

Senator from Virginia, that he and I had consulted. I scribbled a moment since the following, referring to Vice President SHERMAN:

Mr. President, as a Democrat who for more than 40 years has always voted the Democratic ticket in every election, local, city, State, and national, and whom I trust God may spare 40 years more to progress in the same direction, I desire to say that I spoke against your election; I voted against your election; and I said nothing in that contest that I would not say again; but in light of the delightful relations with you in this body I should say it with infinitely less bitterness.

I sincerely trust that you may never again become a candidate, for I do most dislike the thought of voting against you. I take this opportunity to bear most cheerful and willing testimony to your delightful, genial, and companionable company, and to say that as the presiding officer of this body you have always been courteous and dignified and your rulings have been absolutely impartial. May Heaven have in store for you many years of life, that your personality and loving disposition may long bless our land.

ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT, having resumed the chair, said:

Senators, your resolution of commendation and thanks for the manner in which I have discharged the duties as your presiding officer is both pleasing and appreciated. While I am aware of shortcomings, I am also conscious that I have at all times sincerely and earnestly striven to discharge the duties of the high office I occupy with fairness and with impartiality.

More pleasing, however, than the resolution you have adopted are the friendship and the good will evidenced by the uniform and continuing consideration and courtesy shown me by all Senators. I am happy in the belief that a protracted and at times strenuous session rather than generating ill will or disregard has brought us all a little closer in touch with one another.

Laying aside for the nonce your legislative duties, to which you have devoted without stint your energies and your splendid abilities, you now go forth to sea or to mountain, to other cares or duties, or, I trust, to recreation, carrying, I am sure, each of you, the best wishes of his fellows. With my Godspeed for a safe journey to the desired destination, I wish you happy days during our separation, a safe return in health and in vigor to renewed public service in December. And with this wish coming from the depths of a heart filled with kindness, with friendship, aye, I might say, with affection for you all, the hour of 3 o'clock having arrived, I declare this extraordinary session of the Sixty-second Congress adjourned without day. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 22, 1911.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

L. F. Cate to be postmaster at Quincy, Cal., in place of Walter J. Ford, resigned.

KANSAS.

Joseph G. Denslow to be postmaster at Burlington, Kans., in place of Clement O. Smith, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 22, 1911.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Second Lieut. Clarence K. Lyman to be first lieutenant.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. Clifford Jones to be captain.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

L. F. Cate, Quincy.

ILLINOIS.

William A. Hardy, Springvalley.

IOWA.

Fred W. Colvin, Correctionville.

KANSAS.

Joseph G. Denslow, Burlington.

VIRGINIA.

Ivan V. Yonce, Salem.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, August 22, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O, Thou great Jehovah, our God and our Father, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, upholding, sustaining, guiding those who are susceptible to Thy holy influence, incline our hearts to do Thy will by living in consonance with the physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual laws which Thou hast ordained, that we may be profitable servants unto Thee. And now, O Father, let Thy richest blessing descend upon all the Members of this House, its employees, and their several families. Take them to their homes in safety. Keep them in health and strength, and at the appointed time bring us together again without the loss of any, in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, who taught us, when we pray, to say: Our Father, which art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors, and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend some remarks in the Record on the question of marriage and divorce, and in connection therewith to print as a part of my remarks House joint resolution 154 introduced by me on that subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend some remarks in the Record on the subject of marriage and divorce, and to print certain documents. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House joint resolution No. 154, having for its sole object the bringing about of the enactment of uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce in the different States of the Union. It will be conceded, I think, by all that it is very desirable that the laws on marriage and divorce ought to be uniform throughout the United States. I will not take up any time in arguing this proposition. The question is, How can this desirable condition be brought about? Under the Constitution of the United States Congress has no jurisdiction to pass any law on the subject of marriage and divorce that would be effective in the different States of the Union, and an amendment to the Constitution conferring this jurisdiction on Congress would meet with much opposition, and I think it is conceded by those who have given the most attention and study to the question that such an amendment would meet with defeat. The only other way to bring about this much-desired result is in some way to induce the different State legislatures to enact uniform laws upon the subject.

For more than a quarter of a century leading men in different parts of the United States, and different organizations, some of them national in scope, have been bending their energies to bring about the enactment of uniform laws on marriage and divorce by the legislatures of the different States. I have the greatest of admiration and praise for these men and these associations. Much has been done to arouse public sentiment on the question, and many of the men engaged in the work have devoted much time, patience, and ability to bringing about the desired result. Some of these associations have met for a great many years. The American Bar Association and the National Congress on Uniform Divorce Laws have dealt with the subject very ably and very fully. While the efforts and labors of these men have been very beneficial, yet the results obtained in the way of uniform legislation on the subject by the different legislatures have not been at all satisfactory.

One of the reasons why, in my judgment, satisfactory results have not been accomplished by these efforts is that in many of these conventions other subjects have been the most prominent for consideration and discussion, and the question of uniform laws on marriage and divorce has been secondary, and sometimes only incidental to the general discussion and the object of the convention or congress. The meetings have lasted but a day or so, and many of the delegates attending, while earnest supporters of the proposition, are in attendance primarily for some other object, and the consideration of uniform divorce and marriage laws is only incidental to their attendance.

In none of these conventions has there been any provision for the payment of the expenses of the delegates, and therefore financial considerations alone prevent the attendance of many men who would be the most competent to legislate upon the subject. Delegates to these conventions are usually appointed by the governors of the different States, but in making the appointment the governors are too often compelled to select men who will go, rather than to select men solely and entirely upon their qualifications. I do not desire to even intimate that the men engaged in this movement are not earnest, sincere, able, and competent, but I think it must be conceded that the method of their selection, if they are selected, or the fact that it is an organization composed entirely of voluntary delegates without appointment, would detract a great deal from the result of their labors when the same was laid before the different legislatures. The meetings are confined, as a rule, to sessions of one day, or at least a very few days, so that time and opportunity are not afforded for the different representatives from different localities to discuss the various laws and remedies proposed.

The moral effect of any proposed uniform law on this subject would, in my judgment, be much greater if it came from a convention or a congress that was instituted or held under some form of law or under some statute giving it a legal and a national status. The resolution that I have introduced provides for a congress of delegates coming two from each State in the Union, upon an invitation extended by the President of the United States, which invitation is given under and by virtue of authority of a law passed by the Congress of the United States. This convention or congress so constituted would not be limited in the time of its deliberation except by the appropriation provided for the payment of the expenses. By paying the entire expenses of the meeting, including traveling expenses of delegates going to and returning therefrom, there is no question but what the congress will be composed of men fitted by their experience and their work in the different States to fully perform the duties imposed upon them.

The result of their labors, when ended, will, through the President of the United States and the governors of the different States, be laid before the several State legislatures, and coming from this source will command a respect and a consideration at the hands of the legislatures that would not otherwise be given, and will, on that account, undoubtedly receive the approval and approbation of the public sentiment of the country and will therefore be much more likely to be enacted into law than though the same recommendations came from an association or congress, however able, that was only voluntary.

I do not deem it necessary to say anything upon the importance of this question. The country has recently been startled by the announcement of a wedding soon to occur in the highest social circles that I believe shocks the moral sensibilities of every citizen of the country. One of the wealthiest citizens and one of the leaders in society is about to contract another marriage relation in defiance of and contrary to the laws of the State of his residence. The moral sensibilities of the good people of our country are shocked by the remarkable condition confronting the country, of this man going outside of the limits and the borders of his own State to be lawfully married in another State, in absolute defiance of the laws in force at the place of his home and his residence. And this is only one illustration in thousands occurring every year and every day. The legitimacy of children, the rights of property, as well as the morality of society are all concerned and all involved in this question. The perpetuity of government, the foundation and welfare of humanity and society is involved in the sacredness of the marriage relation. This is a question involving the purity of every home, the happiness of every fireside, and the sacredness of every hearthstone. The contract of marriage is the most sacred of any known to man or God, and upon its righteousness depends the advancement of civilization and the happiness of the human race. Congress can well afford to take the initiative and to pave the way for the enactment of a uniform law that is so closely and intimately connected with the welfare of humanity.

House joint resolution 154, to which reference is made, is as follows:

Joint resolution providing for a congress of delegates for the purpose of submitting a uniform law on marriage and divorce to the different State legislatures.

Resolved, etc. That for the purpose of securing a uniform law on marriage and divorce throughout the Union, the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to ask the governors of the different States to send representatives to a congress of delegates for the purpose of formulating a uniform law on marriage and divorce and submitting the same to the legislatures of the different States.

Said congress shall be held in the Hall of the House of Representatives in the city of Washington, at such time as the President shall designate in his call. Each State shall be entitled to two delegates,

and each delegate shall be entitled to receive his actual necessary expenses in going to, attending, and returning from said congress, to be paid under such rules and regulations as the President shall prescribe.

Said congress shall report its findings and recommendations to the President, and the President shall forward the same to the governors of the different States, with the request to each governor that he lay the same before the legislature of his State for its information and consideration.

For the purpose of defraying the expenses of said congress, the sum of \$200,000, or so much as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated.

RESIGNATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C.
HON. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender you my resignation as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, the local conditions and various Indian problems in my State demanding so much of my time as to render it impossible for me to give the work thereon the time justly required by such service.
Very respectfully submitted.

SCOTT FERRIS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that OSCAR CALLAWAY, of Texas, be elected to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. FERRIS on the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama nominates OSCAR CALLAWAY, of Texas, to fill the vacancy. Is there any other nomination? If not, nominations will be considered closed.

The question was taken, and Mr. CALLAWAY was duly elected.

THE RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a matter in connection with the RECORD. It has been stated on the floor a number of times that the heading over a speech indicated whether it had been delivered in the House. It was stated that the short form of a heading indicated that the speech had not been delivered, and the long form indicated that it had.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent for two minutes time.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. One minute will suffice. There is a speech with a short form of heading on page 4507 of the RECORD that I think was delivered in the House. There are other speeches following, with the long form of heading, that I think were delivered in the same way. Other delivered speeches on the same resolution vary in the length of heading. In view of these prior statements, I simply wanted the RECORD to show at this time that the character of the heading on a speech in the RECORD is no indication whatever as to whether it was actually delivered on the floor of the House or not.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman note that the heading that he refers to, while it is short, still covers the entire subject, and is as long a heading as they could make?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. It is not as long as they made some of the others on succeeding pages.

Mr. MANN. Not where they insert the whole title of the bill, but there is no title to this resolution. They put in everything they could.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question for information about that. It is claimed that the Chair had some views about this matter. Whose business is it to put the heading on a speech—the business of the man who makes the speech, or the business of the Printing Office?

Mr. MANN. It is the business of the man who makes the speech to put the heading on, but if he does not, then the Printing Office or somebody has to put the heading on.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the statement the gentleman made when he said that all the heading or title was put on that speech that could be put on, because on page 4514 appears the speech, just following my own on the floor, made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOWLAND] on the same resolution, which has a full heading or title of seven lines. It was the same resolution—Senate joint resolution 57. I want to call attention to the matter, Mr. Speaker, merely in order that the statement should not go unchallenged in the RECORD that the character of heading indicated whether the speech had been delivered or not. I unsuccessfully attempted to dispute that proposition when it was made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], and I now do dispute it.

LOCAL OR SPECIAL TERRITORIAL LAWS.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and take up the bill (H. R. 1301) to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the passage of local or special laws

in the Territories of the United States, to limit Territorial indebtedness, and for other purposes," which is on the House Calendar, and pending that I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the House bill the bill S. 2541, which is on the Speaker's table, which is identically the same as the House bill, and pass the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 1301, and pending that, asks unanimous consent to substitute for it the bill S. 2541, of similar tenor.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The two bills are identically the same.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, can not we have the bill reported?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct about that. The bill will be reported. The Clerk will read the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to prohibit the passage of local or special laws in the Territories of the United States, to limit Territorial indebtedness, and for other purposes," approved July 30, 1886, be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows, to wit, by adding to said section the following:

"Provided, That the prohibitions and limitations contained in this section shall not be construed to apply to irrigation districts heretofore or hereafter organized in accordance with Territorial laws."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the Clerk the engrossed bill?

The SPEAKER. That is exactly what the Chair was going to call to the attention of the House. The engrossed bill is not here, and the Chair will ask the gentleman from Virginia to withdraw his motion temporarily.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Would it be in order to offer the Senate bill as an amendment to the House bill, to move to strike out all after the enacting clause?

Mr. MANN. It would not do much good to do that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests to the gentleman that he withdraw his motion temporarily and get the engrossed bill. It must be somewhere.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Very well.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of waterways.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of waterways. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE RECORD.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes, to say a word about the controversy which occurred here yesterday as to the question I asked on Friday last of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] concerning the bridge to be built across the Petit Jean River in Arkansas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to address the House about a controverted question in respect to correcting the RECORD, to which he referred on yesterday, is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last the House passed a bill (S. 3253) giving to two counties in Arkansas the right to construct a steel bridge with a draw across a river, not only to the counties, but to their successors and assigns. That bill did not contain the usual provision "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation." I listened attentively to the reading of the bill and at the close of the reading asked the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON], "Does the bill contain the provision 'at a point suitable to the interests of navigation?'" He said, "Yes; I think so," and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] immediately said, "Yes; it does." Thereupon I said nothing more. Yesterday I called attention to the fact that the RECORD contained an entirely different question from that propounded by me. It did not include the word "navigation" at all. I did not have anything in the way of the notes of the stenographer yesterday. The stenographer did not understand the question, and, as I explained yesterday, made an error in inserting in the RECORD the question which he did insert and was led to insert largely because of the answers by the two gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Illinois declared that I asked the question which was in the RECORD; so did the gentleman from Georgia, and the gentleman from Georgia objected to a correction of the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. In just a moment when I finish this statement.

