have made them a part of the American Army. They are well trained, armed, and equipped, and remarkably efficient. We have also over 5,000 Philippine Constabulary, trained by United States officers, and thoroughly competent for any military service. These forces can be increased to any number thought necessary when sufficient revenues can be secured to maintain them. A force of 200,000 men could be secured for the defense of the islands if there was money to pay them.

The land forces of the Philippines can be increased as increasing revenue will permit, and can be trained under our own officers to become a strong and sufficient army for the defense of the islands. But with the American withdrawal and the consequent loss of revenue, without arms, ammunition, or training or officers, the Filipinos would be helpless.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; for a question.

Mr. GORDON. Does the gentleman propose to tax the American people to raise 195,000 additional men to defend the Philippines?

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman heard me imperfectly, I think. I said the Philippines were not able now to support a defensive force, but as they become economically stronger with the development of the islands under American supervision their forces could be increased from their own establishment and paid for from their own revenues.

Mr. GORDON. Suppose you could not increase them?

Mr. TOWNER. I can not yield any further on that line, I regret to say.

But that is only one phase of the question. If it be admitted that the islands are a source of weakness in so far as military operations by land forces are concerned, the case is far different from a naval standpoint. We have determined to become for our own protection either the first or the second naval power of the world, and to keep that place. It is now apparent that we must control the Pacific for our own self-preservation. That means a fleet on the Pacific strong enough to protect every American coast that borders on its shores. If we are unable to defend the Philippines, we are unable to defend Guam, we are unable to defend Samoa, we are unable to defend the Hawaiian Islands [applause on the Republican side], we are unable to defend Alaska, we are unable to defend the Pacific coast of our own country, and we are unable to defend the Canal Zone. All of these are vulnerable without a commanding navy. If we are to surrender the Philippines because of their military weakness, we should also surrender Guam, Samoa, the Hawaiians, Alaska, and the Canal Zone. This it is not suggested we should do, and with a Navy sufficient to protect these we can not only protect the Philippines, but it will strengthen our Navy to have them as a base.

Naval bases and coaling stations are as necessary for extensive fleet operations as are ships and sailors. But it is said we can retain a naval base and coaling station there and let the islands go. When we dissociate our interests from the Filipinos we make our occupancy in their territory impossible and unsafe. United we can both easily stand; divided we would most certainly fall. Besides, with the islands in the possession of Germany or Japan we could not protect and preserve a coaling station or naval base.

If Japan should send an army to invade and occupy the Philippines it would have to maintain it there. Without the control of the seas, its only line of communication, it could not do so. The control of the seas is our defense of the Philippines, as it is of our other Pacific possessions. Having the mastery of the Pacific, as we must have to protect our other Pacific territory, the possession of the Philippines is not only an advantage, it is indispensable.

It is strange that while every other great nation considers the Philippines a source of strength, there are so many in the United States who consider them a source of weakness. Gentlemen who consider the Philippines, so far from our shores and so near Japan, a source of military weakness might ask themselves if they would consider the occupancy of Magdalena Bay in Mexico a source of military weakness to Japan. Yet this Government, as everybody knows, would go to war with Japan before it would allow such action to be taken. When a Japanese cruiser, chasing a German war vessel, ran aground in Turtle Bay and other Japanese ships went to her relief, the whole Pacific coast

was panic-stricken because it was asserted Japan was preparing to acquire a source of "military weakness" on the Mexican coast. If a settlement by a European power in Mexico, or the Caribbean Sea, or in South America would weaken rather than strengthen a European power, we ought, as an act of preparedness, to encourage rather than protest. Our Monroe doctrine is based on the theory that such possession would be a source of strength to them and a menace to us.

It is the counsel of fear rather than of reason that favors the relinquishment of the Philippines. Unless we have the power to hold the Philippines we might as well surrender in advance the control of the Pacific. A power so dreaded as to compel our surrender of the Philippines can drive our commerce from the Pacific, take our other insular possessions, dispossess us of the Panama Canal, and dictate on what terms we may trade with the Orient. Gentlemen who so believe and advise are not in accord with the traditions and spirit of true Americanism.

The gentleman from Virginia with great care cites some statements from Mr. Roosevelt, recently made, that as the Democratic Party has promised independence, and the Philippines can not easily be defended, we might as well let them go. This late conversion of that gentleman to the Democratic position so pleases the gentleman from Virginia that he nominates his convert as the Republican candidate for the Presidency. I noticed that all the applause given that nomination was on the Democratic side of the House. Not a single handclap was heard on the Republican side. The exceeding popularity of that gentleman's candidacy with the entire Democratic Party does not sufficiently recommend it to Republicans to induce them to accept it, in my opinion. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I wonder if the mention of the name of either of the living ex-Presidents would bring much more applause?

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think the mention of the name of the President would bring much applause?

Mr. TOWNER. I presume sincere expressions of approval would be difficult to obtain at this time.

WHAT THE FILIPINOS WANT.

The Philippine Islands are now self-supporting. The total revenue of the Government is about $17,000,000 annually. It is almost wholly derived from customs and internal revenues. Under powers given it in this bill their resources can be materially increased. The greatest potential wealth of the islands lies in their agricultural resources, the public lands, timber, mines, and water power. To develop and at the same time conserve these will furnish ample and continually increasing revenue for the islands. The Philippines are at present the richest undeveloped region in the world.

For such development capital is the first essential, and capital will not be invested unless there is a reasonable certainty of security. The American withdrawal now, making worthless American investments in the islands, would make it almost certain no foreign capital would go into the islands except for a sinister purpose. Indeed it is difficult to see how the islands can obtain funds to maintain a separate government. Certainly they could not raise and maintain an army. They could not build a navy. They could not borrow money unless they placed themselves under obligations to some nation desirous of controlling or absorbing them. Indeed I can not believe there is any real desire among Filipinos of responsibility for independence unguaranteed.

I remember that only a few months ago that distinguished representative of the Philippines, that brilliant gentleman whom we so admire, said that what they wanted was their independence with an American protectorate.

Mr. QUEZON. Is the gentleman referring to me?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. QUEZON. I never made that statement.

Mr. TOWNER. You did not?

Mr. QUEZON. Never.

Mr. TOWNER. You are quoted as having made it.

Mr. QUEZON. I never made the statement.

Mr. TOWNER. The New York Evening Post, which ought to be considered by you as very good authority, for it is very strongly in favor of Philippine independence, quotes you as saying:

> I have found, after talking with both politicians and these men in the Philippines that they consider a United States protectorate as a more efficient guaranty of the integrity of the Philippines and less liable to produce friction which might result in the absorption of the Philippines by other nations. Speaker Osmena believes with me.

Mr. QUEZON. I want to say that the statement is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. TOWNER. And you were not alone in being so reported. Your colleague, Mr. EARNSHAW, is reported as saying in an interview never repudiated:

> That the United States should, for a period, exercise a protectorate over us until we are able to walk alone among the nations of the earth is a plan which I feel certain meets the approval of all patriotic Filipinos.

The Democratic Party of the Philippines recently assembled to select delegates to the forthcoming Democratic national convention. They adopted resolutions which declared:

> We denounce and repudiate as un-American, un-Democratic, and cruelly unjust to the Filipino people any policy which would cast this people adrift in the dangerous sea of international politics without adequate financial resources and no protection or guaranty of their national integrity.

Instances could be multiplied to show that the people of the islands who want independence desire that the United States shall guarantee their independence until they can take care of themselves.

DEMOCRATIC PROMISES.

Those Democrats of the Philippines have a right to appeal to the Democrats of the United States that no action be taken that casts them adrift without protection. The Democratic Party have always demanded independence for the islands, and have always promised to guarantee it. Now, when they have the power and are called upon to fulfill their promises they propose to get rid of the islands and let them shift for themselves. They are willing to give them their independence, but are unwilling to keep their equally binding pledge to guarantee them against domestic insurrection or foreign invasion.

In their last national platform, adopted in 1912, the Democratic Party declared:

> We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

The party representatives are ready now to give the Filipinos their independence without waiting until a stable government can be established, and they utterly repudiate their promise to guarantee such independence. For years the Democratic Party has called upon Republicans to fulfill what they are pleased to assert was an implied promise. Now we press upon Democrats the observance not of an implied promise but of an express promise—one to the American people that we would not release the Philippines until a stable government had been or could be established; the other to the Filipinos that they should not be cast adrift without protection. Both of these promises the majority will break if it adopts the Clarke amendment.

THE CLARKE AMENDMENT.

The history of the Clarke amendment is not creditable to its sponsors. What is known as the Jones bill was introduced in the Sixty-third Congress and passed the House October 14, 1914, by a large majority. It failed of consideration by the Senate. It was introduced in the Sixty-fourth Congress in the Senate by Senator HITCHCOCK, chairman of the Senate committee, and reintroduced in the House by Mr. JONES, chairman of the House committee. The Senate took up the consideration of the bill before the House, and during the discussion of the preamble, regarding which there was great diversity of opinion among Senators, Senator CLARKE of Arkansas introduced as a substitute for all suggested preambles his provision, which is now section 34 of the pending bill. The preamble originally reported with the Senate bill declared the purpose of the United States to be that independence should be granted "when in the judgment of the United States it will be to the permanent interest of the people of the Philippine Islands." The House bill provided that the United States would recognize the independence of the islands "as soon as a stable government can be established," the House preamble being in exact conformity to the party platform declaration.

The Clarke substitute abandoned both preambles and declared the United States would withdraw from the Philippines in not less than two nor more than four years. It was not believed that such an amendment would receive any considerable support, but when the vote was taken there were 41 yeas and 41 nays; the Vice President voted "yea," and the amendment was adopted. Five Republicans voted for it, and 11 Democrats voted against it.

As a substantive piece of legislation, I do not hesitate to characterize it as discreditable and absurd. It is utterly out of harmony with every other provision of the bill. The bill as a whole provides for a new constitution of government which shall supersede the present system. If adopted, it will require a complete reorganization of the existing establishment. An

elective senate is created, new officers must be elected, and a greatly enlarged electorate is provided. Under existing law the present electorate is about 275,000. Under the new law it will be increased to between 800,000 and 900,000. To these new voters, who never cast a ballot before because of lack of educational qualifications, will be intrusted the formation of a new government, the installation of a new nation.

And this new government, which is to last only two or three years and is then to be cast aside for the new republic, or whatever they shall create, can be of no possible value to anybody. It can do nothing the existing government could not do and do far better than the new government created by the bill. In other words, if the Clarke amendment is adopted, all the rest of the bill is worse than useless. It will only put upon an excited, distracted, disorganized people a costly burden and cast upon an electorate, two-thirds of which never voted before upon any proposition, the most intricate and difficult task any people are ever called upon to perform. If the Clarke amendment is to prevail, then the Senate bill and the Jones bill should both be abandoned, for under such circumstances they are unnecessary, unwise, and dangerous.

It is generally supposed that the United States has the power under the provisions of the Clarke amendment to delay the separation four or five years. That is a mistake. The Filipinos have that power, but not the United States. Full power to take steps to institute their new independent government is given them as soon as their provisional government is instituted. It can not be consummated in less than two years, but if they have their new independent government ready for recognition at the end of two years, and desire us to recognize it—whatever it is, republic, monarchy, or what not—we bind our ourselves by the Clarke amendment to withdraw and recognize its independence.

If in its substance this Clarke amendment is absurd, in purpose it is dishonorable and cowardly. It is dishonorable because by abandoning the islands in a fit of petulance we are falsifying every statement of purpose we have made to the Filipinos and to the world during the 18 years of our occupancy. We have promised to educate them, to develop them, to elevate them, to give them from time to time larger measures of self-government until they would be able to take care of themselves, if at that time they should decide to ask for separation. Men may differ as to when that time shall come, but very few, indeed, claim that it had now arrived.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman is debating a feature of this matter in which I am very much interested. What time would the gentleman suggest as the time when we might properly withdraw?

Mr. TOWNER. That question can be decided when we come to the time, when it is really debatable. My position is that it is not even debatable now. I think the gentleman will hardly contend that at the present time or that within two years the people of the Philippines could take care of themselves.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, I do not agree with the gentleman at all, although I do not pretend to know.

Mr. TOWNER. I agree with the gentleman that we do not any of us know when the time shall come when we can safely grant independence to the Philippines. We ought not to speak dogmatically about it, and certainly we ought not to act precipitately about it. What we should do should be governed by a sense of duty and obligation and responsibility, and not from pique, impatience, or a desire to get rid of what might be considered an unpleasant duty.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the gentleman on that; but I want to ask him this question: Did the gentleman vote in favor of returning Cuba to the Cubans?

Mr. TOWNER. I was not in Congress then.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the gentleman have favored such action?

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman very frankly that I would.

Mr. McKELLAR. There are not so many literate Cubans as there are literate Filipinos. Is not that so?

Mr. TOWNER. Perhaps so, but the proportion is greater.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why make one rule for the Cubans and another rule for the Filipinos?

Mr. TOWNER. That is very easy to answer, for before we entered the War with Spain to free Cuba we promised solemnly to the world that we would not stay in Cuba.

Mr. McKELLAR. Ah, but is not our implied promise to the Filipinos just exactly what our express promise was to the Cubans? [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to my friend that there has not at any time been any suggestion even of an implied promise to fix any definite date for independence. Your party promised independence when a stable government could be established, and when your committee reported a bill fixing the time for independence at 1921, your party leaders repudiated it and forced its withdrawal. Since then you have never dared to fix a date.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are fixing a time now.

Mr. TOWNER. No; you have not done so yet.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are trying to.

Mr. TOWNER. You are trying now to pass a bill that was not formed by the Democratic committee of either the Senate or House, which was disapproved by your Bureau of Insular Affairs, by your Secretary of War, and by your President until he has again changed his mind and asked you to do so, too. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KELLEY. In the case of Cuba did not this Government go back a second time and establish order there?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. KELLEY. Is there anything in this bill which would require us to do that?

Mr. TOWNER. No. In the case of Cuba we reserved that right in the treaty and afterwards exercised it.

Besides we should remember that we are under obligation, because of the Monroe doctrine, to protect Cuba in any event. We did not extend that doctrine when we guaranteed Cuban independence. But we have not extended the Monroe doctrine to the Philippines. We would not be under any obligation, unless we expressly agreed to do so, to protect them, or to prevent any nation from subjugating them and absorbing them after our withdrawal. In the case of Cuba we were only acting in accordance with the traditional policy of the country, in accordance with that doctrine which no party in the United States has ever dared repudiate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman permit me again?

Mr. TOWNER. Just another question.

Mr. McKELLAR. The gentleman said, "in accordance with our traditional policy." Is it in accordance with our traditional policy to govern a foreign people without their consent?

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman that we have governed foreign people without their consent from the very commencement of the Republic. There has never been an hour that we have not done so. We did so when we purchased Florida, when we acquired Louisiana, when we secured California, when we bought Alaska, when we annexed Hawaii. We have governed the Indians, an alien race, without their consent from the beginning, and do so now. We even to this day preserve the fiction of treating them as foreign powers and making treaties with them.

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

Mr. TOWNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to ask the gentleman if the provisions of the Clarke amendment were submitted to the Filipino people for ratification, by referendum, what does the gentleman think the result would be?

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman, frankly, that I think they would vote for it.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Replying to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], is it not true that Jefferson, the great apostle of self-government, purchased Louisiana and governed its people without their consent?

Mr. TOWNER. For years; for decades.

Now, let me say, further, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] asked me what would be the opinion of the Filipinos regarding the Clarke amendment. I think the Filipino people generally have the idea that independence is the most desirable thing on earth. Many of them do not understand what it means. I believe the more intelligent and educated do not desire it without a guaranty. They know that unprotected independence to them would be a vain and idle thing which they might lose within 24 hours.

Mr. GALLAGHER. But the Clarke amendment provides that the United States shall cut away from them entirely.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; it wipes it all out. It proceeds upon the theory that we are under no further obligation to them.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That was the idea of my question. What would they do if they really understood it?

Mr. TOWNER. It is hard to say. They have been so long clamoring for independence that they might still demand it on any terms and take the chances.

But that would not lessen our responsibility nor relieve us from the full performance of our duty. If we believe it probable

that the Filipino people are not now prepared to assume the full responsibility of nationality, if we believe that domestic insurrection would follow our withdrawal, if we believe that they would soon fall a victim to some foreign power, then, no matter what a few politicos may demand, we should not yield to their clamor.

THE AMERICAN OCCUPANCY.

No matter what shall hereafter occur, the record of accomplishment during the American occupancy of the Philippines can never be obliterated. The results may be lost by vain desire and overconfidence, but the history of the last 18 years is the most splendid example of unselfish devotion and unparalleled accomplishment to be found under like conditions in all the annals of the past.

In 14 years an educational system has been established in many respects better than any other ever established either in the Orient or in the Tropics. It is better than that in operation in many of the great civilized nations of the world. During that brief period it has touched 8,000,000 people and has been extended to the remotest regions of the archipelago. More than 600,000 pupils have been enrolled in the public schools, and more than 400,000 are in attendance. One-half of the children of school age are still without facilities, but that is because there are not as yet available funds to build the required schoolhouses and secure the requisite additional teachers.

At the very beginning of the American occupancy, while yet the only established authority was military rule, the American Army opened a school as soon as they had established a post. Before Manila was taken a school had been established on the island of Corregidor, which guards the entrance to Manila Bay. A few weeks after the surrender of Manila four or five thousand children were in attendance in the city schools. As soon as districts were brought under the control of American arms soldiers were detailed to open schools, and the American system of education was begun. As the Hon. Frank L. Crone, the efficient director of education in the Philippines, says:

> It can be truthfully said that the Army traveled with a musket in one hand and a schoolbook in the other.

Upon such a foundation a most carefully organized system has been put in operation adjusted to the needs of the people and consonant with their character and development. A balanced curriculum, from primary to university, embracing academic instruction, industrial and vocational education, and physical training has been established. Courses in farming, domestic science, commercial subjects, and trades are offered with a view to fitting the Filipinos to follow these trades when they leave school. As Dr. Crone declares:

> In working out this plan we have conceived it to be the function of the public-school system to prepare every boy and girl for the happiest, freest, and most efficient life in the sphere to which his activities will probably be confined.

The department of agriculture had been for some time vainly endeavoring to interest the farmers of the islands in raising corn. A corn campaign was finally inaugurated in the schools, which now enroll 50,000 boys, as a result of which the production of corn in the islands was doubled and the Philippines are $4,000,000 a year richer.

The introduction of physical training and American athletics in the schools has had a three-fold beneficial effect. It has increased the health and strength of the children. It has driven out vicious amusements, such as cock fighting, and substituted baseball and basket ball and other American outdoor sports. The rivalries for supremacy in these American games have brought the different parts of the islands, with their various tribes, languages, and customs, into a broader knowledge of each other and a greater harmony of interests. It has been said that in no other instance has the civilizing influence and political value of baseball been so fully exemplified.

Much remains to be done. Only about one-half of the children are now in the schools. New schoolhouses must be built. More teachers must be secured. The system must be extended and strengthened and firmly established. It is self-evident that this must be done under American supervision. Gen. McIntyre, in his official report as the result of a special investigation made last summer, says that more American teachers are necessary to maintain the efficiency of the system, and "any effort to increase the numbers of schools and teachers without obtaining a supply of teachers from the outside would be probably more harmful than beneficial."

Again he says:

> A material increase in the number of schools or the number of pupils would only be justified in case the number of teachers from the United States could be correspondingly increased. I am convinced that any effort to economize in the number of competent American teachers is a mistake, and that steady progress demands that the number of American teachers be not decreased from the maximum of the past five years.

American teachers will remain only during the American occupancy. When that ends, with the American soldier will go the American teacher. Haul down the American flag from the schoolhouses of the islands, and with it will fall the most promising and successful educational work that has been accomplished since man studied the printed book. No American superintendent or teacher who has had any experience in the islands but will say that it is absolutely impossible now for the Filipinos unaided to carry on a general system of public instruction.

Some few believe that after the present system has been extended to all the people and has become well established the Filipinos unaided can carry it on, but not now.

Closely allied to the question of education is that of language. In the Philippines there is no people—there are peoples. In the islands there are scores of languages and hundreds of dialect variations. There are at least 50 linguistic groups differing from one another as much as Spanish and Italian, while many are as different as German and French. Catechisms have been printed in more than 50 of these languages and dialects. No two of these are mutually intelligible. The Tagalog, Visayan, and Ilocano languages are as different from each other as are English, French, and German.

The Filipinos are of Malayan stock, but they come from widely separated sources. The pigmy race of Negritos are, as far as can be ascertained, the only aborigines of the islands. The seafaring Malays came from their widely scattered homes in Java, Sumatra, Borneo, and the hundreds of other sources where the Malays had settled. They came a few at a time, settled on different islands, and built up separate establishments. There were 3,000 islands among which to choose a home, and they were not compelled to fight for a place. The fighting came later. These small and independent migrations, isolated both in time and place of origin, were numerous and extended over a period of several centuries. The linguistic diversity which followed was the natural result of such settlement. Added to these were the later migrations to the islands of the Mohammedan Malays, the Moros, as they were called from the race of Moslems which overran Spain, the Moors. These warlike people were rapidly overrunning the islands and bade fair to exterminate the other and less warlike tribes when their progress was arrested by the advent of the Spaniards.

According to Prof. C. Everett Conant, formerly Government translator and interpreter in Manila, from whom most of these facts are derived, the chief languages of the Philippines are the Visayan, spoken by about 3,250,000; Tagalog, by 1,500,000; Ilocano, by 800,000; Bicol, by 500,000; Pangasinan, by 350,000; Pampanga, by 300,000; Igorot, by 200,000; Ibanog, by 150,000; Moros, 275,000.

There is not now and never has been any common language of the people. They can not now, and never could understand each other. There is not now and never has been any common literature. During the 350 years of Spanish control, the governing body and the specially educated spoke Spanish. But they were few in number. It was the policy of the Spanish Government to teach the language only to the native officials and the wealthier classes. The people who were taught anything were given only a rudimentary training in their own tongues.

The teaching of English in the schools is the first attempt to secure a common medium of communication that has given any promise of success. As a result English is already more widely spoken than is Spanish or any other common tongue. It is absolutely essential to the unity and cohesion of the islands that this establishment of a common medium of communication be continued until it is well disseminated and generally accepted. A unified and common public school system is impossible without it. Reforms in Government, the preservation of a free press, and free speech is dependent upon it. Under existing conditions the continued extension and final establishment of self-government is dependent upon it.

The teaching of English in the schools would be abandoned in less than a year following an American withdrawal. Already its use is challenged and disapproved by political leaders and the national press. The benefit of a common language has never been understood by the people, and from the first they have clamored for instruction in their own languages. With the disappearance of the American language from the schools and from official use will begin the disappearance of American institutions from the islands. We will have worked and sacrificed in vain if we now abandon our trust.

The American Nation must not now, having done so much, give up its duty.

> And when your goal is nearest,
> The end for others sought,
> Watch Sloth and heathen Folly
> Bring all your hope to nought.

No work undertaken by Americans has so excited the admiration and wonder of specialists as the results secured in health and sanitary reform in the Philippines. Until the Americans appeared such work was unknown in the Orient. It was said there was not a sewer east of Suez. The native populations wallowed in the accumulated filth of centuries. For ages smallpox, cholera, bubonic plague, beriberi, leprosy, and many other diseases were considered part of the established order of things. In an article which appeared recently in a leading American magazine reviewing the work of Dr. Heizer, from which many of the facts now stated were taken, it is related that when the doctor visited the principal cities of the Orient and stated his purpose to clean up the Philippines they discouraged him, saying, "No, no, Doctor; let the beggars alone—they'll be much happier and like you better. Go back and sanitate the United States; don't try to clean up the Philippines."

But the doctor did not go back, and he did not give up. He went to work. As a result, Manila, from being recognized as one of the plague spots of the world, is now the cleanest and most beautiful city in the Orient, and one of the healthiest on the globe. The Philippine Islands in less than a score of years have made more progress in stamping out disease and in sanitary reforms than any other nation in the world, civilized or savage.

At the commencement of the American occupancy smallpox carried off 40,000 people annually. The year the Americans began their work there were noted 128,000 cases of cholera. That plague on previous visitations had caused the death of 1,000 persons a day in Manila alone. More than 6,000 lepers roamed the islands, spreading contamination wherever they went. Bubonic plague had raged for centuries. Beriberi destroyed thousands of lives every year. Malaria, amebic dysentery, and tuberculosis were everywhere distributed. It is stated that 70 per cent of the people were tubercular.

Sanitary conditions were such as can not be described. In the cities and villages the homes, built of bamboo and palm on stilts 3 or 4 feet above the ground, were built close together without streets or order. They consisted for the most part of a single room. The floor was made of planks with wide interstices through which the family refuse was thrown into the area below, where the family animals were kept. In such homes as these nine-tenths of the people lived. Pure water was not to be found. Medical attendance could not be secured, and surgery was practically unknown.

In a remarkably short time conditions have changed completely in all of the cities and most of the villages. Pure water is secured from well-protected sources and from artesian wells. Smallpox has been practically exterminated. Dr. Heizer and his associates vaccinated 10,000,000 of Filipinos without a fatality. Manila, where thousands died every year, has not had a single death from smallpox since 1906.

Dr. Heizer gathered the lepers together in the beautiful island of Culion; established a village with well-built houses, streets, a sewer system, water supply, town hall, school buildings, warehouses, dining halls, hospitals, electric lights, a post office, stores, and a theater. Here have been gathered more than 8,000 lepers, and the spread of the disease is stopped. More than all, Dr. Heizer has discovered a cure for leprosy. At the Mohonk conference last October he reported that the year previous four had been actually cured, that 23 had been pronounced cured last year, and that several hundred others were well on the road to recovery.

Up to 1906 the Philippines had annual visitations of the dreaded bubonic plague. The plague has not visited the islands since that date. Two cases appeared in Manila a few years ago and the city was in a panic. But the spread of the scourge was prevented, and with the continuance of strict quarantine regulations its reappearance is practically impossible.

The cause of beriberi has been discovered, and measures are being taken to prevent its prevalence. Already the mortality from that disease has been greatly reduced.

The visitations of cholera have never been entirely prevented, but great progress has been made and the loss reduced to a minimum. Gen. McIntyre reports that the general health conditions of the islands are much better than in any of the neighboring oriental countries. Indeed the East is learning from America in the Philippines and profiting by her example. Japan, Hongkong, Indo-China, the Straits Settlements, Java, India, Australia, Ceylon, and Siam are introducing Heizer methods everywhere. We have taught the world that health can be maintained in the Tropics, and that even the Orient can be "cleaned up."

Is it the sober belief of thoughtful men that when the American withdrawal is accomplished this work will be or can be continued? It is probable that an honest and determined effort will be made by Filipinos who realize what the loss of these results would mean to preserve and carry on the work. But without the stimulus of American ambition for accomplishment and without the benefit of the unselfish devotion of American physicians and scientists working under the American flag not only for the good of the Filipinos but for the honor and glory of their country—without such incentive hope of further progress is small. Against the accumulated ignorance and prejudice of centuries even the unexampled triumphs of 15 years can not expect to stand unless supported by continual reinforcements from the brain and heart of America.

It took France 80 years—from 1790 to 1870—to establish a Republic. Three times it was overturned by her own people, three times by the army, three times by foreign invaders.

It took the United States 150 years to secure, through colonial experience, the knowledge and strength to achieve independence.

It took a century for the South American Republics to establish stable governments, and some of them are far from secure even now. A century ago the revolutions in what are now known as the South American Republics started. One by one they threw off the yoke of Spain. They achieved their independence. But they did not by that means bring to their people peace, prosperity, or stable government. For 50 years revolution succeeded revolution.

Practically every one of them suffered conditions such as now and for many years have existed in Mexico. Their history is one long record of bloodshed, rapine, assassination, and disaster. Their revolutions were so frequent that the historians wearied in recounting them. No period of rest was secured until in effect the Monroe doctrine was established and intrigues ceased and sedition slowly died out. The world will never know and the South American Republics will never acknowledge the debt of gratitude due this country not only for saving them from conquest and absorption by European powers, but for saving them as well from internal revolutions and domestic insurrections. Diaz arrested for a generation the Mexican revolt, but with his abdication revolution broke out anew. Such is liberty without restraint. Such is independence unguarded.

With such instances as these to consider, is it not foolish for anyone to expect that a collection of tribes only yesterday gathered together with a semblance of unity can be made into a self-governing nation able to guarantee life and liberty to its people and protect itself against the world, with but 18 years' preparation and experience?

I have hoped—I still hope—that with the aid and protection of the United States the Philippines will develop into a great, self-governing commonwealth, maintaining some such relation to us as do Canada and Australia to Great Britain. The tie that binds those countries to the mother country is not force, for it has been acknowledged by Great Britain for years that if they should ask for independence Great Britain would not coerce their retention as part of the Empire. They remain associated with the mother country both because of sentiment and self-interest. They are self-governing and self-developing. They live their own lives and work out their own destiny; but knowing they can go, they remain, and it is manifestly better for both that they remain. Such may be and such, I hope, will be the relation between the United States and the Philippines. It is so apparently to the mutual advantage of both that it is difficult to see how either can desire at this time to separate. I hope to so bind the people of the Philippines to us by our service to them, by their love for our institutions, by self-interest, by mutual protection against foreign aggression, that they will not desire separation. We would not and we should not refuse their independence when the day shall come when they can maintain it if they shall desire it. But I hope that they may have an opportunity at least to consider it, and to consider it with intelligence and good judgment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I heard a moment ago an interruption and a suggestion later by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] about our having governed Louisiana without its consent. I think there ought to be incorporated in the gentleman's remarks the term of the cession of Louisiana to us. Article 3 of the treaty says:

> The inhabitants of said Territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of the Constitution of the United States.

And then the first law that Congress passed in pursuance of that treaty which guaranteed their rights extended the Constitution of the United States over Louisiana.

> No law shall be valid that is inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Practically they were guaranteed what Cooley says was always considered a guaranty of territory that we took—to in due time be made into States. Do you intend that for the Filipinos?

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman from Ohio will be able to take care of himself. I will say, however, that because the Constitution has not been extended to the Philippines is because it would have been to their disadvantage to have done so. The duties which are collected in the islands and which now go to support their separate government would have been necessarily converted into the Treasury of the United States if they had been organized under the Constitution. This they themselves do not desire. All this the gentleman very well knows, because he was chairman of the committee when such laws were enacted.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. All I wanted to interrupt the gentleman for was because the gentleman from Ohio said that we had always governed people at one time or another without their consent, and I wished to distinguish between the Filipinos and the people of Louisiana.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask does the gentleman believe now that we should have extended the Constitution and laws of the United States to the Philippine Islands and made them an integral part of our Nation?

Mr. TOWNER. No; we could not do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the gentleman does not believe that.

Mr. TOWNER. There are many reasons why they can not be incorporated as a State into the Union. However, in the Jones bill, the substance of which I approve, we grant them practically every constitutional privilege that we ourselves enjoy. Neither the Philippines nor Porto Rico could maintain themselves if they were organized under the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. The gentleman does not believe in extending the Constitution and laws to the Philippines, but does believe in ruling them indefinitely as colonies?

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, no; not as the gentleman implies. The word "colonies" in its significance to an American means subjection, and colonists in that view are subjects. That idea is of course obnoxious to us. But no Territory under the American flag is so governed. I am in favor, as I hope we all are, of giving the Filipinos the largest measure of self-government which they are capable of using. I would grant to the islands the same right of local self-government, the same guaranty of constitutional liberty that we have in this country, and that is what we have done so far as we can.

HAULING DOWN THE FLAG.

Gentlemen, in no mere desire to rid ourselves of a burden, and in no panic of fear should we haul down the American flag in the Philippines. I know there are some who are anxious to relieve the country of what they consider an unprofitable undertaking. There are some who believe that as a measure of preparedness we should draw in our territorial possessions. But to cast the islands away at this time would be like loosing a lamb among wolves. To do so would be an act of unspeakable cruelty and of unpardonable selfishness.

To release the islands for fear that we might not be able to defend them would be to abdicate our position as one of the great nations of the world. It would be a confession of weakness. It would be an abject surrender that would forfeit the respect of all mankind.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield? I know that he is making a good speech and is familiar with the subject. The gentleman thinks it would be a disgrace to haul down our flag in the Philippines. The gentleman does not think that we were disgraced in hauling down the flag in Cuba, does he?

Mr. TOWNER. We never hauled down the flag in Cuba. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FERRIS. We gave them their independence.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; and we promised to do that before we ever went into the war.

Mr. FERRIS. And we promised it in this instance also.

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, no; we never did. The gentleman can find no such promise anywhere. In the case of Cuba both Houses of Congress passed an act which the President signed which declared our purpose with regard to Cuba. But no such act, nor any other official act, can be found which promised or guaranteed independence to the Philippines at any time.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman is making precisely the same technical subterfuge that his party made when they promised to revise the tariff and did not do so; and I think the gentleman's party will receive the same rebuke at the next election as it did at that time.

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, I presume the gentleman would like to change the discussion of this question to a tariff discussion, and so would I, but duty compels me to stick to the question of Philippine independence at this time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There has been much loose talk about promises of independence to the Filipinos. There could be no person or power authorized to so promise except Congress. That certainly must be clear. Even the Democratic Party in its platform declarations never declared for immediate independence. Nor did it ever fix a date. It declared our purpose should be to grant them independence when a stable government could be established, and left the determination of when that time had arrived to the American Congress. Even then independence was to be guaranteed by the United States.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Is not the gentleman by being in favor of the Jones bill as he was, and is, in favor of now making a promise to the Philippines of ultimate independence?

Mr. TOWNER. That was the declaration of the preamble, and not of the bill.

Mr. HARDY. But the gentleman now is in favor of the preamble?

Mr. TOWNER. No; I am not in favor of the preamble. I voted against it, and I do not think it wise at this time to make such a declaration. I will say this, however, as between the Jones preamble and the Clarke amendment I should certainly support the Jones preamble.

Mr. HARDY. The question I wish to ask is whether the gentleman is now of the opinion that we ought to make a promise to grant them at some time in the future their independence?

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman frankly that I do not so believe.

Mr. HARDY. Then the gentleman is not in favor of ever granting them their independence?

Mr. TOWNER. I would not make any such statement as that. I do not know what the future may bring to us or to them. If when they are prepared for and capable of maintaining their independence it shall seem best to grant it, I would not for any selfish reason refuse it. I would not now or ever dim the luster of our splendid record of altruistic work in the islands by any ignoble or unjust act. Neither would I for any selfish reason desert them now when they need our help and protection more than ever before.

And that is what I mean by hauling down the flag. No party can be justified, in the opinion of the people of this country, in hauling down our flag except for grave, imperative, overwhelming reasons. An experiment of that kind was made once before which may be instructive to recall.

A revolution in the beautiful Hawaiian group of islands had succeeded in overthrowing an intolerable despotism and had established an independent republic. The republic desired to be annexed to the United States, and had sent a commission here to negotiate a treaty. Mr. Cleveland withdrew the treaty "for the purpose of reexamination," and sent a personal representative to Hawaii to investigate and report. President Dole, of the provisional government, in anticipation of what he hoped would follow, had hoisted the American flag over the government building at Honolulu, and the commander of the U. S. warship *Boston* had sent a detachment as a guard of honor. Cleveland's commissioner on the day after his arrival ordered the American flag lowered and directed the marines to return to their ship.

A flood of patriotic resentment swept over the country. Mr. Cleveland's effort to restore the Hawaiian monarchy had to be abandoned, and in a short time the administration was compelled to formally recognize the republic. Annexation followed, and now no President proposes to haul down the American flag in that splendid addition to American territory, in that matchless key to the control of the Pacific.

In the congressional and presidential campaigns that followed every Republican orator rang the changes on this unnecessary, unwise, and unpatriotic act. Our flag will never cease to float over the Hawaiian group, because it stands there, as it does everywhere, for justice and liberty and the welfare and happiness of the people. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is what it stands for to-day in the Philippines, and in the coming campaign, when gentlemen on the other side go out to defend the many indefensible acts of this administration, I suggest that they do not add to them this other utterly indefensible proposition. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, in the last Congress considered and reported to the House a bill the purpose of which was to give to the people of the Philippine Islands more control over their own affairs than they now have, and by a preamble to that bill promised to withdraw the sovereignty of the United States over those islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government could be established therein. That bill passed the House, but failed in the Senate. The same bill as it passed the House in the last Congress, with some minor changes, was at this session introduced in the Senate and reintroduced in the House by the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. JONES, chairman of the Insular Affairs Committee. It was considered for days and weeks by the Senate, and after being amended in some important particulars was passed. Our committee has reported the bill as amended by the Senate to this House without amendment, and that bill is before you to-day.

The chief difference between the bill now under consideration and the bill passed by the House in the last Congress is this: The former bill promised that the United States would withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and recognize their independence as soon as a stable government could be established therein, which was indefinite as to time. The bill now before us, containing what is known as the Clarke amendment, is more definite as to the time fixed, and proposes to give to them their independence in not less than two nor more than four years after the passage and approval of this act, provided that the President for certain reasons may by proclamation extend the time to and including the day of final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of said period of four years. So that if this bill should pass and be approved at this session of Congress the last possible date to which independence under it could be delayed would be the 4th day of March, 1921.

So far as I am concerned, and speaking for myself alone, I am for the definite proposal of independence within a fixed and a reasonable time as provided in this bill, and I desire in the time at my command to give the reasons that have led me to the opinion I entertain.

This bill contains one provision not in the House or the Jones bill that I heartily indorse. It contains some others that as independent propositions I perhaps would not favor, but recognizing the fact well known to all experienced legislators that all important legislation is and must be the result of compromises, I am willing to yield to the legislative will of the Senate in matters that I consider of minor importance in order to secure if possible that which I consider vital and of more importance, namely, the early independence of the Philippine Islands. If this bill passes the House as it is, it will become a law, but if amended in any particular it may not, in my opinion it probably will not, become a law at this session of Congress.

We acquired these islands as the result of the War with Spain, a most unfortunate acquisition, and the misfortune will, in my opinion, continue and grow in magnitude and gravity as long as we continue to hold them. For about 17 years we have had possession of these islands, and during that time they have cost this Government many millions of dollars. The exact amount can not be determined. The late distinguished ex-Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, about 14 years ago declared that the expenses incident to the control of these islands had been $600,000,000, and as near as I can ascertain the cost since that time has been at least $50,000,000 per year, which would make a total of $1,300,000,000. I am sure that I am within safe limits when I state that the cost to this Government incident to the possession and control of these islands has been more than $1,000,000,000. This amount of money would have built good roads, costing $5,000 per mile, for 200,000 miles, equal to 50 gravel roads across this continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or an equal distance elsewhere in the United States as Congress might have determined, or it would have completed the improvements that are now urged for every navigable inland waterway of the United States and furnished adequate and complete protection to the entire country from the floods that have heretofore been so frequent and so destructive to life and property. That amount of money, if properly expended in any of the important lines of internal improvement, would have brought to the American people innumerable conveniences, comfort, and blessings.

But the enormous amount of money that our Government has expended while controlling these far-away islands is not the only sacrifice we have made. Hundreds of our American boys have lost their lives or their health while serving in that distant land. Some of them returned, but some did not. I personally knew a number of friends from my district who went to the Philippines young, strong, healthy, and perfect specimens of American manhood; I saw them when they returned, pale, emaciated, and in some cases physical and mental wrecks. After I came to Congress, now nearly 10 years ago, I was called upon by a lady constituent, Mrs. Ferguson, the mother of a boy who lost his life while in the service of his country in the Philippine Islands. She desired his remains brought back to her so that she might have the sad privilege of looking upon his face again. Through the courtesy of the authorities in the War Department his body was brought back, and he is now buried in the National Cemetery at Jefferson Barracks, in my home State. Another prominent citizen, who formerly resided in my district, Col. Newton Morrison, whose former home, however, is now in the district represented by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY], also lost his life in the Philippine Islands, now sleeps in the beautiful National Cemetery at Arlington Heights, in view of this Capitol. His heartbroken widow soon followed him to the grave, and we laid her to rest by his side. These are but two of many whose lives have been lost or whose health has been permanently wrecked in these far-away islands.

I believe that the control of these islands on the other side of the globe, a distance of 8,000 miles from our shores, is a menace to our peace, and will be as long as we exercise sovereignty over them.

Preparedness is the one question more discussed at this time than any other and largely increased appropriations are urged as necessary to properly prepare for national defense in case of possible invasion by a foreign foe. I am advised that some of the experts testified before the Naval Committee at the present session that a large percentage of the amount desired for the maintenance of the Navy is made necessary by reason of our possession of the Philippine Islands, and that if our control over them should cease the appropriation could be decreased many millions of dollars.

The Monroe doctrine in effect declares to all the world that no foreign hostile nation in the Eastern Hemisphere shall set foot upon the soil of the Western Hemisphere or lay the weight of their hands upon our people. So long as we maintain and uphold that doctrine consistency suggests that we should keep our hands off territory in the Eastern Hemisphere. If we continue to hold these islands I fear they will sooner or later involve us in disputes and war with some other nation. [Applause.]

I am for peace, with its comforts and blessings, rather than for war, with its privations and horrors. I sincerely hope and shall devoutly pray that war with any nation will never come to us; but if it should unfortunately come, may it be only when necessary to defend the honor of our country and its flag. I trust we will never be forced to fight to sustain our sovereignty over the people of the Philippine Islands while ruling over them without their consent and in violation of the basic principles upon which our own independence was won and established. [Applause.]

I am for independence for the Philippines because it is and has been advocated and promised by the great political party to which I belong. In four national platforms that party has promised independence to them as early as they are prepared for it, or as early as a stable government of their own can be established. I am in favor of making good this promise that we have for 16 years held out to them, and I feel that every Democrat in this House owes it to himself and to his party as well as to his country to vote for the passage of this bill.

I further favor the passage of this bill because I believe it is based upon the time-honored principles upon which our own Government was established and has stood for 140 years. The Revolutionary patriots who by the sacrifice of their lives and blood gave to us the independence that we to-day enjoy and that we intend to preserve and to hand down to those who shall come after us, denied the doctrine that England or any other country on earth had a right to rule over us without our consent. I am committed to the faith of our fathers, and glad that I am now in this, the House of Representatives of the American Congress, permitted to defend the principles for which they contended, fought, and died. We are ruling over the people of the Philippine Islands to-day without their consent, and while they are asking for independence, to deny their demands is to repudiate the justice and the right of the cause for which George Washington and his compatriots in arms fought and won in the Revolutionary War.

We were told by the gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. TOWNER] that we must not haul down the American flag, and I agree that wherever our flag has been unfurled in any land it must not be hauled down by unfriendly hands; but whenever raised in any foreign land over a people held in subjection against their consent, if we can take it down and give to them the same independence and freedom we have claimed for our-

selves, then, in my opinion, there would be more honor to us as a Nation in voluntarily taking it down than there would be to continue to have it float by force over the heads of an unwilling people, who are pleading for independence and liberty. [Applause.]

There are some of our citizens who, no doubt in perfectly good faith, say that they are opposed to this bill, because the inhabitants of the islands are not sufficiently prepared by education and training to govern themselves. The same apprehension, I understand, was expressed by the people of England of the American Colonies in 1776. I have never had the privilege of visiting the Philippine Islands and can not speak from personal contact with the people there, but I understand that a large percentage of the inhabitants are educated, intelligent, and self-reliant. I am advised that in 1886 more than 10 years before our occupation of the islands there were more than 21,000 public schools in the islands and a number of colleges and universities. Since that time the number of public schools and other institutions of learning have very greatly increased. There is one thing that I do know, that one of the Delegates from the Philippine Islands, Mr. QUEZON, has one of the brightest minds of any Representative who occupies a seat in this Chamber, and I think it is reasonable to assume that the people whom he represents and who send him here are not without intelligence and appreciation of their public duties as citizens. This able Representative believes that his constituents are qualified for self-government and favors the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

Ex-President Taft is, in my opinion, one of the most competent witnesses upon the question of the competency of the Filipinos for self-government, as he was Governor General in the islands for several years. He is universally respected by the American people, and his opinion upon that question should have great weight. When before the committee in its hearings upon this subject in 1914, he was asked by the chairman of the committee this question:

The CHAIRMAN. Could you not go further, Mr. Taft, and say that they are better equipped for self-government than the Cubans?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

He then gave a long explanation of his reasons for so believing.

By general consent, and I think with practically the universal approval of the American people, we gave independence to the Cubans, and if true, as stated by ex-President Taft, as I have no doubt it is, that the Filipinos are better qualified for independence, I can see no good reason or just cause for withholding independence from them, and, in my opinion, no good reason has been or can be given by any Representative upon this floor.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. For only a short question. My time is limited.

Mr. MEEKER. Did the ex-President in the same hearing advise letting them go in two years?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Ex-President Taft was not at that time in favor of giving them independence, but he said they were better qualified for it than the Cubans, and we had already given them their independence. But the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] says to us to-day that we promised it to the Cubans. Yes, we did; and we did it because it was right, and if right to give freedom to the Cubans so is it right to give freedom to the Filipinos. Another thing, when war was declared against Spain we announced it was not for the purpose of acquisition of territory or self-aggrandizement. This generous spirit of the American people was applauded the world over, and we ought to stand by the promises made at that time.

Some say that the islands still have some uncivilized tribes that are not fit to take part in the control of a government of their own, but that argument could have been urged against this country as well when we were given our independence, as this country was at that time inhabited by many thousands of uncivilized Indian tribes. Less than 10 per cent of the 8,000,000 inhabitants of the islands are classed as uncivilized, and time will, no doubt, correct this unfortunate condition under their own government as well as if continued to be controlled by the United States.

Some say that polygamy still exists there, and for that reason they should not be given independence, but only a few years ago the same could have been truthfully said of the United States. That evil has been corrected in our country, and in due time will, no doubt, be corrected in the Philippine Islands.

Some say that slavery still exists in the islands, and I understand does still prevail to some small extent, but only a few years ago it prevailed in our own highly civilized country. I am not very old and have not lived very long, but I have lived long enough to remember seeing a negro man placed upon an old-fashioned log stile block and sold to the highest bidder, bringing $900 in gold. This was a crime against humanity and a stain upon our civilization, but, thank God, it has been corrected by our own people and slavery in the United States has been blotted out forever.

There are some who contend that the Filipinos themselves, or majority of them, do not desire the passage of this bill, but would prefer to be permanently under the American flag and controlled by the United States. The Philippine Legislature recently, by unanimous vote, passed a resolution favoring the passage of this bill as it passed the Senate, containing the so-called Clarke amendment. This resolution, unanimously passed by that body, is by me, and ought to be by everyone, accepted as conclusive of their wishes. I also understand from the Delegates representing the Philippine Islands in this House, while admitting that some provisions of this bill do not meet with their approval, still they strongly favor the bill as a whole and are anxious to have it passed by this House.

There are some who insist that the passage of this bill giving independence to the people of the islands will be detrimental to the interests of Americans who have made investments there and for that reason are opposed to it. I do not want to lay violent hands upon the property rights of any man, and especially our American investors. Capital in all legitimate lines is entitled to its proper protection, but every American citizen who invested in the Archipelago did so knowing full well that the Democratic Party for the past 16 years has been promising independence, and they should have given that party credit for being honest in their declared purposes. I do not concede that independence will jeopardize the interests of American investors in the islands, but even if it should our people who have gone there to make investments have done so with their eyes open, and were fully advised as to the position of the Democratic Party upon that question and assumed their own risk. In passing upon this question I am not disposed to draw fine distinctions between the rights of money and the rights of men, as they are not of equal importance. I am opposed to the idea of weighing in the balance the question of commercial profits against the rights of citizens, or of fostering human greed at the expense of human liberty.

In conclusion I will summarize in these words: To continue to govern the Filipinos against their consent will continue to add to the burdens of the American people millions of dollars in costs annually and the sacrifice of many lives of our American boys. So far as I am concerned, I would not give the life of one American boy for the privilege of controlling for all time to come all the islands in Asiatic waters. To continue to control these islands will, in my opinion, be a continuing menace to the peace of our country that is so generally desired by our people. It will be a repudiation of our declared purposes when war was declared against Spain, and when we purchased the islands. It will be a positive violation of four national platforms of the Democratic Party, and it will be a grievous departure from the teachings of Jefferson and the fundamental doctrine of our countrymen as written in the Declaration of Independence. We then announced to the world the doctrine that "all men are created equal."

Upon the other hand, the passage of this bill will carry with it the announcement to all the world that this Government, true to its traditions and history, does not stand for an imperialistic colonial policy in violation of the principles upon which it was founded, and it will carry to the hearts and minds of the Filipino people the conviction that we, the people of this Republic, are true to the faith of our fathers, and still believe that liberty is the natural God-given right of man, and that all Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I suggest that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is not present just now, and that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] have one more speech?

Mr. JONES. We have used more time than you have on that side, and I think the gentlemen ought to use some time now.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] for 30 minutes. Before I speak, I would like to get it clear on the record whether I exempted myself from the rule of the caucus. I sent Judge SAUNDERS a telegram which said I had made declarations that would exempt me from the rule of the caucus.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I want 30 minutes, and the chances are that I will yield back considerable of it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY].

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I disagree with my party upon the stand it is taking to-day relative to the Philippine question. If I were to characterize the bill as it stands to-day, I would say that it was a sample of crossroads legislation. It looks to me as if it were a bullheaded attempt to bring about peace and comfort, not to the Philippine Islands, but to bring peace and comfort to the minds of some men who are disturbed by the Philippine question and want to rid themselves of an obligation.

I do not believe that I can open my remarks with better emphasis than to quote President McKinley as to what should be done with the Philippine Islands. He said:

It is imperative upon us that as victors we should be governed only by motives which will exalt our Nation. Territorial expansion should be our least concern; that we shall not shirk the moral obligations of our victory is the greatest.

I have a sympathy with those who oppose colonialism. I do not believe that it was ever intended by those who gave us this Republic that we should colonize. But here is a proposition that comes to us as an incident of war. They did not invite us; we went in there; and it looks to me as if, in passing legislation of this kind, we brand ourselves as cowards in running away from a plain, imperative obligation. [Applause.]

I looked in vain for the compelling reason for the Clarke amendment until I got hold of one of the reports. I was trying to figure out what was the great reason for rushing the Philippines into independence, and in studying the progress of the legislation I find that in the Senate, where the matter was amply considered in committee, the bill as reported agreed with the Jones bill that was passed by the House at the last session. But in some way, after it had been approved by the committee of the Senate, after they had said that a greater measure of self-government should be given to the Filipinos, there was catapulted into the bill from the Senate floor the much-talked-of Clarke amendment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think this is something every man in this House should consider seriously. The vote was 41 to 41, and the tie was broken by the vote of Vice President Marshall.

But in trying to find out the reasons that actuated the Senate and the compelling motive of the statesman from Arkansas—and I must accept that as an underlying reason for this sudden desire to free the Filipinos—I get this from the gentleman from Arkansas. In explaining his act he said—and I want every man here to dwell upon the reasons underlying this bill—

I had no particular reason in introducing this amendment except that no one else would do it. * * * Either I or some one else had to do it. I am getting as much salary as anybody else, and doing about as little, and I did not know but that I had better get busy right along that line.

And that is the statesman-like reason underlying the Clarke amendment, submitted to you for your earnest consideration. [Laughter.]

I believe there is no better way for the House of Representatives to advertise itself as listening to shallow reasoning than to base their action upon those few lines in the minority report as outlining the reasons given by the Senator from Arkansas. I had a great deal of respect, and have to-day a great deal of respect, for Lindley M. Garrison, who until lately was Secretary of War. I consider it a privilege to embody in my remarks the reason assigned by him as to why he did not approve the Clarke amendment. He says:

I consider the principle embodied in the Clarke amendment an abandonment of the duty of this Nation and a breach of trust toward the Filipinos. So believing, I can not accept it or acquiesce in its acceptance.

This may be the easiest way for the United States to rid itself of an obligation. This may be the easiest way out of what is considered to be a difficulty. This may be the easiest way for ridding ourselves of the bogey of the East. But I wish to ask you what would you think of a man who had grown tired of supporting his wife and said, "I want to be through with you forever; you are too expensive for me"? What would you think of a parent who frowned upon a child and said, "I do not want to have anything more to do with you; your expenses are eating up my income"? What would you think of the guardian who ruthlessly throws his ward aside? There is not any question in the world but that that is the easiest way to get rid of a burden. But, my friends—and I say it with all reservation and in all seriousness—it is not the most honorable way to get rid of an obligation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I can not understand the sudden transition which characterized the gentleman from Virginia, the author of the Jones bill. A little while ago he had a vision of Filipino independence in 1921. Then, listening to the objections raised by some men in his own party, he framed a bill declaratory of the purpose of the United States Government to recognize the right of these people to govern themselves without putting any arbitrary date or limit upon the time. Now he gleefully accepts this Clarke amendment.

I feel that I am strictly in accord with Democratic promise and that I am living up to everything enunciated in the Democratic platform when I cast my vote against the Clarke amendment. The Democratic platform declared that we would be for the independence of the islands when the islands would have a stable government.

Now, the question is, Have they got a stable government there to-day? And we here, acting as representatives of the American people, acting as guardians of those Filipinos, must of necessity turn to men better qualified from their experience in telling us whether or not these people are ready for independence and self-government. I know of no man better qualified to speak upon that subject than a man who has grown in national importance vastly since leaving the position of Chief Executive of this Nation. I refer to the honored citizen of this Republic, William Howard Taft. [Applause on the Republican side.] He has given it as his opinion that it will be two generations before a controlling proportion of the population of the Philippine Islands will be prepared to decide for themselves what their political status shall be. As he well says:

Preparation does not mean the organization of a Philippine oligarchy or aristocracy competent to administer government and then turn the government over to it. The capacity of the great body of the people must be considered if we expect to establish a government of the people.

What truer words were ever said about government and the right of a people to self-government than those wise words from a wise statesman? Gather, if you please, a handful of men, perhaps self-seeking, not unconscious of the opportunities it brings to their personal doors; educated, if you will; versed in government, if you will; but the great majority of people that they are to govern, uneducated and unfit for government; and I presume that nobody will challenge the statement that when we went in their 18 years ago 80 per cent of the natives were illiterate. And to-day, by the way, is the eighteenth anniversary of the day that Admiral George Dewey sailed into Manila Harbor and brought a thrill of joy to the American people, not because he was conquering some foreign territory, but because he was proving the prowess of the American Navy and showing the world that we were capable and fit to fight. [Applause.]

Now we have the redoubtable Roosevelt, of whom we read in the public prints once in awhile. [Laughter] A few years ago this virile American—and nobody challenges or questions his Americanism, although some of us believe that he is not averse to a little of the limelight and some of the things that go with it—a few years ago ex-President Roosevelt said:

I trust that within a generation the time will arrive when the Filipinos can decide for themselves whether it is well for them to become independent or to continue under the protection of a strong and disinterested power, able to guarantee to the islands order at home and protection from foreign invasion; but no one can prophecy the exact date when it will be wise to consider independence as a fixed and definite policy.

Now, against the opinion and the expressed judgment of ex-President Taft—and no one will challenge the statement that he is a man of varied experience, knowing a great deal about the government of the Philippine Islands—and against the judgment of Theodore Roosevelt, who has had some experience—all that and more is to be cast into the discard in favor of the unsupported opinion practically of the gentleman from Arkansas, Senator CLARKE, who says he wants to do something to earn his salary; and that is the reason for the Clarke amendment, and for our being here to-day to consider it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I have not the time.

Mr. AUSTIN. We will give the gentleman the time.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to state to the gentleman that Gen. Luke Wright, who lives in the city represented by our beloved colleague Mr. KELLAR, was the Governor General of the Philippine Islands. He is a Democrat and an ex-Confederate soldier. His views coincide with those of ex-President Taft on this subject.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I do not think it will be hard to gather a great many splendid testimonials to the wisdom of ex-Presidents Taft and Roosevelt in their judgment as to what should be done with the Philippine Islands. It is an easy thing to go out on the stump and say, "I voted to make the Filipinos free; I voted to make them an independent nation." That is the easiest thing in the world, and I suppose a thing that would get the readiest plaudits; but there is something beyond the plaudits that greet the stump orator. There is something more than

giving honeyed phrases to the crowd. There is a duty imposed upon the people here, and I believe that the real, true friends of the Filipinos are not the people who will throw them into the maelstrom of the world's politics in a phrase saying, "In not less than two or more than four years you shall be free and independent"; but I take it that the real friends of the Filipinos are those who would continue the liberalizing policy of the American Government and the spirit of education in those islands. [Applause.] We have every reason to be proud of our record there. Education has gone on in wonderful strides. They are learning the art of self-government. They are proud of their connection with us, and I fully and honestly believe that there is no man in the American Congress who feels that he wants to lay a restraining hand upon the Filipinos for all time. It is only a question as to what is best to do for the Filipinos. They are progressive, they are making wonderful strides, a people who were under Spanish domination for hundreds of years, and we go in saying, "We are going to save you and make a great people of you." And lo and behold! we say that by the alchemy of 18 years' domination we are going to take this composite people of eight or nine million, speaking varied languages, many dialects, and embracing all stages of advancement, from the savage to the most highly cultivated, intellectual, and intelligent citizens, and by the alchemy of a few lines written by the gentleman from Arkansas, Senator CLARKE, we will make them a free and independent nation worthy of the respect of the world. It is fallacy. It is more than fallacy. It is humbug. [Applause.]

