

Pursuant to that command the Democratic Congress on August 24th passed the Free Tolls Act.

It also provided that United States trans-continental railroads must sell their ships. The purpose was to force a reduction of railway rates by water competition.

The Canadian railroads still owned their ships, and, naturally, wanted to operate them through the canal free. This would, of course, give the Canadian roads an advantage over the American roads which had sold their ships. The Canadian roads, through the British Government, protested against free tolls for American vessels unless they were also granted free tolls.

Secretary of State Knox forced the admission from Ambassador Bryce that the British claims could not be sustained.

About this time Senator Root made a speech declaring for the repeal of the Free Tolls Act. There was circulated, through the Carnegie Institute, 1,750,000 copies of the speech and organized propaganda to repeal the Free Tolls Act was begun.

No real headway, however, was made until the President appeared before Congress and demanded the repeal of the Act. Here, again, I found myself in opposition with the President. I stood upon the Democratic platform and resisted the repeal of the law.

I held then and hold now that the canal was built by American brains and brawn. It was paid for by the taxpayers of the United States. It belongs to the United States. The claim that our rights are not superior to those of other countries that neither contributed a dollar nor an idea to its construction is, in my judgment, unsound and un-American.

Of course, gentlemen who permit the President to do their thinking would have no difficulty in voting away the canal, but so far as I am concerned, every time I have the opportunity, I shall vote for the doctrine that the Panama Canal is American property and that we can permit our vessels to go through upon such terms as we see fit to dictate.

GOOD ROADS.

The Administration was for the promotion of good roads. I actively supported that policy.

FARM LOAN ACT.

The Administration was for the Farm Loan Act. I served on the Banking Committee to which it was referred, assisted in perfecting it, and supported it upon the floor of the Senate.

CONTROVERSIES WITH MEXICO.

During 1914 and prior thereto, repeated and irritating disturbances occurred in Mexico and across our border.

The President inaugurated the policy of "watchful waiting," hoping that affairs would adjust themselves and that war and bloodshed could be prevented. He was severely and bitterly criticized for not resorting to force. The conditions finally became unbearable, and the President asked authority to send troops into Mexico.

When this measure was before the Senate, the President was again vehemently assailed, this time because he proposed to take action.

I defended the President against these attacks. While I was speaking the news came that our soldiers were already fighting in Vera Cruz. The speech will be found in the Record of April 21, 1914.

I desire to pass no encomium upon myself—reference is made to the incident merely because it offers another illustration of the falsity of the charge that I "always fought the President."

As I recall, the speech was not replied to. The President obtained the desired authority.

IMMIGRATION.

A bill to restrict immigration by applying the illiteracy test passed the House against President Wilson's protest.

The President held that illiteracy was not a fair test as to good citizenship of the immigrant. I supported the President. I supported his veto.

PREPAREDNESS.

Realizing that sooner or later the United States might be drawn into the European conflict, President Wilson, in the winter and spring of 1916, began advocating preparedness.

His Administration caused to be introduced in Congress The National Defense Act of 1916.

As a member of the Military Committee I assisted in perfecting the bill and made speeches in support thereof.

THE PRIVATE SOLDIER AND THE NATIONAL GUARD.

As a member of the Military Committee, I helped frame and insert in The National Defense Act numerous provisions for the benefit of the National Guard.

I succeeded in having the bill amended so as to increase the pay of private soldiers from \$15.00 to \$50.00 per month and to correspondingly increase the pay of commissioned and non-commissioned officers.

My speech in behalf of that amendment will be found in the Record of June 24, 1916.

SHIP PURCHASE BILL.

The Administration sponsored a bill to provide for the construction of a merchant marine which would break the strangle hold of the ship monopoly.

A long controversy ensued, a number of Democrats joined with the Republicans and prevented the passage of the bill.

Subsequently, the bill was revived, and I, personally, worked out the compromise in the committee which obtained the necessary votes for its passage.

This was one of the Administration's pet measures. I defended it from first to last and contributed largely to its consummation.

The foregoing constitute the principal measures of that part of Wilson's first term prior to the election of 1916. It should, however, be added that there were scores, even hundreds of party measures in which the Administration was interested, ranging from special bills to great appropriation measures, which received my constant and tireless support.

CAMPAIGN OF 1916.

At the beginning of the campaign of 1916 I made a speech in the Senate reviewing the achievements of the Democratic Administration which was largely employed as a campaign document, many thousands of copies being printed and distributed. The substance, if indeed not the exact matter, of that speech, was used in the Democratic Campaign Book.