Mr. MANN. But right there.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will please wait until I finish the statement then I will be glad to answer a question, but I desire to get through this in consecutive order. That bill was enacted into law without that provision in it. It would have contained that provision if the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Georgia had not both asserted that it did already contain it.

Now, the gentleman says I did not ask that question, or, at least, he did not understand me to ask that question concerning the interests of navigation. This can all be settled, if anything else is necessary to settle it, on the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who yesterday said I asked that question as I stated it; the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], who said yesterday I asked the question; the gentleman from Michigan and others—

Mr. TOWNER. And I sat here and heard it.

Mr. COOPER. And the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], who sits in front of me, says I asked the question as I stated it yesterday—"at a point suitable to the interests of navigation"—as does also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOWMAN]. Now, the whole controversy turns upon whether I used the word "navigation." It is not in the question in the RECORD. The reporter did not get the question I asked, but this is what he did catch:

Mr. COOPER. Does that contain the usual provision in reference—navigation?

The important word in the question that he caught was the word "navigation." My question as it appears in the RECORD would have been utterly senseless with the word "navigation," because as the question there appears it does not refer to navigation at all. The question in the RECORD is:

I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if the bill contains the usual provision that it is subject to the provisions of the act regulating the construction of bridges over navigable streams?

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say I also heard the gentleman ask the question which he says he did, but in reference to his statement that the question would be absolutely senseless as it appears in the RECORD—

Mr. COOPER. Not absolutely senseless—

Mr. NORRIS. That would depend upon the meaning given to the dash. It might be very emphatic.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. He can explain that now.

Mr. COOPER. The word "navigation" appears in the reporter's notes; that shows that I asked something about navigation.

This multitude of witnesses who sat about me declare that I asked the question relating to a clause concerning the interests of navigation that appears in every other bridge bill with which I am familiar, but does not appear in this bill as enacted into law, owing to the answers of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Yesterday the gentleman from Georgia refused to allow the question to be corrected, although he could have corrected his answer if he had been mistaken in the question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from Wisconsin to state a moment ago that I said yesterday that he had asked a certain question. The gentleman in that statement, if he made it, is mistaken. I did not say what question the gentleman asked the other day. I said that I understood the gentleman to ask a certain question. Now, this was the situation: There was a House bill providing for the erection of a bridge by two counties on a county line. I had marked that House bill for amendment, by inserting at a certain point "suitable to the interests of navigation." There came to the House a Senate bill, and the House bill having been reported, it was in order to take the Senate bill from the table and pass it. When the Senate bill was read in considerable confusion in the House the other day—I think after the veto messages were sustained, probably—the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] asked a question. I understood the gentleman to ask a question as to whether the bill contained the usual provision that the bridge should be built in accordance with the provisions of the general bridge act. If I had caught the question which the gentleman now says he did ask, I think it would have refreshed my recollection as to the amendment that I

had marked to propose to the House bill, not having the House bill before me at the time and the Senate bill being the one that was being read. The question I answered was the question that I thought the gentleman asked, and my answer would be correct if the gentleman had asked that question, and would be incorrect if the gentleman asked the question which he says he asked.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. Yesterday I called the gentleman's attention to this question in the RECORD and declared it was not the question that I asked at all. This is the question:

Mr. Speaker, before that question is taken I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if the bill contains the usual provision that it is subject to the provision of the act regulating the construction of bridges over navigable streams.

That is the record made.

Mr. MANN. Let me say to the gentleman, in that connection, that I had nothing to do with having that question inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that.

Mr. MANN. I do not revise the remarks that I make on the floor of the House or the interruptions which I make.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that, Mr. Speaker. And then I followed that with this statement. My question was: "Does it contain the usual provision at a point suitable to the interests of navigation?"

After I had said that yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] arose and said:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia and myself answered the questions the other day which the gentleman from Wisconsin asked. Both made the same answer, and the question we answered was the question that is in the RECORD, not the question which the gentleman now says he asked.

Mr. MANN. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman just said that he did not say yesterday I asked the question that was in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. That is still correct. We answered the question which the gentleman asked. Under the statement of the gentleman, which I fully and freely accept, we erroneously answered the question, supposing the gentleman asked a different one. I was not attempting to say yesterday that the gentleman did not ask the question which he says he asked, but we had answered a question supposing it was another question.

Now, as a matter of fact, whether the language "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation" had been inserted in this bill makes no difference, because the authority granted here was for two counties to build a bridge across the county line between two counties. There was only one place they could put it.

SYSTEMS OF SHOP MANAGEMENT.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Taylor system of scientific shop management.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LOCAL AND SPECIAL LAWS IN THE TERRITORIES.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2541) and put it on its passage.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2541) to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the passage of local or special laws in the Territories of the United States, to limit Territorial indebtedness, and for other purposes."

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to prohibit the passage of local or special laws in the Territories of the United States, to limit Territorial indebtedness, and for other purposes," approved July 30, 1886, be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows, to wit, by adding to said section the following:

Provided, That the prohibitions and limitations contained in this section shall not be construed to apply to irrigation districts heretofore or hereafter organized in accordance with Territorial laws."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] moves to suspend the rules and discharge the Committee on Territories from the consideration of Senate bill 2541 and to pass the same. Is a second demanded? If not, it will be considered ordered. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, House bill 1301, of the same tenor, was laid on the table.

LOAN OF TENTS TO CITY OF ASTORIA, OREG.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate joint resolution 31, in regard to the loaning of tents to the Astoria Centennial. It is the bill that passed the House a week ago, but on account of a mistake the order had to be vacated because the engrossed copy was lost. Another copy has been found and sent to the House, and I ask that this now be passed by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] moves to suspend the rules and pass Senate joint resolution 31, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution 31, authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for the use of the Astoria Centennial, to be held at Astoria, Oreg., August 10 to September 9, 1911.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to loan, at his discretion, to the executive committee of the Astoria Centennial, to be held at Astoria, Oreg., August 10 to September 9, 1911, 100 wall tents and 100 conical tents, with poles, ridges, and pins for each: *Provided,* That no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property; the same to be delivered to said committee designated at such time prior to the holding of said centennial as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and B. F. Crawshaw, general secretary of said executive committee: *And provided further,* That the Secretary of War shall, before delivering such property, take from said B. F. Crawshaw a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of said property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is contemplated at any future time—

The SPEAKER. If a second is not demanded, it will be considered as ordered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not desire to demand a second, but I merely desire to ask—

Mr. MANN. I demanded a second.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. That is agreed to.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I was addressing the Chair. I desire to know from the gentleman from Oregon if the authorities who are in charge of this exposition contemplate asking Congress hereafter for any appropriation?

Mr. LAFFERTY. I will say to the gentleman, no. I am very glad that the gentleman from Alabama asked the question, because this is the first exposition that has—

Mr. CLAYTON. I wanted that to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. LAFFERTY. The exposition is now under way and will end on the 9th of September. No appropriation was asked for by the State of Oregon.

Mr. CLAYTON. And the gentleman is not going to ask for any appropriation hereafter?

Mr. LAFFERTY. No; because the exposition will be concluded on the 9th of September.

Mr. CLAYTON. But there may be a deficiency bill brought in later on.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I beg to assure the House that there will be no request for Federal aid outside of the loan of these tents.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to agree to suspend the rules and pass Senate joint resolution 31.

The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

LOT 53, SQUARE 140, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and take up Senate bill 1704.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 1704) relieving and exempting lot No. 53 in Ann S. Parker's subdivision of lots in square No. 140 of the city of Washington, D. C., from the operation of an act entitled "An act to restrict the ownership of real estate in the Territories to American citizens," approved March 3, 1887.

Be it enacted, etc., That lot No. 53, in Ann S. Parker's subdivision of lots in square No. 140, of the city of Washington, D. C., be, and is hereby, relieved and exempted from the operation of an act entitled "An act to restrict the ownership of real estate in the Territories to American citizens," approved March 3, 1887, and that all forfeitures incurred by force of said act by reason of the alienage of Isabella Wilkie be and are hereby remitted.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. It will be considered as ordered.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to demand a second. I think it will take only a moment or two to pass the bill, but I would like to have an explanation of it from the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The right way, then, to get that would be to demand a second.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that will be done. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] has 20 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the real object of this bill is to clear, not a real but an apparent cloud upon a land title. When it comes to a question of the title to property in the District of Columbia, the title companies, as a matter of fact, are really superior to the courts, for the reason that if the title companies report any kind of a cloud upon a title the owner can neither sell nor borrow upon his property. The question here arises as to the distinction between the words "descent" and "inheritance."

This property is worth about \$3,500. It is, and has been at all times, in the hands of the owner. Now, it is desired to borrow some money upon it; but, as long as this apparent cloud is upon the title, he can neither borrow nor sell.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This property was inherited?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It passed by descent.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It was inherited by an alien sister of a United States Army officer?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. So I understand.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman informed sufficiently to be able to tell whether this alien sister was ever a citizen of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The reason given by the title company for refusing to recommend acceptance of the title to the property was because, upon the death of Robert Grant Wilson, intestate, his sister, Mrs. Isabella Wilkie, an alien, took the property by descent. Upon the death of Wilson the descent was cast and there was a cloud to that extent upon the title to the property.

As will be seen from the act of March 3, 1887, aliens might acquire real property by inheritance. The title company, recognizing the distinction between the words "descent" and "inheritance," were unwilling to approve the title.

The law as last amended gives aliens the right to acquire real property within the District of Columbia.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I agree with the gentleman as to the law. I have no real objection to the bill, but I wanted to find out, as a matter of fact, whether the sister of Robert Grant Wilson, the original owner of the property, had been a citizen of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. She was an alien.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was she an alien by birth or by marriage?

Mr. MANN. She was an alien by birth.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then she was not an American citizen who married a foreigner? The gentleman from Kentucky does not know whether she was a native American who married a foreigner?

Mr. MANN. She was not. My information is that she was never a resident of the United States. I have been over this matter.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There would be no other heir to this property except this sister, and in the event of our failing to pass this bill the property would escheat to the United States.

Mr. MANN. Probably not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I understand that good lawyers say it would not, and that this cloud put upon the title by the title companies is a mere quibble, but, nevertheless, it is put there by them, and as long as it is there this man can neither borrow nor sell.

Mr. MANN. It involves a very fine distinction, if anyone can make it, between "descent" and "inheritance." The law provided that any alien who inherited property had a certain time in which to dispose of it. This property went to a sister of the deceased, as I recall it, and it is claimed that the descent cast is not inheritance.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Illinois is informed that the sister of this Army officer of the United States is a native of another country and not of the United States?

Mr. MANN. That is my information.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Therefore she has in no way violated any of the social proprieties by going abroad to obtain a husband.

A MEMBER. Or if she did, she did not get one. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is my information that under the act of March 3, 1887, by the fourth section thereof, this is really cured, but the title companies have not seen fit to go sufficiently deep into the matter to clear up this title, and that leaves the alleged cloud remaining there.

Mr. NORRIS. Does this bill purport to be general in its nature, or does it apply only to this case?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It applies only to this case, and there are 19 precedents for it.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to ask the gentleman why it would not have been better to make the law general so as not to put Congress in the predicament of clearing a title in individual cases?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. We have a law. I believe the law is all contained in section 4 of the act of March 3, 1887, but inasmuch as one of the officers of this title company reports this cloud it is more to meet the objections of the title company.

Mr. NORRIS. And every time they do that is it necessary for Congress to pass an act?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Kentucky will permit me, I will say that we have passed a general act since this matter arose. This only applies to a cloud that was cast on the title before the general act went into effect.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask if this property was left to the English sister by will?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; her ancestor died intestate; it came by descent.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Really, then, there is no other remedy.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. I would like to inquire if, since this trouble is characterized as a mere cloud, whether or not the parties in interest might not file a bill of equity in the District and have the cloud removed?

Mr. MANN. But they can not file a bill against the Government.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, at first I was inclined to be opposed to the bill as relieving or exempting a specified tract of land from the operation of a general act. But it seems that this is an exceptional case. The general law prevents aliens from holding real estate in the Territories or in the District of Columbia, and this piece of land was owned by a United States Army officer, an American citizen, one Robert Grant Wilson. He died leaving no heirs except a sister living in England to whom the title on his death passed. She conveyed it to her son, who is an American citizen. The question is whether the passage of the title to this alien sister should deprive this American citizen of holding this land. It would be at the best a mere technical ground on which the United States would seek forfeiture or an escheat of this land and would be a great injustice. It seems to me that this particular act is a proper one.

Mr. BUTLER. Give the man a chance to borrow the money.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

THE WOOL BILL AND FARMERS' FREE LIST BILL.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, this session is about to close, and I presume and assume that Members on this side and on that side of the House are interested in ascertaining as best we may the feeling of the country toward the character of the work that has been done. I know of no better way of getting at the sentiments of the people, realizing that the eyes of 90,000,000 people are fixed upon this House, than by glancing them through the newspapers published in the country districts.

I hold in my hand an editorial which appeared in a paper in central Missouri—the Democrat-Sentinel, of Sedalia, Mo.—one of the brightest papers in that section of the country, and one that is in touch with the people of that section. I take it that they are not different from the people of other sections of the country. I am going to send that editorial to the desk and have it read in my time. I believe it throws some light on the opinions of the people as to the work of this session of Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISSED HIS OPPORTUNITY.

Without exultation and divested of all partisan feeling, it can be said that President Taft has by his acts in vetoing the wool and farmers' free-list bills sounded his own political death knell.

During the struggle for reciprocity it was often said that the Democratic majority in the lower House and the Democrats of the Senate, by supporting and fighting for that measure, were strengthening Mr. Taft's political fortunes, and it was freely stated that they were making a political blunder. Despite this, however, the party representatives never faltered, and, recognizing an opportunity to give the people some small measure of relief, even though it might advance the personal popularity of the head of the opposing political party, carried to victory the pet measure of his administration.

