

E 769

.H26

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 982 487 8

Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F3-1955

64TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DOCUMENT
No. 1315

SPEECH OF NOTIFICATION

By SENATOR WARREN G. HARDING

AND

SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE

By MR. CHARLES E. HUGHES



AUGUST 2, 1916.—Ordered to be printed

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1916

111

D. of D.
AUG 8 1916

111

111

SPEECH OF NOTIFICATION AND SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE.

SENATOR HARDING'S SPEECH.

Senator Harding said:

Mr. HUGHES: The committee here assembled, representing all the United States and Territories, chosen by the Republican national convention, which met in Chicago on last June 7, is directed by that convention formally to notify you of its action in selecting you as its nominee for the Presidency of the Republic.

Speaking for the committee, it is my pleasure to say directly what was conveyed to you by telegraph while the convention was yet in session—that you are the unanimous choice of the Republican national convention for the party standard bearer.

That convention uttered the principles of a confident, determined, reunited, and enthusiastic Republican Party, which turns to you, in highest respect and trust, as a nominee best typifying the party's purposes and the people's desires.

Inasmuch as the unusual circumstances inspired an informal notice at the time of the convention's action, and you then made an informal acceptance of the call to patriotic duty which won the plaudits of our people, I shall not refer in detail to the action of the convention or the declared principles to which the Republican Party is committed. But it is fitting that I should speak the congratulations of this committee on your most extraordinary nomination.

It has no parallel in the history of the Republican Party. As the whole people have approvingly witnessed, you have been chosen for leadership by a convention which comprised the best thought, the highest intention, and deepest consecration of a great and historic party when you were not only not an aspirant but discouraged all endeavors in your behalf.

Notwithstanding your holding aloof from all conference and participation, that unflinching understanding which directs popular sentiment to highest victory called you to the service of the party and the Nation. Your record of public service, your well-known and courageous views on public questions when in executive position, your abiding devotion to Republicanism, your possession of a confidence which has united all believers in Republican policies under our party banner, your unalterable and abiding Americanism, your high personal character and well-known capacity—all these have

fixed you in the American mind as the best exponent of Republican principles and the wisest leader to restore American prestige and efficient government.

We bring you now the commission to that leadership. We bring it in full confidence that the people will gladly acclaim the Republican restoration under your trusted leadership. We bring it in the highest appreciation of that peace of right and justice which your unwavering Americanism will hold secure rather than endanger. We bring it in the strong belief that American material good fortune, under Republican industrial preparedness, will be the glad reflex of our own peace and the world's peace, and be held permanent under Republican protection. We bring it in firm conviction that you, sir, will hold that platform promises constitute a sacred party covenant, and the expressed will of the people at the polls must find response in capable and efficient administration.

Aye, sir, we bring it believing you will add to our self-respect, confidence, and good fortune at home and to that respect and good opinion abroad which meets our higher American aspirations.

MR. HUGHES'S SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE.

Senator Harding, members of the notification committee, and fellow citizens, this occasion is more than a mere ceremony of notification. We are not here to indulge in formal expressions. We come to state in a plain and direct manner our faith, our purpose, and our pledge. This representative gathering is a happy augury. It means the strength of reunion. It means that the party of Lincoln is restored, alert, effective. It means the unity of a common perception of paramount national needs. It means that we are neither deceived nor benumbed by abnormal conditions.

We know that we are in a critical period, perhaps more critical than any period since the Civil War. We need a dominant sense of national unity; the exercise of our best constructive powers; the vigor and resourcefulness of a quickened America. We desire that the Republican Party as a great liberal party shall be the agency of national achievement, the organ of the effective expression of dominant Americanism. What do I mean by that?

THE EXPRESSION OF AMERICANISM.

I mean America conscious of power, awake to obligation, erect in self-respect, prepared for every emergency, devoted to the ideals of peace, instinct with the spirit of human brotherhood, safeguarding both individual opportunity and the public interest, maintaining a well-ordered constitutional system adapted to local self-government without the sacrifice of essential national authority, appreciating the necessity of stability, expert knowledge, and thorough organization as the indispensable conditions of security and progress; a country loved by its citizens with a patriotic fervor permitting no division in their allegiance and no rivals in their affection—I mean America first and America efficient. It is in this spirit that I respond to your summons.

Our foreign relations have assumed grave importance in the last three years. The conduct of diplomatic intercourse is in the keeping of the Executive. It rests chiefly with him whether we shall show competence or incompetence; whether the national honor shall be maintained; whether our prestige and influence shall be lowered or advanced. What is the record of the administration? The first duty of the Executive was to command the respect of the world by the personnel of our State Department and our representation abroad. No party exigency could excuse the nonperformance of this obvious obligation. Still, after making every allowance for certain commendable appointments, it is apparent that this obligation was not performed.

WEAKNESS AND INEXPERTNESS.

