HUGHES SCORES WILSON'S STAND

Tells Union League Members G. O. P. Victory Would Not Hearten Enemy.

CITES LOYALTY OF PARTY

Gathering at the Republican Headquarters Hears Smith's Candidacy Assailed.

Charles Evans Hughes, former member of the Supreme Court of the United States, was the principal speaker last night at the big rally of the Union League Club, in which the cradle of New York Republicanism held many notable persons who came to voice their resentment of the President's call for the exclusion of Republicans from national politics, and to urge that the voters of the State see that Tammany Hall did not gain the ascendency at the coming election.

Judge Hughes began his calm address with a significant statement that he had completed the work for the Government which had engrossed him for some time. In this quiet manner he called attention to the fact that the Hughes report on the work done in producing American airplanes was now in the hands of the Democratic Administration and that there could now be no excuse for not giving it to the public.

The distinguished jurist then spoke forcefully of the order of the President that Republicans shall not have a voice in the national business, and in an even, possessed effort called for a rebuke for this Presidential assumption at the polls.

Scores Smith's Candidacy.

Two hundred and fifty members of the club and their guests were present. Robert C. Morris, chairman of the campaign committee, presided. In presenting Judge Hughes Mr. Morris said:

"Until the President issued his proclamation to the effect that the only patriotic vote this November would be a Democratic vote we saw in our New York election only one issue.

"That issue, indeed, was an important one, and sufficient, we believed, to make certain the reelection of Gov. Whitman. It was the simple question whether Tammany Hall should control the business of the State. At other times Tammany has attempted to seide the departments at Albany, but never before, at least in my time, has she gone about it so boldly.

"This year, instead of seeking a respectable figurehead to mask her real purpose of spoliation, she has selected as her candidate a man who publicly boasts that he has run sixteen times for public offices, each time as a candidate of Tammany Hall. She has chosen as her candidate a man who was born a Tammany man, who has had all through his life no other occupation than that of a Tammany office holder, and who, if elected, can be depended upon to to run the State in accordance with the most approved Tammany principles.

"As opposed to this type of Governor we offer a man who made his great public reputation as a fighter of Tammany iniquities, who sent Tammany rascals to fusion and Tammany criminals to the electric chair, and who as head of the State has given New York a clean and efficient administration, and has shown himself entitled to take a high position in our history as a great war Governor."

The members of the club gave three cheers for their president, who had just returned to them after his Governmental labors. Justice Hughes was compelled to wait for a few minutes more while the applause had away.

Lauds Union League Patriotism.

Mr. Hughes said in part:

"We meet once more in this historic and patriotic club in the exercise of the right which no one can deny us of expressing our political preferences. Permit me a personal word at the outset. For several months I have been absent from you engrossed in a difficult but necessary task, which has been performed with the single thought of ascertaining and presenting the exact truth with respect to one of the most important fields of our war activity. That task, I am glad to say, has been finished and it is with the keenest pleasure that I return to the genial hospitality of this club and take up again my official duties as your president.

"It was with the sense of deep pride and gratification that I learned from time to time of the splendid efforts you have put forth in connection with the Fourth Liberty Loan. I congratulate the war committee, under the able leadership of Mr. Fairchild, upon what it has accomplished. True to the traditions it cherishes, the spirit of service and sacrifice has dominated the Union League Club in this war for the destruction of unscrupulous military power.

"I have said that we are here in the exercise of our right to express our political preferences. And why should we not express them? Have we no interests at stake, no loved ones in the ranks, no hearts responding to the nation's call, no sacrifices to endure? Is our contribution in lives, in devotion, in fortune, in readiness to serve, so slight that we must forego the privilege of effective representation in the nation's councils?

"Are we to give up the right of suffrage, or if we are permitted to exercise that right, is a vote for Democratic Congressmen and Democratic Senators and Democratic State candidates to be the final test of our service to the nation?

Regrets Issue Has Been Raised.

"I deeply regret that this issue has been raised. I deplore it as a citizen, anxious that in this hour of strife we should have the utmost unity in national endeavor, but solicitous that this unity should be preserved by taking counsel together and hearing the voice of all parties after the methods of a republic and not by abject submission according to the example of autocracy. I am glad to be told that no political party is paramount in patriotism. Of course not. Read the answer in our Liberty Loans, our service in arms, in the trenches and on the sea and, for that matter, in the votes in Congress. Let the record speak.