I agree with this minority report. Great progress, unparalleled progress, has been made. Of that both Americans and Filipinos have a right to be proud. It is a reason why we should now grant a larger measure of self-government to the Filipinos and why we should continue such grant until absolute self-government is secured. What is the underlying reason beside this peculiar wording of the gentleman from Arkansas, Senator CLARKE? I will tell you what it is. It is an un-American policy. It is an un-American thing lying at the bottom of this majority report, written in letters so large I feel ashamed to say it. It is fear on the part of the American Nation. [Applause on the Republican side.] They say, "We fear to further guard and protect you. We fear further to educate you. We fear further to conduct you along the path of progress and civilization to the day when you shall be fit for government, because we are afraid that if we keep you we will get into trouble ourselves." I, for one, do wish to say emphatically here to-day that I have no sympathy with that reason. I am willing that this great country of ours should shoulder the responsibility and maintain it; that it should keep on as it has, in spite of any power in the world. Let us say: "These are our wards. We are ready to protect them. We are ready to guard them. We are ready to lead them along the pathway of civilization and progress. Lay a hand on them, if you dare!" [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. On behalf of the chairman of the committee, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM].

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, during my entire service in Congress I have been a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives. I hope the time has now arrived when the work that has been so consistently and persistently engaged in by that committee will reach its full culmination. In the world-wide tragedy that is now being enacted I think I learn a lesson. I see in Europe the great British Government drawing support and aid from its colonies like Canada and Australia; all people of kindred races and tongues. They are a distinctive asset to the British Government to-day. In fact, judging from reports, they are doing about all of the British fighting. On the other hand, the weak spots, the danger zone to Great Britain to-day are her colonies of India and Arabia and Egypt, because they are wholly unlike her either in race, customs, manners, or religion, as well as climatic conditions.

It is a reasonable conclusion that the great bulk of British soldiers are required to hold India, Arabia, Egypt, and her possessions in that quarter of the globe in subjection. Large numbers of her soldiery are necessary to safeguard the Suez Canal. Her soldiers are in Persia and in Turkey. What is the argument? We are forcing a government on an unwilling people—the Filipinos. They are not bone of our bone or flesh of our flesh, they do not fraternize with us, they have nothing in common with the English-speaking people, due largely to climatic conditions. The government we are forcing upon them is obnoxious, odious, and objectionable to them.

Now, what is my argument? You can not mix oil and water. The people of the United States are as distinct and separate in race, in manner, in customs, in religion from the Philippine Islands as are the people of India, Persia, Arabia, and Egypt from that of Great Britain. If the day should ever come when trouble arises, I entertain the most serious doubts whether we would find the Filipino an ally ready to aid, help, and assist us, or whether we would discover them to be a distinct liability.

Now, I believe that the feeling to-day, encouraged by the prospect of independence in the near future, creates in the hearts of the Filipinos a decidedly friendly disposition toward our Government. But let it be once distinctly understood, as some of you Members state, and as the Republican Party advocates, never to give them their independence, I doubt whether that cordial, fraternal feeling that exists there now will continue to exist.

I learned a further lesson from the Spanish-American War. It was absolutely impossible for Spain to defend Cuba, just off our coast, against the United States, as it will be for the United States to defend the Philippine Islands from any country in the world, any world-power country that is close to the Philippine Islands as Cuba is to the United States. We could not send an Army to defend the Philippine Islands—in the first place we have not it, and in the second place you have not a sufficient or adequate Navy for that purpose. In God's name, if we have not the instruments and means of defending our continent, what have we to send 7,000 miles across the ocean to defend the Philippine Islands?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The military experts say that Alaska would be infinitely harder to defend than the Philippine Islands. Would the gentleman suggest a withdrawal from Alaska? They also say that Hawaii is harder to defend than either Alaska or the Philippines. Would the gentleman withdraw from all three?

Mr. HELM. No; because I do not believe, in the first place, that Alaska or Hawaii are harder to defend than the Philippines; and, second, the possession of the latter does not strengthen but weakens our defense of both Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Then, where does cowardice cease and bravery begin?

Mr. HELM. When you talk about cowardice and bravery, when you pat yourselves on the back and poke out your chest and talk about how game you are, how brave you are, how capable you are, the best thing is to have ample means of defense and protection when it comes to a showdown—what can we do to defend these islands, and what have we to do it with? [Laughter.] It is all right to brag, boast, and strut around until somebody calls your hand. We Americans are a mighty chesty Nation of people. We take a great deal of stock in ourselves, and I am glad of it. We are good on claiming, but I doubt whether we are very long on performance.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman enumerate the times when the Americans failed to perform on a showdown with any nation until now? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HELM. We never want that time to come, and that is one reason why I think that this is the opportunity to prove our good common sense and not lay ourselves wide open so that the time may never come when we can not perform successfully when we have to perform. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am far from being a disciple of that man who once made Republican history and is still molding the policies of that party, Ex-President Roosevelt, but for the benefit and edification of those who are his disciples I submit an extract from a chapter in his recent autobiography on this, the question of Philippine independence, which is as follows:

> I do not believe that America has any special beneficial interest in retaining the Philippines. Our work there has benefited us only as an efficiently done work performed for the benefit of others does incidentally help the character of those who do it. The people of the islands have never developed so rapidly from every standpoint as during the years of American occupation. The time will come when it will be wise to take their own judgment as to whether they wish to continue their association with America or not. There is, however, one consideration upon which we should insist: Either we should retain complete control of the islands or absolve ourselves from all responsibility for them. Any half-and-half course will be both foolish and disastrous. We are now governing and have been governing the islands in the interest of the Filipinos themselves. If, after due time, the Filipinos themselves decide that they do not wish to be thus governed, then I trust that we will leave; and when we do leave it must be distinctly understood that we retain no protectorate—and, above all, that we take part in no joint protectorate—over the islands, and give them no guaranty of neutrality or otherwise; that, in short, we are absolutely quit of responsibility for them of every kind and description.

If it should result that he is to be the Republican nominee for President, it would be fit and proper for the Republican convention, to be held at Chicago, to place a plank in its platform

indorsing the bill now under consideration, and it will be amusing to see those who are now violently assailing this bill advocating it on the stump as one of the reasons why the Republican Party should be restored to power.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. TOWNER, I yield 30 minutes to Mr. MILLER from Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, adequately to debate so tremendously an important subject as Philippine independence within the limits of a single session is, of course, impossible, as such limited time is wholly inadequate for so great a purpose. Nevertheless, as it seems to be the purpose of gentlemen on both sides of the aisle to vote to-day, we are confined to the limits of a few hours, and in them but a few phases of the question can be discussed.

Mr. Chairman, I am not afraid to meet the vote in a moment, in a week, or a year's time. The question of Philippine independence is one that affects vitally 8,000,000 of people of those islands, but in no less a degree it affects the honor, the glory, and the national aspirations of the hundred millions of American citizens on this continent. [Applause.]

I listened to-day for the first time, and I hope, Mr. Chairman, for the last time, to the Members of this House asking that we go back upon history, that we turn our backs upon civilization, upon our plain duty once magnificently assumed, that we throw away the glory Dewey won with his guns at Manila Bay 18 years ago because we, as Americans, are too cowardly to assume and discharge our national duty. If, Mr. Chairman, there is anything concerning the American people that should receive our undivided support, it is that Americanism and nationality are the watchwords of the hour. Our national passion is at high heat, and our people will to be just, honorable, and great as they will our Nation to be strong. But Americanism and nationality are the same yesterday and to-day. The duty assumed at Manila Bay is still America's duty; the American opportunity that opened up with Dewey's victory is still before us. The movement to greatness and to glorious achievement is real and living to-day, and we of to-day should give it our full measure of undying devotion. If we are Americans, robust and strong, confident of a great mission before our people, we should triumphantly bear our national responsibilities, and especially when they lead directly to our own strength and greatness. Cowards do not deserve to grow, and grow they do not; nor do they perform their allotted share of civilization duty.

While, indeed, perhaps it would be more congenial to me were I to discuss this subject entirely from the standpoint of American interests, yet I now feel that I should direct the attention of the Members of the House to the thoughts and the feelings and the ideas of the Filipino people themselves. Oh, I know it was said by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES]—and he rolled the words over and over with an unction that made me think they were sweet morsels to his tongue—that the Filipino people to-day ask that this Clarke amendment and this bill be passed. I want his attention when I say that they ask no such thing. It is true that by lip service some individuals in the Philippine Islands in political power have sent to him word that they want this bill passed. Whether that lip service speaks the conviction of their hearts I know not, but I do know that the heart throbs of the people of the islands to-day beg that you vote against the Clarke amendment and the bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] It may be you think I am not fortified in what I say. Let me direct your attention as serious-minded men who really want to do the right thing, men who have sworn to let their conscience and their judgment and the interest of their Nation guide their vote—let me direct your attention for a moment to what has been said lately by some of the Filipino people. There is in the islands a paper which is the official organ of one of the leading parties there, La Democracia. It is not the organ of the party represented by the gentleman from the islands [Mr. QUEZON]. He represents the Nationalistic Party. La Democracia represents the Progresisto Party, which, with his party, has taken a position on the question of independence. In an editorial appearing in that paper just after the Clarke amendment passed the Senate I find the following:

> The present epoch in the history of the islands is the most critical in all their history. It can not be overlooked that, left to their own efforts, the Filipinos are unable to repel foreign aggression of powerful people like Japan, nor would they be able to withstand the peaceful aggression of immigration that even China with all her power, was unable to resist.

That is but a beginning, and that is but a start in the expression of the people of the islands. There is a gentleman in the islands named Vicente Soto, who has had a notable career. It is sufficient to say that he has recently been permitted to return to the islands. My friend Mr. QUEZON will bear me out when I say that of all the Filipinos who have ever lived he is probably the most anti-American of them all, also one of the most steadfast champions of Philippine independence from the early days of Aguinaldo until now. He came back to Manila and is now publishing a newspaper. In that paper recently appeared this article:

> In our patriotic zeal we must not forget that Japan is our neighbor. We must not trust in the delusive hope of diplomacy. Our security in the future lies in our strength. Our prayer to keep out foreign invasion will not avail.

To-day, looking far to the east in early morn the Filipino beholds the rising sun, and against it the American Statue of Liberty, in uplifted hand the beacon light of liberty, an emblem of eternal hope and benediction. Remove this sovereignty and in the place of that view the Filipino will behold another sunburst, emblazoned across it in letters of blood, "Banzai."

And listen to these words, freighted and charged with potential meaning:

> If it is the intention of the people of the United States to give us complete independence within four years, could we protect ourselves from foreign invasion and have the respect of the rest of the world? With our present economic situation it would require a return a thousand times greater than our present revenue in order for the Government to organize within the short space of four years a force of sufficient strength to preserve and maintain our national integrity and honor.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. For a brief question.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I think I shall vote the way the gentleman does upon this bill, but does he advance as an argument that they should not have their independence the fact that they could not repel a foreign invasion?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not place it alone upon that ground. I am simply giving the position of the Filipino as he manifests an opinion to-day toward the Clarke amendment. It would require a commercial prosperity and an economic advancement a thousand times greater than that which they themselves say they possess in order to carry out and maintain this fatuous independence it is proposed to give. That leads us naturally to inquire what is their present economic condition? We might indulge ad libitum here in discussion pro and con as to the intellectual attainments of the Filipino. Let us just forget that subject for a moment. Let us address ourselves to a practical question upon which there can be no difference of opinion. There is a system in the islands enabling us to determine exactly who is doing the business in the archipelago. It is required that every man transacting business, wholesale or retail, shall secure a certificate and pay a tax upon his business. This gives us reliable and complete statistics. Those statistics show that 95 per cent of all of the business done in the islands is performed by foreigners. Ninety-five per cent of the business in the islands is in the hands of foreigners. There are in the islands about 40,000 Chinese, and there are about 8,000,000 inhabitants altogether, but these 40,000 Chinese to-day are paying 72 per cent of all of the taxes in the islands. Forty thousand aliens pay 72 per cent and 7,960,000 pay about 28 per cent of all of the taxes.

Of the 7,960,000, by far the greater part of the taxes is paid by the European and American foreigners. Thus we see that the Filipino as yet does little of his own business and pays only a small fraction of the taxes necessary to run his government. The Filipinos must yet develop an industrial and merchant class throughout the islands. There is invested in the islands to-day $300,000,000 of Spanish capital. Pause for a moment to reflect upon our duty toward that capital. In the treaty that we made at the conclusion of the war with Spain we guaranteed two things. We guaranteed, first, to protect religion in the islands. We guaranteed that there should be freedom of religious worship in the islands as we have decreed it here within the United States. We pledged our sacred word to the people of Spain that we would maintain absolute freedom of religion for all the people there, especially the Spanish people. Should we haul down the flag now and relinquish our sovereignty, who for a moment dare stand up and say that there will be freedom of religious worship in all the islands? Here is an obligation we can not throw if we are to retain a decent respect from the Christian nations of the world. We guaranteed something more practical, too. We guaranteed to the subjects of Spain that there should be given protection to their property. We have no right to complain of the assertion that treaties are but "scraps of paper" unless we live up to our own treaty obligations. [Applause on the Republican side.] If we pass this bill as it stands we repudiate as solemn an obligation and treaty as was ever assumed by any nation since the stars first began to shine. No one can pretend that conditions throughout the islands are now such that if we withdraw life and property will be protected and absolute freedom of religion shall exist.

We should not lose sight of the fact that the Filipinos are the only Christians among all the hundreds of millions in the Orient. Surrounded, as they are, by more than half the human race, all pagans, our duty as a strong, protecting Christian Nation becomes clear.

Let me digress, Mr. Chairman, long enough to observe that idle words we sometimes hear, to the effect that the Filipinos are aliens and can have nothing in common with us. This is wide of the mark. The 6,000,000 Christian Filipinos have had 300 years of Christian influences at work upon them. All their civilization Spain gave to them; therefore it is European, not oriental. No greater affront to these sensitive people could be given than to suggest that they are like the Japanese race, and we may as well let the Japs have them. Filipino history still tells of martyred missionaries who went from the Filipinos to Japan and were put to death with fierce cruelty. The Filipinos are not Japs. The two peoples are aliens in race, religion, and civilization.

There are $300,000,000 of Spanish capital invested in the islands. Should we withdraw our sovereignty under the conditions now existing, betray the confidence Spain reposed in us when we entered into the treaty with her, who can say what awful responsibilities will come thick upon us in the years to come? Nations can not break their plighted word with impunity even in these days of the world's woe. We made this straight contract with Spain to protect Spanish capital, and stand by it we must. Not only that, but our own citizens have now invested American money in the islands to the extent of $125,000,000. Unless our Government protects this investment, it is unworthy the name of a Nation and not fit to be called great.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If I can conclude the main course of my remarks in time, I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. GARRETT. I would like to interrogate the gentleman upon that particular point.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not know what actuates or could actuate the thought of any man who looks upon his fellow citizen with disfavor because he has gone beneath the American flag, under American sovereignty, and invested capital for the welfare not only of himself but also of the people among whom he has invested the money. So if we are going to refuse our protection to American property under the American flag, let us renounce our nationality and surrender for all time all claims to a sovereign State.

My good friends, I do not believe the American people ever indorsed or ever will indorse the statement that has been made that American business men who have gone into Mexico should be left to their own peril. I am one of those who believes that wherever, legitimately and according to the laws of the country, American capital goes and finds investment it should be protected to the last flutter of our flag. [Applause.]

How much greater our duty to give adequate protection to this capital that has been invested under our flag in the Philippine Islands! Do not for a moment let yourself be beguiled into thinking that this capital has not been welcomed by the Filipinos. It has. They are sitting up nights now praying for more capital to come in. They realize their economic dependence. They are asking that money come from the United States to relieve their necessities and help them develop their industries and their country. Let us answer that call by giving full and complete protection to American capital that already is invested there; otherwise that capital and all the foreign capital will struggle to get out, precipitating a condition in the islands I shudder to contemplate. And let us give heed to their call when they say that they know they are not in a position to handle independence at the present time. There is not only American capital and Spanish, but about $60,000,000 of English capital, $15,000,000 of German capital, $15,000,000 of Swiss capital, and $5,000,000 of French capital invested there. Practically all the business of the islands is supported at this hour by foreign capital. We believe capital will demand protection. If not received by the United States, under which it shall be beneficent, it will be received under some foreign flag that will know not the rights of man. [Applause.]

I am not limited to newspaper comment as expressing the hope and the wishes of the people. Shortly after the passage of the Clarke amendment in the Senate I received a cablegram signed by an ex-member of the Philippine Assembly, Señor Ramon Lopez, in which he said that the farmers of the Philippine Islands, more particularly in the great islands of Negros and Panay, begged that Congress not enact the Clarke amendment into law. I replied that I wanted petitions to that effect, signed by the most substantial and capable men that could be found. About two weeks ago I received the first petition. I am going to read it to you. I will have to read the translation, because the original is in Spanish. This translation was made by the Bureau of Insular Affairs. It reads, and I ask you to listen:

> We, the undersigned residents and property holders of the islands of Panay and Negros, P. I., and all Filipino citizens, respectfully state that it is our opinion that the passage of the Jones bill in the form that it was passed by the Senate of the United States would be fatal to social progress, to the development of the commerce, industry, and agriculture, and to the political well-being of all the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands;
>
> Therefore we earnestly beg the Congress and the United States Government and its citizens that they suspend all action on the Jones bill, and that the question of the political independence of the Philippine Islands be definitely suspended for a period of 20 years, and that when this period arrives that no action as to the independence of the Philippine Islands be taken without the vote of the Filipino people.
>
> Iloilo, Province of Iloilo, P. I., this day, the 1st of March, of the year 1916 A. D.

Will you listen to these earnest people, words coming from men who are not engaged in the political exploitation of their islands, asking you to protect their homes, their property, their civil and political rights, and their very islands from an unconscionable, from a contemptible, from a humiliating withdrawal of sovereignty and stable government and the abandonment of our duties once heroically assumed.

My good friends, it seems to me that the voice of the Filipino people should be heard. This petition is signed by 92 men. They have been checked over by those who are best acquainted with the islands. I am informed that they represent the farming industry in value exceeding $20,000,000; that they are the most substantial men of the entire central group of islands. It is certain these signers are men each representing a big sentiment in his own locality. This one petition is overwhelming in what it represents and in the request it makes. But I was informed when this came that other petitions would follow.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, another came this very morning, and still another, making three in all, and altogether representing the farmers of the islands. These petitions are to the same effect, but in a little different language. One is signed by 125 men, the other by 95, who, I am informed, represent the best in thought, and best in business, and best in earnestness, and best in all that goes to make up the life of the Filipino people.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Certainly, for a question.

Mr. KEATING. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think that Lord North, in 1776, might have secured a similar petition signed by substantial property owners in the American Colonies protesting against the Declaration of Independence?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not know, and I do not care anything about what Lord North might have done. I know that this is a voluntary petition, and sent without political glare, to represent the sentiment of the Filipino people. Maybe the gentleman will close his ears and shut his eyes to it, because he does not want its truth to sink into his soul; but I believe a majority of the men in this House will have a nobler conception of their duty here to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I can not yield further.

We all have in mind the words of the great Secretary of War, who resigned a few weeks ago, a Democrat of Democrats, and who resigned because he would not be a party to such an iniquitous measure as it was proposed to pass. He said this:

> I consider the principle embodied in the Clarke amendment an abandonment of the duty of this Nation and a breach of trust toward the Filipinos. So believing, I can not accept it or acquiesce in its acceptance.

There is a Democratic gentleman whom I know very well, with whom I have talked many times relative to things concerning the Philippine Islands, but with whom I have found but little opportunity to agree. I find, however, that he and I are agreed to-day. He is the arch apostle of Democracy relative to all things Philippine. He it was who became the first great champion of Democratic principles for the islands, and has continued such down to this hour. He went over as a soldier from the State of Georgia. He bears a distinguished name. He remained there to serve as a judge. He has now resided in this country for some years, devoting himself largely to the study of Philippine questions. I refer to Judge Blount, the author of The American Occupation of the Philippines, and this is his position:

> I am wholly unable to understand the intellectual processes of an honest and patriotic American who will vote on foreign or quasi-foreign affairs for party reasons. We are all in the same boat, all Americans, and, to use a familiar colloquialism, it is like rocking the boat. If I were in the House now, I would vote with my party on domestic affairs, such as the tariff, the currency, and so forth, with all the fidelity of a Tammany sachem; but on a question that concerned the national honor of my country, like this Clarke amendment with the neutralization cut out, I would feel ashamed to vote any way but against it, because, as Senator STONE said, the whole world would look upon throwing the Philippines overboard in any such way with

amazement, and we would fall under the just condemnation of mankind.

So far as I have been able to determine—and I have endeavored with the utmost industry to ascertain the facts—there is not a single Democrat charged with the administration of Philippine affairs, directly concerned with them or conversant with the present conditions in the Philippine Islands, who favors the passage of the Clarke amendment. It is repugnant, in my judgment, to the opinions of any man, regardless of politics, who views with concern his Nation's honor.

Mr. Chairman, we might spend hours in discussing what it means to the Philippine people should we at this hour withdraw our sovereignty. To the great mass of the people that flag flying there has meant the same that it has meant to the boys of America. It has meant opportunity to them all. I was informed a few weeks ago that an Army officer living in the Philippines was asked by one of the servants of his house this question: "Sir, I am told the United States is going to give independence to the Philippines and that the Americans are going to leave." He said, "That is what I hear from America." The young man departed. In an hour's time this officer had occasion to go into another part of the house, and there he found five, all of his Filipino servants, together in tears, and he asked them why. The reply was, "The Americans are going to leave us in the hands of the politicos, and we, the poor people, know what that means."

That has been duplicated, according to my information, time out of mind in the Philippine Islands during the past two months. When I say that the people of the islands ask that this bill be defeated in its present form, I know I am expressing their heart convictions. I know the distinguished and lovable gentleman, my friend, Señor QUEZON, in a few moments will tell you about his party, the Nacionalistas, and their party propaganda, and the Progresistas and their party program and the Partido Tercera and their party program—I know he will say these things, because he ought to say them. But while he speaks for the political parties of the islands, I speak for the Filipino people, and I know what they want.

Should it be desired to inquire what may be the attitude of the non-Christian peoples, permit me in a word to tell you that they are to the last soul, 1,200,000 of them, not only begging but demanding that our sovereignty remain. Thus far I have devoted myself exclusively to the area occupied by the Christian Filipinos. A consideration of prime importance to us should be the wishes and the welfare of the non-Christian people. In the passing of time all these peoples will become fused together, cemented into a nation, but only if American sovereignty remains many years yet. I have journeyed among all these wild people, the head hunters of the north, the Moros of the south, and many tribes between, and from their own lips received the unvarying request that the American Government remain, and if it does not there will be trouble. The hauling down of our flag will be the signal for the struggle to commence. These peoples—the Christian and the non-Christian—have not yet learned to know and trust each other. It must be remembered that the American sovereignty is the only one that has ever existed over all the non-Christian area, about one-half of the entire area of the islands. Our plain duty to these people, who now trust us implicitly and believe in us devotedly, is to continue that opportunity the coming of our flag brought to them.

More than 1,000 American boys—our soldier dead—lie buried in the Philippines—they died that stable government, free institutions, and opportunity for all might come to these people. Shall we to-day defile their memory and shall the angels on high tell them they died in vain? No; a thousand times no! Their achievement shall be perpetuated, and the world shall know that we who act to-day are worthy to come after such heroic souls.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand now?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has used 1 hour and 35 minutes. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has consumed an hour and 43 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, opportunities such as to-day confront this House are seldom given to a legislative body. We have the privilege of extending to a race of people numbering nearly 10,000,000 inhabitants the rights, privileges, and enjoyment of a free and self-regulated form of government.

Every boy when he reads the early history of our own country is convinced of the great justice and the righteousness of the cause in which our struggling Colonies fought for eight long years for just that status which we now attempt to give to the Philippine people by the enactment of this legislation now before the House.

This should not in any sense be a partisan question, for there is glory enough for all parties if upon this occasion the great measure now before us is enacted into law. The Republican Party was the agent of our Government in freeing the islands from Spanish rule and establishing a form of government there looking to the future independence of the islands, and the Democratic Party was and now is our Government's agent in perfecting the preparation for self-government and fixing a time when that self-government will become operative.

There is one cardinal principle which should not be lost sight of when we are considering this measure, and that is the great precept that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed.

Do the Filipino people consent to our continuation as the molders of their destiny? Their representative here says no. It is readily comprehensible that the people of these islands would trust us when we first made representations to them that ultimately they were to be free, because our history, our ideals of liberty, and our actions have always bespoken our attitude. On these assumptions they trusted us, and now we should not belie that trust.

Those people had been studying our history and had dreams of the days to come when they, too, would be blessed by the virtues of liberty and self-government. Do not be deluded into the thought that we are now continuing our sovereignty over the islands of the Philippines for their own good. Throughout the ages of history you will find repeated the arguments that will be heard on this question at this time, namely, that we are reserving our control over the Philippine Islands for their own good. No people can be helped nor can they thrive properly when weighed down with the thraldom of usurped power.

In my opinion our mission has been a benevolent one, and one that has been appreciated by the people of those islands. I also firmly believe that we have almost completed our justifiable mission, and should now keep our promise and set an example to the world of justice to our fellow men without resorting to force, coercion, and subjugation.

After having given the people of the Philippines the assurance of ultimate independence the question naturally arises, Is this the proper time to give them self-government; and if not, when will that time arrive? When this same question was before the House during the Sixty-third Congress I was anxious to secure information first-hand, and I therefore wrote to one of my close personal friends residing in the Philippines and who is dean of the law school at Manila.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss the relative merits of the Clarke amendment with the original Jones bill, but I have asked for this time more especially to read some questions which I submitted to the dean of the law school of Manila, who, by the way, is not of my political party, and his answers to those questions, for the enlightenment, it may be, of the gentlemen of this House, and especially of those of his political party.

This gentleman was for a number of years an assistant attorney general in the Philippine Islands, and is now the dean of the law school in the Philippine Islands. I know him very well, and therefore I submitted to him these 10 special questions and asked for his answers in detail. I have before me his answers, and I am going at this time to read what he has to say in answer to those questions which I deemed pertinent. He prefaces his remarks with this sentence:

At the beginning I must warn you that on a subject on which there are as many varying opinions as there are debaters, the viewpoint from which the person starts is most important. Both Filipinos and Americans in the Philippines can be roughly divided into three classes: First, there are those who fawn on the people of the opposite race for personal advancement; second, those who, through ignorance or prejudice, have bitter racial feelings; and lastly, those who recognize both the good and the bad characteristics of the Filipinos and Americans, respectively, and treat each other courteously and fairly as men. I am glad to bear testimony to the fact that the large majority of Americans and Filipinos fall within the last division.

It is also true that if an American publicly advocates immediate Philippine independence some of his countrymen are sure to scoff and jeer at him as a hair-brained Filipinista and theorist, while if a Filipino publicly advocates permanent or indefinite joinder with the United States he is looked upon by his fellows as a heretic and a traitor. I am certain, nevertheless, that there are a respectable number of Americans who conscientiously favor independence for the Philippines within the next few years, and a corresponding number of Filipinos who would dislike to see their country absolutely independent within the same period. The problem is therefore primarily not one of race but of actual existing conditions.

It is further true, I am sorry to say, that the environment, avocation, or training of the speaker or writer is largely or entirely responsible for his conclusions. Whether done consciously or unconsciously, it has the same result. A merchant will naturally think in terms of business and the effect on commerce; a churchman in terms of religion and the effect on his church; a soldier in terms of war and the chances for conquest or glory; a Government official as to how the outcome affects his position; an outsider who spends two or three weeks in the islands and considers that he knows the country, from prejudiced, theoretical principles; a Moro with the sole interests of his people and religion in mind; a Filipino from natural patriotic instinct, without possibly taking into account future consequences, and so on ad infinitum.

Personally I can only state that I have, during more than seven years in the Philippines, spent in different educational and legal positions, with somewhat extended travel throughout the islands, seen and become acquainted with different conditions of people. I shall in my abrupt statements herein, containing not alone by own views but the perspective of others, try to disassociate myself from personal motive as much as is humanly possible. You state in the concluding paragraph of your letter, "I am writing to you because I would like to get an honest opinion from one who is on the ground floor. I want to do what is right by my own people and by the people there, and for that reason I would appreciate it if you would write me an extended brief covering your views." I shall endeavor not to disappoint you, although it is not for me to say whether I approach the criterion laid down by Resident Commissioner QUEZON in his speech before the House of Representatives on February 13, 1913, when he said, "To know a people you must not only live with them for a number of years, but share their feelings, possess a sympathy for their aspirations, and, most important of all, be broad-minded enough to abandon race prejudice and fixed views on the superiority of one civilization over another."

I follow the order of questions as stated by you:

(I) "Does the policy now in vogue in the Philippine Islands hamper the development of the Filipinos?"

I note the word "now." I answer categorically "No." Every branch of the Government is progressing rapidly toward Philippine self-government. Commercial intercourse, internal improvements, sanitary betterment, and educational advancement are going forward as rapidly as the finances permit. Omitting the mooted point of independence, I think all intelligent Filipinos and all impartial observers will admit that this is true. While I differ from you and Gov. Harrison politically, it is only fair to say that the Governor General is carefully and persistently advancing these ideas.

(II) "Could the Filipinos take entire charge of the government of the islands and make a success of it?"

The bearing of time is here most important. They could not tomorrow, as would likewise be impossible for any people by such a sudden change. The Filipinos could take entire charge of the legislative and judicial departments. In the legislative department the Philippine Assembly, composed entirely of Filipinos, has been most remarkably successful. Critics are inclined to make fun of it because of the foolish bills introduced, forgetting that the same is true of any legislative body. The members of the Philippine Commission, composed of a majority of Filipinos, has also proceeded cautiously and conservatively in its work. The members of the judiciary have likewise proved their integrity and judicious bearing alongside of American judges. In many executive positions, however, the Filipinos need American assistance and supervision. It is only common sense to promote capable Filipinos from one position to the position next higher. It is foolish to thrust one into an important office without previous training and experience. This does not mean that there are not many Filipinos who have filled high executive positions with entire success. For example, Araneta, Villamor, Palma, Tinio, Monreal, Kalaw, Nieva, and others could be mentioned. But in many technical positions, such as engineering, education, accounting, and so forth, Americans will be needed until the requisite number of Filipinos can be trained. When this result shall be reached, and it can be accomplished in a much shorter period than is generally believed, then I think that the Filipinos could take charge of the government and make as great a success of it as one could reasonably expect under the particular and grave conditions in which placed.

(III) "If not, are there any departments that they could conduct as efficiently as they are now conducted?"

This question is practically answered under No. II.

(IV) "Could all the peoples of the different islands be brought to recognize a civil government conducted by their own people?"

There is no doubt in my mind that, excepting the Moros, all the people of the other islands would recognize and support a government conducted by themselves. The Moro problem is one on which I am not capable of expressing an opinion. I do know, however, that the proverbial statement that there is jealousy and hatred between the so-called tribes and that if given self-government they would fight among themselves "like cats and dogs" is more fanciful than real. It is not nearly as evident as is the same feeling between races in other countries. I have yet to hear a native boasting of himself as a Visayan, a Tagalog, or an Ilocano, but always speaking of himself as a "Filipino." I have never noticed such a division in the schools, in the Philippine Assembly, or elsewhere.

(V) "Would the inhabitants of Manila and the immediate vicinity in any way control the entire government?"

The facts easily bear out the negative. There are, it is true, and naturally also, I think, able men in public life who reside either in Manila or the surrounding country. There are, for example, Chief Justice Arellano, Commissioner Quezon, Acting Secretary of Public Instruction Palma, Commissioner Illustre, Assemblyman Corpus (a leader of the assembly), Mr. Ortigas, of the code committee, and many others. On the other hand, from the southern islands, are such men as the speaker of the assembly, Mr. Osmeña, possibly the most influential Filipino; the only secretary of an executive department, Mr. Mapa; a Filipino commissioner, Mr. de Veyra; the leader of the assembly, Mr. Adriatico, and others. From the northern Provinces, Attorney General Villamor, Commissioner Singson, the director of lands, Mr. Tinio, and others. The inhabitants of the city of Manila would bear the same relation to the government of the Philippine Islands as the capital or metropolis of any State or country bears to that State or country, and no more.

(VI) "Would you recommend that the United States Government place the government there entirely in the hands of the natives or only partially?"

If it were given to me to recommend, I would say that the government should be placed only partially in the hands of the Filipinos now, entirely, unless in isolated instances by the express desire of the Filipinos themselves, in the near future. The changes in the judiciary will work out gradually as Americans resign. The next step in the legislative department should be the creation of a Philippine senate. The legislature, composed of the assembly and the senate, should then be given jurisdiction over all of the Philippine Islands, unless it be the Moro Province, as to which I express no opinion. The Governor General should then be given the veto power with an appeal from his veto by a two-thirds vote of each house, to the President of the United States. Administratively, the Governor General can, in pursuance of his present policy, Filipinize that division of the government.

(VII) "In what pursuits and occupations do the Filipinos excel?"

First, in law, preeminently. There are as great lawyers among the Filipinos as will be found anywhere. Chief Justice Arellano, Secretary of Finance and Justice Mapa, Attorney General Villamor, Justice Torres, Judge Araullo; Messrs. del Pan and Ortigas, of the code committee; Mr. Agoncillo, president of the bar association; ex-Secretary Araneta; and a long list of others will bear comparison with the bar and judiciary of any country. In medicine also there being not only a number of older Filipino physicians, such as Dr. Calderon, Dr. Singian, and Dr. Bautista, but other skillful ones among the younger generation. In business, there being among the merchants of the islands MANUEL EARNSHAW, the Resident Commissioner; Teodoro R. Yangco, the great Filipino philanthropist; the Fernandez brothers; Mr. Mauro Prieto; and others. In literature, science and art, Dr. Pardo de Tavera; Luna and Hidalgo, now deceased; not to mention the great Filipino patriot, Dr. José Rizal. There are, further, capable pharmacists, artisans, and farmers.

(VIII) "What influence will the generation now growing to manhood and womanhood exert on the civilization of the entire people?"

While I do not underestimate the inherent capability of the Filipinos and the influence of Spain on their civilization, possibly I am an extremist and enthusiast in emphasizing the national good which the American Nation has accomplished in its work with the Filipino youth. Although in some instances it must be conceded the American Government has tried to force a western civilization on an eastern people, and in other instances it may not have taken into account the prejudices and desires of the people of the islands, it has, nevertheless, given a chance for education to the lower and middle classes formerly debarred from such opportunities. It has trained students in democratic ideals, in practical pursuits, and in the elements of good government. It has elevated the Filipino women, opening to them useful pursuits, such as nursing, teaching, stenography, and household industries. It has, moreover, conducted this training in the English language, for, whatever may now be the viewpoint, it must eventually be conceded that it was well to ingraft a common method of communication which happens to be the great commercial language of the world. There are, of course, small jealousies on the part of some of the older people or on the part of some of the "ilustrado" class trained in the private schools according to Spanish methods, and, on the other hand, small jealousies on the part of some of the students trained in the public schools. In the main, and leaving these minor matters out of consideration, the influence of the generation now passing into manhood and womanhood, or which within the next 50 years will do so, will be found to be so extensive and so diverse as to be the leading factor in a progress which will give the Filipinos the same standing as Japan without a monarchial form of government.

(IX) "How could the functions of government be more economically administered?"

The Philippines have had from the beginning of American administration a most scientific system of government. If this system had any defect, it was in being too elaborate and top-heavy. The present administration is remedying these defects by making the government more simple and elastic. It is also cutting out unnecessary positions and Filipinizing the service wherever possible. I think this point can well be left to the best judgment of the present Governor General.

(X) "The main question is: Are the Filipinos ready for independence; and if not, how soon will they be likely to be ready? I am satisfied that the people of this country are looking forward to the time when the Filipinos will be free; but is it to be to-morrow, next year, or many years hence?"

As you state, this is the main question. It is a question on which no two persons can hardly agree. It would appear foolish, therefore, for me to rush in where so many have trod before. I offer my suggestions with some diffidence.

I do not believe any of your possibilities fit the case. The Filipinos should not be made free to-morrow; they should not be made free next year; they should not be made to wait many years. I consider there is a safe medium between "next year" and "many years hence."

The conclusion on such a point should be reached from a nonpartisan standpoint. It is not and should not be a matter for political controversy. It is a subject which should rise above Republican, Democratic, or Progressive platforms. It should be decided from the high altitude of what is best for the Filipino people and what is best for the American people. It should be the considerate dealing of a great and powerful nation with another nation less fortunate.

I say that the Filipinos should not be made free to-morrow or next year. They lack, and it is no reflection on them as a people, many of the characteristics and safeguards which are needed for a free and independent country.

I say also that it is not necessary to wait many years or many generations. One point which many Americans miss, either voluntarily or through lack of investigation, is that the Filipinos have had these aspirations and training not simply since American occupation, but through hundreds of years previous thereto. There was developed in the islands a civilization of their own. The church and the kingdom of Spain added to this from time to time. I fail to see how, if the Filipinos can not be made independent within a respectable period, they would be in any better position if they await the coming of generations yet unborn.

I would therefore think it only fair both to the United States and the Philippines that a resolution be adopted by Congress formally asserting the intention of the United States to make the Philippines free and independent on a given date, say in 1925. In the meantime, by administrative action, the Filipinos can be prepared for this event. In the meantime, also, and up to that specific date the sovereignty of the United States is supreme. Thereafter the United States would have no further obligations, moral or otherwise, and would have withdrawn itself from a dangerous position in the politics of the Orient. The United States should only have retained in the islands the island of Corregidor, on which it has expended so large an amount of money, and the necessary coaling station for its fleet.

GEORGE A. MALCOLM,
Dean, College of Law.

I will say that this letter was written before the last bill which has been reported here, which provides for a Philippine senate, was passed by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Will the gentleman kindly tell us from whom he is quoting?

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. George A. Malcolm, dean of the law school of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. What is the date of the letter?

Mr. HELVERING. It was written when the Jones bill was up for consideration in the previous Congress, November 20, 1913. For the information of the House I will say that Mr. Malcolm has been in the Philippines for nine years. He has been Assistant Attorney General in the office of the Attorney General, and is now, as I stated, the dean of the law school of the islands; and I submit his letter, not in support of the Clarke amendment to the present bill, but in support of the general proposition that we should at this time give some definite assurance of ultimate independence to the Philippine Islands. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, when we were trying to reach an agreement at 11 o'clock, under my right to reserve a point of order I wanted to suggest that we confine our discussion to the one point in dispute, the amendment that gives the Filipinos independence, and thus reduce the time so that we might reach a vote to-day. I did it because of what I knew would take place—that if general debate was the order, the House would empty and the speeches be delivered largely to vacant seats. I do not think that to discuss an issue involving such a change of policy as this amendment involves—in the House of Representatives, of 435 Members—and to discuss it with the House largely empty is very creditable either to those who speak or to the House itself. It does not speak very well for our interest in great public questions. That is the reason I wanted that suggestion made.

I have no pride in my opinion, and I am not here to criticize unduly any leader or any political party for this proposed legislation; but it does seem to me that it involves enough so that the membership of this House should be here when it is discussed.

I made a somewhat careful examination of the issues involved in this issue of independence; but, under leave to extend, I propose to insert that statement, cut loose here, and speak my mind as it is now stirred by the speeches made by the friends of this Senate policy.

Eighteen years ago the American flag went up in the Orient, figuratively speaking, for it was then that Dewey went through that dangerous channel into Manila Bay, when the command "Keep cool and steam ahead" became famous.

It is now to be determined to-day by the vote of this House whether we will haul down the American flag 18 years after it went up. It seems to me that the scuttle policy involved in that proposition ought at least to enlist the attention—if it does not of the American people, as I know it will—of every Member responsible for his vote to-day.

I have listened to this debate. I have analyzed the objections to a further continuance of the United States in those islands. I have listened to the argument that we should now get out. I notice that certain gentlemen put it upon the basis of fear. Fear, my fellow countrymen, in a time of crisis, when the honor of the Nation is involved, was never spoken of the American soul, and it is too late to do it now. [Applause.] They say that the Philippine situation is a military weakness, and therefore we should turn tail, recognize our inability, dishonor our past history, haul down our flag, and take to the woods. That does not appeal to me, and I feel sure it will not appeal to the American people. [Applause.]

Another line of argument is that it is based upon economy; that it has been costing too much. And in estimating the cost we have heard counted the cost of the establishment of the Army there. My fellow countrymen, should we to-day cut loose from the Philippines, we will not disorganize the Army. We will still keep somewhere in the world that establishment that is expensive to us. And that argument has no meaning to me, because the economy of it will be disrespected as soon as we take the vote, no matter how the vote goes. The fact is the islands can and will become self-supporting in time. They now support the constabulary while we support the Army, Navy, and harbors.

I have heard upon this floor that it is our duty to the Filipinos as well as to ourselves. There I differ from the author of those utterances. I do not believe that it is our duty, after inaugurating in the greatest laboratory for civilization that the world has ever known the work of training and disciplining people for self-government, and then right at the beginning of the promise of future ability to govern themselves, to scuttle the ship and run away, allow them to revert to the original type, which is absolutely sure to happen when we leave them. [Applause on the Republican side.] In the language of Abraham Lincoln in 1858, could we tell where we are and whither we are drifting we could better tell what to do and how to do it. In this discussion it is pertinent to ask the question "Where are we?" For 18 years we have been in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I think I will have to yield to my friend.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman has made three very forcible points. I wanted to ask him whether he was willing to recognize the logic of his position and say that the time would never come when we would agree to withdraw from the Philippines?

Mr. FESS. I would not take that position. I have voted and I will continue to vote to pursue the policy inaugurated by President McKinley and followed by Roosevelt and Taft. [Applause on the Republican side.] If you will keep out of your bill the mischievous promise in your preamble, which would mean nothing simply because it might mean anything, and of course the Clarke amendment of this Senate bill, which is a complete abandonment of our duty, I will vote for your bill. I have not taken the position that the United States shall never consult the time for withdrawal, but I am opposed to making any promise that future events may compel us to break; for you can not tell what is in the future, and no wise policy would commit you to some proposition that you might not be able to follow. You can not give self-government; it is not a gift; all we can do is to give opportunity to develop self-government. The Philippines are not ours by choice. We are not there by choice. We are there by the result of war the results of which we could not control. And now, when we get out, we must get out only when we are convinced that our duty to these people is fully performed, and not in the beginning of the performance of that duty that can not be effectively performed before conditions are attained that will make self-government possible. To do so would be a willing abandonment of a work the wonder of the Orient, to permit it to lapse back to former conditions. This will be a repudiation of an honor as well as duty that will invite the condemnation of the world and compel an admission on our own part of a miserable, craven spirit of cowardice.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to the chairman.

Mr. JONES. Did the gentleman not sign the minority report?

Mr. FESS. I did.

Mr. JONES. Does not the minority report say that you gentlemen would be willing to accept the House bill, preamble and all?

Mr. FESS. Preferentially, as between two evils, I will accept the lesser, of course, and so would other people. Eighteen years ago we started upon the solution of a problem that came to us not from our wish. That problem was to inaugurate a system of government of the best that we could do in the far Orient among a people unused to the modern spirit of enterprise. Some people said, "Get out and let them go to shift for themselves." Others said, "Convey them to another country." Having destroyed one government me must substitute another. Consequently still others said, "Let us stay and do the work for the Filipino, with no special regard to the selfish view of our own interests, and when we have put them in position to become what we hope some day they will be, a country of themselves, then we will let them pass, if such would seem to be the wise policy of mutual benefit to all concerned, but not until that time." That time must be determined by this Government, and not by Filipino agitators.

Now, you propose to do it in 18 years. A nation can not be built by the calendar. Nation building is not the result of a coming and going of the seasons. Nation building is the result of generations of careful preparatory education which must begin with the childhood of the nation and end with the full stature of its manhood. When the child that is in the primary grade of the school to-day in the Philippines becomes a man of 25 of 30 under American discipline and such training of the people that we will continue to require by that time, I doubt not we will be able to set a day to let them go. But you can not do it in a year or in a score of years; it is a thing to be done in generations.

Now, I waive aside all of the considerations mentioned except the one for the Filipino. I say nothing about the very important items of a commercial or material character involved in this bill. Others have done and will do that. I am not going to spend a moment upon the Philippines in reference to ourselves, but only as to our duty to these people, and what we have done.

Will you hear me and believe that there is a thousand times more in formation of character than in reformation? We begin with the child, believing that if you want to clean up a boy you do not begin with his body but with his mind. If you want to better the next generation, you begin on the minds of the children of this generation. That, in McKinley's mind, was fundamental. The first thing he did was to call the country's experts and to inaugurate a system of education, and among some of the men he sent there were some of my own personal friends. Here is a letter from one of the brainiest and best-informed men in America, the present president of Colgate University, a former head of the education department in the Philippines, and well versed on the subject. I wrote him, and said, "Give me your honest opinion." Here is what he said:

HAMILTON, N. Y., *April 24, 1916.*

Hon. S. D. FESS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It would be a mistaken policy for the United States to give independence to the Philippines within a quarter of a century.

First. It would be an injustice to the Filipinos themselves. They need and deserve the tutoring and the defense which the United States has started so well.

Second. It would be an injustice to the United States, because (a) in our present standing internationally to give up the Philippines would add decidedly to the feeling already held by many nations that we are hopelessly weak and vacillating in our policies; (b) to give up the Philippines at this time would mean that the money and lives that have been spent in this service would have been spent in vain.

Third. It would be a mistake from the standpoint of the larger civilization. I am told by a recent careful observer that the American school system in the Philippines, and the American ideas and ideals as exemplified there, are becoming very rapidly the standards for the entire Orient, especially China.

Sincerely,

E. B. BRYAN,
Sometime Commissioner of Education in the Philippine Islands.

Another capable gentleman, now a member of the faculty of the Miami University, in Ohio, wrote me as follows:

DAYTON, OHIO, *April 25, 1916.*

MY DEAR DR. FESS: Your favor of the 21st has just reached me, and I hasten to write you a few words on the Philippine question, for I, too, am opposed to trying to give the Filipinos their independence. I use the word "trying" advisedly and with a purpose, for no matter how much we might desire to give the Filipinos independence at this time, it would be an impossibility. If we cut loose from over there we will be turning the government over to the half-cast caciques, the "shoe hombres," who will only impose upon the 90 per cent of ignorant Filipinos. It is easy enough for men like QUEZON to make smooth speeches here in America about the way they will conduct the government for the good of all if they are only given an opportunity, but everyone who knows the islands intimately knows just what treatment the Filipino tao (common man) will receive at their hands. By all that is good and right and just, I beg of you and your coworkers to save the Filipinos from this untimely fate.

I was in the islands from July, 1909, to October, 1913, as one of the 35 or 36 division superintendents of schools. I was a graduate of Indiana University before going out there, and had during my college course taken more than an average interest in the Philippine question. I was firmly convinced that it was wrong to hold them in subjection, and had often warmly supported that side of the question in debate. But four years, three of which were spent in Samar and on Panay among the real Filipinos and away from the political storm center at Manila, then one year in Manila seeing that side of their life, fully convinced me of my error and showed me just how foolish I had been in my former position.

The Filipinos have made splendid progress under the control and guidance of their strong foster father. Instead of 40 to 60 meager dialects and so many isolated, warring tribes, they have been given one good language, with a literature that is unexcelled. They have been "scrambled" and brought to know each other, and this has led to respect. Only a few days ago I clipped an item from a Manila paper by a Moro boy who had been educated in Silliman Institute up in Negros. He said he had become acquainted with the Filipinos in the school and he was inviting them to come to Mindanao and take up claims in the rich lands down there. The full significance of this only dawns upon you when you recall all those troublesome years of Spanish rule, when the Moros were forever out among the islands on their pirate expeditions, pouncing down upon a town, killing the men, carrying away the women, rice, cattle, etc. Also, you remember that the Moros served notice on Gov. Forbes, Secretary Dickinson, and others that they will never submit to Filipino rule. But a few generations of American schools and they will be mixed up with all tribes, intermarriage will have taken place, they will have a common language, and race prejudices will be forgotten.

Another thing: There is a stable government now in the islands, and every Filipino knows that if he grows rice, sugar cane, hemp, or some other crop, or if he has horses, caraboo or cattle, they will not be taken away from him without his consent. A Filipino one time called my attention to an item in a Manila paper in regard to the unsettled conditions then prevailing in Cuba, particularly to the fact that wandering bands of ladrones had destroyed crops and carried away live stock. Then he remarked, "I am very glad for the Stars and Stripes here, only I don't dare to say so out loud." I then asked him how many of the Filipinos felt as he did and he told me at least 90 to 95 per cent of them.

Another thing: The Filipinos are for the most part just children. They are doing splendidly under the guiding hand of Uncle Sam, and are some day going to be grown up, if we give them a chance. It is up to us. They may occasionally need the strong hand—most children do—and the sooner we come to recognize this the better off both will be. I could give you incidents by the score to show you what I mean by saying they are just children. I will bother you with but one: One evening, while living in San Jose, word was received that a merchant vessel had gone down on the west coast of Panay early that morning and that the masts were still visible. My sister and I got our ponies and rode up along the coast to take a look. The ship had run head-in into a small, rocky island off the shore. The only explanation given for the accident by those who escaped was that the steering gear had got out of order and they could not control the ship. But the Americans present, and the Filipino provincial treasurer, too, who was a very intelligent Chinese-Italian-Filipino, knew what had happened—the crew had gone to sleep.

Not long after this I was returning from a division superintendents' convention in Manila and had to change steamers at Iloilo for San Jose. The steamer on which I embarked from Iloilo was manned entirely by Filipinos of at least average, or possibly above the average, in intelligence on the part of the captain, chief engineer, first officer, and others of the crew.

We left Iloilo at 10 p. m. and were due around at San Jose at 5 a. m. the next day. I slept on a bench on the upper deck that night, for one never knew what might happen. About daylight the next morning I awoke and found everyone aboard asleep and the boat drifting 25 miles out of its course without a wheel turning. The fire was out in the boiler and the only indication of life anywhere on the boat was that manifest among the fighting cocks, which were beginning to awake and crow.

I aroused the chief engineer and told him to get up steam, then called the captain and helped him get up a big sail so we might steer away from the rocks which were near. We reached port 10 or 12 hours later.

The only explanation the captain and other officers had to offer for going to sleep was that they were sleepy. And I suppose that is excuse enough for children. But until the time comes when they can feel a greater responsibility than they do now it will be sheer folly to try to turn the government over to them.

There are almost no Filipino business men; they have not a score of men who could lead if they were given a place among the nations of the world; their whole government revenue for a year, if I am correctly informed, would not pay for one modern warship; and the fact that the Filipinos now are as independent as the citizens of Ohio, these and further facts indicate very clearly that the United States ought to continue the same policies which were in effect until October 7, 1913, when Francis Burton Harrison landed there.

If the above is anything like what you wanted I am glad for this opportunity to say a word in behalf of the 90 to 95 per cent of Filipinos among whom I lived and worked for four years and who treated me with the greatest kindness and consideration during the entire time.

Use any of this you choose. If convenient I would be glad to have copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing the speeches made on the Philippine Islands question, both in the House and Senate.

Yours, very truly,

GEORGE E. CARROTHERS, *Oxford, Ohio.*

Hon. S. D. FESS,
House of Representatives United States.

If we will but continue this system of education where these 500,000 children now in the schools are studying the English language and continue the policy for a generation or two, the people who now speak the English language will be greatly multiplied, and the English language will in due time become the universal language in the islands. [Applause.] And with this as the universal language, we will develop a national spirit in the islands. Without a universal communication the national spirit is impossible. This is the greatest problem that confronts us.

Now the question is, If we take away these requirements, what will these people do? Their unrest, their fretfulness now under the present régime but indicates that they would take the first opportunity to revert back to the dialects of their own people and their own habits. This is self-evident. It must be the work of generations, not of years.

The child in the ash heap loves the ash heap for years after you take it into the new environment and will continue to love it until through education you change his ideas and his ideals. It will get back. When the Dutch people who first came here, among them the father and mother of one of the most famous men that ever sang in America, lived on the outskirts of this Capital City, that mother fretted for months and years for a place back home where she could wear the wooden shoes, dress in the simple garments, and live in the simple way. Our conditions were not indigenous to her country and she could not accept them. There is no truth more apparent in the law of biology than that of Herbert Spencer, that when original types develop, evolving a new type under new conditions, it will revert to the old type as soon as you remove the environment under which the new type was developed. That is not only true in biology, it is true in every form of life, and is especially true in nation building. Are we ready to say that our presence in the islands and our work in the schools are nationally unjustified and to be condemned and that we will withdraw now and let it all be lost? If you keep those directions for another generation then it will continue, I think, to be the law of the islands.

That is not all. Out of this system of education has come the most marvelous campaign for sanitation that is known to man. The results of sanitation expressed in outward form is the hospital system of Manila and the marine work, especially in Manila and other places in the islands. The immediate results of science under this direction is to eliminate all smallpox, all bubonic plague, and all cholera. No greater work was ever done than that in Habana by Col. Gorgas, equaled only by that done in the Panama Zone by the same distinguished surgeon, unless it has been done in Manila and throughout the islands. Are you going to lose by leaving too soon the fruits of that

remarkable achievement? Not only do you have it in sanitation but you have it in industrial education all through the islands, better industries under vocational training, better methods of dressing, clothing—the clothing of primitive life giving way to the modern methods.

If these things are wrong, then civilization is wrong. Men say to me, "You have no right to fasten upon the Filipinos our ideas." Then, if that be true, you have no right to interfere with slavery there; you have no right to interfere with peonage there; you have no right to interfere with polygamy there; you have no right to interfere with any of the things that have grown up under 300 years of domination by one of the countries of Europe. I say that we have a right, not because it helps us, but because we are developing the finest flower of civilization yet to be under our dominance yonder in the Orient that the oriental life knows. [Applause on the Republican side.] I was present at some of the hearings, and I have studied them carefully. The information is here. Not a man is recorded in these hearings who spoke for independence within the next two years—not one. They spoke for the preamble, a thing that I think is unwise; but, my God, the preamble does not hold a candle in its vicious criminalities to this Clarke amendment, for it is entirely different. The Clarke amendment is scuttle, and do it quickly. It is craven; it is cowardly; it is dishonorable; it is discreditable; it is shameful at this hour. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We have a suggestion of how the Filipinos regard modern methods in the building of the schoolhouses. It was objected to—or was, at least, in the hearings—and when it was asked why, they said, because they are too good; they are made of concrete. They wanted to go back to the ancient, primitive bamboo shack. There was too much expense connected with the building of the schoolhouse that would withstand the typhoons and the erosion of nature and stand forever; and that suggestion of opposition to the present régime indicates what they will do when restraints are removed. Back they will go to the ash heap—to the primitive life. We have built roads there, and the roads are objected to because they are too good. They say they are too expensive. In other words, they say they prefer to hold to the trail that perambulates from place to place; they want to take their time and not be hurried over a road that is built for all time.

The Chinaman originally objected to the first street cars that were built in China, and they literally upset the cars and said the reason was that they landed you at your destination too soon; that you did not have time to rest on the way. I am not giving you fiction; I am giving you what occurred in China, and to-day, under the American régime, in which the highest type of altruism ever displayed in the world is seen, and under the keenest and most discriminating leadership in nation building the world has ever known, these people are becoming modern, under a discipline that produces fretfulness, and when restraints are removed original customs will be resumed. Modern schoolhouses are being provided for them; they are becoming modern in education, modern in sanitation, modern in sewage, modern in pure water, modern in railroads, modern in roads, modern in the post office and in the postal savings banks and in telephones and telegraphs. As early as in 1907 more than 90 places were connected with Manila by telephone and telegraph. We are modernizing these people at an expense that they fret under a little, but which we believe pays, because it is not wholly for their convenience, but is for the next generation; and this fretfulness suggests to me what will take place when we remove the restraints of the American Government. The result is inevitable and is at once an act of enormity.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. For a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that many American communities might be found where if some foreign power came in and undertook to improve according to their methods and make the American native pay for it there would be resentment and restlessness?