At the very beginning of the present administration, where in the direction of diplomatic intercourse there should have been conspicuous strength and expertness, we had weakness and inexpertness. Instead of assuring respect we invited distrust of our competence and speculation as to our capacity for firmness and decision, thus entailing many difficulties which otherwise easily could have been escaped. Then, in numerous instances, notably, in Latin America, where such a course was particularly reprehensible and where we desire to encourage the most friendly relations, men of long diplomatic experience, whose knowledge and training were of especial value to the country, were retired from the service apparently for no other reason than to meet partisan demands in the appointment of inexperienced persons.

Where, as in Santo Domingo, we had assumed an important special trust in the interest of its people, that trust was shockingly betrayed in order to satisfy "deserving Democrats." The record showing the administration's disregard of its responsibilities with respect to our representation in diplomacy is an open book, and the specifications may easily be had. It is a record revealing professions belied. It is a dismal record to those believing in Americanism. Take, for example, the withdrawal of Ambassador Herrick from France. There he stood, in the midst of alarms, the very embodiment of courage, of poise, of executive capacity, universally trusted and beloved. No diplomat ever won more completely the affections of a foreign people; and there was no better fortune for this country than to have at the capital of any one of the belligerent nations a representative thus esteemed.

WHAT REMOVING HERRICK MEANT.

Yet the administration permitted itself to supersede him. The point is not that the man was Ambassador Herrick, or that the nation was France, but that we invited the attention of the world to the inexcusable yielding of national interest to partisan expediency. It was a lamentable sacrifice of international repute. If we would have the esteem of foreign nations we must deserve it. We must show our regard for special knowledge and experience. I propose that we shall make the agencies of our diplomatic intercourse in every nation worthy of the American name.

The dealings of the administration with Mexico constitute a confused chapter of blunders. We have not helped Mexico. She lies prostrate, impoverished, famine-stricken, overwhelmed with the woes and outrages of internecine strife, the helpless victim of a condition of anarchy which the course of the administration only served to promote. For ourselves, we have witnessed the murder of our citizens and the destruction of their property. We have made enemies, not friends. Instead of commanding respect and deserving good will by sincerity, firmness, and consistency, we provoked misapprehension and deep resentment.

In the light of the conduct of the administration no one could understand its professions. Decrying interference, we interfered most exasperatingly. We have not even kept out of actual conflict, and the soil of Mexico is stained with the blood of our soldiers. We

have resorted to physical invasion, only to retire without gaining the professed object. It is a record which can not be examined without a profound sense of humiliation.

THE CASE OF HUERTA.

When the administration came into power Huerta was exercising authority as provisional President of Mexico. He was certainly in fact the head of the Government of Mexico. Whether or not he should be recognized was a question to be determined in the exercise of a sound discretion, but according to correct principles. The President was entitled to be assured that there was at least a de facto government; that international obligations would be performed; that the lives and property of American citizens would have proper protection. To attempt, however, to control the domestic concerns of Mexico was simply intervention, not less so because disclaimed.

The height of folly was to have a vacillating and ineffective intervention, which could only evoke bitterness and contempt, which would fail to pacify the country and to assure peace and prosperity under a stable government. If crimes were committed, we do not palliate them. We make no defense of Huerta. But the administration had nothing to do with the moral character of Huerta, if in fact he represented the Government of Mexico. We shall never worthily prosecute our unselfish aims or serve humanity by wrong-headedness. So far as the character of Huerta is concerned, the hollowness of the pretensions on this score is revealed by the administration's subsequent patronage of Villa (whose qualifications as an assassin are indisputable), whom apparently the administration was ready to recognize had he achieved his end and fulfilled what then seemed to be its hope.

JOHN LIND'S MISSION.

The question is not as to the nonrecognition of Huerta. The administration did not content itself with refusing to recognize Huerta, who was recognized by Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Spain, and Japan. The administration undertook to destroy Huerta, to control Mexican politics, even to deny Huerta the right to be a candidate for the office of President at the election the administration demanded. With what bewilderment must the Mexicans have regarded our assertion of their right to manage their own affairs. In the summer of 1913 John Lind was dispatched to the City of Mexico as the President's "personal spokesman and representative" to the unrecognized Huerta, in order to demand that the latter eliminate himself. It was an unjustifiable mission, most offensive to a sensitive people. John Lind lingered irritatingly. The administration continued to direct its efforts at the destruction of the only government Mexico had.

In the spring of 1914 occurred the capture of Vera Cruz. Men from one of our ships had been arrested at Tampico and had been discharged with an apology. But our admiral demanded a salute, which was refused. Thereupon the President went to Congress, asking authority to use the armed forces of the United States. Without waiting for the passage of the resolution, Vera Cruz was seized. It appeared

that a shipload of ammunition for Huerta was about to enter that port. There was a natural opposition to this invasion, and a battle occurred in which 19 Americans and over 100 Mexicans were killed. This, of course, was war. Our dead soldiers were praised for dying like heroes in a war of service. Later we retired from Vera Cruz, giving up this noble warfare.

