

County, Ind., to accompany House bill correcting his military record—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Petition of the Transvaal Committee of California, asking for a thorough investigation of the complaints made by Hon. Charles E. Macrum while consul in Pretoria—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Transvaal Committee of California, expressing sympathy for the people of the South African and Orange Free State Republics—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Commercial Travelers' Mutual Accident Association, for a trade treaty between the United States and Canada—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petition of C. T. McGilvia and others, of Harrison, and M. E. Turner and others, of Mitchell, S. Dak., favoring the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. A. R. Knapp and other citizens of Jefferson, S. Dak., against the passage of the Loud bill relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Petition of Ernst Hein and other citizens of Indiana, in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Liberty Post, No. 133, of San Francisco, Cal., Grand Army of the Republic, in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: Petition of Isaac Emerson and others, of Brigh-ton, Ohio., favoring the passage of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the White Ribbon Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwalk, Ohio, urging the enactment of House bill 5475, known as the anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of John H. Hodgkins and 2,280 others, in support of the Brosius pure-food bill, No. 9154—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petition of Andrew Crawford Post, No. 6, of New Philadelphia; S. M. Neighbor Post, No. 494, and Richard Lanning Post, No. 69, of Coshocton, Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Transvaal Committee of California, expressing sympathy for the people of the South African and Orange Free State Republics—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic Post of Bruceville, Ind., in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of citizens of West Rutland, Ira, and Clarendon, Vt., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of Ed. Fehlman and others, of Hoopole, Ill., in relation to the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Resolutions of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Lyons, Mich.; also resolutions of a meeting of citizens of Byron Center, Mich., favoring the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicants in the new possessions—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 9, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.
The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think the Journal should be read.

Object.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and it will be read.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

SHIP EUNICE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the vessel ship *Eunice*, Thomas Seal, master; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MEMORIAL BRIDGE ACROSS THE POTOMAC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, submitting the report of the board of officers of the Corps of Engineers and of architects appointed by order of the Secretary of War to consider and report upon the relative merits of the designs submitted for a memorial bridge to be constructed across the Potomac River, at Washington; which, on motion of Mr. HANSBROUGH, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before Senate the following concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be 6,000 additional copies of the report of the Director of the Mint on the production of the precious metals for the calendar year 1898, bound in cloth and wrapped, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,000 for the use of the Senate, and 3,000 copies for the use of the Director of the Mint.

Resolved. That there also be printed 7,500 additional copies of the report of the Director of the Mint covering the operations of the mints and assay offices of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, to be bound in cloth and wrapped, 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,500 for the use of the Senate, and 3,000 for the use of the Director of the Mint.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed at the Government Printing Office 8,000 copies of any matter furnished by the Director of the Bureau of American Ethnology relating to researches and discoveries connected with the study of the American aborigines, the same to be issued as bulletins uniform with the annual reports, 1,500 of which shall be for the use of the Senate, 3,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 3,500 for distribution by the Bureau.

GOVERNMENT FOR HAWAII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 223) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. CULLOM. I will simply ask that the bill lie on the table and be printed, before I request a conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will lie on the table and be printed.

CONSTRUCTION OF WAR SHIPS AT NAVY-YARDS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I present a letter from H. W. Dennett, E. M. Kelley, and H. Prevost, a committee of Mount Washington Lodge No. 276, International Association of Machinists, of Concord, N. H., asking that a portion of the Government work on the new war ships be given to the navy-yards of the country in place of being given to private shipyards.

I desire simply to say that I sympathize with this request. I never have been able to quite understand why we should have these expensive navy-yards in the country and then proceed to give pretty nearly all of the work to private shipyards. I presume it is done on the plea of economy, but it seems to me it is a false economy and that some of this work ought to go to the navy-yards of the country.

I move that the letter be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

MUZZLING OF DOGS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have been requested to present a petition of 2,000 citizens of the District of Columbia, protesting against the order that is now in force muzzling the dogs in this District. I will read a letter, addressed to me, which accompanies the petition:

By resolution of a mass meeting of the owners and the friends of the dog, held at the National Rifles Armory on the 30th ultimo, I was directed to present to the honorable District Commissioners a petition signed by 2,000 persons in this city protesting against the muzzle order issued December last for the muzzling of all dogs running at large in the District of Columbia. In accordance with instructions received at that meeting I did, on the 2d instant, present to the said Commissioners the aforesaid protest, together with an argument against a continuance of the muzzle order.

Under date of April 4, the Commissioners of the District, through their secretary, have advised me that, on account of the fact that the subject is being considered by a committee of the Senate, they did not deem it advisable to take any steps looking to a rescinding of the order pending their action, and therefore returned the petition and accompanying papers to me.

Complying with further instructions of the mass meeting that, in the event of the Commissioners refusing to take any action looking to a rescinding of the proclamation in question, I was to present the petition, through you, to the proper committee having this investigation in charge. I therefore transmit, for the information of the committee, all the papers connected with this matter, and earnestly beg that early legislation may be had annulling the proclamation of the District Commissioners, for the reason that we believe it will be both cruel and inhuman to require the dogs to be muzzled in the approaching hot season.

If I may be permitted to do so I would suggest that section 7 of the act of June 19, 1878 (20 U. S. Stat., page 174), be indefinitely suspended or repealed

and that an amendment to that effect be incorporated in the District appropriation bill now being considered by your committee.

Very respectfully,

GEO. W. EVANS.

Chairman of the meeting of the friends of the dogs.

Among the petitioners, Mr. President, I find the names of Rev. A. Mackay-Smith; Surgeon-General Moore, U. S. A.; General Cragin; Henry E. Davis, United States District Attorney; Hon. A. G. Riddle, Mrs. A. L. Barber, Mary Foote Henderson; the president, secretary, and other officers of the Humane Society; W. F. MacLennan, Dr. George B. Simpson, Dr. Ed. R. Young, Dr. E. C. Barstow, Dr. F. X. Dooley, Dr. Percy M. Cox, Judge McCammon, Dr. Reginald Munson, Dr. W. C. Billings, Dr. W. J. Dillenback, Dr. J. W. Anderson, Dr. J. F. Kernan, Dr. P. E. Nagle, Dr. Horace Coleman, Dr. James Laws, Dr. J. R. Hayes, Dr. Robert R. Cooke, Dr. Fred Swett, Dr. J. H. Johnson, Dr. Henry Darling, and Veterinary Surgeon W. C. Kempton, and many others well known in this community.

In reference to the matter, Mr. President, I desire simply to say, on my own responsibility, that I regard this order as an unnecessary, unjust, and cruel one, and trust that the District Commissioners may see the propriety and good sense of revoking it at an early day.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. I should like to ask the Senator a question before that matter is disposed of. I ask it for my own information. I should like to ask my friend, who is an eminent physician and surgeon, whether he believes there is any such disease as hydrophobia?

Mr. GALLINGER. In answer to that I will say to the Senator that I practiced medicine for thirty years and never saw a case of hydrophobia, and that I have asked a great many very eminent surgeons who have spent a lifetime in the hospitals of the United States, who said to me that they never saw a case of hydrophobia. Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi, who gave testimony a few days ago before the Committee on the District of Columbia, and who has been for a long time in practice in the city of New York, in making some suggestions regarding hydrophobia said in reply to a question from me that she never saw a case of hydrophobia.

I will say, Mr. President, that in my opinion—it may not be worth much—hydrophobia is a disease almost unknown, and if a case has occurred in this city it was an isolated case.

Now, Mr. President, just one word more in reference to the order that is in vogue in this District. Some young scientist in Washington (we have them here as we have them elsewhere), for the purpose, as I believe, of self-glorification, made an examination of a dog's brain and came to the conclusion that the dog had rabies. Immediately that was reported, and this order was the result.

I believe it is a well-established fact that the test that was in vogue in England last year to determine rabies by an examination of the brain of dogs has been entirely abandoned, and that this year they have a new test, which they claim is all right, and that it does determine the existence of the disease.

I do not believe there has been a case of rabies in the District of Columbia this year, last year, nor the year before; nor have I the least apprehension that if these poor dogs are allowed the freedom that man's best friend ought to have we will be troubled with hydrophobia as a result.

Now, Mr. President, my opinion may not be worth anything. I give it for what it is worth.

Mr. VEST. I do not propose to express any expert opinion on the matter. I remember when I was a very young man, which was a number of years ago, I sat up with an associate who died with all the symptoms of hydrophobia. He was thrown into convulsions by the appearance of water and barked like a dog, and the physician—

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, in hydrophobia the patient does not bark like a dog. That is not one of the symptoms at all.

Mr. VEST. Very good; but the physician in Lexington, Ky., and we had there the most celebrated surgeons in the world almost at that time, Dr. Ben Dudley, pronounced it hydrophobia; I know nothing about it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not desire to controvert the opinion. All that I meant to say was that barking like a dog is not a symptom of hydrophobia and can not be found in any book, notwithstanding the popular opinion that it is a sure symptom of the disease.

Mr. VEST. I supposed that the water test was the one which gave the name to the disease, hydrophobia; that is, hatred of water.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

Mr. VEST. This gentleman who died had that aversion to water; but I did not intend to say anything about that. My opinion is worth nothing. I simply state what I saw.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wish we could hear the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. VEST. What does the Senator say?

Mr. BERRY. You are not heard on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I ask for order in the Chamber.

Mr. VEST. Without going into the question whether there is such a disease, I will simply say that I saw in the morning papers two days ago a statement that a dog had bitten a little girl here. The dog was immediately killed by a policeman, and under the new practice the carcass of the animal was sent to the Chief Chemist, I think, in the Agricultural Department. He analyzed the carcass and, I think, declared that the dog had rabies. That is my impression, though I may be mistaken. Anyway, he analyzed the carcass and gave an expert opinion as to whether the disease was there or not.

I do not understand that my friend from New Hampshire says there is no such disease, but he says that in thirty years' practice he never saw it. It is a very rare disease, for God in His mercy has made a malady so terrible as that exceedingly rare. If an ordinary disease, it would be the terror and curse of the whole human family.

That leads me to make one statement myself. If there is a possibility of there being such a disease I would muzzle every dog in this country rather than have a single human being suffer from it.

I do not know all of these gentlemen. I know a few of those who signed this petition; but if they think there is a possibility of such a disease, and the experts here know what they are saying about the carcasses of these animals, and yet are willing to keep their fancy dogs, even if they pay \$500 or \$1,000, as some insane people do, for dogs, I have very little respect for them. I can not conceive a case in which there ought to be any question about muzzling every dog in a town or city or locality where there is any sort of suspicion that this terrible malady exists. I see from the newspapers that they think they have got it here, whether they have or not.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that is one of the unfortunate things that when an agitation of this kind arises it makes the community think a disease exists that does not exist.

Now, Mr. President, I have not denied and will not deny that there is such a disease as hydrophobia. I say that it is so rare that, in my opinion, it is not worth while discussing it. I picked up a Philadelphia paper yesterday morning and I read of two families and one individual who had been saved from sure destruction by dogs. In two instances the dogs gave the alarm and saved the family from being burned up in their homes, which would have been inevitable had it not been for the faithful dog. In my judgment dogs save a hundred times as many lives as perish from this so-called disease of hydrophobia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Petitions and memorials are in order.

Mr. WARREN. I ask permission to ask the Senator from New Hampshire one question on the subject he has just discussed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That petition has been referred.

Mr. WARREN. Then I am out of order?

Mr. WOLCOTT and others. No.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator can proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I hope unanimous consent will be given.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will proceed, without objection.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to ask merely one question. I shall not be tedious. Is there any reason for us to suspect that hydrophobia is more prevalent in the city of Washington than in any other city in the United States or in the world? Is there anything in the climate or atmosphere here to make it more prevalent? In general terms, is there any more reason for the muzzling of dogs three hundred and sixty-five days in the year in Washington than there exists in any other city in the United States?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think the only reason is that we have more young scientific gentlemen who want to make reputations for themselves in discovering this disease, which, in my judgment, does not exist. Of course hydrophobia is not more prevalent in Washington than elsewhere.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, in answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming, I should like to say to him that in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of most men who have looked into this question, there is no more danger of hydrophobia in Washington than anywhere else.

The trouble with the muzzling order is that owing to our system of organization of this Republic we can not have a uniform muzzling order all over the United States. There has been in England for the last three years the most splendid illustration of the ability of a firm centralized government to stamp out the disease of hydrophobia that has ever been heard of. The home secretary, Mr. Long, entered an order that no dog in the United Kingdom should go without a muzzle and that no person upon any pretext or excuse, on payment of any duties or fines whatever, should be permitted under any circumstances to bring a dog into Great Britain.

Up to that time there had been the death of thousands of cattle. There had been many human beings who died of hydrophobia. He persisted in his order against all the ignorant physicians and mock humanitarians and people who cared more for dogs than for human beings in the United Kingdom, and the agony column of the Times was filled day after day with attacks upon him. But he persisted in his order, with the result that hydrophobia has been absolutely stamped out of Great Britain. Now, in view of that, he has been able to remove the restrictions and permit the unmuzzling of dogs.

Only the other day we were hearing of thousands and thousands of dollars' worth of valuable blooded cattle in the State of New Jersey that were compelled to be killed because dogs with hydrophobia ran with them through certain sections of the State. If this muzzling order could not only be continued here, but extended throughout the United States, it would stamp out this dread disease, and without it, in my opinion, we can not.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire simply to say a word further, and that is that I have been delighted to hear this learned medical and scientific exposition from the Senator from Colorado. I believe the Senator has been misinformed. I do not believe a word of it, and I go on record as not believing a word of it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to know whether the Senator speaks as a physician or as a Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, both.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, possibly a little personal experience may not be without its value, even if suggested to the Senator from New Hampshire.

I am not a physician, but I have had some personal experience on this very matter similar to that narrated by the Senator from Colorado. I myself in one season lost seven or eight valuable head of cattle bitten by dogs and that died with every symptom of hydrophobia. Not only that, but in another season I had a very valuable mare that was bitten in the nose by a dog and which undoubtedly died from hydrophobia. Whether it is hydrophobia or not I do not know. Certainly it is a disease which is communicated by the bite of a dog, and the animals die with the symptoms which are generally reputed to be those of hydrophobia. Of course I do not profess to have any scientific knowledge on the subject, but I have had a very serious practical experience in connection with it.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of Photographic Engravers Union No. 5, of Chicago, Ill., praying that the Government Printer be authorized to print the label of the Allied Trades on all publications issued by the Government; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 7356, American Federation of Labor, of Mount Vernon, Ill., praying that an increase be made in the salaries of machinists employed at the Government Printing Office; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented the petition of C. H. Clements and sundry other citizens of Centralia, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect free labor from prison competition, and also to limit the hours of labor on public works; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Moweaqua, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 98, United Mine Workers, of Duquoin, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation requiring the labeling of oleomargarine and all kindred dairy products; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of the Missouri and Kansas Association of Lumber Dealers, of Kansas City, Mo.; of Pomona Grange, No. 8, Patrons of Husbandry, of Schuyler County, Ill., and of the Pennsylvania State Grange, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of St. Joseph, Ill., and a petition of sundry citizens of Mayview, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors and opium in Hawaii, and also for the prohibition of gambling therein; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the legislative committee of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of more adequate anti-trust laws; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the board of health of Charleston, S. C., praying for the establishment of a national health department at Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a petition of the Pennsylvania State Grange,

praying for the passage of the ship-subsidy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Grocers' Association, of Peoria, Ill., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law and remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Pennsylvania State Grange, praying for the enactment of legislation requiring the labeling of oleomargarine and all kindred dairy products; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of Cushing Post, No. 231, Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the enactment of legislation to give preference to veterans in public employment; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Onondaga Academy of Science, of Syracuse, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the song birds of the country, especially the insect-destroying ones; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the West Glens Falls Church, of Queensbury, N. Y., and a petition of the Independent Congregation of Dunkirk, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Portville Grange, No. 842, Patrons of Husbandry, of New York, and a petition of Madison County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Earlville, N. Y., praying for the establishment of postal savings banks; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Portville Grange, No. 842, Patrons of Husbandry, of New York, and a petition of Madison County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Earlville, N. Y., praying for the enactment of more adequate anti-trust laws; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Madison County Pomona Grange, of Earlville, N. Y., and a petition of Portville Grange, No. 842, Patrons of Husbandry, of New York, praying for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of Portville Grange, No. 842, Patrons of Husbandry, of New York; and a petition of Madison County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Earlville, N. Y., praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Jewett Grange, No. 826, Patrons of Husbandry, of Prattville; of Portville Grange, No. 842, Patrons of Husbandry, and of Madison County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Earlville, all in the State of New York, praying for the extension of free rural mail delivery; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Madison County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Earlville, N. Y., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Portville Grange, No. 842, Patrons of Husbandry, of New York, and a petition of Madison County Pomona Grange, of Earlville, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of adulterated food products; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of Portville Grange, No. 842, Patrons of Husbandry; of Stockton Grange, No. 316, Patrons of Husbandry, and of Madison County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Earlville, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to control the sale of imitation dairy products; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of Colley Grange, No. 385, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennsylvania, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Colley Grange, No. 365, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennsylvania, praying for the extension of free rural mail delivery; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ALDRICH presented petitions of Summit Grange, No. 15; Foster Center Grange, No. 28; South Scituate-Grange, No. 25, and West Kingston Grange, No. 10, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the election of United States Senators by a popular vote of the people; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of Summit Grange, No. 15, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, and a petition of Foster Center Grange, No. 28, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of shoddy in manufactured goods; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of Foster Center Grange, No. 28, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, and a petition of Summit Grange, No. 15, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Foster Center Grange, No. 28, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, and a memorial of Summit Grange, No. 15, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of reservoirs or irrigating canals for the irrigation of arid lands; which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented a petition of Foster Center Grange, No. 28, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, and a petition of Summit Grange, No. 15, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, praying for the extension of rural free mail delivery; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Summit Grange, No. 15; of South Scituate Grange, No. 25, and of Foster Center Grange, No. 28, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of more adequate anti-trust laws; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Summit Grange, No. 15, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, and a petition of Foster Center Grange, No. 28, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, praying for the establishment of postal savings banks; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Summit Grange, No. 15; of Foster Center Grange, No. 28, and of South Scituate Grange, No. 25, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of adulterated food products; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of the Cuban-American League, of New York City, praying for the establishment of free trade between Porto Rico and the United States, and also for the repeal of the fourth paragraph of the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, recognizing the independence of the people of Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

He also presented the petition of Moses R. Newell and three other railway-mail clerks, of Woonsocket, R. I., praying for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of 31 members of Post No. 9, of 65 members of Post No. 1, and of 19 members of Post No. 4, all of the Grand Army of the Republic of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for military instruction in public schools; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN presented petitions of Cascade Grange, No. 63, and Thetford Grange, No. 789, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Michigan, praying for the establishment of postal savings banks; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Mayfield Grange, No. 756; Kinney Grange, No. 754, and Deenville Grange, No. 804, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Michigan, praying for the extension of free rural mail delivery; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Cascade Grange, No. 113, and Hillsdale Grange, No. 77, Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of adulterated food products; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Cascade Grange, No. 113, Patrons of Husbandry, of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to control the sale of imitation dairy products in the several States; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Hillsdale Grange, No. 77, Patrons of Husbandry, of Michigan, praying for the election of United States Senators by a popular vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of Hillsdale Grange, No. 77, Patrons of Husbandry, of Michigan, praying for the enactment of more adequate anti-trust laws; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THURSTON presented a petition of the Modern Woodmen Society of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the adoption of an amendment to paragraph 4 of section 5 of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the Independent Order of Good Templars of Big Lake, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in our new island possessions; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the city council of Oakland, Cal., praying for the appointment of a commission of United

States engineers to examine the present harbor plan and make report of plan for improvements and preservation of Oakland Harbor; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants' Exchange of Oakland, Cal., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Progressive Grange, No. 308, Patrons of Husbandry, of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of shoddy in manufactured goods; for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; for the extension of rural free mail delivery; for the establishment of postal savings banks, and remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of reservoirs or irrigating canals for the irrigation of arid lands; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented memorials of the congregation of the Orchard Avenue Baptist Church, of Los Angeles, Cal., and a memorial of the congregation of the Church of the Redeemer, of Los Angeles, Cal., remonstrating against the manufacture and sale of cigarettes; against the sale of intoxicating liquors to soldiers; the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors and opium and the prohibition of gambling in Hawaii; to prohibit the kinetoscopic reproduction of prize fights, and for the exclusion of illiterate immigrants from this country, and praying for the enactment of legislation limiting absolute divorce in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals of Oakland, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation regulating the transportation of live stock from one State to another; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Eldorado County, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of the Lake Tahoe Reservation; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. KENNEY presented the petition of Thomas Chase, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that he be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHANDLER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wolfeboro, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors on premises of the United States used for military purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Greenfield Grange, No. 23; Fitzwilliam Grange, No. 154; Cold River Grange, No. 19; Pasquaney Grange, No. 266; Lincoln Grange, No. 159; Excelsior Grange; Lyman Grange, No. 237; Granite Grange, No. 7; Star Grange, and Lebanon Grange, No. 126, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of shoddy in manufactured goods; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of Cold River Grange, No. 19; Nubamsit Grange, No. 263; Lebanon Grange, No. 126; Greenfield Grange, No. 23; Morning Star Grange; Lyman Grange, No. 237; Excelsior Grange, No. 136; Fitzwilliam Grange, No. 154, and of Pasquaney Grange, No. 266, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Monadnock Grange, No. 103; Excelsior Grange, No. 136; Candia Grange, No. 167; Lyman Grange, No. 237; Wautastiquet Grange, No. 133; Lebanon Grange, No. 156; Fitzwilliam Grange, No. 154; Nubamsit Grange, No. 263; Cold River Grange, No. 19; Pasquaney Grange, No. 266; Lincoln Grange, No. 155, and Granite Grange, No. 7, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the establishment of postal-savings banks; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Dover Grange, No. 225; Cold River Grange, No. 19; Umbagog Grange, No. 231; Advance Grange, No. 20; Prentice Hill Grange, No. 207; Mascot Grange, No. 220; Spofford Grange, No. 83; Pasquaney Grange, No. 266; Stark Grange, No. 42; Lebanon Grange, No. 126; Hudson Grange, No. 11; Lyman Grange, No. 237, and Piermont Grange, No. 219, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the election of United States Senators by a popular vote of the people; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of Excelsior Grange, No. 160; Cold River Grange, No. 19; Dover Grange, No. 225; Prentice Hill Grange, No. 259; Mascot Grange, No. 220; Spofford Grange, No. 83; Lyman Grange, No. 237; Advance Grange, No. 20; Piermont Grange, No. 219; Granite Lake Grange, No. 115; Umbagog Grange, No. 213; Stark Grange, No. 42; Pasquaney Grange, No. 266; Hudson Grange, No. 11; Comfort Grange, No. 226; Eclipse Grange, No. 110; Franklin Grange, No. 116; Colon Grange, No. 150; Enterprise Grange, No. 280; Howlett Grange, No. 256; Camden

Grange, No. 126, and Herling Grange, No. 242, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of more adequate anti-trust laws; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Lyman Grange, No. 237; Pasquaney Grange, No. 266; Cold River Grange, No. 19; Lebanon Grange, No. 126; Nubaunsit Grange, No. 263; Fitzwilliam Grange, No. 154; Glenfield Grange, No. 23; Surry Grange, No. 156; Granite Grange, No. 7; Lincoln Grange, No. 189; Concord Grange, No. 12; Excelsior Grange, No. 136; Wolf Hill Grange, No. 41, and Candia Grange, No. 167, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the extension of rural free mail delivery; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Piermont Grange, No. 219; Granite Lake Grange, No. 125; Stark Grange, No. 43; Umbagog Grange, No. 231; Hudson Grange, No. 11; Pasquaney Grange, No. 266; Lebanon Grange, No. 126; Dover Grange, No. 225; Cold River Grange, No. 19; Prentice Grange, No. 257; Spofford Grange, No. 83; Mascot Grange, No. 220; Advance Grange, No. 20; Lyman Grange, No. 239, and Candia Grange, No. 167, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of adulterated food products; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented memorials of Lyman Grange, No. 237; Excelsior Grange, No. 124; Lebanon Grange, No. 126; Nubaunsit Grange, No. 263; Granite Grange, No. 7; Wautastiquet Grange, No. 129; Pasquaney Grange, No. 266, and Fitzwilliam Grange, No. 154, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of reservoirs or irrigating canals for the irrigation of arid lands; which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. MCCOMAS presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors and opium in Hawaii; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUARLES presented a petition of the Society of Good Templars of Horicon, Wis., praying for the enactment of the legislation requiring the labeling of oleomargarine and all kindred dairy products; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MONEY presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 3969) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Nancy Eddins, deceased; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of Mrs. J. A. Harding and 235 other citizens of New Mexico, praying for the enactment of the legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

COURTS IN TEXAS.

Mr. PETTUS. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report back a bill simply to change a county in Texas from one judicial district into another district. It involves no cost, and I ask that it be put upon its passage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read to the Senate for its information.

The Secretary read the bill (H. R. 9284) to attach the county of Foard, in the State of Texas, to the Fort Worth division of the northern district of Texas, and providing that all process issued against defendants residing in said county shall be returned to Fort Worth, and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COURTS IN GEORGIA.

Mr. BACON. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 60) to create the northwestern division of the northern district of Georgia for judicial purposes and to fix the time and place for holding court therein, to report it without amendment. I will state that I am directed by the committee to ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 939) to permit C. R. S. Nichols to make

a second homestead entry, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST. I am directed by the Committee on National Health and Public Quarantine, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4037) for the protection of the public health, to report it back. I call the attention of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. FOSTER] to this bill. The bill ought to be referred to the Committee on Manufactures. I understand, not directly from the Senator, but by information, that he desires to have it so referred. However, I report it back with the request that the Committee on National Health and Public Quarantine be discharged from its further consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee will be discharged, and—

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DEBOE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1364) increasing the pension of Henry H. Blockson, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SIMON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 182) for the erection of a public building in Reno, Nev., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1897) to amend an act entitled "An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain property in the city and county of San Francisco, Cal.," reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3284) for the relief of Eugenie Baptiste, sole surviving heir of Francisco Krebs, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims; which was agreed to.

Mr. THURSTON. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3685) to amend the seventh section of the act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals, and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, to report it with an amendment. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall have to object to the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. THURSTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1794) for the relief of Fred Wredde, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 876) for the relief of John E. Welch, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for grading and improving Joliet street, between the Tunlaw road and Wisconsin avenue, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. SULLIVAN, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2456) for the relief of the heirs and assignees of Philip McLoskey and John Hagan, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 4076) granting a pension to Thomas Kelley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

- A bill (S. 4077) granting a pension to Frances Horton Force;
- A bill (S. 4078) granting an increase of pension to Erastus W. Harman;
- A bill (S. 4079) granting an increase of pension to Orrin S. Thatcher;
- A bill (S. 4080) granting an increase of pension to Julius Reno;
- A bill (S. 4081) granting a pension to Eveline Sheridan; and
- A bill (S. 4082) granting an increase of pension to Phillip H. Whyrick.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 4083) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John R. Smithson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 4084) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Pillow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 4085) to correct the military record of C. R. Dickson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 4086) granting an increase of pension to T. L. Turnipseed; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 4087) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Mansur; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 4088) to aid in maintaining the gold standard, to provide free coinage for coins of small denominations, to limit their legal-tender value, to make them more convenient for use, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 4089) to establish a representative form of government for the citizens of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 4090) granting a pension to Daniel W. Roughton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4091) granting a pension to D. M. Woodhouse; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4092) to correct the military record of Alexander Smith; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MCCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 4093) for the relief of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4094) for the relief of Ellen Ogle Thomas, administratrix de bonis non cum testamento annexo of Jane Thomas, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4095) granting a pension to Mary L. Tweddle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DEBOE introduced a bill (S. 4096) granting a pension to Elizabeth D. Hatchitt; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 4097) granting an increase of pension to George C. Tracy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

SALARIES OF CERTAIN JUDGES.

Mr. FAIRBANKS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3450) to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEWART submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salaries of 21 station keepers in the District of Columbia from \$700 each to \$900 each, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SIoux CITY AND PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1291) authorizing the settlement and adjustment with the Sioux City and Pacific Railway Company of its indebtedness to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

AMENDMENT TO CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1676) for the payment of certain claims; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

READJUSTED SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS IN WYOMING.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be, and he hereby is, directed to report upon a schedule to the Senate the readjusted salaries of all postmasters who served in the Territory and State of Wyoming between July 1, 1864, and July 1, 1874, whose names as claimants appear in the Court of Claims in the case entitled Edwin S. Whittier and others vs. The United States, No. 18326, each such salary account to conform in all respects to the order of the Postmaster-General published by circular under date of June 9, 1883, and to the requirement of the act of March 3, 1883, as said requirement was published by the Postmaster-General in the newspapers of the country under date of February 17, 1884, and with such report transmit to the Senate a full copy of the text of the construction by the Postmaster-General of the act of March 3, 1883, embodied in said circular and publication in the newspapers and in circular form No. 1223, the text of each of which, under date of November 8, 1897, was transmitted by the Postmaster-General to the Attorney-General for use in the case of Jane Yarrington and others vs. The United States, No. 16345.

IRRIGATION OF PIMA RESERVATION, ARIZ.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut submitted the following resolution, which was read:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to carefully examine and report upon the proposed plans for irrigating the Pima Reservation in Arizona particularly:

First, with reference to the feasibility cost, and comparative merit of such plans;

Second, the extent to which the Indians occupying such reservation have heretofore been furnished irrigation for their lands;

Third, by what means they have been deprived of such irrigation, whether legally or otherwise;

Fourth, whether the irrigation which they have heretofore enjoyed has been in connection with any enterprise for the irrigation of lands belonging to individuals or syndicates;

Fifth, Whether any of the proposed plans for irrigating lands upon the Pima Reservation are exclusively for the benefit of the Indians; if not, whether plans can be devised for supplying water to the Indians upon such reservation independent of and disconnected with the rights of individual or company landowners other than the Indians.

Sixth, Full information as to the claims of the Florence Land Company or other owners of land to the right of water to be supplied to the Indians upon such reservation, and the quantity of lands thus owned.

Seventh, Whether there are unoccupied Government lands which might be irrigated under any of the proposed plans after fully supplying water for the irrigation of such reservation.

Eighth, All facts necessary to inform Congress as to the feasibility of irrigating such Indian reservation with or without furnishing water for the irrigation of private lands, and the probable cost thereof.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to remark in regard to that resolution—I shall not object to its being passed—that on the land above where these Indians are the waters have been absorbed by the people who have settled about Pima in very large communities. The water can not very well be taken from them, and there must be more water furnished to the people above before it reaches the Indians on the reservation below.

While I am opposed to the Government undertaking irrigation schemes, I think, perhaps, that the subject ought to be investigated and suitable contracts made to furnish water for the Indians on this reservation. If the old method they had of furnishing water was resorted to, it would utterly depopulate that whole region. That would be out of the question. There must be provision made for storing a large amount of water above in order to furnish sufficient water for the Indian reservation below for use on their lands.

It may be necessary to appropriate a certain sum to furnish water so as to irrigate these lands for the Indians. The Government has got to provide something. We have appropriated \$20,000 for those Indians this year, and we must continue to appropriate, because they are a good lot of Indians, who have been self-supporting for some time. I have visited their homes. They are, on the whole, a very superior class of Indians in every respect, but they have got to be taken care of by the Government. Whether it would be cheaper, taking into consideration the people above them, to build a dam is a question to be determined, for the building of a dam is a pretty expensive work; but there is a magnificent place there for a reservoir, and it would furnish plenty of water.

I am glad the Senator has taken hold of the matter. The information we shall secure in answer to the resolution may be a help in deciding what is the best plan to be pursued in regard to the subject.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not desire to discuss the situation there. This resolution simply calls upon the Secretary of the Interior to furnish such information as will put Congress in possession of all the facts in the case.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT].

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 5765) to extend the coal-land laws to the district of Alaska;

A bill (H. R. 6250) extending the time for proof and payment on lands claimed under the desert-land law of the United States by the members of the Colorado Cooperative Colony in southwestern Colorado;

A bill (H. R. 8963) to fix the terms of the district and circuit courts of the western judicial district in the State of Louisiana; and

A bill (H. R. 9634) to set apart certain lands in the Territory of Arizona to be known as the Petrified Forest National Park.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution to print, in black cloth binding and wrapped for mailing, 5,000 copies of the national banking laws for the use

of the office of the Comptroller of the Currency; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further transmitted to the Senate the resolutions of the House on the life and services of the Hon. RICHARD PARKS BLAND, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE BLAND.

Mr. COCKRELL. I give notice that to-morrow at 1 o'clock I shall ask the Senate to consider resolutions in regard to the death of the late Representative BLAND.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution reported from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Hon. Matthew S. Quay is not entitled to take his seat in this body as a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the friends of my motion to strike out the word "not" from that resolution are ready to vote at this time.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the Senator to let me call up a bill which will not lead to any discussion.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is the bill, may I ask?

Mr. ALLEN. A bill for the relief of Mary A. Swift. It will lead to no debate.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the bill will lead to no debate, I shall not object, but I feel that I ought to object to any other bill after that.

MARY A. SWIFT.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of the bill (S. 3476) for the relief of Mary A. Swift.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to appropriate \$12,000 for the relief of Mary A. Swift, widow of the late John F. Swift, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Japan, that amount being the salary allowed by law to the above-named office for one year.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the following resolution, reported by Mr. TURLEY from the Committee on Privileges and Elections January 23, 1900:

Resolved, That the Hon. Matthew S. Quay is not entitled to take his seat in this body as a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is on the amendment to strike out the word "not" in the pending resolution. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I hope that the question on that motion will not be put to the Senate at this time. I will say to the Senate that a vote can be had upon this matter just as soon as Senators who desire to be heard have concluded what they have to say. I am in receipt of a dispatch from an absent Senator saying that he will be here in the morning and that he desires to be heard on this case.

