

# The Watchman and Southron.

THE SUMTER WATCHMAN, Established April, 1850.

"Be Just and Fear not—Let all the ends Thou Aims't at be thy Country's, Thy God's and Truth's."

THE TRUE SOUTHRON, Established June, 1866.

Consolidated Aug. 3, 1881.

SUMTER, S. C., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1, 1914.

Vol. XXXVIII. No. 11.

## UNDERWOOD EXPRESSES HIS VIEWS OF PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

### The Future Strength of U. S. Naval Forces and Sovereignty Endangered.

CLAIMS THAT IT WOULD DISCOURAGE COAST WISE SHIPPING. IF AMERICAN INDUSTRY WERE NOT ENCOURAGED — SPEECH BOLD IN DENIALS OF CLAIMS OF PRESIDENT WILSON. YET WITHHOLDING ALL PERSONAL FEELING—TELLS OF DEMOCRATIC PLEDGE.

Washington, March 27.—Declaring that the future naval strength of the United States, its right of sovereignty in the Panama Canal Zone and its privilege to encourage United States coastwise shipping to meet the subsidies of foreign governments were threatened by the proposed repeal of the free tolls clause of the Panama legislation, Oscar Underwood, majority leader of the House and a prominent factor in all the councils of his party, in a speech in the house today took issue with President Wilson on the question of free canal tolls for United States coastwise ships. The speech was notable for its restraint of personal feeling, yet bold in its denial of the president's claims.

"Are we now to yield the sovereign rights of a nation, and for what?" he asked. "Can anyone tell us plainly why we surrender, and what is to be accomplished by it? Are we to yield merely because the sentiment of Europe is against us? When has the sentiment of Europe ever been with us in matters of moment?"

"When Was Europe With Us?" "Was Europe with us when we protested against the British government taking us without granting representation in the Parliament? Did Europe protest against the unlawful seizures and search of vessels in the second decade of the last century?"

"When will the time ever come when we can expect to maintain and preserve our rights, political and commercial, with the acquiescent sympathy of European governments?"

Facing a house divided in both its Democratic and Republican membership upon this question, the Alabama leader began with a reminder to his party associates that they were proposing a violation of the pledge given in the national platform upon which they were elected. Then, suggesting ironically that most of them did not share his views of the sacredness of a pledge, he went into a deliberate analysis of the effect of the repeal upon the United States commerce, United States naval security and United States rights as one of the family of nations.

#### Solemn Platform Pledge.

"The Democratic national convention that met in Baltimore and named Woodrow Wilson for president and Thomas R. Marshall for Vice President on the 24 day of July, 1912," said Mr. Underwood, "promulgated the platform of the national Democratic party and made the following declarations in reference to tolls of United States ships passing through the Panama Canal:

"We favor the exemption from tolls of United States ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal. We also favor legislation forbidding the use of Panama Canal by ships owned or controlled by railroad carriers engaged in transportation competitive with the canal."

"There can be no contention as to the meaning of this language. No one can raise the issue that the bill now pending before the house, introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Sims), is not in direct conflict with the Democratic platform."

"Personally, I believe that the party pledge should be lived up to in good faith by those who claim allegiance to party principles, but as there are many here who differ from me in reference to the binding effect of a party platform, I will not at this time endeavor to discuss the pending bill from that standpoint."

"Let us resolve the issue into the question as to whether the platform of the Democratic party favoring exemption of tolls of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal is best for the nation and the people of this country or whether the gentleman from Tennessee, in the bill now pending before the house repudiating the declaration of the Democratic party, is proposing legislation that will be most beneficial to our nation

and our people." Reviewing in detail the cost of the canal and the estimated tonnage to be handled during 1915, Mr. Underwood showed that the canal would pay about 2 per cent on the investment even if the coastwise traffic, calculated at 11 per cent of the total, were allowed to go through free. This would be raised to 3 per cent with the growth of commerce, he predicted, without levying any charges on our coast-to-coast ships. At Suez on the other hand, he demonstrated, the stock company operates a property much less efficient in the length of time required to traverse it, with a tonnage toll of \$1.30, as against \$1.20 in the United States canal. Better service in every way, he contended, would be given in Panama than in Suez, and it had been provided because the United States people wished to build up their own commerce and to strengthen their own naval power.