DID NOT GET THE SALUTE.

We had not obtained the salute which was demanded. We had not obtained reparation for affronts. The ship with ammunition which could not land at Vera Cruz had soon landed at another port, and its cargo was delivered to Huerta without interference. Recently the naked truth was admitted by a Cabinet officer. We are now informed that "we did not go to Vera Cruz to force Huerta to salute the flag." We are told that we went there "to show Mexico that we were in earnest in our demand that Huerta must go." That is, we seized Vera Cruz to depose Huerta. The question of the salute was a mere pretext.

Meanwhile, the administration utterly failed to perform its obvious duty to secure protection for the lives and property of our citizens. It is most unworthy to slur those who have investments in Mexico in order to escape a condemnation for the nonperformance of this duty. There can be no such escape, for we have no debate, and there can be no debate as to the existence of this duty on the part of our Government. Let me quote the words of the Democratic platform of 1912:

The constitutional rights of American citizens should protect them on our borders, and go with them throughout the world, and every American citizen residing or having property in any foreign country is entitled to, and must be given, the full protection of the United States Government, both for himself and his property.

The bitter hatred aroused by the course of the administration multiplied outrages, while our failure to afford protection to our citizens evoked the scorn and contempt of Mexicans. Consider the ignominious incident at Tampico in connection with the capture of Vera Cruz. In the midst of the greatest danger to the hundreds of Americans congregated at Tampico our ships which were in the harbor were withdrawn and our citizens were saved only by the intervention of German officers, and were taken away by British and German ships. The official excuse of the Secretary of the Navy is an extraordinary commentary.

NAVAL COMMANDER'S DILEMMA.

Our ships, it seems, had been ordered to Vera Cruz; but, as it appeared that they were not needed, the order was rescinded. Then, we are told, our admiral was faced with this remarkable dilemma: If he attempted to go up the river at Tampico and take our citizens on board, the word of "aggressive action," as the Secretary called it, "would have spread to the surrounding country" and it was "almost certain that reprisals on American citizens would have followed and lives would have been lost." We had so incensed the Mexicans that we could not rescue our own citizens at Tampico save at the risk of the murder of others. We must take Vera Cruz to get Huerta out

of office and trust to other nations to get our own citizens out of peril. What a travesty of international policy.

Destroying the government of Huerta, we left Mexico to the ravages of revolution. I shall not attempt to narrate the sickening stories of the barbarities committed, of the carnival of murder and lust. We were then told that Mexico was entitled to spill as much blood as she pleased to settle her affairs. The administration vacillated with respect to the embargo on the export of arms and munitions to Mexico. Under the resolution of 1912 President Taft had laid such an embargo. In August, 1913, President Wilson stated that he deemed it his duty to see that neither side to the struggle in Mexico should receive any assistance from this side of the border, and that the export of all arms and munitions to Mexico would be forbidden.

But in February, 1914, the embargo was lifted. In April, 1914, the embargo was restored. In May, 1914, it was explained that the embargo did not apply to American shipments through Mexican ports, and ammunition for Carranza was subsequently landed at Tampico. In September, 1914, the embargo was lifted on exports across the border; thereupon military supplies reached both Villa and Carranza. In October, 1915, an embargo was declared on all exports of arms except to the adherents of Carranza. There was an utter absence of consistent policy.

CARRANZA'S RECOGNITION.

For a time we bestowed friendship on Villa. Ultimately we recognized Carranza, not on the ground that he had a constitutional government, but that it was a *de facto* government. The complete failure to secure protection to American citizens is shown conclusively in the note of the Secretary of State of June 20, 1916, in which he thus described the conditions that have obtained during the last three years:

For three years the Mexican Republic has been torn with civil strife; the lives of Americans and other aliens have been sacrificed; vast properties developed by American capital and enterprise have been destroyed or rendered nonproductive; bandits have been permitted to roam at will through the territory contiguous to the United States and to seize, without punishment or without effective attempt at punishment, the property of Americans, while the lives of citizens of the United States who ventured to remain in Mexican territory or to return there to protect their interests have been taken, in some cases barbarously taken, and the murderers have neither been apprehended nor brought to justice. * * * It would be tedious to recount instance after instance, outrage after outrage, atrocity after atrocity, to illustrate the true nature and extent of the widespread conditions of lawlessness and violence which have prevailed.

The Santa Ysabel massacre, the raid at Columbus, the bloodshed at Carrizal, are fresh in your minds. After the Columbus raid we started a "punitive expedition." We sent a thin line of troops hundreds of miles into Mexico, between two lines of railway neither of which we were allowed to use and which we did not feel at liberty to seize. We were refused permission to enter the towns. Though thus restricted, the enterprise was still regarded by the Mexicans as a menace. Our troops faced hostile forces, and it is not remarkable that our men fell at Carrizal. What other result could be expected?