Unquestionably, after the passage of this measure Mr. Taft stood higher in the estimation of the people than he ever had since he so strongly denounced the Payne tariff bill and then weakly signed it. It was to be expected that after his Winona speech, in which he admitted that duties were too high on wool, that he would take advantage of the first opportunity offered and sign the bill reducing these duties. It was to be expected also that after fathering the reciprocity bill, which reduces the duties on farm products chiefly, he would have welcomed the chance to make things even with the farmers by signing the bill that reduces the tax on the things that they buy, thus doing justice all around.

But he lacked the courage of his convictions, and while he could withstand the protests of those who claimed they were speaking for the farmers, he had not the bravery to refuse the demands of the great woolen manufacturers and the millionaire makers of agricultural implements.

It must be admitted that it does require a great amount of personal heroism to withstand the tremendous pressure that must have been brought to bear against the two bills. All the wealth, not only of the manufacturers immediately interested, but the vast power and influence of what is called the "interests," fell into line and exerted every possible effort to prevent the bills becoming laws. Not only that, but all the leaders of his party, the great Senators and Congressmen, who control the inside workings of the mighty organization, were ever at his elbow, urging and demanding compliance with the wishes of their masters, and so he faltered and failed, missing the greatest opportunity for true greatness that has come to any Chief Magistrate for almost half a century.

His veto messages give no reasons, adequate, for his actions. All that he does say is that 1,000,000 people are interested, directly or indirectly, in the wool industry, and that their interests should not be jeopardized, and pleading for delay until next December.

Thus he placed the welfare of 1,000,000—a great exaggeration—men and women against the daily material welfare of 90,000,000 others, who are clamoring and pleading for justice. As against the 90 he chose the 1, and to the cry for action he replied, Procrastinate, tomorrow, next week, next December.

No, President Taft can never be reelected President.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 9048. An act to remit the duty on pictorial windows to be imported by the Gate of Heaven Church, South Boston, Mass.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 943) to improve navigation on the Black Warrior River, in the State of Alabama.

MEMORIAL TO NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 1671) to provide a suitable memorial to the memory of the North American Indian, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). The gentleman from New Jersey moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 1671 as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there may be erected, without expense to the United States Government, by Mr. Rodman Wanamaker, of New York City, and others, on a United States reservation, in the harbor of New York, in the State of New York, and upon a site to be selected by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, a suitable memorial to the memory of the North American Indian.

Sec. 2. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act a commission, consisting of the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the United States Senate, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and Mr. Robert C. Ogden, of the city of New York, shall be created, with full authority to select a suitable design, and to contract for and superintend the construction of the said memorial, the design of the memorial to be subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there a second demanded?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from New Jersey is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois to 20 minutes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, practically in this form, was passed by the House at the last session. It was referred by the Senate Committee on the Library to the Fine Arts Commission for a report, and that commission did make a favorable report. It was received, however, too late for action in the Senate, and it was reintroduced in this session. It merely provides that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall select a site in the harbor of New York upon which Mr. Rodman Wanamaker, a citizen of New York, may erect, entirely at his own expense, a monumental statue typifying the North American Indian. The Committee on the Library, of which I am at present the acting chairman, instructed me to report this resolution, and I do so, and make this request.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. The expense is to be defrayed entirely by Mr. Wanamaker?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Entirely.

Mr. NORRIS. I remember that some time ago—I think last winter—there was a movement on foot to build this kind of a monument by a subscription from school children.

Mr. TOWNSEND. This has no relation to that whatever.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Has the location of the site been practically determined?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I can not answer the gentleman definitely. I assume it will be on one of the several islands in the lower bay.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can say I suppose definitely whether the location has been fixed already?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It has not been.

Mr. MANN. By the Fine Arts Commission?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Oh, no; the Fine Arts Commission made the report upon the design of the statue.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know how many reservations the Government has that would be subject to this provision?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Military and otherwise, I should say, in the harbor or adjacent, 10 or 12.

Mr. MANN. This bill provides that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy practically shall select the site, but we have reservations there under the Secretary of the Treasury and under the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. Why should we permit the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to select a site that is under the control of the Treasury Department over the protests of the Secretary of the Treasury, or the same thing as to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I assume it is because the sites desirable for such a statue are under the control of the Secretaries of War or Navy.

Mr. MANN. Why not say that in the bill? Who knows what they will select?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I did not draw the bill.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman had had as much experience with some of these commissions as some of us have had, he would know that no one can foretell not only the verdict of petty jury, but the verdict of one of these commissions.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The commission, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, has nothing to do with the selection of the site. The commission has been asked to approve the proposed design of the statue.

Mr. MANN. I assume that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy would be a commission for that purpose. I do not see what object there is in letting the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy say that they can put a monument on a reservation that is under the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, the Immigration Service, or the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am not familiar with any desirable situation in or about the harbor of New York that is not, I assume, under the control of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman familiar enough to say that no site will be selected now under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury or of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am not.

Mr. MANN. Yet he wants us to agree to pass a bill on the presumption that there is no site.

Mr. TOWNSEND. My presumption and my belief and my knowledge, considerable knowledge of the geography of New York Bay, is that the desirable sites, islands in the lower bay where this monumental statue would be erected, are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the

Navy. The present monumental statue there is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. MANN. Suppose they wanted to locate this monument at the Treasury Building in New York City or at the Post Office Building in New York City. They would have the authority to do so under this bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think that is rather a violent assumption.

Mr. MANN. Well, I don't know whether it is or not.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think the post office is not situated in New York Harbor, I would suggest to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. No; it is not in the harbor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. TOWNSEND. With pleasure.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am in entire sympathy with the purpose of this bill and hope it will pass, but I want to ask the gentleman whether he will consent to an amendment, on page 1, line 4? After the words "Mr. Rodman Wanamaker," insert the words "of Philadelphia." [Laughter.]

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will make that "of Philadelphia and"; insert the three words "of Philadelphia and."

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will say to the gentleman we know Mr. Rodman Wanamaker as a resident of New York, and Mr. Wanamaker lives in the district of a Representative from New York in this House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I desire to say we recognize Mr. Rodman Wanamaker as a product of the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will grant he is a product, but he has removed his person.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. His largest business enterprises are in the city of Philadelphia and in Paris.

Mr. MANN. He makes his money in Philadelphia and spends it in New York; lots of people do the same thing.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It seems to me it would cement the entire Pennsylvania delegation if we had an amendment bringing us closer to the facts, and locating Mr. Wanamaker properly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I hope the gentleman will be satisfied to have his remarks in the Record.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Entirely satisfied, but will the gentleman consent to that amendment?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I could not do that without consulting Mr. Wanamaker. If he chooses to select New York as his place of residence, of course the gentleman from Philadelphia may regret his choice, but still it is his choice.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is why I propose this substitution. In view of the fact that Mr. Wanamaker's fame extends far beyond New York, and that he is fairly well known in Paris, as a result of his having been born in Philadelphia, why not strike out "of New York City" and say "Mr. Rodman Wanamaker"?

Mr. TOWNSEND. If the gentleman will insure me the vote of the entire Pennsylvania delegation, I will consent to that amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course I do not know how we may fare at the hands of the present occupant of the chair [Mr. PALMER], but if the gentleman does not desire to accept that amendment I will withdraw it, having drawn the attention of the House and the country to the fact that Mr. Rodman Wanamaker is a very proud possession of the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is as courteous as he is patriotic. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIFENDERFER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DIFENDERFER]?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. DIFENDERFER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], I would like to suggest that Mr. Rodman Wanamaker is a resident of the section that I represent, in Cheltenham Township, and not of the city of Philadelphia. Fortunately I happen to be a neighbor, and I want to say in this connection that I am extremely interested in the passage of this measure, for the reason that Mr. Wanamaker has gone to an immense expense in bringing about this idea. It was suggested to him at a dinner, and he has sent out to the Indian country and gathered, for possibly the last time in the history of this country, an Indian council of war; and he has, through the cinematograph, registered the sign language of the Indian, something that never has been done

before or possibly will never be again, and in his judgment he has selected New York Harbor as the place best situated for the erection of this bronze statue for the commemoration of the Indian. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWNSEND] to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 1671 as modified.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Chair states "as modified." I did not understand that it has been modified, and if it has been, I think the House ought to know what the modification is.

Mr. MANN. It is an amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not know but that it was a modification suggested by one of these gentlemen from Pennsylvania. I did not want the gentlemen from Pennsylvania to get something they were not entitled to.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is a simple change, correcting the title of the National Art Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWNSEND] if the bill as read at the Clerk's desk is in the form in which he desires to have it presented to the House?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will again state the question. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWNSEND] to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 1671 as read at the Clerk's desk.

The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

PUBLICATION OF PAIRS IN RECORD.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House at this time, of course, not for its present action, but for its present and future consideration, a resolution, which I introduced in the last Congress and reintroduced in this Congress, to abolish the publication of pairs in the Record. I am not afraid of having this proposition stolen from me, as some other propositions have been. But if anybody wants to steal the proposition or help pass it, I will be mighty glad to surrender any authorship of it. I worked hard and introduced a resolution last Congress to abolish the secret caucus, and to make it out of order to appoint anybody on a committee in this House who was selected by a secret ballot or secret caucus. Last November I gave out the interview in the Nashville Banner—which interview I will publish in my remarks—which was also published in a Washington paper and also away out in Nebraska, in opposition to a secret caucus, but it did not do a bit of good or seem to have any effect upon the country until three very distinguished gentlemen stole my thunder. One of them was way out in Nebraska, and his name is W. J. Bryan. The other two are distinguished Members of this House, one the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the other the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], chairman of the Committee on Rules. I see from an article in the paper to-day that they are all in favor of this proposition which I have been trying to get the country to accept for a long time. Now, I am glad they have taken charge of it, for I know now that the results will follow which I desire.

The Democratic Party in 1896 stole about everything that was good from the Populist Party. And after having appropriated it and galvanized it into respectability, the Republican Party came along and stole from us nearly all the good things we had stolen from the Populists and a lot that we had not stolen, until finally, during the administration of President Roosevelt, some of our newspapers cartooned Mr. Bryan as a bird with every feather gone but one, and that was called "tariff reform," while President Roosevelt was depicted as sitting near in a nest completely feathered with Democratic pilloined feathers.

Now, you see that the country is getting the benefit of these reforms, whether they come through those who originated them or not. Now, when I tried to abolish appointing committees by the Speaker by resolution in a Democratic caucus I was voted down, and only got 40 votes for my motion. But it came. Now, like Mr. Bryan, this little feather is all that I have left, namely, to abolish publishing pairs in the Record. The pair list is largely a fraud, a cheat, and a false statement. When gentlemen are out of this Chamber without the consent of the House—off somewhere or other—and the pair clerks walk down there and pair off one absent gentleman against another without knowing anything on earth about how they would have

voted or whether they would have voted at all, it is a fraud, and a cheat, and a swindle, only enabling such gentlemen to say when they are attacked at home for their absence, "I was paired against a Republican," or, "I was paired against a Democrat." At this time, when we are stealing each other's platforms and principles and party doctrines, how does a pair clerk know how to pair anybody, unless the Member himself has authorized it?

Now, I say I am not afraid of that feather being stolen. [Laughter.] In this House I want to urge seriously this reform. I want gentlemen seriously to think of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be allowed to proceed five minutes longer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes longer. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SIMS. I do with great pleasure.

Mr. CANNON. I have listened with great interest to the gentleman when he spoke of the various larcenies committed by his party, the Democrats—larcenies in which his party stole from the Populists all that was good—and his assertion that we, the Republicans, then stole from his party some of those things. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I want to ask the gentleman in all seriousness whether he ever had a specific for the stolen goods, because if we have got any of them I would like to know what specific is indicated against those diseases. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman want the specific things pointed out?

Mr. CANNON. No; I want the antidote. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. Why, I do not care anything about the antidote; but if anything is good we are willing to accept it from any source, even from the Republican Party. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Recently here we voted for a reciprocity bill which had been stolen bodily from the Democratic Party. We accepted it, and we passed it without the help of the gentleman from Illinois. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CANNON. That is correct. And when you go home and appear before your farmers I would like to know what specific you will take. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Oh, I will say to the gentleman that our farmers require no specific when an attempt is made to tear down a tariff wall. They are Democrats in principle, and not even for a tariff for revenue only when the revenue in part is to go into their own pockets. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, I want to say that in the next Congress we shall have 432 Members—

A MEMBER. Four hundred and thirty-three.

Mr. SIMS. Yes; 433. There will be an increase of 42. We are in the majority in this House, and I have no doubt we will be in the majority in the next House, and we might as well take this matter up and act upon it, and so amend our rules that this pair farce will no longer deceive the public. Gentlemen can readily obtain leave of absence here, and the RECORD will show it, and the RECORD will show how long a Member has been absent.

I do not think that gentlemen who are paid \$7,500 a year for their time have any right to absent themselves from this Hall and go out and pursue their private business and make money out of their very absence, and have the Sergeant at Arms racing about the city of Washington in the dead of night and at all other times in the effort to get enough men here to make a quorum.

I am not afraid this feather will be stolen. [Laughter.] This feather will stay, even though it is a pinfeather. But I tell you, gentlemen, it will work great results. Publicity is the remedy, and when we have it Members of this House, rather than absent themselves from this Hall to make money for their own pockets, when the RECORD does not show that they are paired with some dead duck engaged in the same kind of business, will be here. [Laughter and applause.] Therefore I have taken this up for discussion at this time for the purpose of bringing seriously to the attention of the Members, both Democrats and Republicans, the fact that we have got to do something to break up absenteeism, and this is the only thing that at present occurs to me that will so effectively abolish a lot of falsehoods in the RECORD put in there by pair clerks. Then we can abolish

the pair clerks and save that much expense, as we will not need them.

Mr. RODENBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SIMS. I do.