#### Purpose to Build Up Shipping.

"The purpose of congress," he said, "in providing in the act of the opening, maintaining protection and operation of the canal that no tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States and providing further that it should be left discretionary with the president to exempt from tolls our ships engaged in foreign trade, was an effort on the part of congress to discriminate in favor of American shipping and to re-establish our merchant marine. This has been a policy of the Democratic party since the beginning of the government. The Democratic tariff law that is now on the statute books carries in it a discrimination amounting to a reduction of 5 per cent of the duties on goods imported in United States ships. If we have built the canal for the benefit of an American merchant marine and not for the practical exclusive use of foreign shipping, we must adopt a policy in favor of American ships, or we must in the end pay indirect subsidies to enable our ships to compete with the ships of foreign nations. The subsidies and discriminations that European governments have given their shipping interests have practically driven United States ships from the seas. In 1870 United States ships carried about 35 per cent of the total import and export trade of the country. Today they carry less than 5 per cent."

#### Other Nations' Subsidies.

Underwood presented statistics on the total subsidies paid by Germany, France, Japan and Russia to their vessels passing through the Suez Canal, the subsidies being greater than the amount of tolls paid by these ships.

"I believe that the Democratic party was both wise and patriotic when it announced in favor of the discrimination in favor of our coastwise ships going through the Panama Canal," he declared, "and there is no reason at this time why we should abandon a solemn promise made to the people of the United States in one of the most prominent planks in our party platform."

"We are told that we are violating a solemn treaty made with another nation and that in good faith we should abandon the Canal to foreign rivals without contest or dispute, in order that we may keep our standing in the family of nations. Not for one moment do I believe that we have violated a treaty right, and not for one moment do I believe that the English government would seriously contend that we have violated a treaty right."

"Our whole difficulty in the matter arises from the un-American spirit of surrender that some of our own people have exhibited toward this important question from the very beginning. If congress had unanimously passed the canal tolls bill two years ago I do not believe that the question would ever have been raised."

## FREE TOLLS FIGHT ON.

DEBATE BEGUN IN HOUSE FRIDAY AMID SCENE OF INTENSEST INTEREST.

Call for the Question Gives Advocates of Repeal Initial Victory of 207 to 176 Votes—Speaker Attacked in Preliminary Skirmishes.

Washington, March 27.—With galleries packed and nearly every member in his seat the house today resumed consideration of the rule limit on debate of the free tolls repeal bill. With prospects of at least two roll calls on the rules and other complications it is now doubted whether a vote can be reached on the repeal bill before next Tuesday afternoon. The discussion on the bill will begin late today, with 20 hours of stirring oratory ahead. President Wilson today reiterated his belief that the measure will pass.

Interest in party crisis was reflected in the tense faces of congressmen as Speaker Clark asked the chaplain to pray. Congressman Adelson, of Georgia, opened the debate with a direct attack on the speaker which was very bitter.

Congressman Gardner of Massachusetts followed with an appeal for the support of the rules committee in order to pass the repeal bill. Congressman Clayton, of Alabama, supported the repeal. McDonald, Progressive, opposed the report of the rules committee and bill, as did Sherwood of Ohio.

When the test vote came on ordering the previous question, there were two hundred and seven ayes to one hundred and seventy-six noes. This is an initial victory for the repeal bill.

#### Deal Estate Transfer.

R. J. Manning, Chas. G. Rowland and Geo. D. Shore, to W. B. Upshur, lot on Caldwell street, \$4,500.

#### Right of Defense Coordinate.

Turning to the effect of the repeal upon our naval security, Representative Underwood asserted that the right to encourage commerce was accompanied by the right to use the canal for national defense.

"We are told by those in favor of the repeal bill," he said, "that when the Hay-Pauncefote treaty used the words, 'The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations observing the rules on terms of entire equality,' we are prevented from preferring our own vessels of commerce. If the language applies to vessels of commerce it must apply to vessels of war. We built the canal primarily as an addition to our war power, as it permits the quicker transfer of our naval forces from one ocean to another. Its inland lake provides a harbor of refuge in which our navies can rendezvous and as occasion offers strike at either ocean."

"If no discrimination can be made in favor of our war vessels, we will be compelled to recognize the contention that if during a war with a foreign power we find an enemy's man-of-war in the canal, we can not drive it out, and if it leaves we must wait twenty-four hours before giving chase. If engaged in war our own ships must chase themselves out of the canal in twenty-four hours. To do so would be to convert the canal in time of war into a liability instead of an asset. Of course, we made no such contract."

#### Asked to Surrender Sovereignty.

"Yet the most serious surrender that the advocates of the British contentions desire to make is to make the admission that we are not sovereign in the Canal zone. By your vote on the report of the committee in this case you are asked to ratify for all time to come the British desire that we surrender this sovereignty, and admit that the canal is an international waterway in which we have no rights that are not possessed by all other nations. The statement made by the majority of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the canal is an international waterway in a foreign country, constructed by the consent of other nations, is manifestly unsound and without the warrant of a single fact behind it."