I will state to the Senate that I trust the appropriation bill now before the Senate will be out of the way, so that I may have the privilege of addressing the Senate on this matter on Wednesday—the day after to-morrow. I therefore ask that the resolution may be laid aside for to-day. I would go on to-morrow, only I am advised that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] desires to ask the Senate to consider resolutions in relation to the death of a distinguished citizen of his State, late a member of the House of Representatives; but on Wednesday I shall be very glad to proceed to the discussion of the case, and then will cooperate with the Senators at any time thereafter possible to be agreed upon for taking the vote.

Mr. CHANDLER. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] will return to-day and be here to-morrow. To-morrow I shall ask to have unanimous consent for fixing a day when the vote may be taken upon the resolution.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] says he is not willing to go on to-day, and suggests that the Indian appropriation bill ought to be passed. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON] in charge of the bill that he ought to have an opportunity to-day to pass that bill. I am informed that it is not likely to take more than half an hour or an hour, and perhaps not so long as a half hour; and so I do not see why the Senator from Michigan, whose mind and manuscript are full on this subject, should not go on to-day instead of waiting until Wednesday next. Therefore I think the Senate should go on with the Indian appropriation bill, and when that is finished to-day the Senator from Michigan ought to go on with his speech.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] that the Indian appropriation bill will in all probability not occupy more than

one hour; certainly it will be finished within the limits of that period.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] who has the Philippine bill in charge is absent, and that matter, being the unfinished business before the Senate, will not be called up to-day. Therefore the whole of this day, under the unanimous-consent agreement, can be given to the consideration of the Quay resolution.

The Senator from Michigan distinctly stated last week that he would speak to-day upon this question. There is no public business before the Senate preventing him from so doing, and unless he stands here and states that he is unprepared or unwilling to do so he can not justify himself before this body for any further delay.

I appeal to the fair-minded spirit of this Senate that this case, which has been prolonged for months when it might have been disposed of early, shall, now that no other business before the Senate interferes with it, be promptly disposed of. I appeal to the Senator from Michigan, with all this day before him, to make his speech and to cooperate in the prompt disposition of the case.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that he is entirely in error when he says that I gave notice that I would speak on this case this morning.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, if the Senator will let me correct the statement he attributes to me, I did not intend to say that he gave notice. I went further than that, and said that the Senator from Michigan practically agreed to speak upon this day.

Mr. BURROWS. I did not so understand the statement of the Senator; but be that as it may, neither my mind nor my manuscript is full upon this case at this time.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to inquire of the Senator—

Mr. BURROWS. I will ask the Senator to desist for a moment.

Mr. STEWART. I was just about to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. BURROWS. I desire to say, as I said before, that I shall be ready, so far as I am concerned, to proceed with the discussion of this question on Wednesday immediately after the close of the routine morning business; and whenever the Senate shall determine to vote, either by unanimous consent or in any other way, it will be entirely agreeable to me. I shall put no obstacle in the way. I want a vote on this question; but I want an opportunity to be heard, and I know of absent Senators, who are not here, who desire to be heard, and, as I said before, to-morrow the Senate will be occupied with another matter. The chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections well knows that that committee will be in consultation to-morrow all day upon a very important question, which will preclude the further consideration of this question, so far as I am concerned, to-morrow. I think there is nothing unreasonable, under the circumstances, in asking that the matter may go over. I trust, as I said before, that the appropriation bill may be gotten out of the way, so that we can proceed on Wednesday.

Mr. STEWART. I regard the request as very unusual and very unreasonable. After having entered into a solemn agreement by unanimous consent to take this case up and go on with it, with the exceptions named in the agreement, and those exceptions not appearing, I do not see that it is reasonable or convenient for any one Senator to persist in making motions for a continuance.

Mr. BURROWS. Does the Senator lose sight of the fact that an appropriation bill is now pending before the Senate and that the Senate is dividing on the yeas and nays?

Mr. STEWART. But I do not lose sight of the fact that the Senator objects to going on this afternoon after the appropriation bill shall have been disposed of, if it shall be disposed of.

Mr. BURROWS. I do, because there would not be time for me to conclude what I desire to say to-day.

Mr. STEWART. That does not make any difference. You agreed—

Mr. BURROWS. It makes a difference with me.

Mr. STEWART. It does not make any difference with you as to the unanimous-consent agreement which was made. You are going to violate it for your convenience, are you?

Mr. BURROWS. The agreement was that the consideration of the case should commence on the 3d of April.

Mr. STEWART. This case was to be proceeded with, exclusive of all other business, with certain exceptions named.

Mr. BURROWS. That is precisely what we are doing and what we have been doing.

Mr. STEWART. And now you propose that it shall be continued for your convenience.

Mr. BURROWS. Not at all.

Mr. STEWART. And not to the exclusion of other business, but for your convenience. That is violating the agreement; and I shall object, when the time comes, to the case being postponed or the agreement being violated.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Mr. President, this matter now pending is a question of high privilege, and I want the Senate to observe

that five months of this session have passed; and if the idea of some shall be carried out of shortening the session and concluding it within sixty or seventy days hence, it appears to me unseemly that such a question of high privilege should be from week to week and from month to month postponed in this fashion. It seems to me that Senators must admit that the time has arrived when the case should be brought to a vote. My colleague on the committee [Mr. BURROWS] desires to speak on Wednesday. I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections that he now ask that a day be fixed during this week for a final vote on this proposition.

There is now on the Calendar another case of like high privilege, and I desire at an early day to call up the West Virginia case. I apprehend that it will take but very little time, because I think there is no occasion in that case for difference, and I have no apprehension of any discussion or delay upon it.

After that will follow another very important case, the Montana case, soon to be decided in committee, which should be disposed of at this session of the Senate. The Calendar will thus have upon it, if this matter remains longer unacted upon, three cases of the highest privilege awaiting their turn after every other order of business. It seems to me the time has come to fix a day for a vote in the Pennsylvania case, and that the best judgment of this Senate should favor an early vote. If it can not be obtained by consent, it should be obtained by a motion here; so that we may see whether or not for a half year this Senate will refuse to vote yea or nay upon the right to a seat in this body of a gentleman whose credentials are already upon our table and whose case for months has been debated before this body.

I suggest to the experienced and skillful Senator who is in charge of this resolution that he should endeavor to have the Senator from Michigan to make his argument on Wednesday, and that thereafter on that day or the next day the vote should be pressed, and no longer should delay be consented to in this important matter, so that the other questions as to seats here may follow in their order and be voted upon.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending resolution may be voted on on Saturday of this week, at 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the pending resolution and any amendment at the time pending shall be voted on at 3 o'clock next Saturday afternoon. Is there objection?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I do not wish to agree to that. I do not like the way this case has been proceeded with; and if I may be permitted to make a single remark, in saying why I object, I will say I do not think it has been wise to take up the resolution and consider it for a little while, one Senator making a speech, and then lay it down until some other Senator was ready to make a speech. I do not wish to speak on measures considered in that way. I do not know whether I desire to speak on the Quay case or not, but if I do, I want it taken up for consideration and have the Senate go on with it, and I desire to say what I wish to say in the way of debating this question. I think we might get a vote before Saturday; but I do not wish to-day, after the methods which have characterized the consideration of this case, to agree to any time for a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, if I may be permitted a remark, I believe the business of the Senate would be facilitated by taking the vote on the pending resolution in regard to the Pennsylvania case; but it seems that it can not be done this week. If it can be done at any reasonable time in the future, I think that the business of the Senate could be proceeded with to greater advantage both to the public and to the Senate itself. I would suggest, if the time can not be fixed now, that we fix a later time than that suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, so as to give every member of the Senate who desires to speak upon the case a chance to speak, and then the case can not be injected into our business constantly. I think that those who are favorable to the seating of Mr. Quay, as well as those who are opposed to it, will see the fairness of this suggestion.

I suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire, if the time he named is not agreeable, to try a date later on. I would suggest two weeks from to-day, although perhaps it would seem that I am interfering with a matter which does not particularly concern me.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to say just one word in reply to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], who says he does not like the way this case has been dealt with. The fault is certainly not with those who are in favor of seating Senator Quay. There seems to be an anomalous kind of unanimous-consent agreement here, which provides in the first clause for continuous consideration of this case; and, of course, that means continuous debate, just such as the Senator from Connecticut wishes; but somehow or other, while those who are in favor of seating Mr. Quay are willing to vote without debate, those who are opposed to seating Mr. Quay—and among them is the Senator

from Connecticut—do not give any debate by making speeches; they are not ready; but we are ready for a vote. I will ask the Senator from Connecticut how he proposes to bring about the sort of debate upon the resolution which he thinks would be orderly and preferable, which I conceive is provided for by this continuous-consideration agreement, if it is to bind the Senate?

Now, Mr. President, I will ask, in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], that unanimous consent be given for a vote upon the resolution two weeks from to-day at four o'clock.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that Tuesday would be a little better day than Monday, because Senators who may leave at the end of the week may not get back until Tuesday.

Mr. CHANDLER. Suggestions are again made to me from three sources, and I will name two weeks from to-morrow at 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that a vote be taken on the pending resolution two weeks from to-morrow at 4 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I am not going to interpose an objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, but I do wish to make some remarks with relation to unanimous-consent agreements. I said in the Senate at one time that I would never consent to a unanimous-consent agreement of this sort hereafter in any case in which I felt an interest. No agreement of this sort is ever made but that when it comes to a vote it is misinterpreted and some one suffers by it. I have suffered by these unanimous agreements in a way which to me seemed serious. I do not know that I care to say anything on this case, but if I make any remarks upon it I wish to speak when the case is really under consideration.

I have not postponed or put any obstacle in the way of the consideration of this case. I do not propose to; but I do wish to enter my protest against a pro forma and nominal consideration of a case of this sort where a Senator comes and makes a speech to which no one listens, and where there is no real consideration. I think it ought to be taken up and proceeded with until it is disposed of. I think that vastly better than to make a unanimous-consent agreement about when we will take a vote. If we make an agreement as to when we shall take a vote, we shall never have any real, serious debate on this case. A Senator will come in here some morning, and having given notice, will deliver an essay on the subject, to which no one will pay any attention. I hope those in charge of the case, if this agreement is to be made, will some time within the next fortnight bring forward the case for actual consideration, discussion, and debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I desire to say only this: I am embarrassed somewhat by a dispatch which I have received from an absent Senator, who says in his dispatch that he will be here to-morrow morning and desires that no time shall be fixed for a vote. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire, if it will not make any difference, if he will wait until to-morrow morning, and then we will be able to determine it. For myself, I have no objection.

Mr. ALDRICH. Before the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, I think it should be stated that fixing a time to vote permits any of the motions which would be in order upon the case to be acted upon—that is, a motion to postpone indefinitely, or to postpone to a fixed time, or any of the ordinary parliamentary motions which would be permissible if the agreement had not been made.

Mr. GALLINGER. All subsidiary motions.

Mr. ALDRICH. All subsidiary motions which would be in order under ordinary circumstances. Otherwise we should be in the position we were in once in this Chamber, as I remember, when we could vote upon nothing but the passage of the resolution itself. I suppose that will be understood if the agreement is made.

I suggest to the Senator from Michigan that no absent Senator, it seems to me, could expect to have this matter postponed to a very much greater extent than it has been, and I can not help thinking that the Senate is doing justice to itself and to the claimant to the seat by fixing a time. I think certainly that a sufficient amount of delay has intervened to enable every Senator to express his opinions upon this subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Michigan to object?

Mr. BURROWS. Well, as I said, I am embarrassed by the request that came to me this morning by wire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan object?

Mr. BURROWS. I think I will ask the Senator from New Hampshire to wait until to-morrow morning, simply as a courtesy to an absent Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan objects.

Mr. BURROWS. I think then the agreement can be made.

Mr. BERRY. I should like to ask if the Indian appropriation bill is to be proceeded with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not able to inform the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BERRY. I desire to be informed when the Indian appropriation bill does come before the Senate. I do not know whether it is the unfinished business or not.

Mr. PENROSE. Do I understand the Senator from Michigan to object to the request for unanimous consent to-day?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator from Michigan to object.

Mr. BURROWS. I stated that I would ask that the matter be laid over until to-morrow, as a matter of courtesy to an absent Senator. That was all.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan whether he has any objection to mentioning the name of the absent Senator.

Mr. BURROWS. I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask the Secretary to read from the RECORD the statement of the Senator from Michigan in reply to the Senator from New Hampshire regarding his intention to speak to-day upon this case.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I inquire what is before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution touching the seating of the Senator from Pennsylvania is before the Senate.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. PENROSE. I have asked for the reading of a statement from the RECORD.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, although I dislike very much, in view of the dispatch I have received, to consent to this arrangement, yet I am so anxious that this matter shall be brought to a conclusion that I am tempted to forego what I otherwise ought to do—insist upon waiting until to-morrow, and to say that I will agree, so far as I am concerned, that a vote shall be taken two weeks from to-morrow, with the understanding, as stated by the Senator from Rhode Island, that all motions which are ordinarily in order upon a resolution shall be in order at that time.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, I did not understand the conclusion of the Senator from Michigan, but two weeks from to-morrow is two weeks away, and I can see no objection, as a matter of courtesy to any absent Senator who does not want a unanimous-consent agreement made for a vote in his absence, why it should not lie over until to-morrow, when he can be here, without any regard to who that Senator may be. If the Senate is willing to-morrow or day after to-morrow to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement to take a vote two weeks from to-morrow, or two weeks from day after to-morrow, the matter will not be delayed one hour by simply postponing the making of the unanimous-consent agreement until the other Senator can be present; and if no Senator will object under the circumstances, I will.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. STEWART. I do not want it understood that this debate goes over until to-morrow by any consent, because I do not want the unanimous-consent agreement to be waived by the person in charge of the case. It has to give way to the Indian appropriation bill, of course, under the consent agreement. When the Indian appropriation bill is disposed of I hope this resolution will be called up and continued, according to the consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is now before the Senate.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask for the reading from the RECORD which I sent to the desk of the statement of the intention of the Senator from Michigan to proceed in this case to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read, as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Page 3874 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 7, 1900.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The appropriation bill is not before the Senate.

Mr. THURSTON. I understand that. I ask that the resolution concerning Mr. Quay be informally laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. I object to that if anyone is ready to speak on the Pennsylvania resolution. I had supposed some Senator would be ready to speak after the notice which I gave the other day, and that Senators who intended to speak might properly be asked to be ready and not to longer delay the Senate in the consideration of this resolution. I will ask the Senator from Michigan if he is ready to proceed this morning?

Mr. BURROWS. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I am not, and I do not know of anyone who is prepared this morning to proceed. We shall be ready next week, probably on Monday, to go on with the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan only stated that he would himself be prepared to speak to-day

upon this case, but he also declared, and so did the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], that there were probably ten or twelve Senators who desired to be heard on the other side of this question. I have already referred to the fact that the Indian appropriation bill will hardly occupy an hour. I ask the Senator from Michigan, if he is unable to keep his agreement to go on to-day himself, whether any of the ten or twelve gentlemen to whom he referred are present in the Chamber and ready to proceed.

Mr. BURROWS. It is hardly necessary for me to reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I made no such agreement as that to which he alludes. I expressed the hope that probably I should be able to proceed at this time. That is all the answer I desire to make.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask the Senator what has become of his ten or twelve orators?

Mr. BURROWS. The Senator will hear them in due time.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to hear them.

Mr. FORAKER. I have been absent from the Chamber two or three days, unavoidably, and have just returned. I gather what is under consideration. I rise to inquire what is the objection, if this resolution is under consideration, to voting now, if there is no one here who wishes to speak in opposition? Every time this matter comes up it is to be voted on at some indefinite time in the future, and we have never yet been able to agree upon a day. I do not understand why we should be continually occupying the attention of the Senate with agreements that are unnecessary, it seems to me, if we proceed in due order with the consideration of this matter to its disposition. I am prepared to vote upon it now, and if there is no Senator who wishes to speak in opposition or who desires to speak in favor of it, I do not see why we should not take a vote now and dispose of it.

Mr. BURROWS. I call for the regular order.

Mr. FORAKER. I understand this is the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] to strike out the word "not."

Mr. BURROWS. I understood there was an understanding that this case should be voted upon two weeks from to-morrow. That was the request of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection was made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. BURROWS. I did not understand that. Then I repeat to the Senate that I desire to be heard in this case, as I know other Senators do, and that I shall be ready to speak day after to-morrow; and if the Senate thinks it is courteous and proper to push this case to a vote now, without further discussion, of course I shall have to submit, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. STEWART. Undoubtedly it would be highly proper. It is the unanimous understanding, and I am opposed to the idea that it would be proper, under the unanimous-consent understanding, to give a man several more months to get ready to make a speech when he is ready with his speech always on all other occasions and waive the unanimous-consent agreement. I want to vote upon the case according to the unanimous-consent agreement, if there is nobody ready to speak.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a House bill for reference.

Mr. PENROSE. Do I understand that the Quay resolution is before the Senate?

Mr. FORAKER. I wish to say before this matter is passed that I did not understand that the Senator from Michigan had given notice that he wanted at any particular time to make a speech on this subject.

Mr. BURROWS. I stated that I desired—

Mr. FORAKER. I understood the Senator at times stated that he contemplated making a speech on this subject and at other times that he had some doubts in his own mind whether or not he would speak. I was of the impression that now he did not intend to speak.

Mr. BURROWS. I stated—

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator from Michigan allow me to conclude?

Mr. BURROWS. I stated, before the Senator from Ohio came in, that I desired to make some remarks on this case and would do so Wednesday morning, as to-morrow is to be occupied with another matter.

Mr. PENROSE. Before the Pennsylvania resolution goes over until to-morrow, I desire to have a distinct understanding as to what is the present purpose of the Senator from Michigan. I thought I knew it last week, and I have had the RECORD read reciting his statement. It appears that I was wrong, and most of the Senate was wrong, and the public press was wrong as to the character of his intention. I understand now that he is ready and determined to proceed on Wednesday next, that he has some ten or twelve gentlemen who desire to be heard on behalf of the majority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that at

the request of a Senator, unknown to this body, he desires the case to go over until to-morrow. If I am wrong in my understanding of the present status of the matter, I trust that the Senator from Michigan will relieve me of my error.

Mr. BURROWS. I will correct the Senator from Pennsylvania if he will allow me.

Mr. PENROSE. I shall be very glad to be corrected.

Mr. BURROWS. I have already consented that a final vote shall be taken upon this matter and that it shall be concluded two weeks from to-morrow. I do not object. As to the ten or twelve gentlemen who desire to speak, I have the list of Senators—not that I have secured them to speak, but they are Senators who have expressed to me a desire to be heard; and they will be heard in due time, if they have the opportunity.

Mr. STEWART. There is no consent to put the case over two weeks from to-morrow.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is reason in all things. I think under the circumstances this case had better go over until to-morrow, in view of the objection made by the Senator from Arkansas; and when the resolution comes up after the routine business to-morrow morning, I shall ask that two weeks from to-morrow at 4 o'clock in the afternoon the subject may be disposed of by a vote of the Senate, without further debate, and I shall expect that that request will meet with unanimous consent. I do not think it is worth while to undertake, after the Senator from Nebraska finishes with the Indian appropriation bill, to force anyone to discuss the subject to-day. If there is anyone ready to go on to-morrow, he will proceed; the Senator from Michigan will speak on Wednesday, and I humbly entreat the Senator from Nevada, whose zeal in behalf of the same cause that I have espoused is great, to allow this disposition to be made of the case to-day.

Mr. BURROWS. That statement is entirely satisfactory to me.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (H. R. 5763) to extend the coal-land laws to the district of Alaska;

A bill (H. R. 8250) extending the time for proof and payment on lands claimed under the desert-land law of the United States by the members of the Colorado Cooperative Colony in southwest-ern Colorado; and

A bill (H. R. 9634) to set apart certain lands in the Territory of Arizona to be known as The Petrified Forest National Park.

The bill (H. R. 8963) to fix the terms of the district and circuit courts of the western judicial district in the State of Louisiana was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL BANKING LAWS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed, in black cloth binding and wrapped for mailing, 5,000 copies of the national banking laws, for the use of the office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. THURSTON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7433) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, the yeas and nays were ordered, but there being no quorum present, I presume the amendment is still open to debate. It is pending with the yeas and nays ordered upon it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks that upon demand the yeas and nays having been ordered and partially completed, they must be completed.

Mr. BERRY. There having been no quorum present, I suggest that the vote was not taken and could not be said to have been taken. It stands now that the yeas and nays are ordered as though no vote had been attempted. It is certainly open to debate. That has always been the rule here. That is my understanding of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks in regard to the pending amendment. I ask the Secretary to read the amendment offered by my colleague.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert at the end of line 14, on page 54, the following proviso:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior may make contracts with present contract schools for the education of Indian pupils during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, but shall only make such contracts at places where the Government has not provided school facilities for all the children of school age residing thereat, and to an extent not exceeding the number of children in attendance at said contract schools at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I desire to say that in all matters pertaining to Indian affairs, of which committee my colleague is a member and I am not, it has always been my pleasure to take his judgment on questions arising about which there was any doubt and with which he was unquestionably more familiar than I could be. But this particular question has been before the Senate so long and has been so often discussed that every Senator upon this floor has had an equal opportunity to determine as to its merits.

Now, as has already been stated on this floor, some six years ago strong opposition arose to contract schools. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] stated Saturday that that was due and attributable to the prejudice against the Catholic Church, which church was teaching most of these Indians. I think a large part of that opposition is probably due to the cause to which he ascribes it, but it was not due wholly to that. There were a great many American citizens who have no prejudice against any church who oppose any legislation that tends to violate the principle upon which this Government is founded, that church and state should always be kept separate and that no aid should be granted to any particular denomination, and who believed that this legislation, having that tendency, ought to cease.

The House of Representatives was opposed to these contract schools. They came here, and the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses realized that if such schools were abolished at once, there would probably be a number of Indian children who would be left without school facilities, and realizing that it was impossible to get the House to agree to continue the appropriation for contract schools, schools taught by the churches, unless there was an understanding, they made an agreement that these appropriations for contract schools should be decreased 20 per cent per year. It was no secret agreement made by these two committees. It was stated upon the floor of the Senate. It was stated by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] and by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL]. It was agreed that at the end of that time the Interior Department would provide for the education of these children by the Government, and thereafter there would be no appropriation for contract schools. But for that agreement the House of Representatives would never have consented to continue the appropriation for the five or six years past.

It was stated, if I remember correctly, that the time expired one year ago; and while the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior stated then that they were able to make provision for these children, yet there were Senators on this floor who doubted it and believed that some of them would be left without such facilities. They asked that one year more be given, notwithstanding this agreement, and the House of Representatives were reluctant, but agreed to it. They said if it was put in the law that after that no such appropriation should be made, so that there could be no misunderstanding hereafter, they would consent to it. It was put into the law.

I assert that these appropriations for the last four years never could have passed both Houses but for this agreement. I assert that the Committee on Appropriations, of which I was a member, secured votes to continue that here by stating that this agreement had been made. It otherwise never would have been done. I submit whether it is good faith and in keeping with that agreement, stated publicly in the Senate, to again insist at this time on further appropriations for these contract schools.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BERRY. I yield.

Mr. VEST. Probably I am anticipating what the Senator is about to say, but I wish to ask him a question. Does he think any agreement made in a former Congress or at a former session should bind the Senate or the Congress of the United States if an unforeseen emergency should arise for different legislation. If I am incorrect I want to know it, but I understand by the statement of the Senator's colleague and other Senators that while this agreement was unquestionably made and a year added to the five years, there are now for some reason, and I do not care to discuss that, 2,600 Indian children who are not provided with any means of education at all for the next fiscal year. Is it in violation of any agreement heretofore made if we provide for this emergency; or shall we, because of an agreement having been made, the facts having changed and an emergency arisen, call it a breach of faith

because we legislate? I would not violate any agreement, but I do not understand that we are violating it.

Mr. BERRY. I understand as well as the Senator from Missouri that one Congress can not bind another, and I understand that we can, if we desire to do it, violate any agreement. We can violate the agreement we made with the Cubans or rather disregard the promise we made to give them a free and independent government; but I do not think we could be justified in our minds or retain the respect of mankind if we did it.

In regard to the remainder of his question, I have heard it stated—the Senator from Nebraska stated it on the floor Saturday—that the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs had stated before the committee that they could provide for these children and that none would be left without school facilities; and I know that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs made that statement one year ago. Yet Senators said he did not know what he was talking about, and that he could not do it, but if they had one year, then there could be no doubt about it. We gave them that year. He says he can do it. Whether he can or not I do not know.

Mr. VEST. If my friend will permit me, I think it only fair that he should state also what is the fact, as I am informed by members of the Indian Affairs Committee, that what the Commissioner means by providing for these children is by taking them three or four or five hundred miles from their reservations to other schools.

Mr. BERRY. I did not so understand it.

Mr. VEST. The Senator's colleague can state.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. He stated that he could take care of them by removing them to other places.

Mr. BERRY. Not specifying three or four hundred miles.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. He did not say anything about the distance, but removing them from their own reservations.

Mr. BERRY. The agreement may not be binding on others, but I was a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee realized that the House did not want to make an appropriation for these contract schools five years ago, and a majority of the committee and the Senate agreed with the House. It was because it was said, and repeatedly said, in the Senate that these children would be left without educational facilities that they finally consented to this arrangement which was made upon the floor of the Senate. There may be Senators who were not then Senators who may not feel that it is binding upon them. So far as I am concerned individually—I question no man's right to vote in any other way—I would feel, after what I have said in order to get this matter finally arranged, that I was guilty of bad faith and of failing to keep the agreement I made if I did not oppose this amendment. I do not say that that applies to my colleague or to the Senator from Missouri, but it would apply to me.

My colleague stated that this amendment did not make an appropriation. That is true; but the bill makes appropriations, and the amendment provides that the Secretary of the Interior may use the money to continue these contract schools, and it seems to me that is as much a violation of the spirit of the agreement as though the appropriation was made direct.

I can see no difference in it to my mind. As I said a while ago, it is not at all pleasant for me to vote against an amendment in regard to Indian affairs proposed by my colleague, as I am always delighted to follow his judgment in such matters because of his superior information as to Indian affairs; but I do believe that after that agreement by which we got an extension one year ago and put it in the law, then for the Senate to seek to put on the House bill an amendment which is in violation of either the letter or the spirit is not treating the House of Representatives fairly, and it is unjust to those Senators who voted for the bill before and who would not have voted for it but for that agreement.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, what troubles me with regard to this matter is how we are to keep our agreement. It was based on the idea that preparations were to be made by the Government to take care of these children. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee, or of anyone who may know, whether any recommendation has been made by the Department or any action taken in the estimates for the Indian service for buildings in which to take care of these schools.

Mr. THURSTON. I stated very fully on Saturday, and what I stated is in the RECORD, if the Senator had been present or had read the RECORD, that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs says that he has school facilities adequate to take care of Indian children for the ensuing year without providing for any of them in contract schools. He also has full authority to buy any of the buildings. His appropriation is sufficient to buy any of the buildings now used for contract schools. He has been ready at all times to buy those buildings. He has bought two or three of them already.

But the fact remains that the school buildings are not for sale. The fact further remains, Mr. President, as a practical question,

as I stated fully on Saturday last, that the church using these schools in pursuance of a great and good and beneficent purpose do not propose to give up their schools and do not propose to turn the Indian scholars out; and as a practical question the scholars now educated at the expense of the Government in the Indian schools, whether we pass this amendment or not, will be educated there another year, and another year, and another year, and will not be turned back to the care and custody of the United States.

Mr. STEWART. In case the Government should erect buildings at the localities where these Indians live and offer to take them, does the Senator still believe that the children would be retained in the Catholic schools, where they are now?

Mr. THURSTON. I do. That has been in substance the statement of the representatives of these schools as far as they have been heard from.

Mr. STEWART. Then erecting buildings at those localities would be useless, because the Government could not get the scholars.

Mr. THURSTON. In my judgment, yes; at the present time. The Catholic Church, Mr. President, has been engaged for many years in a great missionary enterprise among the Indians. I believe in it myself. I believe they have done a wonderful and a splendid work, and they have large mission schools now in different parts of the country where they are educating Indian children. In those schools they have never asked one cent from the Government of the United States to assist them. They have also had these schools on the reservations that are called contract schools, where we have paid for the education of the Indians. But in my judgment it is the settled purpose of that church, and I am glad of it, to continue their great scheme of education of the Indian children both at the missions and in the schools on the reservations, whether the Government provides the expenses or not.

Mr. STEWART. I concur with the Senator from Nebraska that they have done a great work. I have visited many of their schools, and the church is organized to do the work. No other church appears to have the facilities. Others can not get the teachers and have not the organization to carry it on. The Catholics have done a great work not only in the United States, but on the Western Hemisphere. They have their faults, and all that, but on the Western Hemisphere they have made a great many millions of Indians citizens of the countries where they live and have vastly improved their condition.

Take Mexico. Nine-tenths and perhaps more of the people of Mexico are Indians that have been civilized mostly through the agencies of the Catholic Church, and that is the case in all South America. They have done a great work. Abuses grow up in that church as in all others. There were many abuses when Diaz became President. He took hold of the work with a strong hand and remedied the abuses. That created great friction for the time being, but I believe the church now recognize that he was a real reformer, and they are in favor of his remaining in office.

That church is like all other churches. It is like human nature. It must come in contact with opposition. There must be competition in everything in civilization to make it reach its highest perfection. I think all the churches of the United States have reached a higher plane on account of the freedom of religion than they would otherwise occupy. Where all can worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences and each is emulating the other, it raises them to a higher plane. Where there is diversity of opinion, where they discuss questions freely, zealous men and women on all sides always raise religion to a higher plane than where it is left confined to one church, no matter what church it may be.

In the United States all churches, I believe, on an average, are of a higher grade than in any other country in the world, owing to our free institutions. The Catholic Church in the United States, in dealing with the Indians in their education, can hardly be criticized. I have seen its work, and anybody who follows it up will approve of it, I think. But the other churches, the people at large, do not think that the Government ought to get entangled with any church, and for that reason this law has been passed. I do not think many Senators who voted for it voted for it at all upon the ground that the Catholic Church was not doing its duty and doing a great work with the Indians, but on the ground that the Government ought not to patronize any particular church under our system of government; that it might lead to abuses. That, I think, was the only reason for changing the system. It was determined to change the system, and that is going to be done now by the decision of both Houses of Congress. I do not know but that this is as good a time as any, and under the circumstances I shall vote to sustain the committee.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. My colleague [Mr. BERRY], a few minutes ago, in giving the reason why he was not willing to vote for this amendment, stated that it was agreed a year ago, in the Appropriations Committee, perhaps, that that should be the last appropriation for contract schools and that the Commissioner of

Indian Affairs would have sufficient accommodations for the schools the next fiscal year.

Now, if that agreement was made it was twofold: It stipulated, first, that we would make no more appropriations for contract schools, and, second, that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs would have sufficient accommodations for the school children. If he has sufficient accommodations for the school children, then this amendment proposed by me can do no possible harm, because there is not one word in the amendment directing that he shall do anything, but it simply gives him permission, if it is necessary and these children can not be taken care of in Government schools, that he may then have them taken care of in contract schools.

If we must break the agreement that my colleague thinks was made a year ago, the question is, Would it be better for us to break it in the matter of disappointing the children or in the matter of using some money to have the children educated in contract schools? That is all.

The Secretary of the Interior, if this agreement is adopted, will not be required to put one single Indian child in a contract school. There is not one word in this proposed amendment making an appropriation of one dollar nor one cent for any such purpose. It simply leaves the discretion in the Secretary of the Interior, if he finds that these children can not be taken care of on the reservation, where they ought to be, that instead of having them without school facilities during the next year he may make provision for them in the contract schools. During that year he may, if he sees fit to do so, have necessary buildings put up—necessary schools provided.

This amendment will apply only to a single year. It does not propose to return to the contract-school system, but simply provides that for the time being, when there is no other means of educating the Indian children, he may have them taken care of by making contracts with schools on the outside. This is all the amendment proposes to do; and it seems to me there can be no objection to it by the most bitter opponent of the contract-school system.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion about an agreement, and I think it is proper that I should say something in that connection.

I had charge of the Indian appropriation bill, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, for four years during the time when these reductions were being made for the contract schools, and, as far as I am concerned, there was no agreement whatever and no understanding that this appropriation should cease at the end of any definite period. On the contrary, an amendment was placed on the bill by the Committee on Appropriations providing for these contract schools, and in the Senate the opponents of the appropriation contested it at every session bitterly and undertook to defeat the appropriation. If there had been an understanding, certainly they would not have taken this position. If there had been an agreement and they understood there was such an agreement, they would not have opposed the appropriation, but would have insisted that the agreement should be carried out.

The fact of the matter is that there was no agreement. The appropriations were decreased year by year, and during the time I had charge of the bill, although it was a Senate amendment, there never was any understanding in conference between this body and the other House on the subject. What may have been done last year I do not know, but I do know that I stated on this floor publicly that I would abide by no understanding, and if it was understood that an agreement was to be made that I should call up the matter again this year, unless sufficient facilities were furnished to take care of these Indian children.

Now, the facilities have not been furnished in the State of South Dakota. I know there are several hundred Indian children that the Government has not the facilities to take care of. The Government may have schools somewhere else outside of the State of South Dakota, but I do not think it is right and just that those children should be taken beyond the borders of the State. There are three schools, one with 140 children, another with 210 children, and another with over 40 children, that are supported by the Catholic Church. We provide a fund amounting to \$108 per capita for a portion of those children in the schools; about 200, I think, in the three schools.