Mr. RODENBERG. If this reform is carried out what will become of the Chautauqua lectures? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Oh, I do not know whether the gentleman has any interest in that inquiry or not, but being one of the hand-somest men in the House and a great orator—we having heard him deliver one of the finest orations ever delivered in this House in favor of New Orleans over San Francisco—I would imagine that the Chautauqua people would be after the gentleman with very enticing figures. [Laughter and applause.] But I am glad to say that he is patriotic enough to believe that "standpatism" requires his attention and presence here, and that a little matter of \$100 or \$200 a day or any other amount of money does not seem sufficient to compensate him for deserting his colors in this House in order that he may make money for himself on the outside. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, so as to print two newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The newspaper clippings are as follows:)

CLARK CHOICE OF DEMOCRATS—ELECTION REGARDED BY CONGRESSMAN SIMS AS APPROVAL OF HIS CANDIDACY—CHANGING HOUSE RULES—SPEAKER SHOULD NOT HAVE THE POWER TO APPOINT STANDING COMMITTEES—PEOPLE ARE TIRED OF DOMINATION—PREVENTION OF ABSENTEEISM.

Congressman SIMS, when asked whom he thought would be elected Speaker of the House by the Democrats in the next Congress and what change in the rules was desirable, said:

"Hon. CHAMP CLARK was the unanimous choice of the Democrats for Speaker of the present House, the entire Democratic vote having been cast for him. It was generally expected throughout the country that in case the Democrats were successful in the congressional elections this fall that Mr. CLARK would be the Democratic Speaker. The election having so resulted, I regard the vote as in the nature of an approval of Mr. CLARK'S candidacy.

"In the great fight last session to liberalize the rules of the House Mr. CLARK took a very advanced position in favor of taking from the Speaker all power to appoint the standing committees of the House. He made it plain that in case he should ever become Speaker that he would not want such power. He said we were all human and that it was 'human' to use great power more or less arbitrarily. The Democrats can not afford to take any backward step in reforming the rules in such a way as to take from the Speaker the power to appoint the standing committees. So far as I am concerned, I will not support any man for Speaker who is not clear in stating his position. No evasion or equivocal declaration goes with me.

MORE IMPORTANT THAN TARIFF.

"I regard the reform of the rules as more important than tariff reform, badly as that is needed. If we had not been gagged by the present rules the Payne bill could not have passed the House last year in the form it did. Without a radical revision of the rules, organic in its nature, the 'Cannonism' of to-day will become the 'Clarkism' of tomorrow. These gag rules have been supported largely by the outcry that they are necessary in order for the House to 'do business.' Well, the House has been doing 'business' under these rules for the last 16 years, and at last the country has gotten tired of the kind of business done under these rules, as evidenced by the results in the recent election.

"The people will not longer tolerate one-man power in the House of Representatives. They are tired of 'machine domination,' and they have no more use for a Democratic 'boss' than for a Republican 'boss.' If the Democrats want to remain in power, they must obey the voice of the people, and in no half-hearted way. The reformation of the rules must be real and substantial.

POWER TO NAME COMMITTEES.

"All power to appoint the standing committees of the House must be taken from the Speaker and vested in a committee or committees, or else be selected by a caucus of the Members of the dominant political parties, in like manner as the present Committee on Rules was selected, except that the caucus should be open and vote taken by roll call. I am opposed to the 'secret ballot' in the 'secret caucus.' There is no more reason for a secret caucus in organization than there is for a secret session of the House in electing the caucus nominees.

I am earnestly in favor of the open caucus. I see no more reason for a secret party caucus than for a secret party convention. Turn on the light, and let the representatives of the press be present and report the proceedings to the world, just as they do the proceedings of the House or Senate. Much of the most important legislation of Congress as at present conducted is shaped up in secret party caucus, with no record kept of votes or speeches of Members, with no report of the proceedings of the caucus except such as 'leaks' through some Member, and often in such shape as to be misleading.

PLENTY OF TIME.

"There is always as much as a year elapses between the election of a new House of Representatives and its first regular session. This gives an abundance of time in which to elect the Speaker and all House officers and for the election in caucus of all the standing committees.

"Take the newly elected Democratic House as an illustration. We can be called together in caucus on the first Monday in November, 1911, and have a whole month in which to organize and select the committees. If this is not sufficient time, we can meet the first Monday in October, 1911, and have two months for this work. Members of the Sixty-second Congress will receive their salaries from March 4, 1911, and it will be no hardship or expense for the Members to meet in Washington a month or two in advance of the next regular session on the first Monday in December, 1911, and in this way have an abundance of time in which to select in caucus all members of the standing committees of the House.

GROWING EVIL.

"Absentism of Members is a growing evil and should be prevented, and I know no better way to prevent it than to change the rules so as to allow record 'yea' and 'nay' votes of the House while sitting in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, so that these roll calls will disclose the absence of Members, to be followed by another change of the rules to prevent the publishing of pairs of Members in the daily record of the proceedings of the House. By such a change as above indicated absentism of Members of Congress will be reduced to the minimum."

[From Washington Post, Aug. 22, 1911.]
FOR PUBLIC CAUCUSES.

The Democratic Members of the House in caucus last night discussed the plan of Democratic Leader UNDERWOOD to open to the press the party caucuses of the future. The result was the appointment of a committee composed of Representatives UNDERWOOD, JAMES of Kentucky, PALMER of Pennsylvania, HARDY of Texas, and Speaker CLARK, who will report to a Democratic caucus early in the coming regular session.

Mr. UNDERWOOD urged that open caucuses would be for the best interests of the party and for the successful conduct of legislative affairs. Though some opposition developed, there were many in attendance who agreed with him, and it was determined that the question should be made the subject for further discussion in December.

Representative HENRY of Texas, chairman of the Rules Committee, in a public statement yesterday advocated the Underwood plan.

"If I can have my way," said Mr. HENRY, "there will be no more secret Democratic caucuses. They should be wide open and public, so that all may see and hear the proceedings. There should be no star-chamber proceedings in Democratic affairs."

UNIVERSAL PEACE.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL] asks unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I have no objections to the gentleman's taking time until the House has other business to proceed to.

Mr. HAMILL. I did not catch the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. MANN. I say, I would have no objection until the House had other business to attend to.

Mr. HAMILL. The gentleman means until the President's message comes in? If so, that is thoroughly reasonable.

Mr. MANN. That is the understanding.

Mr. HAMILL. That is, if the message comes in, the speaking will have to stop.

Mr. MANN. That is what I mean.

Mr. HAMILL. That is thoroughly reasonable.

Mr. MANN. With that understanding, I have no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of good roads.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of good roads. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from New Jersey having 30 minutes to address the House, with the understanding that if a message comes in from the President the speech is to be suspended?

Mr. MANN. Or if any business comes over.

The SPEAKER. Yes; or if any business comes over. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday before last the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] addressed the House on the subject of universal peace. As I propose to take exception to some remarks the gentleman then made, I am sincerely sorry he is not present to hear what I have to say. I diligently attempted to find him by telephoning for several days to his office, and on each of the days on which I telephoned I searched for him on the floor of the House. I learned afterwards that he is on his way to Europe, so that it was impossible to get him here. During the course of his interesting remarks he referred to the arbitration treaties now pending in the Senate, and expressed the hope that the Senate would at once proceed to ratify them. So strong was his desire for immediate ratification that he even submitted a form of resolution to that effect, which he thought would be opportune and wise for this House to adopt.

Mr. Speaker, I fully concur in the laudable desire expressed by the gentleman for universal peace. I, too, fervently hope the Utopian day will soon arrive when swords will be beaten

into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks, and the nations of the earth relieved of the intolerable burden of maintaining immense armies and navies.

The present arbitration treaties, however, are not a step in that direction. On the contrary, they would, if ratified, become a fruitful cause of interrupting and of eventually destroying such peaceful international relations as now exist. A very fair way of showing what would be their probable and expected purpose is found in the utterances of those best situated to know it.

On the 13th of last March Sir Edward Grey delivered a speech in the English House of Commons. Sir Edward Grey is the English secretary for foreign affairs, and hence speaks with authority for the English Government. The speech I refer to was made in opposition to a motion to reduce naval armaments, and while defending the retention of England's two-power naval standard, the greatest menace to-day to the peace of Europe, he welcomed what he was pleased to call President Taft's proposition for arbitration, and in regard to it then continued:

The nations that made such an agreement might be exposed to attack from a third power. This would probably lead to their following with an agreement to join each other in any case where one of them had a quarrel with a third nation which had refused to arbitrate. I do not think that a statement of this kind made by a man in Mr. Taft's position should go without response.

These words bear but a single interpretation. The circumstances in which they were employed make their significance plain. They were used in a speech opposing a proposition to reduce naval expenditures. They were preceded by a speech in the same behalf made by Reginald McKenna, secretary for the navy (First Lord of the Admiralty), in which that official repeatedly asserted that England's reason for building *Dreadnaughts* is to keep ahead of Germany. They mean that this arbitration treaty is considered as the first step in an alliance for war—an alliance which shall pledge the power of the American Navy and the resources of the American Government to assist a foreign nation in the event of European war.

How are the treaties regarded in France? We can gather a good understanding of the use to which they may be put by consulting the *Figaro*, an influential French journal, which authoritatively reflects the sentiment of the country. A cable from Paris, dated August 3, the day the Franco-American arbitration treaty was signed, contains the following:

The *Figaro*, in a long study of the resulting situation, declares that if other nations do not join the movement those who have pledged for arbitration should adopt the principle of boycotting, by inserting a clause in the international agreements providing that they shall suspend all relations of commerce, transportation, and postal intercourse with any country warring upon one of the signers. For example, the paper says, that if the United States, France, and Great Britain should boycott Germany by refusing all relations with her, the action would be certain to cause the confusion and ruin of that nation. "By boycotting," the *Figaro* adds, "we will obtain obligatory arbitration, and then the delimitation of all armaments."

Will anyone undertake to say that such action would not irresistibly provoke war? If, then, the same construction can be put by the French upon their treaty as the British secretary for foreign affairs puts upon the English pact, we are at any time likely to find ourselves engaged in European hostilities without even the necessity of declaring war.

All treaties entered into heretofore have excepted from their scope questions of vital interest and of national honor. These two reservations have ever been considered matters which no nation could wisely place in the field of arbitration. These treaties inaugurate a departure, and it is well worth contemplating what results such a course could lead to.

Would the American people allow arbitration on questions arising under the Monroe doctrine? The peace advocates, so called, have studiously avoided reference to this probable effect of the treaties, but according to the press reports of Sunday, August 13, Secretary of State Knox, who assisted in drawing these documents, admitted in his argument before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations the possibility of questions involving the Monroe doctrine being submitted to arbitration. The next day, however, according to a press report purporting to come from the honorable Secretary, this statement is denied. If, then, questions involving the Monroe doctrine are not to be included within the scope of this treaty, let us follow the advice published in the *Washington Post* a few days ago and plainly write this reservation across the face of every clause of the treaties.

The gentleman from Missouri extricates himself from the difficulty by attempting to show that the Monroe doctrine is not as important as formerly. In an address made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], on the 4th of last May, before the Peace Congress at Baltimore, and submitted to this House on

the 17th of the same month, I find on the ninth page as the title of a section of that address.

Its—

Meaning the Monroe doctrine—
importance has passed. The rule—

He says—

laid down by Mr. Monroe served a good purpose one time, but the necessity for it passed long ago.

In this connection let me read from the influential North American, of Philadelphia. In its issue of the 11th instant, it said editorially the following:

It is no time for prejudice or factional or partisan thought when, in honest error, the Monroe doctrine has been put in peril. Hannis Taylor, skilled diplomatist and expert in international law, states the case in the Washington Post exactly as it must appear to all who give proper thought to this Nation's past and future and to these new peace treaties:

"The only practical outcome of these treaties will be the submission to tribunals, necessarily dominated by European influences, of the vital and subtle questions arising out of the Monroe doctrine, upon which our overlordship in this hemisphere depends. When we agree with European nations to arbitrate 'questions of vital interest and national honor' behind the veil, the Monroe doctrine and its consequences is really the one substantial thing involved.

"Only special students of the history of the Monroe doctrine, created by the pcns of Presidents and Secretaries of State, understand its peculiar and exceptional relations to that set of understandings we call international law. It is the outcome of our peculiar position of isolation from the European nations, a position which makes it possible for us to direct the affairs of this hemisphere without entangling alliances with them.

"President Cleveland, who finally gave it scientific definition during the controversy with Great Britain as to the boundaries of Venezuela, said: 'It was intended to apply to every stage of our national life, and can not become obsolete while our Republic endures. If the balance of power is justly a cause for jealous anxiety among the Governments of the Old World, and a subject for our absolute noninterference, none the less is an observance of the Monroe doctrine of vital concern to our people and their Government.'

"Just as it would be impossible for the nations of Europe to submit the questions arising out of the maintenance of the balance of power there to a tribunal dominated by new-world influences, so it is impossible for us to submit the Monroe doctrine and its subtle and far-reaching consequences to a tribunal dominated by old-world influences.

"The radical difficulty arises out of the fact that as the Monroe doctrine is a law of our own creation for our own special benefit, it has no such recognized status in international law as to make it enforceable by an international tribunal administering that law. It is in its very nature nonjusticiable by any tribunal whatever, because it is an emanation of our sovereign will. It is a law unto ourselves.

"If the President should attempt to defend himself by asserting that it is not the purpose of the arbitration treaties to involve the Monroe doctrine, then let that fact be clearly written across the face of each one of them. The moment that is done the European powers will refuse to be parties to them.

"Let every patriotic American, no matter whether Democrat or Republican, answer in the same spirit whenever any man or set of men attempts to overthrow that precious and peculiar heritage known as the Monroe doctrine, upon which our primacy in this hemisphere depends.

"No one has been more devoted to the cause of international arbitration, within reasonable and patriotic limits, than I have been. In my work on international law I have been its humble and steadfast defender. The first Hague conference was a brilliant success, because it kept within the bounds of the reasonable and practical. The second Hague conference was a dismal failure, because it attempted to invade the realm of Utopian dreams.