"Have not Republicans in every permitted field of effort fought and toiled; have we not spent our days and nights in anxious labor; have we not given without stint or limit, with no thought of party or of partisan advantage, that this war might be won? Yes, we are patriotic, that is not questioned—but must we patriotically toil and give without seeking a voice in the National Assembly, yielding our representation to Democrats, not as more worthy or more loyal, not as more sacrificing or intelligent, but to Democrats as such, simply because they are Democrats, in order that in this most critical period there may be exhibited, not the unity of the nation achieved through the action of both parties, their members vieing with each other in patriotic endeavor and resolving their differences through fair discussion in the national legislative body, but the unity of a mere party supremacy?

"The issue is a transcendant one, for it speaks to the conscience and fundamental purpose of every voter. I want to see complete victory in this war; to see tyrannical and arbitrary military power crushed; to see the dawn of the new era of the peace of justice. And did I think that the Republican party would not, through its representatives, aid in the efficient conduct of this war and in the settlement of a righteous peace, I should leave the party. It is because I believe that the Republican party is an important and necessary agency in the winning of this war and in establishing a just peace that as a Republican, but not in a narrow partisan spirit, I join with you in the earnest support of the Republican candidate.

"It is said that the return of a Republican majority to either house of Congress would be interpreted as a repudiation of the leadership of the President. I think that from a national standpoint the suggestion is most unfortunate. If the President stood before the nations of the world only as a party leader his influence would be slight indeed. His just influence is based on the extent to which he faithfully represents the sentiment of this nation regardless of party. He will not be the effective spokesman of the nation, save as through consultation and deliberation with those representing the important thought of the nation he can be said to express a strongly preponderating if not unanimous sentiment. But how is the sentiment of the country to find expression if we do not send to the nation's assembly those who represent our opinion? How is the nation's will to be truly voiced if voters do not express their honest convictions? No! There is a better way. We are all for the war. We are unanimous in our earnest desire to drive through to complete victory.

No Danger of Misunderstanding.

"Let us have free expression, let us send our Representatives to Congress, let there be fair and open discussion and free consultation and then we can trust the future. With the country almost equally divided between two parties, the freest expression and choice of representatives should be welcomed.

"But it is said that a return of a Republican majority will be misunderstood abroad. By whom? By the Germans? They know that the Republican leaders are intent on complete victory. By the Allies? They have no reason to doubt that their interests would be safe in Republican councils. No—we shall not be misunderstood. We shall support the President as the President, not as the President of a party, not as the President of half the nation, but as the President of the entire nation as he acts according to the genius of our institutions, and we shall save him from the lesser dignity and influence of mere party leadership.

"We welcome to-night our State candidates. They are men whom we know and trust. It is safe to say that in no State in the Union has the national Administration had more hearty and efficient support than has been given by the Republican administration in the State of New York. Measure after measure points to the well directed activity of the State administration in support of the war.

"We see no reason for trying to make the world safe for democracy by putting Tammany Hall in control at Albany. I distrust Tammany even in its most amiable aspect. I distrust Tammany particularly when it talks of economy. I know it never practices economy at the expense of the faithful. It was only a few years ago that I heard much preachment of economy and denunciation of Republican extravagance. But there ensued certain years of Democratic control which made our citizens hang their heads in shame. We do not think that the people of the State are disposed to take a chance this time. We propose to reelect Gov. Whitman. His administration has been a credit to the people of the State and he deserves our confidence."

Applause for Mr. Hughes at the end of his address was even warmer than the reception he got at the start, which caused him to say, "Well, my old friends, that warms my heart."

Francis M. Hugo, Secretary of State, predicted that the Republican plurality outside New York city would be not less than 300,000; that two-thirds of the vote above The Bronx would be Republican. Charles D. Newton, candidate for Attorney-General, promised to give the same attention to that office that he has given to his country law practice.

"I assure you New York lawyers," he added, "that you can't fool all the people all the time, not in a country village. You have to win a law suit once in a while."

All the State candidates talked except Lieut.-Gov. Schoeneck, and there was a refreshing lack of political "bunk" in what they said and their manner of saying it.

REPUBLICANS SEE WILSON REACTION

Continued from First Page.

publican leaders have thrust partisanship into the Congressional contest which, under our Constitution was unavoidable at this critical period of the world's war.