Now, I do not know where they are going to put those children if they are not to be educated in those schools, and therefore I believe the Government ought to provide for continuing them there. If they are removed to a Government school it will cost us \$167 apiece for each one of the children where now it costs us but \$108; and in addition to that we must furnish fuel and lights and the buildings and take care of the buildings, while when the Catholics take care of the children they furnish all this for \$108. I believe it is greater economy and better for the children that their education should be finished in the schools where they are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will suspend for a moment. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived,

it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2355) in relation to the suppression of insurrection in, and to the government of, the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

Mr. THURSTON. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made. The Senator from South Dakota will proceed.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BATE. Let the amendment be read, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 14, page 54, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior may make contracts with present contract schools for the education of Indian pupils during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, but shall only make such contracts at places where the Government has not provided school facilities for all the children of school age residing thereat, and to an extent not exceeding the number of children in attendance at said contract schools at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll will be called on agreeing to the amendment which has just been read.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut (when Mr. KYLE's name was called). The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] has been called home suddenly. He is paired on this question with the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called.) On this question I am paired with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE].

Mr. PETTUS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. QUARLES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. I do not observe him in the Chamber. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Why not transfer your pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]?

Mr. THURSTON. Acting on the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut, I will transfer my pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER].

Mr. WELLINGTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. As he is not present, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McMILLAN. I ask if the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am paired with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask if the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the junior Senator from Kansas has not voted.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I withhold my vote, as I am paired with that Senator.

Mr. QUARLES. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. SPOONER] is absent from the city by reason of sickness in his family.

Mr. SCOTT. I desire to state on behalf of my colleague [Mr. ELKINS] that he is paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CHILTON].

Mr. McMILLAN. The Senator from Montana [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], and I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY]. A transfer of those pairs enables both the Senator from Montana and myself to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Montana. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], but under the arrangement stated by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN], I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TURLEY. I have a general pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], as I announced on the previous vote. He is absent, and I therefore withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CLAY (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to

ask if the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the junior Senator from Massachusetts has not voted.

Mr. CLAY. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts and therefore withdraw my vote. Were he present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. BEVERIDGE] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. He stands paired on this vote, as has been stated, with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. BACON. I understand the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE] has not voted. If I am correct in that, I withhold my vote, as I have a general pair with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the junior Senator from Rhode Island has not voted.

Mr. TURLEY. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. QUARLES] is paired with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and with his consent I transfer my pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], so that we can vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. QUARLES. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 30; as follows:

YEAS—16.

Bate,	Hansbrough,	McLaurin,	Pettigrew,
Carter,	Heitfeld,	Martin,	Talafarro,
Clark, Mont.	Jones, Ark.	Monag.	Turley,
Daniel,	Kenney,	Morgan,	Vest.

NAYS—30.

Aldrich,	Foraker,	McBride,	Scott,
Allison,	Frye,	McCumber,	Sewell,
Berry,	Gallinger,	McMillan,	Shoup,
Clark, Wyo.	Gear,	Platt, Conn.	Stewart,
Cullom,	Harris,	Platt, N. Y.	Teller,
Davis,	Hawley,	Pritchard,	Thurston.
Deboe,	Jones, Nev.	Quarles,	
Fairbanks,	Kean,	Ross,	

NOT VOTING—41.

Allen,	Cockrell,	McComas,	Spooner,
Bacon,	Culbertson,	McEnery,	Sullivan,
Baker,	Depew,	Mallory,	Tillman,
Bard,	Elkins,	Mason,	Turner,
Beveridge,	Foster,	Nelson,	Warren,
Burrows,	Hale,	Penrose,	Wellington,
Butler,	Hanna,	Perkins,	Wetmore,
Caffery,	Hoar,	Pettus,	Wolcott.
Chandler,	Kyle,	Proctor,	
Chilton,	Lindsay,	Rawlins,	
Clay,	Lodge,	Simon,	

So the amendment of Mr. JONES of Arkansas was rejected.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. THURSTON. There are three or four amendments that I think will lead to no debate, which I desire to offer at the request of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and I prefer to offer those at this time if the other amendments can wait a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WARREN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska to complete the committee amendments.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There was an amendment adopted on my motion on Saturday last in which I made a mistake in the date, which I should like to correct. On page 39 I offered an amendment, and where the words "December sixteenth" are inserted the intention was to make it "December fifth and ninth," striking out the word "sixteenth" and inserting "fifth and ninth," so as to read "December fifth and ninth, eighteen hundred and ninety-nine."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any objection to the correction? The Chair hears none, and it will be made.

Mr. THURSTON. At the request of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, whose letter on the subject I ask leave to print in the RECORD, I submit an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter will be printed in the RECORD, without objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, April 7, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to invite your attention to an important omission in the Indian bill. The following clause should go in on page 70, after the word "provision," line 31:

"Provided, That so much of the appropriations herein made as may be required to pay for goods and supplies, for expenses incident to their purchase, and for transportation of the same, for the year ending June 30, 1901, shall be immediately available, but no such goods or supplies shall be distributed or delivered to any of said Indians prior to July 1, 1900."

"This clause has been in every Indian bill for many years, except that for 1900, in which I see that it is omitted; probably an oversight. It is very important that it should go in. The office is about to open bids and make contracts for Indian goods and supplies for next year; and it is necessary to start some of the goods forward prior to June 30, so they may be on hand in time for issue on July 1."

Very respectfully,

W. A. JONES,
Commissioner.

Hon. JOHN M. THURSTON,
Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment presented by the Senator from Nebraska will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 5, line 11, page 71, insert the following proviso:

"Provided, That so much of the appropriation herein made as may be required to pay for goods and supplies, for expenses incident to their purchase, and for transportation of the same, for the year ending June 30, 1901, shall be immediately available, but no such goods or supplies shall be distributed or delivered to any of said Indians prior to July 1, 1900."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THURSTON. On Friday last an amendment was adopted after line 10, on page 54. I move to amend that amendment as adopted by adding, after the words "Tuba City," the following: "or so much thereof as may be required."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert, after the words "Tuba City," in the third line from the bottom of the amendment, the words "or so much thereof as may be required."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THURSTON. At the request of the Secretary of the Interior, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Following the amendment on page 54, after line 10, it is proposed to insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the procurement of timber and stone for such domestic and industrial purposes, to be used only in the Indian Territory, as in his judgment he shall deem necessary and proper, from lands belonging to either of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, and to fix the rates of royalty to be paid therefor, and collect the same for the benefit of said tribes; and every person who unlawfully cuts, or aids, or is employed in unlawfully cutting, or wantonly destroys, or procures to be wantonly destroyed, any timber standing upon the land of either of said tribes, contrary to the regulations prescribed by the Secretary, shall pay a fine of not more than \$500, or be imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both, in the discretion of the court trying the same.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I make the point of order against the amendment that it is general legislation and entirely out of order.

Mr. THURSTON. I admit that the amendment is subject to the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. THURSTON. In connection with the presentation of the amendment, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, I ask to have his letter inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, Washington, April 5, 1900.
CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS,
United States Senate.

SIR: The act of Congress approved June 28, 1898 (30 Stat., 495), contains no specific authority for the Secretary of the Interior to make regulations relative to the procurement and use of timber in the Indian Territory for domestic and industrial purposes, and, in my judgment, it is especially desirable that statutory authority be given the Secretary to make appropriate regulations so that such timber can be obtained as may be necessary for domestic use and the industrial development of the Indian Territory, and to be used only therein. The Secretary should be authorized to fix the rates of royalty to be collected under his direction for the benefit of the several tribes, and the law should also prescribe the penalty to be enforced against any person securing timber contrary to said regulations.

I have therefore to recommend that an amendment be incorporated, if deemed practicable, in the Indian appropriation bill [H. R. 7439], as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the procurement of timber and stone for such domestic and industrial purposes, to be used only in the Indian Territory, as in his judgment he shall deem necessary and proper, from lands belonging to either of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, and to fix the rates of royalty to be paid therefor and collect the same for the benefit of said tribes; and every person who unlawfully cuts, or aids, or is employed in unlawfully cutting, or wantonly destroys, or procures to be wantonly destroyed, any timber standing upon the land of either of said tribes, contrary to the regulations prescribed by the Secretary, shall pay a fine of not more than \$500, or be imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both, in the discretion of the court trying the same."

A draft of said amendment is inclosed herewith.

Respectfully,

E. A. HITCHCOCK, Secretary.

Mr. THURSTON. At the suggestion of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 76, line 15, after the word "dollars," it is proposed to insert:

"Provided, That of this amount \$3,118.25 may be used to reimburse Maj. R. H. Pratt for amount expended by him in the purchase of band instruments for the use of said school in 1898."

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to know what excuse there is for that amendment?

Mr. THURSTON. In that connection I will read the letter of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who says:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, April 7, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith a bill of C. G. Conn, against Capt. R. H. Pratt, for band instruments furnished him in 1898, amounting to \$3,118.25.

These instruments were obtained with a view of equipping Carlisle band for the Paris Exposition, and were paid for by contributions by private parties, the idea being that the band could give concerts in some cities and with the proceeds reimburse the contributors. Unfortunately this has proved a failure, and Major Pratt is confined at the school by sickness and unable to carry out his original plans. He is consequently embarrassed, and wishes that the instruments described should be paid for out of Government money, of which there will be enough in his next year's appropriation without adding anything thereto.

The band instruments at Carlisle, so far, have not cost the Government a dollar, having been contributed by private parties. At other schools in the service the Government furnishes instruments, and there seems no good reason why it should not be so at Carlisle. I am therefore of the decided opinion that the amendment which I handed you yesterday should go in the Indian bill. As has been said, it does not increase the appropriation for Carlisle School at all.

Very respectfully,

W. A. JONES,
Commissioner.

Hon. JOHN M. THURSTON,
Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I object to any settlement of a claim in this way, and I object to the amendment. It seems to me it is subject to the point of order. It is clearly a claim on an appropriation bill; and besides, it is a claim not well founded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota make the point of order on the amendment?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I make the point of order on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, on Friday last the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SHOUP] proposed an amendment on page 37, which at the time seemed to be unnecessary. In the present bill, by amendment already adopted, we have retained the agent at the Nez Perce Agency in Colorado. The provision of the bill on page 37, "for support and civilization of Nez Perce Indians in Idaho, including pay of physician, \$1,000," was limited to that amount upon the theory that the agency was to be discontinued. Having continued the agency, it is necessary, as shown by the telegraphic correspondence between the Senator from Idaho and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to increase that appropriation. I therefore move that the word "one," after the word "physician," in line 7, on page 37, be stricken out and the word "three" inserted. That will allow \$3,000 instead of \$1,000 for the support and civilization of the Nez Perce Indians in Idaho.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THURSTON. In that connection, I will ask that the correspondence in relation to that amendment be embodied in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be printed in the RECORD if there be no objection.

The correspondence referred to is as follows:

TO COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS:

APRIL 7, 1900.

Is there any general appropriation from which employees at Nez Percés Indian Agency, Idaho, can be paid if not specially appropriated for? See line 6, page 37, Indian appropriation bill. No employees provided for there except physician. If there is no general fund from which such employees can be paid, what amount should be appropriated in Indian appropriation bill, which will pass the Senate within an hour or so? Early response requested.
GEO. L. SHOUP.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT, April 7, 1900.

Hon. GEORGE L. SHOUP, United States Senate:

There is no general appropriation from which agency employees can be paid if not specially appropriated for. Only appropriation from which Nez Percés Agency employees can be paid next year, if amount on page 19 was omitted, are page 37, line 6, and on page 43, line 11. Salaries of agency employees present year aggregate \$7,330. If agency is to be continued, it will require at least \$3,000 to run it any way efficient.

W. A. JONES, Commissioner.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, I believe that completes all the committee amendments, and all that I have been asked to offer by the Department.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in on line 10, page 6 of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.
The SECRETARY. On page 6, line 10, after the word "dollars," it is proposed to insert:

For additional payment for the last three quarters of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, \$750.

Mr. THURSTON. What is the proposed amendment?

Mr. WARREN. The proposition is to add \$750 to the payment of the agent at the Union Agency for the last three quarters of the present fiscal year.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, that matter was before the committee; and my recollection now is that we reached the conclusion that the compensation of that agent should be increased to \$2,500 per year and that the general opinion in the committee was that it would only be fair to have that same compensation cover a portion of the present fiscal year. So far as I am concerned, I do not object to the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will ask to have printed some

correspondence of the Department regarding this matter; also part of a letter from Agent J. Blair Shoenfelt.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The correspondence referred to by the Senator will be printed in the RECORD, in the absence of objection.

The correspondence referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES INDIAN SERVICE,
Washington, August 23, 1899.

SIR: On the 10th instant the Department referred to your office for consideration and report, when estimates are submitted, a letter from the Hon. F. E. WARREN, United States Senator from Wyoming, recommending that the estimate for the salary of the United States Indian agent for the Union Agency, Ind. T., also for the chief clerk, be increased, on account of the "remarkable increase in labor and responsibilities" of said officers.

The large amount of disbursements made by said agent under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 23, 1899 (30 Stat., 495), renders it important, both to the Government and the claimants, that said disbursements be made quickly as possible consistent with safety to all parties.

When it was proposed by your office on January 7, 1899, to require Agent Wisdom, at said agency, to give an additional bond of \$275,000, on account of the collection and disbursement of moneys under the provisions of said act, objection was made by the agent that it cost him \$125 more to secure a bond of \$50,000 and it was unjust to require such a large special bond with no increase of salary. Thereupon the United States Indian Inspector forwarded said objections of the agent with a recommendation that "Agent Wisdom be not required to give additional bond for reasons stated and that necessary moneys be remitted to him in installments."

On January 27, 1899, you forwarded said paper with the recommendation "that the plan proposed by the agent be adopted."

On January 31, 1899, the Department advised you that "The recommendation of Inspector Wright, as approved by you, is concurred in by the Department, but it is deemed advisable that the Indian agent, in view of the large amount that will be transmitted to him for these special payments, be required to deposit in the subtreasury at St. Louis, Mo., at the end of each week, all the moneys derived from collection, rents, and royalties under the provisions of section 18 and the agreement in section 29 of the act of Congress approved June 23, 1898 (30 Stat., 495)."

Experience in the recent payments of the moneys due the Creek Nation shows that it is desirable that the agent receive installment of \$50,000 instead of \$25,000, and in order to accomplish this his bond should be increased to \$100,000, or \$50,000 additional. If the agent gives this additional bond, which must cost him, according to Agent Wisdom's statement, \$125, his salary should be increased so as to cover the expense incurred and sufficiently remunerate him for his additional duties.

You will therefore request Agent Shoenfelt to give an additional bond of \$50,000, and also advise him that should such bond be given the Department will recommend that Congress increase his salary so as to amount to \$2,500 per annum.

Very respectfully,

THOS. RYAN,
Acting Secretary.

The COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES INDIAN SERVICE,
Washington, August 24, 1899.

SIR: I inclose herewith a copy of a letter addressed to this office by the Acting Secretary of the Interior, under date of 23d instant, relative to the desirability of your filing an additional or cumulative bond in the sum of \$50,000. In compliance with the instructions contained in the last paragraph of said letter, you are hereby requested to give such a bond, and advised that should you do so, the Department will recommend that your salary be increased by Congress to \$2,500 per annum. I also inclose the necessary blanks for the proposed new bond, filled up as far as practicable, and a sheet of instructions as to the proper manner of executing the same.

If you comply with the Department's wishes in this matter, you are directed to deposit all funds in your hands and to your official credit to the credit of the United States and close your accounts under your present bond on the day preceding the date of the new one.

You will then open a new set of accounts under both bonds, commencing with and including the date of the new one. Your final accounts under your present bond should be submitted to this office for adjustment without delay and accompanied by a sworn statement made by comparison of your check book with your bank account, showing the number, date, amount, and payee of each check drawn by you as United States Indian Agent and remaining outstanding and unpaid.

Very respectfully,

A. C. TONNER,
Acting Commissioner.

Mr. J. B. SHOENFELT,
United States Indian Agent, Union Agency, Ind. T.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES INDIAN SERVICE,
Union Agency, Muscogee, Ind. T., January 31, 1900.

The United States Indian agent, Union Agency, Ind. T., is charged by law with the following duties in connection with the administration of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes:

CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS.

First. The collection of all royalties on coal, asphalt, and other minerals. The amount received for the fiscal year 1899 was \$113,313.22.

Second. The collection of all sums due on account of town lots appraised and sold by the town-site commissions.

The volume of work in connection with receiving remittances on account of town lots can only be shown relatively, as thus far but two towns—Sterrett, population, 400, and Colbert, population, 200—have been platted and appraised. In Colbert the commission appraised and sold 70 lots, and at public auction disposed of 173 lots. In Sterrett the commission appraised and sold 206 lots, and at public auction disposed of 700 lots.

Amount received from Sterrett.....	\$4,719.45
Amount received from Colbert.....	1,271.48

5,990.93

The Choctaw town-site commission, having platted and appraised Atoka, Ind. T., population 2,500, is now engaged in its work at South McAlester, Ind. T., population 4,500. No remittances have been received from Atoka, as it is understood by this office that the plat has not yet met with the approval of the Department.

The Chickasaw town-site commission is at work at Ardmore, Ind. T., a

town of some 7,000 or 8,000 inhabitants. The volume of business on account of remittances from this place, as well as the other towns, will greatly increase the work of this office.

Third. Payment of salaries of the 105 neighborhood-school teachers.

Fourth. Payment of the 50 employees and teachers of the five academies of the Choctaw Nation.

These teachers and employees are paid quarterly by checks drawn on the Assistant Treasurer of the United States.

Fifth. Payment of warrants.

The Indian agent is required from time to time to disburse any funds that may be appropriated by Congress out of the moneys held in trust by the United States for the payment of indebtedness, as evidenced by warrants issued by the executives of the Choctaw Nation. For instance, during the quarter closing December 31, 1899, the Indian agent disbursed out of the \$75,000 appropriated by the act of March 3, 1899, the sum of \$66,093.89.

To make this payment 78 individuals signed the rolls and 443 warrants were canceled and retired. Most of this payment was conducted by correspondence, and almost invariably, the warrants having been issued for a number of years and the custom having been heretofore very lax in reference to indorsements, the warrants presented for payment were improperly indorsed. This, of course, necessitated considerable correspondence before the warrants could be paid.

CREEK NATION.

First. The collection of all royalties on minerals mined.

Second. The collection of occupation and traders' taxes.

There are in the Creek Nation at the present time 36 towns and 550 licensed traders. Amount received for fiscal year 1899, \$4,913.63.

Third. The collection of all permit taxes and all other revenues, such as the royalty on hay, cattle, etc.

Fourth. The collection of all sums due and payable on account of town lots appraised and sold by the several town-site commissions.

Fifth. Payment of warrants issued by the principal chief.

During quarter closing September 30, 1899, \$199,000 was disbursed and 1,800 warrants canceled and retired. All obligations incurred for every purpose by this nation are paid by means of warrants.

CHEROKEE NATION.

First. Collection of royalty on minerals.

Second. Collection of royalty on hay.

Third. Collection of all permit taxes and the tax on licensed traders.

In the Cherokee Nation there are 93 towns and 675 traders or merchants. Amount collected during the fiscal year 1899, \$3,150.87.

As revenue inspectors have been appointed for the Cherokee and Creek nations, the royalties collected under the direction of the Indian agent for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, will be greatly increased.

Fourth. Collection of all moneys due on town lots which have been previously sold by the Cherokee authorities.

Fifth. Payment of warrants.

All indebtedness incurred by the Cherokee Nation is paid by means of warrants issued by the principal chief. All of these warrants bear 6 per cent interest, which is payable yearly. At the present time there are about \$600,000 worth of warrants outstanding. About \$150,000 is expended each year in paying interest and retiring these warrants.

SEMINOLE NATION.

First. Enforcement of the intercourse laws of the Seminole Nation.

Second. Protection of its citizens from the aggressions of noncitizens.

Third. Advising and counseling with the principal chief and Indian citizens whenever called upon so to do.

GENERAL EXPLANATIONS.

Every remittance must be accompanied by sworn statements in duplicate. These statements show what the remittance is intended to cover. During the quarter closing December 31, 1899, 1,181 remittances were received at this office, which involved the handling of \$41,180.96. At the close of each week this money is transmitted to the assistant treasurer of the United States, St. Louis, Mo., and once a month is placed to the official credit of the Treasurer for the benefit of the tribes to which it belongs.

The remittances vary in amount from 15 cents to \$3,000 and are received by check, draft, postal and express money order. There is received at this office an average of 70 or 80 letters per day, a number of which are complaints made by Indian citizens on account of encroachments made by white and negro noncitizens. The agent's time is largely occupied in investigating these complaints and answering these letters and in listening to similar complaints made personally by Indians and others on various subjects.

At the present time there are in this office over 400 petitions asking for the removal of noncitizen tenants and renters, for the reason that their leases have expired under the provisions of section 23 of the Curtis Act, which makes void on January 1, 1900, all agricultural and grazing leases.

ASSISTANTS.

To assist the Indian agent in the discharge of his duties there are 6 clerks; and if the volume of business continues to increase, the number of clerks allowed will not be sufficient to handle it.

To carry out and execute the orders of the Indian agent there are 28 Indian policemen.

SALARY.

The salary of the United States Indian agent at this agency is \$1,500 per annum, and is not commensurate with the duties and responsibilities of his position. He is bonded for the faithful discharge of his duties in the sum of \$100,000, which bond is given through security companies at an annual cost of about \$300, thus reducing his salary to about \$100 per month, or \$1,200 per annum, which is the amount usually paid to chief clerks at Indian agencies. Any erroneous payments which he may make must, under his bond, be made good, and he therefore receives no compensation for the responsibility and risk taken above what a clerk or stenographer with no such responsibility would receive.

Many of the Indian agents on reservations where no money is received and very little, if any, is paid out have a salary of \$1,800 per year and furnish a bond of one-half, or less, the amount that the agent at Union Agency is required to give.

Attention is invited to the annual report of my predecessor in office, Col. Dew M. Wisdom, and especially to that part wherein he states:

"In view of my probable retirement from my present position as Indian agent for the Five Civilized Tribes, I feel that as a disinterested party I may and should respectfully suggest that in my opinion the salary of the agent should be increased to one commensurate with its onerous duties and requirements."

RECAPITULATION.

Choctaw and Chickasaw nations.—Collection of royalties on minerals. Collection of money for town lots. Payment of salary of school employees. Payment of warrants.

Creek Nation.—Collection of royalties on minerals. Collection of merchandise and occupation tax. Collection of permit tax. Collection of money for town lots. Payment of warrants.

Cherokee Nation.—Collection of royalties on minerals; collection of permit tax; collection of merchandise tax; collection of money for town lots; payment of warrants.

Seminole Nation.—Enforcing intercourse laws; protection of citizens; advising principal chief.

General.—Investigating and adjusting complaints; regulating trade and intercourse; hearing and making recommendations in reference to the applications of railway companies for additional lands for station purposes. During the quarter ending September 30, 1899, the Indian agent received and disbursed \$252,670.71. During the quarter ending December 31, 1899, the agent received \$146,288.48, disbursed \$115,460.00; balance on hand (subject to disbursement, \$30,828.48).

The United States Indian agent for the Union Agency, Ind. T., has jurisdiction over the following tribes, viz: The Cherokees, Creeks, Seminoles, Choctaws, and Chickasaws. The entire landed estate, embracing over 19,000,000 acres of land, a territory nearly equal in extent to the State of Indiana, is owned in common by Indians, negroes, and whites, aggregating about 80,000 souls. An additional population of over 400,000 white people make their homes within the Indian Territory.

To supervise and direct the management of the affairs of such a heterogeneous mass of people requires time, patience, and a familiarity with local laws and conditions.

Respectfully submitted.

United States Indian Agent.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES INDIAN SERVICE,
Union Agency, Muscogee, Ind. T., March 17, 1900.

DEAR SENATOR: My salary for the past year will amount to less than \$1,000, as I have given three bonds since last April and the premiums have used up a third of my salary. I have received less compensation for my services than a second-rate clerk in my office, and much less than my chief clerk. * * *

I have dictated over 10,000 letters and examined and passed upon about 4,000 complaints, received and disbursed almost a million dollars the past eight months, and have over 200 employees on the pay roll, and have to carry upon my property account all property of the Government in the various schools in the Indian Territory. I am sure the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs do not expect me to do this at a salary less than my chief clerk receives.

With kind regards, I remain, sincerely,

J. BLAIR SHOENFELT.

HON. F. E. WARREN,
Washington, D. C.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator state what the salary of the agent at that agency was before?

Mr. THURSTON. One thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the compensation of the agent was only \$1,500, and more than \$500 of this salary he was compelled to use in securing bond.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. So that \$750 is for three-quarters of a year?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; as additional compensation for three-quarters of a year.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I will suggest that the Senator had better add to the amendment the words "to be immediately available."

Mr. THURSTON. That will give the agent in all \$2,250 for the present fiscal year.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. As I understand, the Senator from Wyoming wants to have that \$750 paid to the agent now. In that case he ought to add to the amendment that the appropriation should be immediately available.

Mr. WARREN. The suggestion of the Senator is a good one, and I shall be glad to have that language incorporated.

Mr. THURSTON. I am willing to have those words added to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming modifies his amendment by adding the words "to be immediately available." The question is on the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 14, on page 37, it is proposed to insert:

That the sum of \$12,311, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to pay the claims for improvements as appraised by an Indian inspector under the provisions of the Indian appropriation act of July 1, 1898, of William Evans, William Jones, Nelson Yarnell, William H. Rogers, administrator of the estate of James Rogers, deceased, and Stefano Geni, made upon lands within the Wind River Indian reservation, in the State of Wyoming, which had been settled upon as unsurveyed public lands prior to their inclusion within the said reservation by the treaty with the Shoshone and Bannock tribes of Indians dated July 3, 1868, and which appears in House Document No. 223, Fifty-fifth Congress, third session.

Mr. THURSTON. The committee had this amendment under consideration and declined to place it upon the bill. Under those circumstances I must oppose it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection until I can very briefly state what I understand to be the case. Of course it is the privilege of the chairman of the committee to make such an objection.

This is a case where, when the Shoshone Indian Reservation was laid out many years ago, certain settlers were already upon the land, and although it was unsurveyed, still, under our common law, they had vested rights. The Government desired their

removal and provided for a board of examination, appraisal, and report. The board made an appraisal, and appraised the aggregate value of all their then improvements at \$9,871.50. A report was made to Congress, and an attempt was made in the Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, and subsequent Congresses to appropriate the money, but in every case failed until about 1889. Meantime the money not appropriated, a settlement was never attempted with those settlers until twenty-one years after their property had been appraised.

During the twenty-one years these men went on, as naturally they would, being homesteaders and home builders, with increasing families, improving their property, and by expending money increased its value, so that the later appraisal makes the difference between that first appraisal and the present appraisal, the sum I have asked for in the amendment, \$12,311.

The case, as I have stated, ran along—the amount not appropriated—until 1889, when partial payment and settlement was effected. In 1893 the men were removed from the reservation. It is simply a matter of common justice and decent respect for the nation's honor, in my mind, that these settlers should be now paid exactly what the agent of the United States duly detailed for that purpose has lately brought in as the sum yet due them.

If the first appraisal had been acted upon in due and reasonable time and the nine thousand and some dollars had been paid accordingly, that would have closed the incident, and this later payment would never have been demanded. During the twenty-one years that passed before settlement was tendered, these settlers added to their improvements and expended their money to the extent that they now ask reimbursement for.

So the question is, Shall the Government, after waiting twenty-one years, pay for the improvements at the value they were then worth instead of taking into consideration the improvements that were made afterwards and the loss thus suffered by those settlers?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I ask the Senator if the Secretary of the Interior, in the document to which he has referred, does not report unfavorably upon these claims?

Mr. WARREN. I have not discovered such a report.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. My recollection is that he does.

Mr. WARREN. As I understand it, the report from the Interior Department is very much like the reports which sometimes come in here on certain claims from the Court of Claims—that is, they find the facts; they find the amount that is due, without recommending whether it be paid or not. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a claim pure and simple. Whether it ought to be paid or not, it certainly ought not to go on the Indian appropriation bill, and so I make the point of order against it.

Mr. WARREN. I submit that the point of order may lie against the amendment, but I wanted before dismissing the subject to get a declaration from the chairman of the committee whether his objection is on the ground that the claim ought not to be paid or whether it is simply on the matter of a point of order. I think the claim should be paid in some manner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 54, at the end of line 17, it is proposed to insert:

That wherever there are trust funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of, or moneys due under treaties or other agreements, any tribe or band of Indians, the principal of which or any portion thereof, or the interest on which or any portion thereof, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized by law, in his discretion, to use for the benefit of said Indians, and the parents or guardians of any children entitled to the benefit of such funds shall make choice of a school or schools where they desire their children or wards to be educated, then, and in that event, if, in his judgment, such schools are proper institutions in which to educate children, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to use said funds so belonging to said Indians and set aside for their benefit to pay the expenses, or any part of the expenses, of educating said children in the schools so chosen by said parents or guardians.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will say, in connection with this amendment, that it simply allows the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to use the trust funds for the education of the Indian children in such schools as their parents may desire to send them. It seems to me it is a very proper discretion, and I am confident that the amendment, if adopted, will result in much good to those Indians and prevent the closing of some schools which ought not to be closed. That is all I care to say on the subject.

Mr. THURSTON. I feel constrained to make the point of order on the amendment. I make the point of order that it is legislation and not germane to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. On page 58, at the end of line 8, it is proposed to insert:

For support and education of 50 Indian pupils at St. Labret Mission School, at Tongue River, Montana, \$5,400, at not to exceed \$108 per annum for each pupil.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think that is open to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. It increases an item in an appropriation bill without ever having been sent to the Committee on Appropriations or being reported by a standing or select committee of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is it responsive to existing law?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. No; it is not responsive to any existing law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Then the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I find on page 60 this provision:

For support and education of 120 Indian pupils at the school at Hampton, Va., \$20,040.

The Senate have decided that they will not make any appropriation for sectarian schools, and we have struck out every such item. The last amendment which I offered was for a school in Montana, which is controlled by the Catholic Church. It is a school where we have heretofore contracted for pupils. If we are going to adopt the policy of refusing to contract with outside schools we ought to make it uniform and treat all alike.

The Hampton school is a Protestant school; it is not a Government school; and we make contracts by this special provision for the care of 120 Indian pupils at that place. I should like to know why this exception should be made? We say the Catholics shall not educate the Indians; that we will not contract with them; that we will not deal with any institution outside of the Government schools themselves; and yet we continue this item in the bill. I should like to hear some justification for continuing it in view of the policy which we have clearly established.

Mr. THURSTON. Do I understand the Senator to move to strike out the provision to which he has referred?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Unless I shall hear some good reason why it should remain in the bill, I may make that motion.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think I can give a good reason why it should remain in the bill, Mr. President, if the Senator desires to hear it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The school at Hampton, whatever it may have been in the past, is not a sectarian or denominational school at present. It was originally started by the American Missionary Association, but afterwards was incorporated by the State of Virginia, and the American Missionary Association withdrew long ago from any responsibility for the school. It is not sectarian or denominational in any sense.

It is probably true that of all the outside contributions, which are used indiscriminately, I suppose, for education in negro and Indian schools, probably the largest contributions come from persons who are connected with the Protestant churches in the United States. Perhaps I overstate even that.

I presume that the largest contributions come from business people, wealthy people, who either have no church relations or who do not contribute to this school because they have any church relations—for instance, Collis P. Huntington within the past year or two has given, I believe, \$100,000 to enlarge the industrial education there. I do not know what church, if any, Mr. Huntington belongs to, but largely the school is sustained by contributions from business people who have been interested in the education of the negroes and the Indians as carried on at that school.

I listened with great interest to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] when he was describing the work which was done by the Jesuits in the Catholic schools which have been established in this country, and in his commendation of the work of Mr. Washington at Tuskegee.

I think, Mr. President, the first inception of the idea of industrial training to make Indians capable of self-support, teaching them trades and occupations, was at the Hampton School; and no institution in the country, neither Carlisle nor any school of the Catholics, has had greater success or so great success in the matter of educating scholars, in training Indian boys and girls so that they shall be fitted to go out and carry on the ordinary occupations which white people carry on in this country. No institution has so good a record, I think; certainly no institution has a better record than this institution as to what the scholars who have gone from there have done. I should like to refer for a

moment to that record, if it will not occupy the attention of the Senate too long.

Of the 500 scholars who have been educated there a record has been kept as to what they have done and accomplished since they left the school. They have been educated to the trades; they have been educated as blacksmiths, as carpenters, as harness makers, indeed, in all of the trades, as well as in farming; and the record shows that more than 75 per cent of those scholars who have gone from there have turned out excellently well. Some of them are engaged in machine shops, some away from the reservations in various trades which they learned there; others are teachers at the reservations. It is a wonderful record that this school has made. I desire to put this showing in the RECORD:

The following will show how our returned students have been employed this past year—

That is, those who have been educated there—

Attending higher schools	4
Attending other schools	15
Self-supporting off the reservation (engineers and machinists, 7; printers, 2; blacksmith, 1; painter, 1; trained nurse, 1; servants and farm hands, 4 girls and 9 boys, 13)	25
Teachers, academic (camp, 5; boarding, 12; district, 2)	19
Teachers, industrial	31
Field matrons	3
Church work (catechists, 12; missionaries, 11)	23
Agency employees (interpreters, 5; clerks, 5; police, 9; carpenters and wheelwrights, 19; blacksmiths, 13; millers, 3; agency farmers, 5)	59
United States employees (surveyors, 2; postmaster, 1; soldier, 1)	4
Independent workers in the West (physicians, 2; trained nurse, 1; lawyer, 1; contractors, 3; storekeepers, 5; clerks, 5; carpenter, 1; blacksmiths, 4; painters, 5; loggers, 10; stock raisers, over 100-head farms, 23; good farms, 98)	158
Girls making good homes	88
As in past years, we have kept as perfect a record as possible of the character of the work accomplished and the influence each student seems to have exerted. The 500 now living are graded in this respect as follows:	
Excellent (those of unusual ability, influence, and opportunity)	111
Good (those living civilized, Christian lives)	246
Fair (the sick and unfortunate, from whom nothing can be expected)	163
Poor (those not actively bad, but exerting an unfavorable influence)	31
Bad (those doing wrong while knowing better)	9

Out of the 500.