"It is those Utopian dreams which the framers of the pending treaties are attempting to vitalize through a surrender of the basic principle upon which our American system reposes."

These statements of Mr. Taylor are not those of a casual student or superficial critic, but are the expressed convictions of a man whose reputation as an authority on international law is world-wide. When he published his world-famous treatise on international public law it drew from the Harvard Law Review the statement that it is "the best American work since Wheaton," and from the Law Quarterly Review, of London, the comment that "this book is, probably, on the whole, the fullest treatise in the language on its subject." Sir Ludovic Grant, professor of international law in the University of Edinburgh, exceeded these tributes when he said:

I do not hesitate to say that Dr. Hannis Taylor's International Public Law, replete with historical learning, characterized by philosophical breadth of view, and distinguished for the classical stateliness of its diction, entitles its author to a conspicuous place in a galaxy which includes the names of Wheaton and Kent and Halleck, of Woolsey and Dudley Field.

Mr. Taylor contends that if the Taft administration is sincere in its declaration that the pending arbitration treaties are not intended to embrace the Monroe doctrine or any of its direct and necessary consequences, it should be so stated. Let the treaties be amended and that fact written in clear and unmistakable terms in the preamble of each one of them. If the administration refuses to take that course, then its purpose to submit the Monroe doctrine to arbitration stands unmasked.

If, under such conditions, President Taft dares to appeal to the people to turn against those faithful Senators of both political parties who are now defending their Nation's interests, a vital issue will arise—not of politics, but of patriotism. The question will be this: Can the American people afford to trust

their most vital interests to a President who is willing to bargain it away to the European powers for benefits which are purely imaginary, or at best totally inadequate? [Applause.]

In the same editorial the North American, referring to the President, also says:

We have not one word to retract from our commendation of his single-minded, uninfluenced purity of patriotic motive in this matter. It is with genuine regret that we fear he has been deluded again and provided new, deplorable proof of his ineptitude for the conduct of national affairs.

To such straits, however, are the advocates of this treaty reduced in their efforts to have these unfledged treaties ratified that they hack and belittle the importance of our one distinctively American doctrine. Yet with the building and completion of the Panama Canal, bringing us into closer relations with the Central and South American countries, that doctrine will become immensely more important than ever.

Would the majority of American citizens allow arbitration on the question of the right of this Government to fortify the Panama Canal? Yet this question could, under the terms of the treaties as signed, be made an arbitrable proposition.

In this connection it is valuable to note that those treaties, so we are informed, are to be followed by a similar agreement with Japan. One of the vexatious questions which is apt to disturb peaceful relations with that newborn world power of the Orient will be whether this country can discriminate against the admission of Japanese laborers, and the status which Japanese subjects shall enjoy in our cities on the Pacific coast. Thus by our own voluntary act we court the menace of coolie labor.

The party to which our President belongs has always avowed deep solicitude for the welfare of American labor. It has justified the imposition of what they term protective tariffs on the ground, among others, that a high rate was necessary to safeguard American labor. Aside from the merits of the protective tariff in this respect, let me ask of what use will it be to levy high-tariff taxes in an attempt to keep up for the workman the American system of living?

Of what value are your schedules if the cheap coolie labor of the East could be landed by thousands on our western coast to imperil the American rate of wages? The gentleman from Missouri expressed surprise that the Central Labor Union of Washington should have opposed the treaties. Here is a reason sufficiently potent to impel any workman to condemn them. He would be blind not only to his own interests but to those of his country were he to act otherwise. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us consider briefly the terms in which these treaties are couched. With the exception of the preamble, their terms are almost exactly identical. For the information of the House I shall read the English pact as signed, omitting the preamble. Here are the terms:

ARTICLE I.

All differences hereafter arising between the high contracting parties, which it has not been possible to adjust by diplomacy relating to international matters in which the high contracting parties are concerned by virtue of a claim of right made by one against the other under treaty or otherwise, and which are justiciable in their nature by reason of being susceptible of decision by the application of the principles of law or equity, shall be submitted to the permanent court of arbitration established at The Hague by the convention of October 18, 1907, or to some other arbitral tribunal as may be decided in each case by special agreement, which special agreement shall provide for the organization of such tribunal if necessary, define the scope of the powers of the arbitrators, the question or questions at issue, and settle the terms of reference and the procedure thereunder.

The provisions of articles 37 to 90, inclusive, of the convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes concluded at the Second peace conference at The Hague on the 18th October, 1907, so far as applicable, and unless they are inconsistent with or modified by the provisions of the special agreement to be concluded in each case, and excepting articles 53 and 54 of such convention, shall govern the arbitration proceedings to be taken under this treaty.

The special agreement in each case shall be made on the part of the United States by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, His Majesty's Government reserving the right before concluding a special agreement in any matter affecting the interests of a self-governing dominion of the British Empire to obtain the concurrence therein of the government of that dominion.

Such agreements shall be binding when confirmed by the two Governments by an exchange of notes.

ARTICLE II.

The high contracting parties further agree to institute as occasion arises and as hereinafter provided a joint high commission of inquiry, to which, upon the request of either party, shall be referred for impartial and conscientious investigation any controversy between the parties within the scope of Article I before such controversy has been submitted to arbitration, and also any other controversy hereafter arising between them, even if they are not agreed that it falls within the scope of Article I: *Provided, however,* That such reference may be postponed until the expiration of one year after the date of the formal request therefor, in order to afford an opportunity for diplomatic discussion and adjustment of the questions in controversy if either party desires such postponement.

Whenever a question or matter of difference is referred to the joint high commission of inquiry, as herein provided, each of the high con-

tracting parties shall designate three of its nationals to act as members of the commission of inquiry for the purposes of such reference; or the commission may be otherwise constituted in any particular case by the terms of reference, the membership of the commission and the terms of reference to be determined in each case by an exchange of notes.

The provisions of articles 9 to 36, inclusive, of the convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes concluded at The Hague on the 18th October, 1907, so far as applicable and unless they are inconsistent with the provisions of this treaty, or are modified by the terms of reference agreed upon in any particular case, shall govern the organization and procedure of the commission.

ARTICLE III.

The Joint High Commission of Inquiry, instituted in each case as provided for in Article II, is authorized to examine into and report upon the particular questions or matters referred to it, for the purpose of facilitating the solution of disputes by elucidating the facts and to define the issues presented by such questions, and also to include in its report such recommendations and conclusions as may be appropriate.

The reports of the commission shall not be regarded as decisions of the questions or matters so submitted, either on the facts or on the law, and shall in no way have the character of an arbitral award.

It is further agreed, however, that in cases in which the parties disagree as to whether or not a difference is subject to arbitration under Article I of this treaty, that question shall be submitted to the Joint High Commission of Inquiry; and if all or all but one of the members of the commission agree and report that such difference is within the scope of Article I, it shall be referred to arbitration in accordance with the provisions of this treaty.

ARTICLE IV.

The commission shall have power to administer oaths to witnesses and take evidence on oath whenever deemed necessary in any proceeding or inquiry or matter within its jurisdiction under this treaty; and the high contracting parties agree to adopt such legislation as may be appropriate and necessary to give the commission the powers above mentioned, and to provide for the issue of subpoenas and for compelling the attendance of witnesses in the proceedings before the commission.

On the inquiry both sides must be heard, and each party is entitled to appoint an agent, whose duty it shall be to represent his Government before the commission and to present to the commission, either personally or through counsel retained for that purpose, such evidence and arguments as he may deem necessary and appropriate for the information of the commission.

ARTICLE V.

The commission shall meet whenever called upon to make an examination and report under the terms of this treaty, and the commission may fix such times and places for its meetings as may be necessary, subject at all times to special call or direction of the two Governments. Each commissioner, upon the first joint meeting of the commission after his appointment, shall, before proceeding with the work of the commission, make and subscribe a solemn declaration in writing that he will faithfully and impartially perform the duties imposed upon him under this treaty, and such declaration shall be entered on the records of the proceedings of the commission.

The United States and British sections of the commission may each appoint a secretary, and these shall act as joint secretaries of the commission at its joint sessions, and the commission may employ experts and clerical assistants from time to time as it may deem advisable. The salaries and personal expenses of the commission and of the agents and counsel and of the secretaries shall be paid by their respective Governments and all reasonable and necessary joint expenses of the commission incurred by it shall be paid in equal moieties by the high contracting parties.

ARTICLE VI.

This treaty shall supersede the arbitration treaty concluded between the high contracting parties on April 4, 1908, but all agreements, awards, and proceedings under that treaty shall continue in force and effect and this treaty shall not affect in any way the provisions of the treaty of January 11, 1909, relating to questions arising between the United States and the Dominion of Canada.

ARTICLE VII.

The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by His Britannic Majesty. The ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible and the treaty shall take effect on the date of the exchange of its ratifications. It shall thereafter remain in force continuously unless and until terminated by 24 months' written notice given by either high contracting party to the other.

In faith whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty in duplicate and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at Washington the 3d day of August, in the year of our Lord 1911.

[SEAL]
[SEAL]

PHILANDER C. KNOX.
JAMES BRYCE.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the original treaty this day signed.

PHILANDER C. KNOX,
Secretary of State.

AUGUST 3, 1911.

On Saturday, August 12, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held a meeting, which was an executive meeting, I understand, in order to consider the treaties. Mr. Knox, the Secretary of State, attended the meeting for the purpose of urging the committee to report the treaties without amendment. The committee, however, in its wisdom, amended the documents by eliminating the third paragraph of Article III. This paragraph creates the Joint High Commission, which shall first determine what questions are arbitrable.

One half of this commission would be composed of three members appointed by the Executive without first obtaining the consent of the Senate and the other half would be composed of

three foreigners. The effect of the creation of this commission would be to take from the Senate the important power of deciding whether each particular question of difference should be subjected to arbitration and it would confer that right upon the international commission. What motive can there be for this attempt to divest the Senate of this important power? It can hardly be an American motive, and fortunately we are not left to mere conjecture to determine who first probably suggested the idea. It is well known that Mr. James Bryce, the English ambassador, gave great assistance in the preparation of the arbitration pacts.

Mr. Bryce does not favor the right of the Senate to possess the power referred to. In the American Commonwealth, the work for which he is perhaps best known in this country, he has, in volume 1, edition of 1910 (chap. 11, pp. 109-110), thus expressed himself:

The Senate may and occasionally does amend a treaty, and return it amended to the President. There is nothing to prevent it from proposing a draft treaty to him or asking him to prepare one, but this is not the practice. For ratification a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present is required. This gives great power to a vexatious minority, and increases the danger, evidenced by several incidents in the history of the Union, that the Senate, or a faction in it, may deal with foreign policy in a narrow, sectional, electioneering spirit. When the interest of any group of States is, or is supposed to be, against the making of a treaty, that treaty may be defeated by the Senators from those States. They tell the other Senators of their own party that the prospects of the party in the district of the country whence they come will be improved if the treaty is rejected and a bold, aggressive line is taken in further negotiations. Some of these Senators, who care more for the party than for justice or the common interests of the country, rally to the cry, and all the more gladly if their party is opposed to the President in power, because in defeating the treaty they humiliate his administration. Thus the treaty may be rejected, and the settlement of the question at issue indefinitely postponed. It may be thought that a party acting in this vexatious way will suffer in public esteem. This happens in extreme cases; but the public are usually so indifferent to foreign affairs, and so little skilled in judging of them, that offenses of the kind described may be committed with practical impunity. It is harder to fix responsibility on a body of Senators than on the Executive; and whereas the Executive has usually an interest in settling diplomatic troubles, whose continuance it finds annoying, the Senate has no such interest, but is willing to keep them open so long as some political advantage can be sucked out of them. The habit of using foreign policy for electioneering purposes is not confined to America. It has been seen in England and in France and even in monarchical Germany. But in America the treaty-confirming power of the Senate opens a particularly easy and tempting door to such practices.

For us as Americans, who are, as the gentleman from Missouri very correctly observed, constituents of the Senators, it is decidedly not gratifying to have a foreigner accuse them of the practice of "sucking" political advantage out of questions of momentous national importance. It throws, however, a strong light on the reasons for attempting to thus unwarrantedly rob the Senate of one of its powers.

It is interesting to note that this very sharp and unfounded assault upon our Senate has been republished by Mr. Bryce as British ambassador in the very latest edition of his work, from which I have just quoted, a book which he is selling every day to the American people through an American publishing house.

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, as I have said, expunged paragraph 3 of Article III, and in so doing they exhibited wise and commendable regard for the Constitution of the United States. By the Constitution the Senate possesses the right to say what questions shall be submitted to arbitration. And if they surrendered this right it would open the door to Executive usurpation and destroy to that extent the coordinate power of the Senate. Not only did the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate do an act which is commendable in eliminating this clause from the draft as presented to them, but they would have been remiss in their duty had they done otherwise. The Senate has no right to divest itself of its constitutional power. This would be an alteration of the Constitution brought about in an irregular and unconstitutional manner under the guise of making a treaty, although the Constitution itself provides the manner in which it shall be changed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me in this place make brief passing reference to a few statements which the gentleman from Missouri made during the course of his remarks. He expressed his pride as an American that an American President, has by the signing of these treaties, taken the initiative in the great movement for more permanent peace, and he cherished the hope that by his action in so doing President Taft would rank next to Abraham Lincoln. I certainly would not gratuitously carp at any compliment the gentleman might see fit to pay our President, who is personally one of the most popular chief executives who ever occupied the White House. It would cause me as much pride as it would the gentleman from Missouri to see the name of our present President achieve the deathless fame which surrounds the name of the illustrious Lincoln, and I sincerely hope he may one day realize this sublime and patriotic ambition. But the facts of history prevent us from ascribing to

President Taft the initiative of this movement and the paternity of these treaties. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The claim that President Taft was the originator of the proposition to arbitrate all questions that may arise between this Republic and other nations is refuted by the first sentence of Article I of the arbitration treaty of 1897, which was negotiated under the Cleveland administration and which failed of ratification by the Senate. The first paragraph of Article I said:

The high contracting parties agree to submit to arbitration, in accordance with the provisions and subject to the limitations of this treaty, all questions in difference between them which they may fail to settle by diplomatic negotiation.