"I wish they could have been animated by the same lofty spirit of patriotism which moved one of the cleanest and most highminded Republicans in the United States, the Hon. Rodman Wanamaker, who in a recent letter to me used these words:

"'During these strenuous days when our courageous lads are offering their lifeblood for the Stars and Stripes we at home must back them up with all we have, and stand by the President with everything that is in us, and to those tottering believers who are either personally or in gatherings and in the newspapers criticising the methods and the great diplomatic work that is now being done in Washington, I can only say that no one is a true American who stoops to such criticisms or fears.'

"Upon request for permission to give to the public the statement above set forth Mr. Wanamaker sends me the following:

"'I have just received your despatch. You are at perfect liberty to use any words I have said in support of our Government. Personally as a private citizen I feel very much disturbed by the stand of people and journalists who are discussing in a partisan way the efforts of the President to bring about the freedom and liberty of the world.

"'I have a firm belief in those to whom is given the power to represent the country at Washington that with every drop of blood that goes through their hearts they will prove themselves to be true patriots, avoiding the bickerings of politicians who are trying to contort the minds of the people from the real issue. We are not Republicans nor Democrats, we are Americans.'"

FURLOUGH MEN TO VOTE HERE.

Hugo Names Polls for Soldiers and Sailors.

Soldiers and sailors who are citizens of New York State and who are at home or on furlough on election day may cast their votes at places designated by Secretary of State Hugo, according to an announcement at the Board of Elections in the Municipal Building yesterday.

The polling places are at the Twenty-second Regiment Armory, 168th street and Fort Washington avenue; the Sixty-ninth Regiment Armory, Lexington avenue and Twenty-sixth street, in Manhattan; the Twenty-third Regiment Armory on Brevoort place and the Naval Base at Fifty-second street, Brooklyn. The polls will be open from 6 A. M. to 6 P. M.

FORD PACIFISM TOLD BY SECURITY LEAGUE

Refuses to Answer Questionnaire—Newberry Gives Complete Reply.

PEACE RECORD PREPARED

MotorManufacturer's Attacks on Preparedness and Flag Recalled.

A record of the anti-preparedness attitude and pacifism of Henry Ford, candidate for the United States Senate from Michigan, was issued by the National Security League yesterday. It was prepared by Dr. William Herbert Hobbs of the University of Michigan.

The league gives the replies that Commander Truman H. Newberry, U. S. N., the Republican opponent of Mr. Ford, made to its questionnaire, in which he declared he had been strongly for preparedness since July, 1914; was for the use of any necessary force in the preservation of the rights of American citizens prior to our declaration of war, and still held to that view, and was willing to pledge himself to "peace with victory." The league then states that Mr. Ford made no reply to the questionnaire, nor did he answer a later telegraphic request as to whether or not he intended to do so.

This is Mr. Ford's record prepared by Prof. Hobbs:

"September, 1915—Contributed $1,000,000 to campaign against preparedness and promised $10,000,000 for peace propaganda.

"September, 1915—It was publicly announced that Mr. Ford was to consult concerning his peace policy with Herman Ridder, editor of the *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung*, and with Jeremiah O'Leary, Sinn Feiner, now on trial on a charge of conspiring to obstruct the military operations of the United States.

Opposed Loan to Allies.

"September, 1915—Mr. Ford expressed open opposition to the United States loan to the Allies and was reported to have threatened to withdraw his deposits from any bank which subscribed to the loan.

"November, 1915—Ford's peace ship was chartered to convey a shipload of pacifists to Europe in order to 'get the soldiers out of the trenches by Christmas.'

"December, 1915—Mr. Ford had letters sent to every Senator and Representative in Congress requesting them to inaugurate a campaign against patriotic songs, moving pictures of battlefields, preparedness plays and munitions workers.

"February, 1916—Mr. Ford inserted whole page advertisements in hundreds of newspapers in all parts of the United States, of which the following are extracts:

"'Concerning Preparedness.'

"'To the American People: Conscription, the base of militarism, is advocated openly. And it is done under the guise of patriotism. The flag is flaunted before the eyes of the people and we are told that our "national honor" is at stake.

Approves Tavenner Speech.

"'The flaunting was started by an organization of men known as the Navy League. Congressman Clyde H. Tavenner delivered in the House two remarkable speeches—"The Worldwide War Trust" and "The Navy League Unmasked"—giving startling revelations of an organized body of war traffickers who promote war and preparations for war preparedness. I strongly urge every American who is interested in this subject that should interest all to write to the Hon. Clyde H. Tavenner . . . for the speeches revealing the motives at the bottom of the "preparedness" agitation.'

