

that his program is right. He knows that I am thoroughly convinced that it is wrong. He knows, too, that my convictions on the subject are deep and sincere and that I have given the subject mature study and thought and have reasons for my position. I had a most cordial and pleasant interview with him for an hour and a half on November the 8th. On this question we simply agreed to disagree, both expressing regrets (and, I am sure, sincere regrets) that I could not support the program. My inability to agree with him and my opposition to this program do not interfere with the pleasant, cordial relations that exist between us. As he said in his Manhattan speech, and assured me, as well as others, this question IS NOT A PARTY QUESTION BUT ONE FOR THE THOUGHT AND CONVICTION OF EACH INDIVIDUAL. The President knows, too, that in all matters before my committee, and especially in raising sufficient revenue to finance all appropriations and in every effort that he shall make to redeem the pledges our party made to the people, he shall have my hearty and earnest co-operation.

I fear that neither the President nor the secretary of the navy, with their other manifold duties, have possibly had the time to give the detailed study and thought to the subject which many of us have. I recall that the President, in his letter of July 21st to the secretary of the navy (which, by-the-way, I had not seen until some time after my letter in September to the New York World), asked for advice of naval experts, saying: "I want their advice, a program by them formulated in the most definite terms." I can not help believing that the military and naval experts have badly advised and misinformed both the President and the secretary of the navy. Naval officers or experts are not competent judges of the policy which this country should pursue. Their very training of thought and their ambition are to see only one function of the government—that of the navy. They know what will gratify their ambition. They know what they want. From the time a man enters Annapolis, as long as he lives, his ambition is to command battleships, the magnificent floating sea palaces, and battleship fleets. This consumes his thought. It is natural, therefore, and inevitable that he should consider the needs of the country in accordance with his wants and ambitions. The naval expert knows how to build or superintend the building of ships and how to fight them when built. That is his thought, his profession, his ambition. Since the general navy board was established in 1903, every president and every secretary of the navy, except one, has recognized these propensities and limitations of the naval officers or naval experts, and every president since 1903, since the naval board's first recommendations, and every secretary, except one, until now, have rejected and declined to accept their recommendations, and no congress has ever yet approved them. Mr. Roosevelt did not accept them. Only one of his secretaries, Mr. Metcalf, did. Neither did Mr. Taft, nor his secretary of the navy, accept their recommendations at any time during his four years term. Both Mr. Wilson and Mr. Secretary Daniels in 1913 declined to accept their recommendations. They declined again to accept their expert opinions in 1914, five months after the European war had begun. They both opposed their recommendations and so did Admiral Fletcher, the highest active officer in the navy, commander of the Atlantic fleet. But now the papers denounce me as an "idiot," as a "traitor to my country, to my party and to the administration" if I do not swallow at one gulp the recommendations of the naval experts, because the President and his secretary of the navy, for the first time, accept them.

#### 7.—THE REGULAR, ORDERLY, NORMAL PROGRAM:

At the last session of congress (this year) the President, the secretary of the navy, Admiral Fletcher, and other naval commanders, and the democrats in congress opposed the program of the Hobsons, Gardners and other jingoes (much smaller than the present proposed program). The policy of the administration was summed up before the Naval committee in the words of the secretary of the navy "It would BE MOST UNWISE for us to act today in any particular as we would not have acted if there was no war. My theory IS THAT OUR COUNTRY OUGHT TO BE CARRYING ON ITS REGULAR ORDERLY, NORMAL PROGRAM AS TO THE NAVY. With our policies and our American ideas I think the policy recommended in my report and adopted by the last session of congress (and recommend-

ed at this session) is the steady development that is needed. IT MEETS THE NEEDS OF THE COUNTRY." The democrats supported that policy. It was enacted into law. This same policy, as I have heretofore shown, is MAKING OUR NAVY BIGGER, STRONGER AND MORE EFFICIENT THAN EVER BEFORE—THE STRONGEST IN THE WORLD, except that of Great Britain.

It is my undoubting conviction, that it is most UNWISE AND DANGEROUS at this time, especially under the present circumstances, to abandon that policy and adopt the big, enormous, revolutionary program proposed.

#### 8.—WHY MY OPPOSITION TO THE PROGRAM AS AN INDIVIDUAL AND NOT AS MAJORITY LEADER

It is not a party or partisan question. The President so declares. Everybody knows it is not. It is one for each individual member to decide as to his vote for himself. The majority members of the Ways and Means committee, in the first instance, make up the committee assignments of the house. I am chairman of the committee, which carries with it the position of majority leader. I shall not use such positions in influencing in any way any member on the question. Those who oppose my position and those who endorse it will be treated alike as to their assignments to committees and as to all other matters which I, as such chairman and leader, and the members of the house, individually and collectively, are concerned.

#### 9.—THE ATTACKS OF THE NEW YORK HERALD:

This paper (whose owner, years ago, disdaining the fellowship of Americans, abandoned his native country to live amid the high life of Paris, and who, by cable from Paris, dictates its policy) has been fighting the democratic party nearly twenty years. This is the same paper which only a few months ago, to show its disgust of and contempt for President Wilson, while with consummate statesmanship he was steering the country safely through its greatest crisis, loudly exclaimed "Oh, for a Roosevelt in the White house!"