Thus, according to the most reliable information we have been able to obtain, we have a very fair margin to our claim that three-fourths of our returned students are doing well—346 excellent and good records to 40 poor and bad.

That is a wonderful record for any school, even for white scholars, and there is no Indian school or negro school that is doing better work than this school at Hampton. It is not a sectarian institution in any particular, as I have already said. Its contributions are from all classes of people. Catholics have contributed to it. The principal lines of training there are industrial and manual. Those are the two great departments. At the head of each of these departments a Catholic teacher is employed. A Catholic clergyman is called upon to open the services of the school whenever there is opportunity. No discrimination has ever been made against a Catholic teacher or a Catholic employee. I should like to read a word from the testimony of Dr. Frissell on this subject. I asked:

Is there any theological school there?

Dr. FRISSELL. No, sir.

Senator PLATT. You do not pretend to turn out ministers?

Dr. FRISSELL. No, sir; we are devoting ourselves to the industrial and agricultural side of the question. What I do is to make teachers of the negro and Indian race, especially along the industrial and agricultural lines; that those who come out of the schools of the West may be fitted to go back as teachers. We have made a report to the Secretary of the Interior, which has been submitted to Congress, showing that eighty-seven out of every hundred of our Indians have engaged in regular occupation.

That is the best showing that any school has made. I asked this question:

While most of your teachers are Protestants, I understand you to say that you have never in any way run a distinctively Protestant school?

Dr. FRISSELL. No, sir; I do not think so. Of course, most of us, as you say, are Protestants, but I have never asked the question. I have made the point clear since I have been in charge of the school that if he is a good man he should not be shut out because he is a Catholic.

Senator PETTIGREW. Have you a single male instructor who is a Catholic?

Dr. FRISSELL. Yes, sir; in charge of the manual training—Mr. Jenkins.

Senator PETTIGREW. Have you Catholic students?

Dr. FRISSELL. Some. There are comparatively few. We do not teach the dogmas of any church.

Senator PETTIGREW. Do you require them to attend a Protestant church on Sunday?

Dr. FRISSELL. Yes; those who board. I consider the school catholic in the best sense of the word.

Senator PLATT. There is no discrimination against Catholics in any way, shape, or manner?

Dr. FRISSELL. No, sir.

Senator PLATT. Is there any particular denomination that has any influence there?

Dr. FRISSELL. No, sir. The board of trustees, as I said, represent six different denominations, and no one of them has a majority.

Senator PLATT. There are no Catholics on the board of trustees?

Dr. FRISSELL. No, sir; of course, most of our support comes from the Protestant church.

Senator PLATT. You get some from the Catholic?

Dr. FRISSELL. We have had help from the Catholic Church—that is, from individuals.

Senator PLATT. Your help comes from individuals, I suppose?

Dr. FRISSELL. Largely so.

Dr. Frissell further stated:

As I have said, we have had Catholic inspectors and Catholic priests down there who have never made the slightest objection to the sort of training. So far as I know, there has never been a word said against the Catholic Church there.

Senator PLATT. In no sense is it anti-Catholic or pro-Protestant?

Dr. FRISSELL. No, sir; we have prided ourselves that it is non-denominational. We have had meetings all over the country and had on the platforms Catholic priests, Hebrew rabbis, and men of different denominations.

I do not need to go further except to say that when Congressman FITZGERALD appeared before us to be heard in relation to Catholic contract schools he expressed entire satisfaction with the school at Hampton.

Mr. President, it is true that the Government educates Indian children there by contract; that is, it pays for a portion of the education, but it is not true that the school is in any sense sectarian or denominational or Protestant to the extent that it is anti-Catholic. It is a broad, liberal school in those respects and in all respects, and it constitutes, to my mind, an exception to all the other schools which have been heretofore called contract schools.

This matter came up in committee, and the committee, considering it, thought it was a case in which the appropriation was properly made. They do the same thing that they do at Carlisle. There is no difference except that the one is a purely Government school and the other is a school where the Government pays for the scholars.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, the Hampton School is a Protestant school and the scholars are compelled to attend the Protestant church service every Sunday, and religious teaching is mixed up with the other teaching during the week. At one time, and very recently, since 1894, they had a theological department; whether it is continued now or not I do not know. There they trained ministers for the Protestant church. They have a chaplain who is a Protestant. The principal of the school is a Congregationalist minister. Some of these Indian pupils have been prepared to become Protestant missionaries, and I see by the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for 1895, page 414, that of the returned students six were missionaries and fifteen catechists.

Now, I think this is a good school. The other contract schools were good schools. Many of them were much better than the schools conducted by the Government—for instance, the St. Ignatius Mission School, in Montana, which, as I recall, has as high record as the Hampton School for efficiency and success in handling and educating Indian children. I am not going to move to strike out the provision for the Hampton School. It was not estimated for by the Department. It was put in by the House. It is a good school. But if we are going to be consistent, if we are going to be fair, if we are to stand upon principle in this case, we ought to treat all alike and prevent dissatisfaction and complaint which can justly be made if we make an exception in this case. The Catholics have a right to say that the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the United States make a discrimination against them in favor of the Protestant churches if they continue this item. We have shut out all the other contract schools, and I think it is our duty to shut out this one or put the others back. While I shall not make the motion now, I shall very earnestly insist that the practice shall not be continued next year, if this item again appears in the bill, unless we treat everybody the same as we treat these people.

While, Mr. President, this question has been raised often and much discussed, and I have examined the reports of the Hampton School time and again, and while I do not think they teach the special dogmas of any particular branch of the Protestant church (and I think there are some thirty or forty different creeds), they teach in general the doctrine of the Protestant church in contradistinction to the doctrines of the Catholic Church. There is no question but that the objection lies which the Catholics urge when they say that we discriminate against them if we continue this item.

No one has ever asked that this item be stricken out, but I must say that they will have good reason to say that we are inconsistent and to ask that it be stricken out in the future if the policy is now settled that no contract schools shall be tolerated.

Mr. FOSTER. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, line 13, after the word "thousand," it is proposed to strike out the word "five" and insert "six;" so as to read:

At the Yakima Agency, Wash., \$1,600.

Mr. FOSTER. This is an increase of the pay of the Yakima agent to \$1,600. Heretofore, for many years, he received \$1,800 a year, but last year in preparing the appropriation bill it was cut down to fifteen hundred. That is a very important agency, and the salary should be placed back to where it was, \$1,800. But still the agent says he will be satisfied if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. THURSTON. The amendment proposes an increase of a hundred dollars, as I understand?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; \$100.

Mr. THURSTON. I shall not oppose the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Shall the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole be concurred in in the Senate in gross?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There was an amendment agreed to the other day, proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES]—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Connecticut pardon the Chair? Does the Senator desire to reserve an amendment?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I simply wish to call attention to it, and then I shall be willing to have all the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole voted on in gross; but I wish to say before the amendment is concurred in that I think it was unnecessary, and then it can go to conference.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator refer to the amendment?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. It is with reference to the Mississippi Choctaws.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is another thing. I offered another amendment that I desire to find.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. On page 41 of the bill, where the appropriation is made for the Dawes commission, the bill contains this provision with reference to the work of the commission:

But it shall not receive, consider, or make any record of any application of any person for enrollment as a member of any tribe in Indian Territory who has not been a recognized citizen thereof, and duly and lawfully enrolled or admitted as such, and its refusal of such applications shall be final.

That was amended so that it shall be final when approved by the Secretary. Then there is this clause:

But this shall not in any manner affect the provision of the act of Congress of June 23, 1898, respecting the Mississippi Choctaws.

The Senator from Arkansas proposed an amendment. I do not know that I have the amendment here.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, let the amendment be read from the desk.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let the Secretary state the amendment. It is on page 42.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment to which the Senator refers.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I moved to strike out the words:

But this shall not in any manner affect the provisions of the act of Congress of June 23, 1898, respecting the Mississippi Choctaws— and to insert the words which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Provided, That any Mississippi Choctaw, duly identified and enrolled as such by the United States Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, shall have the right at any time prior to the approval of the final rolls of the Choctaws and Chickasaws by the Secretary of the Interior, to make settlement within the Choctaw-Chickasaw country, and on proof of the fact of bona fide settlement they shall be enrolled by the said United States commission and by the Secretary of the Interior as Choctaws entitled to allotment.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not wish to raise in the Senate the question whether that amendment shall be concurred in, but I wish to call attention to the fact that I think it entirely unnecessary, in order that when the matter goes into conference it may be carefully considered.

I tried to find the section of the act of 1898 which is referred to in the amendment which was reported by the committee, but I was unable to find it when the amendment was under consideration. This is the language which was stricken out of the bill:

But this shall not in any manner affect the provisions of the act of Congress of June 23, 1898, respecting the Mississippi Choctaws.

That act contains this language:

No person shall be enrolled who has not heretofore removed to and in good faith settled in the nation in which he claims citizenship: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be so construed as to militate against any rights or privileges which the Mississippi Choctaws may have under the laws of or the treaties with the United States.

The Dawes commission has identified over 1,900 Mississippi Choctaws living in the State of Mississippi. It has made a report, being called upon to do so by the Congress, that in the opinion of the commission each one of these identified Mississippi Choctaws may move even now to the Indian Territory, take up his residence there in good faith, and become entitled to share in the distribution and the allotment of the land, and their rights are fully preserved, as I think, under the statute of 1898.

But, Mr. President, it has come to my knowledge that efforts are being made by attorneys and speculators to induce some of the Indians who still remain in Mississippi to migrate to the Choctaw country for the purpose of becoming entitled to land there. I am assured, and I think I can not be mistaken, that lawyers, as they are called, have been there and have made contracts with some of these Indians that if they will go to the Indian Territory, claim citizenship there, and get the land to which they are entitled, the lawyers will pay their expenses of removal and in return shall receive half of the land.

Others have proposed that they would lend the Indians a hundred dollars apiece to pay the expenses of their removal there, upon the understanding and the contract that when the land was awarded to them the persons lending the money should have a portion of the land to repay the hundred dollars and interest.

I do not wish to do anything to prevent a Mississippi Choctaw from going in good faith to the Indian Territory, take up his residence there, and thus become entitled to his share of the land; but I do not wish to do anything by way of a provision in this bill that will facilitate the speculation which I believe is on foot to take them over there temporarily for the purpose of obtaining land which they are to divide with the lawyers and attorneys and persons who take them there. I simply wish to say this before the amendment is concurred in, in order that the matter may be fully considered in the committee of conference.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, I do not think the amendment offered by me enlarges the rights of these people in any sense. I think it simply preserves the rights they have under the present law. I agree fully with the Senator from Connecticut in his desire to prevent any such job as he mentions; but, if he will notice, in the amendment offered by me the proposition is that the Mississippi Choctaws may be entitled to property there if they go over and in good faith become citizens of that nation. There must be such circumstances surrounding those people as will satisfy the Dawes commission that they have in good faith removed to the Indian nation with the intention of becoming citizens and residents there. If they choose to do that, it is not necessary for them to do anything except to get money enough to pay their expenses from Mississippi to the Choctaw country to avail themselves of these rights, and there is absolutely no sense in their agreeing to give half of the property they get in the nation to lawyers for permission to do what they can do without anybody's assistance and without permission from anybody in the world. It would indicate that they are simply childish in their business relations.

If they want the land in the Indian Territory, all they have to do is to go there and get the whole of it for themselves, and I see no reason why they should make an agreement to go there and then give one-half of what they get to a lawyer. A lawyer can not help them unless he advances the money on which to make the removal, and there is no doubt that plenty of people would be willing to let them have the necessary money to make the removal on reasonable terms, without undertaking to rob them in that way. I do not see how the amendment can possibly be used for the purpose of carrying out a scheme of that kind; but if there is any possibility of it being done, I agree most cordially with the Senator from Connecticut that it ought to be prevented, and I will join him in making any change necessary to prevent that or in striking the provision out of the bill entirely. In fact, since the committee amendment was made in that section, I am not sure but that the wisest step to take in connection with it is to strike it out.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Is the Senator willing that the Senate should now nonconcur in the amendment, or does he prefer to have it go into conference, to be taken up there?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I prefer that it should go into conference, but I would not seriously object to nonconcurring now. Still it can do no harm to let it go into conference and let the matter be carefully looked into.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That is entirely agreeable to me. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer the amendment I send to the desk. The SECRETARY. On page 52, strike out all after the word "hereby," in line 23, and all of lines 24 and 25, and insert:

Granted the right to a patent to the land so entered upon the payment to the local land officers of the usual and customary fees, and no other or further charge of any kind whatsoever shall be required from such settlers to entitle him to a patent for the land covered by his entry. All sums due any Indian tribe shall be paid by the United States.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of the free-homestead proposition, and will be glad to cooperate with the Senator from South Dakota in securing legislation of that character at this session of Congress. In both Houses bills for that purpose, free-homestead bills, have been reported and are upon the Calendars of the respective Houses. I believe from what I hear that the free-homestead bill is sure to pass the House. I know from the sentiment shown at the former sessions of Congress it is sure to pass the Senate, and I have no doubt that we can secure that very desirable legislation at the present session.

I do not feel, however, that this legislation should be forced upon the pending appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the Senate, and I feel compelled to interpose the point of order that the proposed amendment is legislation and not germane to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I wish to argue the point

of order a little. The amendment which I offered is to this paragraph of the bill on page 52:

That the settlers who purchased with the condition annexed of actual settlement on all ceded Indian reservations be, and they are hereby, granted—

That part of the paragraph I do not interfere with. I move to strike out after the word "granted." The bill reads:

An extension to July 1, 1901.

Instead of an extension to July 1, 1901, I propose that they shall not be required to pay at all. As the law now stands, and as it will stand if this paragraph remains in the bill unamended, they would have to pay at the end of another year, and I simply propose to change it so that they shall not have to pay at all.

This same question was up in 1898, when I offered this same amendment, although in a slightly different form, to the Indian appropriation bill, and it was adopted. I moved in that instance to strike out these words from the Indian appropriation bill:

That the settlers who purchased with the condition annexed of actual settlement on all ceded Indian reservations be, and they are hereby, granted an extension of one year, in addition to the extensions heretofore granted, in which to make payments as now provided by law.

I moved to strike out that clause. It is almost identical with the language in the bill as it now stands. Then I moved to insert the following:

That all settlers under the homestead laws of the United States upon the public lands acquired prior to the passage of this act by treaty or agreement from the various Indian tribes, or upon military reservations which have been open to settlement, etc.—

Being the language employed in this amendment.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. No, not the same language.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Not the same language exactly, but far more subject to the point of order than what I now propose. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] made the point of order against the amendment for the reason that it embraced the military reservation and did not apply solely to Indian reservations. I thereupon withdrew the amendment and offered it with the words "military reservations" stricken out. Here is the amendment which I did offer. I said:

I desire to withdraw the amendment which I have offered and to offer in its place the amendment which I send to the desk, which I ask to have read as a substitute for the other.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment heretofore submitted by the Senator from South Dakota is withdrawn, and he now submits an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out lines 22, 23, and 24, on page 64, and lines 1 and 2, on page 70, and in lieu thereof to insert:

That all settlers under the homestead laws of the United States upon the public lands acquired prior to the passage of this act by treaty or agreement from the various Indian tribes, who have or who shall hereafter reside upon the tract entered in good faith for the period required by existing law, shall be entitled to a patent for the land so entered upon the payment to the local land officers of the usual and customary fees, and no other or further charge of any kind whatsoever shall be required from such settler to entitle him to a patent for the land covered by his entry: *Provided*, That the right to commute any such entry and pay for said lands in the option of any such settler, and in the time and at the prices now fixed by existing laws, shall remain in full force and effect: *Provided, however*, That all sums of money so released, which if not released would belong to any Indian tribe, shall be paid to such Indian tribe by the United States.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the amendment as now modified by the Senator from South Dakota takes away from this proposition, I think, practically any point of order that I can make against it.

Therefore the point of order was not made, or rather it was withdrawn by the Senator from Iowa, and then he proceeded to argue against the desirability of placing it upon the bill. But after mature discussion the amendment was adopted. It seems to me the amendment offered two years ago was much more objectionable in form than the one that I have offered now, and it does not appear to me that this amendment can be subject to the point of order raised by the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order. Has the Senator finished his remarks?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not know that I care to discuss the question further. Of course, if the Chair sustains the point of order, it is not open to discussion.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator if this amendment has not been placed upon two Indian appropriation bills before?

Mr. PETTIGREW. It has been upon Indian appropriation bills and passed the Senate upon Indian appropriation bills.

Mr. ALLEN. On two different occasions.

Mr. PETTIGREW. And here is what the Senator from Iowa said about it:

I think a point of order does not lie against the amendment as it has been now modified by the Senator from South Dakota, and therefore I do not make it. But I would make it, of course, if it did lie.

The Senator from Iowa conceded that the point of order would not lie against the amendment. The Chair, it appears, differs with the Senator from Iowa, and as they both have had very long experience I will leave it to the next occupant of the chair to establish the precedent for the Senate upon this subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I understood that he did.

Mr. ALLEN. On what ground?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That it is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Before the Chair makes a ruling, I should like to put on record an observation or two upon this matter for whatever benefit it may be in the future. The rule of law known as *stare decisis* is as applicable to parliamentary law as it is to the decisions of courts. That rule means that the law of the case as announced, whether it is right or wrong, is controlling in that particular instance. Now, in invoking that rule in aid of this amendment I want to observe that to my certain knowledge this amendment has been upon two appropriation bills heretofore.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Not this precise amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. This precise amendment in substance. I do not know that there was any change in the language even.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If the Senator will permit me, there is a provision in this amendment that if any deficiency shall arise in the payment to the agricultural colleges—

Mr. PETTIGREW. That is not in the amendment, I will inform the Senator. I struck that part out when I offered it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That is in the amendment as the Senator proposed it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. But not as I offered it.

Mr. ALLEN. Then if that is not in the proposed amendment it is the precise amendment that has been upon the Indian appropriation bill in the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Congresses. My observation has been heretofore that it is very difficult to tell what the rules of the Senate are in the light of the rulings that are made from time to time. It is not difficult to read the rules. It is not difficult to determine what they mean according to the ordinary interpretation of the English language. But it is difficult, Mr. President, to tell exactly what the Chair will hold them to be.

I recall distinctly on an occasion having the question before the Senate as to whether a proposed amendment was general legislation or not, and a temporary occupant of the chair held that the amendment was general legislation and was within the inhibition of the rule. On five different occasions before that, to my certain knowledge, the same thing in substance had been held by different occupants of the chair not to be general legislation. So the precedents, if we have any, seem to have no value unless the rule of *stare decisis* is applied here as it is applied in the courts, and as I understand from Mr. Cushing's work to be the proper rule to be recognized by parliamentary bodies.

Now, no man ought to stumble upon the distinction between general and special legislation. It is as marked and distinct as the difference between daylight and darkness. There can be no division of opinion, for the courts have held—and I suppose they are the final judges of these things—that that legislation is general which applies to a general class or a general condition. A law that is universal, or practically so, or reaches an entire class of individuals or interests, is general legislation. Legislation which refers to a specific subject, which is of a local character and not general, is private or specific legislation.

There is not room to discuss the question one way or the other. I suppose it is scarcely within the natural range of discussion of this measure to submit any observations respecting its merits. But, Mr. President, this is a place to talk plainly. It is a place where a man ought to speak his sentiments. It is a place where the people ought to be informed of the condition of measures that are brought before Congress and the reasons why they are before Congress for its consideration.

There is no more meritorious measure in the United States than this free-homes measure, as it is known. The people who occupy these different reservations that have been opened to the settlement of the whites have undergone all the privations of pioneer life, of which many a man in this Chamber knows absolutely nothing. They have taken these lands, it is true, under a contract to pay a given sum. They have been the pioneers of civilization. They have encountered drought after drought and difficulty after difficulty, until the few hundred dollars they took with them have been expended and are gone. Now they find themselves absolutely unable to comply with the contracts they made with the Government.

Is it not good policy under such circumstances that these people shall be permitted to remain on those reservations and keep them open until such time as the natural increase of the rainfall makes them productive, as it will, we are told by scientific men and close observers, in the course of time? Is it not good policy to permit them to remain there and give them these lands for the benefit they may do the country by opening up and holding the reservations open to settlement?

I understand, of course, that there are certain States in the Union where it is said there are no public lands, and because they have no public lands they want no other State in the Union to have public lands.

Now, Mr. President, there is no reason in that. That is the

argument of prejudice. It is the argument of selfishness. The people who have opened up those new States to settlement and who have blazed the way to civilization there have undergone privations of which the settlers in the Eastern and older States know but little; and all these privations speak loudly in behalf of a just and a humane policy to the settlers upon those lands. They can not pay this sum of money. It is impossible to expect it if conditions continue as they are in many instances. What is to be done under those circumstances? Are they to be turned out of the homes they occupy and that they built? Are all their improvements to become worthless and forfeited to the Government? Are they not to be taken into consideration at all?

This rule, Mr. President, has been invoked to do more injustice in this Chamber than all the other rules combined. Whenever a Senator finds himself arrayed against a proposed amendment he raises the question of its being objectionable under Rule XVI, and of course if he has the power behind him the objection is sustained, and if he has not it is overruled.

I want to submit, Mr. President, in all candor, in all fairness, that these things ought to be determined with judicial accuracy. It ought not to be left to the caprice of the occupant of the chair, whoever he may be. There ought to be a beaten pathway. There ought to be precedents that will be binding upon the conscience and the judgment of the occupant of the chair, and they should be as exact as a judicial decision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is in the Senate and still open to amendment.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA.

Mr. CARTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes. I will change that, on suggestion, to a request for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3419. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CARTER. I understand the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] was temporarily laid aside, and pending the arrival of Senators interested in that amendment I will present several formal amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana submits an amendment which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 329, section 755, after the word "States," in line 3, insert: "or has declared his intention to become such;" in the same line amend by inserting after the word "and" the words: "is a resident."

Mr. STEWART. What amendment is that?

Mr. CARTER. The amendment relates to section 755 and concerns the qualifications of persons admitted to practice law in the district of Alaska. As the section now reads only citizens of the United States could be admitted to the bar. The purpose of the amendment is to likewise admit persons who have declared their intention to become such.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In what section?

Mr. CARTER. Section 755, page 329.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let the amendment be read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The amendment will be again read.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Let the section be read as it would read if amended.

The SECRETARY. If amended, the section would read:

First. That he is a citizen of the United States or has declared his intention to become such and is a resident of said district and of the age of 21 years, which proof may be made by his own affidavit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARTER. I offer the following amendment, to be inserted on page 330 in lieu of section 758.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. What became of the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH]? I thought that amendment was pending.

Mr. CARTER. That was temporarily laid aside, and at my suggestion, pending the arrival of Senators who are interested in that amendment, these formal amendments are being presented.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That amendment is still pending?

Mr. CARTER. It is still pending.

Mr. BATE. Yes, it is still pending.

Mr. STEWART. I propose to call attention to that amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Let the amendment I have now proposed be read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out section 758, on page 330, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Whenever an applicant for admission as an attorney shall present to the district court a certificate showing him to have been duly admitted to practice as an attorney in the highest courts of any State or Territory of the United States, or in one of the circuit courts, or the Supreme Court of the United States, such applicant may be admitted to practice as an attorney without further examination.

Mr. BATE. Let the section be read that it is proposed to substitute.

Mr. CARTER. The section would read just as the amendment reads. The motion is to strike out the section and insert what has been read. The purpose is to permit—

Mr. BATE. That is what I say; but let us see what the original is, to see which is preferable. That is the point.

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The section proposed to be stricken out will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out section 758, in the following words:

Whenever it appears that a person of any State or Territory is an attorney of the highest court of record in such State or Territory, he may appear as counsel for a party in a particular action, suit, or proceeding then pending in court, or before a judicial officer of the district, but not otherwise.

Mr. BATE. Now let the amendment to the section be read.

The SECRETARY. The section if amended will read as follows:

SEC. 758. Whenever an applicant for admission as an attorney shall present to the district court a certificate showing him to have been duly admitted to practice as an attorney in the highest court of any State or Territory of the United States, or in one of the circuit courts, or the Supreme Court of the United States, such applicant may be admitted to practice as an attorney without further examination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARTER. In the amendment heretofore offered, on page 23 of the bill, at the end of section 26, I propose, after the second proviso, immediately after the word "shall" where it first appears, to insert what I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, section 26, line 14, after the word "shall" where it first appears in the proviso, it is proposed to insert "be subject to such general rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may from time to time prescribe, and shall."

Mr. STEWART. That amendment, I hope, will be reserved until after the argument on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH].

Mr. BATE. How will the section read as proposed to be amended?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The section will be read as proposed to be amended.

The SECRETARY. As proposed to be amended, it will read:

Provided further, That the rules and regulations established by miners shall be subject to such general rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may from time to time prescribe, and shall not be in conflict with the mining laws of the United States, etc.

Mr. STEWART. Before that amendment is considered I have some suggestions to make that will be appropriate in discussing the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota. Let that come up first.

Mr. BATE. That, I understand, is altogether a new amendment.

Mr. CARTER. This is presented for the purpose of perfecting the amendment as it now stands.

Mr. STEWART. I have an amendment to the amendment to offer.

Mr. CARTER. I will withdraw the amendment for the time being to accommodate the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. STEWART. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] is the amendment now pending, as I understand.

Mr. CARTER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota is the amendment now pending.

Mr. STEWART. I ask that that amendment may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of section 73, on page 469, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 73. That persons who are not citizens of the United States, or who prior to making location had not legally declared their intention to become such, shall not be permitted to locate, hold, or convey mining claims in said district of Alaska, nor shall any title to a mining claim acquired by location or purchase through any such person or persons be legal. In any civil action, suit, or proceeding to recover the possession of a mining claim, or for the appointment of a receiver, or for an injunction to restrain the working and operation of a mining claim, it shall be the duty of the court to inquire into and determine the question of the citizenship of the locator: *Provided*, That no location of a mining claim shall hereafter be made in the district of Alaska

by any person or persons through an agent or attorney in fact, and all locations heretofore made by any person or persons through an agent or attorney in fact upon which \$100 worth of labor or improvements had not been expended or made within ninety days first succeeding the date of such location are hereby declared to be null and void.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, when this amendment was first proposed and I made some remarks upon the liberal treatment extended to miners by the English Government and our own Government, I was met with the assertion that the laws of Canada and of British Columbia were extremely brutal; that they did not allow American miners to work the gold mines of that country. I was very much surprised at this statement; and I wish there were a full Senate, that I might correct the false impression that has undoubtedly gone out from the assertions that were then made. I do not like to suggest the want of a quorum, but I should like to have the Senate know what the Canadian laws are. I have them here, and I think before we proceed or undertake retaliatory measures we ought to know how we are treated by them.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the roll will be called.

The Secretary called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names.

Aldrich,	Daniel,	Kenney,	Quarles,
Allen,	Foraker,	McBride,	Ross,
Allison,	Foster,	McComas,	Shoup,
Bacon,	Frye,	McMillan,	Simon,
Bard,	Gallinger,	Martin,	Stewart,
Bate,	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	Teller,
Berry,	Harris,	Penrose,	Thurston,
Carter,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Turley,
Clay,	Heitfeld,	Pettus,	Vest,
Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Platt, Conn.	Warren,
Culberson,	Jones, Nev.	Platt, N. Y.	Walcott,
Cullom,	Kean,	Proctor,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Nevada will proceed.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I regard the facts as to the mining laws of Canada and British Columbia as very important. Inasmuch as there has been so much said which might be regarded by our neighbors as abusive and unjust, and which might lead to retaliation on their part, I think it is well that we should understand exactly what they have done. I have looked up all the mining laws of Canada and British Columbia and have made a synopsis of them. That synopsis is here, and if any Senator wishes to read it at length, he may do so. The "Laws of Canada, 1898," English edition, under the head of "Orders in Council," etc., page 20, are as follows:

REGULATIONS GOVERNING PLACER MINING IN THE YUKON, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

Title interpretation.—"Free miner" shall mean a male or female over the age of 18 or under that age, or joint stock company, named in and lawfully possessed of a valid existing free miner's certificate and no other."

Page XL of same volume—

"Free miners and their privileges."—1. Every person, but not under 18 years of age, shall be entitled to all the rights and privileges of a free miner * * * and shall be considered a free miner upon taking out a free miner's certificate. * * *

2. A free miner's certificate may be granted for one year * * * upon the payment therefor of the sum of \$10.

That is, Canadians and Americans were treated exactly alike.

At Page L of the above volume, regulations concerning quartz-mining claims, part 1, "every person over the age of 18 shall be considered a free miner. A free miner's certificate runs for one year."

Royalty to be paid: At Page XLIV, section 30, of above volume, a royalty of 10 per cent of the gross product from any placer mine is exacted, but this royalty is not to be applied where the amount of gold taken out of any single claim is less than \$5,000 in any single year.

NOTE.—Formerly the amount of exemption was \$2,500, but this was changed by order in council of March 30, 1899. (See Statutes of Canada, English edition, 1899, Page LXVII.)

There is no royalty exacted from quartz miners, and there is no alien law as applied to such claims.

BRITISH COLUMBIA MINING LAWS.

In January, 1899, a law was passed by British Columbia confining the issuing of miners' licenses for placer mining to British subjects. This act applied only to claims located after February 3, 1899, the date when the news of the change from free mining reached Atlin, British Columbia. Previous to this free mining for both quartz and placer was allowed. There is a 1 per cent royalty on gross output in certain classes of mines in British Columbia in lieu of the ordinary property tax. Quartz mining is free to all persons in British Columbia. (See Engineering and Mining Journal, volume 67, at pages 107, 123.)

The Atlin district is just over the line in British Columbia. Dawson and all that region where mining has been carried on is in what they call the Yukon territory. Foreigners and citizens are treated alike. This law of British Columbia did take in the Atlin district, but that district turned out not to amount to much, and very little mining is pursued there. I do not know about the administration of the law, but so far as the law itself is concerned in the Yukon district, it is the same for foreigners as for natives; and it was the same for foreigners and natives in British Columbia and all over Canada until 1899.

As to placer claims in Canada, the law was changed in 1899, but it did not take effect until news reached Atlin that this mining

district had been established. That was a very unfortunate law, because it did them very little good and broke a rule which had prevailed very long. As to quartz mining, however, which is the main thing in which our people are interested, there is nothing required but a miners' license to be taken out once a year, of \$10 or \$5; I think not over ten. That applies to all of them alike.

So there is no hostile legislation whatever except the act of 1899, which applies to British Columbia alone, and does not reach the Yukon region. Under the Canadian statutes and the statutes of British Columbia, so far as our country is concerned, we have had practically free mining, and foreigners have located there from time immemorial, although the statutes of 1872 of the United States provide that mineral lands shall be only open to exploration and development by citizens of the United States and those who have declared their intention to become such; but that in practical operation has had no particular value on account of the decisions of the courts upon that subject. There has been free mining to foreigners as well as to natives. The Supreme Court holds that if an alien locates nobody can take advantage of that but the Government; that his title is good if the Government does not interfere. I have here the case—perhaps the most recent case, in 152 United States Supreme Court Reports, decided in 1893, on page 595—the case of Manuel vs. Wulff. The syllabus of the case is as follows:

A deed of a mining claim by a qualified locator to an alien operates as a transfer of the claim to the grantee, subject to question in regard to his citizenship by the Government only.

If, in a contest concerning a mining claim, under Revised Statutes, section 2320, one party, who is an alien at the outset, becomes a citizen during the proceedings and before judgment, his disability under Revised Statutes, section 2319, to take title is thereby removed.

Under the decision of the court nobody can take advantage of this disability but the Government, and people have been selling there and people have been buying. The law is well settled, and we have pursued a very liberal policy, which has been reciprocated by our Canadian neighbors so far as their legislation is concerned. There is a very large amount of property now held by American citizens in British Columbia in gold and silver mines. Vast interests are involved in this, and hostile legislation will only make more friction and accomplish no good result. But, as has been stated here—

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the size of a placer claim in Canada is 250 feet on the creek line, as I understand it, and the same locator is entitled also to 250 feet on what is known there as a hill claim. On our side of the line placer claims are 1,320 feet in length; at any rate, they are 20 acres, as fixed in the statutes. There is a difference in that respect between the laws of Canada and the laws of the United States.

Mr. STEWART. That does not relate to citizenship or to aliens.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Certainly not. Just one other word, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The American miner who goes to Canada and who works in the mines must pay a royalty, whilst Canadian miners pay no royalty on this side.

Mr. STEWART. They all pay the same. After they have taken out \$5,000 in a placer claim, all pay 10 per cent.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Not on our side.

Mr. STEWART. On their side.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I admit that.

Mr. STEWART. I say the only discrimination between natives and foreigners in all the Canadian and British Columbia legislation consists in the act of 1899 of British Columbia, which is confined to British Columbia, where they prohibit foreigners from locating placer claims to go into effect after notice is given in the locality. Otherwise, up to that time, their laws treated their own citizens and foreigners precisely the same.