"May, 1916, Mr. Ford had an interview with Henry A. Wise Wood, who summarized it in a contribution to the New York *Times* of May 17, 1916, as follows:

"'When the word patriotism was touched upon Mr. Ford burst out with the assertion that he did not believe in patriotism, that no man is "patriotic" and that the word "patriotism" is always the last resort of a scoundrel. To my inquiry as to what he would do in the event of war he replied that even if we were to be invaded he would not make a dollar's worth of arms for the United States.'

"Finally I said: 'Mr. Ford, on your roof are three American flags. On seeing them it hurt me to think that beneath them was a man who is spending vast sums, amassed under their protection, to ruin the defences of his country and lay it open to a possible hostile world.' To this he replied: 'When the war is over those flags shall come down, never to go up again. I don't believe in the flag. It is something to rally around.'

"April, 1916—Regarding the sinking of the Lusitania Mr. Ford in an interview said: 'A man asked me my opinion in regard to that, and I told him that before replying I was going to ask the opinion of five boys. I picked out five, varying in age from 11 to 16. To a boy they answered: "What in h—— did they go on board for?"'"

WALSH IS PROPAGANDIST.

Uses Official Card to Boost Democratic Campaign.

From his office in the Woolworth Building Frank P. Walsh, joint chairman of the National War Labor Board, gave out yesterday four and a half pages of closely typewritten propaganda urging the election of a Democratic Congress in line with the appeal of President Wilson. Attached to it was the official card of Mr. Walsh, carrying his title as chairman of the board.

Declaring in effect that a vote for a Republican for Congress would be a vote for the repudiation of the President's war policies Mr. Walsh said:

"All who believe in them [the policies] will fight for a Democratic Congress. All who have selfish interests to serve in opposition to our country's programme will work for the success of Republican candidates this fall, with the consequent condemnation of those policies.

"A failure to elect a Democratic Congress next month would bring on an avalanche of German propaganda to prove that the American people are not behind the President and the national Administration."

G. O. P. WAR RECORD TWISTED BY FERRIS

Of Ten Offenses in Congress Charged by Democrat Some Predated Hostilities.

OTHERS ARE EXPLAINED

Republican Support Which Passed Wilson's Draft Bill Is Ignored.

Special Despatch to THE SUN.

WASHINGTON, Oct. 29.—The question of which party had given the better support to the President was brought down to brass tacks to-day through the issuance of a carefully prepared statement by Chairman Ferris of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee reviewing the action by the two parties in Congress on ten measures designated by him as war measures. The Ferris statement was intended, it was admitted by Democrats, to be such a broadside as would blow the Republican claim of greater support out of the water.

Mr. Ferris enumerated the ten measures and the Congressional action on them as "Offence No. 1," "Offence No. 2," and so on. The selective draft act and the bill to increase the pay of soldiers from $15 to $30 a month, which were carried only through Republican efforts, and in fact Republican leadership, were omitted in the Ferris statement, a fact to which the Republicans immediately called attention.

"Offense No. 1" in the list made out by Mr. Ferris was the McLemore resolution calling on the President to warn Americans against travelling on the armed ships of belligerent nations. This, Mr. Ferris said, was "the very acid test of loyalty," the statement saying:

"This was a measure to obstruct the President in his efforts to avoid war, a mischievous resolution that President Wilson asked be summarily killed. The roll was called: 181 Democrats voted to table the resolution, 33 Democrats voted against tabling it, 92 Republicans voted to table it and 101 Republicans voted against tabling it. Thus 33 Democrats voted against the President, 101 Republicans voted against him. More Republicans voted against him than with him. Is that support of the President? Is that helping more than hindering? Which party served its country best that day?"

Antedated War by 13 Months.

In reply the Republicans pointed out first that the McLemore resolution was voted down on in the House thirteen months lacking one day before the United States declared war; also that it was eight months after this vote that Woodrow Wilson was reelected President largely on the campaign slogan "He kept us out of war."

In addition to this argument the Republicans referred to the *Congressional Record* to show that one of the main fights in the House was that the rule under which the resolution was considered did not permit of a direct vote on the adoption or rejection of the McLemore resolution and that a vote "to table" did not give any indication of whether the voter favored the actual purposes of the measure.