THE PURPOSE UNACCOMPLISHED.

We were virtually ordered to withdraw, and without accomplishing our purpose we have been withdrawing, and we are now endeavoring to safeguard our own territory. The entire National Guard has been ordered out, and many thousands of our citizens have been taken from their peaceful employment and hurried to the Mexican border. The administration was to seize and punish Villa for his outrage on our soil. It has not punished anyone; we went in only to retire. Future movements are apparently to be determined by a joint commission.

The Nation has no policy of aggression toward Mexico. We have no desire for any part of her territory. We wish her to have peace, stability, and prosperity. We should be ready to aid her in binding up her wounds, in relieving her from starvation and distress, and in giving her in every practicable way the benefits of our disinterested friendship. The conduct of this administration has created difficulties which we shall have to surmount. We shall have to overcome the antipathy needlessly created by that conduct and to develop genuine respect and confidence. We shall have to adopt a new policy, a policy of firmness and consistency, through which alone we can promote an enduring friendship.

DEMANDS PROTECTION OF CITIZENS.

We demand from Mexico the protection of the lives and the property of our citizens and the security of our border from depredations. Much will be gained if Mexico is convinced that we contemplate no meddlesome interference with what does not concern us, but that we propose to insist in a firm and candid manner upon the performance of international obligations. To a stable Government, appropriately discharging its international duties, we shall give ungrudging support. A short period of firm, consistent, and friendly dealing will accomplish more than many years of vacillation.

In this land of composite population, drawing its strength from every race, the national security demands that there shall be no paltering with American rights. The greater the danger of divisive influences, the greater is the necessity for the unifying force of a just, strong, and patriotic position. We countenance no covert policies, no intrigues, no secret schemes. We are unreservedly, devotedly, whole-heartedly for the United States. That is the rallying point for all Americans. That is my position. I stand for the unflinching maintenance of all American rights on land and sea.

We have had a clear and definite mission as a great neutral nation. It was for us to maintain the integrity of international law; to vindicate our rights as neutrals; to protect the lives of our citizens, their property and trade from wrongful acts. Putting aside any question as to the highest possibilities of moral leadership in the maintenance and vindication of the law of nations in connection with the European war, at least we were entitled to the safeguarding of American rights. But this has not been secured.

SERIES OF DIPLOMATIC NOTES.

We have had brave words in a series of notes, but despite our protests the lives of Americans have been destroyed. What does it avail to use some of the strongest words known to diplomacy if ambassadors can receive the impression that the words are not to be taken seriously? It is not words, but the strength and resolution behind the words, that count.

The chief function of diplomacy is prevention; but in this our diplomacy failed, doubtless because of its impaired credit and the manifest lack of disposition to back words with action. Had this Government, by the use of both informal and formal diplomatic opportunities, left no doubt that when we said "strict accountability" we meant precisely what we said, and that we should unhesitatingly vindicate that position, I am confident that there would have been no destruction of American lives by the sinking of the *Lusitania*. There we had ample notice; in fact, published notice. Furthermore, we knew the situation and we did not require specific notice. Instead of whittling away our formal statements by equivocal conversations, we needed the straight, direct, and decisive representations which every diplomat and foreign office would understand. I believe that in this way we should have been spared the repeated assaults on American lives. Moreover, a firm American policy would have been strongly supported by our people and the opportunities for the development of bitter feeling would have been vastly reduced.

It is a great mistake to say that resoluteness in protecting American rights would have led to war. Rather, in that course lay the best assurance of peace. Weakness and indecision in the maintenance of known rights are always sources of grave danger; they forfeit respect and invite serious wrongs, which in turn create an uncontrollable popular resentment. That is not the path of national security.

THE MAINTENANCE OF RIGHTS.

Not only have we a host of resources short of war by which to enforce our just demands, but we shall never promote our peace by being stronger in words than in deeds. We should not have found it difficult to maintain peace, but we should have maintained peace with honor. During this critical period the only danger of war has lain in the weak course of the administration.

I do not put life and property on the same footing, but the administration has not only been remiss with respect to the protection of American lives; it has been remiss with respect to the protection of American property and American commerce. It has been too much disposed to be content with leisurely discussion. I can not now undertake to review the course of events, but it is entirely clear that we failed to use the resources at our command to prevent injurious action, and that we suffered in consequence. We have no ulterior purposes, and the administration should have known how to secure the entire protection of every legitimate American interest and the prompt recognition of our just demands as a neutral nation.

We denounce all plots and conspiracies in the interest of any foreign nation. Utterly intolerable is the use of our soil for alien intrigues. Every American must unreservedly condemn them and

support every effort for their suppression. But here also prompt, vigorous, and adequate measures on the part of the administration were needed. There should have been no hesitation, no notion that it was wise and politic to delay. Such an abuse of our territory demanded immediate and thoroughgoing action. As soon as the administration had notice of plots and conspiracies it was its duty to stop them. It was not lacking in resources. Its responsibility for their continuance can not be escaped by the condemnation of others.