There has been much said about the Laplanders as an excuse for this violent legislation against foreigners. I find that that is not sustained by the facts. I will ask the Secretary to read a portion of the pamphlet which I send to the desk.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Before the Senator passes from that—

Mr. STEWART. I have not passed from that, and I will not pass from that for half an hour.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I say before the Senator passes from the particular phase of the subject which he has been discussing, I desire to call his attention to a decision of the court from which he read a while ago, in the case of Manuel vs. Wulff. As I understand it, in that case the locators in the mines in controversy were American citizens.

Mr. STEWART. Oh, well, we will deal with that. I want to have read from the report of Sheldon Jackson, LL. D., general agent of education in Alaska, in regard to these Lapps and their wonderful wickedness. I ask the Secretary to read what I have marked, commencing on page 46.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

NATURALIZATION OF THE LAPPS.

As an evidence of the purpose of the Norwegians and Lapps recently brought over from Lapland to become permanent citizens, the following persons have taken out their first naturalization papers: Magnusi Kjeldsberg, Johan Eira, Wilhelm Basi, Lauritz Stephansen, Johan Hilmar Hansen, Karl Johan Sacariassen, Ole M. Rapp, Alfred Hermansen, Ole Olsen Bar, Jeremias Abrahamsen, Isak Johannessen Hatla, Isak Salamonsen Nakkila, Per Andersen, Samuel Johannessen Balto, Nils Persen Sara, Nils Klemetsen, Lauritz Larsen, Otto M. Leinan, Hans Samuelsen, Ole G. Berg, Thoralf Kjeldberg, Peder Berg, Ole Johansen Stenfeld, Karl Ove Suhr, Japeth Lindeberg, Ole Krogh, and Johan Petter Stalorgo.

The Lapps are well satisfied with their new home, and promise to make a very valuable and important addition to the population of Alaska and the development of its resources.

In my estimation, next to the discovery of gold, the most important event, commercially, in the history of Alaska during this year is the importation of this colony of Lapps. Experience is rapidly demonstrating that the only possible efficient transportation service in Alaska must be through the use of reindeer, and this necessitates the trained and expert drivers of reindeer found among the civilized Lapps and Finns. The 68 men that were brought over by this expedition are all picked men and expect to be permanent settlers of Alaska. They hope ultimately to have herds of their own and raise and train reindeer to sell to the transportation companies. Their success will naturally attract others of their people and render permanent the establishment of the reindeer industry in Alaska.

In this connection I make acknowledgments of the assistance rendered in the movement of the Lapps and reindeer by Brig. Gen. Henry C. Merriam, U. S. A., commanding the Department of the Columbia; also to Capt. W. W. Robinson, jr., U. S. A., at Seattle; Capt. B. Eldridge, U. S. A.; Capt. D. L. Brainard, U. S. A.; Capt. William R. Abercrombie, U. S. A.; Lieut. W. S. Graves, U. S. A., and especially to my associate, Capt. D. B. Devore, U. S. A., who shared with me in the perplexities, difficulties, and hardships encountered in Lapland.

Mr. STEWART. I will say to the Senator that I will furnish him some further authorities on this point if he desires them. I have sent for the books. But I will go on with my remarks. I ask the Secretary, in regard to the history of this matter, to read an affidavit of Dr. Kittilsen, the recorder.

The Secretary read as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, city of Washington, ss:

Albert N. Kittilsen, M. D., being first duly sworn, on oath says, that he is a citizen of the United States, and has been a resident of the Territory of Alaska since 1896; that he arrived at Cape Nome, Alaska, about October, 1898; that prior to that time there were three men located at Cape Nome; two of them were Swedes by birth, but had been in the United States some ten or fifteen years; the third was a Norwegian. Two other persons went there with me—one of them a Laplander and one an American citizen. The Laplander had declared his intention to become an American citizen in the early spring of that year, and his declaration was filed before L. B. Shepherd, who was a United States commissioner at St. Michaels.

The six persons who were then at Cape Nome located claims; some of them had located previous to our arrival. We then formed a mining district and adopted rules and regulations under the laws of the United States. I was elected recorder. A few weeks after that miners from the surrounding country commenced coming in, and during the following winter the number rose to between two hundred and three hundred. I recorded all their claims, and in every sense was recognized and acted as mining recorder. The first Laplander located three good claims; one for himself, one for his brother, and one for an associate, who arrived soon after and took possession and worked the claims. These Laplanders worked their claims during the working season of 1899 and sold out to Mr. Lane in the fall of 1899. One Norwegian located claims on about six different streams and has been in possession of them ever since. The claims of these Laplanders, while they were in possession and working them, were relocated by other persons called "jumpers." Later on the claims of the Norwegian were relocated by "jumpers" and recorded by me, because it was my duty to record all claims presented for recordation. I was so instructed by the judge of the district court.

In the summer of 1899 three lawyers located themselves at Cape Nome whose names were Hubbard, Beeman, and Hume. These relocators, although they did not take possession or work upon the claims they relocated or "jumped," employed Hubbard, Beeman & Hume as their attorneys. Mr. Hubbard, of the firm of Hubbard, Beeman & Hume, an attorney for the relocators, is in the city of Washington. I met him on the 5th of this month in the committee room of Senator HANSBROUGH.

I have no interest whatever in any of the "jumped" or relocated claims, either as original locator or as a relocater, and no private interest that would be affected by any of the proposed legislation.

A. N. KITTILSEN, M. D.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 6th day of April, 1900, at Washington, D. C.

[SEAL]

ELKANAH N. WATERS,
Notary Public.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Kittilsen was elected recorder by the first six. There were very few there. He was one of them. That is usual in going into a mining district. If the rules and regulations are unsatisfactory, when the rush comes they are changed. The fact that they recognized him is a thorough confirmation of his title, and it is what occurs usually in mining regions. The few who get there first make the rules, and if when the others come the rules are not satisfactory, they have a miners' meeting and revise them. No revision was made at all. He continued to record them, and every man who came there to get his claim recorded added to the custom. He has been recorder up to the present time. Consequently he has the best means of knowing exactly what occurred.

Now, it will be observed that this amendment absolutely forfeits the claims which Mr. Lane bought to the persons who relocated them. The one Laplander who happened to be a foreigner intended to become a citizen. He made every effort to become a citizen. He went there to reside. He went before the commis-

sioner. He supposed that was sufficient. He did it in good faith. The remainder were citizens so far as we know. One of the Norwegians had failed to declare his intention to become a citizen. These claims were relocated after Mr. Lane had bought them. The Laplanders had only a few claims, because there are only a few good claims in any district. They are claims which he bought at a high price. This is no attempt to swindle anybody. They were the pioneers. They were there first and had a right to it. They were subsequently located. The subsequent location, of course, would not stand a minute in court or before a jury, under decisions of the courts; but if this amendment is adopted these claims are transferred from the purchasers, from those who located them, from those who have invested a large amount of money in them, to men who have done nothing. They simply located them and appointed attorneys, and one of their attorneys is here in the Capitol visiting committee rooms. The affidavit so states as to one of the attorneys for these men who jumped the claims; and if they can succeed, of course they will make a very large amount of money.

Now, the question comes right down to this: Is the Senate to legislate one man's property into the hands of another? Mr. Lane is perfectly satisfied with his title in the courts. There is no doubt about that. He asks no assistance from anybody. He is in good faith; but if you nullify his title, the title of those who have located since, and have not done a day's work upon the claims, becomes good. That is what we are liable to do in a case like this, without understanding the facts. I did not anticipate that there was anything so grossly unjust in this, and of course the Senator from North Dakota would not know anything about it; none of us would have known anything about it. We take representations from far off, but unless we exercise great care in changing the laws we are liable to do great injustice.

Mr. BATE. Do I understand the Senator from Nevada to say that the owner of this property, Mr. Lane, is satisfied with the law as it now stands?

Mr. STEWART. Entirely.

Mr. BATE. What would be the situation, then, in case the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota should pass?

Mr. STEWART. He would lose his title.

Mr. BATE. How much is there involved?

Mr. STEWART. Oh, he is involved very largely.

Mr. BATE. Do I understand further that he purchased the claim from a Lapp who thought he had taken the necessary steps to become a citizen, but in point of fact had not?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; one of the best claims.

Mr. BATE. I wish the Senator would explain how it is that Mr. Lane should be content with the law as it is.

Mr. STEWART. Nobody can take advantage of that but the Government, and he does not fear that the Government will confiscate his claim. Then, if the Government should hold that he is not entitled to hold it under that title, he himself could locate it if he had a fair chance.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator from Nevada know how much Mr. Lane paid for these claims?

Mr. STEWART. I have a letter from Mrs. Lane to show the investment there.

Mr. BATE. Read it as a part of your speech, unless it is private.

Mr. STEWART. No, sir; it is not private.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 6, 1900.

MY DEAR SIR: I desire to make a statement to you as to the amount of money invested by my husband, C. D. Lane, in the purchase and working of mining claims and general development of Alaska.

The amount expended in the purchase of mining claims is something over \$300,000. He has already purchased a pumping plant to be used in supplying water to the miners in the vicinity of Cape Nome owning claims on which there is no natural water supply. In the purchase of this necessary pumping plant and the pipe lines and ditches connected therewith he has already and will have expended within the next season \$400,000. The materials necessary for the construction and operation of about 5 miles of railroad have also been purchased, and this railroad will be constructed during the coming season at an expense of about \$60,000.

I send you this communication in order that you may know what Mr. Lane has already done and what he contemplates doing, not only for himself, but also for the general development of the Cape Nome mining region, as the railroad and pumping plant are an absolute necessity for the proper development of the mining claims in that region.

Yours, very truly,

(Mrs.) C. D. LANE.

HON. WILLIAM M. STEWART,
United States Senate.

Mr. BATE. Do I understand that Mr. Lane gets any advantage by virtue of having possession of the property now? I am not familiar with the mining laws. I desire to know whether he has any advantage by virtue of holding that property for years past? Will he have an advantage in perfecting his title over any other person?

Mr. STEWART. He has the advantage of guaranteed possession. Nobody can take possession from him; not the United States.

Mr. BATE. But suppose the amendment passes; then what?

Mr. STEWART. Then the other man will be the prior locator.

Mr. BATE. Mr. Lane loses his property?

Mr. STEWART. He loses his property absolutely.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the letter which he has just read—it is a delicate thing to criticise a letter written by a lady—states in a general way that Mr. Lane has expended about \$300,000 in Alaska. The Senator from Nevada does not desire the Senate to understand that Mr. Lane has expended \$300,000 on these alien claims?

Mr. STEWART. There are no alien claims.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I claim that there are.

Mr. STEWART. I claim there are not.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. There are a great many of them.

Mr. STEWART. There are not. He bought no alien claims. One or two of the very best claims—one, I believe—were located by a Laplander, who came to this country and desired to become a citizen, but he was advised by those who brought him out there that he could file his declaration when he got to St. Michaels before a commissioner of the United States there. All hands thought he had a right to, and that was long before he made any location. The United States, under those circumstances, would never take this advantage. He acted in good faith. If it intends to do justice the United States will ratify that declaration and make it effective. It will cure that by an act of legislation, because it was done in good faith. It was six months before this discovery that he made the declaration of his intention to become a citizen. All of his comrades who went out with him became citizens. Not one went back. They are all working in different capacities in that country, because it is to them a congenial climate like that in which they were reared, and they like the country.

Mr. BATE. May I ask one question in this connection? Do I understand the Senator from Nevada to say that the man who located one of the most valuable claims had taken steps, six months before the discovery, to become a citizen?

Mr. STEWART. Six months before.

Mr. BATE. And he is the one who located this claim?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; it was six months before.

Mr. BATE. Before it was found?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir; that is the man. It was six months before. He supposed he was an American and that he had a right to locate when he went into that country, where he is now residing. The Laplanders and Swedes were accustomed to the climate and could go where the others would not go, and they made these discoveries; and all of them were citizens, or declared their intention of becoming citizens, before they went there. This man supposed he had; and it would be unjust to take the best claim and give it to a man who relocated it and then employed a lawyer in Washington. He never did any work upon it and never had possession.

Mr. TELLER. What was done in the way of location?

Mr. STEWART. Nothing.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to say to the Senator, as he no doubt is aware, that the courts of the United States have repeatedly declared that when a piece of land is in possession of a miner nobody can invade that possession and get title. These people who filed their claims got no title. If the Laplanders have not got any title, the court will say so when the matter gets into court. That is the place to leave it. We have no business to take it away from them, in my judgment.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator from Colorado will allow me to interrupt him, I will state that the object of this amendment is not to legislate for the future. It is to legislate in the interest of those who have jumped these claims.

Mr. BATE. Have it read.

Mr. NELSON. That is what it is.

Mr. TELLER. To legislate in the interest of them?

Mr. NELSON. Yes; to enable them to go into the country and get a standing in court, which they would not otherwise have.

Mr. TELLER. If they have any claim there, they have a standing in court. We do not want to give them a claim by legislation which they have not now, do we?

Mr. NELSON. No.

Mr. TELLER. The amendment may mean that; I presume it does. I think it is safe for us to leave this thing alone and let the courts settle it. The courts have said that when a man, being a foreigner, went on the public grounds, nobody but the Government could raise that question. They will be allowed to stay there, and these people who went up there in good faith and thought they were citizens, tried to be citizens, ought not to be interfered with.

Mr. BATE. But this very amendment, as I understand it, proposes to interfere with that.

Mr. TELLER. That is where the trouble seems to be. The amendment seems to take it away from the courts and to attempt to settle it here.

Mr. BATE. I read it as the Senator from Minnesota reads it.

Mr. TELLER. That is what it intends.

Mr. BATE. It is intended to disturb existing law, and it carries with it these evils.

Mr. TELLER. We do not want to settle that question. Let the court settle it.

Mr. ALLEN. If these Laplanders entered the mining claims in good faith, complied with the law on the supposition that they were citizens, or at least in a legal attitude that would authorize them to make the entry, and sold the claims in good faith, and afterwards it was demonstrated that they were not qualified to make the entry, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether it does not present a case for legislation rather than for the courts?

Mr. TELLER. What does the Senator propose—to confirm their title?

Mr. DANIEL. This would destroy that.

Mr. TELLER. This would destroy their title, as I understand. Their title is all right if we let it alone.

Mr. ALLEN. I have not read the amendment. I supposed it was broad enough to cover that.

Mr. TELLER. Their title is all right if we do not pass any legislation on the subject. If we leave them alone where they are, the courts will take care of their title, unless the Attorney-General institutes a suit, which he is not likely to do.

Mr. ALLEN. Is there any question about the good faith of those who entered these mining claims, and is there any question about the good faith of the purchasers from the Laplanders?

Mr. DANIEL. Not a suggestion.

Mr. TELLER. I know absolutely nothing on that point, and I can not answer the question; but I have the feeling which a man gets who has lived in a mining camp for pretty nearly forty years. That is, that the men who make the first location, who are the first discoverers, are the men who are to be taken care of and protected; and in our country we do not care very much whether a man is a citizen or whether he is not. We all approve of that rule of the court which says "we will not hear any citizen complain of that, but if there is any complaint it must come from the Government."

If these people are let alone, the court will hold that they had good title and that they had a right to transfer the title; that is, if they complied with all the conditions of the law, of course.

Mr. ALLEN. How did the Laplanders happen to be in that country?

Mr. TELLER. They went there in the interest of the Government to take care of the reindeer, in the first place. After their term of service to the Government had expired they turned out to be farmers and stock raisers and almost everything. Some of them have gone to raising deer and others to mining.

Mr. ALLEN. Was there any understanding when they went there that they were to become permanent residents?

Mr. TELLER. That was the understanding I had at the time. They agreed to stay with the Government for a certain time and then they had a right to quit. I will say I was consulted about it. I was very anxious to get some of that class of people in there, because I believed they would make the country worth something to the people of the United States. They are adapted to that climate; Mr. Jackson took great pains to get them there, and they have been very satisfactory, I believe. If they did not make themselves citizens when they tried to, it does not make any difference so far as their right to hold this property is concerned. They have a right to hold it if they are not citizens.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, it seems to me that the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota is inequitable. Its sting is found in these words:

Nor shall any title to a mining claim acquired by location or purchase through any such person or persons be legal.

The "persons" referred to being those who are not citizens of the United States. We have had a memorandum laid before us from certain American citizens who acquired mining claims from certain Laplanders who had gone into Alaska for the purpose of aiding the United States in its reindeer service, and who came with the full intent and purpose of becoming citizens of this country. Many of them did take out their papers legally and properly, and consummated that purpose. Quite a number of them, however, made the appropriate affidavits before a commissioner of the United States, being assured by him, an officer of the United States, and being assured by their friends, that this was all right. Titles have been derived through them, and to step in and destroy those titles in order that benefits afterwards discovered and afterwards accruing may go to new comers, would seem to be inconsistent with a just and an equitable spirit.

In a rude, cold, uncomfortable, little-inhabited region like Alaska, and dealing with persons who have acted in good faith, but who had natural ignorance as to the peculiar technicalities of American law, we ought to deal in no sharp and rigid spirit, but with the utmost regard for the natural principles of right and justice. I will give no opinion upon the question whether in

a court of equity, under the rules of equity jurisprudence, a claim might not be made and supported by those who, under the peculiar circumstances of these well-intentioned Laplanders, obtained these titles. That is not necessary. The rules of equity jurisprudence are for a technical science. They must leave out, by their regularity and uniformity, many cases which possess the strongest appeal to the equity of a legislative body.

Now, with respect to these people, they have excellent credentials. They are highly spoken of, and I will read a brief extract quoted from the report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson on the introduction of domestic reindeer into Alaska, which is found in Senate Document No. 34, Fifty-fifth Congress, third session, which says of them what I will read. He gives the names of 68 Laplanders who were introduced into this country. He speaks of the beneficent service they have rendered, and here is his estimate of the value that they are to that country and to us:

In my estimation—

He says—

next to the discovery of gold, the most important event, commercially, in the history of Alaska during this year is the importation of this colony of Lapps. Experience is rapidly demonstrating that the only possible efficient transportation service in Alaska must be through the use of reindeer, and this necessitates the trained and expert drivers of reindeer found among the civilized Lapps and Finns. The 68 men that were brought over by this expedition are all picked men and expect to be permanent settlers of Alaska.

The people with whom we are at present dealing are those who took every step in good faith unchallenged to execute their preconceived intention of permanent residence in that region, and for a great Government, like ours is, which needs such inhabitants, which has the opportunity to gather them into that region through the methods which have brought these pioneers, to deal with them severely seems not consistent with the just temper of the American people nor with true principles of equity.

I agree with what the honorable Senator from Colorado has said, and he is much more familiar with such topics than I am, that we had better vote down this amendment and leave these questions to settle themselves.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada has referred to the fact that there are some lawyers in Washington City who are striving for the enactment of this amendment into a law. I presume that is true. In fact I know of one gentleman, at least, who is here in that interest, a gentleman by the name of Hubbard. He has been referred to in an affidavit which has been read at the desk, the affidavit of Dr. Kittilsen, who came to my committee room a few days ago with a letter of introduction from the honorable Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and while he was there he met Mr. Hubbard. I think that affidavit referred to him by name, and therefore I think I am justified in having read at this point an affidavit from Mr. Hubbard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The Secretary will read the paper submitted by the Senator from North Dakota.

The Secretary read as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, City of Washington, ss:

Oliver P. Hubbard, being duly sworn, on oath says that he is a citizen of the United States, an attorney at law, engaged in the practice of his profession at Nome City, in the Cape Nome mining district, district of Alaska, United States of America; that he first went to Alaska in the spring of 1898; that he is a member of the law firm of Hubbard, Beeman & Hume, of Nome City, Alaska; that the members of the firm are Edwin R. Beeman, formerly a practicing attorney of Minneapolis, Minn., and William I. Hume, formerly a practicing attorney at Portland, Ore., and this affiant, formerly a practicing attorney at Chicago, Ill.

Affiant says that the firm of Hubbard, Beeman, & Hume are attorneys in a number of mining suits now pending in the United States district court for the District of Alaska; that among others are suits brought to recover the possession of certain mining claims alleged to have been staked by alien Laplanders; that these claims were located by American citizens in the months of November and December, 1898; that all of the alleged Laplander and alien locations were located by American miners in the fall of 1898 and the winter of 1898 and 1899; that among the miners who made such locations were Louis Melsing and John Waterson; that these two miners located claims on Anvil Creek, in said Cape Nome mining district, which, it is alleged, were theretofore located by Laplanders; that, on or about the month of March, 1899, Melsing and Waterson were arrested at Chenik, a point on Golvin Bay, and carried to St. Michael under arrest, the arrest having been made by the military authority, the troops being under command of Lieutenant Spaulding, who was acting under instruction from Capt. E. S. Walker, in command at Fort Get There, at St. Michael; that this arrest was made by reason of the said Melsing and Waterson having made the aforesaid locations on Anvil Creek; that one L. B. Shepherd, formerly United States commissioner at St. Michael, was a party to this arrest; that the two men arrested were carried to St. Michael, a distance of not less than 150 miles, and there detained for three weeks, and were then released, they having in the meantime refused to make transfers of the claims to the Laplanders, as they were pressed to do by the officers having them under arrest; that the facts herein stated are sworn to by the said Waterson and Melsing in a complaint now on file in the United States district court for the district of Alaska, wherein Melsing and Waterson are plaintiffs and E. S. Walker and L. B. Shepherd are defendants, with damages alleged therein at \$25,000; and

This affiant further states that during the month of August, 1899, Judge Johnson, of the United States district court for the district of Alaska, visited Nome City, having with him at the time the clerk of his court and the assistant United States district attorney for said district; that the said district judge remained at Nome City about one week; that during his stay numerous suits were commenced over the disputed mining claims in the Cape Nome mining district; that among this number were suits by Melsing and Waterson against two Laplanders; and

Affiant further says that he is informed that one Charles D. Lane, who came to the Cape Nome mining district in June or July of 1899, asserts that he has bought the aforesaid mining claims from the Laplanders, together with other contested property, and that the said Lane, in person or through his representative, is now in Washington City engaged in an attempt to make the Senate of the United States believe that he is an innocent purchaser of the said mining claims and that the passage of certain laws now pending would result seriously to his injury; and

Affiant further says that the facts connected with the arrest of Waterson and Melsing, as also the bringing of the suits against the Laplanders and against Walker and Shepherd, are well known at Nome City; that the attorneys for the Laplanders are Mr. Lane's attorneys, and that he must have been fully advised of the situation when he made the alleged purchase.

Affiant further says that the said L. B. Shepherd referred to in this affidavit is the same party to whom reference is made in the memorial of Charles D. Lane and the affidavits attached as having attempted to naturalize the Laplanders and other claims.

OLIVER P. HUBBARD.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 6th day of April, 1900, at Washington, D. C.

[SEAL.]

BENJ. VAIL, Notary Public.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The man Shepherd, who is referred to in that affidavit, is the court commissioner in Alaska, located, I believe, at St. Michael. It was this officer who assumed that he had the authority to issue first citizens' papers to the Laplanders and others in that country. The Revised Statutes, I believe, provide that citizens' papers can be taken out only in a court of record before the judge or the clerk of the court. Therefore Mr. Shepherd had no authority whatever to make citizens of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator permit me a question?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. Granting that the statement of the Senator from North Dakota be true—and it is true—that the papers must be taken out in a court or before the clerk—notwithstanding that fact, were these entries by the Laplanders made, as a matter of fact, before the judge or the clerk of the court. Therefore Mr. Shepherd had no authority whatever to make citizens of the United States.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Before which entries, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. ALLEN. Before the entries of Shepherd, or whoever these other parties may be?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I will come to that very shortly.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit—I will not interrupt him unnecessarily. It strikes me that the whole thing can be stated in about ten lines. When were these respective entries made? If they were made by the contestants first, and in good faith, and their claims were sought to be disturbed or jumped, as it is commonly called, by the Laplanders—

Mr. TELLER. It is the other way.

Mr. QUARLES. It is the other way.

Mr. ALLEN. Then the grantee of the Laplanders ought not to be recognized. On the other hand, if the Laplanders made a bona fide entry in the first instance, and their holdings were sold in good faith to some other person, then it becomes, it seems to me, a question of morals and of equity in its broadest sense as to what to do. Were these Lapps used as a mere cat's-paw? Is there any evidence or any contention of that kind, that they entered these lands really for the benefit of somebody else, or were the contestants used as a mere instrument to enter these lands for some other person? What are the facts in the case in those respects?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, I hope I shall reach that phase of the discussion in a very short time, but before I reach it I desire to refer to the gentleman who has made the affidavit which has been read. Mr. Hubbard, as I understand, is a reputable attorney at law, having practiced in Chicago and in Indianapolis. Under the Harrison Administration, I am advised that he was the private secretary to Attorney-General Miller.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator allow me to ask a question?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART. Does Mr. Hubbard deny that he is the attorney for these jumpers?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Not at all. He has the right to be the attorney for anyone.

Mr. STEWART. Does he deny that he wants his lawsuit settled here and not in the courts?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I do not know that he denies that. I do not know that it is necessary for him to deny it.

Mr. STEWART. It is necessary for him to deny it.

Mr. TELLER. He can not very well do it after that affidavit.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Now, I refer at length to Mr. Hubbard for the simple reason that there has been an insinuation here that because he was found in my committee room there is something wrong.

Mr. STEWART. I beg pardon; there is no insinuation against you. The fact that there was a person in charge shows that there was an agent here trying to settle it. Of course you are not presumed to know anything about it. There is no intention to reflect upon you or anybody else. Of course we may come in contact with people who come here for crooked purposes, but it is not presumed that we know it.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. An affidavit has been read at the desk

to the effect that Mr. Hubbard was seen in my committee room, and it was put in a way so as to cast some reflection upon some one. Now, I only want to say that there seems to be a disposition in certain quarters to reflect upon the integrity of those who are interested in this amendment. I find in a newspaper clipping which has been sent to me an interview under date of Seattle, Wash., the 1st of April.

The interview is with one ex-United States Court Commissioner Kenneth M. Jackson. He was a court commissioner, I believe, under President Cleveland. Mr. Jackson, I am advised, is now one of the attorneys of Mr. Lane on the Pacific coast, and is associated with a man by the name of Hatch. I am also advised that Mr. Jackson is a sort of a bird of passage, and that his reputation is exceedingly shady; but I do not care to reflect upon him.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Jackson asks for legislation to help him in a lawsuit.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. If the Senator will allow me to proceed—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Jackson in his interview goes on to say:

I have been informed, from what I consider a reliable source, that Senator HANSBROUGH, of Dakota, who introduced an amendment to the Alaska civil code providing that a judge must inquire into the location of mining claims in Alaska, and if he find that an alien made the location, then he must give the plaintiff a receiver or restraining order immediately, has a personal interest in claims relocated, but first located by individuals whom he calls aliens.

Now, Mr. President, I am not in the habit of denying newspaper reports. In common with many of my brother Senators, I have been very severely criticised in my political career, but here is a direct reflection by one of the attorneys who are engaged in prosecuting the case of Mr. Lane. I simply reply to it by saying that I have no interest in any of these Laplander or alien claims in Alaska, immediate or remote, direct or indirect, contingent or otherwise. That is my answer to that.

Now, Mr. President, I am advised that up to the time these aliens went into the Cape Nome district the rule in Alaska was that the size of a placer claim should be 500 feet up and down the creek or gulch. These people located that rich region about Nome, got together, as the Senator from Nevada stated, five or six of them, and made rules and regulations fixing the size of the claim at 1,320 feet up and down the creek or gulch, or 20 acres apiece. That was the first time that a claim was ever made of that size in Alaska, as I am advised.

Mr. ALLEN. What has been the ordinary size?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Five hundred feet up and down the creek or gulch.

Mr. ALLEN. Who makes this change?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The aliens who went in there and first got hold of those rich diggings.

Mr. STEWART. I beg pardon; there was but one alien. I ask if the man who declared his intention was an alien?

Mr. TELLER. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that 20 acres is the general rule under the United States statutes.

Mr. STEWART. That is the amount designated.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. That is to say, that it shall not be larger.

Mr. TELLER. Not larger than 20 acres, and six men might take out 20 acres together if they saw fit. The courts have settled this question very positively.

Mr. ALLEN. Is not that pretty large?

Mr. STEWART. That is the law.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I understand that thoroughly, and I understand also that six men or thereabouts, most of them aliens, have taken about 2,000 acres in Alaska. Now, what are the facts in this case? In September, 1898, three men by the name of Lindbloom, Lindeberg, and Brynteson staked for themselves four claims. I am told that two of these men were not citizens. They had applied to the court commissioner for their first papers, and I understand that he had issued some sort of writing to them to the effect that they had taken out first papers.

Mr. STEWART. That was true only as to the one.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. It is true as to two of them.

Mr. STEWART. Two declared before the court down below before they got up there.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Then they proceeded, through alleged powers of attorney, to stake from 6 to 10 more claims on Anvil Creek alone, in all taking about 3 or 4 miles along that creek, which is considered to be the richest creek in the region. They then proceeded to Glacier Creek, where they took three claims, one each for themselves, and many others through powers of attorney; and on a gulch, the name of which I have not here now, but a tributary of Glacier Creek, they did the same thing, taking all the ground in the gulch. They did this on several creeks and gulches in that region, so that they claim that they hold from 1,000 to 2,000 acres of placer ground in that section.

Mr. ALLEN. Does the Senator say that only two individuals did all this?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Three.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the Senator reading from, may I ask?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. From some notes that I have made.

Mr. DANIEL. Where is the evidence of that?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I think the evidence that I furnish here is quite as good as the evidence the Senator from Nevada has been furnishing.

Mr. DANIEL. I think so. Will my honorable friend allow me to ask him a question.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. How can the Senate decide rightly a case on mere ex parte affidavits, on loose statements of attorneys, and supersede the courts of law, who can have the parties before them, cross-examine the witnesses, and settle their rights in a legal way? Does not the Senator think that it is a more appropriate method to determine a case like this in the courts of law of the country and not in a body which was not devised for that purpose?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. A portion of the amendment which I offer provides that the question of citizenship shall be considered by the court. If the Senator will examine the amendment—

Mr. DANIEL. It tells the courts how they must decide it after they have considered it. They certainly must consider it and then decide it our way.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, I have stated that this took place in September, 1898.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Of course.

Mr. ALLEN. I wish to know how to vote on this question, and therefore I want to know the facts. I do not care anything about deductions and conclusions. Is it possible under the existing statute for the men you have spoken of to enter 2,000 acres?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am stating what has been related to me and what I believe to be true, and which is not denied.

Mr. ALLEN. I am entirely ignorant on the subject. The Senator thinks that several thousand acres have been entered by these three individuals?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. From one to two thousand acres, I am advised.

Mr. ALLEN. Can they, under the terms of the mining laws, enter that number of acres? Is there any limit?

Mr. CARTER. I will state for the information of the Senator that any individual who is a citizen of the United States, or who has declared his intention to become such, may locate not to exceed 20 acres of placer mining ground in one location. There is no limit to the number of locations that such an individual can make.

Mr. ALLEN. Can he go from town to town, from locality to locality, and enter 20 acres where he sees fit?

Mr. CARTER. He can locate any number of claims he may desire.

Mr. STEWART. I will state in this connection that although the statute does not limit the number of claims that he may locate, the mining rules everywhere confine him to one mining district for one claim, on one creek, on one stream, on one lode. I will get the statute and read it.

Mr. CARTER. We are speaking of the condition which obtained, presumably, from the statement of the Senator from North Dakota, in the Cape Nome country at the time these locations were made; at a time when no miners' rules or regulations existed. In the absence of local rules or regulations the individual who is a citizen, or who has declared his intention to become a citizen, may locate a placer-mining claim embracing not exceeding 20 acres upon making a discovery of gold within the limits of the claim staked out.

Mr. ALLEN. Can he go a mile from that camp and stake out another?

Mr. CARTER. He can stake out 20 acres contiguous.

Mr. TELLER. No.

Mr. CARTER. And continue that indefinitely. There is no restraint in the laws of the United States on that subject.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to correct the Senator from Montana. He can not do it in that way.

Mr. CARTER. He can not patent the two claims together.

Mr. TELLER. Nor can he stake them contiguous, either. This is the law—

Mr. CARTER. I should like to have the Senator from Colorado cite any section of the statute which restrains it.

Mr. TELLER. I do not cite any, but I can show you a ruling of the courts on that subject. Mr. President, this is the law: Any man who discovers a placer claim and finds gold on it may take up 20 acres at that point—say, on one stream. Then he has that with the burden that he has to do certain things; he has to stake

it; he has to work it; he has to put \$100 worth of work on it each year, and he must keep that up until he has put \$500 worth of work on the claim, and then he can get a patent.

Mr. CARTER. There is no obligation on him to take out a patent?

Mr. TELLER. He is not obliged to do it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But he is obliged to do one hundred dollars' worth of work each year.

Mr. TELLER. He may go on doing that for fifty years, if he is content, and not take out a patent.

Mr. ALLEN. What is the limit as to the number of claims?

Mr. TELLER. Under the general law there is no limit. If a man discovers on Glazier Creek a gold-bearing placer claim, he takes a claim; and if he goes over on Mesa Creek, he may take another claim if he discovers a mine there.

Mr. ALLEN. Then the mining law is more liberal than the homestead law.

Mr. TELLER. There is supposed to be some merit in the discovery of a mine, the finding where the gold is located. Then the burden is that the miner shall work the mine each year to a certain extent.

Mr. ALLEN. Should we undertake to settle disputed titles in a bill of this kind?

Mr. TELLER. I do not think we ought to legislate in a case now pending between individuals.

Mr. ALLEN. We are attempting to try the title here?