During all this time, I constantly supported the policy of the President to keep out of the European war. I defended that policy upon the floor of the Senate and upon the platforms of the country.

In the election of 1916 I not only campaigned my State, carrying President Wilson's banner, but, although myself a candidate, I went into other states and made speeches for the Democratic ticket.

This review brings us to a time subsequent to the election of 1916.

Events were now rapidly shaping themselves so that war appeared to be inevitable.

ARMING MERCHANT SHIPS.

Congress was dissolved by law on March 4, 1917. A few days prior to that date the President came before Congress and asked authority to arm merchant ships. There was bitter opposition led by my distinguished friend and colleague, the lamented Senator Stone.

I, upon that question, separated from my old friend. When, because of the limitation of the time and the vehemence of opposition, the bill could not be passed, I joined with 75 other Senators in signing the "round robin," which assured the President and the world that if a vote could have been taken we would have supported the President in his demand.

Those who refused to sign were at once characterized by the President as the "willful twelve." At least, I escaped that denunciation.

THE WAR.

I voted and spoke for the declaration of war.

I voted for conscription, although I did endeavor to have a period of 90 days allowed for volunteering. This could have been done without delaying the draft a single day, because it required that period of time to organize and place in operation the machinery of the draft.

I voted for every strictly war measure, among other things:

All of the Liberty Loan Acts.

For every dollar, every man, every ship, every gun, the President ever asked to carry on the war.

Some of the principal acts which I assisted in passing are as follows:

April 6, 1917.—Declaration of State of War.

April 20, 1917.—Act increasing the size of the Naval Academy.

April 20, 1917.—Act increasing the age limit of naval officers from 35 to 50 years.

April 20, 1917.—Act authorizing rifles and equipment for home guards.

April 30, 1917.—Act authorizing the President to seize German and Austrian ships.

May 9, 1917.—The Administration's amendment to the Federal Reserve Act.

May 14, 1917.—The Espionage Act.

May 15, 1917.—Act to increase the strength of the navy and marine corps.

May 19, 1917.—Act known as the Urgent Deficiency Bill, appropriating over \$3,000,000,000 for war expenses.

June 2, 1917.—The Food Survey Bill.

June 15, 1917.—Act condemning land for military purposes.

June 16, 1917.—War Priority Shipments Bill.

June 21, 1917.—Act for National Security and Defense by stimulating agriculture and making an appropriation therefore of \$11,846,000.00.

July 21, 1917.—Aviation Appropriation Act of \$941,000,000.00.

September 11, 1917.—Act to secure secrecy of patents on war inventions during war.

September 11, 1917.—Administration bill regulating manufacture of explosives.

September 12, 1917.—Act creating the Aircraft Board.

September 12, 1917.—Trading with the Enemy Act.

September 25, 1917.—Second War Appropriation Bill, carrying over \$5,000,000,000.

September 25, 1917.—Act providing for soldiers in foreign service making allotment of pay for support of dependents.

October 4, 1917.—War Risk Insurance Act.

January 18, 1918.—Act authorizing U. S. Shipping Board to acquire lands, buildings, etc.

February 22, 1918.—Federal Control of Railroads Act.

March 7, 1918.—War Finance Corporation Act.

May 1, 1918.—Housing Corporation Act.

June 24, 1918.—Act appropriating \$50,000,000 for President Wilson to use as he saw fit for the national defense.

June 29, 1918.—Army appropriation bill authorizing increase of the drafted army.

July 13, 1918.—Telegraph, Telephone and Cable Control Act.

September 11, 1918.—The Mineral Control Act.

I refrain from further specifying. Suffice it is to say, that my other votes and all of my energies were devoted to making the war a success.

AEROPLANE INVESTIGATION.

As a member of the Sub-committee on Military Affairs I assisted in an investigation of the aeroplane situation.

It was disclosed that the aeroplanes being manufactured were inefficient and that not a single first-class fighting plane had been produced and sent to France.

The investigation forced the dismissal of a number of men responsible for the condition. Contracts for the construction of worthless planes to cost, as I recollect it, over four hundred and fifty millions of dollars were cancelled. The manufacture of up-to-date aircraft was undertaken, but, unfortunately, although our Gov-

ernment expended nearly a billion and a quarter of money on aeroplanes, scarcely a single American-made fighting plane reached the front before the war was terminated.

I do not say this to criticize the Administration. Mistakes were inevitable, but the singular thing is, that for making this investigation and disclosing these lamentable conditions, the committee was denounced.

I come now to a measure which I opposed:

PRESS CENSORSHIP.