To prove this Republicans quoted former Representative Fitzgerald (N. Y.), who declared in the debate that members of the House desirous of dodging the question in direct opposition to the President's written request that it be beaten, would vote to table it. The statement by Mr. Fitzgerald quoted by Republicans was:

"I apprehend that gentlemen upon that side of the House who are loud in their professions of a desire to warn Americans off armed ships of belligerents are preparing to cover up their retreat by voting to lay the McLemore resolution on the table."

"Offense No. 2" charged by Mr. Ferris was the failure to support the shipping bill. This measure he described as "a bill absolutely essential to the transportation of troops, food and ammunition," continuing: "Recommended by every branch of the Government; legislation that has been sought for fifty years. One hundred and ninety-four Democrats voted in favor of the bill, four Democrats voted against it. Ten Republicans voted for the bill and 155 Republicans voted against it, faltered, failed to do their duty and obstructed their country at a time when it was entitled to their support."

Ship Bill Not a War Measure.

To this the Republicans immediately retorted with the statement that this bill had nothing to do with troops, or food, or ammunition, and was voted on in the House ten months before war was declared. Republican opposition, they pointed out, was for two reasons—that the bill was put through under an unfair "gag" rule and that it committed those who voted for it to the policy of Government ownership. Not only that, but it appropriated $60,000,000, in those days a great big appropriation.

"Offense No. 3," cited by Mr. Ferris, was the revenue bill passed by the House on July 10, 1916. This bill Mr. Ferris described as "a preparedness bill, a bill to equip, feed and clothe an army, and advocated by the President. The roll was called: 194 Democrats voted for it. No Democrat voted against it; 28 Republicans voted for it, and 138 Republicans voted against it. Twenty-eight Republicans stood with the President; 138 fought him, opposed him and voted against the bill. They were supporting the President with a vengeance."

The Republican answer was that the 1916 revenue bill was not a measure to raise, feed and clothe an army, and was not a war measure at all, as it antedated America entering the war by nine months, and there was hardly any army to feed and clothe at that time. In addition to this, Republicans referred to the record of the debates on the measure to show that Republican opposition was based on unwillingness to impose high taxes without resorting to revision of the tariff when a great deal of the money to be raised by the bill was to defray deficiencies caused through operation of the Underwood-Simmons tariff act.

Republicans called attention to the fact that at the time this bill was before Congress the minority called it "the Democrat deficiency revenue bill."

The fourth "offence" charged to Republicans by Mr. Ferris is opposition to the bill which was an amendment to the naval appropriation bill to establish a government owned armor plate plant.

"A bill advocated by the President," said Mr. Ferris, "a bill in the interest of Government economy. A non-partisan bill, a preparedness measure; 182 Democrats voted for the bill; eight Democrats voted against it; forty-seven Republicans voted for the bill, and 126 Republicans voted against it. One hundred and twenty-six Republicans voted against the President."

In answer to this argument Republicans said and referred to the *Congressional Record* to prove their statements that the armor plate plant amendment, like the shipping bill, involved the question of Government ownership and Republicans opposed it largely on that account. To show that they were by far the stronger supporters of preparedness, the Republicans pointed to the vote which immediately followed the vote on the armor plate plant amendment, when Representative Browning (N. J.) sought to have the bill recommitted and reported out immediately with a long series of amendments greatly increasing the number of ships to be built, cutting down the time allowed for their completion and increasing the appropriation very materially.

On this there was a strict party division 189 voted against "the increases—nearly every one of them Democrats—and 183—nearly all Republicans—voted for them, Republican leaders pointed out, as indicating as how the minority stood on preparedness in 1916.

Armed Ship Bill Cited.

"Offense No. 5" was the Cooper amendment to the armed ship bill designed to prohibit sending munitions in armed ships of American registry.

"The amendment was vicious," said Mr. Ferris. "It was opposed by the President. It was an effort to aid Germany and a hindrance to our Allies. The military establishment opposed it. It was vital, it was well understood it was not political—it was nation wide in scope. One hundred and eighty-nine Democrats voted against it, 48 Democrats voted for it, 121 Republicans voted against it and 73 Republicans voted for it—voted against their President. Thus it will be observed that more Democrats voted to support the President than did Republicans. Thus it will be observed that more Republicans voted against the President than did Democrats. Did the Republican party then stand more solidly behind the President than did the Democratic party?"