Mr. TELLER. No; we have never tried to quiet a title which has been pending in court since I have been here.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is entitled to the floor and declines to yield.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing that my friends here who are versed in the law shall argue these questions after I have made a statement of facts, as I believe them to be facts. I have referred to some things that took place in September, 1898. In October of the same year came the Laplanders in the employ of the Government. They went there as herders of reindeer. They were accompanied, as I am advised, by Dr. Kittilsen, a missionary, and Mr. Rice, who, I believe, is a relative of Mr. Lane, who makes this memorial to the Senate.

These Laplanders, who went to Nome with Mr. Rice and Dr. Kittilsen, took about all the claims in that mining district. Dr. Kittilsen was made the recorder of the district. The district, I am told, was about 25 miles square. On one occasion, when miners came in at a later period and voted to reduce the size of the claims, they were intimidated and driven away.

In November, 1898, quite a number of American miners, American citizens, came along dragging their sleds over the snow and ice of that country. The Laplanders had the benefit of reindeer to bring them into the country and to drag their packs into the country, but the American citizen was obliged to drag his sled over the ice and snow by hand, and hence he did not get into the diggings until November, 1898; and when he got there he found all those mines located, the very richest of that district taken by those people, who were not citizens of the United States; and they did, Mr. President, precisely what any gentleman here would do under like circumstances. They proceeded to stake over the alien and to make locations thereon, and having staked over the alien they are contestants there to-day.

Where does Mr. Lane come in? I do not know Mr. Lane, but he has friends here on this floor. I am advised, however, that he is a very wealthy man, and, as is shown by the letter which was read here, he is taking a great deal of machinery into that country, going to build a railroad, and all that kind of business. But Mr. Lane did not get into Alaska in the year 1898. He got there in July, 1899, and he made his alleged purchases of these alien claims about October of that year.

It has been stated here that Mr. Lane spent a very large sum of money for these mining claims. Does any business man believe that he (Mr. Lane)—and he must be a business man because he has acquired great wealth—would pay a large sum of money for mining property over which there was a contest or concerning which there was a controversy in regard to the title? I do not believe that any business man in this body—and I assume there are business men here—would pay a large sum of money for a mining claim that was contested or that had been jumped.

Not only that, Mr. President, but these American citizens who came in and staked over the aliens, proceeding by legal processes, brought suit against the aliens to oust them, and those proceedings were pending at the time Mr. Lane is claimed to have bought and before he was alleged to have purchased this property. Those proceedings were pending in the courts; but when Judge Johnson came on the ground in 1899 he remained at Nome only one week and could not try the case.

Mr. President, I have every reason to believe that the facts I have stated here are correct. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] said in his remarks a little while ago that there had

been no revision of the miners' rules attempted subsequent to the date that the aliens got together and made rules to govern that district. Why, sir, it was a matter of common notoriety, as everybody will tell you who has been to Nome and who was there in 1899, that the miners, the American citizens who went into that country, without reindeer or Government rations to help them in, held meetings and attempted to formulate new rules and regulations.

The American citizens who came there got together and attempted to draft rules and regulations for the governance of that district. What happened? There was a company of United States troops there under the command of Captain Walker and Lieutenant Spaulding, and those officers, with those troops behind them, broke up the meeting and drove the miners out of the building at Nome City at the point of the bayonet.

Mr. STEWART. What evidence have you of that?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. It has been told me by a hundred men. Mr. STEWART. It has been denied by dozens I have talked with.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have never heard it denied until now. Mr. STEWART. I have; but it is immaterial one way or the other.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Very well. Mr. President, that is all I care to say on this question at this time.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator state the size of the claims? Are they 1,300 feet?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The Senator from Colorado asks me the size of these claims. I am advised that they are 1,360 feet up and down the creek or gulch.

Mr. TELLER. How wide are they?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. They are sufficiently wide to make 20 acres. I do not know the exact width.

Mr. TELLER. It is enough to make a 20-acre claim.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Yes; and up to that time the size of placer claims in Alaska had been 500 feet up and down the creek or gulch.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the Senator has such a fashion for calling those men aliens that it seems to me an alien must have injured him at some time. These Norwegians and Laplanders are very good people. I do not think they would hurt the Senator particularly.

Mr. HANSBROUGH rose.

Mr. STEWART. I am not going to say anything unkind about the honorable Senator from North Dakota; but we have got the sworn statement of the recorder, Albert N. Kittilsen, and he is a man whom his neighbors give the highest character.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. STEWART. Oh, yes; but I was just going to make a few remarks about the evidence.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me to correct a matter just now?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to say to the Senate here and now that a great deal of prejudice is sought to be created because these men were Lapps. I want to call attention to the report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson, in which he says:

Of the party that took up claims at the mines I am informed and believe 26 were Norwegians and Finns and but 14 were Lapps.

Mr. STEWART. They took up different portions. There were not that number up there. I now read from the affidavit of Dr. Kittilsen:

Albert N. Kittilsen, M. D., being first duly sworn, on oath says that he is a citizen of the United States, and has been a resident of the Territory of Alaska since 1896; that he arrived at Cape Nome, Alaska, about October, 1898; that prior to that time there were three men located at Cape Nome; two of them were Swedes by birth, but had been in the United States some ten to fifteen years—

These men are called aliens—

the third was a Norwegian. Two other persons went there with me; one of them a Laplander and one an American citizen.

There was only one Laplander.

The Laplander had declared his intention to become an American citizen in the early spring of that year, and his declaration was filed before L. B. Shepherd, who was a United States commissioner at St. Michaels. The six persons who were then at Cape Nome located claims; some of them had located previous to our arrival. We then formed a mining district, and adopted rules and regulations under the laws of the United States. I was elected recorder.

There was only a pretense that one of them was an alien and that one had declared his intention to become a citizen. The other six men who were there were citizens, and there is nothing in this talk about the number of claims located and that we are trying a case that is a case for a court. We are trying a case now of a Laplander's location, whether he, having failed to declare his intention to become a citizen before the proper officer or not, although he did so declare in good faith, shall lose his claim or his grantee shall lose his claim. That is the question.

A few weeks after that miners from the surrounding country commenced coming in, and during the following winter the number rose to between two

hundred and three hundred. I recorded all their claims, and in every sense was recognized and acted as mining recorder. The first Laplander located three good claims—one for himself, one for his brother, and one for an associate, who arrived soon after and took possession and worked the claims. These Laplanders worked their claims during the working season of 1899 and sold out to Mr. Lane in the fall of 1899.

One Norwegian located claims on about six different streams, and has been in possession of them ever since.

They located a claim on each stream. They were allowed to do that, because the policy of the law is to encourage discovery, so that the discoverer might locate another vein, if they were quartz veins, or locate on another creek, if they were placer claims.

The claims of these Laplanders, while they were in possession and working them, were located by other persons called "jumpers."

Later on the claims of the Norwegian were relocated by "jumpers" and recorded by me, because it was my duty to record all claims presented for recordation. I was so instructed by the judge of the district court.

In the summer of 1899 three lawyers located themselves at Cape Nome, whose names were Hubbard, Beeman, and Hume. These relocators, although they did not take possession or work upon the claims they relocated or "jumped," employed Hubbard, Beeman & Hume as their attorneys. Mr. Hubbard, of the firm of Hubbard, Beeman & Hume, an attorney for the relocators, is in the city of Washington. I met him on the 5th of this month in the committee room of Senator HANSBROUGH.

That does not reflect upon the Senator from North Dakota, and I have no intention whatever to reflect upon the Senator. I have here a good many decisions bearing on the question in dispute. I have not time to refer to them; but the supreme court of Utah rendered a decision which I desire to read. I have before me the Pacific Reporter, volume 56, page 300—the case of Wilson et al. vs. Triumph Consolidated Mining Company—in which it is held:

1. Where a mining claim is located by an alien on unappropriated Government land, and all the acts necessary to a valid location are performed by him, and he and his representatives, claiming to be the owners thereof, perform the work necessary to keep the claim good until it is conveyed to a citizen, and no rights of third parties have attached prior to the conveyance, as between private citizens, in which the Government is not interested, the conveyance vests the title in the citizen, although the original locator was an alien.

2. A corporation organized under the laws of Utah is a citizen of the State.

3. Although it is true, as a general rule, that only citizens of the United States can locate mining claims, the question of citizenship can only be raised by the Government; and in an action of ejectment, in a contest between individuals, the question can not arise.

There are other decisions of the same character, which can be had if Senators desire them.

What Mr. Lane asks is to be let alone, not to have his property taken away from him, and not to have it taken by a case tried here on the wild statements which are made in attempting to influence it on the allegation that all the men who went there and located these claims were aliens. These allegations are all denied, and any court before whom the case should be tried would very soon sift them. Mr. Lane does not want any legislation to interfere with his claims, which are undoubtedly good. I have never known a case in the United States, where a contest is pending and where a case is in litigation, that the Senate or the Congress of the United States undertook to decide it against one party and for another.

There is another very harsh thing in the amendment of the Senator. He declares in the amendment that there shall be no locations made hereafter by an attorney or an agent. I do not object to that hereafter, but then the balance of it says that none that are already made shall be valid unless \$100 worth of work shall have been done. They have, under the law, a year in which to do the \$100 worth of work after the location. If the location was a valid one, the locators had a year originally or some fixed reasonable time after that when the work should be done, so that it would not be a confiscation.

Three months after the passage of this act would be a short enough limitation to say that those who had not already done work, when the law did not require it, should have their claims confiscated. There are very likely men who have induced others to go to Alaska and make locations and who have spent large sums of money in sending those men up there. Of course if you deny the right to agents to locate hereafter, that will stop such proceedings. But where that has been done in good faith I do not think we ought with a law like this to destroy the property they have, after they have held it according to the laws and customs which have heretofore existed. If it was located through an agent or attorney they ought to have a reasonable time to do the work hereafter.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Nevada if he holds that a man who is not a citizen of the United States, and who has not declared his intention to become such, is competent to take a mining claim, or a homestead claim, or any other claim under the Government?

Mr. STEWART. No; he is not competent to take a mining claim; but if he gets possession another man can not oust him; it is only the Government of the United States that can take advantage of that. You can not jump his claim. If you want to get him off you must get the Government to interfere. That is in accordance with the decisions of the courts right along, and it is a decent and humane policy. Our laws ought to be at least as

good and as liberal as the laws of Canada; and the laws of Canada and British Columbia up to 1899 made no distinction between aliens and natives.

The only law which was different that they have passed was in 1839, when they prohibited aliens in British Columbia from locating mining claims; and I think it is time they ought to be ashamed of it, and if we should pass a law practically confiscating the property of persons who have gone there in good faith, thinking they were citizens of the United States, and give it to men who had jumped it, I think we should be ashamed of ourselves. But the Senate has never done and will never do anything of that kind.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, this is not a question of whether Mr. Lane is entitled to this property or not. He has bought these claims of some of the Laplanders or foreigners. I am going upon the theory that they are foreigners. I do not care anything about their attempt to make a title.

The statutes of the United States say that citizens of the United States may locate mining claims. The Supreme Court has decided over and over again, as did the court of appeals of the eighth circuit in a case involving at least a half million dollars, that nobody but the United States could raise that question. It has become a rule of property that is absolute.

When the Senator says that Mr. Lane bought with the knowledge that these men were aliens, he bought with the knowledge of what the Supreme Court had said the law was. He had a right to buy. He knew that unless the Attorney-General brought suit nobody in the world could raise that question, and nobody ought to be allowed to raise it except the Government of the United States itself. These men are the prior locators.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. How can the Government of the United States raise the question?

Mr. TELLER. I have no doubt they can.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. But how?

Mr. TELLER. It is an old right which the Senator remembers; the alien would hold until "office found," until it was alleged that he was an alien, and when that question was raised the Government would determine it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I know; but could the United States Attorney-General bring a suit without being authorized by Congress?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know but he could, though I do not now recall any such suit brought.

Mr. STEWART. He has brought a good many suits of a similar character.

Mr. TELLER. Not in regard to citizenship, I think. I do not recall any suit upon the question of citizenship.

Mr. STEWART. But as to the want of title.

Mr. TELLER. Sometimes the Attorney-General has brought suits because title has been got in fraud of the law; but it has never been regarded that an alien could take the benefit of a fraud of the law. The policy of the law was to open this country to settlement; and it has always been presumed for hundreds of years, not only in this country but in others, that the men who took from the earth gold and silver were public benefactors; and privileges have been held out to them, as was the case under the Spanish law and under our law, as a reward for the discovery of a mine containing precious metals.

Every man for many years who has discovered such a claim was entitled to take twice as much out of it as any man who came after him. That was a measure of reward to him; and so the Government of the United States has quietly allowed foreigners to take claims; and the Supreme Court of the United States has, as I have said, repeatedly held that that is not a controversy that can be settled between a citizen and an alien.

These men took up not only these claims, but many others. At least sixty or seventy of these Laplanders were up there, and I am informed, upon what I regard as good authority, that they are the men who opened up that rich country, the men who went in there and found gold; and perhaps it would never have been found if they had not gone there. They have taken these claims under the decisions of the courts, and they have a right to take them, subject to the right of the Government of the United States to take proceedings against them. Is it possible that the Senate of the United States is going to settle a controversy which an affidavit here presented shows is now in court? Are we competent to settle these questions? Shall we determine as to questions of justice between these men?

I have lived in a mining country for nearly forty years, and of all the contemptible creatures who ever saw the light of the sun it is the man who jumps another man's claim. You take the common, honest miner, and he looks to see who is the first man who puts a spade in the ground, who is the first man that uncovered it, who has brought the mineral to light, and who has shown to the world that it is a valuable thing to hold. If you can show to a jury that any man is a jumper, they will decide against him. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred where a claim is jumped it is

done for the purpose of blackmailing the original holder, to see if some defect can be found in his title.

I have an innate prejudice from long experience against the man who attempts to take the holdings of another; and the evidence here from the Senator himself who is advocating this shows that these people went in there; and what did they do? They simply, I suppose, went into the recorder's office and filed a claim on it, as I have known hundreds of men to do for the purpose of instituting a contest and securing a compromise. Yet men come here and ask us to act with the affidavit of this man Hubbard here showing that a suit is now pending to determine this question. Why should we interfere? Why should we make a rule that shall apply to these poor Laplanders that does not apply to everybody else? Why should we change the law of property—we who know nothing about the facts—not affecting Mr. Lane alone, but affecting every man who has taken a piece of property, affecting hundreds of others perhaps who have bought from foreigners, citizens of the United States, who are entitled to the protection of the laws?

Mr. President, this is an unheard of proposition. I never supposed until Saturday that the amendment included any such proposition. I had never read the amendment. I am willing, if the law is not strict enough, that it shall be made more strict with reference to the future and other appropriations of mining lands, but I am not willing to change the law that now exists and disturb the title of nobody knows who or how many people in the United States. The curse of the mining country has been the litigation we have had for many years. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] says to me that it affects the district of Alaska alone. It does not make any difference that it pertains to the district of Alaska alone. If these men have gone in there and done what they ought not to have done, the courts will settle the question.

The courts have been settling such questions for forty years, and there has grown up a class of law with which lawyers who have not practiced in a mining country are unfamiliar; but the court up there will be familiar with it, and the court will do justice between these people. If these people have taken what they are not entitled to take—that is, if they have taken more claims—the court will say, "You have taken too many." If they have taken what the law allows, they are the owners of them, and we can not take them away. We can embarrass them, we can disturb them, we can distress them, and we can destroy them, for that is what it means, although we may not have the legal power to do it. We can create such a condition as will make that property valueless to them. I am speaking not of Mr. Lane—he will take care of himself. I am speaking of the people who are not here in any shape and have not been heard of—the miner, the Laplander who is holding under his supposed citizenship.

Mr. STEWART. And the Norwegian.

Mr. TELLER. Or the Norwegian or anyone else, holding under a decision of the Supreme Court of many years' standing that nobody but the great Government of the United States can be heard to question his title.

Mr. President, thousands of dollars are put by these foreign miners into claims, and when they want to get a patent they are obliged to be citizens, and then they make their citizenship by the time they get ready for a patent. There is nothing for us to do but to let this thing alone—absolutely alone. It would be criminal for us to attempt here to pass on the rights of these people. I am astonished that it should find any support here whatever, and I do not believe it will find very much when the vote is taken.

NAVAL OBSERVATORY.

Mr. CARTER obtained the floor.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Montana yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CARTER. I will yield for a moment to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am desirous of submitting to the Senate at an early moment some remarks with reference to a very peaceful subject—that of the Government Naval Observatory in Georgetown. I shall be prepared to speak at any time. Whenever the debate lags upon the pending amendment to the Alaska bill, or on any other bill that may be before the Senate, I will endeavor to slip in my remarks.

Mr. CARTER. There has been no evidence of lagging on the part of this debate. I was about to move that the Senate adjourn.

POLICY RESPECTING THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Montana yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that on Tuesday, April 17, a week from to-morrow, after the conclusion of the routine morning business, I will submit to the Senate some remarks upon the Philippine question, either upon the bill now before the Senate or some one of the resolutions pending.

MINNESOTA AND MANITOBA RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. NELSON. I ask the Senator from Montana to yield to me.
Mr. CARTER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a moment.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8876) granting the right of way to the Minnesota and Manitoba Railroad Company across the ceded portion of the Chippewa (Red Lake) Indian Reservation, in Minnesota.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CARTER. I move that the Senate adjourn.
The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 10, 1900, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 9, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

REARMING THE NATIONAL GUARD.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10508) for the rearming of the National Guard, and the same was referred to the Committee on Militia.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ESCH, for ten days, on account of important business.

PRINTING OF NATIONAL BANKING LAWS.

Mr. HEATWOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Printing to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House concurrent resolution 29.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota, chairman of the Committee on Printing, by direction of that committee calls up the following resolution and asks unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed in black cloth binding and wrapped for mailing 5,000 copies of the national banking laws for the use of the office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HEATWOLE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

FOREST RESERVES.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho submits the following privileged resolution.

The resolution as amended by the Committee on the Public Lands was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the House of Representatives as to the number of acres now included within forest reserves belonging to land-grant railroad companies or other corporations or individuals at the time of the creation of said forest reserves; and also the amount of so-called forest-reserve lien scrip, or of right of lieu location, which has been issued therefor or for which claims are pending; and also what new forest reserves and extensions to existing reserves are in contemplation, or have been recommended, and by whom requested or recommended, and where located; also the amount of railroad land or other grants included in such proposed new reserves or extensions; and also the number of acres which have been located by said so-called forest-reserve scrip or right of lieu location and where located.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been unanimously reported from the Committee on Public Lands. The information which is called for is desired from the Secretary of the Interior, in order that the Committee on Public Lands may have information sufficient to enable them to frame legislation affecting forest reserves.

The act of June 4, 1897, which was a general appropriation act, unfortunately contained a provision authorizing the settler or owner of a tract included within a forest reservation to relinquish the same to the United States and to select in lieu thereof other vacant, unoccupied land belonging to the Government.

The intention of Congress was, manifestly, to allow a settler whose claim might be included within a forest reserve to take another claim or homestead in lieu thereof, if he so desired.

Forest reserves in the Rocky Mountain States had been created

in the early spring of 1897, embracing many millions of acres. Other reserves were created after the passage of this act. The Department of the Interior construes this act to apply to lands granted to railroad companies as well as to individual settlers, and to authorize said railroad companies to relinquish their lands included within forest reserves and take other lands in lieu thereof, whether surveyed or unsurveyed. This right is held to be assignable.

The effect of this legislation is therefore to permit land-grant railroad companies to exchange land of little or no value, in many instances, for land of very great value, provided a forest reserve has been made to include lands granted to the company. This right of lieu location has become valuable, being worth, as I am informed, as much as \$5 an acre, while the land which was exchanged for it was not worth, on an average, more than 50 cents an acre. The result of this exchange is therefore very profitable to the land-grant companies.

In the State of Idaho, which I have the honor to represent in this House, forest reserves have been created, or are proposed, which will include within their limits lands heretofore granted to railroad companies to the amount of 800,000 acres. These lands are not worth to exceed 50 cents per acre, or \$400,000. The Northern Pacific Railroad Company will be entitled to receive lieu forest-reserve scrip, or right of lieu location, for this land, which has a market value of \$5 per acre. The exchange, therefore, to this one company in this one State is worth \$3,600,000. The people of Idaho have never asked that any of these reserves be created. On the contrary, many of them have protested against their creation, and their representatives have verbally and in writing protested against such creation.

There is a proposition now pending in the General Land Office for the creation of new reserves which will include 500,000 acres of railroad land. There is a further proposition pending for the creation of a reserve which will include the county of Washington and parts of Boise, Ada, and Canyon counties, in said State. This proposed reserve will include within its limits more than 100 schoolhouses, 3 towns of more than 1,500 people each, \$4,000,000 worth of assessable property, and a population of many thousands of people. Four-fifths of the area within that proposed reserve is entirely devoid of timber. The creation of this reserve can work no possible good purpose and would do infinite harm to the people there. It would reserve all the land from homestead settlement or any entry except mineral entry.

It would prevent the grazing of sheep on the public lands within such reserve. In fact, it would practically stop all improvement or advancement of the section in question. The people do not want this reserve and their representatives have protested against it. Notwithstanding all this, a representative of the Interior Department has recommended its creation, and the same is now being considered by the Department.

The figures I have given as to the area of forest reserves and proposed reserves in Idaho, together with the railroad lands therein, are reliable, having been obtained by me from the General Land Office.

The information asked for in this resolution is absolutely essential in order to enable the Committee on Public Lands to prepare proper legislation to correct this great evil. The resolution as originally introduced by me has been slightly modified, and has thus been unanimously reported from the committee. I therefore hope, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution will be adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. WILSON of Idaho, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PENSIONS TO MEXICAN SOLDIERS.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend an act approved January 5, 1893, entitled "An act granting increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases," so as to extend the provisions of said act to all Mexican soldiers pensionable under law.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the benefits of an act approved January 5, 1893, entitled "An act granting increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases," and which granted an increase from \$9 to \$12 per month to all those who were then on the pension roll, be, and the same is hereby, extended so as to include all Mexican soldiers who are pensionable under the laws, irrespective of the time that they may or may not have been upon the roll.

The following amendments recommended by the Committee on Pensions were read:

Change the title so as to read:

"A bill to extend the provisions of an act entitled 'An act granting increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases,' approved January 5, 1893."

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute therefor the following:

"That the benefits of the act entitled 'An act granting an increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases,' approved January 5,

1893, be, and they are hereby, extended to all survivors of the Mexican war who are pensionable under existing Mexican war service pension laws, and who have become, or may hereafter become, wholly disabled for manual labor and in such destitute circumstances that \$8 per month are insufficient to provide them the necessities of life, irrespective of the date of the granting of the said service pension."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman just what the bill does—what is the effect of it?

Mr. SNODGRASS. I will say to the gentleman that in 1893 this Congress passed an act increasing the pensions of all indigent Mexican soldiers who were then on the rolls from \$8 to \$12 per month. That act created a class, and what called it to my attention was the fact that a Mexican soldier in my district, whose claim for a pension was pending before the passage of the act of 1893, but whose certificate was issued just after the passage of that act, is cut off from the benefits of that act. There is no reason why any distinction should be made between indigent Mexican pensioners, and I therefore introduced this bill to remove that distinction and to grant to all indigent Mexican soldiers equal pensions, as should have been done by the act of 1893. There are comparatively few of these Mexican soldiers—

Mr. PAYNE. Then I understand that the act of 1893 gave an increase of pensions from \$8 to \$12 a month to soldiers of the Mexican war who were then pensioned, in certain cases, where they were disabled.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Yes; who were then on the rolls.

Mr. PAYNE. Where they were totally disabled.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Where they were totally disabled or incapacitated from earning a living, etc., and were then on the rolls.

Mr. PAYNE. And some names have been placed on the rolls since at \$8 a month, and this proposes to put them in the same class, under the law of 1893?

Mr. SNODGRASS. Yes.

Mr. COX. I should like to ask my colleague one question. Is that act broad enough to cover the widows of Mexican soldiers?

Mr. SNODGRASS. No, sir.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. It just puts those Mexican soldiers who have been pensioned since 1893 on an equality with those who were pensioned before 1893.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I think the bill is absolutely right, except it ought to be \$12.

Mr. SNODGRASS. It is \$12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment to the title will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. SNODGRASS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10538) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have an agreement with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], representing the minority of the committee, on the length of general debate. What suggestion has the gentleman to make?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I think I will probably be able to yield some of the time back to the House; but from the requests I have had, I will ask for three hours upon this side; and I will also ask that gentlemen who speak be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD, which may save time to the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. For myself, I have no objection to any gentleman extending his remarks in the RECORD. I would suggest to the gentleman that we close debate at 5 o'clock. I am not going to occupy any time myself more than five minutes; I prefer to explain the bill under the five-minute rule, as we read it by sections.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I expect debate will be closed at 5 o'clock, but I have received a good many requests, and amongst others some from gentlemen that I do not see in their seats now. It may be possible that they will not be here, but as little time as I can afford to take on this side by an agreement now would be three hours; but if we take on this side three hours, and you take less over there, we will get through

with general debate by 5 o'clock. But I would not be willing to agree to less than three hours. I think the probabilities are that a part of the time I ask will be given back to the House, but I can not make an agreement for less than three hours.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I suggest to the gentleman that general debate be closed at 1 o'clock to-morrow, unless sooner closed by unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Would that give us the morning hour, or would we get from 12 to 1 o'clock for debate?

The SPEAKER. There is no morning hour unless it is called for.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That will give us our three hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate close to-morrow at 1 o'clock, unless by unanimous consent it is closed sooner; and that of that time three hours be given to the side of the minority.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And that gentlemen who speak have consent to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Also that gentlemen speaking on the bill may extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (Mr. O'GRADY in the chair).

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10538) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this is the usual appropriation bill for the maintenance of the Agricultural Department. There is no new legislation in the bill, except one item—extending leave of absence to employees of the Weather Bureau and the Bureau of Animal Industry outside the city of Washington. The other changes are simply changes in the wording in the different paragraphs under which the lump-sum appropriations are to be expended. The bill presented, according to the report, is \$390,778 in excess of the appropriation for the last fiscal year, which shows an increase of about 12 per cent. The main item of increase is \$40,000 additional allowed by the committee for the distribution of free seeds.

I am sorry to say that was asked for by a petition of 225 members of this House, and the committee conceded it. There is an addition of \$60,000 to the Weather Bureau, part of which is to provide for the erection of iron storm-signal towers and a part of which is to meet the increased cost of paper and other material used in that Bureau. Another increase of \$38,000 is allowed for the purpose of purchasing a new quarantine station at the harbor of New York, the present one having to be abandoned on account of opening the streets of the town through it. Another increase is for the erection of a new laboratory at Washington.

The Agricultural Department is at present paying \$10,000 a year rent for additional service in outside buildings which are used as laboratories. Ten thousand dollars would be 5 per cent of the cost of a new laboratory. The committee, looking at it as a business proposition, thought it would be far better for the Government to own the building. There is another increase of \$5,000 in the Bureau of Agrostology to carry on, in a more practical and extended manner, the introduction and distribution of roots and seed of valuable pasture and forage plants and grasses for experimental purposes in the various sections of the United States. The amount carried for the Weather Bureau is \$1,057,620, which is about the same as last year.

Now, with that brief explanation of the main features of the bill, I prefer to take it up by sections when we come to read it under the five-minute rule and answer any question that may be asked.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman whether there is anything involved in this bill concerning the civil pension list?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not a thing.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Where shall I find that provision that the leave of absence shall be extended to the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under the division of salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I understand that the general law

provides that under the regulations of the Executive Departments in Washington the Government employees shall have thirty days' vacation and in addition a sick leave of thirty days in the year, and which is generally taken, and that the vacation leave is to be extended to the Agricultural Department, but limited to fifteen days as to the agricultural employees outside of Washington.*

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is limited to two weeks' vacation, and applies only to employees outside of the city of Washington. The employees within the city come within the general law. We have put in an amendment applying it to the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry outside of the city of Washington.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I think there is nothing unreasonable about that, but I think there is as to the manner in which the vacation, or rather the sick leave, is availed of here.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That can not be corrected here. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman has evidenced that by the provision in this bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The climatic conditions are not so severe outside of the city, and a great deal of the labor of the employees outside of the city of Washington is done in the open air.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And yet Washington has always been lauded as a salubrious climate.

Mr. TALBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any contention here in regard to any particular item in the bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not think there is the slightest. We agree upon all points. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] I think will confirm me in that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The committee is unanimous upon the bill.

Mr. TALBERT. I thought there might be some particular item about which the committee were divided, and I would like to know what it was in the beginning.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; we are the most unanimous body of farmers you ever saw. [Laughter.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if there is any provision in it by which the use of vaccine matter may be continued?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no provision in the bill to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from pursuing the policy he is now pursuing.

Mr. LLOYD. Does he pursue the policy he is now pursuing under a specific act?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; the general powers granted him by the bill cover that.

Mr. LLOYD. And the general officers of the Department perform the work, and he does not need any specific appropriation for vaccine matter?

Mr. WADSWORTH. He does not. Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] forty-five minutes.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I desire the Clerk to read in my time the following beautiful poetic tribute to the indefatigable zeal of the members of the House in supplying their constituents with things other than their speeches.

I think the House will agree with me after hearing it read that this constituent of mine, Mr. W. H. Settle, the author, who resides in Madisonville, Hamilton County, Ohio, and who is a free-silver, simon-pure Democrat, who knows he is a Democrat, who has voted the Democratic ticket all his life, and who is a splendid fellow, ought to be nominated for Vice-President on some one of the Democratic national tickets.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SEEDS THAT NEVER GROW.

I nearly hate the thought of spring,
With its delightful sun,
For well I know the mail will bring
A pack from Washington:
A little package, duly franked,
No postage stamps to show,
And it contains those little seeds—
The kind that never grow.

Our good and zealous Congressman,
Remindful of our vote,
Upon his memorandum's page
Puts down a little note,
And when the proper time arrives
For us to wield the hoe,
He sendeth us the little seeds—
The ones that never grow.

There're squashes with enticing names,
And cabbages, I wot,
So large that you would think that one
Would shade a garden spot;
So with the pack from Washington
You amble forth to sow,
With many a drop of sweat, the seeds
That never care to grow.

How often have I plied the rake;
How oft I've lounged about,
With eyes alert to catch the first
Signs of the coming sprout;
In vain, in vain, my hopes have fled,
My heart has filled with woe,
Above the seeds from Washington—
The seeds that never grow.

But yet each year my hopes revive,
As spring reclothes the tree,
And to my homestead surely comes
The package marked "M. C.;"
And, foolish-like, again I wield
The sprinkler and the hoe,
And, like a ninny, plant the seeds
That never care to grow.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if that is the kind of seeds he has been sending out? [Laughter.]

Mr. SHATTUC. I never sent this Democrat any. He got them from other Democrats from other sections of the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. TALBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman if they did not grow?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes; mine grew. He is referring to Democratic seeds. [Laughter.]

Mr. TALBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman if that is the Republican policy to give the Democrats poor seeds?

Mr. SHATTUC. Oh, I would cut off the Democratic seed entirely, in all directions, if I could. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the problem now confronting this country is the Philippines particularly, and in our other island acquisitions generally, is not beyond the solution of the wisdom and the statesmanship of the Republican party and the patriotism of the American people.

Graver problems have been solved by the party now in power and deservedly enjoying the confidence of the people—problems, sir, which had to deal with the treatment of high-spirited and brave, though misguided, millions of our own fellow-citizens, exceeding numerically the population of the Philippine Islands and bound to us by the ties of consanguinity, of common inheritance, and of inseparable destiny.

Then, as now, efforts were made and obstacles were raised to embarrass the Government in the enforcement of its delegated powers, the dignity of its sovereignty, and the maintenance of that authority which can alone preserve domestic tranquillity and secure the respect of the world.

It is as true as it is epigrammatical, in the issues now confronting us and which divide us from our opponents, that "history repeats itself," for along precisely the same lines the Democracy of to-day, as in the sixties, conduct their warfare on the legislation and policy of the Republican party.

If, after more than four years of the greatest civil war in history, the Republican party emerged not only triumphant in the vindication of the principles at issue, but, of equal importance to posterity, so preserved the Union of the fathers, which was sought to be disrupted, that the sons of the rebels of the sixties led the advance of our storming columns and charging lines in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, what great or insolvable problem lies in the Orient and affecting the future of an inferior race which warrants the impeachment of the wise policy and tried statesmanship of the Republican party? [Applause.]

In the uniforms of their fathers' foes the sons of the Southland, with the gallantry of their race, followed the flag of the Republic from Santiago to Manila. Nay! Many of the surviving veterans of Lee and Jackson, from private soldier to major-general, bivouacked on the hill of San Juan and in the rice fields of Luzon with the veterans of Grant and Sherman. Does it lie in the record of our opponents to successfully impeach before the American people the party and the policy which, while preserving the Union in a sanguinary war, has restored not alone tranquillity, peace, and prosperity to all sections of the Republic, but by its far-seeing legislation, its conspicuous humanity, its broad patriotism, and its love of justice and of country made a patriot of the rebel and a standard bearer of his son? [Great applause.]

Representatives of a loyal people on the floor of this House thirty-five years ago led armed treason and sought the life of the Republic; and I but voice the universal sentiment of a united country when I thank God that they have lived long enough to give sons to the military service of the United States, and some of them themselves become the heroic leaders of our brave soldiers on the battlefields of Cuba and the Philippines. And, sir, what prophet or the son of a prophet, though he bore a commission franked by Heaven itself, would be believed did he predict within the memory of many of us, and now within the knowledge of all, that these things would come to pass in a little over three decades after the Confederacy of the South struck its flag and the battle flags of the North were triumphantly furled? [Continued applause.]