President Wilson insisted upon a law being passed which would authorize him to appoint a press censor. The proposition passed the House of Representatives by a large majority.

Against this restriction upon the liberty of the press I contended with all my might. I held then and hold now that a free press is essential to the liberties of the people; that the people of the United States were waging and supporting the war and that they were entitled to know the truth.

Had the bill passed and taken the course of other war legislation, we might have had a press censor until peace was finally declared.

I may have been wrong in refusing to "throttle" the press, but so long as I live I will never cast a vote which will deny to the people the right of peaceable assemblage and the right to know through an untrammelled press the condition of the world in which they live.

I am reminded at this point that there are certain gentlemen, some of them aspirants for office, who have often declared that they endorsed and supported President Wilson in everything he ever did or suggested.

Such a man must stand before the bar of public opinion convicted by his own admission of a willingness to impair a right without which no people can be free.

THE WAR CABINET BILL.

While I opposed the President in his demand for a press censor, I gave him support in one of the most eventful and crucial hours of his career.

The war had progressed for some time. There had been many mistakes, many failures, much waste of money. This was inevitable under the circumstances, but it produced tremendous discontent in Congress and for a time in the country.

Under these circumstances, a bill, really conceived by Senator Weeks, but introduced by Senator Hitchcock, was brought forward.

It proposed to appoint a joint committee of Congress to supervise all of the expenditures of the war.

The President denounced it as an attempt to take the conduct of the war out of his hands and to deprive him of his constitutional rights.

The bill, apparently, had the backing of nearly all the Republicans. It also was supported by a considerable number of influential and powerful Democrats.

If the bill had passed, the President would have been shorn of a large part of his power.

I took the floor against this measure. I will not say that I made a good speech but I made the best of which I was capable.

I believed the bill to be unconstitutional and so declared. I believed it to be unwise and unfair to the President and so declared.

I will not be egotistical enough to say that my speech produced the result, but the fact is, no one challenged me in debate and the bill was "killed."

If I had been an enemy of the President, if I had desired to humiliate or cripple him, this was the opportunity to have struck a deadly blow.

MR. HOOVER AND FARM PRICE REGULATION.

I have been bitterly criticized for opposing Mr. Hoover.

Whatever the view of others may be I am certainly not deriving any criticism by the Missouri farmers for opposing Mr. Hoover and his methods.

Let me tell you that story:

Mr. Hoover left the United States when he was 23 years of age. He took employment by British companies. He remained absent from this country for 23 years. He had lived no part of the last 23 years of his life in the United States, except that he had occasionally made flying visits to this country. He had never cast a vote in the United States, and has not up to this day. He was engaged in organizing foreign syndicates. He had his house and holdings in London. Substantially all of his interests were with foreign corporations. He had attained some reputation in transporting food into Belgium.

I did not believe that a man so situated should be placed in control of the productive energies of America.

It was proposed to give him the authority to license and control, among other business institutions, millers, grain exchanges, companies engaged in the foreign shipment of grains and farm products, stockyards and packing houses.

The power to license and take away a license is the power of life and death over a business institution. I was certain that Mr. Hoover would exercise this power in order to force down the prices, particularly of wheat and of other cereals raised largely in the State of Missouri.

I insisted that the American farmer was patriotic; that he would be willing to make all necessary sacrifices for the war, and that he would submit to a regulation of his prices, provided all other prices were similarly regulated. But I urged that if the farmers' prices were reduced upon all he had to sell and he was compelled to pay war prices for all he purchased, the farmer would be greatly injured if not impoverished.

My arguments fell upon deaf ears. Everybody seemed willing to regulate the grain farmers. By dint of hard fighting I succeeded in having steel brought within the terms of the bill, then cotton manufactured goods, then copper, and finally, cotton itself.

The result was that many of the Senators representing states in which these several interests were important declared against the bill. In this situation the President called a conference and it was agreed to take out of the bill the several products I have named. In this way, the votes were marshalled

to pass the bill. However, it was agreed, as some protection to the farmers, that a minimum price would be established for wheat and that the Government would guarantee that price.

At once warned the Senate that Mr. Hoover would make the minimum price the maximum price and that wheat would not be allowed to go above the minimum. In spite of all I could do the bill was passed.

Mr. Hoover did substantially make the minimum price named in the bill the maximum. He accomplished his end in this wise: He informed each grain dealer that if he paid more than the price Hoover fixed for wheat, his license would be revoked. He fixed the price the millers must pay the grain dealers. This gave the grain dealers a huge profit. He organized the Export Grain Corporation and placed at its head one of the greatest grain gamblers of the world. Through that corporation Hoover fixed the prices upon export grain.