The opening paragraph of Article I of the present treaty says:

All differences hereafter arising between the high contracting parties which it has not been possible to adjust by diplomacy relating to international matters in which the high contracting parties are concerned by virtue of a claim of right made by one against the other under treaty or otherwise and which are justiciable, etc.

It will be seen that the Olney-Pauncefote treaty of 1897 was apparently even more sweeping in its scope than the present treaty, because the reservation, "and which are justiciable," was not made in it. The defeated treaty of 1897, which was inspired by the subtle mind of Lord Salisbury, and the present treaty are, in essence, the same, but the present one is put in a new dress and given an American nativity in order to make it more attractive to the people of the United States. The class of questions to be arbitrated is the same, the only difference is in the method of arbitration and in the creation in the present treaty of the joint high commission, which is to usurp the power of the Senate. No; the treaty proposition had foreign origin which brought it into disrepute, but Mr. James Bryce carried the fountling to Washington and laid it at the door of the White House, and our genial President, with his noble and characteristic good heartedness, took the abandoned bantling in and adopted it as his own. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Missouri undertakes to inform this House what the attitude of Irish citizens is on this treaty. Now, he may or may not be an authority on the attitude of the Germans—he certainly, to my personal knowledge, is not an authority so far as the Germans of New Jersey and the Germans of the great city of New York are concerned. They are overwhelmingly against this treaty.

But I must protest against his statements regarding the Irish citizens. Some of those statements are utterly unfounded and others, whether intended or not, are decidedly insulting. He said:

Some of our Irish friends are opposed to the treaty with Great Britain for reasons which need no explanation. To the credit of that sturdy element of our citizenship be it said that the great majority did not approve and could not be induced to join demonstrations which meant the obstructing of a great American policy by a European heritage, as there is good ground for hope that the concession of Home Rule to Ireland by a Liberal British Government will soon reconcile whatever opposition manifests itself from that quarter.

Where did the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMT] get his information, and whence does he derive his authority to speak for the Irish citizens of this Republic? Can he name one representative Irish citizen or one Irish paper in America that has publicly declared for this treaty? I say without fear of contradiction that 99 per cent of the Irish citizens are opposed to this treaty. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Does the gentleman pretend ignorance of the perfect deluge of protests which have come to the Senate from Irish organizations, or does he undertake to throw doubt on their authenticity or their representative character?

But, Mr. Speaker, whether there are few or many Irish citizens opposed to this treaty is an insignificant question compared to the imputation that Irish citizens are actuated by any but American reasons in their political action and attitude. I resent as an insult to my race, which has proved by its loyalty and devotion to this Republic in every crisis of its history, in war and in peace, from the time of the Revolution to the present day, the insinuation that their action is governed or influenced by "a European heritage" or by any consideration other than the honor and the interests of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The question of home rule for Ireland does not enter into this matter. The denial of home rule does not influence the action of Irish citizens, and neither the promise nor the actual concession of home rule will alter their attitude in the smallest degree. They are opposed to all entangling alliances, whether open and avowed or disguised as arbitration treaties. Their well justified distrust of England is nothing compared to their love of America.

No reasons but such as are American in character have been given by those Americans, whom he is pleased to call "our Irish friends," for opposing this treaty. Their arguments have

all been made from a well-taken American point of view, and to take any other would be improper and unpatriotic. I therefore advise the gentleman that it would be far more creditable to his statesmanship to draw his inferences from well-established facts rather than from the suggestions of imagination.

Mr. Speaker, there is no occasion for untimely haste in concluding these treaties. Let the question be fully and carefully discussed throughout the entire country. There has been no public discussion heretofore, and the attempt to drive these treaties through the Senate with unreasoning haste is mysterious at least. This is a question which involves a radical departure in our foreign policy, and it should not be arranged at a secret meeting in the White House and ratified at an executive session of the Senate.

And let us in the meantime recall these weighty words spoken by the immortal Washington in his farewell address:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government.

Viewed in the light of present events, these words were inspired by prophetic vision. They have marked out the path along which this Nation has heretofore traveled and led the world in the march of progress, enlightenment, and civilization. It is a priceless heritage, and we ought to pause and give searching criticism and profound consideration to any proposition to barter it away. [Loud applause.]

THE COTTON SCHEDULE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 108), which was read, as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return, without my approval, H. R. 12812, entitled "An act to reduce the duties on manufactures of cotton."

Though its title mentions only manufactures of cotton, the bill in fact changes also all the duties imposed under Schedule A of the Payne Act upon chemicals, oils, and paints, and under Schedule C upon metals and manufactures of metals.

My objection to the cotton schedule is that it was adopted without any investigation or information of a satisfactory character as to the effect which it will have upon an industry of this country in which the capital invested amounted in 1909 to \$821,000,000; the value of the product to \$629,000,000; the number of wage earners to 379,000, making, with dependents, a total of at least 1,200,000 persons affected; and the wages paid annually amounted to \$146,000,000. The bill would not go into effect by its terms until January 1 next, and before that time a full report to be submitted to Congress by the Tariff Board, based upon the most thorough investigation, will show the comparative cost of all the elements of production in the manufacture of cotton in this and other countries. The investigation by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House did not cover the facts showing this comparative cost, for the reason that the committee was preparing a bill on a tariff for revenue basis and their view of a proper tariff was avowedly at variance with the theory of protection. Pledged to support a policy of moderate protection, I can not approve a measure which violates its principle.

Coming now to the amendments to Schedules A and C, I have examined the records of Congress for the purpose of informing myself as to the facts and arguments which in the opinion of Congress make these changes in the law expedient. I find that there was practically no consideration of either schedule by any committee of either House. There was no report of any committee explaining or stating the basis of the proposed amendments. There were no facts presented to either House in which I can find material upon which to form any judgment as to the effect of the amendments either upon American industries or upon the revenues of the Government. The revisions of Schedules A and C were contained in amendments offered upon the floor of the Senate, were never referred to any committee, and were disposed of without any attempt to adjust the details or to furnish the basis of fact for adjusting the details of the different paragraphs to the great number or variety of industries to be affected, with a view to any degree of protection whatever, however moderate. I can not make myself a party to dealing with the industries of the country in this way.

The industries covered by metals and the manufacture of metals are the largest in the country, and it would seem not only wise but absolutely essential to acquire accurate information as to the effect of changes which may vitally affect these industries before enacting them into law.

The haste in the preparation of the bill is apparent in many of its pages. Section 3 of the bill reads as follows:

Sec. 3. That on and after the day when this act shall go into effect all goods, wares, and merchandise previously imported and hereinbefore enumerated, described, and provided for, for which no entry has been made, and all such goods, wares, and merchandise previously entered without payment of duty and under bond for warehousing, transportation, or any other purpose, for which no permit of delivery to the importer or his agent has been issued, shall be subjected to no other duty upon the entry or withdrawal thereof than the duty which would be imposed if such goods, wares, or merchandise were imported on or after that date: *Provided, however*, That if the duties above provided to be collected and paid shall, as to any article or articles, be greater than that provided to be paid by the present existing law, less 30 per cent, then in every such case the duty or duties which are hereby levied and which shall be collected and paid on said article or articles shall be a sum equal to the duties provided to be levied, collected, and paid by the present existing law less 30 per cent and not greater.

The first part of section 3, without the proviso, was original section 2 of the bill when it affected only the cotton schedule. It is now placed in the bill after the amendments to the chemical schedule. The proviso was added in the Senate. The proviso was doubtless intended to make certain that the duties in the preceding cotton and chemical schedules were all to be 30 per cent less than the rates fixed in the present law. But this can not be. The proviso is so placed in section 3 that it has no operation except upon the rates to be charged on articles described in the first half of section 3—that is, on the goods already entered or in bond or transportation and which have not paid duty. This would give, over all chemicals now in bond not taken out before the law goes into effect, the benefit of a greater reduction by 5 per cent than would be afforded to chemicals imported after the passage of the act. The result is an inevitable construction and in its manifest error is not out of keeping with some of the other features of the bill to which I am now about to refer.

Even if the proviso effects the purpose evidently intended by the authors of limiting the rates of the whole cotton and chemical schedules, it is legislation of the crudest character, for two reasons: It imposes on customs officers in every entry under those schedules the burden of transmuting the specific rates of the Payne Act to ad valorem rates under the proposed bill, a process which is most difficult and liable to error; secondly, it imposes a duty of 5 per cent less than the duty intended in the whole of the preceding chemical schedule, and furnishes a unique instance in tariff legislation of imposing two different rates of duties on the same articles in succeeding paragraphs of the same bill.

The empirical and haphazard character of this bill is shown more clearly, perhaps, in the amendment to Schedule A than in any other. The only explanation of it was made when introduced as an amendment. It was then said to be a horizontal reduction of the existing chemical schedule by one-fourth, or 25 per cent of the present duties. It was said that the specific duties in the existing law had been transmuted into their equivalent ad valorem, and that the result had been reduced by 25 per cent. The method used in reaching this equivalent was quite inaccurate, as is shown by actual inquiry as to the real market price of each article. An examination made by an expert chemist of the Tariff Board into certain paragraphs of schedule and verified by customs experts of the Treasury Department shows discrepancies in the alleged 25 per cent reduction of rates and gives ground for believing that, if time permitted, a close and careful analysis of all the paragraphs would show many others. Instead of a horizontal reduction of 25 per cent this examination shows that the reductions made by the amendment in some paragraphs are much greater than 25 per cent, and that in others the change is a substantial increase instead of a reduction of the present duties.

Thus, boracic acid is dutiable under the present law at 3 cents per pound. The amendment imposes a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem. At the foreign price of 6 to 6½ cents per pound the amended rate would be from 3.6 to 3.9 cents per pound, or an actual increase in the duty under the present law of from 20 to 30 per cent. Tartaric acid under the amendment has a duty 4 per cent higher than that of existing law. Alum under the amendment has a rate 10 per cent higher than existing law. Bleaching powder has a rate under the amendment that is 30 per cent higher than the existing rate. Zinc oxide has an increase of rate in the amendment of 95 per cent over that of existing law. On the other hand, we find in other cases a greater reduction than the proposed 25 per cent. Thus, borax is given a rate in the amendment which is a reduction of 80 per cent below the existing rate, while commercial chloroform in the amendment has a reduction of 90 per cent from the present rate. Hydrate, or caustic soda, is given a rate in the amendment which is a 50 per cent reduction from the present rate. A curious result appears in the rate fixed for alumina hydrate containing less than 64 per cent of alumina, and the same containing more of alumina. The latter is a finished product as

compared with the former, but the latter in the amendment is given a duty of only 5 per cent, while the raw and unfinished product has a rate of 15 per cent ad valorem.

These are some of the typical inconsistencies and instances of haste in preparation and of the error of calculation in the proposed sweeping horizontal reduction of a most important schedule in the tariff. The 85 paragraphs of Schedule A do not refer to the various manufactured forms of one or more materials. Each paragraph relates to a different subject, the duty on which, both with reference to its revenue-producing capacity and with reference to its protecting effect upon an industry of this country, ought to be determined by separate examination, and the taking of careful evidence of experts, because the subject is peculiarly one for experts. The figures I have given show that the method pursued in making what was thought to be a reduction of 25 per cent would, if it became the law, produce the greatest confusion in respect to the whole chemical schedule.

But the most remarkable feature of this amendment to the chemical schedule remains to be stated. The internal revenues of this country to the extent of \$160,000,000 are dependent on the imposition of a tax of \$1.20 a gallon on distilled spirits at 100 degrees proof, which is a liquid consisting of 50 per cent absolute alcohol and 50 per cent water. The intrinsic cost of spirits of this proof varies from 10 to 20 cents a gallon, so that the enormous tax as compared with the intrinsic value of the article furnishes a motive for fraud and evasion of the law stronger than in the case of any commodity within the range of Federal taxation. It has therefore been necessary in all customs legislation to protect the internal-revenue system against the introduction from foreign countries of alcohol in any form and in association with any other article except upon the payment of such a customs duty as shall make it unprofitable to import the alcohol into this country to be used in competition with alcohol or distilled spirits of domestic manufacture. The customs duty on a proof gallon of alcohol is \$2.25. The care and anxious concern with which Congress has heretofore guarded against the introduction of alcohol in any form without the payment of sufficient duty to prevent its interfering with our domestic production and the payment of the internal tax may be seen in at least 10 paragraphs of the chemical schedule of the Payne law and previous enactments:

Thus, in paragraph 2 of the existing law it is provided that vegetable, animal, or mineral objects, immersed or placed in or saturated with alcohol shall have a duty of 60 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem, and the same duty is imposed in that paragraph on alcoholic compounds not specially provided for. Sixty cents a pound is equivalent to 60 cents a pint of the alcohol or distilled spirits used at proof, and this is equivalent to \$4.80 a gallon for alcohol, which of course prevents its importation for any purpose other than as specified in the paragraph.

Again, in paragraph 3, chemical compounds containing alcohol and chemical mixtures containing alcohol have a duty of 55 cents per pound, which would protect the domestic alcohol by a duty of \$4.40 a gallon.

The same thing is true in paragraph 65, covering medicinal preparations containing alcohol, or any preparations in which alcohol is used. These have a duty of 55 cents per pound, which would impose a duty on the alcohol used of at least \$4.40 a gallon.

Again, on perfumes, including cologne and other toilet waters containing alcohol or in the preparation of which alcohol is used, there is a duty of 60 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem, by which the domestic alcohol used in American-made perfumes is protected by a tax of \$4.80.