In reply Republican leaders recalled the fact that at the time the Cooper amendment was voted on the United States had no allies or "nations associated with them in the war against the Imperial German Government" and in fact did not declare war for five weeks thereafter.

The Cooper amendment, they pointed out, was aimed at ammunition for all belligerents and merely provided that such ships as carried ammunition or arms for the fighting nations, if of American registry, should not be armed. There was no Republican opposition to the passage of the armed ship resolution worthy of the name, as the measure was passed, 403 to 14, immediately after the rejection of the Cooper amendment.

"Offence No. 6" in Mr. Ferris's indictment was the declaration of war against Germany. "One hundred and eighty-nine Democrats voted for it; 16 Democrats against it," said Mr. Ferris. "One hundred and eighty-one Republicans voted for it; 32 Republicans against it. One hundred and eighty-nine Democrats kept the faith and voted for the war; only 16 Democrats failed. Twice as many Republicans failed to stand up and do their duty as did Democrats. Thus it is observed how 'the Republicans stood behind the President better than did the Democrats.'"

Of the Republicans who voted against the war resolution one is dead, nine have been defeated for renomination and one, Representative Johnson (S. D.) is in the army, Republicans pointed out, while only one of the sixteen Democrats who opposed the war declaration has been defeated by his own party. The affirmative Republican votes on the war declaration and on the conscription act, which Democrats fought tooth and nail Republican leaders pointed out, overwhelmingly show the measure of support consistently given the President on real war measures.

"Offense No. 7" was the espionage bill, "a bill to punish spies; to punish pro-Germans; to punish disloyal I. W. W.'s," Mr. Ferris described it. "A bill to protect our boys who are sailing across the seas; 169 Democrats voted for the bill; 10 Democrats voted against it; 88 Republicans voted for it; 96 Republicans voted against it. Thus it will be observed, while ten Democrats failed to keep the faith ninety-six Republicans faltered, failed to do their duty and stand by the President.

Republicans answering this charge pointed out that in the House the bill contained what they considered to be a provision for gagging the press of the country in direct contravention of the specific constitutional freedom given the newspapers. Also this enormous censorship power they said would have been placed in the hands of Postmaster-General Burelson, a notorious partisan.

The eighth on the list of "Republican offences" cited by Mr. Ferris was the vote on the first war revenue bill. Of this measure Mr. Ferris said:

"We were at war. The vote was taken thirteen days before 10,000,000 American men were to register for military service against the Hun. One hundred and fifty-one Democrats voted for the bill; no Democrats voted against it; 84 Republicans voted for the bill and 76 Republicans, while we were at war, refused to vote for a bill providing revenue to feed, clothe and equip our boys. Who served best that day? Who stood the highest test on this most important bill?"

The Republican attitude toward part of this bill was exactly in line with the economic theories of the Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, the Republicans pointed out to-night. Their opposition was to the theory of taxation of business profits written into the bill by Chairman Kitchin of the Ways and Means Committee, it was pointed out.

Mr. Kitchin, who voted against the war and conscription and is credited with the statement that the North caused the war and therefore ought to pay for it, the Republicans said first put the objectionable excess profits system of business taxation into this bill, the same system that has been opposed by Secretary McAdoo. The Republican hope at the time was to beat the Kitchin bill substitute for the excess profits tax, with a tax on business earnings more in line with the sounder theories of the Treasury Department.

As the ninth Republican "offence" Mr. Ferris cited the vote on a bill permitting national banks to contribute to the Red Cross out of net profits available under the law for dividends. On this measure 125 Democrats and 65 Republicans voted aye, while 11 Democrats and 57 Republicans voted against it.

"Five times as many Republicans voted against it as did Democrats and nearly as many Republicans voted against it as for it," said Mr. Ferris. "Which party stood up best on a measure so completely non-partisan?"

Republican leaders were amused at the inclusion of this measure as one showing support or failure of support of the President.

The last indictment of the Republicans in "Offence No. 10," according to Mr. Ferris, is the Republican record on the revenue bill recently passed by the House. On this Mr. Ferris said:

"When this bill was being considered by the House Hampton Moore, one of the Republican leaders, pursuant to caucus action and party instruction, made a motion to recommit the bill and insert in it a provision which would turn astrip ahrdl ardl adl adl arlar strip the President of his power and turn it over to a special select political committee. This motion to recommit will be found on page 6707 of the *Congressional Record*, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session."