The result was that there was no place in the world for the farmer to sell a bushel of wheat except at the price fixed by Mr. Hoover. Mr. Hoover was able to accomplish this by the arbitrary abuse of the licensing power granted to him.

Because of this legislation and Mr. Hoover's attitude the price of grain, as I recall, fell at once more than a dollar a bushel in the market.

The Grain Control Act was continued in force until long after the war ended. When the control was released wheat immediately advanced, as I now recollect, more than 60 cents a bushel.

It is safe, therefore, to say that Mr. Hoover took from the farmers of this nation \$1.00 a bushel upon all the wheat raised during the period of grain control. The enormous total must have reached nearly one billion dollars per annum.

By similar methods he controlled the price of other cereals.

He also called the packers together and fixed an arbitrary price for livestock.

I will remember when the Missouri Farmers' Association came to Washington during those dark days and compelled Mr. Hoover to a revision of the pork and beef specifications for the army and navy. This they were able to accomplish by threatening to provoke a rebellion in Congress against his methods. I gave these farmers such assistance as I could.

I also recall when Hoover had forced down the price of livestock to a point where the feeder was compelled to lose heavily upon every bushel of grain fed.

It is impossible to accurately estimate the amount of money thus taken from the farmers of the United States, but I believe they were deprived of not less than from three to five billions of dollars.

In the meantime, the farmers were compelled to buy everything they used from war profiteers at war prices. The result was they were robbed at both ends. The war profiteers got rich almost overnight. Millions were made by the thousands. Munition manufacturers, copper companies, manufacturers of agricultural machinery, shoes, harness and clothing, raised prices and plundered at will. Wages advanced four or five times. But the farmer, to use a slang phrase, was compelled to "hold the sack."

His boys were taken from the field of production and sent to the field of war. He was obliged to hire labor at four or five times the normal pre-war cost.

Nor were the bread consumers of the United States much benefited by this crucifixion of the farmer. The miller, the baker and the distributor managed in some way to increase their prices and enlarge their gains. But England, the country in which is located Mr. Hoover's house and holdings, received American grain at the restricted value. In the meantime, however, Great Britain sold abroad more goods in value than at any time in her history, and all of these she sold at top war prices.

This is the story of Mr. Hoover and of my opposition to him.

If I could but have succeeded the farmers of Missouri might have had balances in the bank to their credit in order to carry them over the slump in prices which inevitably succeeded the war. The great profiteers had made their money and were able to withstand the cut—the farmer was the victim.

During all this contest Mr. Hoover had a publicity machine working night and day. Hundreds of thousands of dollars, I believe millions of dollars, were taken from the public treasury and employed by him in exploiting his virtues and laying the foundation for his campaign for the presidency upon some ticket which he had not yet selected.

Why were the farmers subjected to this treatment? Largely because they are unorganized. Capital is organized and it demanded large gains. Labor is organized and it demanded larger wages. Manufacturers are largely organized and they took their profits. But the farmers were unable to concentrate their strength.

In that respect they were not much differently situated than they have been from time immemorial.

The day has come when the intelligent farmer must recognize the fact that it is necessary for him to procure some sort of unanimity of action in order to protect his interests. Nor will this policy be injurious to the country for the prosperity of the country depends upon the prosperity of the farmer. Destroy him and you will bring ruin to the country. You will drive the boys from the farms to the cities and reduce that population upon which the independence and patriotism of the country so largely depends.

Since I have been in the Senate, I have endeavored in every possible way to guard the interests of the farmer.

Some weeks ago I agreed without charge to assist in defending in the Supreme Court of the United States the Act which was passed by the recent Missouri Legislature, which declares that a board of trade or a grain exchange is a public market and that being a public market the farmers of this State shall have the right to establish their own co-operative grain

commission companies within these heretofore exclusive precincts.

I intend to give that cause the last ounce of my ability.

Not until the farmers of the country are able to have a free and open market in which to sell their products will American agriculture be safe, and not until agriculture is safe will the Republic be safe.

Should I be returned to the Senate there are two things to which I pledge myself without reservation:

(1) That in the future, as in the past, I will do what I can to the end that the farmer may receive a square deal so far as legislation can assure it, and

(2) That I will fight for a reduction of the heavy taxes which are a millstone about the neck of the American people.

QUESTIONS FOR CRITICS AND OPPONENTS TO ANSWER.

There are those who say they were for everything the President proposed and that every man should be condemned who even in a single instance differed from the President.