We are a peace-loving people, but we live in a world of arms. We have no thought of aggression, and we desire to pursue our democratic ideals without the wastes of strife. So devoted are we to these ideals, so intent upon our normal development, that I do not believe that there is the slightest danger of militarism in this country. Adequate preparedness is not militarism. It is the essential assurance of security; it is a necessary safeguard of peace.

SHOCKINGLY UNPREPARED.

It is apparent that we are shockingly unprepared. There is no room for controversy on this point since the object lesson on the Mexican border. All our available regular troops (less, I believe, than 40,000) are there or in Mexico, and as these have been deemed insufficient the entire National Guard has been ordered out; that is, we are summoning practically all our movable military forces in order to prevent bandit incursions. In view of the warnings of the last three years, it is inexcusable that we should find ourselves in this plight. For our faithful guardsmen, who, with a fine patriotism, responded to this call and are bearing this burden, I have nothing but praise. But I think it little short of absurd that we should be compelled to call men from their shops, their factories, their offices, and their professions for such a purpose.

This, however, is not all. The units of the National Guard were at peace strength, which was only about one-half the required strength. It was necessary to bring in recruits, for the most part raw and untrained. Only a small percentage of the regiments recruited up to war strength will have had even a year's training in the National Guard, which at the maximum means 100 hours of military drill, and, on the average, means much less.

Take the Eastern Department as an illustration. The States in this department contain about 72 per cent of the entire Organized Militia of the country. I am informed by competent authority that the quota of militia from this department recently summoned with the units raised to war strength as required would amount to about 131,000 men; that in response to this call there are now en route to or on the border about 54,000 men, and in camp in their respective States about 28,000 men; and thus, after what has already been accomplished, there still remain to be supplied in recruits about 48,000 men.

UNTRAINED MEN CALLED OUT.

Men fresh from their peaceful employments and physically unprepared have been hurried to the border for actual service. They were without proper equipment; without necessary supplies; suitable

conditions of transportation were not provided. Men with dependent families were sent, and conditions which should have been well known were discovered after the event. And yet the exigency, comparatively speaking, was not a very grave one. It involved nothing that could not readily have been foreseen during the last three years of disturbance, and required only a modest talent for organization. That this administration while pursuing its course in Mexico should have permitted such conditions to exist is almost incredible.

In the demand for reasonable preparedness the administration has followed, not led. Those who demanded more adequate forces were first described as "nervous and excited." Only about a year and a half ago we were told that the question of preparedness was not a pressing one; that the country had been misinformed. Later, under the pressure of other leadership, this attitude was changed. The administration, it was said, had "learned something," and it made a belated demand for an increased Army. Even then the demand was not prosecuted consistently, and the pressure exerted on Congress with respect to other administrative measures was notably absent. The President addressed Congress but little over six months ago presenting the plans of the War Department, and Congress was formally urged to sanction these plans as "the essential first steps."

They contemplated an increase of the standing force of the Regular Army from its then strength of 5,023 officers and 102,985 enlisted men to a strength of 7,136 officers and 134,707 enlisted men, or 141,843 all told. It was said that these additions were "necessary to render the Army adequate for its present duties." Further, it was proposed that the Army should be supplemented by a force of 400,000 disciplined citizens raised in increments of 133,000 a year through a period of three years. At least so much "by way of preparation for defense" seemed to the President to be "absolutely imperative now." He said: "We can not do less."

ARMY ORGANIZATION BILL.

But within two months this program was abandoned, and the able Secretary of War who had devoted himself persistently to this important question felt so keenly the change in policy that he resigned from the Cabinet. Now, the Army organization bill provides for an army on paper of 178,000, but, in fact, it provides for only 105,000 enlisted men for the line of the Regular Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and I am informed that for the next fiscal year there will be an increase of only 15,000. The plan for the supplemental Federal Army completely under Federal control was given up.

We are told that the defects revealed by the present mobilization are due to the "system." But it was precisely such plain defects that, under the constant warnings of recent years, with the whole world intent on military concerns, should have been studied and rectified. The administration has failed to discharge its responsibilities. Apparently, it is now seeking to meet political exigencies by its naval program; but it has imposed upon the country an incompetent naval administration.

We demand adequate national defense, adequate protection on both our western and eastern coasts. We demand thoroughness and efficiency in both arms of the service. It seems to be plain that our Regular Army is too small. We are too great a country to require of our citizens who are engaged in peaceful vocation the sort of military service to which they are now called. As well insist that our citizens in this metropolis be summoned to put out fires and police the streets. We do not count it inconsistent with our liberties or with our democratic ideals to have an adequate police force. With a population of nearly 100,000,000 we need to be surer of ourselves than to become alarmed at the prospect of having a Regular Army which can reasonably protect our border and perform such other military service as may be required in the absence of a grave emergency. I believe, further, that there should be not only a reasonable increase in the Regular Army, but that the first citizen reserve subject to call should be enlisted as a Federal army and trained under Federal authority.