Mr. FESS. Oh, yes; there are a good many things in our country that we ought not to have here and which we would like to improve.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that any argument why we ought not to have the right to govern ourselves?

Mr. FESS. It is an argument, yes, because there are certain things existent that you believe we ought to remove. I know the gentleman does, because I know his standards, and the gentleman would not say that because it is a habit of theirs that has grown up in 300 years of a certain form of government that we should not change the habit, even though they do not want it changed.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is an argument against the gentleman's position, that no nation in the world can superimpose its standard of civilization on any other people in an entirely different climate and of an entirely different race.

Mr. FESS. The standard of civilization would be in regard to the form of government, the customs of the people, and so on. We have a right to see that no form of government that is for and by the few as against the many can exist under our rule. I would not say that we should superimpose any form of religion or anything of that kind any more than would the gentleman. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, Judge DICKINSON.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, 18 years ago the American flag went up in Manila. Eighteen years ago the American flag went up in Cuba, and came down, according to American promise. The Filipino people look to this country to perform its promise made to them that independence should be given them, as it was given to Cuba. Four times in the Democratic platforms in national convention the party to which I belong has pledged itself to give independence to these people, and these people, nearly 10,000,000 in population, look to-day for the fulfillment of that pledge. The Clarke amendment is complained of, which promises independence in four years, and yet in the Senate every Democrat voting on the passage of the bill finally voted for the Clarke amendment in the bill as it came from the Senate to the House, together with a number of Republican Senators—such is the record in the Senate on this bill. It is true some Senators of both parties failed to vote, and such is the record on the passage of every bill. This bill passed the Senate by a vote of more than two to one.

It comes here to-day with the Clarke amendment in it, and the Filipino people ask to-day for the fulfillment of that promise, and have indorsed this bill in its present shape, with the Clarke amendment in it.

On April 20, 1898, the Congress of the United States, by joint resolution, declared—

> That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent—

And further resolved—

> That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Mark the language of the resolution relating to Cuba—occupation of Cuba merely for the purpose of pacification thereof. Our Republic has been opposed to a colonization policy. You would merely pacify Cuba. You would own and dominate and govern for all time the Philippine Islands, an alien people far remote, more numerous, and more intelligent and far more capable of self-government than the Cubans are.

If selfish business interests were not urging continued and permanent control of the Philippine Islands this bill would pass beyond any question. I will not impugn the motives of any Member here in this House. I know that many of you believe that we should extend our business relations everywhere. I believe in friendly commerce with all people, but I do not believe, with our ideals before us, that we should exploit any nation to the detriment of its people. Continue our control and refuse now to fix the date for independence for these people, and business reasons will grow stronger and stronger until, if they can have their way, those islands and lands will be exploited, and all that is worth anything in those islands will be in the possession and under the control of a foreign people. The aspirations and hopes of those people are the same kind of aspirations and hopes and love for freedom and desire for liberty and for independence that has been the heart throb and in the breast of every people since time began. It was in the breast of a majority of the people in the days of Greece when she was in the ascendency, and when in my youth I read Grecian history, my heart went out to those who begged for equality of opportunity, the same kind of equality of opportunity that you pleaded so strongly for years and was extended to the black people in this country.

I believe that even Mexico long ago would have been a splendid Republic and her people would have had a liberal government had it not been for the domination of foreign power in the past and the control by special interests and of the huge concessions to the few as against the wishes and prosperity of the many. [Applause.] The same heart throbs that have been in the breasts of the Irish people for four centuries against the

domination by England are in the hearts of the Filipino people, who have the same natural desire for liberty and independence and who had been oppressed for four centuries by the cruel rule of Spain. [Applause.]

The Filipinos are not ours to own; their lands are not our possessions for permanent control. Those islands belong to them. The Philippine Islands are entitled to be independent of foreign control, the Filipino people to their freedom from foreign domination.

Nation building comes not from oppression nor by foreign control. Japan has grown great and strong without foreign domination. Let the Filipinos have the same opportunity to rise to high estate, unfettered by repressive influences from abroad. Let us keep our promises so often made by official and public utterances to grant to this people their independence when a stable government was established, now not denied. Why not fix a time for performance on our part? Let us not longer subject ourselves to the criticism of want of good faith in further postponing compliance with our plighted word.

You of the opposition party of all men should not stand in the way of freedom for this people. Freedom for the black race in this country gave birth to your party, and you rose to power and control of this Government by crying aloud against slavery of the black race. I will not unduly attack your motives now. But separate yourselves entirely from selfish interests and those who would exploit those lands and people for selfish purposes and quickly the faith of this Nation will be kept.

The Filipinos are a brave, courageous people, and make good soldiers. Gen. "Chinese" Gordon, as he was called, said of the Philippine troops who formed part of his forces in the Chinese war:

> They are a fine, sturdy body of fellows, faithful and long-suffering, bearing hardships without murmurs; plucky, and never losing heart in defeat, and considerably superior to the Japanese.

It is said that the Philippines are at present the richest undeveloped region in the world. Greedy commercialism seeks to exploit these islands and rob these people of their own blessed heritage. They have earned what they fought for in their struggle for independence.

The large majority of the American people desire that which the Filipinos hope and pray for and demand as their right. Keep the promise made. Will the Republican Party cease to proclaim that it is the champion of human rights and of equal opportunity for all men and people in its desire now to do the bidding of selfish greed, so that a few exploiters may reap great profits at the expense of a people appealing for independence and at the expense of the American people? It has been oft said in this debate that already there has been expended more than $700,000,000 in our control of these islands.

Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, one of the ablest Senators that ever sat in that great body, an eminent Republican, who opposed the acquisition of the Philippine Islands bitterly and vigorously, declared more than 10 years ago that the United States had expended up to that time the enormous sum of $600,000,000, and we have kept constantly on the islands a standing army of United States soldiers at great expense to our country. Shall this expense continue forever, and shall the hope of these people for independence be destroyed in order that the greed of commercial interests may indefinitely exploit those islands, or shall we fix an early and definite date for their independence, as provided in the Clarke amendment, so earnestly desired by those people?

Does the Republican minority here, representing a great party, that has always claimed to be especial champions of liberty for all people and all classes, and came into power by reason of its advocacy of freedom for the slaves of the South—will it lend its efforts now to defeat this resolution at the instance of special interests, who want to defeat independence for selfish reasons? How any Democrat can join the Republican minority in this effort is passing strange. For the time being he violates the most sacred principles of Democracy, which believes that no people, however enlightened, are good enough to govern another people without their consent.

You say this is mere sentiment and should be set aside for business reasons. In reply I will say that sentiment based upon common honesty between men and nations should rule the world, as against that kind of greed for power and conquest that involves the world in war and misery.

What becomes of our famous Monroe doctrine, whereby we seek to prevent the acquisition of additional territory on this continent by foreign nations, and yet we seek to retain possessions in the far-away Orient, in another hemisphere, against the protest of those people.

I have hoped this resolution would pass as it came from the Senate, and thus evidence to the world that love of liberty and justice was stronger with us than selfish greed, and that the exploitation of a helpless people by force would not be laid at our door by other nations, who are controlled by the doctrine of force and the hunger for other possessions.

The people of this country will draw the distinction sharply between the Democratic Party, standing for human rights everywhere, as against any party controlled by special interests; between the party that openly declares with honest purpose its intention to keep its plighted faith and promise for independence of these people as against the party that seeks to postpone indefinitely, for so-called business reasons, the time when the ambitions of these people may be realized, under the claim that the Filipinos are not yet capable of self-government.

If we should hold on to these lands, what a mistake we made when we failed to acquire permanently the island of Cuba, so near to our shores and so close to the Panama Canal, which we must and will protect. Much more logical to have sought permanent domination over Cuba, title to which we could have acquired and held, with better purpose than to have purchased from Spain title to her possessions in the Philippines for $20,000,000, which she owed Cuba and could not pay and which we assumed and paid in exchange for a title in the Philippines, which she could no longer defend.

The Filipinos had about won their fight against Spain. It was assured when Admiral Dewey sailed into Manila Bay and destroyed the Spanish Fleet. It was the end of Spanish power in those islands. The Filipinos would soon have acquired that title by force of arms in their fight for freedom and independence against Spanish thralldom that had lasted for centuries. The twenty millions paid by the United States for Spain's title to her possessions in those islands was a mere gratuity to Spain, and we have taken the place of Spain and continue to our detriment to hold those islands and people as our possessions on the idea that they are not capable of self-government, when all high authorities familiar with both people admit they are far more intelligent and capable than the Cubans are.

What the American people desire, what the Filipinos by one voice ask for, what Francis Burton Harrison, Governor General of the Philippines, and President Woodrow Wilson both urge, should be done. What has been done by the American Senate by a vote of more than two to one should be done now by this House.

Far better take all the West Indies and round off our territory, as advocated by Thomas Jefferson; far better take Mexico and Central America, lying adjacent and south of us, and extend our dominion to the Panama Canal for the benefit of stable government in those countries and for business and other reasons, than to exploit under claims of right the Philippine Islands, in the far-away Orient, 8,000 miles away from our shores. We have more business interests in nearby Mexico, crying out for protection, than in the Philippines, and we are not seeking to extend our dominion over the countries south of us.

Let us be consistent. Let us be honest in purpose and keep faith with the American doctrine against the holding of colonies by this Republic. We have not held to the idea of acquiring additional territory without the ultimate purpose of granting statehood to the people thereof. Nobody expects or desires that the Philippine Islands shall ever become States of this Republic. Let us stay with our ideals. Let foreign nations hold to their ancient views of colonial possessions. They will break down in time and lose their colonies, as imperial governments in all the past have done. Such was the history of Greece and Rome. Such was the history of Spain. Lift the veil of the future, and such will be the fate of Great Britain and of Germany or any other imperial government that seeks to perpetuate its life by the domination of foreign lands and alien people. Let us not follow in the paths of those imperial governments, that in their eager desire to extend their power over foreign lands have destroyed not only the liberty of alien people but have brought ultimate injury and permanent loss to their own country. Let us not by any act of ours withhold independence from any friendly and foreign people on earth.

Let not human liberty and the spirit of independence be crushed or destroyed by the acts of this, the greatest of all Republics, but let the beacon light of a liberty-loving people blaze out so it can be seen as a living example to all the world, so that the people of every clime and country may look with admiration upon and behold with glad eyes the Republic of the United States standing as a strong man, with honest purpose, battling for the right and for justice and for liberty and for independence and the right of each distinct people to control their own affairs and to govern themselves. Stand for this high purpose and the Statue of Liberty, erected at the entrance to New York Harbor, crowned with a beacon light of liberty and bidding all to look and come to a country loving and standing

for freedom and independence. Stand for these things and that great statue, with its beacon light of liberty enlightening the world, will not have been raised in vain.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the campaign that will be conducted this fall is going to be quite different from that of any campaign conducted in recent years. The American people are going to hold their public servants to strict account, and they are going to inquire just what their position is and has been upon issues that vitally affect the well-being of this Republic. They are going to want to know have you voted to remove dangers that threaten international complications and war, or have you voted for policies that sow dragon's teeth in the path of the Republic. To-day you have the opportunity to render signal service to this Nation. Are you for America and her highest and best interest or are you on the side of Shylock and his Philippine bonds? Choose ye this day whom you will serve. [Applause.] The Philippine Islands is our danger point. It hangs like a millstone about the neck of the Nation, and it means trouble and war some day for our people.

Whenever we think of a future foreign war in which we might be engaged we think of the Philippine Islands, and we say if we ever have war with any foreign power it will be caused by our occupancy of the Philippine Islands. It was a mistake to take the Philippine Islands in the first place, and now, since we realize that, our holding on to something that we ought not to have is a menace and a danger to our peace and happiness, it is right and the part of wisdom to do as we did in Cuba, give freedom to the Filipinos and withdraw from the field of conquest and imperialism. [Applause.] Do you believe that the patriots of America want you to vote against fixing a time when we can be rid of the dangers that threaten us on account of the Philippine Islands, 8,000 miles away? In spite of the fact that the Filipino 18 years ago was as well qualified for self-government as the Cuban, we have expended over there $900,000,000. That is money enough to build a wide road, a boulevard, across the Republic from east to west and another from the northern boundary line to the southern, and pay for our river and harbor appropriations for this Congress, and pay for carrying out our preparedness program for both the Army and the Navy, and then have money left. [Applause.] Every intelligent man admits that our occupancy of the Philippine Islands is the thing that invites attack and that it is the thing that annoys and worries our people, who are not willing to spend American money and sacrifice American lives to hold something that we do not need and should not have. But gentlemen on that side talk about not taking down the flag when once we have planted it on foreign soil. God grant that we may never lack for courage and patriotism to take it down if it be the righteous and honorable thing to do. [Applause.] No right-thinking, patriotic American is willing to commit us to the unpatriotic and un-American policy of remaining in the Philippine Islands when to do so may involve us in a foreign war at any time. Our occupancy of the islands is a source of annoyance and embarrassment to the President now. These are critical times. We are told that if we should be drawn into war with any foreign power that Japan would engage us in an effort to take the Philippine Islands; that Japan says, "the Filipino is a yellow race, as we are, and the Philippines is a tropical country, the home of the dark and the yellow race," and we know that climatic conditions are such that the white man can not live there any great length of time and retain his health. Diseases common to that country and climate have carried hundreds of our soldiers into insane asylums and to untimely graves. The great God of Nature and of the eternal fitness of things is showing us by these unmistakable signs that the Philippines is not a white man's country.

Mr. Chairman, what an opportunity is ours to-day. When the armies of kings and emperors are fighting to the death in the Old World, here is an opportunity for the head servant in the household of nations in the New World to remove the only danger that threatens her peace, prosperity, and happiness, and at the same time give freedom to the Filipino and bring into existence the Philippine republic. [Applause.] The percentage of illiteracy in the Philippine Islands is less than that of the Republic of Chile; less than that of Brazil. The chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is a Filipino, and hundreds of Filipinos who hold office in the Philippine Islands got their places through the civil service. There are 500,000 Filipino children in the schools, and yet you talk about the people there not being capable of self-government. I am in favor of giving them their freedom, of coming out of the Philippine Islands and staying out. The immortal founders of this Government never intended that it should be so perverted from the ends of its institution as to fasten it on to a policy that would jeopardize its best interest and endanger the Republic. [Applause.] We can not defend the Monroe doctrine and say to foreign countries, "You shall not acquire territory and set up your authority on this continent" and at the same time go 8,000 miles into the Pacific Ocean, acquire territory, and set up American authority in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Chairman, we have come to the parting of the ways. We must decide whether we will give the Filipinos their independence and withdraw from the islands and stand by the Monroe doctrine and keep foreign powers out of territory on this continent or abandon the Monroe doctrine and by doing so tear down the mightiest bulwark of our liberties, and for the privilege of acquiring and holding territory abroad barter to foreign powers the privilege of acquiring and holding territory adjacent to us. This is the mighty problem involved in the proceedings here to-day. [Applause.]

But some gentlemen take the position that some Americans own Philippine bonds and others say that some of their constituents have invested money in the Philippine Islands.

I do not want to see any American lose a dollar on the Philippine bonds and I do not want to see any citizen of this country lose his investments in the Philippine Islands, but I am not willing, on account of a few men who went on their own accord and made these investments, to fasten upon a hundred millions of American people the colonial policy back of these gentlemen who oppose this measure to-day. In the four years between now and the time for granting independence to the Filipinos arrangements can be made about the bonds and Americans desiring to do so can arrange to leave the islands or stay, as they choose. I for one am for doing the wisest and best thing for the American people.

I am willing for the American boy to fight and, if need be, to die in protecting that flag and in defense of our country, but I am not willing to see a single American soldier sacrificed upon the unholy altar of the Philippine policy that un-American interests are calling for here to-day. [Applause.] The Democratic platform has declared time and again for the independence of the islands.

Speaking of these Americans who own Philippine bonds. Do you know what happened when the bonds were sold? The act of Congress required that they should not sell them under par, but they did it, anyhow. Did you know that they asked Mr. Taft and Mr. Root to guarantee those bonds and that both of them refused? Did you know that Mr. Taft and Admiral Dewey both said that the Filipinos were as well prepared for self-government as the Cubans? And you do know that we gave freedom to the Cubans and, strange to say, refused to give it to the Filipinos. Mr. Chairman, 18 years have gone; $900,000,000 have been expended; our soldiers are still on guard in the islands; and under our watchful care the Filipino is far better prepared for self-government than when Mr. Taft said that he was more capable of self-government than the Cuban. But Americans who have money invested in the islands and those who own Philippine bonds inspire more enthusiasm among Republicans than does giving liberty to the Filipino and providing for the safety and well-being of the Republic. You Republicans make speeches on that side and talk about Lincoln whenever you want to put over a deal for sinister interests. If Lincoln lived to-day he would certainly be for the freedom of the Philippine Islands. [Applause.] He believed in putting the man above the dollar, and you Republicans are voting to-day to put the dollar above human liberty and above the best interest of your own country.

You are voting against America's best interest and in the interest of Philippine bondholders, and I predict that for every Democrat that we lose to-day we will gain one in place of a Republican in the election this fall. Mark that prediction. Nine hundred million dollars have gone; $40,000,000 of American money a year spent in the Philippine Islands. Do you believe that the American people are willing to be taxed $40,000,000 a year in order to protect and safeguard $17,000,000 worth of Filipino railroad bonds?

I predict that in the next Congress we will have Democrats enough here from the great West and Northwest to register the judgment of the people on this question. [Laughter and applause.] "Who laughs last laughs best." Our time to laugh will come in November, when the voice of the people will be heard above that of the bondholders of the Philippine Islands. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHEELER. If all the predictions that you have made in the last three or four months come true, do you think we will have as many as two Members on this side of the House next fall?

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, if we do reduce the number to two Republicans, I shall be delighted to see my good friend here as one of them. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. How much time is there remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has consumed 2 hours and 5 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa 2 hours and 13 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not desire to use time now.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, 18 years ago to-day our great hero, Admiral Dewey, made history for the Republic. His victory in the harbor of Manila made us a world power. Congress is going to make history again on the 1st day of May for the United States. We are going to make it by the solid votes of the Republican Members and 30 splendid, red-blooded, American Democrats on the other side of the House. [Applause on the Republican side.] We are going to have a patriotic union here to defeat a bill the title of which should be changed to that of "the scuttle bill" [applause], a measure to present to Japan, our commercial and naval rival in the Pacific, an empire in the Orient, with a population of 8,000,000, and in extent as large as all New England and the Empire State (New York) combined, or larger than Italy, and nearly as large as England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. We have been denouncing in the public press and in speeches the violation of the treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium, but this movement here to-day on the part of the administration is to make absolutely worthless a sacred and binding treaty we negotiated with the Government of Spain.

We promised under the terms of that treaty we would guarantee religious freedom in the Philippine Islands and the protection of the property of the Spanish subjects in the islands.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to have you tell us how we violate that treaty?

Mr. AUSTIN. We promised under the terms of that treaty we would guarantee religious freedom in the Philippine Islands and the protection of the property of the Spanish subjects in the islands.

It is a treaty binding upon the honor and the conscience of honest people and upon an honest Government.

You are attempting to transfer a treaty obligation to a new government, a native government, and yet you dare not guarantee the integrity of the proposed government, although you promised to do so four times in your party platform. Many Members wish to turn these islands adrift because they are afraid. I would rather be dead than a coward. [Applause.] And the nation too cowardly to stand up for its rights, for its people, and its honestly acquired territory is not worth fighting for, living for, or dying for. [Applause.]

The following Democrats voted against the Clarke amendment in the Senate: Messrs. HITCHCOCK, LEE, LEWIS, MYERS, O'GORMAN, PHELAN, POMERENE, RANSDELL, REED, SAULSBURY, and WALSH. [Applause on the Republican side.]

President Taft, the first Governor General of the Philippine Islands; Gov. Gen. W. Cameron Forbes, of Massachusetts; and Gov. Gen. Luke E. Wright, of Tennessee, all assure us the Filipinos are not ready for self-government and that this bill should be defeated. Gen. Luke Wright is a citizen of the State I represent in part. He is as high a type of an American citizen as can be found in any State of the Union, while President Taft and Gov. Forbes also enjoy the respect and confidence of the American people. Prof. Thomas L. Blayney, of Houston, Tex., spent some time visiting the islands last year, and he corroborates the statements of the gentlemen I have mentioned, who presided over the Philippine government for a number of years with credit and honor. I challenge any Member of the Texas delegation to say that Prof. Blayney is not worthy of belief. We have a reliable Democratic witness from Florida in the person of Judge Arthur F. Odlin, of Arcadia, who served on the bench in the Philippine Islands. In a recent letter published in the New York Times he states the Filipinos are not prepared to conduct stable government. Our colleague, Mr. CLARK, tells me Judge Odlin stands high in Florida. President Wilson, the highest Democratic authority, has this to say about the Clarke amendment:

> It is my judgment that the action embodied in the Clarke amendment in the bill, extending further self-government to the Philippines, is unwise at this time.

Are you going to attempt to commit the Democratic Party to legislation when the head of that organization, over his own signature, stated it was "unwise at this time"?

Mr. GALLAGHER. What document is that, I will ask the gentleman?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is an extract from a letter, written by President Wilson to his late Secretary of War, Mr. Garrison.

Mr. GALLAGHER. When was it written?

Mr. AUSTIN. On February 10, 1916. In that correspondence Secretary Garrison stated:

> I consider the principle embodied in the Clarke amendment an abandonment of the duty of this Nation and a breach of trust toward the Filipinos; so believing, I can not accept it or acquiesce in its acceptance.

In addition to the views of the distinguished Republicans and Democrats I have quoted, it would not be out of order to state that the Republican and Democratic Parties in the Philippine Islands, composed exclusively of Americans, in convention assembled to send delegates to the Republican and Democratic national conventions next month, have passed resolutions condemning the pending bill, and protesting against its passage. The Merchants' Association of Manila, composed of American merchants and business men, and being the strongest organization of the kind in the Orient, has sent a vigorous protest to Congress against the Clarke amendment.

The American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, in its recent convention in the city of Atlanta, passed a resolution against this iniquitous bill and its members followed up that action by signing and transmitting to Congress a petition of protest bearing the names of the leading cotton manufacturers of the Southern States.

My good friend Mr. HEFLIN, of Alabama, says we are spending $40,000,000 a year there. The fact is, the islands are now practically self-sustaining. The gentleman from Alabama only missed it by about $33,000,000. The expense to our Government at this time is almost entirely in transporting the Army to and from the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. How much is the cost?

Mr. AUSTIN. The testimony as shown in the discussion in the Senate on this bill is that the annual cost is from six and one-half to seven million dollars. If we take the Army out of the islands and turn all military work over to the native constabulary and scouts, we can maintain law and order and save this expense. But we have been keeping our Army over there not only to preserve order in the Philippine Islands, but to care for our interests in China and keep a watchful eye on Japan. [Applause.] If the Philippine people are prepared at this time to run an orderly, safe, and stable government, why doesn't President Wilson withdraw the Army now and use it in Mexico?

Now, let us see about some other matters. There are about 7,000 Americans in the Philippine Islands, hundreds of whom went there as soldiers, many of them from my own State. They fought to maintain our sovereignty and to plant our flag over the historic walls of Manila. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided that the Philippine Islands are American territory. So these Americans went there in good faith, 18 years ago, and built or purchased new homes and became interested in various business enterprises. They established wholesale and retail houses, opened mines and lumber camps, constructed mills and factories. Members of this House almost weep and cry over the Filipinos, but forget all about their own kith and kin, fellow Americans, in the Philippine Islands.

They would withdraw the Army and Navy; they would turn over the lives and property to the care and keeping of the natives without a pang and without hesitation. They would take the chances of giving the world another Mexico, Haiti, or San Domingo.

If the Members of this House could go there and meet those splendid Americans, they would be proud of them. They are longingly looking to Washington City for friendship, for protection, for justice from a country they have served in peace and in war. They have carried $150,000,000 there under an invitation of our Government and invested it and made these islands the marvel and the admiration of the world.

Their money, talent, energy, pluck, and courage have wrought wonders in the far-off Orient—higher wages, increased trade and commerce, countless blessings and opportunity, prosperity, progress, education, and happiness for the Filipinos.

American capital was used to build sewers and waterworks, to drive out Asiatic cholera and the plague, to give the natives health and strength. And now that these honest, courageous, and patriotic Americans, with their hard-earned American dollars, have gone there to build up, improve, and develop the islands;

to bring to the natives health and modern sanitary conditions; to construct railroads and public utilities, you say, "Oh, let the bondholders go." Yet these very bonds were sold to men, women, and children in the United States. What will you do with the Tennessee soldier who went over as a member of the First Tennessee Regiment, which immortalized itself under the flag, who now has his little boot and shoe store in Manila? What will you do with Judge Ingersoll, from my State, who has his last dollar invested in a mining proposition? What will you do with the southern man from Georgia who has his every cent invested in a lumber enterprise? What will become of the other Americans, hailing from every State in the Union? Will you create another Mexico for them? Oh, no, my countrymen. Is there no sentiment, is there no sense of justice in the hearts of the Members of this House, that we can forget and desert our good, true, and tried Americans in the far Orient?

Mr. Chairman, I would feel disgraced, dishonored, to cast adrift the 7,000 Americans in the Philippines. If we do it, we will regret it the rest of our lives. Our children will blush for us long after we are gone. Are we wholly indifferent to the welfare, safety, and happiness of our fellow Americans in the Philippine Islands?

Something has been said about trade. When the Philippine Islands were under the Spanish Government we exported to the islands 8 per cent of all their imports. Just prior to the European war we exported to them 51 per cent of all they bought. Under the Spanish Government we sold American goods to the value of $120,000. In 1914 we sold them $27,000,000. We sold to them under the Spanish Government $325 worth of American cotton goods. Last year we sold them $6,900,000, very largely from the cotton mills of the South. Practically one-sixth of all the cotton goods exported from America to-day are sold in the Philippine Islands—five times more than we sell annually to the 400,000,000 people of China. We sold to our insular possessions—Porto Rico, the Philippine Islands, and the Hawaiian Islands—$7,500,000 under foreign flags. We sold $85,000,000 under the American flag in 1914. [Applause.]

Our sales in the Philippines for 1914 exceeded our exports to China for the same period, and was equal to half of the amount we disposed of in Japan and greater by $2,000,000 than the amount we shipped to all of the following countries in South America during 1914: Venezuela, Peru, Colombia, Uruguay, Bolivia, and Paraguay. Our trade in Chile and Peru combined fell a million and a half dollars behind the Philippine orders in 1914. Comparing our trade in the islands with some of our exports to European markets, we have the following: Our Philippine trade in 1914 exceeded by $3,000,000 all we sold to Greece, Portugal, Switzerland, and Turkey in Europe, and fell short only $3,000,000 in equaling our exports to Russia.

Raise the American flag, give Congress the right to pass trade and tariff laws, and we will increase our trade, which means work in the workshops, in the mills, and in the factories to the great army of deserving American wage earners. Are we going to abandon the Orient, when Manila can be America's Hongkong for the awakening trade of more than half the population of the entire world? The Philippine Islands are the richest, most fertile undeveloped islands in the world, and in a short time under our flag we can increase our trade there $200,000,000 a year. No, my countrymen. Let us go forward and not backward. Let us go on and not retreat. Let it never be written in the annals of American history that we are too cowardly to stand for our flag and to defend our possessions. [Applause.]

The chairman of the committee, Mr. JONES, says they are going to make some provision for the bondholders. What are you going to do about the merchants, the manufacturers, mine operators, and so forth? What are you going to do about the lawyers and professional men in Manila and elsewhere? What are you going to do with the Americans engaged in the wholesale and retail jobbing business? What are you going to do with the American business men in the hemp, coconut, and sugar industries, in the lumber and mining business? Are you going to single out the bankers and guarantee them against loss? Yet you forget the plain man, you forget the Spanish-American soldier, who has made Manila his home for the past 18 years. Where is his guaranty; his security? What would the guaranty given to the bondholder amount to, executed by a native government, where more than 80 per cent of the adults can neither read nor write, with a population of 8,000,000, of 800,000 non-Christian tribes, speaking 15 or 20 dialects, and with a total government income of less than $15,000,000, not enough to purchase a modern battleship. Such a guaranty would not be worth the paper it was written upon. It would be a gold-brick proposition, pure and simple. What else? Here is the only country in the Orient with a Christian religion. What is going to become of it if turned adrift? If this bill becomes a law, Japan will, in a short time, own these islands. Here is a San Francisco paper, with interviews with returning Americans, who tell how Japanese are buying up the public utilities, sugar lands, and so forth, and getting ready to take these islands over. Are you going to turn adrift, abandon the American missionaries with their churches, schools, and hospitals? Every one of them has appealed to Congress not to do this foolish thing. Catholics, Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopalians, all sects enter their protests against this unwise legislation.

I know there has been some criticism of certain Democratic Members of Congress because they oppose this bill. I have criticized Tammany myself as a partisan Republican, but I say all honor to the representatives of Tammany Hall and their Democratic colleagues who have the courage to stand up in a Democratic Congress and fight for America. [Applause.]

I send to the Clerk's desk an article from a Manila paper containing an interview with one of the Filipino graduates from the University of the Philippines. I know the native public officeholders and native editors and politicians in the Philippine Islands are for this Clarke amendment. But you finish the educational training of the Filipino until he becomes a voter, and he would rather taken poison than have the United States withdraw its Army and Navy.

The Clerk read as follows:

The feet of the young men are leading them toward political office nowadays. A number of them are contestants in the race for membership of the municipal board, under the new city charter, and among these is Bienvenido A. Tan, a graduate of the University of the Philippines. He was interviewed by the Free Press as to his platform, and we make no apology for reproducing certain passages from the statement which he furnished. Said this young man:

"I have observed that most of the people do not understand the real situation in regard to the Jones bill. The politicians of the 'old school' tell the people, either intentionally or from ignorance, only about the advantages to be gotten from the Jones bill, but not the responsibilities that go with it. They tell the people that with the Jones bill we shall be a free people, have less taxation, and no worry about anything. Some of the people believe that with independence taxes will be abolished. This is the opinion I heard among representative people in my own Province. I explained to them that just the contrary will happen—that taxes will be doubled, for the expenses then will be greater.

"Most of the leading Filipino leaders do not understand the real truth; if they do, they are careful not to tell the people about it. * * *

"* * * I am not opposed to independence, but I do not want the premature independence promised now. I believe in stable, real independence; not the independence of one or two years, but a permanent independence based on economic independence. When I believe my country is ready, I shall be the first man to cry for independence. When the country is ready, I believe independence will fall like ripe fruit—you won't need to ask for it. To-day were a vote taken among the young men of the Manila High School on the Jones bill, I believe 90 per cent of them would vote against it. And they are just as good patriots as Osmena and QUEZON and Palma or anybody else." (Manila Free Press.)

Mr. AUSTIN. In conclusion, I challenge any man on that side of the House to name a single Democratic daily paper in the United States which has indorsed the Clarke amendment. From one end of this land to the other the daily press of this country, Republican, Independent, and Democratic, are opposed to that amendment. There are no editorials stronger against this "scuttle bill" than those contained in the New York World, an administration paper, and the strongest was published in that paper to-day. Public sentiment is against this unpatriotic measure. If this question could be submitted to a vote of the Democratic Party, that party would decide against it at the November election. It is not the pledge guaranteed in the Democratic national platform. You promised protection and that you would guarantee their independence until a neutrality treaty could be made. If you cut them adrift, if you scuttle them, if you withdraw the strong protecting arm of the American Army and Navy, if you lower our flag, you could not do a greater wrong or perpetrate a more lasting disaster upon the Filipino people than by the passage of the pending bill. [Applause.]

Grover Cleveland lowered our flag and deserted Americans in the Hawaiian Islands, and for the offense was punished at the first election. A similar political fate awaits Woodrow Wilson if he repeats the performance in the Philippine Islands.

I am a southern man. I have been in the Philippine Islands, and I say, without reflecting upon the Philippine people, who deserve credit and have made wonderful progress, that the American colored man is better qualified and better equipped for self-government to-day than are the Philippine people. And yet the men on the floor of this House who are advocating the so-called independence of the Filipinos, putting them over the Americans in the islands, would not dare vote to give the colored people in many of the Southern States the right of franchise.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman mean to convey the impression that he will never vote to grant independence to the Filipinos, or that he does not desire that result?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am too good an American to see the flag of my country lowered in a land that we purchased with American money and the blood of American soldiers. If you will educate these people, they will know the value of being protected by a strong Government like our own, and the very fact that they want to turn themselves adrift is the best evidence that they are not prepared for self-government. Besides, there is always ample independence, liberty, and justice beneath our flag and on our territory.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the gentleman is not in favor of granting independence to Cuba, because it was purchased by American blood?

Mr. AUSTIN. We made a great mistake when we failed to hold Cuba. We have been sending our Army to Cuba to restore order, at our own expense, since she set up a government of her own. The United States ought to have Cuba and Mexico and on down to the Panama Canal. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Does not the bill give the Filipinos every right and privilege that Canada now enjoys?

Mr. AUSTIN. As much liberty and freedom and as much government as the British give to Canada, as the United States has given to any American territory, and far more than the people of Washington City and the District of Columbia enjoy. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON].

[Mr. QUEZON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee yields five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, it is almost trite that one who knows so little of the Philippine Islands should speak immediately after the Resident Commissioner of the islands, Mr. QUEZON, who knows so much of his own people and his own land and is so capable of presenting it here. [Applause.] If any doubt had ever lurked in my mind regarding our duty of granting independence to the Philippines, the speech of the Resident Commissioner, just delivered, has forever dissipated it. [Applause.] Each time as interruptions by the different Members were made, I almost held my breath to know if the Resident Commissioner would be able to so acquit himself that his speech and his conduct would commend both him and his people to us on this most important day; but as the replies fell from his lips I found him thoughtful, careful, and painstaking in diplomacy, capable, able, fearless, and courageous. I can not but pause and wonder if the speech of the gentleman just concluded does not for the moment break through the barriers of partisanship and tug at the heartstrings of the Republican Party, which is to-day, in unison and accord, standing in the pathway as an obstruction to Philippine independence, the thing these people most desire. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Ten million Filipino people, 10,000 miles away, occupying 3,000 islands of the sea, are through their accredited representatives in Congress this day asking for independence. I am proud of my party to-day as I have never been before, that it is striving to give them their one wish—that of independence.

It was 18 years ago to-day when Admiral Dewey triumphantly entered Manila Bay and forever banished Spanish rule from the Philippine Islands. It was a glorious victory then for our Navy, it was even a greater victory for the Philippines; and my only hope is that those two righteous victories may this day ripen into a more genuine one, that of liberty and freedom and home rule for these people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Our Government then, and at every intervening moment since then, has been well meaning and helpful to the Filipino people; but as every utterance and every brief and every understanding, both express and implied, has been toward the ultimate independence of the Philippine Islands, the time is now upon us to take a firm and positive stand and to actually fix the day at which our withdrawal may be expected and actually had. The great political party of which I am an humble member has not during the 18 years of Philippine occupancy been silent on this great question. The last four national conventions, beginning with 1900, again in 1904, again in 1908, and again in 1912, all promised plainly, emphatically, and without equivocation their intention to ultimately withdraw and deliver full independence to the Philippine Islands. Their several provisions dealing with this subject are as follows:

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM—1900.

We condemn and denounce the Philippine policy of the present administration. It has involved the Republic in unnecessary war, sacrificed the lives of many of our noblest sons, and placed the United States, previously known and applauded throughout the world as the champion of freedom, in the false and un-American position of crushing with military force the efforts of our former allies to achieve liberty and self-government. The Filipinos can not be citizens without endangering our civilization; they can not be subjects without imperiling our form of government; and as we are not willing to surrender our civilization nor to convert the Republic into an empire, we favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and, third, protection from outside interference, such as has been given for nearly a century to the Republics of Central and South America.

The greedy commercialism which dictated the Philippine policy of the Republican administration attempts to justify it with the plea that it will pay, but even this sordid and unworthy plea fails when brought to the test of facts. The war of criminal aggression against the Filipinos, entailing an annual expense of many millions, has already cost more than any possible profit that could accrue from the entire Philippine trade for years to come. Furthermore, when trade is extended at the expense of liberty, the price is always too high.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM—1904.

We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now and upon suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people upon their feet, free and independent, to work out their own destiny.

The endeavor of the Secretary of War, by pledging the Government's indorsement for "promoters" in the Philippine Islands, to make the United States a partner in speculative legislation of the Archipelago, which was only temporarily held up by the opposition of the Democratic Senators in the last session will, if successful lead to entanglements from which it will be difficult to escape.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM—1908.

We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandoning a fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM—1912.

We reaffirm the position thrice announced by the Democracy in national convention assembled against a policy of imperialism and colonial exploitation in the Philippines or elsewhere. We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder, which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandonment of the fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

So far as I may speak for myself, so far as I am permitted to speak for my district, in the limited way that I may speak for my party, I hope on this eighteenth anniversary we will proceed to do the actual thing in office that we have promised to do while securing office. No member of the Democratic Party at all mindful of his platform pledge can read or hear read the planks in the platforms just presented without feeling and knowing and understanding that his full duty is to-day to vote for the Philippine independence bill and do it without equivocation, mental reservation, or purposes of evasion.

Every member of the Republican Party who has spoken on this subject to-day is opposed to even naming a day in the future at which they would promise to have our Government withdraw and grant independence to these people. Nearly, if not quite, all of the speakers on the Republican side have been interrogated on the subject, and each and every one of them has refused to name a day, however distant that may be. Can the Republican Party longer travel in the realm of hyprocrisy and assert that they are or ever will be for Philippine independence? Can the remnant of the Republican Party, that have in Illinois descended from Lincoln to Lorimer, in Ohio from McKinley to Taft, and who are still on the toboggan, longer even feign friendship for these people or hold out any hope looking toward the independence of a people who, first, have been promised it; second, are asking for it; and, third, who prize it as their one hope and desire?

We are told around the cloakrooms and corridors that some 28 or 30 Tammany Hall Democrats from New York will to-day join hands with the Republican Party and defeat the Philippine independence bill. I hope this may not be true; but if the Philippine independence bill must die this day, let it be well known and

well understood that it was the combination and coalition of a solid Republican Party plus Tammany of which it was born.

Vague charges have been made that the pending bill does not protect capital invested in the islands. On this I enter an emphatic denial of fact; but if it were a fact, I shall not allow the greed of the dollar mark to interfere with or interrupt my efforts and the efforts of my party toward doing full-handed justice and granting full independence to a people whose one wish by day and by night is liberty, freedom, independence, and life. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The opponents of the bill—and I may add, with one exception, in the debate to-day, have all appeared from the Republican side of the Chamber—are saying that they are for independence and freedom for the Philippines "as soon as they are fit for it." This answer was the answer of King George to the American colonists in 1776 when they craved more liberty than they were allowed, when they asked more than they received. Such an answer is the answer that every monarch in power has made since time began to those without power. It shall not be my answer, nor the answer of my party on the eighteenth anniversary of the freedom of the islands from Spanish rule. To make such an answer as the opponents of Philippine independence make here to-day is a hollow mockery and a sham, is an insult to intelligence, is unworthy to be made in behalf of any great political party. To make such an answer is but to blight the glory of a Republic by resorting to stock phrases and practices of monarchies long since banished and destroyed.

We are told that a remnant of the party of Jefferson will to-day join the solid phalanx of the Republican Party and aid in the blasting of promises made and further break faith with a people unable to enforce justice at our hands, but I hope it is not true. We are told that certain of our party will turn deaf ears to the teachings of Jefferson and Lincoln and go groping with strange gods on strange missions in strange lands, but I am hoping that the Democratic Party will to-day on this occasion suffer no such disaster.

We are told by the opponents of Philippine independence from that side of the Chamber "that we shall not haul down the American flag." This is another stock phrase of standpatism borrowed from the monarchs of old and conceived by them, and intended to convey an idea of cowardice, lack of patriotism, or retrenchment from the position of a brave, courageous Republic. I resent such imputations and assert them to be as untrue as they are unfounded, that the Democratic Party or any part of it is lacking in patriotism, courage, bravery, or admiration of the American flag. To lower the flag in cases like this is in the interest of liberty, of justice, of freedom, and of generosity is as honorable as it is courageous. To leave aloft the flag in a foreign land 10,000 miles from the seat of this Government, 7,000 miles from our nearest seaport, to rule over a people unwilling to be governed by us, means imperialism and unwelcome aggression that ought to be unknown and unheard of in a Republic like ours. To allow the flag to remain up longer, after 18 years of earnest, solemn promises that we would withdraw is but the submarining of a Republic, the debauchment of our Constitution, and the derailment of earnest and honest intentions to fulfill every requirement of a republic. You opponents of the bill on the Republican side of the Chamber say, "It shall not be, it will not be; we will not haul down the flag." I answer you that we did haul down the flag in Cuba, and ask is there this day friend or foe who will gainsay the righteousness of our act in so doing?

I present here five brief letters between this Government and Cuba at the time we last "hauled down the flag":

FROM PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT TO PRESIDENT PALMA.

WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1902.

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA.

SIRS: On the 20th of this month the military governor of Cuba will, by my direction, transfer to you the control and government of the island of Cuba, to be thenceforth exercised under the provisions of the constitution adopted by your constitutional convention as on that day promulgated; and he will thereupon declare the occupation of Cuba by the United States to be at an end.

At the same time I desire to express to you the sincere friendship and good wishes of the United States and our most earnest hopes for the stability and success of your Government, for the blessings of peace, justice, prosperity, and ordered freedom among your people, and for enduring friendship between the Republic of the United States and the Republic of Cuba.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE GOVERNMENT BY PRESIDENT PALMA.

HABANA, *May 20, 1902.*

Hon. Gen. LEONARD WOOD.

SIR: As President of the Republic of Cuba, I hereby receive the government of the island of Cuba, which you transfer to me in compliance with orders communicated to you by the President of the United States, and take note that by this act the military occupation of Cuba ceases.

I take this solemn occasion, which marks the fulfillment of the honored promise of the Government and people of the United States in regard to the island of Cuba, and in which our country is made a ruling nation, to express to you, the worthy representative of that grand people, the immense gratitude which the people of Cuba feel toward the American Nation, toward its illustrious President, Theodore Roosevelt, and toward you for the efforts you have put forth for the successful accomplishment of such a precious ideal.

T. ESTRADA PALMA.

MESSAGE OF GRATITUDE FROM PRESIDENT PALMA TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

HABANA, *May 20, 1902.*

THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
President, Washington:

The government of the island having been just transferred, I, as Chief Magistrate of the Republic, faithfully interpreting the sentiments of the whole people of Cuba, have the honor to send you and the American people testimony of our profound gratitude and the assurance of an enduring friendship, with wishes and prayers to the Almighty for the welfare and prosperity of the United States.

T. ESTRADA PALMA.

FROM SECRETARY ROOT TO PRESIDENT PALMA.

WASHINGTON, *May 20, 1902.*

PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA:

Believe in my heartfelt congratulations upon the inauguration of the Republic which the people of Cuba and the people of the United States have fought and labored together to establish. With confidence in your unselfish patriotism and courage and in the substantial civic virtues of your people, I bid you God-speed, and on this happy day wish for Cuba for all time liberty and order, peace and prosperity.

ELIHU ROOT, *Secretary of War.*

FROM PRESIDENT PALMA TO SECRETARY ROOT.

HABANA, *May 21, 1902.*

ELIHU ROOT,
Secretary of War, Washington:

I am deeply moved by your heartfelt message of congratulation on the inauguration of the Republic of Cuba, to the birth of which the people and the Government of the United States have contributed their blood and treasure. Rest assured that the Cuban people can never forget the debt of gratitude they owe the great Republic, with which we will always cultivate the closest relations of friendship and for the prosperity of which we pray to the Almighty.

T. ESTRADA PALMA.

I pause and ask here, Is there an American with soul so dead who can not and will not appreciate this brave record of magnanimity toward the Cubans and Cuba? Can the prattling words of mad imperialists, speaking for an imperialistic standpat party, dim the glory so justly earned in our brave dealings with Cuba? What glory would we deserve that we would not receive if we treated the Philippines, 10,000 miles away, as we treated Cuba, only a few miles away? What great change has been wrought that would make it a virtue and imperishable glory to haul down the flag in Cuba in 1902 that would make it hypocrisy, pusillanimous, and lacking in patriotism to haul it down in the Philippines to-day? [Applause.]

Again, we are told by you spokesmen of the Republican Party who are to-day fighting with all your might Philippine independence "that we will have another Mexico on our hands," but in all fairness and in all justice there can be no comparison and no analogy between the two. In Mexico less than 2 per cent of the population can read or write and more than 50 per cent are peons and savages, while in the Philippines more than 90 per cent are Christianized and civilized and more than 50 per cent are literate and educated. Between two such countries, I assert, there can be no comparison; between two such countries there can be no analogy. Perhaps an even better way to establish the dissimilarity may be found in the exercise of suffrage. In the Philippine Islands, with less than 10,000,000 people, there were cast at the last election 200,000 votes, while in Mexico, with 15,000,000 people, less than 20,000 votes were cast at the most popular election ever held, when the late Madero was elected President of the Republic of Mexico.

In the Philippines 500,000 children attend the public schools and are being taught the English language. Does that entitle them to be compared with Mexico? Does conduct like this banish their hopes to escape perpetual bondage? Will the Republican Party again turn its back on a people like this? Will you again go on the rocks of standpatism, reaction, and a hovering of big business and the interests? The burdens of conducting a great Government like ours during a world war have been fraught with care and responsibility. This has occasioned many, if not quite all, of the progressives to return to the Republican Party. Still, not waiting for their complete return under your banner, you are again to-day in solid phalanx, fighting liberty, fighting freedom, breaking promises, blasting hopes, and underminnig the most sacred principles of liberty, freedom, and independence of the Republic founded by our forefathers. Why so soon a return to standpatism; why so willing to again begin your efforts of plunder? Is it because your last President's name is seldom if ever spoken, and your preceeding President has even found it necessary to abdicate himself from the party whose commission you now hold? Patriotism, love of country, or duty to country, never was, is not now, or never shall be measured in dollars. Still, it is certainly worthy of a

passing glance to observe it as an element in the economic side of this question. The Philippines have already cost this Government the snug sum of $900,000,000 and is costing us annually $50,000,000 more to maintain and uphold. For me and mine, this is the time and place to stop. The Philippines are asking it, and for my part they shall receive it. We have promised them independence for 16 years. I am in favor of doing in office what we promised to do while securing office.

You opponents of Philippine independence may quibble and construe, may falter and object, but I am in favor of doing something tangible, something real, and the passage of this bill through the House to-day, with a President willing to sign it, is an opportunity to really do the exact thing we promised to do. A vote for the Philippine independence bill to-day just as it stands will deliver to the Philippines their independence, the thing that they most desire, and will relieve us of further burdens, a thing the Republic most deserves.

It has been loosely, and I may say lavishly, asserted on this floor and elsewhere that the Philippines themselves do not desire independence. I can not for my own part think such an unfounded statement can be worthy of much serious argument in reply. Everywhere the proof of the falsity of this is so abundant. From the eloquent words of the Resident Commissioner of the islands, whose speech has just electrified this Chamber; from the pen and words of Gov. Gen. Francis Burton Harrison, now governor of the islands, and long an honored Member here; from the words, resolutions, and solemn actions of the Philippine Legislature, all in unison and accord asking for Philippine independence. All this, for my part, seems so sufficient, so convincing, that further comment upon it would seem unnecessary. But above and beyond any words that can be written or spoken stands the life's blood of the approximately 100,000 Filipinos who consecrated their hopes and ambitions and life's blood on the battle field for independence. The proof of their uniform desire for independence is everywhere abundant, is everywhere sufficient, and no Member of this House to-day can hide behind the flimsy wall of misinformation about it. No one class in the Philippines holds any monopoly of this one stalwart and unswerving desire. It is everywhere present, everywhere earnest, everywhere persistent. I repeat, the Philippines are 10,000 miles from our seat of Government and 7,000 miles from our nearest shore; they are not our kind of people; they are on the other side of the globe from us; their hopes and ambitions are not like ours. Annexation would never be feasible for a country so remotely situated; independence is their earnest desire; it is my opinion that the great bulk of the American people desire them to be independent, and alongside of that they desire to be free from the burden of protecting a country so unlike our own. Let us this day take the last step. Let us break down the last barrier. Let us once and for all do away with this mad quest for territorial aggrandizement and devote our attention to the problems of the Republic that confront us in America.

The opponents of Philippine independence have here to-day and elsewhere asserted that if we did withdraw we would have to maintain a watchful eye over them. I assert that inasmuch as our going would be at their request and solicitation, no longer would watchful care over them be due or expected from us. We could well and in good conscience withdraw our 12,500 soldiers from the islands and bring them home and set them about the task of our coast defense, Alaska, Hawaii, the Panama Canal, and any other problems that do or may confront us. These latter tasks are, for my part, the ones of first importance.

With a world war raging among all the first powers save our own, it is our abundant duty to sweep away the cobwebs of misunderstanding, of doubt, and of danger, and proceed along the same lines as did our fathers, who founded a greater Republic than they knew.

We are told that when the final vote will be taken to-day that every member of the Republican Party on this floor will cast his vote against this Philippine independence bill. We are even told that some 28 or 30 Democrats from New York will join hands with them and aid in the overthrow of the most sacred provision of the Declaration of Independence, wherein it says:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

The remnant of the once proud party of Lincoln may pursue this course to-day; the Tammany Hall Congressmen may turn their backs on their party and its teachings and perform this act of perfidy; but as one whose faith is so unbounded in the party of Jefferson and Wilson, I can not believe it will to-day lend aid and comfort to a policy that is against the first tenets of our Government; that is uneconomic, un-American, unwise; and that does not do even-handed justice from a strong Government to a weaker one! [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, whether one is mistaken or not on such a question as this, justice to himself and justice to those who listen might well require more than 10 minutes. After all, however, at this stage of the session, with that which is in front of us, with a program that somebody outside of this House in the main lays down for this House, I am quite willing to rest on 10 minutes to refer to a few things—progress, the location of the Philippines, the population of the Philippines, the religion of the Philippines, the development of the Philippines.

I have no doubt that there are many bright men in the Philippines. I think the gentleman who has just addressed the House [Mr. QUEZON] is perhaps one of the brightest. If they could all be like him, and then if they had two parties there to watch each other, and an intelligent public opinion, I suppose they could get along; but I was down in the Hawaiian Islands about a year ago now, with many gentlemen upon that side and upon this side. Do you recollect what we saw down there in the convict camps? The specimens of the Filipinos that they had there? I have no doubt that there are some good Filipinos there, but what a chance they had if they had remained at home. They were not regarded as a success outside of a convict camp. I am not speaking disrespectfully of them. You recollect it, my Democratic friends who were there.

Gentlemen, I must simply touch and go. Let me reminisce a little bit touching this question. I was a Member of this House, with the present honored Speaker, when the war began, as was said, for the freedom of Cuba; and after it was over the present honored Speaker of this House said, "We Democrats took you Republicans by the scruff of the neck and the seat of the breeches and threw you into that war." [Laughter.] There you are! There was a public sentiment that you could not restrain. As McKinley said and as Reed said when the war commenced, no man could tell the end thereof. But the end came.

Now what happened? Oh, when the treaty of Paris was made and came up for ratification in the Senate of the United States, who ratified it? The Republicans did not have the necessary votes in the Senate. We lacked two of a majority. It took two-thirds to ratify the treaty. What happened? Well, Mr. William Jennings Bryan came to Washington in January, 1899, and secured the Democratic, Populist, and silver votes ncessary to ratify that treaty. I will put the vote in the RECORD.

Mr. Gorman (for Mr. Vest) proposed the following amendments to the treaty:

> Article 3, strike out the words "cedes to the United States" and insert in lieu thereof the words "relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over and title to."
>
> Add at the end of article 3 the following:
>
> "The United States, desiring that the people of the Archipelago shall be enabled to establish a form of free government suitable to their condition and securing the rights of life, liberty, and property and the preservation of order and equal rights therein, assumes for the time being and to end aforesaid the control of the Archipelago, so far as such control shall be needful for the purposes above stated, and will provide that the privileges accorded to Spain by articles 4 and 5 of this treaty shall be enjoyed."

Those who voted in the affirmative were: Messrs. Bacon, Bate, Berry, Caffery, Chilton, Clay, Cockrell, Daniel, Gorman, Hale, Heitfeld, Hoar, Jones of Arkansas, Jones of Nevada, Kenney, McLaurin, Martin, Mills, Mitchell, Money, Murphy, Pasco, Pettigrew, Rawlins, Roach, Smith, Tillman, Turley, Turner, and Vest.

Those who voted in the negative were: Messrs. Aldrich Allen, Allison, Baker, Burrows, Butler, Carter, Chandler, Clark, Cullom, Davis, Deboe, Elkins, Fairbanks, Faulkner, Foraker, Frye, Gallinger, Gear, Gray, Hanna, Hansbrough, Harris, Hawley, Kyle, Lindsay, Lodge, McBride, McEnery, McMillan, Mantle, Mason, Morgan, Nelson, Penrose, Perkins, Pettus, Platt of Connecticut, Platt of New York, Pritchard, Quay, Ross, Sewell, Shoup, Simon, Spooner, Stewart, Sullivan, Teller, Thurston, Warren, Wellington, and Wolcott.

The vote on the ratification of the treaty was as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Aldrich, Allen, Allison, Baker, Burrows, Butler, Carter, Chandler, Clark, Clay, Cullom, Davis, Deboe, Elkins, Fairbanks, Faulkner, Foraker, Frye, Gallinger, Gear, Gray, Hanna, Hansbrough, Harris, Hawley, Jones of Nevada, Kenney, Kyle, Lindsay, Lodge, McBride, McEnery, McLaurin, McMillan, Mantle, Mason, Morgan, Nelson, Penrose, Perkins, Pettus, Platt of Connecticut, Platt of New York, Pritchard, Quay, Ross, Sewell, Shoup, Simon, Spooner, Stewart, Sullivan, Teller, Thurston, Warren, Wellington, and Wolcott.

Nays: Bacon, Bate, Berry, Caffery, Chilton, Cockrell, Daniel, Gorman, Hale, Heitfeld, Hoar, Jones of Arkansas, Mallory,

Martin, Mills, Mitchell, Money, Murphy, Pascoe, Pettigrew, Rawlins, Roach, Smith, Tillman, Turley, Turner, and Vest.

On neither vote did the Republicans have a majority of those voting. Thirty-nine Republicans, 8 Democrats, and 6 Populists and Silver Senators defeated the Vest amendment; 39 Republicans, 10 Democrats, and 8 Populists and Silver Senators ratified the treaty.

Senator Hoar and Senator Hale voted against it from beginning to end.

The Philippines were ceded to the United States. Porto Rico was ceded to the United States. The Treasury paid $20,000,000, and this Government made certain guaranties as to what it would do for the Philippines—the protection of property, freedom of religion, and so forth. When Senator Vest offered his amendment, which I put in the RECORD, he said, "We want you to relinquish," and that amendment to the treaty was to relinquish the Philippines, just as Spain relinquished Cuba. But Spain ceded the Philippines, and the United States paid Spain $20,000,000. We paid, not because we thought we were getting something valuable. We knew then that from the Equator up to 20° north of the Equator there were a people who were not homogeneous. We knew that they had slavery. We knew that they had polygamy. We knew that the Moro was there, and the Moro in cruelty and perhaps in fixity of character can give the Filipinos cards and spades and then win.

Well, there they are. What progress have they made? Our teachers went there. Our people of various churches went there. The United States sent the Army there. We sent our money there that we appropriated. We gave assistance from every standpoint, and I put it here and now to you gentlemen who have been in the Philippine Islands that there has been greater progress—you boast of your progress in education—there has been greater progress from a material standpoint in the development of the Philippines, in the building of roads and railroads, in commerce, and in production in 18 years since we acquired the Philippines than there had been in any previous century. If I recollect aright, Spain had possession there for nearly three centuries. Well, what are you kicking about? The lives of hundreds and thousands of men in our Army were sacrificed before we could get a chance to have a start. Was not Aguinaldo quite the equal of my friend Mr. QUEZON, the gentleman who made this eloquent speech a little while ago? I guess so. Some of his followers fought and fought and fought. I will ask my friend, and he may answer in his own time, or somebody for him, are you not glad that Aguinaldo was overthrown? Are you not glad that this progress has been made?