Instead of a special and select political committee being proposed by Representative Moore (Pa.), Republicans pointed out in answer to this argument it was intended to have a committee of thirteen members of the Senate and House, headed by a Democrat, and with a membership of seven Democrats and six Republicans as a check on the waste of Government funds as notably instanced by the throwing away of millions of dollars in the aeroplane fiasco.

G. O. P. HAS SPENT $469,096, IT REPORTS

Largest Single Contributors Were Only of $5,000 Each.

WASHINGTON, Oct. 29.—The Republican National Committee's detailed report on pre-election expenses, filed to-night with the clerk of the House of Representatives showed to-day receipts of $482,345 and expenditures of $469,096, most of which was sent to aid in the various State campaigns. The Senatorial and Congressional National Campaign committees received $35,000 each.

The largest contributions were $5,000 each by J. Ogden Armour and J. H. Taylor of Chicago, and Alfred J. Sweet of Auburn, Me. The other contributions ranged down to $50. James A. Patten, Chicago, gave $3,500; Will H. Crocker, San Francisco, $3,000; C. M. Warner, New York, $2,500; E. J. Buffington, Chicago, $2,000; Samuel P. Colt, New York, $1,500; Mrs. L. W. James, Baltimore, $3,000, and Ethel Crocker, San Francisco, $1,000.

Among the many contributors of $1,000 were John D. Rockefeller, Sr., John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Lars Anderson, Mortimer Schiff, T. Coleman du Pont, James Deering, Charles Deering, Robert H. McCormick, John D. Spreckles, Dan R. Hanna, R. T. Crane and George W. Perkins.

Money sent into the States went to the following: A. J. Sweet, Maine, $5,000; John W. Hart, Idaho, national committeeman, $11,000; T. A. Marlow, Montana national committeeman, $16,000; W. C. Cook, South Dakota national committeeman, $5,000; A. T. Hert, Kentucky national committeeman, $21,000; Jacob L. Babler, Missouri national committeeman, $22,500; H. G. Humphries, Nevada national committeeman, $5,500; John M. Morehead, Senatorial candidate in North Carolina, $3,500; C. A. Spiess, New Mexico national committeeman, $11,000; Senator William M. Calder, New York, $19,000; John W. Blodgett, Michigan, $1,000; Maurice McKenzie, New York, $15,000; Patrick Sullivan, Wyoming, $5,000, and Frank L. Smith, Illinois, $25,000.

In the Northern and Western States several candidates, including Henry Ford, the Democratic Senatorial candidate in Michigan; Truman H. Newberry, his Republican opponent; Senator Weeks of Massachusetts, Republican, and Senator Nelson of Minnesota, Republican, have filed reports that they personally have received and spent nothing.

Mr. Ford's preelection report states that he has made no promises or pledges. The "Non-Partisan Ford for Senator Club," Mr. Ford states, received $581 and spent $335.

His opponent, Mr. Newberry, states that he has not given, contributed, expended, received, used or promised any money or thing of value, nor authorized their receipt with his knowledge or consent.

Many candidates for the House, both Democrats and Republicans, report they have not spent a penny.

Among them are Republican Leader Mann and former Speaker Cannon, both of Illinois, and acting Republican Leader Gillett of Massachusetts. Chairman Fess of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee also reports he has made no expenditures, as does his Democratic opponent, George H. Thorne. Chairman Ferris of the Democratic committee says he has spent $75, while Democratic Leader Kitchin reports the expenditure of a like sum. Speaker Clark of Missouri has spent $459.

Fitzgerald Wins Ballot Case.

BOSTON, Oct. 29.—The Ballot Law Commission decided to-day that the name of former Mayor John F. Fitzgerald shall be printed on the ballot as Democratic candidate for Congress in the Tenth district. The decision was given as the result of the commission's hearings on allegations of fraud at the primaries made by Representative Peter F. Tague, who was a candidate for the nomination. The commission found that the allegations were not sustained.

1% Per MONTH ON PLEDGE OF PERSONAL PROPERTY

THE PROVIDENT LOAN SOCIETY OF NEW YORK

Applications for loans of large amounts will be considered at the office at Fourth Avenue and 25th Street.