NATION WANTS MODERN METHODS.

The country demands that our military and naval programs shall be carried out in a businesslike manner under the most competent administrative heads; that we shall have an up-to-date preparation; that the moneys appropriated shall be properly expended. We should also have careful plans for mobilizing our industrial resources; for promoting research and utilizing the investigations of science. And a policy of adequate preparedness must constantly have in view the necessity of conserving our fundamental human interests; of promoting the physical well-being of our population, as well as education and training; of developing to the utmost our economic strength and independence.

It must be based upon a profound sense of our unity and democratic obligation. It must not mean the abandonment of other essential governmental work, but that we shall have in both efficiency and in neither waste or extravagance. We should also be solicitous, by wise provision and conference, to remove so far as possible the causes of irritation which may in any degree threaten friendly relations. In our proposals there is, I repeat, no militarism. There is simple insistence upon common sense in providing reasonable measures of security and avoiding the perils of neglect. We must have the strength of self-respect; a strength which contains no threat, but assures our defense, safeguards our rights, and conserves our peace.

We are deeply interested in what I may term the organization of peace. We cherish no illusions. We know that the recurrence of war is not to be prevented by pious wishes. If the conflict of national interests is not to be brought to the final test of force, there must be the development of international organization in order to provide international justice and to safeguard so far as practicable the peace of the world.

FAVORS A WORLD COURT.

Arbitration treaties are useful within their proper sphere, but it is worse than folly to ignore the limitations of this remedy or to regard such treaties as an adequate means of preventing war. There should

be an international tribunal to decide controversies susceptible of judicial determination, thus affording the advantage of judicial standards in the settlement of particular disputes and of the gradual growth of a body of judicial precedents. In emphasizing the desirability of such a tribunal for the disposition of controversies of a justiciable sort it must not be overlooked that there are also legislative needs.

We need conferences of the nations to formulate international rules, to establish principles, to modify and extend international law so as to adapt it to new conditions, to remove causes of international differences. We need to develop the instrumentalities of conciliation, and behind this international organization, if it is to be effective, must be the cooperation of the nations to prevent resort to hostilities before the appropriate agencies of peaceful settlement have been utilized. If the peace of the world is to be maintained, it must be through the preventive power of a common purpose.

Without this it will still remain not only possible but practicable to disregard international obligations, to override the rights of States, particularly of small States, to ignore principles, to violate rules; and it is only through international cooperation giving a reasonable assurance of peace that we may hope for the limitation of armaments. It is to be expected that nations will continue to arm in defense of their respective interests, as they are conceived, and nothing will avail to diminish this burden save some practical guaranty of international order. We, in this country, can and should maintain our fortunate freedom from entanglements with interests and policies which do not concern us; but there is no national isolation in the world of the twentieth century.

OUR INTERNATIONAL DUTY.

If at the close of the present war the nations are ready to undertake practicable measures in the common interest in order to secure international justice, we can not fail to recognize our international duty. The peace of the world is our interest as well as the interest of others, and in developing the necessary agencies for the prevention of war we shall be glad to have an appropriate share: and our preparedness will have proper relation to this end as well as to our own immediate security.

When we contemplate industrial and commercial conditions we see that we are living in a fool's paradise. The temporary prosperity to which our opponents point has been created by the abnormal conditions incident to the war. With the end of the war there will be the new conditions determined by a new Europe. Millions of men in the trenches will then return to work. The energies of each of the now belligerent nations, highly trained, will then be turned to production. These are days of terrible discipline for the nations at war, but it must not be forgotten that each is developing a national solidarity, a knowledge of method, a realization of capacity hitherto unapproached. In each the lessons of cooperation now being learned will never be forgotten. Friction and waste have been reduced to a minimum; labor and capital have a better understanding; business organization is more highly developed and more intelligently directed than ever

before. We see in each of these nations a marvelous national efficiency. Let it not be supposed that this efficiency will not count when Europe, once more at peace, pushes its productive powers to the utmost limit.

On the other hand, in this country, with the stoppage of the manufacture of munitions a host of men will be turned out of employment. We must meet the most severe competition in industry. We are undisciplined, defective in organization, loosely knit, industrially unprepared.

THE CONDITION OF LABOR.