Under the present bill, all these precautions against the undue introduction of foreign alcohol in articles and compounds included in the chemical schedule are in fact abolished by striking out the specific duties per pound. Thus in paragraph 2, the specific duty per pound is stricken out and the whole rate is fixed at 50 per cent ad valorem. In paragraph 3 there is a similar change; in paragraph 65 the change is to 45 per cent ad valorem; and in paragraph 69, to 60 and 50 per cent ad valorem. With alcohol at a foreign cost of 20 cents a gallon, this would make the tax, so far as the alcohol is concerned in paragraph 2, 10 cents a gallon; in paragraph 3, 8 cents a gallon; in paragraph 65, 9 cents a gallon; and in paragraph 69, from 10 to 12 cents a gallon. That is, the alcohol thus introduced would pay, under this chemical schedule, from 8 to 12 cents a gallon duty instead of \$1.20 a gallon as imposed by our internal-revenue system, or \$2.25 a gallon as imposed by our customs laws upon the introduction of proof alcohol, or the higher rates as fixed in the existing chemical schedule. Alcohol is also used in the manufacture of collodion and fruit ethers, and under the existing law the invasion of our internal-revenue system is here

also prevented by the imposition of high rates per pound as the equivalent of the internal-revenue tax. By this amendment the compensatory duties for the high domestic tax on alcohol in collodion and ether is abolished, and if the bill passed the domestic manufacturer would pay \$1.40 a gallon for his alcohol while his importing competitor would pay but 30 cents.

I need hardly dwell on the disastrous effect such an amendment in reference to alcoholic compounds would have upon the internal-revenue system of taxing distilled spirits, nor need I point out the opportunities of evasion and fraud thus presented. Of course, the change was not intended, but if this bill became law it would be made.

This bill thus illustrates and enforces the views which I have already expressed in vetoing the wool bill and the so-called free-list bill, as to the paramount importance of securing, through the investigation and reports of the Tariff Board, a definite and certain basis of ascertained fact for the consideration of tariff laws. When the reports of the Tariff Board upon these schedules are received, the duties which should be imposed can be determined upon justly and with intelligent appreciation of the effect that they will have both upon industry and upon revenue. Very likely some of the changes in this bill will prove to be desirable and some to be undesirable. So far as they turn out to be just and reasonable I shall be glad to approve them, but at present the proposed legislation appears to be all a matter of guesswork. The important thing is to get our tariff legislation out of the slough of guesswork and log-rolling and ex parte statements of interested persons, and to establish that legislation on the basis of tested and determined facts, to which shall be applied, fairly and openly, whatever tariff principle the people of the country choose to adopt.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 22, 1911.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution requires a two-thirds vote in this House to override the President's veto. The Democratic Party lacks a two-thirds vote in the membership on this side of the House. On the wool bill some patriotic and progressive Republicans voted with this side of the House [applause on the Democratic side] to pass the bill, and we thank them for their support. But it is evident, Mr. Speaker, that we have not the votes in this House at this time to override the President's veto, and I therefore move that the message be printed and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed House bill 1671, to provide a suitable memorial to the memory of the North American Indian.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9048. An act to remit the duty on pictorial windows to be imported by the Gate of Heaven Church, South Boston, Mass.;

H. R. 1671. An act to provide a suitable memorial to the memory of the North American Indian;

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a per capita payment to the enrolled members of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, and Seminole Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes entitled to share in the funds of said tribes;

H. R. 12534. An act to extend time of payment of balance due for lands sold under act of Congress approved June 17, 1910;

H. R. 13002. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the funds of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of August, 1911, on the day of the adjournment of the present session.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 2003. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to make partial payments for work already done under public contracts; and

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution extending the operation of the act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had receded from its amendments to the bill (H. R. 13002) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the funds of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution and bill of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a per capita payment to the enrolled members of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, and Seminole Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes entitled to share in the funds of said tribes; and

H. R. 12534. An act to extend the time of payment of balance due for lands sold under act of Congress approved June 17, 1910.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1995. An act to restore Capt. Alpha T. Easton to the active list of the Army; and

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to pay mileage to certain employees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had receded from its amendments to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 158) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of August, 1911, on the day of adjournment of the present session.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President, to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses, having completed the business of the present session, are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

In compliance with the foregoing, the Vice President appointed as said committee Mr. CULLOM and Mr. MARTIN of Virginia.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 943. An act for the improvement of the navigation of the Black Warrior River, in the State of Alabama;

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution extending the operation of the act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes;

S. 2003. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to make partial payments for work already done under public contracts;

S. 2541. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the passage of local or special laws in the Territories of the United States, to limit Territorial indebtedness, and for other purposes";

S. 1704. An act relieving and exempting lot No. 53 in Ann S. Parker's subdivision of lots in square No. 140 of the city of Washington, D. C., from the operation of an act entitled "An act to restrict the ownership of real estate in the Territories to American citizens," approved March 3, 1887; and

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for the use of the Astoria Centennial, to be held at Astoria, Oreg., August 10 to September 9, 1911.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills and joint resolutions:

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of August, 1911, on the day of adjournment of the present session;

H. R. 12534. An act to extend the time of payment of balance due for lands sold under act of Congress, approved June 17, 1910;

H. R. 9048. An act to remit the duty on pictorial windows to be imported by the Gate of Heaven Church, South Boston, Mass.;

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a per capita payment to the enrolled members of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, and Seminole Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes entitled to share in the funds of said tribes; and

H. R. 13002. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States funds of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 1995. An act to restore Capt. Alpha T. Easton to the active list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to pay mileage to certain employees of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. Latta, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

August 22, 1911:

H. R. 7263. An act to authorize the counties of Bradley and McMinn, Tenn., by authority of their county courts, to construct a bridge across the Hiwassee River at Charleston and Calhoun, in said counties;

H. R. 7690. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Snake River at the town of Nyssa, Oreg.;

H. R. 13276. An act to provide for the disposal of the present Federal building site at Newark, Ohio, and for the purchase of a new site for such building;

H. R. 13391. An act to increase the cost limit of the public building at Lynchburg, Va.;

H. R. 11545. An act to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to place the name of Annie M. Matthews on the pension roll of the police and firemen's pension fund;

H. R. 13367. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes," approved May 27, 1908;

H. R. 9048. An act to remit the duty on pictorial windows to be imported by the Gate of Heaven Church, South Boston, Mass.;

H. R. 12534. An act to extend the time of payment of balance due for lands sold under act of Congress approved June 17, 1910;

H. R. 13002. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the funds of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a per capita payment to the enrolled members of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, and Seminole Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes entitled to share in the funds of said tribes; and

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of August, 1911, on the day of adjournment of the present session.

THE JUVENILE COURT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 109), which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the fifth annual report of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia for the year ended June 30, 1911.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 21, 1911.

THE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the present session of Congress has lasted something over four months. During that

time Congress has appropriated \$301,052.20. Of this amount approximately \$141,000 was necessary to meet the expenses incident to the session of Congress. Of the other \$160,000, \$150,000 was to meet contract obligations for the rebuilding of the Army supply depot at Fort Mason, Cal., which must be met by October 1, 1911, and which should have been appropriated by the last Congress.

Attention was called during the last session of the Sixty-first Congress to the fact that it was imperative that this money should be appropriated for this Army supply depot, but the estimate was deliberately withheld from Congress.

No session of Congress has ever run for so long a period and appropriated so small a sum of money as the session just closing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No new offices or new employments have been created under Democratic auspices. The House of Representatives has initiated a policy of retrenchment and reform, which, if continued, and it will be, will have far-reaching results in its effect upon the fiscal affairs of the Government.

A Democratic House distinguished itself in the beginning by abolishing 65 salaried places in its own organization, with a consequent reduction in its annual pay roll of \$111,443.28, and in addition it has ended the custom heretofore existing of granting an extra month's pay to the officers and employees of the two Houses of Congress, resulting in a further saving of \$140,795.59 for each session of Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

At the beginning of the session a joint resolution was introduced in a Democratic House and has been enacted into law by which errors in appropriation bills passed at the last session of Congress were corrected by the repeal of certain appropriations aggregating the sum of \$347,650.

The net result of this is that Congress has appropriated \$301,052.20. It has repealed appropriations aggregating \$347,650, a saving of \$46,597.59. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In addition, it has declined to appropriate \$140,795.59 as extra compensation for employees of Congress, and a Democratic House has reduced its pay roll in the sum of \$111,443.28, so that the total saving in money as a result of the enforcement of Democratic policies during the present session of Congress is \$308,836.67.

A determined effort will be made to effect proportional savings in the administration of the Government in every department. That there is much room for reform in our administrative methods is very apparent from the fact that, although this present fiscal year has not run two months, estimates have been submitted to the Congress for appropriations in addition to those heretofore made for the present fiscal year which aggregate \$1,989,784.10. While it is undoubtedly true that in some instances it is impossible to estimate with accuracy the money necessary to carry on the operations of the various departments of the Government, it is, nevertheless, the fact that in many years there has been a laxity in the preparation of the estimates and in the observance of the statutes to prevent deficiencies which have been responsible for much of the extravagance in governmental affairs.

This House is pledged to reform the administration of public affairs and to retrench public expenditures. No legitimate activity of the Government is to be curtailed, but not a dollar will be appropriated which a careful investigation does not demonstrate should be expended in a wise, efficient, and effective administration of public affairs. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is usual for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations at the close of a regular session of Congress to submit a statement of appropriations. I think it is unusual for such a statement to be made at the close of an extraordinary session of Congress when the general appropriation bills are not reported providing for the service of the coming fiscal year. I do not, however, desire to criticize the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I am gratified to note that while there was all the way from \$180,000 to \$200,000 of decrease in expenditures for the employees of the House at the beginning of the session, it has dwindled now to \$111,000. I commend the statement to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly, if I can have a moment more.

Mr. PALMER. The figures given out at the beginning of this session that a saving of \$182,000 would be made were erroneous.

They should have been \$228,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That amount has actually been saved, and the statement of the gentleman from New York is not to the contrary, but the figures of \$228,000 include not only the sinecures which we abolished, but also the gratuity of the additional month's salary to the employees, which we have abolished at both ends of the Capitol. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Then I would commend to the gentleman that he move to amend the statement of \$111,000 by inserting \$220,000, \$111,000 being stated by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BURLESON. I would like to know if the gentleman got the full import of the statement made by the gentleman from New York, that after defraying all the expenses of this extraordinary session of Congress we, by efficient handling of the money bills at this session, had actually saved money.

Mr. CANNON. So be it, if the gentleman claims it, but let me tell the gentlemen from Pennsylvania and New York that this is the close of the extraordinary session, and there is a quotation from the New Testament that I think will prove apt in light of your investigations and expenditure, well made, and perhaps in some cases in the end not well made, which have to be taken account of later—

Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off.

I welcome any legitimate curtailment of expenses, and I may be pardoned if I say perhaps that an economy that at least temporarily incommodes Members of the House of Representatives in the performance of their legislative duties, for the want of sufficient help here for the duties which they perform is a questionable economy. This is a great aggregation that we have in the House of Representatives, speaking and legislating for 90,000,000 of people, plus, and it is small economy to deprive the individual Members and the aggregate representation of the necessary help to enable them to perform their duties touching matters of detail of a clerical nature, and especially touching cleanliness in the quarters that they occupy. [Applause on the Republican side.] I wish that there had been competent people—

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CANNON. One moment; I desire to finish this sentence—I wish it had been in their power to furnish enough competent experts for the leading committee of this House that had charge of revenue legislation that it might have formulated, presented, considered, and passed legislation that would not have been subject to the just and meritorious criticism contained especially in the last veto message of the President. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CANNON. In one moment I will yield.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may have one minute more—

Mr. CANNON. I would like, possibly, more than one minute—

Mr. STANLEY. That the gentleman have five minutes additional.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent is asked that five minutes additional be granted to the gentleman from Illinois. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky in a moment. Mr. Speaker, there is great room and has been for many, many years for intelligent, faithful, industrious scrutiny of appropriations and expenditures. Estimates come sometimes not well prepared, sometimes made expecting a cut. I have always stood in my service in this House, and I want to say in justice to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], in my judgment he has stood in good faith, for a proper curtailment of estimates for the public service, not an improper curtailment.

There is plenty of room when we have expenditures that run up toward a thousand million dollars for correct legislation, wise scrutiny of expenditures, intelligent and courageous legislation covering these great amounts—and they are great amounts, they are mountains. For this Congress coming in as it does with a Democratic majority for the first time in almost 16 years in this House, there is plenty of work and great work for it to do. And let me say to the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania [Mr. PALMER], with the greatest courtesy and the highest respect, that I believe the country will not approve the waste of time over the saving of cents here and there when the great affairs touching expenditures that aggregate nearly a thousand million dollars are neglected. Now, I say this in perfect kindness and I stand ready to cooperate with the gentleman from New York and with both sides of the House in all efforts in good faith to better the public service and to see to it that expenditures in the future shall be made according to law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STANLEY, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey rose.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman from Kentucky want to interrupt?

Mr. STANLEY. For just one moment.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the gentleman from Kentucky got the last five minutes yielded to the gentleman from Illinois, for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. STANLEY. I just want to make a statement. The gentleman from Illinois complains that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York have not provided enough help to keep them clean. [Laughter.] Now, I readily understand that more help was needed when the Republicans were in power to keep that side clean than is necessary when we are in power to keep this side clean. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I have a bathtub of my own. [Laughter and applause.]

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO WAIT ON THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen will suspend to enable the House to receive a privileged communication.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed by the House to join a similar committee on the part of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses were ready to adjourn and to ask him if he had further communications make report that they have performed that duty and that the President says he has no further communications to make.