To those individuals, whether candidates seeking election upon the platform that they are followers of Wilson or citizens who denounce me for occasionally differing from him, I issue the challenge that they plainly and publicly answer the following questions:

(1) The President demanded the right to appoint a press censor for the duration of the war.

Would you have voted to "throttle" the press?

(2) Months after the armistice had been signed and our soldiers were largely returned, the President, through his Secretaries of Navy and War, demanded that we should have a regular army of 509,000 men, with 250,000 sailors and marines attached to the navy.

He also demanded universal military training for every boy. This would have kept under arms at all times at least 1,250,000 men.

On top of this, it was proposed to create a great national guard and a reserve army.

Would you have voted for this vast military scheme?

(3) The President favored the United States accepting a mandate over Armenia. He sent Gen. Harbord to investigate. The General reported that it would require an army of 25,000 to 200,000 American troops to maintain the mandate.

Would you have voted to accept the mandate and furnish that army to serve in Asia?

(4) The President proposed that we should make a treaty with France and Great Britain, binding the United States to defend France against attack by Germany.

Would you have voted for such a treaty?

(5) The President vetoed the War-time Prohibition Bill.

Would you have voted to sustain the veto or would you have voted against the President?

(6) The President backed Mr. Hoover when he forced the farmers to sell their products at regulated and reduced prices, although the farmers were compelled to buy all they consumed at unregulated war prices.

Tell the farmers of Missouri whether you would have supported a scheme so unjust to them!

I have already briefly scanned the course of the present Administration. I propose in other speeches to discuss its policies in detail.

THE NEWBERRY CASE.

I desire now to call attention to one incident of tremendous moment and of appalling significance.

I shall not take your time to review the evidence in the Newberry case.

When he was seated in the United States Senate those who voted for him summed up the case in the resolution giving Newberry his seat. Beyond the terms of that resolution we need not look. The resolution was as follows:

"Resolved. . . . That Truman H. Newberry is hereby declared to be a duly elected Senator . . . and is entitled to hold his seat. . . ."

"That whether the amount expended was \$195,000 or . . . in excess, the amount . . . much larger than ought to have been expended. . . ."

"The expenditure of such excessive sums in behalf of a candidate . . . being contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the honor and dignity of the Senate, and dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government, such excessive expenditures are hereby severely condemned and disapproved."

Those who voted for that resolution boldly proclaimed the fact that Newberry had been guilty of the act contrary to sound public policy; that his conduct had been harmful to the honor and dignity of the Senate and that it was dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government.

Having thus arraigned Newberry for acts which were destructive of the Government, they proceeded to ratify his election and make him a part of the Government. They thus endorsed the corrupt acts and made themselves particeps criminis.

When it is possible for a majority of the United States Senate to so boldly proclaim knowledge of infamy and to indecently ratify and confirm the result of that infamy, the Republic is imperiled. The guilty parties should be lashed from public office.

This action of the Senate can only be understood when the fact is recognized that that body is again being crowded by men whose only qualifications for office is the possession of millions.

Where money rules the use of money finds sanction. If we are to preserve this Republic then we must have regard for principles—not dollars.

No man should be given a high office merely on account of the magnitude of his wealth, whether earned, inherited or otherwise acquired.

"Newberryism" cannot be tolerated in the Republic!

CONCENTRATION OF POWER.

Another menace which hangs over the Republic is the concentration of power in the Federal Government.

This concentration of power has already proceeded to an alarming degree.

One after another the rights originally exercised by the States have been impaired or abrogated. Many of the attributes of Government which the States formerly performed have been transferred to a multitude of Boards and Bureaus in Washington. Moreover, the power of these Boards and Bureaus has been extended far beyond anything originally contemplated by the States themselves.

An attempt has been made to put business into leading-strings and to regulate by Washington Boards the most intimate and sacred relations of life.

Among other things, it was recently proposed that the control of maternity should be given to a board of unmarried women at Washington.

The national ownership of highways, of coal mines, of gas, has already been suggested. It is but a step from such propositions to the control of all the necessities of life.

If these processes continue, we will, in a short time, have established a Federal Socialism which will destroy the liberties of the individual man, sap the energies of our people and produce a Government by Boards, Commissions, and Bureaus which will undertake to control the affairs of the country and the private life of the people.

I shall in other speeches discuss this great question.

I stand for a return to the old fundamentals of Democracy;

For the abolition of useless Boards and Bureaus;

For the restoration of business to the people who created it;

For the cessation of Governmental interference in the homes and lives of the people;

For the reduction of taxation;

For a strong National Guard, a small standing army, and as effective a navy as can be had under Harding's treaty;

For letting the mothers raise their babies without interference by a Washington board;