Our opponents promised to reduce the cost of living. This they have failed to do, but they did reduce the opportunities of making a living. Let us not forget the conditions that existed in this country under the new tariff prior to the outbreak of the war. Production had decreased, business was languishing, new enterprises were not undertaken; instead of expansion there was curtailment, and our streets were filled with the unemployed. It was estimated that in the city of New York over 300,000 were out of work. Throughout the country the jobless demanded relief. The labor commissioners of many States, and our municipal administrations, devoted themselves to the problem of unemployment, while the resources of our voluntary charitable organizations were most severely taxed. What ground is there for expecting better conditions when the unhealthy stimulus of the war has spent its force and our industries and working men are exposed to the competition of an energized Europe?

It is plain that we must have protective upbuilding policies. It is idle to look for relief to the Democratic Party, which as late as 1912 declared in its platform that it was "a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government, under the Constitution, had no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue." We are told in its present platform that there have been "momentous changes" in the last two years, and hence, repudiating its former attitude, the Democratic Party now declares for a "nonpartisan tariff commission." But have the "momentous changes" incident to the European war changed the Constitution of the United States? Is it proposed to use a tariff commission to frame a tariff for revenue only? Is the opposing party ready to confess that for generations it has misread the Constitution? Is that party now prepared to accept the protective principle? Rather, so far as the tariff is concerned, it would appear to be without principle. Witness its action in connection with the sugar duties, its reaffirmation of the doctrine of a revenue tariff, its dyestuffs proposal, and its formulation in lieu of protective duties of an "antidumping" provision, the terms of which are sufficient to show its ineffective character.

THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

The Republican Party stands for the principle of protection. We must apply that principle fairly, without abuses, in as scientific a manner as possible; and Congress should be aided by the investigations of an expert body. We stand for the safeguarding of our economic independence, for the development of American industry, for

the maintenance of American standards of living. We propose that in the competitive struggle that is about to come the American workman shall not suffer.

The Republican Party is not a sectional party. It thinks and plans nationally. Its policies are for the promotion of the prosperity of every part of the country—South, East, North and West. It is not simply a question of a wise adjustment of the tariff in accordance with sound principle, but there is also the need in other respects for stable conditions for commercial and industrial progress. If we are to meet effectively the conditions which will arise after the war is over, we must put our house in order. Let it be understood that the public right is to be maintained without fear or favor. But let us show that we can do this without impairing the essential agencies of progress.

There is no forward movement, no endeavor to promote social justice which in the last analysis does not rest upon the condition that there shall be a stable basis for honest enterprise. This subject has several important phases to which at this time I can allude only briefly. We should place our transportation system on a sure footing. We should be able wisely to adjust our regulative powers so that the fundamental object of protecting the public interest can be fully secured without uncertainties or conflicts and without hampering the development and expansion of transportation facilities. This national end may be accomplished without the sacrifice of any interest that is essentially local, or without weakening public control. Our present system is crude and inadequate.

COMMERCE, INDUSTRY, SHIPPING.

Moreover, in the severe economic struggle that is before us, and in seeking, as we should, to promote our productive industries and to expand our commerce—notably our foreign commerce—we shall require the most efficient organization quite as efficient as that found in any nation abroad. There must be no unnecessary wastes and no arbitrary obstructions. We have determined to cut out, root and branch, monopolistic practices, but we can do this without hobbling enterprise or narrowing the scope of legitimate achievement. Again, we must build up our merchant marine. It will not aid to put the Government into competition with private owners. That, it seems to me, is a counsel of folly. A surer way of destroying the promise of our foreign trade could hardly be devised. It has well been asked: Does the Government intend to operate at a profit or at a loss? We need the encouragement and protection of Government for our shipping industry, but it can not afford to have the Government as a competitor.

We stand for the conservation of the just interests of labor. We do not desire production, or trade, or efficiency in either for its own sake, but for the betterment of the lives of human beings. We shall not have any lasting industrial prosperity unless we buttress our industrial endeavors by adequate means for the protection of health; for the elimination of unnecessary perils to life and limb; for the safeguarding of our future through proper laws for protection of women and children in industry; for increasing opportunities for

education and training. We should be solicitous to inquire carefully into every grievance, remembering that there are few disputes which can not easily be adjusted if there be an impartial examination of the facts. We make common cause in this country, not for a few, but for all; and our watchword must be cooperation, not exploitation. No plans will be adequate save as they are instinct with genuine democratic sympathy.

FEDERAL COMPENSATION LAW.

I stand for adequate Federal workmen's compensation laws, dealing not only with the employees of Government, but with those employees who are engaged in interstate commerce and are subject to the hazard of injury, so that those activities which are within the sphere of the constitutional authority of Congress may be dealt with under a suitable law.

We propose to promote by every practicable means our agricultural interests, and we include in the program an effective system of rural credits. We favor the wise conservation of our natural resources. We desire not only that they shall be safeguarded, but that they shall be adequately developed and used to the utmost public advantage.