In a little over a year we are accused of failing to accomplish

that which Spain could not effect in three centuries. Imaginary obstacles are presented by our opponents as they were presented at the close of the civil war. Dire predictions are made now, as they were made then, to our successful solution of the problems confronting the Government.

Every experimental effort to gauge our difficulties is hailed with derision and pronounced a failure before trial. Every improvement on experimental policy to meet unforeseen or new conditions is loudly proclaimed a change of front, and sinister motives are ascribed as the cause; and thus it was in the period of reconstruction. Mistakes were made in details, but the general plan was the perfection of a sagacious statesmanship, which resulted in the lasting unification of the Republic.

I hold that since the commencement of our war with Spain, if we have made a mistake in the details of our policy, it was in making declarations for the future, as in the entirely superfluous and uncalled-for announcement of a policy in reference to the island of Cuba, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippine Islands are not the personal property of any political party, to be capriciously given away, exchanged, or erected into independent States by the declarations and pronouncements of individuals, however desirable it may seem to shorten the responsibility intrusted to us. These colonies are the wards of the American people, and the civilized world is entitled to expect that this nation will rise to the dignity of the great trust imposed upon it by, I solemnly believe, the interposition of Providence, and that we will not dishonor humanity by adopting the selfish and inhuman course of making a matter of mercantile traffic of millions of souls.

The conscience, the hearts, and the convictions of the American people rebel against the cowardly abandonment of these people and these islands until our great mission has been fulfilled. That mission, Mr. Chairman, I believe the future will disclose, and that no anticipatory speculations as to its full purport is within the compass, the knowledge, or the certainty of the present hour. We must be guided by and follow the development of events in Cuba, in Puerto Rico, and in the archipelago. One session of Congress did not effect the reconstruction of the revolted States of this Union; enactment after enactment and session after session of Congress were occupied in perfecting the measure so dear to the hearts of all—a united country. But from the inception of the Republican programme of one people, one flag, the Democracy then, as now, fought every step of progress, every inch of ground, and fell in its last intrenchment when the tocsin of war sounded from the North and the South, the East and the West, to fight a monarchical foe oppressing our neighboring people of the island of Cuba. [Great applause.]

Having zealously advocated the late war with Spain, no sooner was it over, or, indeed, fairly started, than the old policy of our opponents manifested itself in opposition to an issue which of right ought to be a national instead of the partisan question the blind fatuity of the Democracy has made it.

Imperialism is the intentional crime we are accused of being ready to commit; bad faith with Puerto Rico and with Cuba is alleged; and while our soldiers are being shot down by armed insurgents in the Philippines, so-called anti-imperialistic societies are publishing and circulating inflammatory, treasonable, and untruthful libels upon their Government and country. While brave men are falling in the enforcement of law and order and while the armed enemies of the Government of the United States defy its authority, men like Edward Atkinson and "aithers of his ilk" are engaged in the treasonable propaganda of libelous literature, under the protection of the flag our soldiers are heroically maintaining the supremacy of in the Philippines.

The question of the future disposition, government, or status of these islands do not enter at this time into the issue at stake. That issue is simply and wholly, shall the armed enemies of the United States be permitted or encouraged to defy its authority in the Philippines? And if in the Philippines, why not elsewhere? The future of these islands and their political status will be determined further along. Then, and not until then, should their status be made an issue or a question of rival policy. At present the great question confronting us is the supremacy of the Government of the United States in those islands.

Men may honestly and parties rightfully differ on expansion and anti-expansion, but I hold, Mr. Chairman, that discussion of that subject at the present time is designedly premature and is for the sole purpose of party capital. No declaration has or ought to be made, in my opinion, by the Republican party outlining its policy toward these islands until the process of development now going on shows us the wisest course to pursue with a view to the paramount interest of the United States. This is the first and essentially the paramount duty of the Government—to subserve the interests of this country and the welfare of our own people. We shall act toward others in that generous and just spirit, and with that helping hand the Republic has ever extended to the unfortunate and the distressed; but it is very properly, I think, regarded in the domain of practical statesmanship that to subserve the

interests of one's own country is the highest and first duty of the legislator and patriot. [Applause.]

On this platform there ought not to be any division in this House, however we may disagree on the treatment or disposition of other peoples, when we reach that issue or question. I am perfectly content to leave the settlement of the future of the possessions which have lately fallen to us through the war with Spain to the future, as in this, like all other problems of governmental affairs, the developments as they occur will be met by suitable and appropriate legislation in harmony with the genius of our country and the spirit of a free people.

The assumption is as unfounded and unjust as the charge is dishonest and untruthful, that the Republican party stands for imperialism or any other ism detrimental to the interests of the United States or representing disloyalty to its flag. We are for the enforcement of law and order in Luzon and the suppression of anarchy and murder there, as well as in the States of the Union. The American people will not tolerate an Aguinaldo when they execute a Parsons; they will not condone in Manila what they punish in Chicago. Riot, murder, and hostility to constituted authority calls for either the abolition of government or the suppression of the malefactor. [Applause.]

The American people will trust the solution of this colonial problem to the party which preserved civil liberty, a republican form of government, and destroyed the slave oligarchy of the South, giving civil and religious liberty to millions of human beings, whom it has raised to the dignity and responsibility of citizenship.

The anti-imperialistic literature, emanating principally from a coterie of New England self-constituted guardians of a republican form of government, at the head of which, as high priest and prophet, is one Edward Atkinson, former superintendent of a Massachusetts cotton mill, and celebrated as the notorious author of the Science of Nutrition and the inventor of the Aladdin oven.

Descended from the Atkinsons of the Revolution, on the wrong side of which his loyal ancestors fought, bled, and held office, he poses before the American people as their guide and conscience in dealing with the natives of the Philippines. Theodore, senior, and Theodore, junior, of the Revolutionary period, were Atkinsons whose names became as infamous to the patriot colonists as the present Edward's is to the patriotic people of to-day. The former refused to surrender to the provincial congress of New Hampshire the records and papers of his office as chief judge of the superior court, and his worthy son, who was secretary of the colony, was the first husband of the notorious Wentworth woman, who married Sir John, governor of the colony, two weeks after the demise of Theodore, junior.

Edward Atkinson, LL. D. and Ph. D., inventor of the Aladdin oven and the workmen's dinner pail, still keeps up the connection with the descendants of his expatriated Tory ancestors and friends, for, in speaking of his celebrated oven, he says:

One of my friends in England, in a great ancestral hall, roasts his own pheasants, venison, and 4-year-old grass mutton in my Aladdin oven instead of in the old way of on a spit before a grate fire.

But it was not for the purpose of simplifying the cooking of pheasants, venison, and 4-year-old grass mutton that Edward Atkinson invented the Aladdin oven. Here is the account he himself gives of this stupendous and revolutionary invention in social economy. Mr. Atkinson says:

I was a cotton factory superintendent, and I noticed the dinner pails of the employees and the mess of indigestible food their pails contained, and I marveled if the stomach of an ostrich could digest so much food.

From this cogitation the genius of invention seized him in a firm grasp, and he says:

I devoted my spare time to the study of pecuniary or social economy.

"And the mountain labored and brought forth a mouse," or rather a pair of mice, for Mr. Atkinson not only invented the Aladdin oven, but the workman's dinner pail. In the design of this universe the great Creator of all placed the first man and woman in paradise, and surrounded them with every delight and luxury his infinite mind could conceive. Nor did He think man was deserving of a less delightful and charming existence. Even after his fall man was given the earth for his sustenance and the luxuries his own labor could secure. [Great applause.]

It remained for this Massachusetts pecuniary and social philosopher to discover that man—that is, the working men and women—were eating too much, at least one thousand million dollars' worth per annum more than was necessary to sustain life and work in cotton mills, factories, and mines. Hence, after the manner of the Chinese, Mr. Atkinson first addressed himself to the discovery of a "patent fuel." The Chinese for ages mixed coal dust with clay and bitumen, and in England the poor people mixed the refuse of the mouths of the pits with sand, marl, clay, and sawdust, but Mr. Atkinson wanted something which would give out less heat and cost less for his dear workmen. He therefore addressed himself to chemical physics, studied Bunsen's Gasometry and Miller's Chemistry. The Aladdin oven and the work-

man's dinner pail, the latter with a lamp attachment, after the pattern of those found at Tarsus, Pompeii, and Herculaneum, were the result. When the created articles first greeted his longing eyes he thus soliloquized—I quote from Mr. Atkinson's Science of Nutrition:

What does this man mean? Does he himself more than half believe what he says? And to that question my answer might be, "I doubt if he does."

[Laughter.]

There is the modesty of genius for you; he doubts and only half believes what he says and what he claims for his inventions, notwithstanding that he beholds them in all their completed beauty. Further along he has another spasm, and he says:

Why, that is so simple that nobody but a fool would ever have thought of it.

And he adds:

That is about the aspect in which the Aladdin oven and workman's pail are presented to my alter ego.

[Laughter.]

Having perfected his social and pecuniary economical utensils, he startled the world—that is, Boston—with the announcement that by the use of his Aladdin's oven and workman's dinner pail any and every hard-working man and woman could live on twelve and a half cents a day! Employers of cotton mills and factory operators cocked their ears to the welcome information and mentally calculated that if their employees could live on less than a dollar a week it would be a pure waste of money to continue paying the wages then prevailing. And so thought Edward Atkinson, LL. D. and Ph. D. Hear him:

I could live well on \$1 per week.

[Laughter.]

But the workmen, sad to state, repudiated his philanthropic intentions and were rude enough, as quoted in his book, to greet him, their benefactor, with such expressions as "We don't want your bone soup nor your pig wash." [Great applause.]

The pecuniary economist was compelled, perforce, to turn to the women, who, he rightly concluded, were more impressionable in things savoring of domestic and household economy. After he had lectured in all the cheap halls and female institutes he could find, and after he had given exhibitions with his Aladdin oven and workman's dinner pail to exclusive lady audiences, he felt encouraged and that the reward of meritorious labors for the good of humanity was not denied him by the softer sex, for he says—I quote from Mr. Atkinson's Science of Nutrition:

I suppose everyone has a mission, whether conscious or unconscious of it. My own mission appears to be to overcome the inertia of woman.

[Continued laughter.]

As superintendent of the cotton mill, no doubt Mr. Atkinson exercised his mission in overcoming the inertia of the female employees, for whose special benefit he published the following bill of fare. It is intended for six persons, and only to be eaten at midday:

	Cents.
Sicilian lentel soup.....	1
Three-fourths of a pound vegetables, chopped fine.....	2
1 pound of the nape of halibut.....	6
Potatoes and skimmed milk and salt.....	1
Entrée, breast of lamb, 1 pound.....	5
Rice, one-eighth of a pound.....	1
Curry powder.....	1
Dessert, bread and butter pudding.....	5
Brown and table bread.....	2
One cup of tea or coffee to each person.....	6
Total.....	30

Or just 5 cents each for the midday meal. [Laughter.]

His diary for thirty days' sustenance for an adult workman, using his Aladdin oven and workman's dinner pail (page 171, Science of Nutrition; Edward Atkinson, author), is just \$2.99, without extras, or 12½ cents per day with extras.

In one of his lectures he tells his lady auditors that—I quote from Mr. Atkinson's Science of Nutrition:

I have imported from Egypt the small red lentil, of which Esau's mess of pottage purports to have been made.

The girls in the cotton factory who participated in the 5-cent dinner were as impressed as the princess in the story of Aladdin and his wonderful lamp.

This time, Mr. Chairman, I quote from "Aladdin's Lamp," and not from Atkinson's Aladdin oven:

At the extraordinary manner in which the sumptuous repast was obtained the princess could not conceal her astonishment—

And if the cotton factory operatives were not equally astonished, surely Mr. Atkinson's office boy must have been semiparalyzed, as Mr. Atkinson says:

One day I told him to prepare just a dinner of five courses for ten people—

And he adds the extraordinary fact that, while the office boy could not tell a lentil from a head of cabbage and had never before cooked even a potato, he got the dinner of five courses ready on time with the aid of Mr. Atkinson's wonderful Aladdin oven—not lamp.

Bills of fare for seven days, 21 meals, containing, he says, "all the requisite elements for nutrition for a workingman, should cost but \$1, or at the very furthest \$1.50 per week," and this to include fuel and tea or coffee!

Why, Mr. Chairman, if Aguinaldo and his Filipino followers were made acquainted with Mr. Atkinson's Science of Nutrition they would be much more encouraged to hold out in their rebellion than they ever have been by his anti-imperialistic and treasonable literature, for the Science of Nutrition would teach them something practical—how to live on wind and husband their resources with a view of wearing out the overfed (vide Atkinson) soldiers who are pursuing them. [Laughter.]

It is inconceivable, sir, to a plain man like myself how this individual, however expert, studious, and scientific, either in the invention of fuel-saving ovens or in the doctrine of nutrition for workmen, can command the attention of any considerable number of people with sound common sense. But I hold now more than ever to a conviction based on observation, that of all asses the literary one has the loudest and the most sonorous bray. [Great applause.]

What weight should be attached to the inflammatory literature of a writer and a student who, after years of study in the science of social economy, declares that a hard-working, honest toiler can live on a dollar a week, when that writer assails the policy of his Government, impugns its motives, accuses it of attempting to subvert liberty, assumes and charges his assumptions as the intentions of the Government to establish an imperialistic dynasty, and incites the armed enemies of the Republic to defy its authority, I shall leave to the common sense of the country to determine, conscious that the verdict will be in his Philippine misrepresentations what it was in his wonderful Aladdin oven and workman's dinner pail—a chimerical, wild, and visionary scheme for the subversion of the natural appetite and a substitution in its stead of the bill of fare in the Science of Nutrition, Edward Atkinson, author. [Great applause.]

The cultured author of the Science of Nutrition resents as a personal affront the return or refusal of his disloyal publications. His enmity and ire, notwithstanding his titles of doctor of law and philosophy are easily aroused, as I have the pleasure of recalling in the matter of some personal correspondence which passed between us. Edward Atkinson, esq., author of the Science of Nutrition, the inventor of the Aladdin oven and workman's dinner pail, topically propounded this query: "Who is this man SHATTUC?" [Laughter and applause.]

Perhaps it was expected of me by Mr. Atkinson to confess my insignificance in comparison with the inventor of the Aladdin oven and workman's dinner pail, and acknowledge that "SHATTUC" was unknown in those circles the members of which boast of their loyal (British) colonial descent and refer to their "friends in England who occupy ancestral halls," but I did not do either. On the contrary, I undertook to find out who this man Atkinson is. [Laughter and applause.]

I present the information to the House and to my constituents, who he has been flooding with his visionary grievances. Whether the latter have also been treated to his pamphlets and essays on the Science of Nutrition I know not, but I am reasonably certain that the workingman element, at least, have no more use for his Aladdin oven and his dinner pail than they have respect for or confidence in any statement emanating from a source which asserts that a hard-working man can live on a dollar a week. [Long-continued applause.]

Mr. Chairman, touching the correspondence to which I have referred, I will read the same as explanatory to my remarks:

ATKINSON TO SHATTUC.

BOSTON, August 15, 1899.

DEAR SIR: A copy of the Anti-Imperialist returned to me with this indorsement—

"Respectfully returned. Take my name off your list. I am no traitor to my country." I am very glad to have the information that you are not a traitor. Had you been, I should have taken your name off the list of members of Congress, to all of whom my pamphlets in support of Senator HOAR and others are sent. I may add that since we may assume that you do not support the opponents of criminal aggression, our effort to take your name off the list of members of Congress at the next election will be fully justified. In the interval you may receive other copies of documents similar to that which you have returned, because I can not at present expurgate my mailing list.

Yours, very truly,

EDWARD ATKINSON.

Hon. W. B. SHATTUC, M. C.,
Madisonville, Ohio.

SHATTUC TO ATKINSON.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, August 25, 1899.

DEAR SIR: I have received your letter of the 15th instant, and beg to tell you that I would not, even for the nomination to Congress, support those guilty of criminal aggression against this Government (as you are guilty of). Your intimation that you may be able to have my name taken off the list of the members of the next Congress because I decline to receive your treasonable documents is another evidence of your monumental gall and egotism. You would succeed in your effort about as well as you did in getting your criminal literature in the hands of Aguinaldo and his followers. You knew

what you were doing when you tried to get this trash in the rebels' hands. Your purpose was to give the rebels encouragement, to embarrass the Government of the United States, and to induce the rebels to hold out until perhaps you could try your luck in having the names of the loyal Congressmen taken off the list at the next election.

Not a precinct in the First Ohio Congressional district would elect you or one of your kind as a delegate to a convention to nominate a director for the county poorhouse. The citizens of this district are loyal, patriotic people, and I am sure that they are not in sympathy with those who are doing all they can to embarrass President McKinley and the Government in the effort to restore order and suppress the rebellion in the Philippine Islands. When that is accomplished, it will be time to determine what form of government shall be established in those islands.

Our people applaud the speech made by our President recently when he said, speaking of our flag: "It is the flag of the free, the hope of the oppressed, and wherever it is assailed, at any sacrifice it will be carried to triumphant peace." That is the kind of talk our people like here.

For fear that you will forget it, let me suggest that you make a memorandum that the nomination for Congress in the First Ohio district will be made about September, 1900. It will be necessary for you, to secure the results you desire, to commence your work a little before that time; the earlier the better, for I am assured that your friend Aguinaldo will cease to exist as a military chieftain long before that date.

Very respectfully,

W. B. SHATTUC, M. C.

EDWARD ATKINSON, Esq., Boston, Mass.

ATKINSON TO SHATTUC.

BOSTON, August 29, 1899.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of August 25. I note with approval that you have published my letter and your reply, which has brought to me many letters of sympathy and approval, with a large demand for the pamphlets, which you do not desire to have sent to you. Perhaps you will also publish this.

Yours, very truly,

EDWARD ATKINSON.

Hon. W. B. SHATTUC, M. C.,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

SHATTUC TO ATKINSON.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, September 2, 1899.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 29th ultimo has been received. No doubt you have received many letters of sympathy from your people in this country, and I am confident that your friend and coworker, Aguinaldo, would have written one, thanking you, had not the Government of the United States effectually prevented further communication between you two chieftains. Neither do I doubt in the least that my protest to you (which was published) against your sending your seditious literature to my home had the same effect as a preacher's denunciation of a disreputable theatrical show. You would not have sent your seditious publications to the Philippine Islands unless you had reason to believe that your friend and coworker, Aguinaldo, would be comforted and aided thereby. Webster says that "treason is confined to the actual levying of war against the United States, or adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort." Webster was a New England gentleman, too.

During the civil war in this country Lincoln was denounced, Grant was vilified, the Government was assailed, and the war was declared unconstitutional, inhuman, and a failure by some people in Boston as well as by people in other sections of the North, and peace was demanded at any price. The men at the front called the authors of such declarations "copperheads" and "traitors."

In your last letter you do not renew your threat to have my name left off the Congressional list for the Fifty-seventh Congress, but you suggest that I publish the letter. I will do so with pleasure, and I may add that I also have received many letters from Boston and the rest of the United States, but not one of them was a letter of sympathy for me or for Aguinaldo. I am sure that those who wrote me had no sympathy for Aguinaldo, and probably thought I needed none.

Yours, very truly,

W. B. SHATTUC, M. C.

EDWARD ATKINSON, Esq.,
Boston, Mass.

ATKINSON TO SHATTUC.

BOSTON, September 6, 1899.

DEAR SIR: It has given me great satisfaction to receive your letter of September 2, in answer to mine of the 29th.

I beg you to observe that I am still without a reply to my letter of August 31, in which, in reply to your invitation to make the attempt to remove your name from the list of members of Congress, I asked for an outline of the district, stating the principal points, so that I might make a good beginning in the distribution of documents.

As I hardly expected much assistance from you in this matter, I have taken other measures, and have dropped an anchor in the center of your district, from which to carry our anti-imperial chain around and through the whole of it.

A very large edition of No. 5 is called for for general circulation, but it is my intention to print a separate edition of 5,000 copies, more or less, as we may find use for them, for distribution in the First district of Ohio. I find from my correspondence that a large body of your Republican constituents will not join you in denouncing as "traitors," "public enemies," and "seditious persons" men like Senator HOAR, ex-Governor Boutwell, ex-Senator Edmunds, and all the other living men with whom and through whose efforts the Republican party originated. It was my privilege to support them in that undertaking, and for many years in the conduct of the Republican party to which you have proved yourself a recreant by surrendering the principle of liberty at the dictation of the present Administration.

As it is evident to me that you have not had a long experience in what might be called good political society, I therefore venture to suggest to you that in your reply (if you send one) to this letter, which, with your other correspondence, will be published in the special edition for the First Congressional district, you do not use bad language or attempt to apply epithets like that of "copperhead" and "traitor" upon the leading members of the Republican party especially, or upon others of your opponents. It is not good form, and those names are stale. Better invent some good old English terms of a more original character if you desire to indulge in that sort of thing. I would not, if I were in your position. When one engages in sharpshooting with opponents of skill and experience, it is not judicious to use a blunderbuss. These ancient and played-out implements are apt to kick back. I hope it will not hurt you when you get your first fall, and when you come to time again I would advise you not to use a blunderbuss.

My special edition is now in the printer's hands. Several days will elapse

before it is ready for the press; therefore there is plenty of time to include your reply to this letter. In the interval the various anchors are being fixed throughout your district and our chains will be riveted ready to pull together on election day.

Yours, very truly,

EDWARD ATKINSON.

Hon. W. B. SHATTUC, Cincinnati, Ohio.

SHATTUC TO ATKINSON.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, September 12, 1899.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of September 6. Your pretended desire for information concerning the boundaries of the First Congressional district of Ohio, and your childish insistence upon an answer; your ridiculous and quixotic programme for carrying said district against me, as well as your bald assertion, unsupported by any evidence, that I have surrendered to the dictation of the present Administration, may be dismissed as the vapors of a distempered imagination. So far as your presence in the First Congressional district of Ohio is concerned, it would have about as much terror to me as the presence of a copperhead with his fangs drawn.

Your reference to my alleged lack of experience in "good political society" is the old, familiar Boston sneer, thinly veiled, at the social standing of anyone not born in the shadow of Bunker Hill Monument or whose ancestors did not come over in the *Mayflower*.

On the other hand, taking your words literally, if you and your environments fairly represent what you consider good political society, you are entirely correct in assuming that I have had no such experience—nor do I crave any. I would be as much out of place in such society as you would be in loyal patriotic company. I observe that you wish to suggest to me what you would do if you were in my place. If you were in my place you would not remain there fifty-nine minutes, notwithstanding the anchor you talk so much about as being in the center of my district. You are not of the kind that would be acceptable in this district.

You really grow hysterical over my use of the words "copperhead" and "traitor." You flutter like one who is hit. I have not tried to be original in using them. They have each a well-defined meaning, the precise meaning that I intended to convey. If they are stale, so are "honor" and "loyalty" stale.

Let me suggest that it is not good form for one like you, who has had long experience in "good political society," to deliberately misrepresent, as you do, when you say I have denounced as traitors Senator HOAR, ex-Governor Boutwell, and ex-Senator Edmunds. You will not find the name of one of these men mentioned in my correspondence with you or with anyone else. I did, however, call your attention to Webster's definition of treason, and you are safe to assume that I would classify the whole bunch in accordance with his definition.

I have no doubt that you have letters from alleged Republicans in Ohio who are as sensitive as you are about the reputation of the alleged Republicans in Boston and the New England States and who will render you all the assistance in their power in defaming and vilifying the good name of Ohio's distinguished and patriotic son, President William McKinley.

Notwithstanding the support you have given the Republican party in past years the party still lives. You have now become a reminiscence. You are now telling what you have done in the past, the great men with whom you have been associated, and you crowd in the name of another friend every time you are denounced as you should be. When you first wrote me, you had Senator HOAR. Your letter was answered, and you now parade the names of half a dozen other men whom you allege to be your brother conspirators, and you hide behind the name of some distinguished man like a wanton who pulls down a good name to the level of her own.

Your sharpshooting from the beginning has been from the rear. From 1861 to the present time your skill and experience have never been developed in a place where you were in any danger of getting your hide punctured. You have always kept at a safe distance from the firing line. I assume this is the reason your hide has become so callous and case-hardened, as it were. You chose to join with your brother conspirators in an attack on the conduct of the Government rather than to go to the front, where the sharpshooting is done by the men who carry guns to back up their opinions. You are now playing the same tactics—your friends are on the other side, rebels against this Government, and you keep at a safe distance, as you have always done, from the scene of hostilities. You are not on the "firing line." You would rather print documents and use them in the endless-chain system at 25 cents a copy, the profits to go to Edward Atkinson, and this manner of doing business has been developed by "your skill and experience."

I care nothing about your theories of expansion or nonexpansion, imperialism or anti-imperialism. A man has a right to believe what he pleases. What I do object to and protest against is your seditious literature being sent to my home, because you advocate the discouragement of enlistments in the Army and because you advised citizens to keep recruits from joining the service. You have done as much as in you lies to embarrass the Government, and you have vilified the good name of our President. You have given aid and comfort to those in rebellion against the authority of the United States and have sent your vicious literature to Manila in the hope that it would be circulated among our soldiers, to the end that they might become dissatisfied and mutinous, and also with the hope that it might reach the rebels and encourage them.

This war is the people's war. They inaugurated it, and they will stand by the Administration, which is endeavoring to carry out their will—that the rebellion be suppressed and order restored in the Philippine Islands, without regard to the bullets in front and the snapping of copperheads like you in the rear. Congress, and not the President, will in due time determine what kind of government should be established in the Philippines; but this question will never be definitely settled while our Government is confronted by an armed force.

Very respectfully,

EDWARD ATKINSON, Esq., Boston, Mass.

W. B. SHATTUC, M. C.

ATKINSON TO SHATTUC.

BOSTON, September 14, 1899.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 12th instant has been received too late to be included in my special edition of No. 5, addressed to the voters of the First Ohio district and others, which will be in circulation next week, having taken your advice in making an early beginning in securing a change in the representation from that district. The document is already going through the press.

Yours, very truly,

EDWARD ATKINSON.

Hon. W. B. SHATTUC, M. C., Cincinnati, Ohio.

SHATTUC TO ATKINSON.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, September 12, 1899.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of the 14th instant, I thought I could start your rebel press in a hurry. I was quite sure you would not want to print a pen picture of yourself, true to life, in one of your own publications. I observe that you are less frisky, less demonstrative, in your last letter than you were when you commenced this correspondence. I had an idea when you sent your first egotistical, patronizing letter that you might possibly discover your mistake before you got through with the correspondence.

You say in your letter of the 6th instant that I "should not use bad language." My "language" expresses my sentiments. Any "language" that stands for patriotism, love of country, and loyalty to same is "bad language" to you. Any "language" that breathes the spirit of secession, sedition, and treason is approved by you. Now, let me call your attention to the fact that my "language" has not been prohibited by this Government from passing through the mails. Your "language" has been so prohibited. It was prohibited, too, because it was treasonable, seditious, and disloyal.

W. B. SHATTUC, M. C.

EDWARD ATKINSON, Esq.,

President Anti-Imperialist League, Boston, Mass.

ATKINSON TO SHATTUC.

[Special dispatch to the Cincinnati Enquirer.]

BOSTON, September 22, 1899.

Edward Atkinson, one of the vice-presidents of the Anti-Imperialist League, is out with a deft to Congressman WILLIAM B. SHATTUC, of Ohio, who returned one of Atkinson's anti-imperialist circulars with the indorsement, "Take me off your list. I am no traitor to my country." Mr. Atkinson mailed Congressman SHATTUC to-day a copy of his new manifesto. In the latest copy of the Anti-Imperialist Atkinson devotes a whole section for distribution in the First Ohio district, now represented by SHATTUC. A part of the edition is published in the German language, for the benefit of the Congressman's constituents who are of that race.

CHALLENGE ACCEPTED.

Mr. Atkinson said: "It would not be good form for the citizens of another State to attempt to influence the voters of the First Ohio district on the matter of an election of a member of Congress unless he had been invited to address them. Having received such an invitation from WILLIAM B. SHATTUC, I feel warranted in accepting his challenge and in making the effort to expurgate the list of members of the present Congress by representing to the voters of the First district the reason why he ought not to be returned. Mr. SHATTUC can not name a single man of any high public repute of those recently dead—Senator Morrill, of Vermont; John M. Forbes and Henry Lee, of Massachusetts, and others—or of those who are now living, by whom the Republican party was established, who is not now opposed to the policy of the present Administration, or who would to-day support him by their influence or their vote were he a candidate in the district in which the living among them now dwell.

A LITTLE SARCASM.

"I never happened to have met or heard of Mr. W. B. SHATTUC before.

INFERENCE DRAWN.

"I should infer from the tone of his correspondence that he might be one without any personal convictions of his own, but resembling in many ways the able-bodied persons of arms-bearing age who, from the safe security of the pulpit, the public office, or of the staff room of a newspaper, attempt to influence public opinion by using bad language and unseemly epithets in respect to men whose 'shoe latches they are not worthy to tie.'

"This class of persons is at the same time endeavoring to induce the ignorant and unwary to enlist in the service in the troops destined for the Philippines, in which they would never expose their own health or their own lives.

"Respectfully submitted to the voters of the First Ohio district and others."

SHATTUC TO ATKINSON.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, September 25, 1899.

DEAR SIR: I see that you have again broken loose, through your organ here, in its issue of Saturday, September 23, and that you are to publish a part of your edition in the German language for the benefit of my constituents who are of that nationality. I write you thus hurriedly, suggesting that you add to your tracts (in the German language) the statistics you have published from time to time in favor of restricting and preventing German immigration to this country, and also copies of the puritanical local and State laws you have assisted in passing in restraint of personal liberty far beyond what is consistent with good government.

But, before I forget it, let me say that during this correspondence you have uttered two distinct falsehoods: First, when you say that I have invited you to address the citizens of this Congressional district, and second, when you say that I have called anyone other than yourself a traitor.

It is possible, as you say, that I can not give a single name of those dead or living who were founders of the Republican party who would not approve your conduct. I can, however, give you the names of ninety-nine out of every hundred Republicans, both leaders and laymen, now living, who will say that you are guilty of treason. You have recommended and you are now recommending that our citizens do all they can to stop enlistments for the Army and that Congressmen only be elected who will vote against supplying munitions of war, who will vote against sustaining the Army, and who will do all they can to defeat our armies in the field.

For a man like you, who has always been too cowardly, though "able-bodied and of arms-bearing age," to accept any place of danger in any of our wars, to characterize our patriotic citizens who support the Government and stand by the flag, because they do not themselves enlist in the Army, is another manifestation of your unlimited gall. In the sixties you were, as a statistician, urging the prosecution of the war, encouraging enlistments in the Army, and sanctioning drafts to fill up the depleted ranks. Give me the name of the company and the number of the regiment in which you enlisted at that time. Why do you characterize others for doing just as you have always done?

You are slandering and vilifying the President and the members of his Cabinet. You are doing all you can to embarrass the Government in the prosecution of this war in every conceivable way. Your literature has been barred from the United States mail because it was seditious. The Government itself has declared you, not in so many words, but in reality, a traitor. I do not understand that the authorities have criticised your grammar, or charged you with using "bad language" in a grammatical sense. One can be a traitor and still use good language. A man may be a patriot and not speak French.

I notice you say you "never have happened to have met or heard of W. B. SHATTUC before." There are at least 44,000 patriotic gentlemen residing in

the First Congressional district of Ohio who have been as fortunate in this respect as I have been, and very many thousands of the residents of this district will accept your statement as to your having not heard of me before as being literally true. Your grandiloquent, egotistical, and patronizing (first) letter to me proves conclusively that you were serious when you made that statement.

I have heard of you nearly all my life. While a boy in the Union Army, on the firing line, shooting as I talked, against secession, I heard of you. You were at home in your luxurious, velvet-carpeted, mahogany-finished, steam-heated office in Boston making statistics at so much a page (for the benefit of Edward Atkinson), showing the resources of the North and the South, and presenting all the arguments that could be presented to encourage patriotic people to support the Administration in its efforts to put down the rebellion and restore order. You claimed that the Southern people (as brave a people as the world ever saw) should be subdued and governed without their consent.

Now, you are the chief rebel of this country. You have done everything in your power to prevent our army being successful in the island of Luzon, in order that rebellion might succeed there, on the plea that we have no right to govern except with the consent of the governed. You are deceiving yourself very much when you imagine that your efforts will have any appreciable effect in Ohio. Our people, as a rule, hold you in utter contempt. The President, a citizen of Ohio, is carrying out the express wishes not only of the people of Ohio but of all the patriotic citizens of the United States. He did not commence this war. It was the people's war. They inaugurated it and demanded action, and it was a long time before the Chief Executive yielded to the public demand.

The patriotic people of this country will stand by the President in his effort to carry out their wishes in suppressing the rebellion and restoring order in the Philippine Islands. Every American citizen has a right to entertain and express his opinions as to the future of the Philippine Islands, but it is another thing when anyone endeavors, as you have done, to obstruct and embarrass our Government in the maintenance of our Army and the conduct of a campaign already in operation under the direction of the Government.

Judging from your correspondence, you no doubt group the population of the United States in three classes:

First, Edward Atkinson.

Second, Ex-Governor Boutwell, Senator HOAR, ex-Senator Edmunds.

Third, The rest of the United States.

In every letter you write you name these three gentlemen as your supporters, and assume that they possess all the brains and patriotism of the country. I have no doubt that it was one of your own ancestors who stated in a public address in Boston over a hundred years ago that civilization might extend as far west as Buffalo, N. Y., but not beyond that point, and the man who made that statement had about as much knowledge of the West as you seem to have of the First Congressional district of Ohio. Your relations with the great men of this country and your connection with the public affairs in the past thirty-six years have been just about as potential in influencing and determining results as the scorer in a base ball game has in determining the result of the contest. Because you have "kept tab" on events as they occurred, you imagine you have been a potent factor in shaping them.