The purported interview by its Washington correspondent with me, published in its issue of November 10th, parts of which have been published in every issue since, is a PURE FABRICATION, A DELIBERATE FALSEHOOD, MANUFACTURED IN THE HERALD'S OFFICE IN NEW YORK FOR THE PURPOSE of forming a basis for its succeeding attacks and sensational stories. No such interview ever occurred. I never saw or spoke to its correspondent before its publication. After reading it in the HERALD, I saw and asked its Washington correspondent if he sent such an interview to the HERALD. He said he had not and knew nothing about it until he saw it published in the HERALD. I never made a reference in the remotest way to any one in Washington or elsewhere as to the "sentiment in my district" or as to "the folks back home." It knew, too, or could have known, as its Washington correspondent knew, that I did not "return to my district because of its exposures of the sentiment of my district." I returned the day I intended to return when three days before I went to Washington.

In conclusion: To differ with the President, to differ with my friends, in and out of congress, in the heat of the moment to be severely criticised, and sometimes denounced by them, gives me not only exceeding regret, but much pain and distress. However, after having given the subject much study and thought, being once on the Naval Affairs committee, and interested for years in naval subjects, I can not support the program. In deciding on this course I knew full well that a part of the penalty which I would have to undergo would be the criticism, the ridicule, the denunciation, the misrepresentation and the libeling of myself by the press from one end of the country to the other. Having the approval of my judgment and conscience, after a mature study and thought, and impelled by a sense of duty, I take the step, mattering not the consequences, political or otherwise, to myself.

CLAUDE KITCHIN.

November 20th, 1915.

We are told in some quarters that the republican campaign in 1916 will be a campaign for a business administration of the government in the interest of business. Which is just another straw showing how easy a victory the democratic party has ahead of it next year.

#### AFTER THIRTY-ONE YEARS

The French have a saying, "look first for the woman," an epigram of the shrewd Parisian detectives, who found some woman's influence behind each shrewd criminal.

But why not turn to the nobler, higher impulses and activities of man for illustration?

Whenever inspiration and aspiration join to impel man to that supreme, continued effort that is the foundation of great deeds, rest assured that the loving, earnest devotion of woman is somewhere down the line of endeavor. Ten thousand men love women; half a thousand, possibly, love woman, and one loves a woman.

One of these men was recently attending a great banquet given in his honor. He was on his feet, holding his audience all in breathless silence with matchless oratory and superb personal magnetism. It was observed that he glanced repeatedly at his watch. Suddenly he paused and said:

"I would like to have my friends here drink a toast with me. I would drink to the one who has borne more than half of my burdens and who deserves more than half of the praise; to a bride, a wife, a mother and a grandmother—my wife. Just 31 years ago at this minute I stood at the altar and was married to the woman who has since that time been my greatest worldly help."

Some of those who heard this wonderful tribute, of a wonderful man to a wonderful woman remembered a wonderful scene. A great political party was in convention, fixing its policies and selecting its leaders. A young and comparatively unknown man rose to speak. Back in a gallery sat his faithful wife, his comrade, his partner. She was his mentor, his guide, she listened and he spoke to her. As his words affected her, he knew it must affect his hearers, and his eloquence guided by her loving understanding, swept like a cyclone through that assemblage, overturning schemes and schisms and selfish ambitions, like chaff and made William Jennings Bryan the standard bearer of his party.

Throughout his career of power and usefulness he has found guidance, solace and council with her who has been his helpmate and his comrade; how much he owes to her no outsider may ever know more than in his tribute to her who has so loyally and so lovingly lived that grandly simple declaration of Ruth, in that sweetest idyl of the sacred story. "Entreat me not to leave thee, for whither thou goest I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people and thy God my God."

It is woman's absolute faith in her "man" that makes her his true helpmeet, more than her counsel or advice or her wisdom in her loving sympathy, her tender confidence in him; she is his city of sanctuary in her unshaken affection and faith when the world seems darkest.

A true, strong woman once wrote "Lover Mine, Oh, Heart of Me, each night I pray for your success and happiness, that you may find joy in helping those others that need you, that you may climb and climb and win love and honor and esteem; that your lifeshall be as sweet and pure and clean and strong as my love and belief in you."

Could any real manly man fail to respond to such an appeal?

A little leaven, leaveneth the whole lump, and what lump mere man is until love has leavened him.

The deepest, holiest impulse of womanhood is her maternity, and that is deepest in her love of the man whom pure affection has fused to her heart to heart and soul to soul, forever.

Such a woman said to another—a woman on life's threshold:

"Some day you'll love a man. You might as well die unless you do! But you'll really love him after you have your children. It may even be long after. It isn't having children that makes a woman, I don't care what the world says about it! They prepare you to love the man. They cease to need you so much; but he needs you more and more. And after the children have deepened you, the thing will come over you. The mother who thought she had spent herself, rises; she is resurrected. Then she turns, mothers a man! She mothers him as she could not have mothered any child for the duty is left out and all the responsibility. It is sheer, beautiful, generous giving."

How deeply the world is indebted to the abiding love of Mrs. William Jennings Bryan none may know, but we honor him the more that he is big enough a man to pay public tribute to her, and whenever we find a man at the fore-front, we shall "Look first for the woman," for all the world loves a lover.—Shelby County Leader.