Well, but they say we want to go now. We want to go! Liberty, liberty, liberty! These words are misleading until you have a population that is so educated as to be capable of self-government; it takes several generations to obtain in an undeveloped country an average population that understands what liberty is. We have heard the same cry in Mexico—Liberty, liberty, liberty! Why, we can produce from Mexico, from Cuba, from the South American Republics—aye, I was going to say from Haiti—just as eloquent appeals for liberty. I suspect that Toussaint L'Ouverture——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, Mr. Chairman, that was a very short 10 minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. How much time would the gentleman like?

Mr. CANNON. I do not want to take time from anybody else.

Mr. TOWNER. I will yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Bryan furnished the votes to ratify the treaty. What did he do then? That was in 1900. He wanted an issue, and he got it—imperialism. Twenty million dollars furnished the issue. Then he came out and wrote it into the platform—imperialism. Take your last platform of 1912. I wish you would read it. I will put it in the RECORD, for you have forgotten it, and if your cheeks do not mantle with shame when you propose to play scuttle in the Philippines, I will give you a certificate of hardened conscience. [Laughter and applause.]

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM, 1912.

THE PHILIPPINES.

We reaffirm the position thrice announced by the Democracy in national convention assembled against a policy of imperialism and colonial exploitation in the Philippines or elsewhere. We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandonment of the fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

I understood the commissioner to say that a Republic could not be successful in colonization. Well, we have done pretty well in this country. We have stretched across from one ocean to another, from 3,000,000 people to 100,000,000 people. We stretch from the northern boundary down to the Gulf, and we have half of the railway mileage of the world. We think we amount to considerable.

Say, are you braver and more intelligent on the average than the American Indian? The American Indians were brave people; some with Indian blood in their veins are now Members of this House. Are you more intelligent or braver than they? And yet failure, failure, failure. Great heavens, if bravery and intelligence were all that was necessary, the American Indian would be here yet occupying this country and we would not be here. [Laughter and applause.] Ajax defied the lightning. Well, if Ajax ever lived, he is dead. [Laughter.] The vocal cords contract and words come forth and then that side of the House cheers. [Laughter.]

Oh, gentlemen, do you propose to organize a republic? Does my friend from the Philippine Islands have ambition to be a monarch? If he has not, there are some other people that live in the Philippines that have. Does he want a privileged class? You have never had any in your political government until the United States went there. What progress did you make for three centuries? You had the disadvantage of being under the Tropics, not as good a place to develop and maintain a civilization as a republic 20° north has in the North and South Temperate Zones. And yet you say you want to cut loose.

There is one little clause here in the Clarke amendment, and what did you put it there for?

In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President may reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines.

Does "may" mean "shall"? Let me turn to our own people, and by our own people I mean citizens of this Republic. Does it mean "shall"; do you want it to mean "shall"? I would ask the Commissioner, representing, as he does so ably, the Philippine Islands. Does he approve of it? Do you want a great and powerful Republic with a naval station there? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the chairman of the committee, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT].

[Mr. DAVENPORT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill, including the Clarke amendment. Indeed, I have but one objection to the bill, and that is, that it does not provide for the immediate freedom of the Philippine Islands. If I had the power I would provide for the withdrawal of our sovereignty without a day's delay longer than is necessary to effect all the formalities. However, we can not all get just what we want in legislation, and inasmuch as this bill does fix a definite time for our withdrawal, I cordially approve it.

In my view we ought never to have taken over the islands. We ought never to have governed them as a colony, and we ought long ago to have given them their independence. Their retention as colonies is a blot upon our national history—a blot that has been mitigated by a benevolent rule, but a blot nevertheless, because our government of them without their consent is violative of the most sacred traditions of this country, and at the same time it is violative of every right of the Filipinos themselves.

SELF-GOVERNMENT.

Our Declaration of Independence provides, among other things:

That to secure these rights (the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness) governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government.

We established this right of self-government by the sword in our war for independence. We put it in our Constitution. We have enacted it into all our laws, and during a period of more than a hundred years of our history this principle of self-government was considered by all our people to be the most

sacred right of civilized man. It has been the polestar, the guiding light of all our governmental institutions. It separated us from monarchy and the divine right of kings. It has been the watchword of our freedom. But for it we never would have become a great Nation. This principle of self-government, established by our forefathers, has given to humanity everywhere a new faith and a new hope. Other great nations have taken it up from time to time, and the principle has grown throughout the world. It ought never to die because it is right. Under the influence of this principle our country grew from a very few scattering colonies into one of the greatest nations of the earth. We committed an error in taking these islands. We committed an error in making a colony of them contrary to our principles and traditions. We made an error in keeping them as long as we have kept them; but let us correct now the error by restoring to them their freedom, and thus remove from our country's history that stain that has been placed upon it by their subjugation and retention.

HISTORY.

The resolution declaring war with Spain passed Congress on April 20, 1898. On April 16 Senator Teller, from Colorado, offered an amendment to the resolution, which was afterwards adopted, which amendment is as follows:

The United States hereby disclaims any disposition or inclination to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island—Cuba—except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the islands to its people.

At that time Congress was overwhelmingly Republican in both branches. Senator Teller was a Republican from Colorado. Of course, at that time it was not dreamed that the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico would be separated from Spain in the same manner that we separated Cuba, but the fortunes of war brought that about, and when the treaty of peace was finally adopted on February 6, 1899, and finally ratified by both Governments on April 11, 1899, Spain ceded Cuba, the Philippine Islands, and Porto Rico to the United States. A comparatively nominal sum paid for all three was $20,000,000. The consideration is only mentioned in the Philippine article, but everyone knows that Spain had no money, and the $20,000,000 in gold secured the whole treaty. We got the same title to Cuba that we got to the Philippines and to Porto Rico. The consideration was the same. We had to pacify all of the islands. As soon as Cuba was pacified, we restored it, because of the Teller resolution, but immediately the Republican Party took the position that the Philippines stood in a different attitude. Of course, everybody knows that the principle was exactly the same, and no one can doubt that if Congress had believed that the Philippines would fall into our hands as the result of the war, they, too, would have been included in the Teller resolution. Our taking possession of the Philippines was not peaceful. After Spain had yielded her sovereignty over the islands we found a revolution already going on. They had been fighting against Spain for some time for their independence, and they continued to fight us after the Spanish treaty, and it took several years for our troops to subjugate the islands.

The Philippines were at first governed by the military power of the United States. In the meantime a great controversy had arisen in this country over the disposition of the Philippines. The Democratic Party declared in favor of giving them their independence. The Republican Party opposed this proposition. The treaty of peace with Spain, by which we acquired the Philippines, was secured by the Republican Party with the help of eight Democrats. The Senate was overwhelmingly Republican, and the treaty received the votes of 49 Republicans and 8 Democrats. The noes were 24 Democrats and 3 Republicans. The reason for the position of the Democrats was they did not believe in taking over the Philippines. The fight became so warm that the Republican Party was unwilling to proclaim boldly its intention of permanently holding the islands. They wanted to do then just what they desire to do now, to postpone the matter with the hope of permanently retaining them without committing their party to that policy. Not long after the war closed a resolution of intention was passed the Republican Senate, thus committing the Republican Party in the Senate to such resolution. The resolution is as follows:

That by the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain it is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands in the citizenship of the United States, nor does it intend permanently to annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States; but it is the intention of the United States to establish on said islands a government suitable to the needs and conditions of the inhabitants of said islands and to prepare them for local self-government, and in due time to make such disposition of said islands as will best promote the interest of the citizens of the United States and the inhabitants of said islands.

This resolution passed the Senate on February 14, 1899, but did not pass in the House. The Democrats in the Senate tried in vain to amend the above resolution so that the said islands should not be governed against the will of the people thereof, but all amendments were voted down by the Republicans, and the resolution passed the Senate as above stated.

On April 7, 1900, President McKinley appointed the Philippine Commission, consisting of five members. Mr. Taft was made the president of this commission, and Gen. Luke E. Wright, of Memphis, my warm personal friend, and one of the ablest men in the country, was one of the commissioners. When this commission first went to the Philippines its powers and authority was somewhat vague, the military power claiming precedence; but afterwards Mr. Taft was appointed civil governor and Gen. Wright vice governor, and the commission actually governed the island. Later on Filipinos were appointed on the commission, and during the administration of President Wilson changes in the commission have been made, so that now a majority of the commission are Filipinos. However, the Governor General is still an American and really rules for the United States. From time to time the Filipinos have been given larger powers in their own government. Congress gave them the right to have their own general assembly, and provided that the commission above named should be the higher branch of the Philippine Legislature, the commission, the Congress, and the President having the right of veto. Our Government has at all times kept a considerable body of troops, ordinarily ranging from 12,000 to 18,000, in the islands to protect them. In addition to the United States troops, Congress has established an organization known as the Philippine Scouts, amounting to about 5,700 in number, commanded for the most part by American officers, but the enlisted men made up of Filipinos, and all paid for by the United States.

From time to time Congress has authorized the issuance of bonds by the Philippine government, and it also authorized the Philippine government to guarantee certain railroad bonds for the building of certain railroads in the islands. All these bonds, I am informed, amount in the aggregate to $16,125,000. Many of these bonds are held in this country.

We derive no taxes from the Philippine Islands. We have spent many millions of dollars in fortifying their coasts and improving their harbors. We pay our soldiers, officers, and men large sums—20 per cent, as extra pay for services in those islands.

OUR RULE KINDLY AND BENEFICIAL TO THE FILIPINOS.

I am wholly opposed to the retention of the Philippine Islands, as I have before stated; but it is fair to say that for the most part our rule in the islands has been beneficent. We have been peculiarly fortunate in the selection of American commissioners to rule over the islands. Mr. Taft was first, and made much of his great reputation there as Governor General. Gen. Luke E. Wright was the second, and Americans and Filipinos still remember with pleasure and pride his firm but splendid rule in the islands. Much of our success in the control of the islands has been due to his kindly but firm, able and masterly conduct of our affairs there. Lately we have had as Governor General of the islands one of our former distinguished Members of this House, an able and delightful gentleman, the Hon. Burton Harrison.

During the 16 years we have held the islands we have restored order among them. We have given them a good government and an honest government. We have aided them in securing better methods of agriculture. We have aided them in building up their railroads and roads. We have aided them in building public buildings. We have aided them in building public schools. We have aided them in building public schoolhouses, and furnishing additional educational facilities. We have given them a good banking and currency system, and in a thousand different ways have added to the prosperity and happiness of the people of those islands. We have treated them well. We have treated them as the wards of the Nation, but still we have not given them their freedom. The Constitution does not follow our flag there. The right of local self-government is denied them. They do not have the right to govern themselves, and they want to be free and independent—just as we are—and I believe they are entitled to be free and independent.

ATTITUDE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

The attitude of the Republican Party toward the islands has remained the same throughout. That party was in power when the United States took over the islands, subjugated them, and furnished them with a form of government that was not territorial but provincial. In other words, the Republican Party has governed them as a colony. In doing this it disregarded the principle of self-government, for which our forefathers fought

and in which most Americans believe now. It has never taken a straight-out stand on this question. The heretofore-quoted resolution of the Senate was a subterfuge. It meant nothing and was not intended to mean anything. In its national platform of 1900 it provided that the Philippines should be given—

The just measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them by law.

In 1904 it laid down as one of the achievements of the party that it had taken possession of the Philippines and established law and order and had given a "large measure" of self-government to the people of these islands. In its platform of 1908 it provided:

The Philippine insurrection has been suppressed, law established, and life and property made secure. Education and practical experience are there advancing the capacity of the people for government, and the policy of McKinley and Roosevelt is leading the inhabitants step by step to an ever-increasing home rule.

In 1912 the Republican Party platform ratified its previous utterances on that subject. In other words, even the Republican Party has never declared in terms in favor of holding these islands and governing them as a colony. If we judge from the resolution of the Senate above referred to, the utterances of its leaders, and the platform of that party, its object has been at all times to prepare the Filipinos for self-government and give it to them, whenever they were capable of using it. That is that party's professed attitude. Its real attitude is to hold the islands indefinitely as colonies, and the only reason it does not come out and say so is because it fears the American people.

ATTITUDE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

On the other hand, the Democratic Party has consistently stood for our historic traditions and principles. It has stood for the Constitution. It fought the taking over of the islands. It has opposed the keeping of the Philippines as a colony. It was opposed to the ratification of the treaty taking them over. It fought in vain to commit our Government to stand by the principles of local self-government in dealing with the islands. It opposed the bill which provided originally for their government, and even this bill, passed by a Republican House and a Republican Senate and signed by a Republican President, shows on its face that it was a "temporary" only. In its platform of 1900 it denounced the Philippine policy of the then Republican administration. It declared:

The Filipinos can not be citizens without endangering our civilization; they can not be subjects without imperiling our own form of government, and as we are not willing to surrender our civilization nor to convert the Republic into an Empire, we favor the immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and, third, protection from outside interference.

In the Democratic platform of 1904 it again declared that—

We ought to do for the Philippines what we have already done for the Cubans and set the Filipino people upon their feet, free and independent to work out their own destiny.

In 1908 this position was again set forth. In 1912 it is provided in the Democratic platform:

We favor the immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

It will be thus seen that the attitude of the Democratic Party has always been, and still is, that we should make those islands free and allow them to govern themselves, just as Cuba governs itself.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come when we can establish a stable form of government in those islands. Every fair-minded man knows that. Those people are not a barbarous people. They are capable of governing themselves. It is time to quit our subterfuges. The Democratic Party at all events has made an agreement with the people of the United States to give the Filipinos their freedom. It is our solemn duty to carry out that agreement. We write ourselves down as insincere if we do not do it. For 16 or more years we have been charging our Republican friends with saying one thing and meaning another on this subject, and I believe our charges are true. But now that we are in power if we do not carry out our solemn pledges we put our own party in the same attitude as the Republican Party now sustains.

ARE THEY CAPABLE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT?

I have never been to the Philippines. Therefore I can not speak of my personal knowledge. The only ones that I know are those who have come over here, and I must say that these are very intelligent men. According to the census of 1903 the population of the islands was about 7,600,000. Of these, 6,900,000 were classified as civilized. In other words, there were a little less than 4 per cent of them savages. Of the civilized tribes more than 50 per cent of them above 10 years of age could read and write. In the Tagalog Provinces it is claimed that literacy is highest, and that there is something over 70 per cent of the population above 10 years of age who could read and write before the American occupation, and, of course, this percentage has been largely increased.

The University of St. Joseph and the University of St. Thomas, both in Manila, are universities of a high order, with a large number of students. As far back as 1866 the Spanish school statistics show there had been established 1,674 Government schools which were attended by over 230,000 boy and girl students. In that year there were 1,681 matriculates at the University of St. Thomas alone. Even then there were five colleges devoted to the education of women. There was an agricultural college, and a nautical college, and a school of painting, sculpture, and engraving, and a military academy, together with nine other colleges, and six high-grade latin schools located in various parts of the islands. Since the American occupation there has been a wonderful increase in educational facilities and in school attendance. For 10 years there has been a public-school enrollment of about 500,000. In 1911 this ran up to over 600,000. The total number of public schools last year was about 4,500 with over 9,000 teachers, of whom 8,400, or 92 per cent, were Filipinos.

It will thus be seen that from a standpoint of learning that these people are certainly capable of self-government. There is a wrong notion in the public mind over here in reference to this. We are wont to believe that they are a people, none of whom are more than partially civilized, and most of whom are barbarous. This is entirely incorrect.

While the Filipinos have been ruled as a subject people for more than 300 years by Spain, and since that time have been ruled by the United States, still, that of itself does not mean that they can not conduct their own affairs. There were Filipino representatives in the Spanish Cortes. There have been Filipino delegates to the American Congress, and surely these have conducted themselves in an able manner to the knowledge of us all. A majority of the present Philippine Commission is composed of Filipinos. The lower house of the Legislature of the Philippine government is composed mostly of Filipinos. Their judges, the heads of their municipalities, are mostly Filipinos. The fact that they have always been ruled as a province is no reason that they are not capable of ruling themselves. Who would say that Canada or Australia could not rule themselves, and yet they have been subject provinces for hundreds of years.

AMERICA FIRST.

But whatever our duties and responsibilities toward the Filipinos may be, our first duty is toward America. We have built up the greatest Government in the world, and we have the most remarkable people under the sun. We have strengthened our Government and increased the happiness and prosperity of our people by clinging with a death-like grip to certain immortal principles. One of these is the right of self-government. We won our independence on this principle from a nation that held us just like we now hold the Philippines. Ever since that eventful day when we secured our freedom the word "colony" has had a hateful meaning to us. It still has that meaning. Though the Republican Party took over the islands and has ruled them as a colony, still it has never defended the principle of colonization in its platforms. It has never dared to declare against local self-government. In the laws which they have put on the statute books about these people they have declared on the face of such laws that they were merely "temporary." All of which goes to show that, irrespective of party, the American people are opposed to colonies. Of course the Democratic Party has at all times opposed the making of colonies out of the Philippines. The Philippine Islands were taken by accident. The war was fought on account of Cuba. We took Cuba over, just like we did the Philippines. The Philippines were taken over merely as an incident to taking over Cuba. We gave Cuba her freedom after the formation of a stable government there, and we ought to have long ago done the same thing for the Philippines. I take it, however, that the only reason the Republican Party ever parted with Cuba was because of the celebrated resolution of Senator Teller, above referred to. Senator Teller was an independent Republican. By his resolution our country was pledged to restore Cuba to the Cubans. The pledge did not in words cover the Philippines, and though the principle was the same, the Republican Party held on to the Philippines. I doubt if there is a man in this country who would openly proclaim that he was in favor of forever keeping the Philippines. Many who are interested, directly or indirectly, say that they are in favor of holding them until such a time as they shall be ready for their freedom, and they are the judges as to when they will

be ready. This is not living up to the American ideals and American traditions. Do not let us ever go back on these ideals and traditions. They have made us what we are. Let us stand by them in good faith. Already we have deferred the matter too long. We ought to act at the earliest possible moment, and the earlier the better.

COST TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

But leaving aside the questions of a policy of colonies, contrary to American traditions and ideals and human rights, let us look to the business side of this proposition.

What do they cost us, and what do we make out of them? Since we took the islands over our trade has increased with them. Prior to 1898 we did not sell to the Philippines much over $100,000 worth of goods per year. Since we took them we have largely increased our sales. The figures for the last 11 years are as follows:

1905	$6,000,000
1906	5,000,000
1907	8,000,000
1908	11,000,000
1909	11,000,000
1910	16,000,000
1911	19,000,000
1912	23,000,000
1913	25,000,000
1914	27,000,000
1915	24,000,000

Generally speaking, our imports from the islands were about the same.

Prior to 1898 our imports were about half what they have been since we took them over. I append the exact figures on this matter as a part of my remarks.

The profits on these goods could hardly be in excess of 10 per cent. In other words, the amount that the people of the United States make is $2,500,000 per year at the present time. However, taking the last 16 years that we have owned the islands, the amount would be much smaller and not average over a million dollars in profits per year. This is the credit side of the balance. What is the debit side?

It is hard to estimate. In 1902 Senator Hoar estimated that the islands had cost us up to that time something like $600,000,000 in all. My recollection is he produced a report from the Secretary of War, Mr. Root, showing that the cost in his department alone then amounted to some $132,000,000. So that the House may understand just what they cost us, I am going to mention a few items. The first is, we keep on the islands an average of 15,000 soldiers, officers and men. This amounts to about $18,000,000 a year, because, on an average, it costs a million dollars per thousand soldiers per year, and then 20 per cent increase for Philippine service. The appropriations for fortifications on the islands cost us about $1,000,000 per year. We have 5,700 Filipino troops over there, which is about $6,000,000 more. It is generally assumed that the cost of that part of our Naval Establishment used for the protection of the islands is equally as great or greater than the cost of our Army over there.

If these estimates are correct, the islands cost not a cent less than $50,000,000 a year. If Senator Hoar was correct in 1902 in his estimate of the cost at $600,000,000, and they have cost us $50,000,000 a year since that time, the islands up to this time have cost us $1,300,000,000 and have paid us not exceeding $16,000,000. The cost on the one side of the balance sheet, Mr. Chairman, is thirteen hundred million of dollars and on the credit side of the sheet only sixteen million—a ratio of 16 to 1,300. What a travesty on business. And yet our Republican friends say they only are business men. The result is, this is certainly a bad proposition we have got into and we ought to turn it loose at the earliest possible moment.

Let us take that $50,000,000 a year, and, if necessary, increase our Navy for our own protection at home, or build up roads, or build up the agricultural interests of our country.

Again, it is not believed by anyone that our trade will decrease a dollar because of our giving them their independence. The chances are that we will trade with them more than we have ever before. England does not own them, and yet England's trade with the Philippines amounts vastly to more than ours. We could expend this $50,000,000 a year much better by building a merchant marine to do business with them than we could by throwing it away upon governing them as colonies. With this $50,000,000 used in our own country we could do any one of several things that would be of vast interest to all our people.

First, we might build up a merchant marine. My recollection is Secretary McAdoo did not ask for this much in the merchant-marine bill that was offered last year.

Or, in the next place, we could establish a rural-credits system with Government aid through which the farmers could get their money at not exceeding 5 per cent.

Or, in the next place, we could build up a great system of highways. The bill that we have just passed in the House provides for only $25,000,000. We would be enabled to double that sum without an extra dollar of expense.

Or, in the next place, we could double the amount now appropriated for agriculture. The present Agricultural bill carries about $25,000,000. We could double that sum for the lasting good of the farmers of our country.

Or, with that sum we could build up a splendid system of national colleges by which the boys of our country could be given military training or vocational training to fit them for the needs of defense of our country and to fit them for the ordinary affairs of life.

Or, with one-third of that sum we could build a Government nitrate plant which would reduce the cost of fertilizer to all of our farmers.

A LIABILITY.

But the greatest objection to keeping the Philippines is that they are a constant menace to us. They are 8,000 miles away. They are so situated as to be an easy prey to any first-class country that we happened to get into trouble with. I do not mean to say that any first-class country could take them and keep them, for I do not believe that any nation under the sun could take them away from us and keep them unless we agree to it; and I for one would never be willing to let any nation take them away from us; but it would cost countless thousands of millions of dollars to regain them if they were taken, and, of course, every red-blooded American would fight to hold them, and then we would have a liability on our hands, just as we have now. They are the kind of people that could never become amalgamated with ours. They are not satisfied with our government, and in justice to them and in justice to ourselves we ought to pass this bill and give them their freedom.

THIS BILL.

This bill is, in short, a reenactment of our Constitution and the best of our laws for the benefit of the islands. They already have a legislative body like ours. This will enable them to have a senate like ours, and later on an executive like ours, and all of their own choosing. When we shall have passed this bill we will have done our full duty by the islands. We have established a stable government for them. We have educated them in a larger measure than they have been educated before. We have given them the advantages of American ideals and American institutions. We have shown them how to govern themselves. If they do it wisely and well, as I believe that they will, they have the opportunity of building up a great nation in these far-off islands. There is no reason why they should not do so, and, at any rate, we ought to give them the opportunity and bid them Godspeed.

Fifty years ago no man dreamed that the Japanese people would build up a great empire in that little islands off the coast of Asia, but when the came in contact with European and western civilization they came to themselves and have built up a great civilization of their own and a great empire of their own. The Filipinos are largely of the same stock, and there is no reason why, if given the opportunity, they can not do for themselves just what Japan has done for herself, and I sincerely hope they will.

EXPORTATION OF COTTON GOODS FROM UNITED STATES TO THE PHILIPPINES.

But it is argued that our cotton-goods trade would be injured by our withdrawal from the islands. The statistics show we have exported cotton goods to the islands for the past five years, as follows:

1911	$4,195,665
1912	6,613,682
1913	7,481,456
1914	6,481,734
1915	8,135,809

This is a considerable item, of course, but why should we lose any of this trade? Indeed, it should be added to rather than subtracted from by giving them their freedom. They would be all the more desirous of trading with us.

EXPORTATION OF COTTON GOODS FROM ENGLAND TO THE PHILIPPINES.

England sold cotton goods to the Philippines in the following amounts:

1909	$3,500,000
1910	3,500,000
1911	3,500,000
1912	2,300,000
1913	2,335,000
1914	2,325,000

These figures show that American exportation of cotton goods to the islands has increased and England has fallen off. Why? Not because of our sovereignty, but because the tariff was taken off of American cotton goods. If these islands were given their freedom, it would not interfere with this tariff law; but if the islands enacted a tariff law it will operate against England just as it will operate against this country. If they have no tariff on cotton goods, Americans will continue to sell the islands their cotton goods. It is a question of tariff and not a question of sovereignty.

ARMY AND NAVY COST.

But it is claimed that we ought not to consider the additional cost of Army and Navy because we would have and bear that cost any way. Of course this reasoning is fallacious. We only have need for an Army for defense. If the 15,000 soldiers now in the Philippines were here in the United States and did not have to defend the Philippine Islands, we would have just that much less need for increasing our Army. Indeed, we could get along with a much smaller Army because the Philippines is where we have the largest need for a standing army.

And so about our Navy. As long as we are obliged to keep a part of our Navy around the Philippine Islands to defend them we have just that much less Navy to defend our own country. The power of a Navy is its ability to mobilize quickly. So that, if it were possible to have all our Navy along the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast, where we could get through the Panama Canal from the one side to the other, our power on the seas would be much greater. As long as it is divided, one part in one hemisphere and a part in another hemisphere, we are vastly weakened. Nothing could add to the strength of our Navy like our having it around our own country.

BONDS.

It is claimed, however, that the government in the Philippines has been allowed to issue about $16,000,000 worth of bonds, and Americans have bought many of these bonds, and if the islands are turned loose the value of the bonds will be depreciated. In the first place, these bonds were bought by the investors with the statute staring them in the face that the government that issued them was "temporary." In the next place, I am informed that these bonds were bought, some of them, as low as 60 cents on the dollar. All our Government did was to guarantee the interest. There is a provision in the bill under which these matters can be adjusted, and no doubt they will be adjusted. Surely, however, these kinds of claims should not keep our Government from doing the right thing, the thing it is bound in honor to do, namely, to give the Filipinos their independence. It would be better for the United States Government to pay all of these bonds rather than to pay $49,000,000 expenses for keeping the islands. Of course the bondholders can not expect this Government to pay these bonds, but the Government ought to make the bondholders whole, and I have no doubt it will do so.

We made an express pledge to the Cubans and gave them their freedom, though only about 25 per cent of them were able to read and write when we gave them their government, and when they were not by nature as capable of government as the Filipinos. Our implied pledge to the Filipinos is just as strong. Let us carry it out like Americans. It will be best for Americans and best for the Filipinos.

NEUTRALIZATION OF THE ISLANDS.

Before these islands are turned over by the President I feel absolutely sure that treaties will be entered into with at least Japan, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Russia guaranteeing the integrity of the islands. That is a matter for the treaty-making powers, and I have full confidence that it will be done. With this done and the good start we have already given them, there is no reason why these people should not soon become one of the great nations of the East.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR].

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I have already addressed the House upon this subject some few weeks ago, but being the only member of the Committee on Insular Affairs from the Pacific coast and knowing the feeling of the people of that section of the country, I feel that I would be remiss in my duty if I let this debate go by without raising my voice in protest against this Clarke amendment. That is the question that is before us, and in connection with this matter I wish to read into the RECORD a letter from Mr. Zera Snow, a distinguished attorney of my city, one of the leading members of the Oregon bar, and a lifelong Democrat—a man for whose opinion I have very great respect. Mr. Snow spent several months in the Orient last year, and I wrote him a few months ago asking his opinion on the question of Philippine independence. This is his reply:

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 25, 1916.*

DEAR MR. McARTHUR: You have asked me to state my views on the Philippine question, including the proposition now before Congress to confer independence upon the Filipino people.

Whatever I may say on this question should be prefaced with the statement that personally I am and always have been in favor of abandoning the islands to the people of the Philippines, giving them absolute and uncontrolled sway, regardless of whether or not they made a success of the venture in self-government, whenever it can be known for a certainty that the majority of the people as a whole desire this. By the Filipino people I mean, of course, all the people inhabiting the islands—not alone the Tagalog race. The difficulty, of course, and this is the most serious question of the problem, is to determine whether a majority of the people desire such independence. One swallow never made a summer, and therefore because there may be among the people a desire to undertake the problem of self-government it does not follow by any means that a majority of the people desire this.

I visited the islands last September for pleasure and spent approximately one week at Manila. Both going and coming from the islands and while there I talked with anybody and everybody who would talk upon the question, but more particularly I talked with the American contingent, which it may be said is almost a unit against independence.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. McARTHUR. Certainly.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. From whom is the gentleman quoting? I was not present when he began to read.

Mr. McARTHUR. I am quoting Mr. Zera Snow, one of the leading Democratic lawyers of Oregon. His letter continues:

I do not hesitate to say that, in my opinion, the Filipino people are, on the whole, unable of successfully maintaining self-government in the islands, and I have very grave doubts whether the more educated classes, as a whole, really desire independence, nor have they very distinct views upon the question, or what independence may mean to them. I have no doubt that prior to the present European war there was quite a local sentiment among the people—I do not mean to say, by any means, a majority—for independence, but, in my opinion, the results of the European war have very greatly shaken their faith in the proposition for independence. In my opinion the people are much better off under the present system of government than they would be with the burden of self-government. When Mr. ——— remarked to me what his people wanted was more liberty, I stated to him that the people were having all the liberty which I had in my Territorial days, and unquestionably they have. If I were a Member of Congress called upon to vote upon this question to-day, I should unhesitatingly vote against independence, though whenever I became satisfied that the majority of the people desired it, I should give it to them; but at the present time I can not see that this is their desire, and for this reason I would not force it upon them. Independence would be an easy method of getting rid of a bad bargain, but at the same time a most shameful one under the present conditions.

I found great dissatisfaction existing with the course of the present local administration of the islands, arising in part, no doubt, by the unsettled condition of affairs which the project of possible independence has engendered, and in part by what is supposed to have been mistakes of Gov. Gen. Harrison. I did not learn the details of these supposed mistakes, but I attribute them very largely to the factional feeling arising between Republicans and Democrats. I can well understand how a new man in the islands might make mistakes. I would not visit the mistake, however, with the condemnation which I found the local American sentiment was inclined to impose upon the governor.

In closing I may say that the uncertainty of whether independence is or is not to be conferred is most injurious to the prosperity of the islands. The question should be settled once and for all immediately, and, being settled, should not be opened up again.

I am,

Very cordially, yours,

ZERA SNOW.

Hon. CLIFTON N. McARTHUR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that the President has recently reversed his position on the question of Philippine independence. In a lecture on "Constitutional government in the United States," delivered before the students of Columbia University in 1908, Mr. Wilson said:

Self-government is not a mere form of institutions, to be had when desired if only proper pains be taken. It is a form of character. It follows upon the long discipline which gives a people self-possession, self-mastery, the habit of order and peace and common counsel, and a reverence for law which will not fail when they themselves become the makers of law—the steadiness and self-control of political maturity. And these things can not be had without long discipline.

We can give the Filipinos constitutional government, a government which they may count upon to be just, a government based upon some clear and equitable understanding, intended for their good and not for our aggrandizement; but we must for the present ourselves supply that government. * * * But we can not give them self-government. Self-government is not a thing that can be "given" to any people, because it is a form of character and not a form of constitution. No people can be "given" the self-control of maturity. Only a long apprenticeship of obedience can secure them the precious possession, a thing no more to be bought than given. * * *

We of all people in the world should know these fundamental things and should act upon them, if only to illustrate the mastery in politics which belongs to us of hereditary right. To ignore them would be not only to fail and fail miserably, but to fail ridiculously and to belie ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the Pacific coast are not in favor of this policy of scuttle as proposed by the Clarke amendment.

When the Spanish-American War broke out our regiments went to the Philippines and many of our soldiers were killed in battle. We have paid for the Philippines with our money and the blood of our soldiers, and I say that to turn them over to their own destruction now would be a course of national infamy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back five minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield half a minute of time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING].

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing an address made by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] on the unveiling of a tablet at Trenton, N. J., marking the site of the seventh capital of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WATSON). The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by publishing an address delivered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] on the occasion referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I regard the Clarke amendment in exactly the same light that I would regard a proposition to give the Filipinos immediate independence. It is inconceivable that in two years' time, and especially after this legislation has become a law, the condition of the Philippine Islands will be seriously changed from what it is to-day. Even in four years' time I conceive that there will be no great difference in the conditions from what they are to-day. And so I shall consider this proposition as though it were a proposition for immediate independence.

Mr. Chairman, the United States of America acquired sovereignty over the Philippine Islands from the highest and most altruistic motives. Our war with Spain having destroyed the last vestige of the power of that country to protect or indeed to govern the islands, their helpless and unprotected condition so appealed to the big-hearted McKinley that by his special direction their cession to this country was provided for in the treaty of peace between this country and Spain.

It has never been the policy of this country to seize and hold conquered territory after a war without compensation. It was therefore agreed in the treaty that we should pay to Spain $20,000,000 for these islands. When the treaty with the bill providing for the appropriation of this money came up it was debated earnestly in both Houses of Congress, and the issue was by no means certain until William J. Bryan, then the undisputed leader of the Democratic Party, came to Washington and joined his voice with that of the immortal McKinley. Then by nonpartisan action of both Houses the islands were taken over and the $20,000,000 paid. Since then we have spent vast sums for the pacification and improvement of the islands, though for the past 10 years they have cost us nothing. In fact, during that time we have gotten more out of them than we have put into them. We have, therefore, a princely sum invested in these islands.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HAYES. I will.

Mr. GORDON. Why do you say they cost us nothing in the past 10 years?

Mr. HAYES. Because it is true.

Mr. GORDON. How much do you figure the islands have cost us since we have had them?

Mr. HAYES. Nobody knows.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the gentleman know that Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, estimated the cost of the Philippine Islands, up to and including 1902, at $600,000,000?

Mr. HAYES. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. And does he remember that Secretary Root, who was Secretary of war at that time, estimated the cost of the War Department alone was $132,000,000?

Mr. HAYES. He estimated the entire cost of the maintenance of the soldiers there, and that is not a fair basis of estimate. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that we have a princely investment, and the gentleman wants to throw it away.

Mr. McKELLAR. On the contrary, we want to prevent these losses by getting out of there.

Mr. HAYES. There are no losses. For the last 10 years the Philippine Islands have cost us nothing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the gentleman know that we paid $5,700,000 for the Philippine Scouts alone?

Mr. HAYES. I presume the gentleman is correct. Even if the gentleman is correct in his statement, I still maintain they are costing us nothing, because the trade we are getting from those islands more than compensates for the expenditure, and it has done so for some years.

It should be said that neither when they were acquired nor at any time since has there been any thought of their exploitation. It has been the thought of everybody connected with the Government—the thought, indeed, of the American people—that these islands were to be governed, developed, and managed primarily for the benefit of the Filipino people. It has been so governed, developed, and managed. It was the desire of McKinley, as it has been and still is of many lovers of their kind in this country, to see established right at the doors of oriental despotism an object lesson in liberty and free government that might come to light the whole of the great East. To see in time established in those islands justice, equality, intelligence, and liberty under law that would demonstrate to the world what the beneficent institutions of this country will accomplish for any people, no matter what their race or inheritance.

In the pursuit of this humane and exalted purpose we have sent some of our best blood to those islands to help them on the road that we laid out for them. These men have established there equality and justice. Peace, law, and order reign in the whole archipelago for the first time in its history. New schools were established and those there greatly enlarged, and teachers sent to them by the thousands to start their new educational system. Laws were passed to revive their slumbering industries. And to all of our efforts the Filipino people have responded nobly. They have made great strides in education. Their commerce, domestic and foreign, has doubled and trebled in the last 15 years. The heretofore savage aborigines have felt the civilizing influence of our domination and have ceased their head-hunting and their constant warfare and for the first time in their history have settled down to the arts of peace and are living in amity with their neighbors.

The Democratic Party can not claim that we have failed in the Philippine Islands and offer that as an excuse for now scuttling the ship and running away and leaving it to its fate. Our success there is the wonder and admiration of the world. And yet, in the light of that success, it is now proposed to throw away the millions that our Government has invested there; to run away from a duty to the Filipino people and to the world which we solemnly and voluntarily assumed when we took over the islands; to bring to naught all our efforts for the education and elevation of these people; to make it certain that the peace, order, and security which they now enjoy shall be in a few months succeeded by internecine warfare, bloodshed, and anarchy such as Mexico is now enjoying, and this sure soon to be followed by the domination of some powerful alien nation which will exploit them for the benefit of the people of such alien nation.

Now what excuse is offered for the perpetration of this crime?

1. It is claimed that it is costing us much money to keep them. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Philippines are costing us nothing, and for 10 years have cost us nothing. The people of the islands are paying and for some years have paid all the expenses of the government of the islands. We are paying the Filipino Scouts. It has been said that we pay for keeping the 10,000 or 15,000 soldiers who are quartered there. We do; but if they were not quartered there we would be paying for quartering them somewhere in this country, and I have no doubt they can be kept there cheaper than they can here. I have heard no one claiming that when we leave the islands we should reduce our present standing army by the number we now have there. There is absolutely nothing in the expense argument.

2. But it is said that the United States of America should not have colonies nor possessions and should not be trying to govern alien peoples without their consent. We have had the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson and all the changes on both rung in this debate ad nauseam. I do not hear these same shouters for the right of self-government, whether the people are capable of it or not, demanding the independence of Porto Rico. Indeed, I have not seen them making any great haste to give the right of self-government to the 400,000 of our own countrymen living in the District of Columbia or to bestow such right upon the people of Alaska.

The truth of the matter is that no people are entitled to self-government until they are capable of exercising it, and no people incapable of exercising it will have that right long as the world is to-day. I desire to impugn no man's motives or honesty in his attitude on this legislation, but I undertake to say that much, if not most, of this talk about the expense of maintaining our sovereignty over the Filipinos and the sacred rights of every people to govern themselves is pure cant and hypocrisy, and is intended to cover the real motive that lies behind this legislation. That motive is plain physical, ignoble cowardice.

It is claimed that if we keep the Philippine Islands it will be the cause of a war with some nation unnamed; or, should we be embroiled in war, that those islands will be a source of weakness, strategically, to us; and that, therefore, before they are taken away from us it is the part of wisdom to give them away and withdraw our claim of authority over them. In a few words, this seems to be the last argument of all, or nearly all, the proponents of this measure.

Could anything be more craven or more destructive of self-respect, or the respect of the world for our country, than a course so weak and ignoble as this? We are asked to throw away our vast investment in the Philippine Islands and the vast advantage they will be to us in maintaining ourselves commercially in the Pacific Ocean; asked to throw overboard those people who are depending upon us for protection, whether they realize it or not; asked to violate our obligations to the world as well as to the Filipinos, because, forsooth, we are afraid that some time in the future they are going to be a source of trouble to us.

In our national childhood, when we numbered 3,000,000—a poor and struggling people—we wrested our independence from the British Empire. Thirty years later, when we had 10,000,000 and had come to a vigorous youth, we again defied the British Empire. Can it be possible that from such a vigorous childhood and virile youth we have descended to be a lazy, rich, fat, overgrown, cowardly lubber that is making haste to give away his possessions lest somebody fall upon him and take them away from him? If it is true that we have descended to this condition of fear and weakness, the only cause for it that I can think of is the recent advent of the Democratic Party as the dominant party in this country. But, like the fears of nearly all cowards, these fears exist only in the fervid imagination of those who entertain them.

The Philippine Islands could never be a weakness to this country; on the contrary, in any emergency they would be a strength.

We have spent many millions of dollars already in fortifying a naval base there to which our ships can go for supplies and for repair and relief in case of attack, which will give us a hold in the Pacific more valuable than can be estimated in dollars. Should war come and the Philippine Islands be attacked, whatever energy the enemy bestows on the subjugation of the islands will not be bestowed upon us; and if we extend to them the rights and bestow upon them the blessings that I know all our people expect to extend and bestow as fast as they are capable of receiving them, it is inconceivable that they would not defend themselves and their homes against the common enemy to the very limit of their ability.

Many people said before the beginning of the present war in Europe that India would be a source of weakness to England. On the contrary, it is one of her great elements of strength, and the people of India are astonishingly loyal to Great Britain, and stand ready to fight not only for their own protection but have even joined the English upon the European front.

There is, therefore, nothing in this argument that the Philippine Islands are or ever will be a source of weakness to this country. At this time no country is objecting to our sovereignty over them. The whole world is entirely satisfied with the present status quo. Why, therefore, this sudden haste to pull down the Stars and Stripes where they have brought such blessings, enlightenment, and prosperity to make way for anarchy, internecine strife, and bloodshed? To even propose it is a dastardly, inexcusable, monstrous, cowardly crime. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, the first election after the Spanish-American War—that is, presidential election—was held in the year 1900, and at that time President McKinley was running for reelection on the Republican ticket; and on the Democratic ticket Mr. Bryan, of Nebraska, was running. In the Democratic platform was this clause as to the Philippine policy:

> We condemn and denounce the Philippine policy of the present administration

President McKinley went before the country that year and was elected by an electoral vote of 292 to 155. In 1904 and 1908 the Democratic platform had similar planks, as well as in 1912. But we see the majority Members of this House, in spite of the fact that the gentleman from Nebraska was repudiated, a few days ago permitting that gentleman to ride them through the House, because in 1900 when the issue first came before the country as to what we should do with the Philippines it was settled in a very conclusive manner by the electorate of the country.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I can not yield in five minutes.

We have been told here that to hold the Philippine Islands is holding the people in bondage and oppressing them. Do you call it holding them in bondage when we went our there and cleaned out the pesthouse that existed in the Philippine Islands prior to 1898? Do you call it holding them in bondage by improving their public works, by doing everything that we would do for our own people in our own country? If that is the way the majority side of the House look at it, I must say that they have completely lost their vision.

It has been said to-day that those of us on this side who vote against the Clarke amendment are doomed to political annihilation next year. I disagree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], and I thoroughly believe that if you put this bill through the House to-day it will take Democratic Members out of their seats and not Republicans. And if I was actuated by base political motives, I would like to see this bill go through, and then the gentleman could see how far his prediction would go.

But, gentlemen of the House, I am not actuated by those motives. I want to see the Clarke amendment voted out of the bill first, because, in my opinion, that is one of the most vicious amendments that has ever come on a bill from the Senate. Look what its author said in the Senate when he proposed it. He was not a member of the committee that reported out the bill. He said:

> I had no particular reason in introducing this amendment except that no one else would do it. * * * Either I or some one else had to do it. I am getting as much salary as anybody else and doing about as little.

With all due respect to that gentleman, he is a man of big deeds, but in my opinion this is one of the smallest things he ever did. I continue; he says:

> And I did not know but that I had better get busy right along that line.

That amendment was voted into the bill by a tie vote, which was broken by the vote of the Vice President. Eleven Democratic Senators voted against that amendment, and the 28 Democrats in this House who are going to stand with the minority party in upholding American rights to-day deserve every credit that the country can give them, together with the minority party in this House, that is furnishing the bulk of the vote, and we are proud to vote this amendment out of the bill.

The gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON] completely demolished, in my opinion, some of the strongest arguments that some of the Democrats on the other side have made about the Japanese bugbear in the Far East. As I listened to the Philippine Resident Commissioner in his argument, although I did not agree with him in what he said, I could not help but plainly see how his argument on this Japanese bugbear absolutely demolished the argument that his colleagues on the Democratic side have made on the floor of the House to-day on this question.

What if it does bring us into international complications with Japan? So long as that question has been raised, is that any reason why we should scuttle the ship of state and leave it? We understand that there is a submarine controversy going on with another Government to-day. I say that there is a controversy going on here in this House to-day in which we see one party trying to torpedo the ship of state in the Philippines, and a minority of the Democratic Party combining with the Republican minority of the House trying to save the interests of the country to-day.

Vote this amendment out of the bill, and let the House pass a Philippine bill which gives to the Philippines home rule under the control and protection of the United States. Without that they would not have existed since 1898. Without that May 1, 1898, would not be a day to be proud of in our history; and had we not gone into there 18 years ago to-day the Filipinos and the Philippine Islands would be undergoing the domination of Spain or else that of some other monarchial form of government which, as results have shown, did not work to the benefit of the people when it came to colonization.

Therefore, on the eighteenth anniversary of one of the greatest days in American history, we confidently hope on this side—and we are proud of it— that before adjournment comes to-day you will see this vicious Clarke amendment voted out of the bill, and then there will be some chance of passing a bill that will give some form of home rule to the Philippine Islands under this great Government. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if I have any time remaining, I yield it back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. JONES. We have only one other speaker on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is further debate, the Clerk will read.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. That is all the time that I have.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allotted to me I am unable to discuss the pending bill with that thoroughness which I desire. It will be possible, however, to justify the action of those of my Democratic colleagues who, like myself, are unable to support the bill in its present shape.

I am unalterably opposed to section 34 of this bill, which is known as the Clarke amendment. In my opinion, it is a plain violation of the pledges made by the Democratic Party in its national platform; it is inconsistent with the action taken by the Democratic House in the last Congress; it is contrary to the position upon which I made my campaign for Congress in the congressional election for 1914; and it has not the approval of the great mass of the people.

The Democratic national platform of 1912 contained this declaration:

We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippines as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

Such a provision was contained in the Jones bill of 1902, and the attitude of the Democratic Party since that time has practically been unchanged.

My position regarding this question is not new nor of recent origin. In October, 1914, I had the distinction to preside at the Lake Mohonk conference on the Indian and other dependent peoples.

Among the prominent men who participated in that conference were the following: Rev. Ernst H. Abbott, The Outlook; Rev. Joseph Anderson, D. D., Woodmont, Conn.; Rev. E. Ashley, LL. D., general missionary, Episcopal Church, Aberdeen, S. Dak.; Rt. Rev. George Biller, jr., Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; S. M. Brosius, Indian Rights Association, 908 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D. D., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York; Elmer E. Brown, LL. D., New York University, New York; Rev. James M. Bruce, 201 West Fifty-fifth Street, New York; Rev. Thomas Chalmers, D. D., Manchester, N. H.; Rev. W. I. Chamberlain, Ph. D., secretary Board of Foreign Missions of Reformed Church, 25 East Twenty-second Street, New York; Rev. William B. Cooke, First Presbyterian Church, Manila, P. I.; Rev. Charles C. Creegan, D. D., Fargo College, Fargo, N. Dak.; Paul De Schweinitz, D. D., secretary of Missions of the Moravian Church in America, Bethlehem, Pa.; Edwin C. Dinwiddie, superintendent National Temperance Bureau, 30-33 Bliss Building, Washington, D. C.; H. Paul Douglass, D. D., American Missionary Association, 287 Fourth Avenue, New York; Rev. A. E. Dunning, D. D., The Congregationalist, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Carl E. Grammar, 1024 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. R. D. Hall, secretary for Indian Work of International Committee of Young Men's Christian Association, 124 East Twenty-eighth Street, New York; James P. Lichtenberger, professor of Sociology University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Henry M. MacCracken, University Heights, New York, N. Y.; Mrs. E. E. Marean, The Christian Register, 272 Congress Street, Boston, Mass.; Charles F. Meserve, LL. D., Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C.; Rev. Thomas C. Moffett, D. D., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York; Delavan L. Pierson, The Missionary Review of the World, 354 Fourth Avenue, New York; Francis H. Rowley, D. D., 45 Milk Street, Boston, Mass; Doremus Scudder, M. D., D. D., editor The Friend, minister of Central Union Church, 910 Prospect Street, Honolulu, Hawaii; Charles L. Thompson, D. D., secretary Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Rt. Rev. Theodore Payne Thurston, D. D., bishop of eastern Oklahoma, 734 Terrace Boulevard, Muskogee, Okla.; Fennell P. Turner, general secretary Student Volunteer Movement, 25 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Rev. N. H. Van Arsdale, D. D., The Christian Intelligence, 149 Church Street, New York; Miss Lina J. Walk, The Christian Work, New York, N. Y.; Rev. G. A. Watermulder, Winnebago, Nebr.; Rev. Charles R. Watson, D. D., corresponding secretary United Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, Reformed Church Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Arthur P. Wedge, traveling lecturer for the Propagating the Gospel among the Indians, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Rev. Charles L. White, D. D., associate corresponding secretary of American Baptist Home Mission Society, 23 East Twenty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y.; Rt. Rev. Frederick F. Johnson, St. Louis, Mo.

Those gentlemen represented every phase of religious thought in this country. In discussing at that conference the Jones bill, which was then under consideration and had just passed the House of Representatives, I made this statement:

Perhaps the provision in the previous bill which aroused the greatest antagonism was that one which provided that at the expiration of eight years the Filipinos should be granted their absolute independence. I for one was very gravely in doubt as to the wisdom of such a provision. With others, I did not believe it was wise or expedient for the United States to determine eight years in advance that the Filipinos would be ready for their independence, nor that the conditions would be such that the United States would be justified in granting their independence to them. And so, as the result of many conferences and much discussion, that provision was eliminated from the bill.

I also made this statement:

The desire of all, regardless of partisan considerations, is to have the Philippine people have a government which will be most conducive to their happiness and prosperity. The policy which is being carried out was formulated under the direct supervision of President Wilson. I am sure that no one believes that he has any desire to exploit the islands or to bring to the people discomfort or distress; and I am certain that the work, which heretofore with great difficulty and very successfully and with credit to the American people has been carried on, will continue to be done equally successfully, until eventually there is practically an agreement among our people that the time has arrived when the independence of the Philippine people should be granted. When that time comes independence will be granted in such a way that the civilized nations of the world will know that the United States is not casting them adrift to be the prey of some ambitious nation, but that it intends that their independence shall be maintained by all the power and resources of the United States.

The Hon. MANUEL L. QUEZON, the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines, speaking on the same occasion of the Jones bill, said:

One important end is accomplished by this bill. It will settle in the only practical and possible way the controversy regarding the capacity of the Filipino people for self-government. The bill is so framed that, while the Filipinos will have ample opportunity to demonstrate their wisdom and patriotism, the powers reserved to the United States are sufficient to prevent, in case of failure in this test, any serious harm to the people of the islands themselves or to the United States. For this reason alone, if for no other, this bill should have the unanimous support of every American who in good faith believes that no governmental powers should be withheld from the Filipinos that they can properly exercise; and in like manner those who assert that we are incapable of governing ourselves ought to welcome the proposed test as much as we who allege that we are fully capable of self-government, because it will show at once who is right. If they are correct in their views, the fact will be plainly demonstrated and the control of the Philippine government will be transferred to wiser men. If we are correct, a wrong which has already lasted too long will be righted.

That conference adopted, as had been the practice in former conferences, a declaration of principles or a platform, and upon the question of the Philippine Islands the following declaration was made:

The American people, having accepted the privilege and responsibility of fitting the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands for self-government, their undertaking should be prosecuted with conviction and fidelity by Government officials, by teachers in the schools, and by teachers of religion, in order that a moral basis may be secured on which a stable government can rest. The desire for self-government on the part of the Filipino people is a legitimate and praiseworthy ambition. It should not only be encouraged but it should be coupled with the endeavor to cultivate the essential virtues of a self-governing people. The object of our Government should be, not so much to hasten the time when it may be freed from responsibilities as to advance the time when the Philippine people shall be so fused in common purposes, a common language, common sentiments, and ideas and character, that they shall be clearly competent to determine their future relations with the United States. It appears from the Jones bill, now under discussion, that in view of the present Congress, as thus far indicated, a definite time can not yet be fixed when this momentous question of the status of the Philippines shall be finally decided. *It is a view with which this conference is in full accord.*

That gathering of representative men from all parts of the United States, typifying every phase of religious, political, and commercial thought, was unanimously in accord with the action of the Democratic House of Representatives, which had just passed a bill extending to a very large extent the control of their Government to the Philippine people, but refusing to declare any definite time at which they should be fitted for independence.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have a very limited time.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I wanted to ask if that was the bill that had the preamble?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Jones bill had a preamble, which I regret is not in this bill.

That preamble was 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.

That is an expression of what I believe to be practically the universal opinion of the people of the United States—that it is not the intention of the United States to hold the Filipinos forever in subjection, but that when, by reason of the opportunities afforded, they shall have demonstrated their capacity by the exercise of the powers of government not only to establish but to maintain and conduct a government that will secure the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all of the Filipinos and be able to maintain their position as an independent people among the nations of the world, then the United States intends to give them their independence. But it also proposes, Mr. Chairman, according to my belief, that the islands shall not be cast adrift with the statement that they are free, and left, unaided and unsupported, to make the best of their opportunities. When they are freed it ought to be with the knowledge conveyed in unmistaken tones to the world that the United States intends to stand by them and to aid and to assist them to maintain the government that is established until they have attained a position which will enable them to stand alone. [Applause.] This bill, in my judgment, does not do what I believe the American people demand. It does not conform to the declaration upon which the Democratic Party appealed to the country in 1912 and again in 1914.

The so-called Clarke amendment, section 34 of the bill, is as follows:

SEC. 34. The President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines, and he shall on behalf of the United States fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof, and full power to take the several steps necessary to institute such government is hereby conferred upon the said Philippines acting by and through governmental agencies created by this act. This transfer of possession, sovereignty, and governmental control shall be completed and become absolute not less than two years nor more than four years from the date of the approval of this act, under the terms and in the manner hereinafter prescribed: *Provided*, That if the President, prior to the expiration of the said period of four years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years, and thus afford the Congress an opportunity in its discretion to further consider the situation in the said Philippines; but any such extension of time by the President shall not otherwise suspend or nullify the operative force of this act, unless the Congress shall hereafter so direct. For the purpose of a complete and prompt compliance with this direction, the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines or others as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the said Philippines, and to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States and of other countries resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein. In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President may reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines.

The effect of that provision is to cast the Filipinos adrift, not less than two nor more than four years and a fraction from the approval of the bill. They are to be turned loose without ample opportunity to demonstrate their capacity to conduct and to maintain a stable government. There is to be no guaranty by the United States of their independence. They will have no right to look to us for the help and aid and encouragement to which they are entitled. There is to be no assurance that they will be protected from the designs of grasping and hostile powers. They are not to be secured by any declaration of protection by the United States pending the negotiation and ratification of treaties with the civilized powers that their independence will be recognized and protected.

I shall not criticize nor condemn those who advocate such a course. Sincere, able, conscientious, and patriotic men favor such action. I do not. I can not be a party to it. I shall not give my support to a measure to bring about such results.

The Jones bill passed the House of Representatives in 1914 by a vote of 211 to 59. That vote was representative of the matured public opinion of the country. That bill should be passed again by this House. It confers large powers of government upon the Philippine people. It will give them the opportunity to demonstrate their capacity for self-government. It will hasten rather than retard their independence. It conforms to the declaration of the Democratic Party contained in the national platform and expressed in legislative action. It harmonizes with my convictions, and it is in accord with the declarations upon which I appealed to my constituents in the last congressional campaign. [Applause.]

Under the leave to print, I append the address which I made in October, 1914, at the Lake Mohonk conference and from which I have quoted briefly during these remarks.

THE CONTENT OF THE JONES BILL.

[Address by Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD, M. C.]

There has been some discussion during the conference as to the advisability of the adoption of what might be designated as an American policy in dealing with the Philippine Islands. The purpose evidently is to have the United States initiate a policy for the control of the islands that shall not be discussed from a purely partisan standpoint, but that shall represent practically the sentiment of the people regardless of politics. During the present week the House of Representatives passed a bill that had been under consideration for several weeks. It is known as the Jones bill. Perhaps some misunderstanding has been occasioned because of the title of the bill and the fact that in a previous Congress proposed legislation bearing the same title was in many respects radically different from the bill considered at the present session by the House. Perhaps the provision in the previous bill which aroused the greatest antagonism was that one which provided that at the expiration of a period, if I recall correctly, of eight years, the Filipinos should be granted their absolute independence. I, for one, was very gravely in doubt as to the wisdom of such a provision. With many others, I did not believe that it was either wise or expedient for the United States to determine eight years in advance that the Filipinos would be ready for their independence, or that the conditions would be such that the United States would be justified in granting independence to them. And so, as the result of many conferences and much discussion, that provision was eliminated from the bill. The bill as passed by the House represents the matured policy of the present administration; it has the indorsement of the present administration. From the result in the House of Representatives I believe that it can be safely said that it expresses as nearly as can be expressed the American policy of dealing with the Philippine Islands in the future. Upon a recorded vote, taken upon the passage of the bill, 211 Representatives voted in favor of the bill and 59 in opposition to it. Any bill which passes the House of Representatives after extended controversy by a vote of practically 4 to 1 will come as nearly to representing the sentiment of the American people as any legislation that can be enacted. The portion of the bill which excited the greatest controversy and the most partisan contest, strange to say, was the preamble. The preamble is not a legislative act in the sense that is a law, but it is a method used of making a solemn declaration of the purpose by the Government in its future actions.