"Our Governmental status on the Canal Zone was established and fixed by a treaty made with the Republic of Panama subsequently to the making of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. Great Britain remained silent after the publication of the treaty, allowed us to build the canal under it, and she is stopped now to deny the right we acquired under this treaty with Panama. Panama has surrendered her sovereignty over the Canal Zone to our government."

## HOUSE DEBATES TOLLS.

GREATEST LEGISLATIVE BATTLE OF YEARS BEGINS IN HOUSE.

Clark Comes Out Strongly in Opposition to Curtailment of Debate. Declaring it is Reiteration of Democratic Policy of Full Argument.

Washington, March 26.—The greatest legislative battle yet undertaken by President Wilson's administration was begun today—the presentation of a special rule in the house to limit debate and prohibit amendments of the administration's proposal to repeal the provision of the Panama canal act allowing free passage to American ships.

For two hours the rule alternately was defended and attacked in heated debate in the house. When adjournment came, with an hour of debate on the rule left for tomorrow, Speaker Champ Clark, who before had not announced his position on the repeal policy, issued a statement vigorously opposing the rule.

"Surely there is nothing sacred about this repeal bill, and there is no reason for this mad rush," said the speaker's statement. "I will not be a party to ramming such a rule down the throats of members."

Impressed with the importance of a measure which President Wilson has characterized as necessary to the conduct of his administration's foreign policy, an extraordinary attendance of members was on the floor when the rule was presented. Throngs of spectators filled the seats in the gallery, occupied the stairways and overflowed into the corridors. The spectators came when the house met at 11 o'clock today and waited hour after hour as routine business delayed the tolls bill and the nervous tension on the floor grew more and more tense.

The legislative way finally was cleared and at 4 o'clock Representative Henry, chairman of the rules committee, presented the rule, limiting debate on the Sims bill to 20 hours and precluding amendment, except for a single motion to recommend. Brief argument brought about an agreement for three hours debate on the rule and the preliminary skirmish of the greatest legislative struggle of a decade was on.

To a house silently attentive, Representative Henry explained the rule and launched into a defense of the repeal bill. Then followed an argument in which the rule received little attention, as compared with the merits of the measure and the president's foreign policy, the right of the American government to exercise control of the canal it has built and the economic advisability of free tolls for American ships were dragged back and forth in the discussion.

Most speakers dwelt on the foreign situation. The president's adherents who spoke, all Democrats, declared that under the treaty, the United States had no moral right to pass its ships free. His opponents, Republicans and Progressives, attacked the foreign policy of the administration and denounced the proposed repeal as an "abject surrender to Great Britain."

Throughout the discussion Majority Leader Underwood, for the first time opposing the administration, sat quietly in his seat, listening attentively to the argument. Republican Leader Mann and Progressive Leader Murdock both made arguments against the rule and the bill.

Administration leaders tonight vigorously sought to keep their supporters in line and to get recruits. The opposition directed its efforts to obtaining votes to defeat a motion to close debate on the rule, which will be made after an hour's debate tomorrow and which, if beaten, would allow amendment of the rule. In this situation, opponents of the bill would attempt to prevent the Sims bill and might force the adoption of a compromise amendment, repealing the tolls section, without surrendering the contention that the United States under the treaties has the right to grant free tolls.

Speaker Clark's statement tonight encouraged opponents of the rule, and Representative Sims, author of the repeal bill, later issued a statement declaring:

"I have heard there will be an organized effort by enemies of the administration, both in and out of the Democratic party, to defeat the motion for the previous question on the rule tomorrow. The object of this would be simply to allow embarrassing amendments to be offered to the bill. A vote against the previous question will be virtually a vote against the bill."

Both sides displayed great activity throughout the evening, preparing for

## SUPREME COURT GIVES LEXINGTON DISPENSARIES VICTORY.

### End of Another of Last Summer's Prohibition Fights.

JUSTICE FRASER'S ONLY DISSENTING VOICE IN OPINION HANDLED DOWN BY JUSTICE HYDRICK. TAKES OCCASION AT SAME TIME TO RAP LAX ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS.

Columbia, March 27.—The validity of the election in Lexington county last August, when the dispensary forces won, was upheld this morning by the Supreme Court in a decision by Associate Justice Hydrick. In his opinion Justice Hydrick called attention to the general laxity in enforcing the general election laws and sounded a note of warning saying: "That the evidence in this case and others which have come before this court shows such laxness in the administration of these laws and such flagrant violations of those laws that

the reopening of the struggle tomorrow.

Speaker Clark's statement read: "I am dead against the rule on the tolls question and intend to vote against it. I will not stultify myself by voting for any such rule. I led the fight to liberalize the rules and practices of the house, thereby imperiling my political future. We won that long and bitter fight and it was the first Democratic victory in 18 years. Time and time again I declared that I would not advocate a thing when in the minority that I would not advocate in the majority."