The SPEAKER. The committee is discharged.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of amazement to me that a Member of this House so distinguished as the former Speaker and so long in the service of his country and of his party in this House could crowd into 10 minutes of talk so many inaccuracies of statement as the gentleman from Illinois has made here this afternoon. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the two hundred and twenty, and odd thousand dollars which we have saved to the Public Treasury in the organization and operation of this House were the extent of the Democratic program for economy in governmental expenditures, I would be ashamed of it. But I want to call attention to the fact that that saving, small as it is, is about 25 per cent of the total expense of the operation of this House, and resulted only from taking out nothing which was necessary, but only those places which were put in here as the pettiest graft which Washington has seen in years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We do not believe we crippled the House or the operation of the Government by abolishing a place in the House organization which had been held for years by a 16-year-old girl who never came to the Capitol. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We do not believe we crippled the operation of this House by abolishing the positions of a couple of telegraph operators who had not put their hands to an instrument in years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We do not believe we crippled this House by abolishing about 20 policemen who never could be found around the Capitol [applause on the Democratic side], or by abolishing places supposed to be held by men downstairs and carried on the pay rolls, drawing \$900 and \$1,000 a year, who were working at the same time in real-estate offices in the city of Washington. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have simply made the operation of this House honest. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. PALMER. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to add that we propose to make the same rule of honesty apply in every executive branch of the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If little graft of the kind that we have seen here in the interests of constituents who are put upon the pay rolls to do no work, but to get money to pay political debts of Members, can flourish here under the very eyes of men who are close to the people as Representatives elected every two years, what can you expect in departments where officers are not so closely responsible to the people? [Applause on the Democratic side.] We believe that investigations now proceeding, the expense of which is not extravagant—because if this cut had not been made those investigations would have proceeded anyhow—will show the same proportion of extravagance and dishonesty in the fair operation of the business existing in the other departments of the Government, and if we can cut down the expenditures of the various departments in the same proportion as we have economized here, we will make a record for economy in the public expense to which we can point with pride. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes on the subject of Philippine independence.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes on Philippine independence. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of 7,500,000 people, inhabitants of the far-off Philippine Islands, are watching this American Congress, eager for some sign that they are not to be overlooked and will speedily be granted what they all practically desire—the independence of their country.

Of these millions, 6,900,000 are Christians, the only Christian people of the Orient.

The Democratic Party in its last three general platforms advocated the independence of the Filipino people. The Filipinos know this, and when the last elections brought to this House a majority of the Democratic Party the Filipinos looked up to us as their redeemers, their saviors, as the only hope that they have to attain their long-felt desire. The history of this Democratic House clearly shows that the Democratic Party is fulfilling each and every one of its promises to the people of this country. One of these promises is to give the Filipinos their independence. [Applause on the Democratic side.] At the beginning of this session and through it many resolutions have been offered to give these people their freedom and self-government. You know, Mr. Speaker, that the sentiment of the majority of the Members of this House is in favor of that independence. It has been unfortunate that circumstances have prevented this House from taking up this question of Filipino independence at this session, but I rise now, Mr. Speaker, to say to the Filipinos and to their able representative, my friend, Mr. QUEZON [applause on the Democratic side], that if this House has not given consideration to the resolutions that give the Filipinos their liberty it has not been because the Democratic Party has lost sight of their wishes and petitions. Their petition can not be forgotten by those who believe and support all of the principles held by the Declaration of Independence signed by our forefathers on the 4th of July, 1776. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is my fervent hope that since by force of circumstances this House has not been able to take up the consideration of any resolution tending to turn over the sovereignty of the Philippines to the Filipinos themselves that this party will, at the next session, take up, consider, and so legislate that the actual work of building in the Orient a republic will be immediately inaugurated.

The present Republican administration, advocating for the cause of the 600,000 uncivilized inhabitants of the islands, claim that the Filipinos are not yet fit for independence and that the care of uncivilized tribes must be taken over and above the interests and welfare of the large majority of nearly 7,000,000 people who are Christians and civilized and are claiming the right to be independent.

With this argument the Republican administration advocates the retention of the islands until such time when these uncivilized tribes are fit for self-government. Is this just? Is this in accordance with the sound principles of our Constitution, which holds that all governments must derive their just powers from the consent of the governed? Must the interest and welfare of nearly 7,000,000 people be sacrificed to the questionable advantage or protection that may be afforded by this administration to the small minority of the uncivilized? The answer of these questions I leave to yourselves and to the Members of the House.

When the Sixty-third Congress will have met I look to see the Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri, unless the Nation shall have tendered him greater honors, I look to see the Speaker outline his plans, and that these will include the Philippine Islands.

American occupation of the Philippine Islands, Mr. Speaker, is a flagrant violation of the Constitution of the United States, a violation of both the spirit and the letter of that document which is the solemn pledge of the faith and honor of our country.

The Constitution was written for the benefit of all the races of the world.

I believe the utterances made in Philadelphia in 1776—

Declares one of the greatest American statesmen—

to have been the greatest evangel that ever came to mankind since the story of Bethlehem. Like the shot fired at Concord, it was heard around the world. It was heard with fear in the palace of the tyrant; it was heard with joy in the huts where the poor man dwelt. I reverently believe it was heard with joy in heaven itself.

My friend, Commissioner QUEZON, will tell you, as he has told me, that in the Philippines the cry of the people for freedom, so deeply felt because of the inborn desire of every human heart to breathe the healthful air of liberty, is based on the very words of the Declaration of Independence. And as one of the few men on the floor of this House speaking before the Tammany Society in New York City on the 4th of July, Commissioner QUEZON said:

Are you still animated with that spirit which inspired Patrick Henry to cry, "Give me liberty or give me death?" Whatever your opinion or feelings as to how foreign people should be treated, are you still unanimous in desiring to have at least here in your homes and for yourselves republican government and republican institutions? Do you still wish this Government of yours to be "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people?" Do you expect to continue being the sovereigns of your country and to have the officials mere executors of your will?

If that be so, then you have to stop at once this colonial policy, because it is endangering your democracy at home.

The historian Froude said: "If there be one lesson which liberty clearly teaches it is this: That free nations can not govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces for mere incompetence for its duties."

In fact, what became of those two great Republics of the ancient times? Greece and Rome remained Republics so long as they did not listen to the voice which spoke of conquest, of extension of power, of extension of territory. But as soon as the Greeks and Romans alike sought to deprive weaker people of their liberty they themselves lost their greatest privilege—their citizenship—and bowed their necks to imperial power.

This is not a theoretical proposition. No nation can permanently maintain two systems of government based on conflicting principles. Sooner or later one system will prevail over the other. Either the autocratic government which we have in the Philippines will invade your democracy at home or the beneficent theories which govern you at home will have to be applied to those islands. The American people can not, without being untrue to themselves, continue to celebrate year after year the Declaration of Independence, thus reaffirming its doctrines, and at the same time assent to a policy in the Philippines which is a flagrant contradiction of these doctrines. They have either to confess that their forefathers were wrong when they revolted against England, and King George was right, or at once withdraw their authority over my country.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

CONTROLLER BAY HEARINGS.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged House resolution No. 290.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina offers the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 290.

Resolved, That 5,700 copies of Hearings Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Controller Bay investigation by the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department be printed for the use of the House document room.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the reading of the report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FINLEY, from the Committee on Printing, submitted the following report, to accompany House resolution 290:

"The Committee on Printing, having had under consideration the House resolution (H. Res. 290) providing for the printing of 5,700 copies of Controller Bay Hearings Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, of the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, reports the same back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to.

"The estimated cost is \$500."

Mr. MANN. These are the first hearings on this investigation, which has been postponed?

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. What is the object of printing these hearings now, when they amount to nothing?

Mr. FINLEY. The object is to comply with the request of the committee having this investigation in charge and to supply a public demand.

Mr. MANN. I do not quite see the object of sending out these hearings, which we on this side think are one-sided.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman yield to me to reply?

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will say to my colleague that the committee itself does not ask for the printing of them, and does not care for them especially, except to supply requests, most of them coming from persons in the far West, and, indeed, all over the country—persons who are interested in getting the hearings. If they are not given, the committee's clerk will have less to do; he will not have them to send out. There are numerous requests for them from every part of the country, especially from the West.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

FEDERAL ANTITRUST DECISIONS.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask immediate consideration of the privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution and the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed and bound 3,000 copies of the Federal antitrust decisions, 1890 to 1911, to be compiled by the direction of the Department of Justice, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FINLEY, from the Committee on Printing, submitted the following report, to accompany Senate concurrent resolution 3:

The Committee on Printing, having had under consideration the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) providing for the printing and binding of 3,000 copies of the Federal antitrust decisions, 1890 to 1911, reports the same back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to.

The estimated cost will be \$5,237.13.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. This is Senate concurrent resolution 3, I think.

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has had on the calendar for a good while Senate concurrent resolution 2, providing for the printing of the Handbook of American Indians—

Mr. FINLEY. Yes—

Mr. MANN. A document that is frequently asked for by Members of Congress?

Mr. FINLEY. I have had no requests for it. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] if he has ever had any requests for it?

Mr. MANN. I have had many requests for it, and I think we ought to have it.

Mr. FINLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois what connection there is between that resolution and this one?

Mr. MANN. There seemed to be an opportunity afforded for getting some information.

Mr. FINLEY. Well, that is a matter of history, and this is a matter of law that has been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. MANN. This is a matter concerning which the joint committee reported a resolution in the House a long time ago.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, a long, toilsome, and important extraordinary session of Congress is at an end. The entire membership of the House is to be heartily congratulated on the industry, efficiency, and punctuality with which its onerous and multifarious duties have been discharged. It is also to be felicitated on the quantity and quality of the work done. It is peculiarly gratifying to remember that in the four and a half months of hard labor, during a considerable portion of which the weather was of nerve-racking quality, there have been very few cross or unparliamentary words spoken, and scarcely any unseemly personal scenes witnessed.

The Members have contended for what they believed to be right with courage, energy, and capacity. Some of the struggles have been of intense interest and of far-reaching conse-

quences, not only to the Members themselves, but to the entire country, whose prosperity, safety, honor, and happiness are the supreme objects of all our labors. [Applause.] It is to be hoped that any personal disagreements which have arisen in the excitement of debate will be speedily forgotten.

I desire particularly to thank all the Members of the House, without regard to political affiliations, for the uniform kindness, friendliness, and consideration which they have shown the Speaker. [Applause.] Without the cordial assistance of the membership I could not have succeeded in discharging the duties of the Speakership in a satisfactory manner.

As the hour for adjournment has arrived, I wish you all safe and pleasant journeys to your respective homes. May you enjoy the vacation which is ahead of us and return in December full of health and vigor for the work which lies before us.

In accordance with the concurrent resolution, I declare the first session of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress adjourned without day.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on the Census, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13988) to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics of tobacco, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 166), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 13999) to establish a subtreasury at Birmingham, Ala.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 14000) providing for a preliminary examination and survey of Johnsons Creek, Bridgeport, Conn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 14001) to subject the lands of the former Fort Niobrara Military Reservation, in Nebraska, to homestead entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14002) to provide for the purchase of additional ground for the Federal building at Sherman, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 14003) to provide for the issuance of process from courts of the United States in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14004) to limit the jurisdiction of district and circuit courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14005) to amend the jurisdiction act of 1887 so as to abrogate Federal jurisdiction over State corporations when the jurisdiction is founded only on the fact that the action or suit brought is between citizens of different States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14006) to prevent the use of the United States mail for transportation of matter relating to "dealing in futures," "stock gambling," etc., and providing penalties for its violation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14007) to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 14008) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the free-delivery system of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes," approved January 3, 1887; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Resolution (H. Res. 302) providing for a special committee to investigate an alleged pool or combination; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolution (H. Res. 303) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to employ a clerk during the approaching vacation of Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HEALD (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 161) directing that a tablet be placed in the Capitol at Washington commemorative of King Louis XVI of France; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 14009) granting an increase of pension to A. N. Oliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 14010) granting a pension to Richard Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14011) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14012) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Mosher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14013) for the relief of Milton S. Harrington; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14014) for the relief of the city of Racine; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14015) for the relief of William G. Keats; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14016) for the relief of the heirs of Patrick Sullivan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14017) to correct the military record of James U. Quinn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14018) to correct the military record of S. Spencer Carr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14019) to correct the military record of John H. Ethridge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 14020) granting an increase of pension to Seymour Avery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 14021) granting a pension to Palmyra Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14022) granting a pension to Lelia F. Devine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 14023) granting a pension to W. H. Elmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14024) granting an increase of pension to George T. Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14025) granting an increase of pension to James W. Todd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 14026) granting a pension to Laura Borjzen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 14027) granting an increase of pension to Albert Bonner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14028) granting a pension to Martha W. Summerhayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14029) granting a pension to Hodges W. Drayton, alias Lawrehce G. Sommers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14030) granting an increase of pension to Silas P. Richmond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14031) granting an increase of pension to James Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14032) granting an increase of pension to George Congdon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14033) granting a pension to Will H. Carpenter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14034) for the relief of Madison W. Heix; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 14035) granting a pension to Anna Cavanagh; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 14036) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. McDonnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14037) granting an increase of pension to William Wilkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 14038) granting an increase of pension to Alfred S. Van Cott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14039) granting a pension to Eliza J. Walrath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 14040) for the relief of the commissioned officers of the Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, Civil War; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 14041) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas St. John and John Chamberlain, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition from James Eads How, extending invitation to attend convention of Missouri Right to Work League, to be held at Washington, D. C., September 1-4, 1911; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Paper to accompany House bill 13714, to pension Emma E. Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Papers to accompany House bill 13812, for the relief of the heirs of Joseph M. Pittman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition to accompany House bill 9449, a bill to amend the Hepburn Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARR: Resolutions signed by Henry Burkard, president, and Karl Werry, financial secretary, of the Scranton (Pa.) Lodge of Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of America, asking for an investigation of the McNamara affair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany House bill 13938; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KORBLY: Petition of J. J. Bouvier, of Indianapolis, Ind., in favor of reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Resolutions of the California State Homeopathic Medical Society, urging Congress to increase salaries of officers of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of sundry citizens of Allen County, Ky., asking for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.