It is a declaration of policy upon the part of the Government. It is a declaration that was demanded by a very large and influential element of the Philippine people, and it is a declaration which is in complete accord with the platform of the dominant party now in the control of the Nation. I hope I may without offense to anyone present dissent from the view expressed here that in the language of olden days political platforms are "not meant to stand on, but to get in on." No public official can afford to assume any such position. A candidate for office or a political party which seeks power upon a declaration of principles and policies can not, after having invited and received the support of a majority of the electorate, assume that the policies favored and to be carried out in the event of success may be regarded as certain treaties, and be considered merely as "scraps of paper" to be disregarded when it was opportune for the party in power.

The Democratic platform, upon which the party was put in control of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, contains this very important and essential paragraph:

We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandoning a fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippines as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

The preamble of the Jones bill is a very mild declaration of that provision of the platform, but it is not the declaration of the policy of the Democratic Party alone. It is merely putting into concrete expression the policy that has been enunciated and has been contemplated by the Republican Party in the years

in which it was in control of the government of the Philippine Islands. I undertake to say that no influential group of men or no substantial body of men at any time in the United States has ever taken any other position than that the purpose of the United States is ultimately to grant to the Philippine people their independence. The only question upon which there has been any difference of opinion is the question as to the time when the Philippine people would be fitted to establish and to maintain an independent government. In 1908 Mr. Taft, as Secretary of War, was sent to the Philippine Islands, and upon his return he made a most voluminous report. In that report he called attention to the fact that many Filipinos desired that the American people should declare a definite policy as to the Philippines, so that they might be informed as to what that policy was to be. He said he did not believe any more definite statement of policy could be enunciated than the policy declared by President McKinley in his instructions to Secretary Root for the guidance of the Philippine Commission. It was practically incorporated in the organic act. "That policy," he said "is declared to be the extension of self-government to the Philippine Islands by gradual steps from time to time as the people of the islands shall show themselves fit to receive the additional responsibility."

It "necessarily involves in its ultimate conclusion, as the steps toward self-government become greater and greater, the ultimate independence of the islands."

In another portion of his report the Secretary, outlining the policy of the United States toward the Philippine Islands, said:

> Shortly stated, the national policy is to govern the Philippine Islands for the benefit and welfare and uplift of the people of the islands, and gradually to extend to them, as they shall show themselves fit to exercise it, a greater and greater measure of self-government.

And he added:

> When the Filipino people as a whole show themselves reasonably fit to conduct a popular self-government, maintaining law and order, and offering equal protection of the laws and civil rights to rich and poor, and desire complete independence of the United States, they shall be given it.

So that the preamble of the Jones bill merely puts in a formal way the uniform policy of the Government and the one intended from the very beginning by the American people, as expressed by the action and attitude of administrations of two opposite political parties. A stable government can not mean any other government than such a government as can maintain law and order, and can extend equal protection of the law to the rich and to the poor.

The treaty with Spain, by which the United States acquired the Philippine Islands, was ratified on the 11th of April, 1899. Until July 1, 1902, all military and civil power was exercised in the Philippine Islands by the President of the United States through such military and civil officers as he appointed. On the 1st of July, 1902, the organic act was enacted by Congress, and it was designated as an act for the temporary government of the Philippine Islands, which act has now been in force for 12 years, and the proposed law is designed to extend to the Filipinos a much larger measure of control and management in their own affairs. In contemplating the capacity of the Philippine people for self-government it must not be forgotten that more than a hundred years ago Filipino representatives sat in the Spanish Cortes in Spain, and at one time as many as 17 representatives of the Philippine people were members of the Spanish Parliament. Before Harvard existed the University of St. Joseph had been established at Manila, where the Filipino youth were educated in the higher branches of learning, in medicine and in law, in literature and philosophy, in science and in art, and an organized system of public schools existed throughout the islands, while for more than 300 years they have had the civilizing effects of the Christian religion. Three years ago more than one-half of the Christian inhabitants, constituting as they do more than nine-tenths of the total population of the Philippines, had learned to speak the English language, and to-day the proportion of those who speak English is much larger, since for several years past the annual attendance in the public schools of about 600,000 Philippine children, taught by about 9,000 teachers, at least 92 per cent of whom are Filipinos, has made possible the acquisition of the English language and the spread of learning to an extent we hardly appreciate. Since 1907 the Filipino Legislature has consisted of an appointive commission and an elective body—a commission of nine members appointed by the President of the United States, one of whom is the Governor General, an assembly composed of Filipinos, elected by the Filipinos themselves. Impartial observers express the belief that this assembly has done remarkable work in demonstrating the capacity of the people for self-government. Everyone does not agree with everything they do, but when we consider how much acrimonious controversy there is over the actions of the United States Congress and of our State legislatures, we can not expect that perfection of work from the Filipino Assembly that would result in complete acquiescence on the part of everyone in all of their actions. Under the present government the commission has equal authority with the Philippine Assembly in legislative matters over the Christian peoples of the Philippine Islands. It has exclusive executive power and exclusive control of legislation over the non-Christian portions of the islands. The result has been that the commission, responsible not to the Philippine people but to the President of the United States, has taken moneys raised by taxation from the Christian people and spent it at will in the non-Christian Provinces. One of the grievous complaints that the Philippine people have had has been the manner in which the commission has disbursed the public funds in the non-Christian portions of the territory. One of them was the expenditure of many millions of public revenues in the construction, maintenance, and upkeep of the Benguet automobile road in non-Christian territory, which has aroused the indignation of the Philippine people, and is a striking illustration of the necessity for the abolition of the Philippine Commission. This short road, some 22 miles in length, has already cost the Filipinos more than $100,000 a mile. Until recently the majority of the Filipino Commission have been Americans. President Wilson, however, inaugurated a new policy by appointing a majority of Filipinos. The effect was immediately noticeable. Although the commission and the assembly for three years were deadlocked upon the appropriation bill, and it was impossible to have the appropriation bill enacted in three meetings of the legislature, at the last session of the legislature, with a majority of Filipinos in the Philippine Commission, the appropriation bill was passed by a unanimous vote in both bodies—not only the Filipinos but the Americans united in supporting it. This is a somewhat striking illustration of their capacity to govern.

The Jones bill declares, first, who are and who may be citizens of the Philippine Islands. It enacts the Bill of Rights, substantially the personal and property guarantees of the Constitution of the United States. It provides that all the expenses incurred by the Philippine Government be defrayed by moneys raised by taxation in the Philippine Islands; that all the powers that are now conferred upon the Philippine Legislature and the Philippine Commission be exercised by the Philippine Legislature; it continues the laws that are now in force until they are changed by the new legislature or by Congress; transfers all the public domain to the Philippine government to be administered for the benefit of the Philippine people; empowers the legislature, in addition to the usual powers, to legislate on tariff, currency, and coinage, but all laws affecting these subjects as well as timber, public lands, and mines must be approved by the President of the United States before they become effective. It retains in Congress the control of the trade relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands; it creates a legislature of two bodies—a senate and house of representatives. The islands are to be divided into 12 senate districts and 90 representative districts, each senate district to elect two senators, each representative district one representative. The Governor General of the islands, without restriction upon residence, is empowered to appoint the two senators and nine representatives from the non-Christian portions of the islands. One senate district is comprised of those Provinces which are not now organized. But the other 22 Senators and 81 representatives are to be elected by the people of the Philippine Islands themselves. The right of suffrage is extended to all who can read and write in any native language. At present it is restricted to those who can read or write in English or Spanish. The Governor General is to be appointed by the President of the United States, as are the justices of the supreme court. The Governor General is to appoint all of the officials in the islands, subject to confirmation by the Philippine senate. The Governor General has a qualified veto over the legislation enacted by the legislature. His veto can be overruled by two-thirds vote of both houses, but if such action be taken the bill must be transmitted to the President of the United States, and unless he approves it it will not become a law. The right is reserved to the Congress of the United States to annul any legislative action taken by the Philippine Legislature.

That is a comprehensive outline of the provisions of the bill. Its purpose is to give to the Philippine people the fullest measure of control over their own affairs, and to retain at the same time such control in the President and in the Congress as will insure protection against hasty, ill-advised, or unjustifiable legislation. There has been some criticism of the present administration of the Philippine Islands. It has not been voiced

at this conference, and I do not believe it is justified when the facts are actually known. The present administration has been "Philippinizing"—to use a word that has recently come into vogue—by placing Filipinos in positions which heretofore have been occupied by American citizens. There has been considerable criticism of such action on the part of the American citizens who have lost the lucrative positions which they have been occupying for some time. And yet it must be apparent to everyone that if the Filipinos are ever to administer their own affairs, they must be placed in control of them. Action has not been taken at random, but changes have been made with care and deliberation in compliance with the civil-service laws, and wholly in the interest of the public service. As the result of this Philippinizing of the Philippine service the Philippine government has reduced its expenditures a million dollars in a year, and it is now arranged to curtail those expenditures $2,500,000 more. The present administration under Gov. Gen. Harrison has repealed the law which permitted the sale of friar lands in excess of the area fixed in the organic act. It has created a public-utilities commission to prevent the exploitation of the islands and to protect the people against exorbitant charges. It has enacted a pure food and drugs act, in line with the progressive sentiment of this country. The judiciary has been reorganized in order more quickly and efficiently to punish offenders against the law. It has substituted civil officials for military in the Moro Province, and despite the fears of those who looked upon such action with alarm there is order, peace, intelligent and progressive work being done in the Moro Province under the civilian officials. The bureau of navigation, maintained at a very high cost, with a number of high-salaried officials, for the purpose of supervising a governmental fleet used largely for official purposes by the officials of the Philippine government, was abolished. Considerable criticism has come from this action by those who have lost lucrative positions in that bureau.

It seems to me that this review of what has been done in the Philippine Islands and a proper understanding of the purpose of Congress leave no doubt that the will of the American people is being expressed in the administration of the islands and in the legislation for them. The desire of all, regardless of partisan considerations, is to have the Philippine people have a government which will be most conducive to their happiness and prosperity. The policy that is being carried out was formulated under the direct supervision of President Wilson. I am sure no one believes that he has any desire to exploit the islands or to bring to the people discomfort or distress; and I am certain that the work, which heretofore with great difficulty and very successfully and with credit to the American people has been carried on, will continue to be done equally successfully, until eventually there is practically an agreement among our people that the time has arrived when the independence of the Philippine people should be granted. When that time comes independence will be granted in such a way that the civilized nations of the world will know that the United States is not casting them adrift to be the prey of some ambitious nation, but that it intends that their independence shall be maintained by all the power and resources of the United States.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] if he has exhausted the debate on his side?

Mr. TOWNER. I have.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRUMBAUGH] the time remaining to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRUMBAUGH] is recognized for nine minutes.

Mr. JONES. I understood from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], who has had charge of the time, that there were 24 minutes remaining to us. That is the understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands from the Clerk at the desk that the time remaining to the gentleman from Virginia is nine minutes.

Mr. JONES. I can not understand that, Mr. Chairman, because it has been understood that we had 24 minutes. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has gone to his dinner, and I think there must be some mistake about the count of the time. We have all understood that it was 24 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman is correct in that understanding.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] confirms my statement that it is 24 minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the Chairman that that is my understanding.

Mr. JONES. The time has been parceled out with that understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the record kept at the desk shows that there are nine minutes remaining to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES. The understanding was that the debate was to close at half past 6 o'clock.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I should like to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the debate began at 11.30, and that by agreement reached this afternoon between the two sides it has been limited to seven hours. That would certainly conclude the debate until 6.30, and, of course, a little time has been lost in yielding, so that the gentleman's contention must be correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, has no record of his own as to the time consumed, but the record that has been kept by the Clerk at the desk shows that 3 hours and 21 minutes have been consumed by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JONES. I ask that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRUMBAUGH] be permitted to speak for 24 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRUMBAUGH] be permitted to proceed for 24 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Reserving the right to object, I ask that this side be given an equal amount of time.

Mr. JONES. Your side have had their time.

Mr. AUSTIN. And according to the statement of the Chairman your side has had the same amount of time.

Mr. JONES. There is no question about your having had three hours and a half.

Mr. AUSTIN. And the Chair says you have had all of yours except nine minutes.

Mr. JONES. The Chair is mistaken about that. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] has stated, we started at half past 11, and seven hours would certainly bring us to half past 6. It is now 10 minutes after 6.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] will not insist on his objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am not objecting. I just withheld my consent to see if we could not make an agreement which I think would be fair.

Mr. TOWNER. I think there is some mistake about it. I think the gentlemen over there are entitled to the time. So I hope no one will object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has been over the record book here and it seems to be correct.

Mr. JONES. I will ask the Chair to submit the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRUMBAUGH] be permitted to proceed for 24 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I desire to thank the House for this courtesy in extending my time at this late hour at the end of this long day of debate.

I appreciate the responsibility as well as the honor of closing the debate for the majority side of the House on this bill dealing with the great question of Philippine independence—a question of such immense magnitude that it affects the future of 9,000,000 people in the Orient and likewise affects the future policy of the Government of the United States, and thereby affects the destiny of mankind in the ages to be.

THE GENERAL PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE PHILIPPINE BILL TO DO THE RIGHT THING AND BE TRUE TO OUR TRADITIONS.

I expect to use the most of my time in telling you something about my personal observations in the Philippine Islands during the last summer. I want to make just this statement before beginning that part of the discussion: I believe a careful study of the Philippine bill as formerly passed by the House in the Sixty-third Congress, and as now before us modified by the Senate, will convince any candid investigator that this bill now under discussion is one of the most important measures ever presented to any legislative body for the government, uplift, and advancement of any people, in any age or any land.

The framers and sponsors of this bill in all its stages, its friends and supporters everywhere, have had in mind always the one desire to formulate and pass such a measure as would be alike fair, just, and honorable to the great Republic of the United States and to the people of the Philippine Islands, whose friends and well-wishers we are and always have been. Our first care and concern has been to do that which would show that we were willing to do the right thing, the fair thing, the just thing, and to do it in line with, and in memory of, all our best traditions of the past.

The passage of this bill will prove to the world, I think, that we are still guided by the teachings of the fathers, the wisest and purest of our statesmen, from Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln to the present time; that we are not to be led astray from the path of freedom and the ideals on which our Republic was founded, by the glamour of conquest, the greed of gain, or to covet the God-given rights and possessions of others; but as a people grateful to God for liberty and a free, independent form of government we are willing to grant to others the priceless heritage we enjoy ourselves. [Applause.]

PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

I had the good fortune to be able to travel from May to October last year in that part of the world, visiting Hawaii, Guam, China, Japan, Chosen, and the Port Arthur country.

I had the great pleasure of spending 35 delightful days in the Philippine Islands. We traveled in automobiles over the various islands, for they have many good roads in most of the inhabitable islands. The Philippines are alive with automobiles everywhere.

With American officials, Philippine members of the legislature, and leading Moros, we traveled together more than 2,000 miles by water among the various islands and tribes. Everywhere the people received us with great kindness and hospitality. I desire to take this opportunity to express my thanks and great appreciation to the people of the Philippine Islands for their great hospitality and the constant courtesies showered upon us. They almost killed us with good things to eat, and almost smothered us to death with kind attentions.

I wish I had the opportunity to tell you a little about their beautiful, fertile country, their farming, crops, roads, bridges, schools, churches, homes, and the people themselves, their unfailing kindness and hospitality, and their conception of civil government.

Everywhere among the Filipinos in all the islands we found the people expressing gratitude to the American people for the services rendered them, while at the same time expressing the hope that the great American Republic would keep faith with them and assist them to set up a republican form of government, so that there would be in the Orient the United States of the Philippines, a republic modeled after our own. [Applause.]

This hope is a passion with them everywhere. Being the only Christian people in all the Orient I found them, as a mass, the keenest, most capable, and best fitted for self-government of all the people of all the Orient.

TRIBUTE TO OUR SOLDIERS, TEACHERS, AND AMERICANS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. Chairman, I can not but pause before entering upon a further discussion of this question to pay a tribute to our soldiers, teachers, and Americans in the Philippines. We can be proud of them all. In this connection I want to insert the printed report of a speech delivered by me July 4, 1915, printed in the Manila Times of that date. Speaking to a large audience of Filipinos and Americans, I said:

"I desire to be understood as to my position in regard to past American occupation in these islands. I am proud of the record. No finer body of soldiers has ever served any country anywhere; no better soldiers on our planet to-day than our boys in the Philippines.

"I am extremely proud of the great work of our American teachers in the Philippines—a noble body of men and women, who have led the Filipino youth up the rugged heights to a purer air and a broader view. With these I also include those American residents who have lived and labored in the professions and in business in no selfish manner to develop the best things in the Philippines. Everywhere I go I see the best evidences of the good influences of all these, my countrymen, and I desire to state my appreciation of their good work. All these things can make mightily for the future. Those who, if any such, would turn all this in the end to their own self-aggrandizement or self-greed or spoliation of the Filipino people seem to me to be untrue to American ideals. All those who labor for the uplift and common good of the people of the islands deserve the praise of all good men and the smile of heaven upon their labors.

"In regard to our present government in the Philippine Islands I want to say that I believe all our Governors General in the past have been good and patriotic men, doing that which they believed for the best at all times. I have no word of criticism to offer concerning the administration of any of them. For the present Governor General, the Hon. Francis Burton Harrison, I want to say that those of us who have known him respect and honor him; those of us who have known him as a fellow member of Congress and know by daily contact of his fidelity to duty, his keen sense of justice, his industry and ability, feel very confident that his administration will prove equal to any of the past and will set a new high-water mark of efficiency and service which will be alike honorable and beneficial to all. Gov. Gen. Harrison has succeeded in doing that which has rarely ever been accomplished in history—that of being the official ruler over a foreign alien people and being universally loved and popular with the people over whom he rules.

THE MORO PROBLEM.

"While I have been a member of the Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and have for years been a student of the Philippine problem, still I recognize the fact that only information and observation gained at first hand can convey any adequate grasp of the needs and problems of the Filipino people. To properly understand another people is the work of time and long association, based upon mutual regard and consideration of each others rights and convictions.

TRIP THROUGH THE MORO COUNTRY.

"Our Southern Island trip of 15 days has been replete with information and absorbing interest. Here, it seems to me, is about all that is left of the real Philippine problem, and the problem is being solved. I want to congratulate, without stint or limit, Gov. Gen. Harrison and the fine men under him, who are solving this greatest of Philippine problems, upon which hangs the future happiness of 9,000,000 souls and 50,000,000 souls to be. I can only speak in words of highest commendation of the magnificent work of Gov. Carpenter and his marvelous success, and also of the fine men helping him—Gov. Gilsheuser, Gov. Rohrer, Gov. Bryant, and Col. Traub, and also the faithful common soldiers and the native scouts and constabulary. I have never seen a finer body of men devoted to a high and sacred duty. Nothing finer or better or nobler has yet been conceived by the mind of man regarding this work than Gov. Gen. Harrison's project at Momungan or Gov. Carpenter's colonization of Filipino colonists in the Moro country. While some critics for self-interest criticize, still the work goes on, and Gov. Gen. Harrison and Gov. Carpenter and their fine helpers are patriotically solving the great Philippine problem.

"Before I went to the Moro country I had great fears about the Moro problem. I think we can dismiss the Moro bugaboo and destroy the straw-man scarecrow Moro problem. We saw in the very heart of the darkest part of Moroland Filipino families living peaceably and friendly with Moros all about them. We saw the 8 different Filipino colonies, each colony numbering over 100 families and each colony numbering from 800 to 2,000 Filipino people, scattered over 150 miles of Moro country, surrounded by late Moro enemies, and living in peace and friendship together. We heard Moro leaders speak in English and ask for more Filipino teachers. We heard the datos speak in praise and love of their Filipino neighbors. We saw colonies where the president was a Filipino and the assistant a Moro dato. It did not look to us as though 300,000 Moros—poor, ignorant, and unarmed, except with primitive bolos—were going to overpower our 6,000 splendidly armed scouts and constabulary down there and come 700 miles through the territory of several million Filipinos to eat blood raw the people of Luzon or any other island, and much less did it look as though they had any desire to do so.

"It did in all fairness look as though the good and noble work of Gov. Carpenter, in making Filipinos and Moros friends and fellow citizens, had been too long delayed, and that in the past Moro prejudices had been played up and played upon for a purpose as an argument against home and native rule at any time in the future. At least very little advantage was ever taken in the past of a most glorious and sacred opportunity to fraternalize Moros and Filipinos and make past enemies future friends. True, there may occur in the future race hatred, clashes, outbreak, and strife among these people. All these things have happened and still happen in the United States, but no one uses it as an argument to discontinue a republican form of government. The truth is that even the ignorant, savage Moro feels the influence of the greatest of all powers on this earth—the power of friendship and love—and this influence is solving the problem better than those politicians who oppose home rule have thought it possible to solve it.

THE JONES BILL.

"There appears to be very much misunderstanding about the Jones bill. It should be remembered that this bill passed the House by about 4 to 1, and, had it been voted upon, would have passed the Senate by a large majority. Only filibustering tactics in the Senate prevented a vote upon it. Many Republicans in the House and almost all the Progressives, or third-party men, voted for it, and many Republican Senators in the Senate avowed their intention of voting for it. Anyone who reads the bill will ascertain that it is a bill of good faith, in

line with the best policies of the past, and is a natural step forward. It is alike honorable to both the American people and American ideals, and also to the best interests of the Filipino people. It does not commit the United States Government to immediate independence to-morrow or next year; it simply leaves us free to do and to go as far as the Filipino people may be able to prove to us that they are able to so govern themselves that it makes it advisable and sensible to go. Would any just man anywhere want it otherwise? The bill, above all else, removes all doubt as to our ultimate purpose in these islands. It does specifically state that the United States, as soon as reasonable and possible, at the time best for all concerned, will grant full and complete independence to the Philippine Islands, and thus, as I hope and pray, be the means of helping you build up in the Orient 'the United States of the Philippines,' a republic that shall honor you and honor us and endure for all time to come. [Applause.]

WE CAN SAFELY FOLLOW PRESIDENT WILSON.

"I want to say to all that we can trust President Wilson. No greater President has ever sat in the presidential chair. The future historian, I believe, will speak of four greatest Presidents—Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson. As time goes by the people will appreciate more and more the man who, regardless of clamor, held the rudder true and kept his country and also Hawaii and the Philippines unstained by blood. No folly of his has caused the angel of death to take the first born of every home a sacrifice in war. No President ever met so many and so great world-wide, perplexing problems in so short a time. He has met them with supreme faith and courage, meeting every delicate emergency with consummate tact and ability, and all the while his fine courage, sense of justice and patriotism have led the thought of the entire world to higher plains and better things. The faith of the American people in his wisdom and statesmanship can not be shaken; it grows stronger all the while. [Applause.]

FUTURE POLICY OF UNITED STATES.

"I have been frequently asked, What is to be the future policy in the meantime of the United States toward the Philippines? Why should anyone who reads the newspapers ask that question? The President stated the policy in his speech to Congress, speaking to a joint meeting of the House and Senate December 2, 1913. I know of no one who could state it so well. Personally I want to say that the President's speech meets with my hearty approval, and I think correctly states the true purposes of the Jones bill and the true policy of the American people toward the future of the Philippine Islands.

"The President said:

"'Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines are ours, indeed, but not ours to do as we please with. Such Territories, once regarded as mere possessions, are to be no longer selfishly exploited; they are part of the domain of public conscience and of serviceable and enlightened statesmanship. We must administer them for the people who live in them and with the same sense of responsibility to them as toward our own people in domestic affairs. No doubt we shall successfully enough bind Porto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands to ourselves by ties of justice, interest, and affection, but the performance of our duty toward the Philippines is a difficult and debatable matter. We can satisfy the obligations of generous justice toward the people of Porto Rico by giving them the ample and familiar rights and privileges accorded our own citizens in our own territory, and our obligations toward the people of Hawaii by perfecting the provisions of self-government already granted them, but in the Philippines we must go further. We must hold steadily in view their ultimate independence, and we must move toward the time of that independence as steadily as the way can be cleared and the foundations thoughtfully and permanently laid. * * *

"'Acting under the authority conferred upon the President by Congress, I have already accorded the people of the islands a majority in both houses of their legislative body by appointing five instead of four native citizens to the membership of the commission. I believe that in this way we shall make proof of their capacity in counsel and their sense of responsibility in the exercise of political power and that the success of this step will be sure to clear our view for the steps which are to follow. Step by step we should extend and perfect the system of self-government in the islands, making test of them and modifying them as experience discloses their success and their failure. We should more and more put under control of the native citizens of the archipelago the essential instruments of self-government, their schools, and all the common interests of their communities, and so by counsel and experience set up a government which all the world will see to be suitable to a people whose affairs are under their own control. At last, I hope and believe, we are beginning to gain the confidence of the Filipino peoples. By their counsel and experience rather than our own we shall learn how best to serve them and how soon it will be possible and wise to withdraw our supervision. Let us once find the path and set out with firm and confident tread upon it and we shall not wander from it or linger upon it.'

"The above from the President is surely in line with President McKinley's attitude and with President Taft's speech at Iloilo in his declaration of the 'Philippines for the Filipinos.' The words of our President are the words of a great statesman who loves justice, a patriot who seeks the common good of the American and the Filipino people. His words should be applauded and sustained by all those who love to see the spread of democratic principles and by all those who have at heart the best interests of their fellow man in all lands. The great Philippine problem is solving itself and will solve itsef in due course of time. With the poet we can paraphrase and say: 'The Philippine problem is moving forward out of darkness into light; it is daybreak everywhere.'

"The President's statement above quoted in regard to the attitude of the United States toward the Philippine problem is in line with the Sermon on the Mount, the Declaration of Independence, and the principles of the Golden Rule." [Applause.]

A WORD ABOUT THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS AND THE PHILIPPINE PEOPLE.

The Philippine Islands are a tropical country, located entirely in the northern Torrid Zone, between 6° and 14° north latitude. The Philippines contain from two to three thousand islands, scattered over 1,000 miles through southern tropical seas. The entire area is about 120,000 square miles, or three States like Ohio. More than nine-tenths of the area is contained in the large islands—Luzon, Mindanao, Cebu, Samar, Mindoro, Leyte, Panay, Bohol, and Jolo. The remainder of the islands are mostly small, rocky, uninhabited islands from 1 to 20 acres in area. To start from any one city and visit the principal islands and return to the place of starting it is necessary to travel more than 2,000 miles in various southern seas. Luzon in area is about as large as Ohio and contains more than one-half as many people. Mindanao is almost as large as Luzon and is principally inhabited by Moros. The entire population of Moros in all the islands, as given by the census of 1903, was 277,547. Cebu is the most densely populated island in the Philippines. The city of Cebu—20,000 population—was discovered by Magellan the same year as the founding of St. Augustine, Fla.

The country is very beautiful and the most fertile tropical country in the world. The mountainous and hilly part of the islands are covered with valuable timber, ebony and mahogany being the most valuable. About one-third of the area is in timber.

PRODUCTS OF THE ISLANDS.

Rice: Rice is the staff of life and raised everywhere. The little rice patties or rice farms are found in all the islands, in the valleys and up the mountain slopes. They have a perfect system of farm irrigation. Rice is used for food, alcohol, beer, and wine.

Hemp: The Philippines is the greatest hemp country in the world. The Manila make of ropes, or manila rope, is known all over the world. They raise about $100 worth of hemp per acre.

Tobacco: The Philippines is the finest tobacco country in the world. The Cagayan River Valley produces the finest tobacco in the known world. There are 40 factories and 40,000 workers in the tobacco factories in the Philippine Islands. In 1913 the islands exported more than 6,000,000 cigars, more than one and one-half million being exported to the United States.

Gold: In 1914 there was mined $1,125,000 in gold ore from placer and lode-rock mines.

Coal is not found in the Philippines.

Coconut: The islands produce 150,000,000 coconuts yearly. They are used for food, drink, and copra or dried fruit.

Nipa palm: Twenty thousand acres of low marshy lands are in Nipa palm. The sap from Nipa palm produces sugar and alcohol. Ten per cent of Nipa palm alcohol mixed with gasoline prduces a good substitute for gasoline for automobiles and other uses. In 1913 the Nipa palm produced more than two and one-half million gallons of alcohol.

Cement: There is shipped into the Philippines more than 500,000 barrels of cement yearly, the duty on cement being 30 cents per barrel. Cement sells at $2.25 to $2.75 per barrel in the Philippines.

There are two railroads on the island of Luzon, and one railroad running through the island of Cebu. A great navigable river runs through the great island of Mindanao. The country is well supplied with rivers and springs and country roads.

In 1913 the total imports were more than $56,000,000; the total exports more than $51,000,000.

PHILIPPINE PEOPLE.

The Philippine people, whether educated or uneducated, whether Filipino or Moro, are naturally a bright, keen, quick-witted people. They are not of the dull, thick-headed kind. There are several dialects, but whether Filipino or Moro they all spring from the Malay race. Magellan, who discovered the islands, found them a keen, virile, patriotic, and brave people, even at that time, and they put up a brave fight before they were conquered. They have their mythology and their history. Spain subdued them, but throughout her entire history with them they struggled to throw off the yoke of Spain, and when Dewey landed at Manila Bay, in May of 1898, they were engaged in a revolution against Spain and had overthrown the Spanish authority in all parts of islands except in and around the city of Manila.

Manila, a city of about 150,000, is a thoroughly cosmopolitan city, with all the conveniences of life found in an up-to-date American city, containing beautiful stores of all kinds, good hotels, and is alive with mercantile and manufacturing interests.

Cebu, the capitol of the island of Cebu, a city of 20,000 people, the home of Speaker Osmenia, is the second city of the Philippine Islands. San Pablo, Anti Polo, Baguio, Surigao, Cagayan, Camp Overton, Iligan, Jolo, Zamborango, and Iloilo are all prosperous towns in the various islands having a population of two to ten thousand people. Most of the cities have waterworks, electric lights, and drainage. We visited all of these islands and cities and found the people very hospitable everywhere. They insisted on serving us from four to six banquets a day. Everywhere were parades, speeches, and banners asking for independence.

LAKE LANAO AND BAGUIO.

While the country is very hot all the year, still they have two remarkable summer resorts. Every night in the year and part of the day it is cool and pleasant at Lake Lanao, in the heart of the island of Mindanao, within 6 degrees of the Equator. At Baguio, on the island of Luzon, you ascend 5,000 feet in 20 miles, and every night of the year you can rest in comfort at the hotel seated by a blazing log fire.

The Baguio Road from the lowlands up the mountains running with the Bued River and crossing it many times is said to be the most wonderful piece of mountain road building in the world. The United States spent $2,000,000 in gold in building this 20 miles of road only to find that we had nothing in the end but the experience. The narrow pass in the mountains slid together and banked up 150 feet of the Bued River. Across this river were some 200 iron bridges, where this road had crossed from side to side in going up the mountain. When the river broke loose it carried away all these bridges and twisted the iron and scattered them along its course like a twisted cotton string.

CAMP JOHN HAY AND NATIVE SOLDIERS.

At Camp John Hay, at Baguio, we saw more than 5,000 Igorotes scout soldiers, a fine body of native soldiers. These are the same Igorotes that traveling showmen take through the United States with rings in their noses, giving a false conception of the country and the people. These soldiers could obey and execute every command, speak English, dressed like our soldiers, lived like our soldiers, and American officers testified to their intelligence and worth.

Ten miles out from Zamboango we find the finest model penal farm of the world at San Ramon and at that place is located the largest and most beautiful coconut grove in the world. Christiana Falls of the Agus River, in Mindanao, is 225 feet high and one of the most beautiful falls in the world.

THE MOMUNGAN COLONY.

On the island of Mindanao is located the settlement of families called squawmen, white men who have married Filipino women. The Philippine Government advanced each family ₱1,200 ($600) to buy 16 hectors, or 40 acres, of land and to put up a home and purchase implements for farming. In Mindanao, also, are eight different Filipino colonies scattered over 100 miles of Moro country. Filipinos and Moros are visiting each other, and the time is thought to be soon at hand when the Moros will elect members to the Philippine Legislature.

SCHOOLS AND CHURCHES.

In all parts of the islands are many old parochial schools and many old, beautiful churches. They have a college in Manila older than Harvard, and to prove to the world that they are not semisavages but educated people, with spirit and ambition ready for self-government, every member of the Philippine Legislature is a college graduate.

THE PHILIPPINE PEOPLE AS DEWEY FOUND THEM IN 1898.

They have many able scholars, business men, and professional men. We should understand that they had 300 years of Spanish education and Christian education and parochial schools before we came among them. When Dewey sailed into Manila Bay, May, 1898, what kind of people did he find in the Philippine Islands? Admiral Dewey, in his communication to the Secretary of the Navy on the 29th day of August, said:

> The population of Luzon is reported to be something over 3,000,000, mostly natives. These are gentle, docile, and, under just laws and with the benefits of popular education, would soon make good citizens.
>
> In a telegram sent to the department on June 23 I expressed the opinion that "these people are far superior in intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races. Further intercourse with them has confirmed me in this opinion."

The United States consul general at Hongkong, China, writing to the State Department at Washington, July, 1898, said:

> The Philippine Malays are a superior race to many other Asiatic peoples. I have lived among the Malays of the Straits Settlements and have been an honored guest of the different sultanates. I have watched their system of government and have admired their intelligence. The natives of the Philippine Islands belong to the Malay race, and while there are very few pure Malays among their leaders, I think their stock has rather been improved than debased by admixture. I consider the 40 or 50 Philippine leaders, with whose fortunes I have been very closely connected, both the superiors of the Malays and the Cubans.
>
> In conclusion, I wish to put myself on record as stating that the insurgent government of the Philippine Islands can not be dealt with as though they were North American Indians, willing to be removed from one reservation to another at the whim of their masters. If the United States decides not to retain the Philippine Islands, its 10,000,000 people will demand independence, and the attempt of any foreign nation to obtain territory or coaling stations will be resisted with the same spirit with which they fought the Spaniards.

The Philippine people when we first knew them were what the above authorities state they were. They have had 18 years of our assistance, more than $700,000,000 of our money, and the benefit of our teachers and missionaries. They print and read many papers and books, and yet we find those among us who still declare that these people are totally unfit for self-government, regardless of the fact that we have some few sections in the United States that have a larger percentage of illiteracy than is to be found in some sections in the Philippine Islands. I found them everywhere in all islands a musical, sentimental, home-loving, keen, quick-thinking, brave, and patriotic people. An Army officer's wife told me that she had often ridden all day with a single Igorrote guide in the mountains among the Igorrote tribes. If they know that you come in peace, as a friend, then everywhere you are safe and will be received with utmost native kindness.

ARGUMENTS USED AGAINST INDEPENDENCE FOR THE PHILIPPINES.

I desire to notice a few of the arguments used against withdrawing from the Philippines and granting independence to the Philippine people.

THE MISSIONARY ARGUMENT.

We used to hear the religious argument advanced—the missionary argument. My observation was that the Filipinos needed missionaries less than any country in the Orient; being a Christian people, these missionaries are needed in every land that I visited more than in the Philippines.

THE SCHOOL ARGUMENT.

We used to hear a good deal on the school question. We have followed the policy inaugurated by McKinley, followed by Taft and Roosevelt, and followed by the present administration, of substituting native teachers for American teachers. We have more than 8,000 native teachers in the schoolrooms in the Philippine Islands. The school question has about solved itself. We have about completed our work. Gentlemen may differ with me on that proposition. I do not believe the Philippine Islands will ever become an English-speaking country. I said to a teacher: "Do these children speak English on the playgrounds?" She said: "No; as soon as they get on the playground they talk in their own native tongue." "Do you try to get them to speak English?" "Yes," said she, "sometimes I threaten to punish them; but you know it is rather a cruel thing to punish a child for speaking in its mother tongue."

If you go into a schoolroom—and gentlemen say we have 600,000 children speaking English—if you go into a schoolroom and happen to know what they are talking about, you will follow them fairly well. They are doing the best they can about learning English. Possibly they are doing as well as we could do in learning their language. Three times we have set a date on which English would be used in court and every time we have revoked the act. But, gentlemen, we need and can use all these splendid American teachers in the United States. Many of them told me that their real work was completed, because they had developed sufficient native Filipino

teachers to take their places. Two years ago I had the pleasure to attend a splendid meeting in the interest of and for the benefit of Berea College, held in the beautiful D. A. R. Hall in this city. The president of Berea College and other noted speakers made most pathetic appeals, and if what the president of the college and others from that locality said about the needs and conditions in the mountainous sections of the Southland be true, then, gentlemen, we can well use all these American teachers now in the Philippines to good advantage in our own land, in a territory larger than the territory of all the Philippines, populated by good, liberty-loving, fine, brave, pure-blooded Americans, who, we were informed, were needing our financial assistance and were most sorely in need of the opportunities of education.

THE TRADE ARGUMENT.

We used to hear a good deal about the trade argument. We spent 23 days going westward on the Pacific Ocean from Hawaii, and we passed one sailing trade steamer. The trail of that old trade argument has been through all the history of the past. Trade is all right when it comes naturally and legitimately, but overanxiety for trade has caused men to rob and murder their fellow men, and has caused nations to do the same thing. Once there was a famous orator who began and ended every speech with the trade argument of his day and age, "Carthage delenda est," and some people would carry the trade idea so far as to make it mean Filipino liberatum delenda est. Our trade will be greater with the Filipinos as our friends than our enemies.

THE ARGUMENT ABOUT AMERICAN INVESTMENTS.

We hear the argument concerning American interests in the Philippine Islands as a reason for not granting independence. Gentlemen, candidly, it is my opinion that it is not so much the bonds that are as the bonds that are to be about which some people are so anxious as to American interests in the Philippine Islands.

THE OLD MORO ARGUMENT.

We used to hear the argument used extensively that we do not hear any more, that if we withdrew our soldiers the Moro element would master the Filipino element—that is, that about 300,000 Moros would kill off 8,000,000 Filipinos. I passed through the entire Moro country.

Mr. Carpenter, a New York gentleman and a splendid man, a Republican whom Gov. Gen. Harrison, a Democrat, has appointed governor of the Moro country, has colonized eight colonies over 100 miles of Moro country in the island of Mindanao, each colony containing from 500 to 2,000 souls. When he first mentioned the proposition to do this everyone said, "Oh, the Moros will massacre the entire population the first night"; but the project was made, and there they live in peace together. I saw their children in their schools together; we met them in mass meetings together; they are living in peace together, working out the great Moro problem.

We had a fine meeting at Dato Piang's place. The dato is second in command under the Sultan of Sulu. The dato's son, whom a Texas lumberman brought to this country, gained a good knowledge of English in six months, and made a remarkable speech in English. I obtained a typewritten copy. I wish I had time to read it to you. I will insert it in my speech.

At Lake Lanao we met several datos with their tribes. We had a great mass meeting together. They all wanted to make speeches to us. While they could not read a word of English, still they showed fine emotion and fine sentiments of feeling.

WAR IS A CURSE; PEACE IS A BLESSING.

I remember the speech of one old dato. He got up and said to Mr. QUEZON, "We are glad you Filipinos are down here; we are glad to see you. The Spanish for hundreds of years have had us fighting each other, and we should not have done it. We are all of one skin; we are all of one race. See, our skin is all the same color. We want you to come amongst us, to live in peace and farm and raise rice." And then he said a remarkable thing: "The greatest disease"—and the word "disease" typifies everything that is horrible in that country—"the greatest disease that can happen to any nation, to any people, is war; the greatest good that can come to any people is peace. We want to live in peace together." And, Mr. Chairman, they will live in peace together if designing men do not go through that country haranguing them and exciting enmity in their hearts against one another. I want to say in passing that these people, all of them, whether Filipino or Moro, are people of great native ability. This is the universal verdict of travelers who are familiar with and have studied conditions in many lands.

I have remarked that both Filipino and Moro are people of great native ability—capable of great development in learning as they are already developed in agriculture and in many of the mechanical arts. As proof of this I herewith insert the speech of the young Moro referred to above—a speech delivered in fairly good English:

SPEECH OF DATU ABDULA PIANG (SON OF DATU PIANG) DELIVERED AT DULAUAN, COTABATO, JUNE 26, 1915, ON THE OCCASION OF THE VISIT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL PARTY TO THAT PLACE.

"Honorable gentlemen, it is a great honor to me to be permitted to address you here in behalf of my people. The Mindanao people are very poor, because they have no schools and have not yet learned the necessity of cultivating the soil in order to grow crops for sale. I have seen many very fine schoolhouses in the northern islands, but we do not have them here because we have no money to build them. We hope that the government will furnish us more money for more schools so that the Mindanao children may be educated. Myself and eight of my brothers have finished the primary school and we can easily see the advantage of education. We realize that the future development of our country depends upon the young people who are now growing up, and we feel the need of education, especially agricultural education. The Mindanao boy is not lazy, but he is exceedingly industrious and very quick to learn. With more schools we promise you rapid development in this valley. There has never been trouble between the Christian colonies and Mindanao colonies since they lived here in Cotabato. We are glad to see them cultivate the land here in Cotabato, as it will increase the amount of rice to be raised here and make greater business for this country. The Christian can learn something from the Mindanao which may be of benefit to him. The Mindanao can also learn things from the Christian which will help him. In this way the two classes of people are better fitted by being brought together. There is much land here in Cotabato which nobody works on. We want to see this land occupied so that it may be of some value. We want each Mindanao family to have enough land to live on, and the other land that is not occupied can be settled by Christians."

This speech was taken down by Gov. Carpenter's stenographer. It is a speech of a young Moro with six months' study of English. The Moros are classed as the most illiterate of all the Philippine people.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman's opinion whether he thinks it is necessary for us to keep the Army over there any longer to maintain peace, or could we recall the Army now and save that expense?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I think we could recall almost the entire Army. The native scouts could take care of the situation.

THE JAPANESE QUESTION.

Reference has been made to the Japanese question. We traveled through Japan from end to end. I talked with all the Japanese officials who would talk to me on the question. There may have been a time when Japan would have liked to have possessed the Philippines. There are not as many Japanese in the Philippines now as formerly. Why? Because they have found, as we have found, that it is not a white man's country or a country for people of the Temperate Zone. It is a Torrid Zone country, intended by the Creator for the home of a Torrid Zone people. As soon as they can earn a little money they get out and go on to the Hawaiian Islands, and as soon as they can earn a little money there they get out and go on to the United States, because the climate is too hot for them in the Philippines. Japan wants us to recognize a Monroe doctrine in the Orient. We do not want Japan to build up a strong nation in Mexico on our border. Our borders on the Orient, the northern islands of the Philippines, are within 100 miles of the southern coast of Japan's possession, Formosa, and Japan does not want us to build up a strong nation in the Orient. That is the entire interest that Japan has in this problem, in my estimation.

One Japanese official stated that the United States would have to pay them a large sum of money to have them relieve us of the Philippine Islands. He reasoned that control of the Philippines for them would mean keeping a large body of soldiers there, and for this the United States would have to compensate them.

THE SMALL AND WEAK NATION ARGUMENT.

The argument is sometimes advanced against giving the Philippine Islands independence that if they were given independence, to use the language so often employed, some stronger nation would gobble them up. If this argument were a valid argument against the founding of a Republic, then there would be no Republic on the face of the earth to-day. The Filipinos are now 9,000,000 strong. In 20 years from to-day they will have in the islands possibly 18,000,000 people. When the Republic of the United States was organized we were but 3,000,000 strong. Why is it necessary to suppose that some stronger nation or several stronger nations will unite to crush the Philippines? Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland,

Belgium, and several South American Republics are all weaker nations than the Republic of the Philippines would be and are situated geographically in far more dangerous positions to invite attack from stronger nations, besides Japan and Russia will not permit any European nation to overthrow the Philippines, and neither would England for like reasons permit any Asiatic nation to overthrow the Philippines. This argument so ofttimes used is an excuse rather than an argument. A republic is a growth—they must be given a chance to begin some time. Why not soon?

THE DIFFERENT RACES AND DIFFERENT LANGUAGES ARGUMENT.

We sometimes hear the argument used that the Philippines could not set up a Republic because of the different races and different languages in the Philippines. This again is an excuse rather than an argument against independence. When we established our own Republic we had many races of people and many different languages and we have found them all to be useful rather than detrimental to our Republic, and out of it has grown the typical American citizen, the most verile, strongest, and best citizenship in the world. This is an unfair argument and is not used against any other nation or people. The island of Great Britain has four distinct races and four distinct languages, and Great Britain has many races and many languages in her foreign possessions. Little Switzerland has a half dozen different races and half dozen different languages. Mexico by our very border has 41 languages and 51 dialects, yet no one uses this as an argument against a Republic in Mexico.

If we must wait until a country has a common language before setting up a republic, then no country on earth ever could or ever can set up a republic. While there are some 30 different dialects in the Philippine Islands there exists, however, three great languages—Spanish, Visayan, and Tagalog. Three-fourths of all the 9,000,000 people in the islands speak Visayan or Tagalog, while the Spanish is the language of the courts. More than 500,000 children are learning English in the schools. Has any nation in the past ever presented a better language situation at the time of founding a republic than the Philippines do at this very moment? The language argument also is an excuse rather than an argument against independence.

PULLING-DOWN-THE-FLAG ARGUMENT.

Of all the unfair arguments advanced toward granting independence to the Philippines the pulling-down-the-flag argument is the most unfair. Those who use this argument forget what our flag stands for. Our flag stands for an undissolvable union of indestructible States. Whenever we make it a sign and symbol of authority for anything but a republican form of government and raise it over anything but a free and independent people, we pull it down from the high level of humanity on which the blood of our fathers planted it to the low level of conquest and subjugation. That grand old man from Massachusetts, Senator Hoar, put it this way:

When you raise the flag over the Philippine Islands as an emblem of dominion and acquisition, you take it down from Independence Hall.

Do those who use this argument mean to imply that anywhere and everywhere the flag is raised for any purpose whatsoever any body of men can gather around it and use it for their own purposes of speculation, and hide behind it with the cry that we shall never pull down the flag? Wherever the American people want that glorious flag raised, they will raise it, and every drop of our blood will be spent, if necessary, to defend it; and when the American people want it taken down, they will take it down in honor and glory. All this they have done in the past many, many times. We raised that flag in Canada in 1812, and we hauled it down in honor. We raised that flag in Mexico in 1848, and planted it upon Chapultepec, and also upon the wall of the homes of the Montezumas, and we hauled it down again in honor. Gen. Lee raised the flag in Cuba and hauled it down again in honor. Decatur raised that flag over the walls of Tripoli, and took it down again in honor. It floated in the breeze of China, and we hauled it down in honor. Wherever it has floated its meaning has been liberty and a republican form of government. I would sooner see it taken down in honor by the American Nation, knowing that its principles had set up another Republic in the earth, than to see the principles of liberty and independence, for which it has always stood, hauled down. Those who use the flag argument have no argument and simply beg the question.

The flag stands for the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and that is what Lincoln said it stood for when he raised it over Independence Hall in 1861. The principles of the Declaration of Independence have circled the earth and changed the destiny of mankind. These principles have thrown down kings, overthrown monarchies, and set up republics all over the face of the earth. I have always believed that our flag and our Declaration of Independence were one and the same thing. One puts in language what the other stands for. I have always proudly believed that our mission among the people of the earth was to encourage nations to set up republics rather than to suppress that God-given desire. No, my friends, let that flag float on ever and always all over the earth, the sign and symbol of liberty and a republican form of government, so that any downtrodden people seeing our glorious banner may know what it stands for and lift up their heads into the sunlight of hope and thank God and take on new courage. [Applause.]

DO THE FILIPINOS WANT INDEPENDENCE?

Gentlemen have asked me, Do the Philippine people really want independence or is it just simply a desire on the part of designing politicians? Let the history of the struggle of 200 years in that country answer that question. In all the history of the past three centuries they have made revolution after revolution in that country and sacrificed blood and treasures to throw off the Spanish yoke.

In 1872 three priests—Burgos, Zamosa, and Gomez—professors in the Manila College, led a revolution of more than 20,000 people against Spanish authority. Spain promised to give them local self-government. After tricking them, on February 15, 1872, they took these three good men out and shot them to death at sunrise. Their school histories, that the boys read in the public schools of the Philippines, state that after this peace was only maintained in the islands at the cannon's mouth.

RIZAL.

They have produced a remarkable character in that country who is the Jefferson of all that country—Rizal. His great writings on liberty and the rights of man remind you of the great writings of Paine, Franklin, and Jefferson during the Revolutionary War. He was educated at the Manila University, also in France, Spain, Germany, and several foreign countries. He led a great movement, a great patriotic society, the Sons of Liberty, sprung up in that country. They tricked Rizal to Manila, and on December 30, 1896, they shot him to death at the spot where his monument now stands. He died with these words on his lips:

What is death to me? I have sown the seed. Others will reap.

THE DESIRE FOR LIBERTY A PASSION WITH THEM.

I visited a schoolroom where a teacher called up a class of boys and girls from 14 to 16 years of age, and that class did something that I do not believe a schoolroom in the United States can do to-day. They recited in concert Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg. I said to her, "Why do the children take to this sort of thing?" She said, "These people have few books. Sentiments about liberty, independence, and the rights of man appeal to these children and all of these people, and they memorize such sentiments and can tell you about these noble ideas. They can tell you what Thomas Jefferson said about the inalienable rights of man. It is a passion with them, inherited from their fathers; they are natural orators and speakers and they long for those things."

Mr. Chairman, I do not have it in my heart to condemn any people who have it in their hearts to long for liberty, who want to lift up their heads in the sunlight of hope, and who have the courage to come out and die for liberty as these men have who have died by the thousands in the struggles of the past. I simply want to allude to one circumstance. When our good ex-President, Mr. Taft, then Governor General of the islands, went to Iloilo and made his memorable speech, "The Philippines for the Filipinos," although we had had at one time 30,000 soldiers in those islands, we had not at that time entirely subdued them, and when he made that speech these people came in and brought in 40,000 Mauser rifles and laid them down, and said: "We are through fighting if that is the proposition we can expect for the future. We do not care much just how long you stay, so that we know that this country is to be ours some time." The Philippine people are the only Christian people in all the world who have never had a chance. Why not give them a chance now? Why not let them know that now for them the sun of liberty and independence is rising out of the long dark night of tyranny and oppression, and that for them the daydawn of freedom is breaking. [Applause.]

A MISREPRESENTED PEOPLE.

I do not know of any people in the history of the world who who have been so maligned and so misunderstood and misrepresented as the Filipino people. People speak of them as savages. Why, at evening parties in the Philippines you will find Filipino ladies in evening dress and Filipino gentlemen in evening dress. They speak two or three different languages, and they sometimes wonder at the extent of our education when we speak but one. They read what you Republicans say

about us Democrats being unable to rule our country successfully, and they read what we Democrats say about you. They read about our burning cities and even men at the stake, and they think that we are a cruel people. They are very kind and hospitable among themselves, and they wonder at last just what we mean by our ideas of civilizing them.

At an evening party a Filipino gentleman gave me this illustration. This gentleman said to me: "Now, we are grateful for what you have done for us here, but let me illustrate my thought. We can not help but be suspicious. We know the number of times we have been tricked by the Spaniards. We can not but be suspicious when we see you making foolish expenditures of money here."

Let me illustrate, said he: Half the human race live in houses made of bamboo wood. Now, if some man came along and wanted to build me a better house, that would be very kind of him, but if, when he had built for me a better house he thereby thought he owned my home and wanted me to move on because he built it, and therefore claimed to own it, then I would have preferred not to have had his help or his kindness, because I was satisfied; and so he said, "When we see you building these fortifications here we wonder what you are going to do with them; and if you intend to leave, why you build them."

THE INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF LIBERTY.

May it not be proper to inquire what rights the Filipinos have even under our Constitution?

We can not deny to a competent people the right to rule their own affairs. The Filipino people, like other races, have the inalienable right of liberty. A republic can have no subjects. Under our Constitution there can be no subjects. I want to repeat what I said to a mass meeting of Filipinos and Americans held on the public square in Cebu June 18, 1915. I said to them: "If we keep faith with the Filipinos we must give you an independent form of government, if you desire it. To my mind it makes little difference whether you can establish a government entirely based on the ideals and theories of the American people; but you should be given an opportunity, if you desire it, to work out your own destiny according to your own ideals and the peculiar conditions that confront you. For your success or failure the Filipino people must be ready to assume the entire responsibility. You must understand what liberty really is. The true republic must be founded on education and on the principle that all people are equal before the eyes of the law, high and low, rich and poor alike. Naturally, you long for your independence; and the most sincere flattery you can give us is your desire to form a republic modeled after our own." [Applause.]

THEIR ABILITY TO MAINTAIN A SELF-GOVERNMENT.

Some have asked about their ability to maintain self-government. Gentlemen must remember that under Spanish rule they held local office, and that they understood how to elect a presidente of their community and local officers. Under United States control we first began by giving them members of the legislature; then the entire legislature; then members of the senate and of the supreme court; and now they have a majority of all the members of the legislature and of the supreme court. And one significant thing, gentlemen, of all the laws they have passed in the Philippine Legislature not one of them has ever been pronounced unconstitutional by the supreme court. The chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Philippines is a Filipino who would grace the supreme court of any land. Judge Johnson, of the Philippine Supreme Court, a former professor of law at Ann Arbor, Mich., told me that this chief justice was one of the greatest legal minds he had ever met anywhere. My friend and traveling companion, Senator SHAFROTH of Colorado, and myself thoroughly agreed in regard to the ability of the Filipino people to maintain an independent form of government.

In view of conditions surrounding the seizure of the Philippine Islands the argument that their people will be satisfied because we have given and will continue to give them better government than they can give themselves, even if possible, becomes untenable and opposed to the impulse of every liberty-loving people.

THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES.

The assistant director of education told me that in Manila alone there were more than 600 efficient native stenographers, who could take dictation in both English and Spanish, and that there were thousands who daily did good work as typewriters.

Native electrical engineers, civil engineers, public accountants, architects, dentists, pharmacists, and all the professions have increased in large numbers.

The census of 1903 showed that of the males 21 years of age and over 32.2 per cent at that time could read and write Spanish, English, or some other language. Gen. Frank McIntyre, Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, before the Senate committee estimated that now 50 per cent could either read or write some language. The increase represents commendable progress.

IN THE SCHOOLS.

There are in the islands 700 American and between 7,000 and 8,000 native school-teachers, all instructing the children in all the branches of education in English. How many of our teachers could conduct all the classes in the various grades of schools in a foreign language? Of course, they could acquire it, but it would take work and ability. Why not concede that the Filipino teachers are civilized and possess education and ability which fits them for citizenship in any country?

It should be remembered that every cent for education, including the cost of all school buildings, has been paid by the Filipino people in taxes laid upon their property for the payment of appropriations cheerfully voted by their general assembly. There is no likelihood that such appropriations would cease with independence or that education would lapse. Even the Aguinaldo constitution of January 20, 1899, provided that "popular education shall be obligatory and gratuitous in the schools of the nation."

There is an intense desire for education upon the part of the Filipino children. There is no compulsory education law in the islands, but 600,000 children are now enrolled, and fully as many more would be in attendance if there were sufficient schoolhouses. In my recent trip to the islands I visited a number of schools, but never found any vacant rooms or unoccupied seats. At Jolo the Moro children were attending school in large numbers, and there was a demand for 60 more schools on that island. They were being taught in English, and a Moro boy delivered the address of welcome to our party in that language.

IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE.

There are now in the Philippine government classified service 2,218 Americans and 7,710 Filipino officers. These were appointed under civil-service examinations. There is no suggestion that these Filipinos are incapable or do not discharge their duties as well and faithfully as the Americans. Would they not be equally as capable and efficient under a government of their own?

The chief justice of the supreme court of the Philippines is a native, and three of the seven members of that court are natives, all of them recognized as able and learned judges.

Of the judges of the courts of the first instance, 22 are Filipinos and 14 are Americans. The municipal courts are presided over almost entirely by Filipinos. The attorney general and nearly all his staff are Filipinos. Of the 9 commissioners who now constitute the upper house of the legislature, 5 are natives and 4 are Americans. Is it possible that these capable, efficient native officers, as soon as their appointment or election were provided for by their own government, would become incapable or inefficient?

The Filipino people for many years have been electing the governors of their Provinces. There has been no contention that the governors selected were not good and capable men, or that their administrations did not compare favorably with those of similar officers anywhere.