"The Democrats won the house in 1910, the first time in 16 years. I was unanimously nominated for speaker and duly elected by every Democratic vote in the house, with the hearty good will of every Republican, because they believed that I am a truthful man. In order to liberalize the rules and practices of the house, I voluntarily relinquished a large portion of the powers of the speaker which I could have retained by making a fight, but I honestly believed that the speaker had too much power under the old system for the good of the house and our institutions. Among other things I declared that I was in favor of throwing bills open to ample discussion and amendment, and I am going to keep the faith, come what may. If I were to vote for the pending rule, I could not look the house in the face. When I made that statement I was speaking particularly of tariff bills, but my statement is equally applicable to all great bills. Here is the situation: We have a rule reported on a bill on the greatest question presented in my 20 years in the house, beside which tariff bills sink into pitiable insignificance; a bill which, if passed, will change our foreign policy, which we have maintained for 125 years, and only 20 hours for debate are permitted under this proposed rule, and the right to amend is prohibited and no intervening motion permitted except on motion to recommend. On such an important and far-reaching measure there should have been at least a week for debate with the unlimited right of amendment. Surely there is nothing sacred about the Sims bill and there is no reason for this mad rush. I will not be a party to ramming such a rule down the throats of members."

Champ Clark's statement aroused widespread discussion among both factions. The president's supporters immediately issued statements in reply. Representative Shirley of Kentucky said: "There is nothing in the rule that is unusual. It provides for three hours' debate on the rule and 20 on the bill. In a body the size of the house, with the many things coming before it, it is absolutely essential to have a closure rule." "The nature of the rule has been known for days. It is surprising to say the least that the speaker should have seen fit to attack the rule only after it was offered and the lines of battle drawn. We, who are supporting a Democratic president and administration in upholding the nation's honor, will not be deterred by any eleventh hour assault by the speaker, particularly when for the first time he has seen fit to show his true colors in opposition to the measure and to the Democratic party."

Representative Henry of Texas, chairman of the rules committee, is-

ought to be any thoughtful citizen. It is fought with the greatest danger to good government and may result seriously when much gravest issues are at stake." Chief Justice Gary and Associate Justice Watts concurred in the decision while Associate Justice Fraser dissented. The court held that because some ballots cast in the election were one eighth of an inch in variance from the size prescribed, would not make the election illegal, as the right of suffrage is not to be denied in technicalities.

## DISPENSARY FOR KINGSTREE.

SUPREME COURT RENDERS DECISION SUSTAINING LEGALITY OF ELECTION.

Kershaw County Murderer to Be Electrocuted—John E. Hough, Lost Appeal in Supreme Court.

Columbia, March 28.—The Supreme Court today affirmed the sentence of the lower court in finding John E. Hough guilty of murder. Hough, a prominent white man of Kershaw county, shot and killed his father-in-law. He was convicted of murder and sentenced to die in the electrical chair. The Kershaw county court will fix the date for Hough to be electrocuted.

Williamsburg county can now open her dispensary, for the Supreme Court this morning upheld the action of the State board of canvassers in declaring that Williamsburg voted for the dispensary last August. The dispensaries have never been opened pending the outcome of the contest made by the prohibitionists in the courts, but it is presumed they will be opened at once.

## NEW YORK LEGISLATURE ADJOURNED.

Special Session Will be Necessary as Financial Legislation Not Enacted.

Albany, N. Y., March 28.—A special session of the legislature will be necessitated by the adjournment of the assembly and senate early today without agreeing on financial legislation. The deadlock between the Republicans of the assembly and Democrats of the senate remaining unbroken after one of the most remarkable legislative sessions which was marked by bitter wrangles, dickering, and finally adjourned in petulant anger.

## MINISTERIAL CRISIS IMMINENT.

Premier Asquith Calls a Second Cabinet Meeting.

London, March 27.—A ministerial crisis is believed to be imminent this afternoon. Premier Asquith called a second meeting of the cabinet and members hurried from the house of commons to the premier's home.

used a statement attacking the speaker for opposing the rule at this late hour. He said:

"Of course, any sensible man knows that he is fixing to jump squarely into the camp of the president's enemies. Instead of opposing rules, non-essentials in this great conflict, he should reveal his real sympathies and march boldly over to the standard of the railroad and ship monopoly."

President Wilson was at the executive offices for an hour tonight. A copy of the speaker's statement was shown to him, but he made no comment for publication.

In the senate the day's activity on the tolls question was limited to the introduction of a resolution proposed by Senator Lewis. This would provide that the amount and payment of tolls to be assessed equally on ships of all nations "shall be regulated jointly by the secretaries of war and the treasury, with the approval of the president." The resolution went over until tomorrow.