MANHATTAN
Fourth Avenue, cor. 25th Street.
Eldridge St., cor. Rivington St.
East Houston St., cor. Essex St.
Seventh Av., bet. 48th & 49th Sts.
Lexington Av., cor. 124th St.
Grand St., cor. Clinton St.
E. 72d St., bet. Lexington & 3d Avs.
Eighth Av., cor. 127th St.

BRONX
Courtlandt Av., cor. 148th St.

BROOKLYN
Smith St., cor. Livingston St.
Graham Av., cor. Debevoise St.
Pitkin Av., cor. Rockaway Av.

"As Others See Us"

What Bankers Say:

Paid Within Eighteen Days

"We acknowledge your voucher for $10,000, the full amount of the bond of our former (defaulting) cashier. Your payment within eighteen days after our bill is very gratifying."

Businesslike $10,000 Payment

"Acknowledging your check for $10,000 in full payment of claim in defalcation of our former cashier, we appreciate your businesslike care in the matter."

Prompt Adjustment

"Your check for $2,969.70 in full settlement (under blanket bond) of our loss through misplacement of three Liberty Bonds. Our thanks for the prompt adjustment."

Courteous Settlement

"Received your voucher for $1,267 in full payment of our loss sustained through one of our messengers. Appreciation for very prompt settlement and courtesy."

"People of Such Character"

"Officers of this bank thank you for your eminently fair and courteous treatment. It is indeed a pleasure to deal with people of such character."

What Our Burglary Policyholders say:

"Red Tape" Eliminated

"Thanks and appreciation for your prompt payment of the burglary loss on our residence. The elimination of voluminous correspondence and all red tape was a revelation to me."

Paid Immediately

"National Surety Company mailed us a draft for $2,013.25 (our actual loss through a daylight hold-up) immediately on receipt of proof. We cannot recommend the Company too highly to any person or corporation desiring the best in burglary insurance."

What Merchants Say:

In Less than Twenty-four Hours

"Received your check for $1,992 in full payment under bond of our ex-watchman. We certainly appreciate your prompt and efficient settlement in less than twenty-four hours' time."

Technical Defenses Ignored

"Allow me, in acknowledging your check for $1,849.01 in full settlement of our claim, to express extreme gratification at your promptness. You might have used technical defenses, but ignored them."

For Twenty-one Years

"Your company has bonded all our employees for twenty-one years. Settlements have always been prompt and relations very satisfactory."

We Appreciate All

"Acknowledging your checks for our $3,000 claim and $375 for money recovered, we appreciate all you have done."

Accepted Partial Proof

"Thanking you for your check, we greatly appreciate your willingness to accept such proof as we could offer."

Broad-Mindedness Protects Bondholders

"We appreciate the broad-minded view which made you pay our claim in the face of your objections. It shows your sincere desire to protect your bondholders fully."

Uniformly Dependable

"For fifteen years we have bonded our employees in the National Surety Company. You can uniformly be depended upon to do the right thing promptly and without technicalities."

Promptly and Cheerfully

"We have used the National Surety Company's service for several years. The Company is one of the strongest. Its rates are very reasonable and it pays its claims promptly and cheerfully."

What a Lawyer Said:

"During six years my corporations have referred to me all questions regarding the National Surety Company's liability under bonds covering our employees. Your service has been highly efficient in every respect during the entire period."

What Public Officials Say:

Paid Eight Thousand Dollars Promptly

"Your draft for $8,000 for full amount of bond of (defaulting) ex-tax collector received. We appreciate your promptness."

Pleasant Handling of an Unpleasant Matter

"Acknowledging your check for $1,730.39 for full claims of this Department against Captain ——, formerly commanding Battery ——, Field Artillery, we appreciate not only your prompt settlement but your pleasant handling of an unpleasant matter."

What Fraternal Orders Say:

Expeditious, Efficient, Satisfactory

"The National Surety Company has been bonding our head officers, and the officers of our subordinate lodges, for many years. All business has been transacted expeditiously, efficiently, satisfactorily."

After Fourteen Years

"We commenced bonding our local officers with National Surety Company in 1904, and can speak with high commendation of the way you administer schedule bonds."

After Twenty Years

"In twenty years dealings with the National Surety Company, I cannot recall a single difference in settling a loss. Your Company has always paid our losses promptly and has never attempted to evade liability."

LET US SIGN YOUR BOND!

NATIONAL SURETY COMPANY

115 BROADWAY

"The World's Largest Surety Company"