In visiting the southern islands I traveled for two weeks with a committee of the general assembly, consisting of the speaker, Mr. Osmenia, and 13 members. They were intelligent, dignified men, and all were fine public speakers. Is it possible that men of such education and learning are incapable of enacting laws to govern themselves? What presumption it is on the part of many of our citizens to contend that such a body in the Philippines can not legislate wisely for their own people.

WHY WE SHOULD GIVE THEM INDEPENDENCE.

I want to give you some reasons why I favor independence for the Philippine Islands and why I think we should state that this is our ultimate purpose. I think we have done our duty by them. If we should go out in 4 years, we will have been there 22 years. We will have spent about $800,000,000 for them. I think we will have done our duty by them. Ex-President Roosevelt has well stated the argument in his recent book, which I shall quote later.

PHILIPPINE MILITARY WEAKNESS.

All of us must recognize the great military weakness that these islands are to us. They would enable any great power in war with us to obtain an easy victory over us. The Philippines are just halfway around the world from where we sit to-day, about 12,000 miles from this Capitol, and 7,500 miles from our western shores. How are we going to get coal there from our West Virginia and Pennsylvania fields? We do not have coal sufficient in our ships, with all the tenders accompanying, to keep a battleship going when we get there, and our ships would be picked off one by one while trying to get to the Philippines.

Coal being a contraband of war, no neutral nation would have a right to sell it to us.

WE NEED CORREGIDORS AT HOME.

At Corregidor, in Manila Bay, we have spent $7,000,000 for one great fortification. We need those Corregidors at San Francisco, New York, Baltimore, and at other places along our shores, instead of 8,000 miles away from home in Manila Bay.

YEARLY EXPENSE TO UNITED STATES.

There has been a dispute about the yearly expense of the islands. I went to the military bookkeeper, as it were, of the islands and the figures he gave me show that we spend $12,000,000 in gold in that country for the Navy and $13,000,000 in gold for the Army. And we have other expenses also. If you will divide the total yearly expenses by 435—the number of congressional districts in the United States—you will find that in each congressional district in the United States the taxpayers are asked to contribute about $60,000 in gold yearly for the expenses in the Philippines. Should we do this for all time to come for the benefit and pleasure of the few Americans in the Philippines and American investors in the Philippines?

Mr. AUSTIN. And do we not have to send that money to the Navy whether in the Philippine Islands or in the Pacific or not?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. But we would have the Army and Navy at home where we need it and where it ought to be, and it would result to the taxpayers in a saving exactly to the amount we spend in the Philippines—that is, about $30,000,000. Thirty million dollars yearly.

NOT A WHITE MAN'S COUNTRY.

The Philippines is not a white man's country. The United States Government recognizes that fact. White men can not live in the sun and work there. They live in the shade with all the servants they have there. Even our American animals, horses, and cattle can not live there. Every ship that comes home has its iron cages bringing our soldiers that have become insane with the heat. The Government recognized that fact when they passed an act so that the soldiers could come back in two years rather than stay there three years, and only 20 per cent of the United States officers there elected to stay in the Philippine Islands the three-year limit.

Gentlemen ask will they have trouble among themselves if we withdraw. Possibly. Every Republic is a growth. We had lots of trouble in this country after the Revolutionary War. We set up and broke down with one form of government. We had six rulers before Washington was elected President. One government entirely broke down. We had 10 distinct attempts at nullification and secession, one armed rebellion, and 3 assassinations of Presidents, and we have even burned cities and men at the stake. I presume these people in their development will have trouble. Nothing more horrible will happen, I think, in the development of their affairs than has happened in our own country, I am sorry to say.

Now, some one has asked can they take care of themselves if we leave them. They have about 6,000 fine native soldiers. They are fine, strong, well-trained men. And besides they had a good many men drilled in the art of war while Spain held control. They will be able to give a good account of themselves if attacked by any foe. Besides they have proven many times that they are a brave people who will die for their country and their liberty.

THE HIGHER OBLIGATION DEMANDS THAT WE KEEP FAITH.

But, above all other considerations, we should give the Philippines independence because of the higher obligation we owe to our honor and to ourselves to keep faith with our promises, expressed and implied.

The true honor of a nation is found only in deeds of justice and strict adherence to the principles upon which it was founded. Whenever a nation departs from the fundamental principles upon which it was established or forgets its ideals it is embarking upon a perilous sea without chart or compass to guide its course.

All true Democrats believe that dependence is the greatest curse that can befall any people; that only a free and independent people can build up a great nation. In order to be strong the people must be self-reliant, self-ruled, and self-sustained. The dependence of one people upon another is destructive of every element which could make them great or prosperous. Such a nation will neither accumulate wealth nor win character; it will neither benefit mankind by the enterprise of its merchants nor instruct mankind by the example of its statesmen. As Americans we are inheritors and conservators of national freedom. Let us, while others are seeking it in restlessness and fear, be a steady shining light to guide their course, and not a wandering ignis fatuus to bewilder and mislead them. Let us not force our habits, customs, and laws upon the Filipino people against their will. Leave them to live their own lives, cherishing their own aspirations, making and meeting their own destiny. This is just, it is right, and it is, under all of the circumstances, the only honorable course to pursue.

I approve and want to insert a part of an editorial appearing in the Ohio State Journal, the oldest Republican newspaper in the State of Ohio. The editorial is from the pen of a Civil War veteran, the able editorial editor of that paper, Col. E. L. Wilson, whose noted review of President Wilson's able leadership, printed in the same paper in 1914, was used as the opening article on the first leaf of the National Democratic Campaign Yearbook for that year:

"This great Republic should grant self-government for the Filipinos, because they want it, if for no other reason. They are as much entitled to govern themselves as we are. Our sole reason for holding back this right to the Philippines is altruistic, which is not a sound reason. It is very easy to assume this superiority and not always as easy to show it. Besides, it is not fair to spend millions of money belonging to the taxpayers of this country to impose upon another people a government they don't want. The greatest good we can render that people is to let them take care of themselves. The very effort is an evolution toward a nobler destiny. We don't want the Filipinos to be Americanized. They belong to a different place in the sun and should be allowed to make the most of it."

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

We should give the Philippine Islands independence because we can not keep the Philippines and also keep the ideals upon which the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States were founded. I prefer to keep these ideals and let the Philippines go. We can not keep the Philippines and retain the Monroe doctrine. I prefer to keep the Monroe doctrine and let the Philippines go. [Applause.]

WHY NOT KEEP THE FAITH?

We went to war with Spain to free Cuba. Congress solemnly so declared. Did we have in our hearts any other motive toward the Philippines?

Could the Philippine people forget the words of President McKinley at the beginning of the Spanish-American War, when he said: "Forcible annexation can not be thought of; that, according to the American code of morals, is criminal aggression"?

From those words would not the Filipino people have a right to understand that forcibly to annex their islands would be criminal aggression? Would they have aided us in conquering Spain if they had dreamed it was our purpose to subjugate them?

In order to comprehend the feeling and point of view of the Filipino people it must be remembered that we are in the islands by virtue of conquest, that their people had never committed hostile acts against us, but on the other hand when we were at war with Spain, in their struggle for independence they furnished us soldiers to be used against our enemy.

It must be remembered that they had issued a declaration of independence and that on July 4, 1898, Gen. Anderson, then in command of our troops, wrote to the commander of the Filipino forces: "I desire to have the most amicable relations with you and to have you and your people cooperate with us in military operations against the Spanish forces," and again on July 23, 1898, in a letter to Aguinaldo he stated: "When I came here three weeks ago I requested your excellency to give what assistance you could to procure means of transportation for the American Army, as it was to fight in the cause of your people."

GRATEFUL TO AMERICA.

And soon thereafter Gen. Aguinaldo issued a proclamation to the Filipinos in which he said: "Die rather than be ungrateful to our American liberators. When you see the American flag flying, assemble in numbers. They are our redeemers."

It must be remembered that the Philippine Army drove from the islands or captured every Spanish soldier except those in the walled city of Manila, and at the time of the surrender of that city their armies occupied nine-tenths of surrounding firing line.

Taking into consideration the circumstances attending the occupation of the islands, our principles of government, and what was said at the time and afterwards by those in authority, it seems to me no one can doubt but that the natives understood that they were to have their independence.

Even Mr. LODGE, a Republican Senator from Massachusetts, said: "We are there because we represent the spirit of liberty and the spirit of the new time, and Spain is over against us because she is medieval, cruel, and dying. We have grasped no man's territory, we have taken no man's property, we have invaded no man's rights. We do not ask their lands."

Mr. Cleveland aptly expressed the views of the Democracy of America when he said: "The Government of a remote and alien people should have no permanent place in the purposes of our national life."

Democrats believe with John Jay, the eminent American statesman, in his observation: "When a nation led to greatness by the hand of liberty, and possessed of all the glory that heroism, munificence, and humanity can bestow, descends to the ungrateful task of subjecting an alien people to its domination and control, instead of giving support to freedom, turns advocate for conquest and subjection, there is reason to suppose she has either ceased to be virtuous or been extremely negligent in the selection of her rulers."

THE SUPREME REASON FOR GRANTING INDEPENDENCE—GOD-GIVEN RIGHT TO ALL RACES.

But the one supreme reason above all others why we should give independence to the Philippines is that freedom and independence is a God-given right to every race of people. The Creator of all men has planted in the breast of every man of every race and every clime the desire for liberty and freedom and independence for his country. I marvel at the conflicting emotions that must come to the honest heart and candid man who in this debate vehemently declares for freedom for some particular people in some particular part of the world, as some Democrats have done to-day. Is it their conception that the Creator and Common Father of all men has intended freedom for some races of men in some certain places of the earth? Their votes and speeches to-day would seem to indicate that that was their conception of the God-given boon of freedom and liberty.

For myself I have a different conviction, and years ago, when a member of the legislature of my native State, I expressed that conviction at the time when the little Republic of the gallant Boers were making one of the bravest and most tragic fights in all the history of mankind for the maintenance of their republic form of government, their homes and firesides, and the graves where sleep their dead. I said then and I say now that I believe in English liberty for Englishmen, German liberty for Germans, French liberty for Frenchmen, American liberty for Americans, Irish liberty for Irishmen, Boer liberty for the Boers, and Filipino liberty for the Filipinos.

When I see men vehementing, orating, and demanding liberty exclusively for their race of people and their fatherland country and then voting against liberty for other races and other countries, I am reminded of the selfish man who prayed thus:

O Lord, bless me and my wife,
My son John and his wife;
Us four and no more.

The very nature of the case would show that such a prayer could not be answered, and the very nature of the other case casts upon it the blighting curse of insincerity and selfish inhumanity. [Applause.]

WHEN SHALL WE GRANT THEM INDEPENDENCE?

When shall we grant them their independence? This is significant. If with a Democratic House and Senate and a Democratic President and with a few investments and bonds there we can not give them independence, will we ever be able to do it when we have hundreds of millions of bonds and when American industries are scattered over all the islands? [Applause.]

ROOSEVELT'S POSITION.

I desire to quote and approve what that great President and statesman, ex-President Roosevelt, recently said on this subject.

Ex-President Roosevelt, in his last publication—1916—entitled "Fear God and Take Your Own Part," at page 226, uses this language:

"This administration was elected on the specific promise to give freedom to the Philippines. The United States must keep its promises. No greater service has been rendered by any people to another during the past 100 years than we have rendered to the Philippines and than we have rendered to Cuba.

"Above all, we have promised the Filipinos independence in terms which were inevitably understood to be independence in the immediate future.

"Such indecision in international conduct shows that this people ought not to undertake the government of a distant dependency, and this both from military reasons and because of the need of keeping promises that have been made. Let us, then, as speedily as possible, leave the Philippines; and, as the Filipinos desire us to leave, we would be quit of all moral obligations for them and would under no circumstances be obliged to defend them from other nations."

Lord Macaulay says: "Many politicians of our time are in the habit of laying it down as a self-evident proposition that no people ought to be free till they are fit to use their freedom. The maxim is worthy of the fool in the old story who resolved not to go into the water till he had learned to swim. If men are to wait for liberty till they become wise and good in slavery, they may, indeed, wait forever." [Applause.]

WHY THE PREAMBLE TO THE BILL AND EXPLICIT PROMISE OF INDEPENDENCE IS NECESSARY.

We who have insisted that the preamble to the independence bill should be explicit and certain in regard to the promise for independence to the Philippines wanted to so fix this entire matter so that in the future the Nation would not be led by false sophistry and commercial greed to violate its sacred promises so often made or be false to our ideals of liberty. In short, to paraphrase that great truism first uttered by a great Democrat and later made immortal by Lincoln, we wanted to make it sure and certain, so that the hope of a free government of the Philippine people, for the Philippine people, and by the Philippine people will not perish from the earth. [Applause.]

THOU SHALT NOT COVET.

The speaker who would set himself to the task to adequately reply to the arguments advanced against granting independence to the Philippines might very properly take for his text the words of that divine personality who was more than man, the Savior of all men, these words: "Thou shalt not covet." And in these words are wrapped up the very essence of the opposition to Philippine independence. I could go through the pages of history, had I the time to do so, and show how those nations of the past that have disregarded this divine injunction have perished from the face of the earth.

The Boer Republic of South Africa and its government were safe until gold and diamonds were discovered there. The thought and declaration of all our statesmen at the beginning and the official words of President McKinley at that time were for Philippine independence, and no reversal of this position was put forth until the fine soil, fine timber, and fine opportunities, and fine official position, argument, and talk became so broadspread over this country. In the United States there are men and in this House possibly there are men who will vote on this bill affecting the destiny of 9,000,000 of people who are coveting the Philippine Islands, not to go there and work there, live and die there as citizens of the Philippines, but to go there and hold high offices of honor, living in splendor with servants and servitude, like Warren Hastings of old, coveting the Philippines for themselves and their friends.

There are business men in the Philippine Islands who went there as soldiers or were sent there as public officials who covet the opportunities and pleasures of political life there or the great profit of being in business in Manila, where $30,000,000 of American gold, American taxpayers' money, yearly sent to the Philippines must necessarily largely filter through their channels of business, thus enabling them, as some have admitted to me, to make three dollars to one, more than they could make in any other place on earth. The purchasing power of our money is double in the Philippine Islands. They can employ the best of servants in the world, the native Filipinos, to run their automobiles, to do their cooking, and to serve them for personal comfort at ₱5, or $2.50 in gold, per month. None of them will or can work in the sun, and they have all the pleasures and comforts of the palmy, tropical Philippines. The most of these men forget all about the rights of men, the Declaration of Independence, the teachings of Jefferson and Lincoln, and when you mention these things in your speeches in their presence in the Philippines, they curtly tell you to cut out all such punk, as they term it; and the most of them will tell you that the Filipino people will not be ready for self-government for 50 years to come, or at least for their lifetime and the lifetime of their children. Some of them told me they had already made all the money they wanted, and when the United States Government left they were ready to leave. Most of them, of course, are opposed to Filipino independence and want to see the stream of gold from the United States Government keep on flowing and the $60,000 yearly from every congressional district in the United States of the taxpayers' money keep on coming to the Philippine Islands.

We are told not to covet our neighbor's house and lands, and the same Divine Authority explains to us just who our neighbors are. [Applause.]

SHALL THE UNITED STATES RULE THE PHILIPPINES OR THE PHILIPPINES RULE THE UNITED STATES?

When the treaty of peace had been signed one of the Spanish commissioners is said to have made this remark to the United States commissioners: "Gentlemen, I thank you for defeating us; our defeat will prove to be our victory; your victory will prove to be your defeat."

We entertain the delusion that the United States is ruling the Philippines. In a much graver sense the facts are that the Philippines are ruling and changing the Government of the

United States. Already the Philippine question has been a deciding factor in two presidential elections in the United States. No such question should enter into the presidential campaigns of the United States. Questions affecting conditions in the Philippines will govern the motives and votes of Members of the Congress of the United States as long as we retain those islands. This unnatural situation for a Republic is neither best for the people of the United States nor for the people of the Philippine Islands.

WHY SHOULD NOT THIS GREAT NATION AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE BE FAIR IF THEY CAN NOT BE GENEROUS IN REGARD TO THE ABILITY AND ADVANCEMENT OF THE FILIPINO PEOPLE?

World-wide travelers have told us after their investigation that the Filipino people were the most able, apt, keen, and quick-witted of all the people of the Orient, further advanced in education and civilization than the Cubans and some South American Republics are, and far superior to all the other island people of the tropical Indian Seas. Admiral Dewey gave this testimoney and American consuls in the Orient have on file in State Department of our Government testimony to the same effect.

I found the common farming country people in the Philippines more intelligent, more humane, and superior in every way to the farming country people in China, Chosen, or Japan, and yet we are supposed to have been sympathizing with the establishment of a Republic in China.

These people have a natural desire for education and information. They publish daily papers in all parts of the islands, they have many authors of great books, they are natural orators and have a fondness for public life which is to be no more condemned in that country than in this. They have many able public men. We are acquainted with the fine ability of their Representative in this Congress, Hon. MANUEL L. QUEZON, who has so well and ably represented his country here, and his colleague Hon. Manuel Earnshaw, while the speaker of their House of Representatives, Speaker Osmenia is a man of great ability who could preside with credit to himself and country over any legislative body in the world, but this, as some gentlemen would have you believe, does not exhaust their list of great men. They have many educated, intelligent, finely equipped men ready for public duties in all parts of the islands. They have a college older than Harvard, and other fine institutions of learning. I was impressed with the splendid ability of their young men between 18 and 25. Many of them are fine speakers in two or three different languages and quite a number of them are authors of books of merit.

They have textbook writers in law, medicine, philosophy, and science whose works are used all over that part of the world, and they even have some millionaires who are philanthropists. Mr. Theodoro R. Yangco subscribed and paid 20,000 pesos to the new Young Men's Christian Association building in Manila, a most beautiful and splendid building, in which I had the pleasure of making an address to a fine, intelligent body of citizens of Manila. In that delicate and intricate science the knowledge of which foretells the storms and disaster on the ocean as our Weather Bureau foretells like storms and disaster on the land, a Filipino professor rules the ships and commerce of the world, and yet some American gentlemen with monumental self-esteem, often men who can barely read and write, assume to tell us that their living among these people and having control over them would be a sort of a divine help and benefit to them.

HAS 300 YEARS OF CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION, EDUCATION, AND CONTROL LEFT THEM SO LOW IN THE SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT?

Do gentlemen here to-day who are opposed to Philippine independence mean to say and affirm that more than 300 years of Christian preaching, teaching, education, and control has been so impotent and barren of results as to leave the Filipino people at this date in a semicivilized condition and unfit to set up and maintain among themselves a decent, self-respecting self-government suited to the needs and conditions that confront them? I deny it and do not believe it. Christian preaching, teaching, education, and control have made them what they are to-day—the only Christian people in the Orient. It is my belief, based upon travel and observation among them, that they can set up and maintain a better republic than one-half the republics in the world to-day.

THEIR MARTYRS AND SACRED SPOTS OF FREEDOM.

Moreover, gentlemen, these people have struggled and shed their blood for liberty for 200 years against Spanish tyranny and oppression in a way and with a spirit that should challenge your admiration. They have had their Joseph Warren, Paul Revere, and Nathan Hale of glorious memory; their Bunker Hill, Lexington, and Valley Forge of sacred history; their Jefferson and Lincoln of immortal fame. [Applause.]

NO NATION CAN ENDURE WITHOUT A COMMON SPIRIT OF NATIONAL PATRIOTISM.

Gentlemen of the House, I want to lay down a proposition—a truism in government—which, if I am in error about, I wish some gentleman would controvert. It is this: No nation can endure without a common spirit of national patriotism.

In most nations this common spirit of national patriotism rests upon a common race blood and in some, in addition, upon a common race or state religion. In this sense we speak of the English Nation, the French Nation, the German Nation, the Italian Nation, the Jewish Nation, the Greek Nation, and the Russian Nation.

In the United States we have no common race blood and we have no common or state religion. Here the mingling of all the best blood of all the races has produced the typical American citizen, the best citizenship of the world.

IN THE UNITED STATES.

In the United States our common spirit of national patriotism rests neither upon a common race blood nor a common religion or state religion. Upon what, then, does it rest? Gentlemen, it rests upon this, and this alone: It rests upon our common ideals of liberty and the rights of man as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and as promulgated into law in the Constitution of our country. He who would weaken or destroy these ideals for any purpose whatsoever weakens and destroys the permanency of this Republic, pulls out the very foundation stones upon which our temple of liberty is builded; and the question I want to put to the heart and conscience of every man is this: How does the principle of permanently holding the Philippine Islands and the Filipino people against their will, should they desire an independent republican form of government, square itself with the principles found in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, the principles which we must observe and cherish if our Republic is to endure? [Applause.]

OUR UNNATURAL AND DANGEROUS POSITION.

To those who want to see the United States adopt the course and follow the colonization policy of Great Britain I want to quote what Gladstone said. Gladstone pointed out that under the theory and genius of our Constitution and Government, the United States could never adopt the British colonizational system without surrendering the foundation principles of the Republic, because in a Republic the central thought and essence is equality, while in a monarchy the recognized and accepted thought is classes and inequality. The British Government recognizes and rules her possessions and people accordingly, and it is the only way that a monarchy and colonial possessions can exist.

It is well known that when our commissioners were sent abroad to arrange a treaty with Spain at the close of the Spanish War President McKinley instructed them under no circumstances to take over the Philippine Islands, but merely arrange for a coaling station there. The way the radical change was consummated is related by the well-known British publicist, Mr. Stead, in the British Saturday Review. I quote him verbatim. He says:

"The diplomatic agents of Great Britain, however, insisted that the United States take these islands to preserve the balance of police power. The United States gets its territory in the east by the assistance of the moral power of Great Britain. Let us be frank and say outright that we expect mutual gain and material interests in this arrangement. The Americans are making their bargain under the protecting naval strength of England."

Thus we entered upon the British colonization system which Gladstone tells us we can not maintain without destroying the ideals upon which our Government rests. [Applause.]

THE NATION'S GREATEST STATESMEN HAVE BEEN CHAMPIONS FOR PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE.

Some speakers here to-day have assumed to affect and impress the country with the idea that the demand for Philippine independence is a premature impulse. Who are the men in the past who have uttered burning words of living truth for Philippine independence? To mention their names is to call the roll of the Nation's greatest statesmen, living and dead, in the past quarter of a century. I wish I had space to give a quotation from each of them. Their ability and patriotism can not be quesioned and their argument and appeal has never been answered.

To those Democrats, and Republicans as well, who are speaking against Philippine independence to-day I respectfully recommend a study of the speeches of this great roll of names, to call the roll of which is to name the Nation's immortals, the Nation's immortals dead, and the Nation's greatest living statesmen in

the last fifty years. A partial list included such patriots, orators, and statesmen as Grover Cleveland, William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, William J. Bryan, and President Wilson; Senators George F. Hoar, George G. Vest, John G. Carlisle, John W. Daniels, George F. Edmunds, A. O. Bacon, A. S. Clay, BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN, William E. Mason, Arthur P. Gorman, Carl Schurz, Stephen M. White, William V. Allen, Henry M. Teller, John Sherman, and others. In the House, Speaker CHAMP CLARK, DeArmond, OSCAR UNDERWOOD, and many others; Andrew Carnegie; Samuel Gompers; David Starr Jordan; Charles F. Adams; Henry Van Dyke; Bishops Spaulding and Potter; Theodore Cuyler; Patrick A. Collins; Rev. Dr. Thomas J. Conaty; and a notable list too long to enumerate.

Is there any gentleman in this House so great in his own estimation and so fatuous with self-importance that he would not consider himself complimented, elevated, and honored to find himself in fellowship with this roll of American scholars, orators, statesmen, and patriots? [Applause.]

SIGNS OF WARNING IN THE SKY OF FREEDOM.

Gentlemen of the House, I am deeply moved and impressed with the importance of this hour. No greater question, of more far-reaching importance, has challenged the attention of Congress in 50 years. I want to, if I can, epitomize this entire proposition as it affects our country's welfare by a few quotations that seem to me to stand out like burning signs of warning on the sky of freedom.

CAUSE OF THE DOWNFALL OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC.

Froude in his Life of Cæsar says that the Roman Republic's downfall dates from the time when the Roman people developed a desire to rule over and possess the country of alien people. God keep our beloved Republic from entering upon that course that has been the downfall of every other republic in the history of the world.

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S ADVICE AND WARNING TO THE YOUNG REPUBLIC.

Thomas Jefferson, the greatest political lawgiver and apostle of liberty the world has seen since Moses, warned the young Republic of the United States never to acquire any territory that was not contiguous, practically uninhabited, and which could not be developed by American citizens into future States of the American Union.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S ADVICE AND WARNING TO THE REPUBLIC.

That great pupil of Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, the great martyr and apostle of liberty, said:

"No man is good enough to govern another without the other's consent."

"He who refuses liberty to another deserves it not himself, and under the dispensation of a just God can not long retain it."

[Applause.]

PERICLES.

Pericles gave his countrymen good advice, and it is good advice to-day:

"Safeguard and defend your boundaries; do not extend them; do not let seas divide them."

THE VERDICT OF HISTORY.

Creasy, in his great work, says:

"There has never been a republic yet in history to acquire dominion over another nation that did not rule it selfishly and oppressively."

When I think of the course in which our ship of state is sailing, these messages of liberty sound like the alarm of fire bells in the night—voices like Joan of Arc heard ring down out of the skies.

LEST WE FORGET.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have observed the course of this debate with the deepest solicitude.

The arguments used here to-day by some of our Republican friends against independence for the Philippines, stripped of its mask and verbiage, means, if it means anything, that you are opposed to ever granting independence to these people.

THE LINCOLN ORATORS OF THIS HOUSE NOT QUOTING LINCOLN, JEFFERSON, AND THE DECLARATION TO-DAY.

I have observed and it has been noted that the Lincoln orators of this House, who quote Lincoln on every occasion, have not referred to him or mentioned his name in this debate. Is it not passing strange that there is a side to a debate dealing with the government and future of 9,000,000 people where the orators on that side can not appropriately quote from Lincoln, Jefferson, the Declaration of Independence, Whittier, Lowell, Wendell Phillips, or William Lloyd Garrison; can not quote from any great epic, oration, poem, or poet of liberty or from any battle hymn or song of freedom?

A GREAT DEMOCRATIC OPPORTUNITY.

I want to warn my Democratic friends that if we fail now in this crisis we will have missed the most glorious opportunity that has come to us in 50 years. Republicans have proudly boasted of freeing 3,000,000 colored men. They have claimed that credit, regardless of the fact that as many Democratic bones bleach on the battle fields and as much blood and treasure was poured out from northern Democratic homes as Republican homes to purchase that freedom. Here we as a party have the God-given opportunity to lead in the movement to give freedom to 9,000,000 people, and it saddens my heart to see that there are those among us who claim to be the followers of Jefferson who can not hear the heart beats of humanity above the clinking of the coin.

Our brethren deceived themselves with excuses, but these excuses will not excuse them.

THE INEVITABLE CONFLICT.

Since the beginning of time there has been an irrepressible conflict between the spirit of race ownership and the spirit of race independence. Education and government of one race by another are irrepressible and irreconcilable influences. One must fail, one must conquer. Let not gentlemen deceive themselves. If we continue to educate the Filipino people, they, like all other races since the dawn of history, will some day strike for an independent form of government, and your action in defeating a promise of independence will simply mean to say to the people of the United States that there are schoolboys now swinging their buckets to and from country homes to country schools who will be called upon in the future some time to fight and die in the Philippines. It will simply mean that men of another race and another clime, 12,000 miles removed from our Capitol, will be stood up and shot down, like in Ireland to-day, because they dare to desire to set up an independent form of government in their own land and to put in practice the principles of liberty and rights of man which our very education has instilled into them. And what is your answer for all this—business, business, business. Business purchased at such a price would be criminal folly.

Across this path I want to place the common-sense signboard of

"STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN!"

Three and a half centuries ago Charles V boasted that the sun never set upon the dominions which Spain maintained by wars in Europe, Africa, America, and the islands of the sea. Where now is that magnificent empire? Gone; forever vanished. Not enough left to cast a shadow. England boasts to-day, as did Charles V, that the sun never sets upon the Empire that, like Spain, she has maintained with unceasing wars. And, like Spain, she, too, in time may see a dismal wreck and ruin, wrought by the natural blight incident to colonial possessions.

Macaulay says:

"We venture to say that colonial empire has been one of the greatest curses to modern Europe. What nation has it ever strengthened? What nation has it ever enriched? What have been its fruits? Wars of frequent occurrence and enormous cost, fettered trade, lavish expenditure, clashing jurisdiction, and indigence among the people."

I want to end this warning with the words of Lincoln, who said:

"He who refuses liberty to another deserves it not himself, and under the dispensation of a just God can not long retain it."

And the words of Thomas Jefferson, speaking of race ownership, who said:

"When I remember that God is just, I tremble for my country."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish you could indulge me for five minutes longer. But I will not take the time if anybody else wants it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I ask in behalf of my colleague from Ohio for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I thank my friend and colleague and the House for this kindness.

OUR COUNTRY'S WELFARE FIRST.

Gentlemen, the preservation of the ideals on which our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution are based is the biggest thing in all this universe to me in the government of mankind. Nothing in the government of human affairs equals this in all the sweep of time. [Applause.]

WHAT LINCOLN SAID.

On his memorable trip to the Capital to be inaugurated President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln stopped at Philadelphia and was asked by the multitude to raise the flag over Independence Hall. In the speech which Lincoln delivered on that occasion he said that he never entertained any

political principle or doctrine not found in the Declaration of Independence. I have often been amazed at the men who will deliver orations of eulogy on Lincoln and then vote against the most sacred principle for which Lincoln lived and for which Lincoln died—the principle of individual human freedom and human liberty.

DO NOT CHANGE THE BATTLE HYMN OF THE REPUBLIC.

I do not want to see the United States change that beautiful line in the Battle Hymn of the Republic which reads:

As He died to make men holy
So we'll die to make men free.

So that for empire, trade, and gain it must read:

So we'll die to prevent men from being free.

I want to see the star of our Republic that rose in the government of mankind like the star of Bethlehem remain the star of hope and liberty to all mankind, and not throw its parting rays on a republic turned to an empire stained with the blood of conquered subjects.

I believe the Declaration of Independence is of Divine inspiration. It is the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule translated into the government and the affairs of men. On the observance of its sacred principles this Nation will live or fall.

Everyone who believes in education and development must admit that we can not always hold the Filipino people against their will, because it would not be just and right to so hold them. Why not let them go now before God comes again walking in the pages of history saying in wrath "Let these people go." Will we be so foolish as to try and put between them and their longing for liberty a Red Sea of oppression and human blood? If we do, I fear ours will be the repeated lesson of history; for through all governments God has stretched his electric live wire of truth and justice, and nations as well as men reach out in greed and avarice and touch that wire and die.

I want to see my country remain a land of benedictions to all mankind, to so act that the foot of Him who hath led us in triumph in 1776 through the wilderness of foreign oppression and in safety in 1861 through our Red Sea of civil strife may not falter nor the light of His countenance be turned away.

Then shall our glorious banner float on forever, every star flashing out the light of liberty and justice to all people all over the earth until their rays of blessing mingle in the light of the millenial dawn. Then for us always shall liberty and justice flourish out of the earth and righteousness and peace smile on us down out of the skies. ' [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order made by the House, section 34, known as the Clarke amendment, will first be considered. The Clerk will report the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 34. The President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines, and he shall on behalf of the United States fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof, and full power to take the several steps necessary to institute such government is hereby conferred upon the said Philippines acting by and through governmental agencies created by this act. This transfer of possession, sovereignty, and governmental control shall be completed and become absolute not less than two years nor more than four years from the date of the approval of this act, under the terms and in the manner hereinafter prescribed: *Provided*, That if the President, prior to the expiration of the said period of four years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years, and thus afford the Congress an opportunity in its discretion to further consider the situation in the said Philippines; but any such extension of time by the President shall not otherwise suspend or nullify the operative force of this act, unless the Congress shall hereafter so direct. For the purpose of a complete and prompt compliance with this direction, the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines or others as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the said Philippines, and to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States and of other countries resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein. In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President may reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TOWNER moves to strike out the section, being all of section 34 of the bill.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an agreement, if I can, with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] regarding the time for closing the debate on this motion.

Mr. JONES. What would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. TOWNER. It was the understanding that the debate would close at 8 o'clock, and I suggest that that be ordered and that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Virginia and myself.

Mr. JONES. That would be 1 hour and 10 minutes from now. That would be 35 minutes on a side.

Mr. TOWNER. On the paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. JONES. Yes; all amendments thereto.

Mr. TOWNER. I would suggest to the gentleman that, if he will make the offer, it shall include the right during that time, if gentlemen have amendments to offer, that all of them shall be debated, and that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at that time.

Mr. JONES. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that, while it has been agreed that this amendment should be voted on first, I overlooked the fact—and other gentlemen did—that there is one other proposition in the bill which gentlemen desire to discuss, and as to which they will want to offer amendments, and that is the proposition in regard to prohibition. Would the gentleman object to having this hour and 10 minutes devoted to the discussion of that amendment, and to change the agreement so as to permit the vote on the prohibition amendment first?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I will object to that.

Mr. TOWNER. I could not agree to that, because it has been stated to so many on this side what the understanding is. I will say to the gentleman that we will have no trouble, I think, in agreeing to any subsequent matter.

Mr. JONES. I do not think there will be any trouble, but a number of gentlemen have suggested to me that they would like to offer amendments to that provision, and I would like to give them an opportunity to do so if they desire it.

Mr. TOWNER. They will have that opportunity, of course, and we will not seek to deprive them of that opportunity. Will the gentleman make that suggestion as to unanimous consent?

Mr. JONES. I made this suggestion in good faith to the gentleman. I understand he objects to changing the adopted order, so that I will not make it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman has the right to reserve his objection.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have done so. Why not give up this time to the discussion of the prohibition, which has not been discussed? Why indulge in an hour and 10 minutes more of discussion on a paragraph that has been discussed for eight hours already?

Mr. TOWNER. So far as this side is concerned, we have 35 or 40 gentlemen who desired to discuss the Clarke amendment but who were not afforded the opportunity. They did not have opportunity in general debate.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I wanted to say something myself, but had no opportunity to do so. Still I would rather have the proceedings varied a little now by having a discussion of the prohibition amendment. It is getting late, and I am getting dry and hungry. [Laughter.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, we are losing time, and so far as I am concerned I will offer no objection to voting upon this and all other amendments at 8 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Will one of the gentlemen submit the request?

Mr. JONES. That is the request.

Mr. MANN. Make it 35 minutes on a side.

Mr. JONES. Well, 35 minutes on a side—that we vote on this amendment, then, at 5 minutes after 8 o'clock, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. TOWNER. I will suggest that the agreement include this amendment and all amendments to this section.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to limit it to that. We will vote on this amendment, and there may be other amendments to offer. If this amendment prevails there will probably be other amendments offered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There can not be any other amendments offered if this prevails.

Mr. MANN. To this section.

Mr. JONES. I will say to the gentleman that while I understand that no amendment could be offered to a section that had gone out of the bill, still the section might be offered in a different form. A new section might be offered to the bill, and I do not want to enter into any agreement that would preclude further consideration of this subject of Philippine independence. I hope the gentleman does not desire that we adopt a rule that would mean that if his motion prevails we will have no other opportunity to provide, in some form, at some time, for the independence of the Filipinos.

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman that certainly he will have ample opportunity to do whatever is parliamentary; but so far as section 34 is concerned, it has been our understanding that there was at least a tentative agreement between the parties that we should determine the thirty-fourth section by this debate and this action.

Mr. JONES. I simply want it understood that if this amendment should prevail and this section should go out, it does not mean that we could not offer another section to the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman must understand that if this section goes out, there will be objection raised to offering as a new section any provision that should have been offered as an amendment to this section. We wish to know now what the plan is to be. We do not want to have an understanding and then find that we have not any.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, if that be so, if what the gentleman from New York states is to be the position of the opposition, then I can not consent to any agreement as to time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not care anything about that.

Mr. JONES. Because we do not propose to put ourselves in a position, if these gentlemen vote out this section, that gentlemen on that side who say that this Clarke amendment is not entirely satisfactory to them, but that something else would be, shall not have an opportunity to vote for a proposition satisfactory to them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman understands that the parliamentary rule is that gentlemen should perfect their provision, and then let the House pass on the question whether it shall remain in the bill or not. If the gentleman from Virginia wishes us to reverse that proposition, so that if it goes out he can then try to put it back in a different form, as far as I am concerned I do not care to have that done if I can prevent it, and I think I know how to prevent it. We want to know what the plan is to be before we vote on the question whether this provision goes in or out of the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I can not consent to any agreement about fixing the time——

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is immaterial to me.

Mr. JONES. I do not want it understood that we on this side agree that if this section is voted out we, under the parliamentary rules that govern the House, can not offer some other proposition—not, of course, an amendment to a section that is no longer in the bill.

Mr. TOWNER. Does the gentleman refer to something extraneous, that would not be proper to offer as an amendment to this? It occurs to me that everything that is proper to be submitted as an amendment to this ought to be included in this agreement.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We are going to insist on our rights, and we want to know what the gentleman is going to do.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order that is raised.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there has been no point of order raised.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. It has been suggested by the gentleman from New York that after you have struck out a section nothing that could be offered as an amendment to that section will be in order. I agree with the gentleman from New York about that entirely. To attempt to do that would only take up the time of the House. Gentlemen ought to perfect their measure first before we vote on the motion to strike it out.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Iowa if he is willing to take a vote at 8 o'clock?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Does the gentleman make that request, to close debate on this amendment at 8 o'clock?

Mr. TOWNER. And all amendments thereto.

Mr. KITCHIN. And all amendments thereto.

Mr. TOWNER. All amendments to this section.

Mr. JONES. I will make no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, will some gentleman state the request?

Mr. TOWNER. As I understand it the request is this, that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at 8 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. Make it 30 minutes on a side, because that is the way to do it.

Mr. TOWNER. Thirty minutes on a side, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] and one-half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending section and all amendments thereto be limited to one hour, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Virginia and one-half by the gentleman from Iowa. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I have five minutes?

Mr. JONES. I think so. I am leaving this very much to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. FOSTER. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois demands the regular order. Is there objection to the request submitted by the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DILLON].

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I favor giving the Philippine people a greater liberty and allow them every possible opportunity to assimilate the blessings of good government. When the Jones bill came before the House, in the Sixty-third Congress, I voted for it, but I am opposed to the Clarke amendment, the effect of which is to set the Philippine Islands adrift without the performance of our covenants.

At the close of the Spanish War we found ourselves in possession of the Philippine Islands. This possession has brought for us great problems respecting our duty and our obligations to the Philippine people. The result of this war made us an involuntary trustee, a custodian of the rights and liberties of these people. At the time we occupied the city of Manila we found these people engaged in a rebellion against the mother country with which we were then in war. We destroyed the governmental power that ruled over them and substituted our own sovereignty over these people. We undertook to establish for the Philippine citizens a stable government. We accepted the trust, assumed the responsibility, and we can not now shirk this duty nor run away from our responsibility. Every citizen should be proud of the achievements we have accomplished in these islands. Down to this very hour we have faithfully fulfilled every covenant made to Spain and to the Philippine people. Since our occupancy of these islands we have crushed out insurrection, suppressed internal strife, established law and order, and have lead these people into industrial pursuits; through our activities, hospitals and homes have been constructed for the sick, schoolhouses and churches have been built for the educational and moral training of the people; we have eradicated diseases, established sanitation in their homes and public places, establish stable currency and equitable system of taxation, tripled their commerce, improved labor conditions, and paved the way for the true standard of living; improved their harbors, built railroads, public roads, bridges, telephones, and telegraph lines; we have sent them our teachers, our missionaries, and gave them the foundation principles upon which they could rear a country dedicated to liberty, justice, and equality. Our conduct with these people is above reproach and has been one of the brighest pages of our history, unselfish and unsullied. This bill, with the Clarke amendment, now calls for a dishonorable retreat from the islands and abandonment of all of our achievements; it places broken promises above faithful fulfillment. The rights of Spain, the rights of the American Government, the rights of the Philippine people are all safely guarded and protected by the Paris treaty of December 10, 1898. For 17 years we have faithfully complied with the terms of the treaty, but now we seek to repudiate it by proclaiming to the world that this treaty is a mere scrap of paper and no longer binding on the heart and conscience of our people.

The articles of capitulation of the city of Manila on the 13th of August, 1898, concluded with these words:

> This city, its inhabitants, its churches and religious worship, its educational establishments, and its private property of all descriptions are placed under the special safeguard of the faith and honor of the American Army.

William McKinley's message to the Philippine Commission concludes in these words:

> I believe that this pledge has been faithfully kept. As high and sacred an obligation rests upon the Government of the United States to give protection for property and life, civil and religious freedom, and wise, firm, and unselfish guidance in the paths of peace and prosperity to all the people of the Philippine Islands. I charge this commission

to labor for the full performance of this obligation, which concerns the honor and conscience of this country, in the firm hope that through their labors all the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands may come to look back with gratitude to the day when God gave victory to American arms at Manila and set their land under the sovereignty and the protection of the people of the United States.

If this sacred obligation rested upon us then, it rests upon us now. If we were right then, we are not wrong now. This city, its inhabitants, its churches, its religious freedom, its educational establishments, its private property are all safely guarded by the faith and the honor of our country. Article 16 of the treaty provides:

It is understood that any obligations assumed in this treaty by the United States with respect to Cuba are limited to the time of its occupancy thereof; but it will upon the termination of such occupancy advise any government established in the island to assume the same obligations.

The rights of the United States with respect to Cuba are limited to the time of its occupancy, and provision is expressly made that any new government could assume the obligations imposed upon the United States by the treaty, but the grant of the Philippines to the United States is in perpetuity. There is not now and never has been any independent Philippine governmet. We bought the islands from Spain and paid $20,000,000 for them, and when the treaty was exchanged we became the sovereign owner of these islands, but we took them with perpetual covenants, with unlimited and unconditional pledges.

No provision can be found for a temporary occupancy or for turning over the trust to another Government for execution. Spain ceded the islands not for 17 years but in perpetuity; we did not accept for a limited period of occupancy, but we made as a part of our contract certain covenants with Spain for all time. The treaty proclaims that the rights of Provinces, municipalities, private and public, ecclesiastical and civic bodies, shall never be impaired. We made a covenant that we would carefully preserve all documents, official archives, and records of the executive and judicial departments relating to property rights of the inhabitants and of the sovereignty of the islands. We made a covenant that the Spanish subjects may remain in such territory or may remove therefrom, retaining their rights of property and the right to carry on their industry, commerce, and professions. We made a covenant that the civil rights, the political status of the inhabitants should be determined by the Congress of the United States. We made a covenant that the inhabitants should be entitled to religious liberty.

Our pledges are unconditional, unlimited, and perpetual. How can we, then, in good faith proclaim to Spain that we no longer are bound by our treaty pact, we will no longer protect the people of the islands in their property rights nor safeguard to them their religious liberty, that Congress will no longer legislate upon their civil and political rights, that henceforth, like a tricky litigant, we shall refuse to perform our sacred contract. The United States would not allow Spain to repudiate her part of this agreement, and Spain ought not to allow the United States to deliberately violate the agreement solemnly made for the benefits of her former subjects. The Spanish Government has vested rights in this peace contract, so have the people of the islands, so has every investor who has invested money on the faith of our promises. No amount of quibbling, equivocation, or trickery will satisfy the sober judgment of the American people that we should now violate our promises and set aside the vested rights in a treaty made with another Government.

If we had an international court, vested with jurisdiction, for the settlement of such controversies, Spain could hail us before the court as a willful violator of our treaty pledges. Every person, wherever he may be, who has invested either in the Philippine bonds or in property in these islands, the civilized and uncivilized citizens of the islands and the Spanish nation are all beneficiaries under our treaty and have a direct interest in the peace pledges. This is not wholly a question of governments deriving their power from the consent of the governed. It is a question of the faithful fulfillment of treaty pledges deliberately made. You talk about colonial policies, imperialism, the creed of the fathers, liberty being the birthright of man, but you are forgetting the fundamentals, the pledges contained in our treaty. If it was right to start on the fulfillment of these pledges, it is right to finish the task. We can no more justify the surrender of these islands than the unfaithful father could justify his willful desertion of his helpless infant children. If you personally held trust funds for beneficiaries, would you select an insolvent trustee, an infant, or a person with bad habits, or one unable to govern himself and expect a faithful and honest accounting of the trust funds? I should think that even a Democratic caucus would hesitate to do such a foolish thing. It is said that the islands are costing us $25,000,000 per year; that they constitute our greatest liability and peril, a burden, a constant expense; that to keep the islands means to defend them, to defend them means an increase in Army and Navy. Yet if we admit all these statements they do not constitute a sufficient argument for a deliberate abandonment of our contract. The honor of our country weighs more than dollars. Every one of you have probably sometime made a bad bargain. I have. Yet you would not want to plead the infant act, intoxication, or mental deficiency as a justification of such act and as a defense to your bad judgment. We have been going along for 17 years cheerfully fulfilling and faithfully executing every element of our contract; now we are to throw up the job and plead the baby act. Read President McKinley's proclamation, proclaiming the ratification of the treaty to the public:

That the same and every article and clause thereof may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof.

However, fulfillment and good faith seems to mean nothing to the members of the Democratic caucus.

I am sorry that this great measure must rest upon the decree of a Democratic caucus. The measure ought to be above party creeds. It should call upon every Member for patriotic service in placing the common good above partisan advantage. No Member should delegate his power of legislation to any caucus. The caucus destroys individuality; it establishes tyranny; it sacrifices the best legislative instrumentality, the conscience; it makes weaklings of its members. The faithful are intimidated by its decrees. They are loath to have places in the party council. They join the ranks of the rulers, and individuality is peacefully put to sleep. We plead for an independent legislative department of Government; one that will not permit the judicial nor the executive departments to trespass upon the rights of the legislative department; one that will not allow a caucus to bind its members; one that will call upon its members to stand for individual opinions; one that will maintain the independence of members; one that will permit its member to stand erect in his God-given rights without coercion and without caucus splints upon his legs.

Under section 34 of this bill we are to withdraw and surrender our possession, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over the islands, and permit these people to form a self-governing nation and recognize their independence. Everyone ought to know that we can not at this time depend upon their ability to perform the covenants we have made with Spain; nor have they at present the ability to protect property rights or religious liberty. If we are to make good our guaranty, we must retain sovereignty, occupation, and ownership, because it is only through sovereignty and ownership that we will be able to perform our covenants. If we could get out of the islands with a complete fulfillment of our obligations, there would probably be little criticism in our doing so, but this is impossible. When we withdraw, what are we going to do without pledges? We can not withdraw them. To turn these islands over to a newly formed Philippine government would not only mean national dishonor, but a destruction of all American and European investments, which were made on the faith of our promises; it would bring on revolution, anarchy, bloodshed, and crime among the 30 different native races inhabiting these islands. How can we expect unity of action when all of these races have for centuries possessed racial prejudices, all speaking different dialects.

We have only to recall the chaos, loss of life, in poor, distressed Mexico and we have an example of a nation with hundreds of years of civilization, with a constitution similar to that of the United States, yet without ability for self-government. A good constitution and good laws will not suffice unless the government of the people can rest upon the heart and conscience of the masses of people. I am convinced that a withdrawal of our sovereignty will leave the people of the Philippines insolvent, defenseless, and helpless, and that they will not be ready for self-government for 50 years to come. I believe that when we leave the islands we should leave them bag and baggage. It has already been demonstrated that the United States can exercise the general sovereignty over these islands without bringing them into a domestic relation with our country. We have been doing so, and there is no reason why we should not continue the work already begun. To turn the Philippine Islands back to Spain at this time would not merit the approval of the American people; to abandon them would not command the respect and the sober judgment of mankind, because it means a breach of our promises. We can not turn the Philippine Islands over to any other country and relieve ourselves of responsibility. We have no right or power to select another country as a residuary legatee. It then becomes our faithful duty to at present continue the marvelous advancement in peace and prosperity that has followed our occupancy in these

islands, that through our tender, sympathetic rule and guidance they may continue unmolested in their wonderful advancement, which has been unequaled in the history of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, no political party in this country has ever been brave enough to face the American people with an unequivocal declaration that they intended to keep the Philippine Islands in perpetuity. Yet every proposition for the ultimate freedom of the islands, or even for their advancement in local self-government, has met with the same resistance and from the same quarter as this bill.

I believe that we ought to adopt this clause for two reasons: First, for the good of the Americans; and second, for the good of the Filipinos. I am glad to believe that our occupancy of the Philippine Islands has been a credit to us and has advanced the Filipino in the direction of self-government. I am glad to believe also that a part of the credit is due to the Filipino in his being able to adapt himself to the needs of a higher political life.

I am thoroughly convinced, however, when I speak of the good to the American people that we as a country have no destiny in those islands. We have no destiny as a Nation in Asia. The Philippine Islands are not colonies; they are dependencies. No man has ever conceived that they can be colonies. The difference between a colony and a dependency as a legal proposition is very clear, and I repeat that no statesman or any party or faction has ever pretended that they would become an integral part of the American Nation, or that the American Constitution would finally become their constitution.

When the argument is made for their indefinite retention, it is for their retention as a subject people, as a dependency, without the natural political rights that men are entitled to enjoy.

We have heard this afternoon in this debate the same old-time worn jingoism about pulling down the American flag that was responsible for the original commission of the Philippine folly. We are not to pull down the flag. Then if we are not to pull down the flag now, after 18 years of peaceful government, let these belligerent patriots say when the time will ever come that they will be willing to pull down the flag. If that time will never come, let them have the manly moral courage to face the American people and say that they are opposed for all time to the freedom of the Filipinos. [Applause.]

Talk about courage; let us have a little moral courage on this subject, and while we are about it let us have the moral courage as well as the physical courage to do what we believe is right by a people, whether they have the power to require it of us or not. Is the only test of right and freedom the power to extort it by force, or are we the only Nation that is able to give a subject people their freedom without driving them to win it at the point of the sword? That is the moral question involved here.

Now, the great fight on this bill is coming and will come from the special interests in this country. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] started out to represent the poor Filipinos, but before he had got very far the mask was off and he was talking about the millions of capital invested in those islands. I have seen in that flag the stripes representing the revolting American Colonies; I have seen the stars representing the self-governing American States; but I hope never to see both stars and stripes erased and nothing but the dollar mark left behind. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER].

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I have been greatly interested in the discussions on the floor of this House since I came here in December, and I have discovered one thing, and that is that the business men of America need not look for or expect any consideration at home or abroad from the Democratic side in this House. [Applause on the Republican side.] Whenever you mention anything that has to do with the business or industry of the American citizen here or abroad the next thing you hear is a sneer that the interests are being defended. We have to-day in Mexico men with their millions who have gone there encouraged by this Government. We are talking about capturing the trade of the world, and a few venture across with their savings into the Philippine Islands, and anything that is said here to-day about looking after Americans in the Philippines is talked of with a sneer from the other side.

I say to you, I can think of no more lonely figure in this Government to-day than the man of enterprise who looks beyond the boundary of his own Nation to capture trade [applause on the Republican side], to bring business to this Nation. He is made to understand that he is the subject of ridicule by the party in power, and he can expect no protection abroad and no protection at home. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I think that the time is here in this country when some men, without apology, remembering that the the Good Book says that "He who provides not for his own household is worse than a disbeliever," shall see to it that we come squarely to a discussion of whether the industrial enterprises of the United States have any hope for life anywhere, here or abroad. What have we heard to-day? We have heard a lot of talk about some Filipinos, but the American in the islands has been sneered at. We have had some talk about some savage tribes wanting their freedom, but not one word from the Democratic side of the House in honor of the men who for 18 years have toiled and died to change that Filipino country from a country of savagery to a country of civilization—not one word. [Applause on the Republican side.] We have heard not one single word in praise of a single boy who wore the American uniform in the Philippine Islands, we have heard not one single word from that side of the House of hope held out to any man, or group of men, who have gone there. It has all been cant and rant about the liberty of men with whom you would not trust your own business for 24 hours. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if ever the party in power is to say anything or do anything to convince the thoughtful business man of this country who is looking somewhere to carry on the enterprise that the great push of American industry would send abroad, it has the opportunity to do it now. And the time has come when that man shall demand some consideration at least from the party on the other side. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] has sneered at what he chooses to call "some Filipinos," stating that it would be wrong to grant independence to a people with whom we would not be willing to risk our business for 24 hours, and he proceeds to extol the "boys" and "business men" who have gone there from America, and in accordance with his ideas, are entitled to first consideration over the welfare of the Filipino people. If it be true that the Filipino people are of such character that we would not be willing to trust our business to any of them for as long as 24 hours, these "boys" and "business men" to whom the gentleman refers have done very little toward civilizing these people during the 18 years they have spent in the Philippine Islands. It is a sorry spectacle that a Member of the American Congress, with all of its traditions and the history of its growth and the things for which it has stood in the past, should be willing to stand upon this floor and deny liberty and independence to 8,000,000 of people, because he does not think it to the best interest of Americans who have gone to the Philippine Islands and invested their money. In former times it would not have been thought possible that a Representative of the liverty-loving people of America would put the selfish interests of a few investors of capital above the rights of a great people to govern themselves and live under their own system.

Before the American Revolution, which won for the United States their indepedence, Englishmen had come into the colonies and invested their money, and, no doubt, they thought their interests should be placed above that of the colonists, who were seeking freedom and the right of self-government, but our forefathers did not hesitate to fight for their independence and their right to govern themselves, simply because British subjects had come into this country and invested their money. Those who were interested in bringing about that revolution and in the formation of this Nation held to the doctrine that the right of self-government is an inherent right and that it is not subject to the prior claims of financial investors.

The Declaration of Independence itself proclaims the doctrine that all men are created politically equal and are entitled to certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It proclaims that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and three-quarters of a century later Abraham Lincoln gave his indorsement to that immortal declaration by saying, "No man is good enough to govern another man without that man's consent." We know that the Filipino people desire self-government. We know that they desire it because they have learned from our Nation and from the things that were responsible for our national existence that the right of freedom and self-government is the most priceless political boon that can be achieved among the political subdivisions of the people of the world.

A great deal has been said about the qualifications of the people of the Philippine Islands for self-government. I have been

impressed many times with the statement of President Wilson that liberty does not come from above, like the showers from heaven, but it springs up among the people themselves and must be attained and maintained by them if it is to be enjoyed. If the question of the qualification of the American colonies to govern themselves had been left to the people of Great Britain, and the question of our liberty had been left for them to decide, we would at this time be a colony of that empire instead of the greatest Republic that the world has known. Avarice, greed, and selfishness always protests that a given people are not suited for self-government, but the question which confronts us here as Members of Congress is whether the Filipino people are entitled to freedom and self-government as a matter of right, and without regard to whether some Americans will be able to make more money under American control of the Philippines than they would under a self-governing Filipino Republic. For my own part, I am willing to bestow upon those people that right, that power of self-government which we have not only contended for for ourselves, but have encouraged among all the nations of the world.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman does not mean to compare the United States in the Philippine Islands with Great Britain in the United States?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not mean to compare the Anglo-Saxon race, wherever they may be found on this footstool, with any other race under the sun; but my contention is that, without regard to race or locality, the principle is the same. The principle is that the right of self-government is not qualified by the color or the location of the people who may be seeking it.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about the lack of education in the Philippine Islands, and yet there are more than 5,000 public schools in those islands, with an attendance of more than 500,000, which is a higher percentage than exists in many other so-called higher civilized nations. The percentage of literacy in the Philippine Islands is greater than it is in Russia, or in Spain, or Portugal, or Brazil, or Chile, or in Guatemala, as well as a number of other nations that might be mentioned. If this be true, how can any fair-minded American contend that the Philippine Islands should not be given their liberty? Certainly a failure to do that could not be justified on the grounds of a lack of education. If it is the moral duty of our Army and our great business men to civilize inferior races of people, how can we justify our course in limiting our beneficence to the Philippine Islands and the other islands of the sea when there are so many other people scattered over the world who are in need of such altruistic service?

Mr. MADDEN. We do not own them.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; and we do not own the Philippine Islands in the sense that they are ours for indefinite occupation and exploitation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Every American officer, from President McKinley on down to the present time, has held out the hope of independence to the Philippine Islands, and they have from the beginning of American occupation been led by every responsible authority to believe that our occupation of the islands was temporary and that they would be granted their independence at an appropriate time. But to-day, for the first time, we hear a Member on the Republican side, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], boldly state that he is not in favor of ever granting freedom to the Philippine Islands, and that he was against giving it to the people of Cuba, and that if he had his way he would go down and take Mexico and all the territory between the United States and the Panama Canal, all of which he would gobble up and place under the control of the American Government and the American Army, without regard to the wishes or the welfare of the people upon whom he would superimpose the authority of the United States.