We turn to other considerations of important policy. One of these is our attitude toward the Philippines. That, I may say, is not a question of self-interest. We have assumed international obligations which we should not permit ourselves to evade. A breach of trust is not an admissible American policy, though our opponents have seemed to consider it such. We should administer government in the Philippines with a full recognition of our international duty, without partisanship, with the aim of maintaining the highest standards of expert administration, and in the interest of the Filipinos. This is a matter of national honor.

FAVORS VOTES FOR WOMEN.

I indorse the declaration of the platform in favor of woman suffrage. I do not consider it necessary to review the arguments usually advanced on the one side or the other, as my own convictions proceed from a somewhat different point of view. Some time ago a consideration of our economic conditions and tendencies, of the position of women in gainful occupations, of the nature and course of the demand, led me to the conclusion that the granting of suffrage to women is inevitable. Opposition may delay, but in my judgment can not defeat, this movement. Nor can I see any advantages in the delay which can possibly offset the disadvantages which are necessarily incident to the continued agitation. Facts should be squarely met. We shall have a constantly intensified effort and a distinctly feminist movement constantly perfecting its organization, to the subversion of normal political issues. We shall have a struggle increasing in bitterness, which I believe to be inimical to our welfare. If women are to have the vote, as I believe they are, it seems to me entirely clear that in the interest of the public life of this country the contest should be ended promptly. I favor the vote for women.

Confronting every effort to improve conditions is the menace of incompetent administration. It is an extraordinary notion that democracy can be faithfully served by inexperience. Democracy needs exact knowledge, special skill, and thorough training in its servants. I have already spoken of the disregard of proper standards in numerous instances in appointments to the diplomatic service. Unfortunately there has been a similar disregard of executive responsibility in appointments to important administrative positions in our domestic service. Even with respect to technical bureaus the demands of science have been compelled to yield to the demands of politics.

THE CIVIL-SERVICE LAWS.

We have erected against importunities of spoilsmen the barriers of the civil-service laws, but under the present administration enactments providing for the creation of large numbers of places have been deliberately removed from the merit system. The principles of our civil-service laws have been shamelessly violated. We stand for fidelity to these principles and their consistent application. And, further, it is our purpose that administrative chiefs shall be men of special competence eminently qualified for their important work.

Our opponents promised economy, but they have shown a reckless extravagance. They have been wasteful and profligate. It is time that we had fiscal reform. We demand a simple, businesslike budget. I believe it is only through a responsible budget, proposed by the Executive, that we shall avoid financial waste and secure proper administrative efficiency and a well-balanced consideration of new administrative proposals.

We live in a fateful hour. In a true sense the contest for the preservation of the Nation is never ended. We must still be imbued with the spirit of heroic sacrifices which gave us our country and brought us safely through the days of civil war. We renew our pledge to the ancient ideals of individual liberty, of opportunity denied to none because of race or creed, of unswerving loyalty. We have a vision of America prepared and secure; strong and just; equal to her tasks; an exemplar of the capacity and efficiency of a free people.

I indorse the platform adopted by the convention and accept its nomination.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 982 487 8

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
SERIALS ACQUISITION
10540 BOWEN DRIVE
BETHESDA, MD 20814
301-709-8900
301-709-8901
301-709-8902
301-709-8903
301-709-8904
301-709-8905
301-709-8906
301-709-8907
301-709-8908
301-709-8909
301-709-8910
301-709-8911
301-709-8912
301-709-8913
301-709-8914
301-709-8915
301-709-8916
301-709-8917
301-709-8918
301-709-8919
301-709-8920
301-709-8921
301-709-8922
301-709-8923
301-709-8924
301-709-8925
301-709-8926
301-709-8927
301-709-8928
301-709-8929
301-709-8930
301-709-8931
301-709-8932
301-709-8933
301-709-8934
301-709-8935
301-709-8936
301-709-8937
301-709-8938
301-709-8939
301-709-8940
301-709-8941
301-709-8942
301-709-8943
301-709-8944
301-709-8945
301-709-8946
301-709-8947
301-709-8948
301-709-8949
301-709-8950
301-709-8951
301-709-8952
301-709-8953
301-709-8954
301-709-8955
301-709-8956
301-709-8957
301-709-8958
301-709-8959
301-709-8960
301-709-8961
301-709-8962
301-709-8963
301-709-8964
301-709-8965
301-709-8966
301-709-8967
301-709-8968
301-709-8969
301-709-8970
301-709-8971
301-709-8972
301-709-8973
301-709-8974
301-709-8975
301-709-8976
301-709-8977
301-709-8978
301-709-8979
301-709-8980
301-709-8981
301-709-8982
301-709-8983
301-709-8984
301-709-8985
301-709-8986
301-709-8987
301-709-8988
301-709-8989
301-709-8990
301-709-8991
301-709-8992
301-709-8993
301-709-8994
301-709-8995
301-709-8996
301-709-8997
301-709-8998
301-709-8999

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 982 487 8

Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F3-1955

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 982 487 8

Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F3-1955