Why is it that there are men, even in Congress, who take such a position? Because of that insatiable desire for business and money making, the desire to subordinate the liberty, freedom, and rights of independent people to work out their own destiny to the dictates and selfish desires of commercialism. It is the desire to crown the dollars as being supreme over the liberty of human beings. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that is the only argument that the gentleman from Tennessee and others have advanced in behalf of their policy for which they have had the courage to speak upon the floor of this House.

I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that I do not advocate the acquisition of power and of territory under the Stars and Stripes by force of arms simply to gratify the ambition of men whose only object in life is the making of money or the exercise of power. The thing which makes the American Nation loved and respected the world over is the fact that it has not stood in the past for political or commercial aggrandizement, but it has always been looked to by the downtrodden people of every nation as the inspiration of freedom and liberty, proclaiming the equality of mankind everywhere. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It was under the influence of this inspiration that the American Nation was conceived, and has grown until it embraces the midcontinent of North America and numbers more than a hundred million true and loyal Americans. It is for these reasons and for many others that I believe the time has come when the Philippine Islands ought to be granted their independence, when the United States should keep faith with those people whom it subjugated against their will, and which it continues to control, in spite of their overwhelming desire and capacity for governing themselves; and I hope that at no distant date we may be able to greet the only Christian nation in the Orient as a fellow member in the brotherhood of self-governing nations under the name of the republic of the Philippine Islands. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS].

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I believe that I shall never forget the emotions that came to me when, 18 years ago to-day, I learned of the triumph of the American Navy in the Bay of Manila. Proud as I was of that achievement, when I came to learn what was to be the ultimate result of the triumph of American arms, I was prouder of my Nation than I had ever been before.

For 400 years our brown brothers of the lonely islands in a far-away sea had been beneath the heel of tyranny and of oppression. For four centuries they had waited patiently for the coming of the giant of the west. When it came and raised the American flag over those islands it was raised with a promise that the genius of our institutions should be given to those savage tribes in the hopes of one day raising them to that point in civilization where they might be trusted with a government of their own. We held out the promise to them that we would install in those islands civilization where savagery exists, Christianity where paganism prevails, a government of law where anarchy prevails, progress where festers decay, and the sunlight of a new age where the shadows of dead centuries lie. In fulfillment of that promise we sent the youth of America, the young men and young women, to take charge of their schools, with the idea of improving the intellectual and the moral standard of the Philippine people.

Mr. Chairman, no man ever gained strength by following the easiest way. No nation ever became mighty by following the line of least resistance. And to-day, after having had in our charge for 18 years those races that had been in savagery for 400 years, for the first time there comes a proposition that because storm clouds have gathered, that because the world has gone mad, that because of the fear that the Philippines may be dangerous for us to control, because they are expensive—for the first time, within my knowledge, at least, the United States is consulting the proposition of expediency in the face of manifest duty.

I say to you that if this Nation is true to its ideals, if its action on this matter shall be in harmony with its history, it will not consult fear, it will not consult difficulty, it will not consult expense, but it will hold on to those islands, it will hold on to those people until they have reached that point in civilization where independence and freedom may be given them without making them and their nation the plaything of world politics. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DECKER].

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Nebraska I remember very well the emotions that filled my heart when I heard of the victory of Dewey at Manila Bay, and I am for turning the Philippines loose, not from the standpoint of expediency, not for a lack of courage, but because of the fundamental principles of this Government that our father founded long before Dewey's victory at Manila Bay. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Eight million people, 7,000 miles away. If they are incapable of self-government, then they have no part or lot under that flag, because as the greatest Republican, and almost the greatest American, that ever lived, said that this Nation can not endure half slave and half free. If they are capable of self-government, the dictates, not of expediency, but the dictates of duty, demand that we carry out the policy of McKinley and give them the right to self-government, and do it now.

This is the anniversary of the victory of Manila Bay. There could be but one better day to give them liberty, and that would be the 4th of July, the day on which we celebrate the Declaration of Independence, "that document which proclaimed not simply our national independence, but the primal rights of all of

mankind; that document the spirit of which goes forth like an angel of human liberation," as Sumner said, "breaking bolts, unloosing bonds, opening prison doors, visiting all who are downtrodden, whispering that there is none so poor as to be without human rights which every man is bound to respect, none so degraded as not to be beneath its beneficent influence, none so lofty as to be above its restraining power, while before it despotism and oligarchy fall on their faces like the image of Dagon, and the people everywhere begin to govern themselves."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the revenues of the Philippine government last year were about $14,000,000, not more than the revenues of the District of Columbia. Turn the islands loose, turn them over, as you may wish to call it, on $14,000,000, and what will become of the 8,500,000 people? The time when they should be given independence will be when they have a schoolhouse on every hilltop, where in the generations that are yet to come the children yet unborn are educated in the principles of government and freedom. That will be the time to liberate the Filipino and give him independence. The flag has been raised upon the Philippine Islands, there to remain as an evidence of liberty and freedom, never to be hauled down until the people of those islands are ready for self-government, but not until they have been taught in the schoolhouses, under an American policy, what self-government means.

Who would defend the Filipinos if they were given independence to-day? Would it be America or who would it be? Surely not themselves. And to turn them loose by this provision of this bill would be a crime, a sin, which the Members of this House, speaking for the American people, ought not by any means to commit. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that the Democratic platform has been explicitly plain on this Philippine proposition. Seven hundred million dollars have been spent by this Government in the last 18 years in the Philippine Islands and between forty and fifty million dollars being spent each year. If war at any time comes, it will be through the Philippine Islands. And the national troubles, all of them combined, the national liability of all other kinds combined, do not compare with the Philippine Islands. And in reply to my distinguished friend from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS], who says it is the part of courage to stay there, I wish to say to him that as a courageous Nation, a Nation that loves the foundation stone of liberty on which it is founded, we owe it to the Filipino people to free them.

This Government is not presumed to go all over the face of the earth for the purpose of washing out the back doors of other people. The Monroe doctrine is not for the purpose of ging 12,500 miles from the Nation's Capital and looking out for some people in the Pacific Ocean; but, according to my interpretation of that famous doctrine, the North American Continent and the South American Republics embrace the entire territory over which our flag shall put any kind of protectorate.

This idea of imperialism and holding the Philippine Islands is backed up by the great "interests" of this country. It is not the people of America. It is the bondholders, the liquor interests, the Tobacco Trust, and the sugar interests of this country that cause the Republican Party and these few Democrats to join in this protest against the Clarke amendment turning the Philippines loose. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This is a battle between the people and special privilege in this Nation. The interests that have been exploiting the Philippine Islands all of these years do not intend to let the American people get rid of that millstone that now hangs so heavy around the neck of this Nation.

You Republicans place the dollar above the man. Don't you know the people of those islands love independence as much as we do? The Tories in the Colonies of America joined in with King George and tried to prevent our heroic forefathers from gaining their independence. Our people fought eight long years to gain independence against the tyranical hand of Great Britain. Some of you say the Filipino people are not capable of self-government. The people of England said the same thing about our American forefathers in 1776.

What right have we to set ourselves up as the judges to say the Filipinos are not able to maintain a stable government? Every man on this floor knows those people can govern themselves. It is the dollar mark that is causing all these flimsy excuses to be offered here to-day.

Wall Street has worked overtime endeavoring to kill this bill. All of the henchmen of the bankers who happen to have bonds in the islands, together with the whisky and beer interests, and the Sugar Trust, and the Tobacco Trust, have put their forces to work to prevent the Democratic Party from fulfilling its pledges to the American people on this question. Now is the time to show what crowd you run with. Are you for the special interests that seek to continue grinding dollars out of the swarthy Filipinos at a great and heavy burden to the people of the United States, or are you for the plain people of this country? Your vote on this Clarke amendment tells the whole story.

If you are for the people, you will vote for the Clarke amendment to stay in. This will give the Filipinos freedom at the end of four years. I would vote to give them their independence to-morrow. I am in favor of the United States Government coming out body and breeches from the Philippine Islands and staying away from there for all time to come. Our Government has enough to do to attend to our own business. Let us spend our money to help our own people. You Republicans want to tax the very life out of our people who toil in order that a few exploiters of the privileged classes can amass millions of dollars out of the Philippine Islands. The truth of it is, you never expect to give the Philippine Islanders their independence. Of all the fake arguments I have listened to since coming to Congress, I have never yet heard any to equal the pretended excuses offered here to-day to kill this bill.

Do you not know this is a day of rejoicing? The American people have their eyes on Congress to-day. They know the strong influences of big business at work to kill this bill. Which side are you on in this conflict? Do you know the tree is judged by its fruit? What kind of fruit will your vote bear? The vote I cast I know is for the people, because every schoolboy in America knows that the people of this country are in favor of granting independence to the Filipinos as early as possible. I am willing to be judged on this vote. Are you men who oppose this bill ready to come out in the open at the bar of public opinion? What are you Republicans going to tell the people?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, to pass the Clarke amendment on the pretense that we are doing it for the benefit of the Filipino people, whereas, in truth and in fact, our real purpose is to avoid our obligations to these people—and this at a time when the world is on fire—would certainly subject our Government to the charge of timidity and insincerity and greatly lower its standing in the eyes of the world, as well as to weaken the moral fiber of our citizens.

Setting the Filipinos adrift, putting them on their own resources before they are ready for self-government and before other nations are asked to cooperate in the matter, would be a serious mistake—one that our Government in all probability would have cause to regret.

The Democratic Party attempts to justify such a course on the ground that its 1912 platform called for the independence of the Philippines as soon as a stable local government could be established in the islands. How soon could such a government be established? Can the administration guarantee a stable government in four years or even in three times four years?

The great majority of our people do not believe that the rank and file of the natives are yet fit for local self-government, and it is beyond the realm of human ability to say on what particular day they will be ready to maintain a government that will protect the lives, liberties, and property of its people.

There is nothing in the preelection declarations of the Democratic Party that will sustain, under the present conditions, the leaders of that party in their attempt to scuttle these islands. Even though the Philippine plank were more specific, would not the party be justified in repudiating it under present world conditions? This administration has repudiated other planks of its platform for little or no excuse—why so supersensitive about this one?

It is quite apparent that the compelling motive for abandoning the islands is not an overpowering desire to square the Democratic Party's action with its platform declarations, but rather a lack of confidence in its own ability to care for and protect these islands.

Conditions in the Philippine Islands are very satisfactory; there is little or no public discontent. The Filipinos are making splendid progress in the art of self-government, as well as in agricultural, industrial, and commercial pursuits. Then, why abandon the policy of educating them patiently and sufficiently for ultimate self-government? Why discard a highly satisfactory policy for a dangerous and uncertain policy—dan-

gerous to the Filipino people and dishonorable to our own Government?

In the treaty of Paris we took on these islands and relieved Spain of all obligation for their protection and government. Is not the United States in honor bound responsible for their future welfare? Can it avoid this obligation, though self-imposed, by seeking its own safety and welfare without any regard for the future welfare of the Filipino people?

To act upon such a doctrine would subject the United States to the contempt of the civilized world.

This is not the time to consider our convenience or profit, but to maintain our honor and duty to a people who were wished upon us as an incident of the Spanish-American War.

It is contended by the supporters of the Clarke amendment that the Philippines should be granted their independence promptly, because that would decrease the possibilities of international complications that might involve the United States in war; besides, such a course would be profitable, as it would save the United States Treasury millions of dollars.

Our Government took on these islands not for the purpose of making profit out of them but for the good of the Filipino people, and the United States does not purpose to lay down its burden until its mission is fulfilled. The United States is the sole judge as to when this task is performed. The Filipino people believed they were ready for independence as soon as sovereignty was transferred from Spain to the United States. Our disagreement with them on that point caused the Filipino-American War that cost hundreds of lives and over $600,000,000. Nothing has occurred since that war to cause us to change our policy toward these people except it be the European conflagration, and instead of that being an excuse for granting independence to the Philippines it to my mind is a very substantial reason why independence should not be granted to these islands during this world-wide disturbance. However, we are reminded by the "scuttle propagandists" that the United States can safeguard the interests of the Philippines as well after they have been granted their independence as they can to-day. Even if we admit this to be a fact, which it is not, the bill under consideration cuts the islands adrift, leaving them to their own protection, and the history of this legislation indicates that such is the intention of the administration. Grant that the administration will be successful in repudiating its trust, what will be its standing before the world?

The proponents of the Clarke amendment in their report make the astounding statement that the Philippines are a source of military weakness, and that we should abandon them as a part of our plan of preparedness.

Mr. Speaker, according to these gentlemen, the United States should abandon any and all possessions outside our continental boundaries, if difficult to defend. If American duties and obligations are to be avoided because we are afraid to perform them lest we become involved with some foreign power, it is time to take stock of our national fiber, as has been well said by the minority. "If counsels of fear are to become the permanent policy of our country we should blot out the heroic history of our past and forget the sacrifices of those who made us a Nation."

The problem before us is a difficult one. It was much easier to take on these islands than it will be to establish for the people thereon a stable government democratic in form.

If we should attempt it at the present time, the inevitable result would be that only a comparative few would control the great mass of the people. In place of its being a democratic government, in fact it would be a sort of autocratic government. The few would govern the many. Such a condition would develop another crop of Villas, Carranzas, Zapatas, and Aguinaldos to disturb the peace and happiness of not only our own country but all civilized powers. Can it be that we have learned nothing from our experience in the last four years with the Mexican situation?

No one should deny to the Filipino people the God-given right to independent existence as soon as they are able to maintain it. We have every reason to believe that as soon as these people are properly fitted for independence they will become a very important member in the family of nations.

Mr. Taft paid them this eloquent tribute:

> It is the only Malay or oriental race that is Christian. They were not like the Mohammedan or Buddhist, who despise western civilization as inferior. * * * They learn easily, and the most striking fact in our whole experience in the Philippines is the eagerness with which the common Filipino agricultural laborer sends his children to school to learn English. There is no real difference between the educated and ignorant Filipino that can not be overcome by the education of one generation. They are a capable people in the sense that they can be given a normal intellectual development by the same kind of education that is given in our common-school system.

Should we abandon our unselfish purpose to serve so promising a people because of the fear of a few frightened leaders?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, our responsibility in the Philippines came to us as an unsought and unexpected incident of a righteous war. The controlling factor in the acceptance of that responsibility was a sober sense of duty and a conscientious devotion to high ideals in its performance.

The record of that performance, including its admitted faults and shortcomings, is the finest story in human history of unselfish effort on behalf of an alien people patiently, faithfully, and successfully performed.

Thanks to the wisdom of the plan adopted, to the devotion of those who directed its administration, to the capacity and good intentions of the people among whom and for whose benefit it was developed, the Filipino people have demonstrated their worthiness and, we hope, capacity for the substantial advance on the road to complete self-government which we now propose to give them, an advance which, if successfully pursued, will lead them to the coveted goal of complete independence.

In this hopeful juncture of our relations with these capable and aspiring people we are suddenly confronted with an amazing proposition affecting those relations and purposed to rudely and precipitately sever them. A proposition born of fretful impatience, urged on the ground of cheap expediency, and counciled by craven cowardice. It is as wickedly unworthy of the American people as it is criminally reckless of the best interests of the people of the Philippine Islands.

I am no prophet and can not therefore vision the future or foretell the day when it may be mutually agreed that the time has arrived when these people may with reasonable safety and security launch their ship of state on the none too tranquil waters of independent sovereignty. Of this, however, I am supremely confident that when that day arrives, it will be heralded and ushered in by no such miserable excuses as that we have tired of the Philippine burden, we are weary of its cost, we are timidly apprehensive of its possible entanglements. On the contrary, when that day comes, it shall be known and proclaimed as the basis of our action that our responsibility has been courageously met and honorably discharged, that our duty has been faithfully accepted and successfully performed.

I hope to live to see the coming of that day, when, with dignity, with consciousness of duty performed, under such a mutually advantageous arrangement as will comport with the dignity of the United States, safeguard its interests in the Orient, and reasonably assure the Philippines from foreign aggression, we may establish the people of the Philippine Islands as an independent sovereignty. Until that day arrives, I would be a craven, recreant to the faith and confidence reposed in me by a faithful, steadfast, and high-minded constituency, if, under any pretext, persuasion, or pressure I should subscribe to the shifting, shuffling policy of scuttle, surrender, and abandonment contained in the Clarke amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TAGGART].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TAGGART] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, I have never criticized a bill that was reported by a committee of the party that I represent in this House, and I have nothing but commendation for that part of the pending bill that emanated from the Committee on Insular Affairs. It is a magnificent piece of work. I do not think that any piece of legislation was ever written in this House that surpasses the bill that is drafted for the government of the Philippine Islands. But unfortunately it contains a provision inserted in the other body to the effect that the United States shall hastily and precipitately retreat from the Philippine Islands and abandon them without guaranty and without protection.

Mr. Chairman, the occupation of the Philippine Islands by the United States is the most unselfish work that was ever done by any nation in the history of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.] During those 18 years in which we have occupied the islands we have established sanitation, we have made public improvements, we have provided schools, we have maintained peace, we have brought the blessings of liberty to the Orient, and not only to the Orient, but into the Tropics in the Orient. We have attempted to teach and now are in process of teaching in the Orient the greatest blessing that mankind ever learned for the first time, and that is the lesson of self-government. I have no criticism of this bill except to say that section 34 cuts off our task in the very midst of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TAGGART. I ask unanimous consent for one more minute.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for one minute.

Mr. TAGGART. I want to see section 34 amended so that we can all vote for it. I do not want any uncertainty in it. I do not want to see that there shall be two years of uncertainty, in which public and private bankruptcy and destruction of business will be brought about in the Philippine Islands. If we could only say in it that 10 years from to-day there shall be complete independence established there, and in the meantime the guaranty of the great nations shall be secured for the integrity of the Philippine Islands, then it would be a provision that would be worthy of this House.

And in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say to some of the best friends that I ever had a word of warning—to conclude this sentence—that you be careful with what ceremony and under what circumstance you haul down the United States flag anywhere. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] to use the remainder of his time. He has about five minutes. There will be only one more speech on this side.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, whenever I read this bill, I think of Arlington, lying under the very shadow of this Capitol, and of the young officers peacefully sleeping there who joined the majority by reason of wounds received or diseases contracted during the Philippine insurrection; and I can not resist the mute appeal of at least one of them to pay my respects to this bill, which as amended and passed by the Senate would destroy and blot out forever all that they fought and died for.

It appears to be conceded that the Filipinos are not now fitted for self-government, and yet it is proposed to fix arbitrarily a time when the President shall have the power to surrender American sovereignty over them and to recognize their independence. The pending bill in many respects is an admirable one, and provides under proper safeguards for instituting in the islands a larger degree of self-government; but it does not necessarily follow that the experiment will meet with material success, or that the inhabitants thereof will be much better prepared to administer the affairs of government three or four years from now than they are to-day. It seems to me that if they are to have independence the proper time to grant it will be when the people of this country are satisfied that the Filipinos, after a fair trial, are fully capable of legislating for themselves and of establishing and maintaining a stable government. And no human being can arbitrarily fix such time.

I remember as if it were yesterday May 1, 1898—a Sunday, as I recall—when the news flashed across America that Admiral Dewey and his brave men had destroyed the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay. That victory brought with it grave responsibilities. It is useless to discuss whether it was wise or unwise to take possession of the islands. You can not change the course of destiny. "Man proposes, God disposes." The fact is that we took possesssion of the Philippines and acquired a clear title thereto, not only by conquest but later by purchase. For some 17 years we have administered the affairs of the islands; we have materially developed their resources and civilized the inhabitants until to-day Christian and pagan alike there recognize and appreciate the justice, equity, and personal freedom of a republican form of government; we have made the islands sanitary; we have established churches and schools; and we have made great progress in educating the people, in uplifting them, and in developing them intellectually, physically, and morally, until to-day they have the aspirations of a nation.

But the undisputed fact remains that they are our wards. We owe an obligation to them just as much as we owed an obligation to Cuba. Of course the Philippines are much farther away than Cuba is, but the principle involved is the same. We made Cuba free. It was a most magnanimous act, the like of which the world had never seen before, but Cuba—we may say de facto and practically—was our ward, and the statesmen of that day fully lived up to the traditions of this country. They did not turn Cuba adrift, but, under the Platt amendment, retained the right of intervention there, a right that secures to Cuba a republican form of government, stable, efficient, and capable of protecting life and property there.

If an insurrection should spring up in Cuba this Government would undoubtedly intervene. If the inhabitants of Cuba should attempt to set up a monarchy, this Government would undoubtedly intervene. Having established this humane precedent in Cuba, how can we consistently and humanely abandon the Philippines to their fate, and leave them an easy prey of revolution or a helpless victim of appropriation by a stronger power, which might establish a monarchy there. Think of the President of the United States entering into negotiations with the king of the Philippines! Why, if that time should ever come, this Republic would not exist long enough to erase the blot in its record upon the page of the history of time.

Why all this haste to get out of the Philippines? It is said that the people of this country will never favor the creation of a State, or States, out of the islands. While not conceding that, yet assume it for the sake of argument. It is said that American citizenship can not be extended to the inhabitants because they are made up of so many different races that assimilation would be impossible. While not conceding that, yet assume it for the purpose of argument. Still those reasons are wholly insufficient as a defense to the charge of abandonment of our wards. The abandonment of a ward is not a tradition of this country. There must be some other reason, and that reason, whether we concede it or deny it, is, in my judgment, founded upon fear—a fear that the retention of the islands, or any interest in them, is an existing and continuing menace to this country, and that the sooner we are out of there the better. Getting out, bag and baggage, is an easy way of getting rid of a great moral obligation, but it is not the manly thing to do, nor the right thing to do. That might relieve fear and menace somewhat but not wholly. If we are going to act upon such a theory, we might with equal logic make up our minds to abandon Guam, the Samoan Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, the Aleutian Islands, Alaska—yes, the Golden Gate at San Francisco; and then tell the people upon the Pacific coast to go and hide themselves in the Rocky Mountains—a great natural barrier—that probably could not be taken by assault.

It seems to me that we must face our destiny standing firmly upon the rock of right and justice. We are the young giant of the west. We have to-day as integral parts of this Union 48 States, many of them like Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Texas, really empires in themselves, all of them forming a compact, immense territorial area extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Dominion to the Gulf. Our wealth and resources are unlimited. It has been said that we were a billion-dollar country in the days of Speaker Reed. We have grown much since then. Our visible wealth is estimated to-day at upward of $200,000,000,000. No prudent person would venture to estimate how many hundreds of billions of dollars worth of property are stowed away in the bowels of the earth contained in these United States and its possessions.

Why should we permit our action to be controlled by a sense of fear? All the world knows that we do not covet a foot of the territory of any other country. We do not desire war with any nation. We are a great Christian, peace-loving people, devoted to the arts of peace, not to the arts of war. We stand for the preservation of human life, not for its destruction. We have millions of men for the defense of our country, but not a youth to sacrifice in any act of aggression. We have billions of dollars for defense, but not one cent for tribute. We know and feel our strength, but should exert it only in the upholding of human rights and in the advancement of Christianity and civilization. We are not blind, however, to human passions and human greed, and propose to put our house in order and to prepare adequately for the national defense and for the protection of the lives and property of our people.

I know that there are those who say that it requires no prophetic vision to see that in the future—it may be near, God grant it may be far—but in the future, some day, somewhere, a great battle will be fought which may determine the continued existence and perpetuity of this Republic, but which will surely determine whether this Republic shall continue to be the dominant power upon this Western Hemisphere. If that great crisis shall ever come, let this Nation be fully prepared to meet it—prepared to meet it with calmness, with resignation, and with absolute confidence of final victory. It is well to remember, however, that true preparedness does not consist in having the largest army in the world nor the largest navy in the world. There are other elements fully as important as the element of size. Courage, skill, expertness, and above all an absorbing national spirit must exist in the man behind the gun.

I well remember, when a boy upon the farm, a very large rooster called Dominick, king of the barnyard and monarch of all he surveyed. One day my brother brought home a gamecock not more than one-third the size of old Dominick. When the gamecock was put down in the yard the two fowls rushed to-

gether in fierce combat. You could not see anything in the air except feathers, but in less than one minute poor old Dominick had cashed in forever.

So I say that in true preparedness we must not neglect the intellectual, the physical, and moral development of the race. We must stand as a people, always and eternally for the right. We must uphold at all times, at all places, at all hazards, and at all cost the priceless traditions of this country.

And I repeat that the abandonment of a ward is not a tradition of this country. We owe it to ourselves, we owe it to the Philippines, to see that, either through ourselves or in conjunction with other friendly nations, a republican form of government is established and maintained there—a stable government fully capable of protecting the lives and property of the inhabitants thereof. Such a government in due time will not necessarily interfere with the independence of the Filipinos, but such a government will prove a tower of strength to us in the uplifting of our own people, and in their sublime confidence that right and justice must ultimately prevail, and that the traditions of this country affecting human rights, in the future as in the past, shall be regarded as the unwritten parts of the fundamental law of the land.

No justification can exist for hauling down the Stars and Stripes in the Philippines until the mission of this Republic has been completely fulfilled there. Those of us whose families have been sorely afflicted in putting down the insurrection in the islands would like to feel, I think, that the young heroes who, at the happy dawn of manhood, at the threshold of lives full of promise, paid the full sacrifice of war in the service of their country there, did not die in vain; that they were martyrs to the ideals of America; that they consecrated their lives to the cause of human freedom; and that their example, their patriotism, and their devotion to the great cause for which they fought and died shall always be an inspiration to posterity. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, the American soldiers and sailors bared their breasts in the furnace of war in the Philippine Islands, on sea and land, and their sacrifices, death, and privations shall not be in vain. Their work and death brought liberty and opportunity to those 10,000,000 people. Happiness and contentment is now theirs as a result thereof. This Congress of American representatives must not now withdraw and haul down Old Glory. If it is done, the result will be that all our efforts for these people will be wasted. How can we face these brave men, their widows and orphans, if we, now in the very midst of finishing the job that our soldiers and sailors made possible, leave these people to their fate. Oh, Mr. Chairman, where is our patriotism, our love for country, our devotion to the valorous men who went thousands of miles, many never to return, in this hour? Our American manhood must and will assert itself, our better judgment will triumph, and this Clarke amendment will and must be defeated. There are plenty of Americans yet brave enough and thoughtful enough to go on and prepare the Philippine people for self-government. They are not ready yet. This Government has done big things in the past, and we can do them in the future. I will not be one of those to cast my vote for this amendment and make for naught the work of my brave comrades who served so valiantly and well in the far-away Philippine Islands. I stand here ready to do them honor that live, and to honor the memory of those who lost their lives while serving there, or who have died as a result thereof. We owe them a debt of gratitude that can never be repaid.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Philippines eventually being turned over to the Filipino people for government by themselves, and I hope that the time is not far distant when that may be done. I believe, however, that the time is not here now; and among all the men who have been in the Philippines, including Members of this House and of the Senate, I have been unable as yet to find anyone who will agree that the time is now ripe when we should turn those islands over to the Filipino people. Not only have I talked with Members of this House and of the Senate who have been there, but I have talked with men who served there with Dewey, with men who served in the islands with the Army when the Army first went there, with men who have served there ever since, and who are serving there to-day, and I have not been able to find one of them who believes that the Filipinos are able at present to organize and conduct a government of their own. I have talked with men who have come from those islands year after year since the insurrection there, and people tell me that the Japanese are there now, ready and waiting for the American people to haul down the flag, in order that they may start insurrection and trouble there and take those islands, and hoist the flag of the Empire of Japan. You gentlemen will not feel very proud of yourselves if by your votes you succeed in turning those islands over to people who are not now and will not for some years to come be capable of governing themselves, and then as a result of that they fall into the hands of another nation. If you do, the same thing will happen that has happened in the past. They will fall into the hands of stronger men, into the hands of those who have armies and navies. Japan will own the Philippine Islands, and all the blood we have shed and all the money we have spent and all the lives of American soldiers and sailors who have died in those islands will have gone for naught. I believe that while a great many of you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are going to vote for this bill, you are hoping and praying that your votes will not pass it, because you know it would be a crime against the patriotism of this country that the American lives which have been lost there should go for naught, and all that has been accomplished there be sacrificed upon the alter of cowardice; for it would be an act of cowardice to haul down the American flag at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time remaining to this side to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, during this long debate many gentlemen have made reference to the fact that this is the anniversary of the naval battle of Manila Bay, a glorious day in the history of the American Republic. Not only to-day but through all the years the memory of that event has thrilled and will continue to thrill the hearts of the American people, and the reason has been and is that the American people understood what Dewey and his men were then fighting for, namely, human liberty and Cuban independence. [Applause.]

In subsequent days, when our troops were ordered into the Philippines to fight the Filipino people, who at that particular time were standing for nothing save that for which the Cubans had been standing, and our boys were dying in those tropical lands, struggling against the very principle that Dewey had fought for in Manila Bay, did the American people thrill with pride? Of course, there was appreciation of the bravery and courage of our soldiers who obeyed orders. I would not reflect upon them; but tell me, where out of all that war of coercion did there ever come a poem or a song that will live in history and prove a matter of pride to the generations that are to follow us? Oh, it is said, and I do not deny it—I take pride in the fact—that since our occupation we have been altruistic and liberal toward those people. I do not come here now to criticize any particular administration. Of course there may be some matters of detail in the past administrations of the affairs of the Philippine Islands with which I would not agree, but let us grant that our course has been wholly altruistic. What of it? I have been somewhat interested to see the different angles from which gentlemen have approached this question. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] who spoke a few moments ago, and others approached it from what they chose to term in some respects the Christian and educational standpoint. Others approached it from the standpoint of glory, others from the standpoint of fame. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] approached it, if I understood him correctly, from all these standpoints, and he would tread all these paths provided they were made luminous by 5 per cent. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Another gentleman has had much to say of treaty obligations to Spain. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] insisted that by reason of the treaty which was made between this country and Spain we undertook certain obligations for the protection of Spanish property, and that that solemn responsibility rests upon us by treaty entered into and ratified by this Government. Gentlemen, I have heard that suggested before. Perhaps some may be impressed by it, and therefore I venture to read to you now all that is contained in that treaty concerning the obligation of this country to protect Spanish rights:

ART. 4. The United States will, for the term of 10 years from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty, admit Spanish ships and merchandise to the ports of the Philippine Islands on the same terms as ships and merchandise of the United States.

ART. 13. The rights of property secured by copyrights and patents acquired by Spaniards in the island of Cuba and in Porto Rico, the Philippines, and other ceded territory at the time of the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty shall continue to be respected. Spanish scientific, literary, and artistic works, not subversive of public order in the territories in question, shall continue to be admitted free of

duty into such territories for the period of 10 years, to be reckoned from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty.

That, Mr. Chairman, is all that is in the treaty with reference to the guaranty of any right of Spain or any Spanish citizen. Well, the 10 years have long since gone by, and certainly no gentleman will say that that argument has not gone glimmering. But other gentlemen, even my good friend from Kansas——

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Very briefly, if you please.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. How about article 10 of the treaty with Spain?

Mr. GARRETT. I have stated every guaranty of property of Spain in that treaty. I am quite pressed for time, as the gentleman——

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It is only three lines, and I hope the gentleman will read it.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman knows I have not the time now.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It guarantees religious freedom.

Mr. GARRETT. That is not a guaranty of property rights; that is a protection of the inhabitants of the territory she was ceding. The gentleman evidently did not understand the argument.

My good friend from Kansas approaches it from the angle of not tearing down the flag. Well, Mr. Chairman, my idea about the question of pulling down the flag is that it depends very much upon what that flag was put up for. If the flag represented in the Philippine Islands what it represents here I should not favor pulling down the flag, but it does not represent it. The Filipino people were bought and then whipped. I do not believe that this Government has ever had a mission, moral or legal, for establishing a government over another people against that people's will.

I undertake to say that it is contrary to the whole spirit of the United States Republic; that it is in violation of all for which this Government has stood.

I believe that if we do not correct this error, if we do not discontinue this policy, if we do not return to the ideals and traditions of a republic standing firmly by them, that it will not be long until this Republic will have gone the way of all other Republics and will become nothing but an imperialism in fact, although the form of republic may be for a time sustained as a hollow mockery. [Applause.]

I venture to hope that it is not yet too late, Mr. Chairman, to return to the ideals, to go back to the old traditions for which our fathers so willingly died—the old traditions and spirit of this Republic which are at once the glory of history and the hope of all the future. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were 155 ayes and 129 noes.

Mr. JONES. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were 193 ayes and 151 noes.

So the motion prevailed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in place of section 34, stricken out:

"SEC. 34. The President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines; and he shall, on behalf of the United States, fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation, and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof; and full power to take the several steps necessary to institute such government is hereby conferred upon the said Philippines, acting by and through governmental agencies created by this act. This transfer of possession, sovereignty, and governmental control shall be completed and become absolute not less than two years nor more than six years from the date of the approval of this act, under the terms and in the manner hereinafter prescribed: *Provided*, That if the President, prior to the expiration of the said period of six years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines, in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof, is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of six years, and thus afford the Congress an opportunity in its discretion to further consider the situation in the said Philippines; but any such extension of time by the President shall not otherwise suspend or nullify the operative force of this act unless the Congress shall hereafter so direct. For the purpose of a complete and prompt compliance with this direction, the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines or others as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the said Philippines, and to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States and of other countries resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein.

"The bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the Government of the Philippine Islands under authority of legislation of Congress shall be payable, both as to principal and interest, at the office of the Treasurer of the United States. The amounts necessary for such payments shall be provided by the Philippine government.

"The President will take such steps as he may deem advisable, and full authority is hereby granted to him for that purpose, to prevent a default of this obligation by the Philippine government or its successors.

"In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President may reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 146, noes 186.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in place of section 34 the following:

"SEC. 34. The President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines, and he shall on behalf of the United States fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof, and full power to take the several steps necessary to institute such government is hereby conferred upon the said Philippines acting by and through governmental agencies created by this act. This transfer of possession, sovereignty, and governmental control shall be completed and become absolute not less than four years nor more than eight years from the date of the approval of this act, under the terms and in the manner hereinafter prescribed: *Provided*, That if the President, prior to the expiration of the said period of eight years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of eight years, and thus afford the Congress an opportunity in its discretion to further consider the situation in the said Philippines; but any such extension of time by the President shall not otherwise suspend or nullify the operative force of this act, unless the Congress shall hereafter so direct. For the purpose of a complete and prompt compliance with this direction, the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines or others as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the said Philippines, and to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States and of other countries resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein.

"The bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the government of the Philippine Islands, under authority of legislation of Congress, shall be payable, both as to principal and interest, at the office of the Treasurer of the United States. The amounts necessary for such payments shall be provided by the Philippine government.

"The President will take such steps as he may deem advisable, and full authority is hereby granted to him for that purpose, to prevent a default of this obligation by the Philippine government or its successors.

"In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President may reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were 149 ayes and 188 noes.

Mr. JONES. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 162 ayes and 193 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After section 33 insert, as a new section, the following:

"That the President be, and he is hereby, instructed to take such steps as may be necessary to secure the adhesion of all maritime States interested therein in a declaration and international guaranty whereby the Philippine Islands, and each of them, shall be forever neutralized and placed under the protection of the said powers. Whenever such neutralization shall have become effective the Government of the

United States hereby pledges itself to cede its sovereignty in, to, and over said Philippine Islands to such body as the said maritime States shall have resolved on: *Provided further*, That no State guaranteeing said convention shall ever acquire, hold, grant, or exercise any exclusive or unilateral power, franchise, or domination, authority, or sway in or on or about said Philippine Islands. Said agreement shall provide for the policing of said Philippine Islands by an international force: *And provided further*, That any infraction of this resolution by any signatory power shall ipso facto rescind the adhesion hereto by the United States."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment can not be offered at this point in the bill. The gentleman will have an opportunity to offer that later as the bill is read in the regular way. I will state to the gentleman that we had an agreement by which section 34 of the bill was read for amendment, and that after that had been disposed of we were to read the bill. We are now about to start the reading of the bill, and when it comes to the proper place the gentleman can offer his amendment. I make the point of order that it is not in order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the point of order is well taken. At this time, under agreement heretofore made, section 34 was to be considered out of order.

Mr. SABATH. If that is the case, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of this act and the name "The Philippines" as used in this act shall apply to and include the Philippine Islands 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 III of said treaty, together with those islands embraced in the treaty between Spain and the United States concluded at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the bill which I have in my hand, being H. R. 1, as a substitute for Senate bill 381.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES offers the following as a substitute for Senate bill 381:

"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"——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order right now that the gentleman can not offer a title at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

Mr. JONES. I offer all after the title. Let the Clerk read the preamble.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that the preamble can not be offered at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

Mr. JONES. Then I will offer the preamble at the end, and ask the Clerk to read from the enacting clause.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the provisions of this act and the name "The Philippines" as used in this act shall apply to and include the Philippine Islands 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 III of said treaty, together with those islands embraced in the treaty between Spain and the United States concluded at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900.

SEC. 2. That all inhabitants of the Philippine Islands continuing to reside therein who were Spanish subjects on the 11th day of April, 1899, and then resided in said islands, and their children born subsequent thereto, shall be deemed and held to be citizens of the Philippine Islands, except such as shall have elected to preserve their allegiance to the Crown of Spain in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain, signed at Paris, December 10, 1898, and except such others as have since become citizens of some other country: *Provided*, That the Philippine Legislature, herein provided for, is hereby authorized to provide by law for the acquisition of Philippine citizenship by those natives of the Philippine Islands who do not come within the foregoing provisions, the natives of the insular possessions of the United States, and such other persons residing in the Philippine Islands who are citizens of the United States, or who could become citizens of the United States under the laws of the United States if residing therein.

SEC. 3. That no law shall be enacted in said islands which shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny to any person therein the equal protection of the laws. Private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.

That in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to be heard by himself and counsel, to demand the nature and cause of the accusation against him, to have a speedy and public trial, to meet the witnesses face to face, and to have compulsory process to compel the attendance of witnesses in his behalf.

That no person shall be held to answer for a criminal offense without due process of law; and no person for the same offense shall be twice put in jeopardy of punishment, nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.

That all persons shall before conviction be bailable by sufficient sureties, except for capital offenses.

That no law impairing the obligation of contracts shall be enacted.

That no person shall be imprisoned for debt.

That the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion, insurrection, or invasion the public safety may require it, in either of which events the same may be suspended by the President, or by the Governor General, wherever during such period the necessity for such suspension shall exist.

That no ex post facto law or bill of attainder shall be enacted nor shall the law of primogeniture ever be in force in the Philippines.

That no law granting a title of nobility shall be enacted; and no person holding any office of profit or trust in said islands shall, without the consent of the Congress of the United States, accept any present, emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever from any king, queen, prince, or foreign State.

That excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

That the right to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated.

That slavery shall not exist in said islands; nor shall involuntary servitude exist therein except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted.

That no law shall be passed abridging the freedom of speech or of the press or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for redress of grievances.

That no law shall be made respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and that the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed, and no religious test shall be required for the exercise of civil or political rights. No public money or property shall ever be appropriated, applied, donated, or used directly or indirectly, for the use, benefit, or support of any sect, church, denomination, or system of religion, or for the use, benefit, or support of any priest, preacher, minister, or other religious teacher or dignitary or sectarian institution as such. That no law shall be construed to permit polygamous or plural marriages.

That no money shall be paid out of the treasury except in pursuance of an appropriation by law.

That the rule of taxation in said islands shall be uniform.

That no bill which may be enacted into law shall embrace more than one subject, and that subject shall be expressed in the title of the bill.

That no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the person or things to be seized.

That all money collected on any tax levied or assessed for a special purpose shall be treated as a special fund in the treasury and paid out for such purpose only.

SEC. 4. That all expenses that may be incurred on account of the Government of the Philippines for salaries of officials and the conduct of their offices and departments, and all expenses and obligations contracted for the internal improvement or development of the islands, not, however, including defenses, barracks, and other works undertaken by the United States, shall, except as otherwise specifically provided by the Congress, be paid by the government of the Philippines.

SEC. 5. That the statutory laws of the United States hereafter enacted shall not apply to the Philippine Islands, except when they specifically so provide or it is so provided in this act.

SEC. 6. That the laws now in force in the Philippines shall continue in force and effect, except as altered, amended, or modified herein, until altered, amended, or repealed by the legislative authority herein provided or by act of Congress of the United States.

SEC. 7. That the legislative authority herein provided shall have power, when not inconsistent with this act, by due enactment to amend, alter, modify, or repeal any law, civil or criminal, continued in force by this act as it may from time to time see fit.

This power shall specifically extend, with the limitation herein provided as to the tariff, to all laws relating to revenue and taxation in effect in the Philippines.

SEC. 8. That general legislative power, except as otherwise herein provided, is hereby granted to the Philippine Legislature, authorized by this act.

SEC. 9. That all the property and rights which may have been acquired in the Philippine Islands by the United States under the treaty of peace with Spain, signed December 10, 1898, except such land or other property as has been or shall be designated by the President of the United States for military and other reservations of the Government of the United States, and all lands which may have been subsequently acquired by the government of the Philippine Islands by purchase under the provisions of sections 63 and 64 of the act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, except such as may have heretofore been sold and disposed of in accordance with the provisions of said act of Congress, are hereby placed under the control of the government of said islands, to be administered or disposed of for the benefit of the inhabitants thereof, and the Philippine Legislature shall have power to legislate with respect to all such matters as it may deem advisable; but acts of the Philippine Legislature with reference to land, timber, and mining, hereafter enacted, shall not have the force of law until approved by the President of the United States: *Provided*, That upon the approval of such an act by the Governor General, it shall be by him forthwith transmitted to the President of the United States, and he shall approve or disapprove the same within six months from and after its enactment and submission for his approval, and if not disapproved within such time it shall become a law the same as if it had been specifically approved: *Provided further*, That where lands in the Philippine Islands have been or may be reserved for any public purpose of the United States, and, being no longer required for the purpose for which reserved, have been or may be, by order of the President, placed under the control of the government of said islands to be administered for the benefit of the inhabitants thereof, the order of the President shall be regarded as effectual to give the government of said islands full control and power to administer and dispose of such lands for the benefit of the inhabitants of said islands.

SEC. 10. That, while this act provides that the Philippine government shall have the authority to enact a tariff law, the trade relations between the islands and the United States shall continue to be governed exclusively by laws of the Congress of the United States: *Provided*, That tariff acts or acts amendatory to the tariff of the Philippine Islands shall not become law until they shall receive the approval of the President of the United States, nor shall any act of the Philippine Legislature affecting the currency or coinage laws of the Philippines become a law until it has been approved by the President of the United States: *Provided further*, That the President shall approve or disapprove any act mentioned in the foregoing proviso within six months from and after its enactment and submission for his approval, and if

not disapproved within such time it shall become a law the same as if it had been specifically approved.

SEC. 11. That no export duties shall be levied or collected on exports from the Philippine Islands, but taxes and assessments on property and license fees for franchises, and privileges, and internal taxes, direct or indirect, may be imposed for the purposes of the Philippine government and the provincial and municipal governments thereof, respectively, as may be provided and defined by acts of the Philippine Legislature heretofore enacted, and, where necessary to anticipate taxes and revenues, bonds and other obligations may be issued by the Philippine government or any provincial or municipal government therein, as may be provided by law and to protect the public credit: *Provided, however,* That the entire indebtedness of the Philippine government created by the authority conferred herein shall not exceed at any one time the sum of $15,000,000, exclusive of those obligations known as friar-land bonds, nor that of any Province or municipality a sum in excess of 7 per cent of the aggregate tax valuation of its property at any one time.

SEC. 12. That general legislative powers in the Philippines, except as herein otherwise provided, shall be vested in a legislature which shall consist of two houses, one the senate and the other the house of representatives, and the two houses shall be designated "the Philippine Legislature": *Provided,* That until the Philippine Legislature as herein provided shall have been organized the existing Philippine Legislature shall have all legislative authority herein granted to the government of the Philippine Islands, except such as may now be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Philippine Commission, which is so continued until the organization of the legislature herein provided for the Philippines. When the Philippine Legislature shall have been organized the exclusive legislative jurisdiction and authority exercised by the Philippine Commission shall thereafter be exercised by the Philippine Legislature.

SEC. 13. That the members of the senate of the Philippines, except as herein provided, shall be elected for terms of six and three years, as hereinafter provided, by the qualified electors of the Philippines. Each of the senatorial districts defined as hereinafter provided shall have the right to elect two senators. No person shall be an elective member of the senate of the Philippines who is not a qualified elector and over 30 years of age, and who is not able to read and write either the Spanish or English language, and who has not been a resident of the Philippines for at least two consecutive years and an actual resident of the senatorial district from which chosen for a period of at least one year immediately prior to his election.

SEC. 14. That the members of the house of representatives shall, except as herein provided, be elected triennially by the qualified electors of the Philippines. Each of the representative districts hereinafter provided for shall have the right to elect one representative. No person shall be an elective member of the house of representatives who is not a qualified elector and over 25 years of age, and who is not able to read and write either the Spanish or English language, and who has not been an actual resident of the district from which elected for at least one year immediately prior to his election.

SEC. 15. That until otherwise provided by the Philippine Legislature herein provided for the qualifications of voters for senators and representatives in the Philippines and all officers elected by the people shall be as follows:

Every male citizen of the Philippines 21 years of age or over (except insane and feeble-minded persons and those convicted in a court of competent jurisdiction of an infamous offense since the 13th day of Aug., 1898), who shall have been a resident of the Philippines for one year and of the municipality in which he shall offer to vote for six months next preceding the day of voting, and who is comprised within one of the following classes:

(a) Those who under existing law are legal voters and have exercised the right of suffrage.

(b) Those who own real property to the value of ₱500, or who annually pay ₱30 or more of the established taxes.

(c) Those who are able to read and write either Spanish, English, or a native language.

SEC. 16. That for the purposes of the first election hereafter to the Philippine Legislature, the Philippine Islands shall be divided by the Philippine Commission into 12 senate and 90 representative districts. In establishing senate and representative districts the commission shall establish in the territory not now represented in the Philippine Assembly one senate and nine representative districts. The first election under the provisions of this act shall be held on the first Tuesday of June, 1916, unless the Governor General in his discretion shall fix another date not earlier than 30 nor later than 60 days after the passage of this act: *Provided,* That the Governor General's proclamation shall be published at least 30 days prior to the date fixed for the election, and there shall be chosen at such election one senator from each senate district for a term of three years and one for six years. Thereafter one senator from each district shall be elected from each senate district for a term of six years. That at said first election each representative district shall elect one representative for a term of three years, and triennially thereafter: *Provided,* That the Governor General of the Philippine Islands shall appoint, without the consent of the senate and without restriction as to residence, senators and representatives who will, in his opinion, best represent the senate district and those representative districts which may be included in the territory not now represented in the Philippine Assembly: *Provided further,* That thereafter elections shall be held only on such days and under such regulations as to ballots, voting, and qualifications of electors as may be prescribed by the Philippine Legislature, to which is hereby given authority to redistrict the Philippine Islands and modify, amend, or repeal any provision of this section.

SEC. 17. That the terms of office of elective senators and representatives shall be six and three years, respectively, and shall begin on the date of their election. In case of vacancy among the elective members of the senate or in the house of representatives, special elections may be held in the districts wherein such vacancy occurred under such regulations as may be prescribed by law, but senators or representatives elected in such cases shall hold office only for the unexpired portion of the term wherein the vacancy occurred. Senators and representatives appointed by the Governor General shall hold office until removed by the Governor General.

SEC. 18. That the senate and house of representatives, respectively, shall be the sole judges of the elections, returns, and qualifications of their elective members, and each house may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member. Both houses shall convene at the capital on the 16th day of October next following the election and organize by the election of a speaker or a presiding officer, a clerk, and a sergeant at arms for each house, and such other officers and assistants as may be required. A majority of each house shall constitute a quorum to do business, but a smaller number may meet, adjourn from day to day, and compel the attendance of absent members. The legislature shall hold annual sessions, commencing on the 16th day of October, or, if the 16th day of October be a legal holiday, then on the first day following which is not a legal holiday, in each year. The legislature may be called in special session at any time by the Governor General for general legislation, or for action on such specific subjects as he may designate. No special session shall continue longer than 30 days, and no regular session shall continue longer than 100 days, exclusive of Sundays. The legislature is hereby given the power and authority to change the date of the commencement of its annual sessions.

The senators and representatives shall receive an annual compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the treasury of the Philippine Islands. The senators and representatives shall, in all cases except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective houses and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either house they shall not be questioned in any other place.

No senator or representative shall, during the term for which he may have been elected, be eligible to any office the election to which is vested in the legislative assembly, nor shall be appointed to any office of trust or profit which shall have been created or the emoluments of which shall have been increased during such term.

SEC. 19. That each house of the legislature shall keep a journal of its proceedings and, from time to time, publish the same, and the yeas and nays of the members of either house on any question shall, upon demand of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the journal, and every bill and joint resolution which shall have passed both houses shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the Governor General. If he approve the same he shall sign it; but if not he shall return it with his objections to that house in which it shall have originated, which shall enter the objections at large on its journal and proceed to reconsider it. If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of the members elected to that house shall agree to pass the same, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other house, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of all the members elected to that house it shall be sent to the Governor General, who, in case he shall then not approve, shall transmit the same to the President of the United States. The vote of each house shall be by the yeas and nays, and the names of the members voting for and against shall be entered on the journal. If the President of the United States approve the same he shall sign it and it shall become a law. If he shall not approve same he shall return it to the Governor General so stating, and it shall not become a law: *Provided,* That if any bill or joint resolution shall not be returned by the Governor General as herein provided within 20 days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him the same shall become a law in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the legislature by adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law: *Provided further,* That the President of the United States shall approve or disapprove an act submitted to him under the provisions of this section within six months from and after its enactment and submission for his approval; and if not approved within such time, it shall become a law the same as if it had been specifically approved. The Governor General shall have the power to veto any particular item or items of an appropriation bill, but the veto shall not affect the item or items to which he does not object. The item or items objected to shall not take effect except in the manner heretofore provided in this section as to bills and joint resolutions returned to the legislature without his approval.

All laws enacted by the Philippine Legislature shall be reported to the Congress of the United States, which hereby reserves the power and authority to annul the same. 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.

SEC. 20. That the qualified electors of the Philippine Islands shall, on the first Tuesday in June, 1916, and at the general elections thereafter provided for the election of senators and representatives to the Philippine Legislature, elect two Resident Commissioners to the United States, who shall be entitled to an official recognition as such by all departments upon presentation to the President of a certificate of election by the Governor General of said islands. 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 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, to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States, and the franking privilege allowed by law to Members of Congress. No person shall be eligible to election as Resident Commissioner who is not a bona fide elector of said islands and who does not owe allegiance to the United States and who is not more than 30 years of age and who does not read and write the English language. The two Resident Commissioners elected in June, 1916, shall hold their office from the first Monday in the month of December following until the 4th of March, 1922; and the term of their successors shall be for six years, beginning from the 4th of March following their election. In case of vacancy in the position of Resident Commissioner caused by resignation or otherwise the Governor General may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the Philippine Legislature, which shall then fill such vacancy; but the Resident Cotmmissioner thus elected shall hold office only for the unexpired portion of the term wherein the vacancy occurred.

SEC. 21. That the supreme executive power shall be vested in an executive officer, whose official title shall be "The Governor General of the Philippine Islands." 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. The Governor General shall reside in the Philippine Islands during his official incumbency, and maintain his office at the seat of government. He shall, unless otherwise herein provided, appoint, by and with the consent of the Philippine Senate, such officers as may now be appointed by the Governor General, or such as he is authorized by this act to appoint, or whom he may hereafter be authorized by law to appoint; but appointments made while the senate is not in session shall be effective either until disapproval or until the next adjournment of the senate. He shall have general

supervision and control of all of the departments and bureaus of the Government in the Philippine Islands as far as is not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, and shall be commander in chief of all locally created armed forces and militia. He is hereby vested with the exclusive power to grant pardons and reprieves and remit fines and forfeitures, and may veto any legislation enacted as herein provided. He shall submit within 10 days of the opening of each regular session of the Philippine Legislature a budget of receipts and expenditures, which shall be the basis of the annual appropriation bill. He shall commission all officers that he may be authorized to appoint. He shall be responsible for the faithful execution of the laws of the Philippine Islands and of the United States operative within the Philippine Islands, and whenever it becomes necessary he may call upon the commanders of the military and naval forces of the United States in the islands, or summon the posse comitatus, or call out the militia, or other locally created armed forces to prevent or suppress lawless violence, invasion, insurrection, or rebellion; and he may, in case of rebellion or invasion, or imminent danger thereof, when the public safety requires it, suspend the privileges of the writ of habeas corpus, or place the islands, or any part thereof, under martial law: *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. He shall annually and at such other times as he may be required make such official report of the transactions of the government of the Philippine Islands to an executive department of the United States to be designated by the President, and his said annual report shall be transmitted to the Congress of the United States; and he shall perform such additional duties and functions as may in pursuance of law be delegated or assigned to him by the President.

SEC. 22. That, except as provided otherwise in this act, the executive departments of the Philippine government shall continue as now authorized by law until otherwise provided by the Philippine Legislature. When the Philippine Legislature herein provided shall convene and organize, the Philippine Commission, as such, shall cease and determine, and the members thereof shall vacate their offices as members of said commission: *Provided*, That the heads of executive departments shall continue to exercise their executive functions until the heads of departments provided by the Philippine Legislature pursuant to the provisions of this act are appointed and qualified. The Philippine Legislature may thereafter by appropriate legislation increase the number or abolish any of the executive departments, or make such changes in the names and duties thereof as it may see fit, and shall provide for the appointment and removal of the heads of the executive departments by the Governor General: *Provided*, That all executive functions of the government must be directly under the Governor General or within one of the executive departments under the supervision and control of the Governor General. 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.

SEC. 23. That the President my from time to time designate the head of an executive department of the Philippine government to act as Governor General in the case of a vacancy, the temporary removal, resignation, or disability of the Governor General, or his temporary absence, and the head of the department thus designated shall exercise all the powers and perform all the duties of the Governor General during such vacancy, disability, or absence.

SEC. 24. That the supreme court and the courts of first instance of the Philippine Islands shall possess and exercise jurisdiction as heretofore provided and such additional jurisdiction as shall hereafter be prescribed by law. The municipal courts of said islands shall possess and exercise jurisdiction as now provided by law, subject in all matters in such alteration and amendment as may be hereafter enacted by law; and the chief justice and associate justices of the supreme court shall hereafter be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States. The judges of the court of first instance shall be appointed by the Governor General, by and with the advice and consent of the Philippine Senate: *Provided*, That the admiralty jurisdiction of the supreme court and courts of first instance shall not be changed except by act of Congress. That in all cases pending under the operation of existing laws, both criminal and civil, the jurisdiction shall continue until final judgment and determination.

SEC. 25. That the Supreme Court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review, revise, reverse, modify, or affirm the final judgments and decrees of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands in all actions, cases, causes, and proceedings now pending therein or hereafter determined thereby in which the Constitution or any statute, treaty, title, right, or privilege of the United States is involved, or in causes in which the value in controversy exceeds $25,000, or in which the title or possession of real estate exceeding in value the sum of $25,000, to be ascertained by the oath of either party or of other competent witnesses, is involved or brought in question; and such final judgments or decrees may and can be reviewed, revised, reversed, modified, or affirmed by said Supreme Court of the United States on appeal or writ of error by the party aggrieved within the same time, in the same manner, under the same regulations, and by the same procedure, as far as applicable, as the final judgments and decrees of the district courts of the United States.

SEC. 26. That the Government of the Philippine Islands may grant franchises and rights, including the authority to exercise the right of eminent domain, for the construction and operation of works of public utility and service, and may authorize said works to be constructed and maintained over and across the public property of the United States, including streets, highways, squares, and reservations, and over similar property of the Government of said islands, and may adopt rules and regulations under which the provincial and municipal governments of the islands may grant the right to use and occupy such public property belonging to said Provinces or municipalities: *Provided*, That no private property shall be damaged or taken for any purpose under this section without just compensation, and that such authority to take and occupy land shall not authorize the taking, use, or occupation of any land except such as is required for the actual necessary purposes for which the franchise is granted, and that no franchise or right shall be granted to any individual, firm, or corporation except under the conditions that it shall be subject to amendment, alteration, or repeal by the Congress of the United States, and that lands or rights of use and occupation of lands thus granted shall revert to the governments by which they were respectively granted upon the termination of the franchises and rights under which they were granted or upon their revocation or repeal. That all franchises or rights granted under this act shall forbid the issue of stock or bonds except in exchange for actual cash or for property at a fair valuation equal to the par value of the stock or bonds so issued; shall forbid the declaring of stock or bond dividends, and, in the case of public-service corporations, shall provide for the effective regulation of the charges thereof, for the official inspection and regulation of the books and accounts of such corporations, and for the payment of a reasonable percentage of gross earnings into the treasury of the Philippine Islands or of the Province or municipality within which such franchises are granted and exercised: *Provided further*, That it shall be unlawful for any corporation organized under this act, or for any person, company, or corporation receiving any grant, franchise, or concession from the Government of said islands, to use, employ, or contract for the labor of persons held in involuntary servitude; and any person, company, or corporation so violating the provisions of this act shall forfeit all charters, grants, or franchises for doing business in said islands, in an action or proceeding brought for that purpose in any court of competent jurisdiction by any officer of the Philippine Government, or on the complaint of any citizen of the Philippines, under such regulations and rules as the Philippine Legislature shall prescribe, and in addition shall be deemed guilty of an offense, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000.

SEC. 27. That, except as in this act otherwise provided, the salaries of all the officials of the Philippines not appointed by the President, including deputies, assistants, and other employees, shall be such and be so paid out of the revenues of the Philippines as shall from time to time be determined by the Philippine Legislature. The salaries of all officers and all expenses of the offices of the various officials of the Philippines appointed as herein provided by the President shall also be paid out of the revenues of the Philippines. The annual salaries of the following-named officials appointed by the President and so to be paid shall be: The Governor General, $18,000; in addition thereto he shall be entitled to the occupancy of the buildings heretofore used by the chief executive of the Philippines, with the furniture and effects therein, free of rental; chief justice of the supreme court, $8,000; associate justices of the supreme court, $7,500 each.

SEC. 28. That the provisions of the foregoing section shall not apply to provincial and municipal officials; their salaries and the compensation of their deputies, assistants, and other help, as well as all other expenses incurred by the Provinces and municipalities, shall be paid out of the provincial and municipal revenues in such manner as the Philippine Legislature shall provide.

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. TOWNER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there can be no consideration of a bill that has been offered in its entirety consisting of several sections for another bill which was offered in its entirety. I suggest to the Chair that there is only one circumstance under the authorities and precedents by which one bill can be substituted for another, and that is in a case where a bill has been offered as a substitute for a particular section of a bill being read with the notice that should the substitute be agreed to a motion will be made to strike out the subsequent sections of the bill when they are reached.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman's point of order comes too late, the Clerk having started to read the amendment. Of course I do not admit that the point of order is well taken. I think there are ample precedents for the action which I propose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think the rule is well settled that when the first section of a bill is read it is in order to offer a substitute for the entire bill, if the gentleman offering it gives notice that if the substitute is agreed to he will move to strike out the other sections of the bill as they are read, but the gentleman from Virginia has given no such formal notice.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I will give that notice, that if the substitute is agreed to I will move to strike out all of the other sections of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is not well taken in view of the statement of the gentleman from Virginia, and the Clerk will continue the reading.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman from Virginia state just what this is?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that this is practically the bill which was passed in the last Congress. There are several slight changes, none of which goes to the substance of the bill at all. The changes were unanimously agreed to by the committee. They were mostly suggested, or some of them, by the War Department, and the others by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

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

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman—and I guess it would be in order—before the Senate bill came over from the Senate, the Committee on Insular Affairs had under consideration the Jones bill, as I understand it?

Mr. JONES. The bill that we passed last Congress.

Mr. MANN. And the committee had practically perfected that bill and agreed upon its terms outside of the preamble?

Mr. JONES. We had agreed upon the preamble and all—everything.

Mr. MANN. Evidently the full committee had not agreed upon it. There was a division of sentiment on the preamble. I am speaking of the rest, anyhow, so never mind the preamble. That is not under consideration.

Mr. JONES. I do not think there was any division on that.

Mr. MANN. That is not the question. As I understand, both sides of the committee had practically agreed upon the bill as now offered by the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. JONES. Absolutely.

Mr. MANN. And I think that is satisfactory.

Mr. JONES. Absolutely. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Now, Mr. Chairman, to save time and avoid reading the following section of Senate bill 381, I ask unanimous consent that they all be considered as stricken out.

Mr. FERRIS. Does that include section 34, too?

Mr. JONES. That is already stricken out.

Mr. FERRIS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Does this procedure take away the right to get a separate vote on the striking out of section 34, which was a committee amendment under the former bill?

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. JONES. I think not. The motion I make is to strike out all of the sections beginning at 2 and ending with and including 33.

Mr. FINLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia a question. I understand his request for unanimous consent is beginning with section 2 now of the Senate bill and is stricken out to what section?

Mr. JONES. Beginning with section 2 down to and including section 33, and all the intervening sections.

Mr. FINLEY. Why could not they be stricken out by vote if the House in Committee of the Whole is opposed to it?

Mr. JONES. It would take a great deal more time, and they would have to vote on each one separately.

Mr. FINLEY. I do not care to be put in a position of agreeing to strike out those sections of the Senate bill.

Mr. JONES. We have already agreed on a substitute bill.

Mr. FINLEY. You can do it by vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent——

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask that they be voted on as one amendment.

Mr. FINLEY. I have no objection to that. I do not want to be put in a position of agreeing to strike out those sections of the Senate bill.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman wish them read?

Mr. FINLEY. No; I do not care about that.

Mr. JONES. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the vote be taken on the motion to strike out all of the sections from 2 to 33, inclusive.

Mr. MANN. That is one motion?

Mr. JONES. That is one motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the sections from sections 2 to 33, inclusive, of the Senate bill, and the motion is to strike out those sections. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] if this is a correct statement of the situation as it is now before us? On page 14 of its report the minority says:

> The minority entirely agree with the majority that the Philippines should be given a new fundamental law granting to the people a larger measure of self-government. The minority would gladly support the passage of the Jones bill without the preamble. They would even support the Jones bill with the preamble as a substitute for the Senate bill with the Clarke amendment.

The Clarke amendment has been voted down. Are we now voting on the Jones bill as approved by the minority?

Mr. TOWNER. I have no objection.

Mr. MANN. We have already had it read.

Mr. TOWNER. That has all been disposed of. Now, the question is whether the parts that were the substitution for it will go out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is agreeable to the minority of the committee?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. We will all vote the Republican ticket now. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out sections 2 to 33 of the pending bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Now, Mr. Chairman, the first section of Senate bill 381 was adopted before the amendment was offered.

Mr. MANN. We adopted an amendment in lieu of that. The gentleman offered an amendment to strike that out and insert the substitute.

Mr. JONES. Very well, Mr. Chairman, I offer the preamble, and ask that it be read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the preamble offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the committee has nothing to do with the preamble. The preamble is acted upon in the House after the bill is passed. My recollection is—and it is refreshed by the recollection of others here—that when the Jones bill was under consideration in the last Congress it was decided then that the preamble was not to be acted upon by the Committee of the Whole House. It was acted upon by the House only after the bill had been passed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Illinois is mistaken about that. The preamble was not voted on until after the bill had been; but I think it was voted on in the committee, but not until after the bill had been voted on.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman might be correct, but my recollection is fairly distinct that that was not the case.

Mr. JONES. I feel quite sure that that was the proceeding. I think the gentleman from Illinois himself made the motion that the preamble would not be voted on until the bill had been completed.

Mr. MANN. I think I made the point of order, and it was sustained, that the preamble could not be dealt with until the bill was passed.

Mr. JONES. No; I think it was before the bill was reported to the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Virginia allow me a question?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. After the bill was passed in the House it would be in order to insert a preamble, would it not?

Mr. JONES. My opinion is that it would be in order to insert the preamble in the Committee of the Whole, but not until after the bill had been adopted.

Mr. CANNON. But what object can be gained? It is not necessary to consider the preamble in Committee of the Whole first. The preamble is never voted upon and never amended until after the bill is passed, and therefore, whatever the action of the committee might be, it would not be binding.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order anyhow, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to delay the game.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] withdraws the point of order. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the agreement is, but will there be an opportunity for debate on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will state to the gentleman that it is subject to debate under the five-minute rule.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized for five minutes upon this preamble.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, when the Jones bill was before the House in October, 1914, I called attention to what Judge Thomas M. Cooley said as to the differences between the English colonial system and our own system under the power granted by the Constitution to

govern dependent territory. Judge Cooley says, speaking of these differences:

The Constitution * * * confers power to govern Territories, but in exercising this the United States is a sovereign dealing with dependent territory. * * * In this dependence of the Territories upon the Central Government there is some outward resemblance to the condition of the American colonies under the British Crown; but there are some differences which are important and, indeed, vital. The first of these is that the Territorial condition is understood under the Constitution to be merely temporary and preparatory, and the people of the Territories while it continues are assured of the right to create and establish State institutions for themselves as soon as the population shall be sufficient and the local conditions suitable, while the British colonial system contained no promise or assurance of any but a dependent government indefinitely.

Thus, according to this great jurist, our permanent retention of the Philippine Islands would mean our adoption of the British colonial system. And yet we are a Republic, and one of the cardinal tenets of our political faith is that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

The British colonial system contained no promise or assurance of any but a dependent government indefinitely—

Whereas—

Under the Constitution we hold out to the people of the Territories that when the population shall be sufficient and other conditions suitable they shall be allowed to establish State governments.

The Filipino people differ from us in many ways. They are possessed of domestic and personal virtues. They have intellect and conscience. They have made rapid progress in recent years. But they differ from us ethnologically. They are another race, 7,000 miles away, and is it to be said that they must forever remain subject to us? Will Congress ever admit them to statehood?

That is the question for us to answer before we vote down this preamble.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman please inform the House in what year Judge Cooley rendered that decision or made such remarks? Did he refer to the Territories in the United States proper or did he have the Philippines in mind?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Judge Cooley says that in his work on the Constitution.

Mr. ANTHONY. Was not that before the acquisition of the Philippines?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That has nothing to do with the principle he sets forth.

Mr. ANTHONY. It has. He refers to territory within the United States proper, not to the territory of the Philippine Islands. He speaks of the establishment of State governments.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, the gentleman is entirely mistaken. This is a principle of universal application in so far as our government of Territories is concerned. For example, after the War of 1848 with Mexico the treaty of Guadalcupe-Hidalgo contained a provision that at some time the territory acquired by the United States should be allowed statehood. We kept those people of Mexico and Arizona out of statehood until only a few years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes in which to answer the gentleman from Kansas.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Vote! Vote!

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] has a mistaken idea as to the application of constitutional principles. Judge Cooley was laying down in this work the different way in which, under the Constitution, we must treat dependencies or Territories from the way in which the British Government treats them.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not yield. The British Government has no colonies in England. All the British colonies are beyond the sea——

Mr. ANTHONY. I contend that this country had no Territories or dependencies at the time Judge Cooley wrote that book.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This is a question of great importance, for it vitally affects the future of 9,000,000 of people who are absolutely helpless in our power, and I regret that when one invokes here a principle of constitutional law laid down by so eminent an authority as the late Chief Justice Cooley, gentlemen should seek to silence him by shouting "Vote!" "Vote!"

Mr. Justice Cooley declared that the difference between our treatment of territory and England's treatment of colonies was this, that England holds out no promise of self-government, whereas we hold out the promise that when population is sufficient and conditions suitable, no matter where the Territory is, the inhabitants shall be granted statehood. Are the Filipinos ever to be granted statehood?

I shall vote for this preamble, because as an American I can not say that this Government is forever to hold in subjugation millions of Malays 7,000 miles from our shores.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is upon the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] for the adoption of the preamble which has been reported.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. TOWNER) there were—ayes 199, noes 152.

Accordingly the motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 381) 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 and a preamble, and with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all the amendments thereto to the final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves the previous question on the bill, amendments, and preamble to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment to strike out section 34.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment to strike out sections 2 to 33, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee demands a separate vote on the amendment striking out section 34. The gentleman from South Carolina demands a separate vote on the amendment striking out sections 2 to 33, both inclusive. The Clerk will first report the last-named amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the first-named amendment comes first.

Mr. GARRETT. The vote is to be taken on my demand first.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There are amendments on which no separate vote has been demanded, are there not?

Mr. MANN. There are two amendments.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There are three amendments.

Mr. MANN. Only two amendments except the preamble, and the vote on that comes after the bill is passed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is one amendment to strike out the first section and insert the Jones bill. There is one amendment to strike out section 34, and one to strike out sections 2 to 33.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is correct. There are three amendments.

Mr. FINLEY. Then I demand a separate vote on the first amendment.

The SPEAKER. The vote will first be taken on the amendment striking out section 34.

Mr. FINLEY. I demand a separate vote on the second amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has that right, but we can not take two votes at once. The question is on the amendment to strike out section 34.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. TOWNER. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 213, nays 165, answered "present" 4, not voting 51, as follows:

YEAS—213.

Allen	Beakes	Bruckner	Carter, Mass.
Anderson	Beales	Butler	Cary
Anthony	Bennet	Campbell	Chandler, N. Y.
Austin	Britt	Cannon	Charles
Bacharach	Browne	Capstick	Chiperfield
Barchfeld	Browning	Carew	Coady

Coleman	Graham	McCulloch	Rowland
Conry	Gray, N. J.	McDermott	Russell, Ohio
Cooper, Ohio	Green, Iowa	McFadden	Sanford
Cooper, W. Va.	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Scott, Mich.
Cooper, Wis.	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin	Scott, Pa.
Costello	Griffin	Madden	Sells
Cramton	Hadley	Magee	Siegel
Curry	Hamill	Maher	Sinnott
Dale, N. Y.	Hamilton, Mich.	Mann	Slemp
Dale, Vt.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mapes	Sloan
Dallinger	Hart	Martin	Smith, Idaho
Danforth	Haskell	Matthews	Smith, Mich.
Darrow	Hawley	Meeker	Smith, Minn.
Davis, Minn.	Hayes	Miller, Del.	Smith, N. Y.
Dempsey	Heaton	Miller, Minn.	Snell
Denison	Hernandez	Miller, Pa.	Snyder
Dillon	Hicks	Mondell	Stafford
Dooling	Hill	Mooney	Steenerson
Dowell	Hinds	Moore, Pa.	Stephens, Cal.
Driscoll	Hollingsworth	Moores, Ind.	Sterling
Drukker	Hopwood	Morgan, Okla.	Stiness
Dunn	Howell	Moss, W. Va.	Sulloway
Dyer	Hulbert	Mott	Sutherland
Eagan	Hull, Iowa	Mudd	Sweet
Ellsworth	Humphrey, Wash.	Nelson	Swift
Elston	Husted	Nichols, Mich.	Tague
Emerson	Hutchinson	Nolan	Temple
Esch	Johnson, S. Dak.	North	Tilson
Estopinal	Johnson, Wash.	Oakey	Timberlake
Fairchild	Kahn	Olney	Tinkham
Farley	Kearns	O'Shaunessy	Towner
Farr	Keister	Paige, Mass.	Treadway
Fess	Kelley	Parker, N. J.	Vare
Fitzgerald	Kennedy, Iowa	Parker, N. Y.	Volstead
Flynn	Kent	Patten	Walsh
Focht	Kiess, Pa.	Peters	Ward
Fordney	King	Phelan	Wason
Foss	Kinkaid	Platt	Watson, Pa.
Freeman	Kreider	Powers	Wheeler
Fuller	Lafean	Pratt	Williams, T. S.
Gallagher	La Follete	Ramseyer	Wilson, Ill.
Gallivan	Lehlbach	Reavis	Winslow
Gardner	Lenroot	Ricketts	Wood, Ind.
Garland	Longworth	Riordan	Woods, Iowa
Gillett	Loud	Roberts, Nev.	Young, N. Dak.
Glynn	McAndrews	Rodenberg	
Good	McArthur	Rogers	
Gould	McCracken	Rowe	

NAYS—165.

Abercrombie	Dixon	Jones	Scully
Adamson	Doolittle	Keating	Sears
Aiken	Doremus	Kettner	Shackleford
Alexander	Dupré	Kincheloe	Shallenberger
Almon	Eagle	Kitchin	Sherley
Ashbrook	Edwards	Lazaro	Sherwood
Aswell	Evans	Lee	Sims
Ayres	Ferris	Lesher	Sisson
Bailey	Fields	Lever	Slayden
Barkley	Finley	Linthicum	Smith, Tex.
Barnhart	Foster	Lloyd	Steagall
Bell	Gandy	Lobeck	Stedman
Black	Garner	London	Steele, Iowa
Blackmon	Garrett	McClintic	Steele, Pa.
Booher	Glass	McGillicuddy	Stephens, Miss.
Borland	Goodwin, Ark.	McKellar	Stephens, Tex.
Brumbaugh	Gordon	McLemore	Stout
Buchanan, Tex.	Gray, Ala.	Montague	Sumners
Burgess	Gray, Ind.	Moon	Taggart
Burke	Gregg	Morgan, La.	Tavenner
Byrnes, S. C.	Hamlin	Morrison	Taylor, Ark.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hardy	Moss, Ind.	Taylor, Colo.
Callaway	Harrison	Murray	Thomas
Candler, Miss.	Hastings	Nicholls, S. C.	Thompson
Caraway	Hay	Oldfield	Tillman
Carter, Okla.	Hayden	Oliver	Tribble
Church	Heflin	Overmyer	Van Dyke
Cline	Helm	Padgett	Venable
Collier	Helvering	Page, N. C.	Vinson
Connelly	Hensley	Park	Walker
Cox	Hilliard	Quin	Watson, Va.
Crisp	Holland	Ragsdale	Webb
Crosser	Hood	Rainey	Whaley
Cullop	Houston	Randall	Williams, W. E.
Davenport	Howard	Rauch	Wilson, Fla.
Davis, Tex.	Huddleston	Rayburn	Wilson, La.
Decker	Hughes	Reilly	Wingo
Dent	Hull, Tenn.	Rouse	Wise
Dewalt	Humphreys, Miss.	Rubey	Young, Tex.
Dickinson	Igoe	Rucker	
Dies	Jacoway	Russell, Mo.	
Dill	Johnson, Ky.	Sabath	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Cantrill	Kennedy, R. I.	Lieb	McKinley

NOT VOTING—51.

Adair	Frear	Liebel	Roberts, Mass.
Britten	Gard	Lindbergh	Saunders
Buchanan, Ill.	Godwin, N. C.	Littlepage	Schall
Burnett	Griest	Loft	Shouse
Caldwell	Guernsey	Mays	Small
Carlin	Haugen	Morin	Sparkman
Casey	Helgesen	Neely	Stephens, Nebr.
Clark, Fla.	Henry	Norton	Stone
Copley	James	Oglesby	Switzer
Crago	Key, Ohio	Porter	Talbott
Doughton	Konop	Pou	Watkins
Edmonds	Langley	Price	Williams, Ohio
Flood	Lewis	Raker	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. HAUGEN.

Mr. SCHALL (for amendment) with Mr. FLOOD (against).

Mr. NEELY with Mr. HELGESEN.

Mr. POU with Mr. CRAGO.

Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. FREAR.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. JAMES with Mr. KONOP (commencing April 26 until further notice by either).

On this vote:

Mr. LITTLEPAGE (against amendment) with Mr. OGLESBY (for).

Mr. GUERNSEY (for amendment) with Mr. WATKINS (against).

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts (for amendment striking out section 34) with Mr. TALBOTT (against).

Mr. COPLEY (for amendment) with Mr. GARD (against).

Mr. GRIEST (for amendment) with Mr. ADAIR (against).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio (for amendment) with Mr. SMALL (against).

Mr. SWITZER (for amendment to strike out section 34) with Mr. LIEB (against).

Mr. MCKINLEY (for amendment to strike out section 34) with Mr. CLARK of Florida (against).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for amendment) with Mr. SAUNDERS (against).

Mr. LINDBERGH (for amendment) with Mr. RAKER (against).

Mr. PORTER (for amendment) with Mr. HENRY (against).

Mr. NORTON (for amendment) with Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois (against).

Mr. EDMONDS (for amendment) with Mr. BURNETT (against).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SAUNDERS. I voted "aye." I wish to withdraw that vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island was called, and he answered "Present," as above recorded.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The vote will now be taken on the amendment striking out section 1 and substituting the Jones bill.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FINLEY. At what point does that amendment begin?

The SPEAKER. It strikes out section 1. This is not the amendment the gentleman desired a separate vote upon. That will come after the vote on this amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment striking out section 1 and substituting therefor the Jones bill.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The vote is now on the question of striking out sections 2 to 33, both inclusive.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINLEY) there were—ayes 251, noes 17.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, this involves the Senate provision giving prohibition to the Philippines, and I think we ought to have a roll call on the House amendment striking out the Senate provision, and I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Seventeen Members, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the preamble.

The preamble was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendments and ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House insist upon its amendments and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to instruct the conferees, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FITZGERALD offers the following:

"That the managers on the part of the House are instructed not to agree to any declaration or provision setting a definite time, or fixing a *definite* period, at or within which the Philippines shall be granted independence."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARRETT) there were—ayes 191, noes 149.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be in order now to move to adjourn?

The SPEAKER. It is always in order to move to adjourn.

Mr. SABATH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 157, nays 209, answered "present" 1, not voting 66, as follows:

YEAS—157.

Abercrombie	Doremus	Johnson, Ky.	Rucker
Adamson	Doughton	Jones	Russell, Mo.
Aiken	Dupré	Keating	Sabath
Alexander	Eagle	Kincheloe	Sears
Allen	Edwards	Kitchin	Shackleford
Almon	Estopinal	Lazaro	Shallenberger
Ashbrook	Evans	Lee	Sherley
Aswell	Ferris	Lesher	Sherwood
Ayres	Fields	Lever	Sims
Bailey	Finley	Lieb	Sisson
Barkley	Foster	Linthicum	Slayden
Barnhart	Gandy	Lloyd	Smith, Tex.
Bell	Garner	Lobeck	Steagall
Black	Garrett	London	Stedman
Blackmon	Glass	McClintic	Stephens, Miss.
Booher	Goodwin, Ark.	McGillicuddy	Stephens, Tex.
Borland	Gordon	McKellar	Sumners
Brumbaugh	Gray, Ala.	McLemore	Taggart
Buchanan, Tex.	Gray, Ind.	Montague	Tavenner
Burke	Hamlin	Moon	Taylor, Ark.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy	Morgan, La.	Taylor, Colo.
Byrns, Tenn.	Harrison	Morrison	Thomas
Callaway	Hastings	Moss, Ind.	Thompson
Candler, Miss.	Hay	Murray	Tillman
Carter, Okla.	Hayden	Nicholls, S. C.	Tribble
Cline	Heflin	Oldfield	Van Dyke
Collier	Helm	Oliver	Venable
Cox	Helvering	Overmyer	Vinson
Crisp	Hensley	Padgett	Walker
Crosser	Hilliard	Page, N. C.	Watson, Va.
Cullop	Holland	Park	Webb
Davenport	Hood	Quin	Whaley
Davis, Tex.	Houston	Ragsdale	Williams, W. E.
Decker	Howard	Rainey	Wilson Fla.
Dent	Huddleston	Randall	Wingo
Dickinson	Hughes	Rauch	Wise
Dies	Hull, Tenn.	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
Dill	Humphreys, Miss.	Reilly	
Dixon	Igoe	Rouse	
Doolittle	Jacoway	Rubey	

NAYS—209.

Anderson	Dale, N. Y.	Gallagher	Hulbert
Anthony	Dale, Vt.	Gallivan	Hull, Iowa
Austin	Dallinger	Gardner	Humphrey, Wash.
Bacharach	Danforth	Garland	Husted
Barchfeld	Darrow	Gillett	Hutchinson
Beakes	Davis, Minn.	Glynn	Johnson, S. Dak.
Beales	Dempsey	Good	Johnson, Wash.
Bennet	Denison	Gould	Kahn
Britt	Dillon	Graham	Kearns
Browne	Dooling	Gray, N. J.	Keister
Browning	Dowell	Green, Iowa	Kelley
Bruckner	Driscoll	Greene, Mass.	Kennedy, Iowa
Butler	Drukker	Greene, Vt.	Kennedy, R. I.
Campbell	Dunn	Griffin	Kent
Cannon	Dyer	Hadley	Kiess, Pa.
Capstick	Eagan	Hamill	King
Carew	Ellsworth	Hamilton, Mich.	Kinkaid
Carter, Mass.	Elston	Hamilton, N. Y.	Kreider
Cary	Emerson	Hart	Lafean
Chandler, N. Y.	Esch	Haskell	Lehlbach
Charles	Fairchild	Haugen	Lenroot
Chiperfield	Farley	Hawley	Longworth
Coady	Farr	Hayes	Loud
Coleman	Fess	Heaton	McAndrews
Conry	Fitzgerald	Hernandez	McArthur
Cooper, Ohio	Flynn	Hicks	McCracken
Cooper, W. Va.	Focht	Hill	McCulloch
Cooper, Wis.	Fordney	Hinds	McDermott
Costello	Foss	Hollingsworth	McFadden
Cramton	Freeman	Hopwood	McKenzie
Curry	Fuller	Howell	McLaughlin
Madden	Olney	Scott, Pa.	Temple
Magee	O'Shaunessy	Siegel	Tilson
Maher	Paige, Mass.	Sinnott	Timberlake
Mann	Parker, N. J.	Siemp	Tinkham
Mapes	Parker, N. Y.	Sloan	Towner
Martin	Peters	Smith, Idaho	Treadway
Matthews	Phelan	Smith, Mich.	Vare
Meeker	Platt	Smith, Minn.	Volstead
Miller, Del.	Powers	Smith, N. Y.	Walsh
Miller, Minn.	Pratt	Snell	Ward
Miller, Pa.	Ramseyer	Snyder	Wason
Mondell	Reavis	Stafford	Watson, Pa.
Mooney	Ricketts	Steele, Iowa	Wheeler
Moore, Pa.	Riordan	Steenerson	Williams, T. S.
Moores, Ind.	Roberts, Nev.	Stephens, Cal.	Wilson, Ill.
Morgan, Okla.	Rodenberg	Sterling	Winslow
Moss, W. Va.	Rogers	Stiness	Wood, Ind.
Mudd	Rowe	Sulloway	Woods, Iowa
Nelson	Rowland	Sutherland	Young, N. Dak.
Nichols, Mich.	Russell, Ohio	Sweet	
Nolan	Sanford	Swift	
Oakey	Scott, Mich.	Tague	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Cantrill

NOT VOTING—66.

Adair	Frear	Littlepage	Schall
Britten	Gard	Loft	Scully
Buchanan, Ill.	Godwin, N. C.	McKinley	Sells
Burgess	Gregg	Mays	Shouse
Burnett	Griest	Morin	Small
Caldwell	Guernsey	Mott	Sparkman
Caraway	Helgesen	Neely	Steele, Pa.
Carlin	Henry	North	Stephens, Nebr.
Casey	James	Norton	Stone
Church	Kettner	Oglesby	Stout
Clark, Fla.	Key, Ohio	Patten	Switzer
Connelly	Konop	Porter	Talbott
Copley	La Follette	Pou	Watkins
Crago	Langley	Price	Williams, Ohio
Dewalt	Lewis	Raker	Wilson, La.
Edmonds	Liebel	Roberts, Mass.	
Flood	Lindbergh	Saunders	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. JAMES with Mr. KONOP.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. GARD with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. FREAR.

Mr. POU with Mr. CRAGO.

Mr. NEELY with Mr. HELGESEN.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio.

Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. NORTH.

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. KETTNER with Mr. SCHALL.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. LIEB with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. RAKER with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. LA FOLLETTE.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the previous question, on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GARRETT. The yeas and nays were ordered on that.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] to demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Journal shows that the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk will call the roll on the motion for the previous question.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 208, nays 150, answered "present" 3, not voting 72, as follows:

YEAS—208.

Allen	Cannon	Cramton	Dunn
Anderson	Capstick	Curry	Dyer
Anthony	Carew	Dale, N. Y.	Eagan
Austin	Carter, Mass.	Dale, Vt.	Ellsworth
Bacharach	Cary	Dallinger	Elston
Barchfeld	Chandler, N. Y.	Danforth	Emerson
Beakes	Charles	Darrow	Esch
Beales	Chiperfield	Davis, Minn.	Estopinal
Bennet	Coady	Dempsey	Fairchild
Britt	Coleman	Denison	Farley
Browne	Conry	Dillon	Farr
Browning	Cooper, Ohio	Dooling	Fess
Bruckner	Cooper, W. Va.	Dowell	Fitzgerald
Butler	Cooper, Wis.	Driscoll	Flynn
Campbell	Costello	Drukker	Focht

Fordney	Humphrey, Wash.	Miller, Minn.	Sinnott
Foss	Husted	Miller, Pa.	Slemp
Freeman	Hutchinson	Mondell	Sloan
Fuller	Igoe	Mooney	Smith, Idaho
Gallagher	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Pa.	Smith, Mich.
Gallivan	Kahn	Moores, Ind.	Smith, Minn.
Gardner	Kearns	Morgan, Okla.	Smith, N. Y.
Garland	Kelster	Moss, W. Va.	Snell
Gillett	Kelley	Mott	Snyder
Glynn	Kennedy, Iowa	Mudd	Stafford
Good	Kennedy, R. I.	Nelson	Steenerson
Gould	Kent	Nichols, Mich.	Stephens, Cal.
Graham	King	Nolan	Sterling
Gray, N. J.	Kinkaid	Oakey	Stiness
Green, Iowa	Kreider	Olney	Sulloway
Greene, Mass.	Lafean	O'Shaunessy	Sutherland
Greene, Vt.	Lehlbach	Paige, Mass.	Sweet
Griffin	Lenroot	Parker, N. J.	Swift
Hadley	Longworth	Parker, N. Y.	Tague
Hamill	Loud	Peters	Tilson
Hamilton, Mich.	McAndrews	Phelan	Timberlake
Hamilton, N. Y.	McArthur	Platt	Tinkham
Hart	McCracken	Powers	Towner
Haskell	McCulloch	Pratt	Treadway
Haugen	McDermott	Ramseyer	Vare
Hawley	McFadden	Reavis	Volstead
Hayes	McKenzie	Ricketts	Walsh
Heaton	McLaughlin	Riordan	Ward
Hernandez	Madden	Rodenberg	Wason
Hicks	Magee	Rogers	Watson, Pa.
Hill	Maher	Rowe	Wheeler
Hinds	Mann	Rowland	Williams, T. S.
Hollingsworth	Mapes	Russell, Ohio	Wilson, Ill.
Hopwood	Martin	Sanford	Winslow
Howell	Matthews	Scott, Mich.	Wood, Ind.
Hulbert	Meeker	Scott, Pa.	Woods, Iowa
Hull, Iowa	Miller, Del.	Siegel	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—150.

Abercrombie	Doremus	Kincheloe	Scully
Adamson	Doughton	Kitchin	Sears
Aiken	Dupré	Lazaro	Shackleford
Alexander	Eagle	Lee	Shallenberger
Almon	Edwards	Lesher	Sherley
Ashbrook	Ferris	Lever	Sherwood
Aswell	Fields	Linthicum	Sims
Ayres	Finley	Lloyd	Sisson
Bailey	Foster	Lobeck	Slayden
Barkley	Gandy	London	Smith, Tex.
Barnhart	Garner	McClintic	Steagall
Bell	Garrett	McGillicuddy	Stedman
Black	Glass	McKellar	Steele, Iowa
Blackmon	Goodwin, Ark.	McLemore	Stephens, Miss.
Borland	Gordon	Montague	Stephens, Tex.
Brumbaugh	Gray, Ala.	Moon	Sumners
Buchanan, Tex.	Gray, Ind.	Morgan, La.	Taggart
Burke	Hardy	Morrison	Tavenner
Byrnes, S. C.	Harrison	Moss, Ind.	Taylor, Ark.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hastings	Murray	Taylor, Colo.
Callaway	Hay	Nicholls, S. C.	Thomas
Candler, Miss.	Hayden	Oldfield	Thompson
Carter, Okla.	Heflin	Oliver	Tillman
Cline	Helm	Overmyer	Tribble
Collier	Helvering	Page, N. C.	Van Dyke
Cox	Hensley	Park	Venable
Crisp	Hilliard	Quin	Vinson
Crosser	Hood	Ragsdale	Walker
Cullop	Howard	Rainey	Watson, Va.
Davenport	Huddleston	Randall	Webb
Davis, Tex.	Hughes	Rauch	Whaley
Decker	Hull, Tenn.	Reyburn	Williams, W. E.
Dent	Humphreys, Miss.	Reilly	Wilson, Fla.
Dickinson	Jacoway	Rouse	Wingo
Dies	Johnson, Ky.	Rubey	Wise
Dill	Jones	Rucker	Young, Tex.
Dixon	Keating	Russell, Mo.	
Doolittle	Kettner	Sabath	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Cantrill	Johnson, Wash.	Lieb

NOT VOTING—72.

Adair	Flood	Lewis	Roberts, Mass.
Booher	Frear	Liebel	Roberts, Nev.
Britten	Gard	Lindbergh	Saunders
Buchanan, Ill.	Godwin, N. C.	Littlepage	Schall
Burgess	Gregg	Loft	Sells
Burnett	Griest	McKinley	Shouse
Caldwell	Guernsey	Mays	Small
Caraway	Hamlin	Morin	Sparkman
Carlin	Helgesen	Neely	Steele, Pa.
Casey	Henry	North	Stephens, Nebr.
Church	Holland	Norton	Stone
Clark, Fla.	Houston	Oglesby	Stout
Connelly	James	Padgett	Switzer
Copley	Key, Ohio	Patten	Talbott
Crago	Kiess, Pa.	Porter	Temple
Dewalt	Konop	Pou	Watkins
Edmonds	La Follette	Price	Williams, Ohio
Evans	Langley	Raker	Wilson, La.

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. PATTEN with Mr. TEMPLE.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. SCHALL.

Mr. EVANS with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. RAKER with Mr. LA FOLLETTE.

Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

On the vote:

Mr. HAMLIN (against) with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington (for).

Mr. LIEB. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. In the negative.

Mr. LIEB. I am paired with Mr. SWITZER, of Ohio. I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. LIEB, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion in the nature of instructions to the conferees.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the motion of instruction to the conferees, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 203, nays 156, answered "present" 3, not voting 71, as follows:

YEAS—203.

Anderson	Farr	Kent	Reavis
Anthony	Fess	King	Ricketts
Austin	Fitzgerald	Kinkaid	Riordan
Bacharach	Flynn	Kreider	Rodenberg
Barchfeld	Focht	Lafean	Rogers
Beakes	Fordney	Lehlbach	Rowe
Beales	Foss	Lenroot	Rowland
Bennet	Freeman	Longworth	Russell, Ohio
Britt	Fuller	Loud	Sanford
Browne	Gallagher	McAndrews	Scott, Mich.
Browning	Gallivan	McArthur	Scott, Pa.
Bruckner	Gardner	McCracken	Siegel
Butler	Garland	McCulloch	Sinnott
Campbell	Gillett	McDermott	Slemp
Cannon	Glynn	McFadden	Sloan
Capstick	Good	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Carew	Gould	McLaughlin	Smith, Mich.
Carter, Mass.	Graham	Madden	Smith, Minn.
Cary	Gray, N. J.	Magee	Smith, N. Y.
Chandler, N. Y.	Green, Iowa	Maher	Snell
Charles	Greene, Mass.	Mann	Snyder
Chiperfield	Greene, Vt.	Mapes	Stafford
Coady	Griffin	Martin	Steenerson
Coleman	Hadley	Matthews	Stephens, Cal.
Conry	Hamill	Meeker	Sterling
Cooper, Ohio	Hamilton, Mich.	Miller, Del.	Stiness
Cooper, W. Va.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller, Minn.	Sulloway
Costello	Hart	Miller, Pa.	Sutherland
Crampton	Haskell	Mondell	Sweet
Dale, N. Y.	Haugen	Mooney	Swift
Dale, Vt.	Hawley	Moore, Pa.	Tague
Dallinger	Hayes	Moores, Ind.	Temple
Danforth	Heaton	Morgan, Okla.	Tilson
Darrow	Hernandez	Moss, W. Va.	Timberlake
Davis, Minn.	Hicks	Mott	Tinkham
Dempsey	Hinds	Mudd	Towner
Denison	Hollingsworth	Nelson	Treadway
Dillon	Hopwood	Nichols, Mich.	Vare
Dooling	Howell	Nolan	Volstead
Dowell	Hulbert	Oakey	Walsh
Driscoll	Hull, Iowa	Olney	Ward
Drukker	Humphrey, Wash.	O'Shaunessy	Wason
Dunn	Husted	Paige, Mass.	Watson, Pa.
Dyer	Hutchinson	Parker, N. J.	Wheeler
Eagan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parker, N. Y.	Williams, T. S.
Ellsworth	Kahn	Peters	Wilson, Ill.
Elston	Kearns	Phelan	Winslow
Emerson	Kelster	Platt	Wood, Ind.
Esch	Kelley	Powers	Woods, Iowa
Fairchild	Kennedy, Iowa	Pratt	Young, N. Dak.
Farley	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramseyer	

NAYS—156.

Abercrombie	Caraway	Edwards	Hilliard
Adamson	Carter, Okla.	Estopinal	Hood
Aiken	Cline	Ferris	Houston
Alexander	Collier	Fields	Howard
Allen	Cox	Finley	Huddleston
Almon	Crisp	Foster	Hughes
Ashbrook	Crosser	Gandy	Hull, Tenn.
Aswell	Cullop	Garner	Humphreys, Miss.
Ayres	Curry	Garrett	Igoe
Bailey	Davenport	Glass	Jacoway
Barkley	Davis, Tex.	Goodwin, Ark.	Johnson, Ky.
Barnhart	Decker	Gordon	Jones
Bell	Dent	Gray, Ala.	Keating
Black	Dewalt	Gray, Ind.	Kettner
Blackmon	Dickinson	Hardy	Kincheloe
Borland	Dies	Harrison	Kitchin
Brumbaugh	Dill	Hastings	Lazaro
Buchanan, Tex.	Dixon	Hay	Lee
Burke	Doolittle	Hayden	Lesher
Byrnes, S. C.	Doremus	Heflin	Lever
Byrns, Tenn.	Doughton	Helm	Lieb
Callaway	Dupré	Helvering	Linthicum
Candler, Miss.	Eagle	Hensley	Lloyd

Lobeck	Park	Sherley	Taylor, Colo.
London	Quin	Sherwood	Thomas
McClintic	Ragsdale	Sims	Thompson
McGillicuddy	Randall	Sisson	Tillman
McKellar	Rauch	Slayden	Tribble
McLemore	Rayburn	Smith, Tex.	Venable
Montague	Reilly	Steagall	Vinson
Moon	Rouse	Stedman	Walker
Morrison	Rubey	Steele, Iowa	Watson, Va.
Moss, Ind.	Rucker	Steele, Pa.	Webb
Murray	Russell, Mo.	Stephens, Miss.	Whaley
Nicholls, S. C.	Sabath	Stephens, Tex.	Williams, W. E.
Oldfield	Scully	Sumners	Wilson, Fla.
Oliver	Sears	Taggart	Wingo
Overmyer	Shackleford	Tavenner	Wise
Page, N. C.	Shallenberger	Taylor, Ark.	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Cantrill	Johnson, Wash.	Rainey

NOT VOTING—71.

Adair	Frear	Liebel	Roberts, Mass.
Booher	Gard	Lindbergh	Roberts, Nev.
Britten	Godwin, N. C.	Littlepage	Saunders
Buchanan, Ill.	Gregg	Loft	Schall
Burgess	Griest	McKinley	Sells
Burnett	Guernsey	Mays	Shouse
Caldwell	Hamlin	Morgan, La.	Small
Carlin	Helgesen	Morin	Sparkman
Casey	Henry	Neely	Stephens, Nebr.
Church	Hill	North	Stone
Clark, Fla.	Holland	Norton	Stout
Connelly	James	Oglesby	Switzer
Cooper, Wis.	Key, Ohio	Padgett	Talbott
Copley	Kiess, Pa.	Patten	Van Dyke
Crago	Konop	Porter	Watkins
Edmonds	La Follette	Pou	Williams, Ohio
Evans	Langley	Price	Wilson, La.
Flood	Lewis	Raker	

So the motion to instruct the conferees was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. HAMLIN with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.

Mr. RAINEY with Mr. HILL.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. MANN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed and the preamble agreed to was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. JONES, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. TOWNER.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. 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 11 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 2, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of Labor submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the service of the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 1078), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CAPSTICK, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11129) for the relief of the owners of the barkentine *Mabel I. Meyers* and her master and crew, and for the relief of the owners of cargo of molasses late on board said barkentine, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 620), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and a resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 15225) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 15226) to provide for a reserve force of officers for the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 15227) to revise, amend, and codify the laws relating to publicity of contributions and expenditures made for the purpose of influencing the nomination and election of candidates for the offices of Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States, extending the same to candidates for nomination and election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, limiting the amount which may be expended, providing for the publicity of campaign expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 15264) to authorize the town of Nome, Alaska, to issue bonds for municipal purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 15265) providing for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building for the Weehawken post office, in the town of Union, Hudson County, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 213) proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to authorize the Congress to enact laws to define and limit the causes for divorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 15228) granting a pension to Sarah E. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 15229) granting a pension to Thomas M. Michael; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15230) granting a pension to Teddy Sexton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15231) granting an increase of pension to James Jeffers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANDLER of New York: A bill (H. R. 15232) granting an increase of pension to Grace W. Post; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 15233) for the relief of William A. Persons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 15234) granting an increase of pension to George L. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15235) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15236) granting an increase of pension to Barton Kearns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 15237) granting an increase of pension to Morgan C. Story; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 15238) granting a pension to Augusta Hoecker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15239) granting an increase of pension to Felix Karl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 15240) for the relief of estate of Sybil A. Penniman; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 15241) granting a pension to Martha A. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 15242) granting a pension to Charles D. Skirdin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOOD: A bill (H. R. 15243) granting a pension to Thomas E. Devlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15244) for the relief of the legal representatives of W. W. Dennis, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 15245) granting a pension to John McCabe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 15246) granting a pension to Frank Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 15247) granting an increase of pension to Reuben R. Vail; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 15248) granting an increase of pension to Cordelia Mulford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 15249) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Markle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15250) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Stonesifer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 15251) granting an increase of pension to Albert Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 15252) granting a pension to Samuel M. Deets; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 15253) granting an increase of pension to Aurelius Bonifield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15254) correcting the military record of William H. Murphey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 15255) granting an increase of pension to William N. Grimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 15256) granting an increase of pension to Alfred T. Hawk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 15257) granting an increase of pension to Betsey La Joy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 15258) granting a pension to Julius Meincke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 15259) granting an increase of pension to Richard Levi; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 15260) granting a pension to Sam Moses; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 15261) granting a pension to Calista E. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 15262) granting an increase of pension to Maria O'Connor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 15263) granting a pension to Katharina Sternberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 15266) granting an increase of pension to John Kelsor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 15267) granting a pension to Daniel J. Keefe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 15268) for the relief of James P. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 15269) granting a pension to Thomas J. Hunt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 15270) granting an increase of pension to Adam Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15271) granting an increase of pension to Sarah D. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 15272) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Huddleston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 15273) for the relief of William H. Dooley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15274) for the relief of George Humphrey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUSTED: A bill (H. R. 15275) granting an increase of pension to James Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15276) granting an increase of pension to William H. Park; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 15277) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Davenport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15278) granting an increase of pension to John S. Prior; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 15279) granting a pension to Lucinda Jenison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15280) granting a pension to Ann E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 15281) granting an increase of pension to James M. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15282) authorizing the health officer of the District of Columbia to issue a permit for the removal of the remains of the late Charles H. Bingham from the Congressional Cemetery, District of Columbia, to Lock Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Boston Typographical Union, of Boston, indorsing the Lewis bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, indorsing the Newlands bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of Cincinnati Branch of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, favoring prohibition for all Territories under jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, memorial of City Council of Cincinnati, favoring civil-service retirement; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Memorial of Friends of Peace of Essex County, N. J., against war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pleasantville, N. J., against compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pleasantville, N. J., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of the Erie Conference of the Evangelical Association, Cleveland, Ohio, against break with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions from the following citizens of New York, Pittsburgh, Missouri, Colorado, Pennsylvania, Illinois, New Jersey, and other States, asking for the speedy passage of House bill 13281, which provides for amending the tariff so as to admit free the products of any American country which will admit our products free: Frank McLees, 140 Highland Cross, N. J.; Lawson Purdy, Municipal Building, New York; E. J. Simon, 51 Wall Street, New York; John T. Allen, 129 Berkeley Avenue, Orange, N. J.; William F. Madill, 2338 University Avenue, New York; Joseph F. Meyers, 111 Centre Street, Orange, N. J.; C. Davey, 1242 Garden Street, Hoboken, N. J.; Clayton F. Ewing, 408 Bradley Avenue, Peoria, Ill.; Clarence E. Hanson, 8404 Tenth Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.; W. B. Vernaus, 775 East Thirty-second Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; J. A. Gamble, 1046 East Thirty-eighth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; W. B. Danforth, 2604 Newkirk Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.; D. F. Graham, 270 Van Brunt Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; William F. Wendt, 688 Quincy Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Gustave Maag, 256 Bradford Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Francis G. Casey, 497 Thirteenth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; James A. Bynn, 1180 President Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Albert Barrett, 48 East Fifth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Harold A. Ruris, 573 East Twenty-second Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; James C. Coleman, 362 Ovington Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Frank W. Garrison, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; E. H. Curtis, 105 West Fortieth Street, New York; A. J. Weiman, 315 Seventy-second Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; M. Gathers, White Plains, N. Y.; Fredrick Wyss, 105 West Fortieth Street, New York; J. Henry Oehrig, 247 Disahurst Street, Brooklyn; E. T. Dippel, 1742 Second Avenue, New York; Frank Quinn, 227 East Thirty-first Street, New York; A. S. Kollock, 1009 Walker Avenue, Woodburn, N. Y.; A. H. Horne, 105 West Fortieth Street, New York; Fred Broonse, 393 Warwich Street, Brooklyn; F. M. Taylor, 251 West One hundred and twenty-ninth Street, New York; William J. Sullivan, 105 West Fortieth Street, New York; C. Keil, jr., 526 West Fortieth Street, New York; M. Gunstensen, 115½ India Street, Brooklyn; F. W. Lord, 105 West Fortieth Street, New York; Charles A. Kochler, 918 North Avenue, N. S.; Edwin J. Maxey, 711 Arch Street, N. S.; E. L. Grant, 1411 Fifth Avenue, N. S.; J. D. Arnold, 7046 Chancer Street, N. S.; W. L. Wintz, 1316 Wylie Avenue, N. S.; Vernon J. Rose, 2920 Olive Street, Kansas City, Mo.; James W. Bucklin, 634 North Street, Denver, Colo.; M. L. Bucklin, 634 North Street, Denver, Colo.; Mart M. Dintenfass, 468 Riverside Drive, New York; F. W. Frendbridge, 51 Clark Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; and Adolph Kretchman, 51 Clark Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., against power plant on proposed site of Potomac River; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of Pittsburgh (Pa.) Shoe Retailers' Association, favoring Merchant Marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of citizens of Imperial, Pa., favoring bill to prohibit exportation of liquors to Africa; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BEALES: Petition of members of the First Church of the Brethren, York, Pa., favoring the suppression of traffic in intoxicating liquors and the passage of the "Sheppard bill"; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petitions of John Aspinwall & Niagara Motor Boat Co., of New York, against numbers on motor boats; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New York, favoring passage of the Stevens-Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Cullen Barge Corporation, O'Brien Bros., and Twin City Ferry Co., all of New York, against 8-hour law for officers of steamboats; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of John J. Berger, New York City, against exhibition of immoral motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BURKE: Memorial of Albert Trostel & Sons Co., of Sheboygan, Wis., and Evangelical Peace Church of Kewaskum, Wis., numbering 510 scouls, protesting against war with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petitions of sundry citizens of California and Arizona, relative to woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of American Hardware Manufacturers' Association, favoring legislation for prevention of floods of Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of men and women voters of Tucson, Ariz., against Judiciary Committee action relative to suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARROW: Petitions of 47 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., against United States participating in the European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: Resolution of twenty-first annual convention of the Texas Hardware Jobbers' Association, Austin, Tex., favoring the passage of the Sheppard bill, providing for an amendment to the interstate-commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of sundry citizens of South Dakota, against break with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of 24 residents of Emporia, Kans., protesting against the passage of House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr EAGAN: Petition of seven citizens of Hoboken, N. J., favoring the passage of an amendment to the Constitution for nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Christian Endeavor Union of the Territory of Hawaii, favoring the passage of a bill for prohibition in Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Friends of Peace of Essex County in re foreign relations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of board of managers of the Baby Hospital Association, of Oakland, Cal., favoring the Keating child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-second congressional district of Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 6915; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Evangelical Association, Cleveland, Ohio, against breaking diplomatic relations with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 6583, for the relief of Elliott E. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 12141, for the relief of James F. Cummins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of S. B. Glenn and others, of Rockford (Ill.) Central Labor Union, against Taylor system in Government shops; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of sundry citizens of Francitas and La Ward, Tex., protesting against the passage of House joint resolutions 84 and 85 and Senate joint resolutions 30 and 55, for a nation-wide prohibition amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY of New Jersey: Petition of citizens of the State of New Jersey, against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of International Association of Machinists, against Taylor system in Government shops; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of American Hardware Manufacturers' Association, favoring bills to prevent flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the St. Mary's Commercial Club, against bill for payment of space for mail carriage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 15205, for relief of W. Epps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9462; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Papers relating to House bill 15118, a bill for the relief of the trustees of the Arcadia-Ironton charge of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ (by request): Petition of Daughters of American Revolution, requesting the passage of a special act granting pensions to all women who have been deprived by murder of the support of citizens killed by bandits in Mexico; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of 23 citizens of Seattle, Wash., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of residents of Lynch, Nebr., in opposition to the enactment of bill to prevent interstate shipment of convict-made goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, against Taylor system in Government shops; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of Friends of Peace of Essex County, N. J., relative to favoring travel of American citizens on merchant ships; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of C. D. Wolff and others, of Sellersville, Pa., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of C. D. Wolff and others, of Sellersville, Pa., favoring bill to amend postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Paul Dunlap and 27 other members of Christian Endeavor, of Lupton, Mich., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of G. W. Gaffney and 35 others, of Sears, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLEMORE: Memorial of citizens of Yoakum, Tex., against breaking relations with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Yoakum, Tex., favoring House bill 8665, against stop watch in Government shops; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McKINLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, against the Taylor system in Government shops; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations in the District of Columbia, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Petition of 56 citizens of Beech Grove, Ind., favoring House bill 8665; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of American Hardware Manufacturers Association of New York, favoring measures for flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, petition of business men of De Ruyter, N. Y., favoring enactment into law of bill to force mail-order concerns to pay community taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Watertown, N. Y., protesting against legislation to grant sovereignty to Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OAKEY: Memorial of Colonel Frank W. Cheney Camp, No. 14, Sons of Veterans, United States Army, South Manchester, Conn., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Montebello, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio: Petition of citizens of the State of Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 8665, against Taylor system in Government shops; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the City Union of Christian Endeavor Society of Lima, Ohio, favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SANFORD: Papers to accompany House bill 15082, granting a pension to Rosella Magee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of Daughters of the American Revolution of the State of New Jersey, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of Philip Holst, Mrs. J. W. Clark, and other citizens of Nebraska, protesting against the passage of House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Thayer and Nuckolls Counties, Nebr., protesting against passage of House bill 652; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Communication from A. C. Barker, Oakland, Cal., favoring Smith-Hughes bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, communication from State Federation of Labor, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the Nolan minimum-wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, communications from Mailliard & Schmiedell, of Los Angeles, Cal.; Clara Todd, of Los Angeles, Cal.; Frank Campbell, of Los Angeles, Cal.; and the woman's section of the Navy League, San Francisco, Cal., all favoring adequate preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, communications from Meyer & Talbott Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., and San Joaquin Valley Lumbermen's Club, Fresno, Cal., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions from Daniel W. Graybill and 33 others, of Los Angeles; Mrs. Olive Morgan and 37 others, of Los Angeles; Mrs. Nevada L. Hubbart and 32 others, of Los Angeles; F. S. Atwell and 37 others, of Ontario, all in the State of California, favoring freedom of speech and of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Building Trades Council of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Buildings Trades Council of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the conservation of food supply in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, letter signed by Emmett A. Fagin and 15 others, of Los Angeles; letter signed by George Ballman and 11 others, of Los Angeles, all in the State of California, protesting against the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, letter from Dr. Ella M. Hunt and others, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Badger Club, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring reorganization of Indian affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, resolutions from Phoebe A. Hearst and others; also mass meeting of 600 people of San Francisco, Cal., all favoring national constitutional suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, communication from city clerk of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring legislation concerning price of gasoline; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, communication from Mrs. Jennie Springer, of Gardena, Cal., regarding Oregon & California Railroad lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, communication from Helmet Lodge, Knights of Pythias, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring pension for superannuated employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, communication from Everett Pulp & Paper Co., of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against House bill 8665; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, communication from R. W. Madison, San Francisco, Cal., concerning Washington Asylum Hospital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, communications from Browning Club, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 137; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, communication from National Security League, San Francisco, Cal., favoring a citizen volunteer army under Federal control; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, telegrams from Laura K. Kuhlmann, Mrs. Helena M. Haines, Louis B. Bock, William H. Haines, William G. Kuhlmann, Charles Davis, and Russell H. Metzger, all of Manhattan Beach, Cal.; John Hermann, president German-American League of California; Aaron G. Barnell and 3 others, of Los Angeles, Cal.; Marie Chelgrene, of Los Angeles, Ca.; and Otto Steinen and 52 others, of Los Angeles, Cal., all protesting against war with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, communications from C. A. Plantz and 17 others, favoring the Warren bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of citizens of New Hampshire and Maine, favoring House bill 8665, against Taylor system in Government shops; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WALSH: Petition of Middleborough Central Labor Union, by Michael J. Baker, president; W. S. Anderson, vice president; and S. L. Brett, secretary, relative to Taylor and similar systems in Government workshops; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WARD: Petition of Guy Cochran and other citizens of Kingston, N. Y., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *May 2, 1916.*

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

Almighty God, we thank Thee that in the midst of the pressing cares of this earthly life Thou hast kept alive within us an interest, an ever-growing interest, in the things that are spiritual and eternal. We find ourselves straitened by the limitation of our earthly reason and in the midst of problems unsolved and mysteries upon every hand. We bless Thee that from above there comes to us the clear light of divine truth and the path shineth more and more unto the perfect day. Still guard within us the spark of life divine, and lead us on, O God, until we shall see Thy face; and coming before Thee may it be with the consciousness of work well done in the world and an influence left here for the betterment of mankind. For Christ's sake. Amen.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM REAR ADMIRAL FISKE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Upon yesterday there came to the office of the Chair a communication signed by Bradley A. Fiske, rear admiral of the United States Navy, addressed to the President of the Senate. While considering whether it should be handed down this morning the Chair was called by a representative of a press association and requested to know whether he could examine the communication.

The Chair does not know how far the right of petition exists in the United States of America, whether officers of the Navy have a right to enter into controversy with the Secretary of the Navy and send their statements to the presiding officer of the Senate, and thus make it his duty to hand them down or not.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair therefore refers the communication to the Committee on Naval Affairs to determine on that question.

Mr. TILLMAN. I was just going to make that motion.

Mr. LODGE. Before the matter passes, as I was not in when the Chair was first stating it, may I ask what is the character of the communication.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The character is the controversy between the Secretary of the Navy and Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske that everyone knows about. The Chair is uncertain whether it is the duty of the Chair to hand down a communication coming from anyone connected with the Army or the Navy touching such controversies.

Mr. LODGE. It is in reply to the statement made by the Secretary of the Navy about Admiral Fiske in the report he sent in the other day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. The Chair is uncertain whether it is the duty of the Chair to hand it down.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that, being an officer of the Navy, he has a right to be heard when a statement of that character is made about him in an official report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know anything about the rules of the Navy or the rules of the Army. The Chair does not know whether it is the right of an officer to call attention to such matters in this way or not.

Mr. TILLMAN. It certainly can do no harm to let the Naval Committee examine it before action is taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair refers it there; and if any member of the Committee on Naval Affairs thinks it is proper, he may submit it to the Senate, and the Chair will receive it.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8067) to quiet title to certain lands in the possession of G. B. Dickson, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6057) to amend section 14 of the reclamation extension act approved August 13,