Yours, etc.,

W. B. SHATTUC, M. C.

EDWARD ATKINSON, Esq., Boston, Mass.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Atkinson has said (and I quote from his Science of Nutrition): "I suppose everyone has a mission. My own mission appears to be to overcome the inertia of woman," and that being so, I suggest that he had better in future apply himself to his mission.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ALLEN of Maine having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 2924. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Colorado Springs, in the State of Colorado;

S. 2493. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for land in certain cases;

S. 3616. An act to authorize the payment of traveling allowances to enlisted men of the regular and volunteer forces when discharged by order of the Secretary of War and stated by him as entitled to travel pay;

S. 3430. An act to increase the efficiency of the Subsistence Department of the United States Army;

S. 3075. An act granting an increase of pension to Marie J. Blaisdell;

S. 2883. An act to change the characteristic of Cape Cod light, Massachusetts; and

S. 2581. An act to incorporate the National White Cross of America, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 8063. An act to legalize and maintain the iron bridge across Pearl River at Rockport, Miss.;

H. R. 10311. An act to authorize the Shreveport and Red River Valley Railway Company to build and maintain a railway bridge across Red River at or near the town of Alexandria, in the parish of Rapides, State of Louisiana;

H. R. 60. An act to create the northwestern division of the northern district of Georgia for judicial purposes and to fix the time and place for holding court therein;

H. R. 9284. An act to attach the county of Foard, in the State of Texas, to the Fort Worth division of the northern district of Texas, and providing that all process issued against defendants residing in said county shall be returned to Fort Worth; and

H. R. 9713. An act permitting the building of a dam between Coon Rapids and the north limits of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., across the Mississippi River.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] who controls the time on the other side will now say to whom he yields.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, there are several gentlemen on this side to whom I promised to yield, but as I do not see any of them upon the floor just now, I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], if he can possibly do so, to yield time now to some one on his side.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from New York for the courtesy he has extended me in granting me a few minutes of the time devoted to general debate. I assure the committee that I will not impose upon their patience or their time by attempting a logical discussion of the merits of the great questions that are now before Congress, but rather will give some impressions that have come to me as a new member, as I have been sitting here for four months a silent listener to those who, by their experience and their ability, have demonstrated their fitness to discuss the issues that are to become the policies of the two great parties in the contest upon which we are about to enter for the purpose of controlling the affairs of our common country for the four years that are to follow.

This debate has been as general as the geographical, commercial, and political interests of the country are diversified. During the early days of the session, when the financial bill was under discussion—that great measure by the enactment of which the Republican party kept its pledged faith to the country and to the world—I felt like congratulating my colleague from Kansas, Mr. RIDGELY, who is all that is left of the Populist party in our State, upon what must have been a very pleasant experience to him—that of seeing the great Democratic party of this country espousing with such vehemence the doctrines which have been the cardinal principles of Populism in Kansas for more than a decade. Out in Kansas every voter is a post-graduate in financial discussion.

We have been the storm center of Populism. It was in Kansas that Jerry Simpson made his barefoot race for Congress upon the financial question. It was in Kansas that the wind blew through Peffer's whiskers and landed him in the United States Senate upon the money question. It was in Kansas that the distinguished gentleman, Mr. LIVINGSTON, of Georgia, who now occupies a seat in this House, came to organize the Farmers' Alliance, which gave birth to Populism, and which was run upon the money question and has become such a powerful adjunct of Democracy in the West.

As I listened in the early part of this session to the discussions of the financial question, the expressions used, especially by the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Texas, were wonderfully familiar to us as they talked about basic money, the money of final redemption, and the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. And as they made their drastic prophecies of misfortune and calamity that would come to us as a people if the gold standard were adopted, I thought to myself history is again repeating itself, for I remember four years ago that the same prophecies were made with a great deal more unanimity upon the other side of the Chamber than at present of the terrible results that would befall us as a people if the Republican party were put into power pledged to such legislation as we were about to enact. Four years ago the discussion started here and was taken up by the great majority of the Democratic press, and he who is the incarnation of Popocracy—and let me define what Popocracy is; it is a cross between Democracy and Populism, with Populism as the mother, and the maternal side has had the best of it in the results. I repeat: He who is the incarnation of Popocracy traveled from ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf, declaring that the commercial depression that was then upon the people and the country could never be relieved until the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 was enacted into law, and that without the aid or consent of any other nation.

I remember very distinctly in the campaign of 1896 that the Demo-Pops of Kansas carried in their torchlight processions transparencies that read: "Vote for Bryan and dollar wheat!" "Vote for McKinley and 25-cent wheat!" And the honest farmer, who was then suffering under the hard times and business depression, incident to a Democratic Administration that was then upon us, and was selling his wheat at 35 cents and his corn from 12 to 16 cents, said, "Things can not be any worse than they are now, and we will take a dose of this new political nostrum and try it once anyway." But Mr. McKinley was elected President. The gold standard is enacted into law, and to-day the farmers of the great Middle West are getting 60 cents for their wheat, 30 cents for their corn; hogs, cattle, and horses are selling for from 50 to 100 per cent more than they did in 1896, and then you prophets of evil have the audacity to stand up in the American Congress and again make your prophecies of misfortune that will come to the American

people if the party is retained in power under whose Administration prosperity has come in spite of your predilections.

"Oh, but," say our Democratic friends, "you Republicans are trying to give McKinley's Administration credit for the famine in India, failure of crops in other countries, and other misfortunes that have befallen the human race during the past three years that are largely responsible for better prices that now exist, and it is simply good luck rather than good management upon your part." My answer is as logical as your premises. For you may call it luck if you choose, but I would rather belong to a party that always has luck follow its administration of the affairs of this country than to belong to a party that never has any luck and only thrives on calamity and despair. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, the great cause of the prosperity that has come to us is the fulfillment of the pledges made by the Republican party in 1896.

We have placed upon the statutes the Dingley bill. We opened the factories rather than the mints, and have given employment to labor everywhere, and we have placed the credit of the country upon a sound financial basis, that has restored confidence and sent a thrill of life through the great commercial heart of our nation that has brought prosperity to us all.

Be not deceived, my Democratic friends, in cherishing the belief that you can any more easily deceive the people in 1900 than you did in 1896. The laboring man who everywhere is receiving better wages with permanent employment, the farmers both North and South, East and West, with the great object lesson of the past four years before them, the burden bearers and the breadwinners everywhere in this great country of ours, will be slow to accept as true any prophecies you may make regarding the future, remembering, as they must, what a colossal failure the Democratic party made in the prophesying business in 1896. And indeed, as I look back half a century, I discover that the Democratic party of to-day is occupying the same position in regard to all the great questions that mark national progress and national development that she has occupied in the past. Simply the party of negation, and is usually a decade behind the times, only acknowledging that as a nation we are making progress when the stern logic of events forces such confession.

I remember that in the latter part of the eighties there appeared in Kansas a little book entitled "The Seven Financial Conspiracies." It was adopted as the text-book of the Populist and Democratic parties in the West. They commenced with the financial history of our country at the time the Republican party came into power and branded each one of the great laws that have been placed upon our statute books by the Republican party. These great laws that mark the milestones of our national growth and progress were characterized as conspiracies against the public welfare, and this sentiment was taken up by the allied forces of Democracy and Populism in 1896, and the crime of 1873 was made their battle cry in that memorable contest. My Democratic friends, did you ever stop to think that when you have a conspiracy you must have a conspirator? The so-called conspiracies, the exemption clause upon the greenbacks, the national banking act, the credit-strengthening act, each one of these great measures that became laws from 1861 to 1865, whose signature, I ask, was necessary to complete these great acts into law and thereby became a part of the conspiracy and one of the conspirators?

I pause with reverence as I take the name of Abraham Lincoln upon my lips and leave it to the great jury of humanity whether he was a conspirator against his country's welfare and his country's honor. And thus they followed along each one of these great provisions until they reached the culmination of all the conspiracies in the so-called crime of 1873. Again I ask you whose signature made that enactment of Congress a law? It was the silent man of destiny who received the sword of General Lee beneath the knotted boughs of the apple tree at Appomattox. I leave history and future generations to render the verdict whether U. S. Grant was a conspirator against the country for which he had done so much and he loved so well; and to say that such a law was passed without knowing its purport is an insult not only to the intelligence of President Grant, but to the American Congress as well.

No bitter denunciations, no glittering generalities, can detract from the splendid history of the Republican party in the past or can swerve it from accepting the responsibilities of the present.

No, my Democratic friends, you may take the most eloquent words that ever fell from the lips of William Jennings Bryan and write them in letters of light across the arch of heaven, with one base of that arch, if you please, resting upon his crown of thorns and the other upon his cross of gold, and just beneath I will write one word in letters plain that will live in the hearts of grateful humanity after Bryan and Populism are forgotten, and that word is Appomattox.

Appomattox, with all the meaning that it conveys; for at that place and that hour the approval of the people of this country was placed upon national sovereignty and national unity, and this

approval was sealed by the blood of the manhood of the North and chivalry of the South.

And now the Democratic party, as they are making up the issues for another national campaign, find themselves in this position: They are afraid to make the slogan of 1896 the main issue in 1900, and they can not abandon free coinage of silver at 16 to 1, for that would mean the passing of Mr. Bryan, who, if he is not discreet, is at least consistent, for having once said the horse is 16 feet high, adheres to it with a tenacity of purpose worthy of a better cause. So they are compelled to make an issue by tendering sympathy and hope to those who are in open rebellion with the armies of the United States.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the attention of the committee for a few minutes, as I shall give the impressions that have come to me as I have listened to the debates upon the new issues that are forced upon us as a result of the war with Spain.

I have listened to this great debate, not as a lawyer, but as a layman, one whose busy life has been spent in the mart rather than the forum, in the producing and in the buying and selling the articles that enter into the commerce of our great country, rather than in the theoretical jugglery with financial theories as expounded by unpronounceable French authors or by men who have no practical knowledge of affairs. And while, upon many of the questions that Congress is called upon to consider, a technical knowledge of the law is of great benefit, and while I have the highest regard for the legal profession, yet, like my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] I am consoled in the thought that my mind is not legal to that extreme degree that constitutional rabies or hydrophobia may take possession of me and lead me to do strange things and follow after strange gods.

I believe the Constitution of the United States is admissible of an interpretation broad enough and generous enough to meet every condition that shall come into our national life that bears upon its face merit and is found to stand for the nation's honor and welfare, for the nation's growth, and the advancement of human progress and Christian civilization.

Then, Mr. Chairman, let us consider briefly the facts as they exist to-day with reference to the relations of our Government to our insular possessions, which have come to us primarily as the fortunes of war, but have brought new and great responsibilities which we must either accept or deny. I believe that from the very hour that Admiral Dewey sunk the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila, the duty and the responsibility has been resting upon our Government to establish law and order, and to guarantee life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness to the people of those unfortunate islands.

The Administration, realizing this great duty, accepted the responsibility. And I most sincerely believe, had it not been for the sympathy and encouragement extended by some of our own people to the insurgents who were opposing, in the Philippines, what seems to me to be the manifest duty of our Government—I believe that order and good government would have been restored there long since, and hundreds of lives of our brave boys would have been saved, and millions of treasure as well.

Mr. Chairman, what would have been the result to the people of the Philippines had the Administration ordered our fleet to sail away after the destruction of the Spanish fleet on that memorable 1st of May? Had this been done there would have been precipitated an internal strife and chaos that would have jeopardized the lives and property of citizens of every country that might have been represented there, and would have been the excuse for some of the other nations of the world to have taken possession and done what was our manifest duty to do.

Had the American fleet sailed away and left that hapless island to its own internal strife and dissension or to be subdued by some of the other nations, the Administration would have justly deserved not only the execration of our own people, but of the civilized world as well.

And I believe I assert the truth when I say that immediate independence for the Filipinos has never for one moment been a possibility since Dewey's guns were booming at Manila Bay. And were it not for the mean political advantage which is hoped to be gained, and I assure you it is only a hope, every honest man who has studied the history and character of these people would agree with me.

And the men who to-day are expending sympathy upon the liberty-loving Filipinos, and are talking loudly of the desecration of the Declaration of Independence, I want to ask them if they know of any flag that stands for a better or greater liberty than does ours? And what country is better equipped to instruct these people in the science of self-government? Oh, but says our Democratic friends, we are drifting toward imperialism, and this is but the beginning of the ending of popular government. Imperialism in its better sense has no terrors to me and need have to no loyal American citizen. If by imperialism you mean our right to govern and control our new possessions until such a time as they have demonstrated their ability for self-government, then I am in favor of imperialism.

But if by it you mean that we are to hold these people, as the Democratic party apparently want the world to think we will, in bondage and slavery, denying to them the blessings of our civilization, imposing upon them unjust taxes for our own benefit, and making no effort to improve their condition, then I am, and all loyal men will be, opposed to imperialism.

But shame, thrice shame, upon the American citizen and a greater shame still upon a great political party that promulgates the theory that a Congress which is to be the guardians of our new possessions will ever be elected by the people of the United States that will not deal fairly and honorably by the people of these dependencies.

I am willing to stake the future not only of our country, but our dependencies as well, upon the common sense, the business judgment, the humanity and patriotism of the people of the United States. And a Congress that shall dare to do other than what is best for the welfare of the people of our new possessions will be deposed by an indignant and outraged people.

The hue and cry that has been raised by the Democrats, assisted by a few misguided Republicans, over the Puerto Rican tariff is a tempest in a teapot, and time will justify the position the Republican party has taken upon this matter, as it has justified the positions she has taken upon all the great questions for nearly half a century. Men who are the unfortunate victims of the constitutional mania, I presume, see in our present position a future freighted with great peril. But to me, as a layman, after listening to the exhaustive debates upon the constitutional phase of this question from both sides, I am thoroughly convinced that there is plenty of law and Constitution for us to take either course we may choose in this matter.

Then, this being the case, let us take a plain, businesslike view of the situation, and adopt that course that can cause us the least embarrassment in the future and at the same time permit us to fulfill the great obligation we are under to the people of these new possessions and to civilization.

And that course will be to hold these new possessions under such government and laws as Congress shall provide until such a time as we can demonstrate to them, or they can demonstrate to us, their fitness for self-government.

When that time shall arrive we can trust the Congress of the United States to mete out to them full and impartial justice.

To admit these people, at this time, to the free rights of American citizens under the Constitution would be both unwise and impolitic.

But in the course of time, if they take kindly to the principles of self-government and liberty, then the question of extending the Constitution to these islands can be discussed with open justice to all. But the great question that confronts us now is to give our new possessions such a form of government that will better their condition morally and commercially, and will develop in them that self-reliance and independence, that love of liberty—not liberty without license, but liberty under law—that is the foundation and the very genius of our Government. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. BAILEY of Kansas] seems to be very much worried about the Populist party and the Democratic party. He seems to think we have gone into "the sere and yellow leaf." I want to say to the gentleman that the Populist party has never abandoned an issue by working with other parties or sacrificed a principle. The Populist party contended, in common with the great mass of the Democratic party, the Silver Republican party, and, really, with the rank and file of the Republican party, that a sufficiency of money is as necessary to prosperity as is a sufficiency of blood to the health of the human body.

The Populist party has always contended that the quantitative theory of money and not the material from which it is made is the gist of the controversy, so the material is good. We have always insisted that neither gold nor silver is in itself sacred, but the object to be reached is to have the amount of good money commensurate with the business to be transacted, and issued and controlled by the Government, and that when such a condition is reached we will have prosperity. That contention has been proven beyond any question, and the Republican party is now on the back track toward this theory; it is now flooding the entire country with its literature, and especially with a speech delivered here a few weeks ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY], elected as a Democrat, but who is now seeking to get the Republican nomination of his district in the State of Pennsylvania, if he has not already gotten it.

That speech which they are now circulating states our position pretty clearly. It argues from our original principles that the quantitative theory of money is the thing that has been dividing parties for many years, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania gives as his excuse for abandoning his former position that the production of gold has become so enormous that it is now furnishing

us abundantly, and more currency than both gold and silver did in the past, and he comes forward now as a Republican, taken into the fold of the party, and is now attempting to be elected by the Republican party on its platform, and he says accordingly that the abundance of money furnished through the increased production of gold and the money furnished by the bank circulation have been so great that it has greatly contributed to the prosperity that is now supposed to exist and dispenses with the necessity for silver, and says that the increase of gold has proven our contention and his former contention.

But I want to say to my friend Mr. BAILEY of Kansas that the Populist party, the Bryan Democratic party, and the Silver Republican party are made of the rank and file of the American people. They represent the manhood of the American people; they represent the individual in our body politic; while the Republican organization is now known all over the country to represent essentially and only accumulated wealth and the classes as against the masses.

Now, sir, we might analyze for a moment how it is that the present Administration is in power.

I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that if the voter in the last election had been untrammelled; if that vote had been the honest expression of the individual voter, without extraneous influences, Mr. McKinley never could have occupied the White House of this nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Republican party, bear in mind, did not get the vote of the laborer on the farm; it did not get the majority out of the white English speaking people of the United States; it did not get the support of the masses without the use of the enormous corruption fund; but it did get the election and how did it secure it? I want to remind our friends on the other side, that the nomination of Mr. McKinley was not spontaneous, I want to remind them of conditions that prevailed then, and let them analyze for a moment how it came about that he did get the nomination. Go to your own leaders, and what do you find?

There appeared in the public press before his nomination, under the signature of a Republican Senator from New Hampshire [Senator CHANDLER of New Hampshire], an article stating that a campaign fund had been contributed by the manufacturing interests and the corporations of the country amounting to about a quarter of a million of dollars. Not that this sum was to be used against the Democratic party in that campaign, but he complained that \$250,000 had been raised for the purpose of securing the nomination of the present incumbent as against any other Republican in his party. And, Mr. Chairman, he not only put that over his own signature in the public press, but he reannounced it on the floor of the Senate of the United States, and gave warning then, before this Administration came into power, that if the moneyed interests raised a quarter of a million of dollars for a favorite son and expended that money on him, the same interests would demand its return when he entered into the duties of the Executive office.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like for our friends on the other side to examine this question and see who have occupied and who now occupy the offices under him in pursuance of that election. I would like them to examine and see where the farmer, where the agriculturist, where the laborer, where the teacher, where the intelligent ordinary citizen of the country has been recognized in the Cabinet of the present Administration and in the control of the Government of this country. I would like them to say whether the manhood, whether the intelligence, of the country has been amply and fully recognized, or whether the mere representatives of wealth are not found as turning the scales in the makeup of the governing forces of the nation.

Now, let us look for a moment at what is going on in governmental circles. But before proceeding with that branch of the subject, I wish to pursue the question of the electors, and of this election in particular, a little further. I wish to ask where and how the electors were obtained. If you take the colored man out of the voting machinery of the United States, the present occupant of the White House never could have succeeded in securing the place which he now holds. That position for him would have been an utter impossibility without the vote of the colored man, as he is numerous enough to make a balance of power.

But, Mr. Chairman, ever since the days when Abraham Lincoln set the pace that gave deserved freedom to every black man in the United States, most every colored man who was the beneficiary of that act has given a Republican vote, as a rule, not from conviction, not from love for living Republican principles, but as an act of gratitude for what the Republican party did for him back in the days of the sixties. But now march these voters to one side; deprive the colored men of their rights as voters, and those who hold office now in the Republican party would certainly be defeated.

But take another view of the case. Leave him and go and take the foreign population of the country—that part of the population who can not speak the English tongue; take that part of the population who have just reached our shores and know nothing of our Government, and who care nothing about the votes they cast;

who vote year in and year out at the behest of the great manufacturers and combinations who work them; put them aside, and the Republican party could never occupy power in this country. Pass them over and take from them the unlimited campaign fund that is used in every portion of the country to buy newspapers, to put in office men who control great bodies of men, and the corrupt disposition of patronage, and you never could occupy positions of trust in this country which are determined by the popular voice.

If there is one thing, Mr. Chairman, that I am proud of, it is that I belong to a party that is in the interest of the men who vote from principle, in the interest of the men who toil, in the interest of the great masses of the people, rather than in the interest of the accumulated wealth and especially favored classes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, sir, I have no objection to the Democratic party, to the Silver Republican party, to the Populist party, to the Prohibition or any other parties that believe in the same doctrines, as I believe in uniting their good efforts. I shall be glad to have them come forward and join hands and say, "We are working for the great principle, and not for any partisan or spoils purpose."

Now, what is the Republican party that the gentleman talks so much about in this Hall doing now? What is it doing at the present time? It is dodging and endeavoring to run the gantlet of an outraged constituency. I noticed in the Denver Evening Post of April 1 a cartoon very significantly delineating its attitude on the Puerto Rican bill. That cartoon shows a box like a ticket office of a theater. Uncle Sam is standing in the box with a bunch of pamphlets containing the Constitution in his left hand and a line of Puerto Ricans walking up to the box office. Uncle Sam says, "Come up, Puerto Ricans, and get your copy of the Constitution." The first one steps up and holds out his hand to take the Constitution of the United States and Uncle Sam hits him in the nose and he drops backward, while Uncle Sam throws up his hands and says, "April fool." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, sir, this morning I picked up the North American, of Philadelphia, a Republican paper, which congratulates the Republican party that it is going to bring General Otis away from the Philippines. It says that the mistake has been going on long enough and that the managers of the Republican party in Washington are to be congratulated that they are going to allow the Republicans of the country to have at least a fighting show for the fall campaign.

Mr. GAINES. Will my friend from Colorado yield?

Mr. BELL. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. The reason why they are bringing him home is probably that they want to stop the war over there.

Mr. BELL. Yes; the war stops every morning.

We find that last night a gentleman who had occupied a high office under this Government, Hon. Webster Davis, made a speech to an enormous audience in this city in favor of the Boers in South Africa. That gentleman has had to lay down his commission within the last few days in order to raise his voice for liberty and humanity. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The teachings of liberty and humanity are inconsistent with the action of the Republican party as it is now operated. The rank and file of all parties love liberty and fair play.

Now, sir, let us go on a little further. When President McKinley was running for office we found that the railroads were pressed into service all over the country. He remained in Canton, Ohio, and men were marched to him by the great employers of labor all over this land, and he sung those beautiful platitudes to them in most dulcet, cadent strains day in and day out, while the Republican press held up Mr. Bryan as subject to the severest criticism for swinging around the circle and talking to the people at their own homes and in their own halls. But I want to suggest to our friends that from the day this Administration came into office, Cabinet officers and other officers of the Administration have been used right along as campaign speakers, and they are trekking over this country; employees often for thirty days at a time off duty, while under the pay of the Government of the United States, speaking for the Republican party.

I know of men who are drawing big salaries who have stayed away from their official places for thirty or forty days to take the platform for the Republican party while under the pay of the people of the United States.

Now, let us see why the bank trusts, sugar trusts, oil trusts, railroads, and all other combines are aligning themselves with the Republican party. One of the best tests for the voter is to find out where the enemies of good government think they are most secure; then the friends of the Government can safely take the other side.

Soon after the last Presidential election the Republican clubs had a meeting in Baltimore, and Senator THURSTON, the chairman of the last Republican convention, addressed those clubs and told them in plain language that all the combinations of capital in the Democratic party, all of the trusts and many of the combines in that party, had been scared out of it by William J. Bryan

with his advocacy of 16 to 1, and he said they all came in and voted for William McKinley in the last campaign. Should he not be loved also for the dangerous elements he deters?

Not only that, but soon after that campaign, the Republican governor of Michigan, before an audience in that State, warned his people of the same thing. He said, "My fellow-citizens, every great combination of capital in the State of Michigan last year moved into the Republican party, and I want to say to you that these are birds of ill omen. I want to say to you that if they keep flocking to the Republican party, they will certainly oust and remove from that party the representatives of the Republicans of Lincoln and Grant. I want you to understand that; and while I believe you are all right, and while I believe the rank and file of all parties are honest, it is the leadership that is wrong." He says: "You may talk about leadership; you may put a man like Lincoln at the head of the Republican party or any other party and you will have a government by the people and for the people."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. BARTLETT. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to conclude his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes additional to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BELL. "But," he says, "you may put some other persons at the head of the Republican party or any other party, and I want to warn you that you will have a government only for syndicates and combines."

That was very significant. Any man can trace the reference; and I want to say, with all due respect to the present Administration, that there never has been before a line of officials in those high places or a party that has come so near wrecking the American government as has the present Administration.

Property interests have run riot. They have had the whole thing. Human beings have not been considered. There has been a combination of capital that has run every department, and it is impossible for this House to attract attention to abuses of that line of persons. I have called attention to the fact before that in your mail contracts and every other contract with this Government the railroads may charge three or four prices for services rendered the Government, and you can not make an official of this Administration cast his eyes in that direction; but you let some poor, unfortunate, weak-dispositioned individual steal \$25 out of the post-office, and they will throw the entire weight of the American Government after him and pursue him until they lodge him in the penitentiary. The same un-American policy runs all along the line.

Now, sir, going further, the Bryan Democrats, Populists, and Silver Republicans are advocating the same doctrines that Jefferson advocated, that Lincoln advocated, that every lover of liberty and good government in this nation and all other nations have advocated, so far as we understand it—that is, a government for and by the people. We have a party of the people; we have a party that is impoverished, that can not raise a campaign fund, and the other side can raise more campaign funds than they can possibly use. Why? Because it is wealth, aggregated greed, it is special privileges, that now have possession of the Government. They put up the expenses, and therefore claim the right to operate it for capital. Men are forgotten. I have become very tired of listening to this harping about patriotism and this harping about patriotic duties by those who ever put capital above men, and what this man and that man is doing for humanity.

Now, our friends talk so much about patriotism for the Cubans and patriotism for the Puerto Ricans and patriotism in connection with the Philippine Islands, when every man in this House knows that the object of the moving powers is not the good of these individuals, but the chief aim is to obtain a control of what they have. That is the ultimate object. It is not to give to the individual freedom or liberty, to benefit him, but to benefit certain investors of this country. Now, nobody can be fooled about this here with what we have seen and heard.

Take it on Puerto Rico alone; one of the Puerto Rican officers, whom I heard in a public meeting here, said there were 93 per cent of the great dailies of the United States that insisted upon free trade being given to Puerto Rico, and all the Puerto Ricans demanded it. Yet we find men stand right up here and say they are doing this for the benefit of the Puerto Ricans; that the Puerto Ricans do not know what they want. Now, everybody knows that what has been done is at the dictation of the sugar men, and especially at the dictation of the tobacco men; yet Representatives are asserting here and they are asserting it to the American people that it is for the benefit of Puerto Ricans. I do not believe they can fool the American people much longer.

If you wipe out coercion among the American voters, they will wipe you out. If you do not use money in elections, you know and I know that this Administration never could succeed itself, and without these depraved methods this Administration never could have gotten its first hold on the American people. Twenty-five or thirty million dollars expended, with its great coercive powers, in the last campaign did the work. I saw it. You go to

the coal miners. There you will find they coerced many of the employees; men who can not speak the English language were voted by you. They secured a change in the precincts so that they might not be mixed with the town people, so if men tried to conceal their votes their employers could detect it if they had voted against them, and if the vote does not go to the Republican party they go out of employment. That is done all over the United States.

I was in Chicago during the last campaign, I was in Nebraska during the last campaign, and I know how they marched them there; I know numerous men who lost their places for even wearing a Bryan button concealed, and yet they call this a free government! These men who benefited through these methods stand up here and prate about freedom, and liberty, and human rights, and freedom of the ballot. Why, I want to say to our friends the abuse of the ballot in the South is not an atom compared with the abuse of the ballot in the great States of the East. Philadelphia, Delaware, New Jersey are hotbeds of political corruption. It is not a drop in the bucket compared with the coercion and force used on the labor vote in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman time to conclude his remarks.

Mr. BELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say further that with all this pretense about government for and by the people, you have not got it, neither are you trying to get it. You can not have a free government purchased, and you can not have a free government coerced; you can not have a free government where every man does not go forth and cast his ballot untrammelled. The powers that control the laborer and the means by which he lives can in many cases coerce his vote against his better judgment.

Now, our friends talk a great deal about the small chances of success of William Jennings Bryan. Why, if they had a man like William Jennings Bryan on their ticket and they had used the same coercion and the same moneyed influence for him that Mr. McKinley had in the last campaign, he would have carried almost every State in the Union. All the success Mr. Bryan has secured is by force of principles for which he contends. His party is without means and has no disposition to use a large fund or to coerce votes. The Republicans have every dollar that they can possibly use.

I saw men in the last campaign, men that had been leaders in our party, claiming to go off and buy sheep and cattle in distant countries, and they turned up in distant States with their pockets full of railroad passes; they turned up in those places working for the Republican party. We had supported them here, this little coterie of Populists in this House, had relied on them, and when the time came they were influenced.

I can pick you out among the appointees of the present Administration lifelong Democrats that are now drawing large salaries, and before election spending thirty and forty days for the Republican party in the campaign, at the expense of the people of the United States. Not only that, but you will bear in mind that when a certain Senator was to be elected in Ohio, the Republican papers all over this country stated that all of the appointees from the State of Ohio had been ordered home; and they were kept there, at the expense of the American people, until a certain man succeeded. And yet these gentlemen talk about free government; they talk about economical government; and they talk about the right to vote and the privileges of American citizenship.

Then they talk about prosperity. There is no extraordinary prosperity where so many men are working for a dollar and a dollar and a quarter a day, when the necessities of life are elevated as they have been since these wars began.

Now let us see about this prosperity. I say there is not a general prosperity. There is this: We have been going on a war footing for over two-thirds of this Administration, and but for the war picking a hundred thousand men out of the labor ranks, putting them in the Army, and starting up all these factories and foundries, and consuming and wasting innumerable tons of material, including breadstuffs, meat, and everything else, there would not have been anything in your supposed prosperity of to-day except such as the increased gold output made.

The increase in money has raised general prices, but that is not great; the cause of the great rise in prices is the trusts, and nothing else. In reference to this great rise in prices you may take up fence wire, and it is doubled to your farmer, while he gets 10 or 15 cents extra for his wheat. Take up nails, and the price has doubled; iron piping doubled; take up the broom you sweep your floor with, and it has almost doubled; take up your oil, and it has greatly enhanced in price. I do not believe to-day that the laboring man of the United States, in purchasing power of his wages, has benefited much except in increased employment.

This prosperity never was made by the Republican party. This same supposed prosperity is in Germany; it is in Europe; it has invaded even China as a result of the enlarged money supply.

The world is getting now the benefit of the great inventions that have been maturing so long. Things are tending higher, men are using more, but the proportion between the men who are running the mill and the men who are working in the mill—the proportion of increase is more than 100 per cent in favor of the men who own the machinery.

The farmer is not getting rich; he never can get rich in a government that gets its wealth by taxing him continually for every other purpose except the one in which he is engaged. The farmer exports a good deal more than one-half of the material that makes up the great balance of trade to Europe. Yet when you talk about the exports you infer that these new islands are the cause. The fact is that you export but a little more than you did formerly to them, if even as much. The statistics show no influence of territorial expansion accounting for our increased trade. No policy of any political party affects it. It is the development of our resources and the great demands of Great Britain, Russia, Japan, and other foreign countries that made these changes.

There is no comparison between the exports to Puerto Rico now and when Spain was in charge. They have grown less. You never did do any business with the Philippines of any consequence outside of our war business over there; you never will do a great deal, because they use but few of our products.

Now, I want to say, in conclusion, that our friend [Mr. BAILEY of Kansas] makes the criticism just indulged in for the purpose of trying to prevent a combine of the Populists, the Bryan Democrats, and the Silver Republicans, but he and his party will make a dismal failure. We do not care whether you say that we have quit the Populist party, or have quit the Democratic party, or that we quit the Silver Republican party, or whatever else you say about us. We intend to work and to vote, as long as we keep our senses, for the human being, for human rights, and human liberty as against corporate greed and the imposition of a heartless power, that is now controlling this and all civilized nations on the face of the globe—the greatest curse with which civilization is now threatened. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

[Mr. SMALL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire now to yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], and after that to yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] kindly agreed to give me a few minutes of his time, and, although I have no prepared speech, I feel that there are certain matters which should be brought clearly before Congress and the people of this country on the so-called "plain duty" policy of the President. The President of the United States in his annual message, December last, stated that it was our "plain duty" to give to the people of Puerto Rico "free access to our markets."

I shall undertake, and shall prove, I think, conclusively, that the President has abandoned his plain-duty policy, and that, too, without giving Congress the benefit of his reasons, if he has any, for so doing. He said: "Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariff between the United States and Puerto Rico and give her products free access to our markets." Where, I ask, does the President stand to-day on this question?

Let us investigate for a few moments. This question was asked no longer than three days ago in the Senate by a distinguished Republican Senator, and the American people are asking the same thing to-day. The people, Mr. Chairman, have the right to know, and certainly Congress, the lawmaking power, is entitled to know, since this question involves particularly the welfare of our country and involves the integrity of our Government.

It has been stated by Republican members of this body outside of this House with particularity, and, sir, in a general way in the House, that the President has reversed himself upon this plain-duty proposition which was involved in the infamous measure swept through this body by a bridled Republican majority, although it undertook to and will yet strip the people of Puerto Rico of their inalienable rights and those guarded and granted by our Constitution, which I contend is the law of that island, as much so as of New Mexico and Arizona.

The President to-day stands in a doubtful position before Congress and the public, but shall not longer if my voice, feeble as it may be, can be raised to state and prove that he has completely reversed himself in the "plain duty" path so clearly marked out for us and himself. I shall lay before the "plain" people of this country the "plain" facts, and I challenge here and now a successful refutation of the plain facts which I shall now state.

I read, first, the conversation had at the Republican caucus on the Puerto Rican bill between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUCK] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], wherein the former asked the latter the question as to how the

President stood on the 15 per cent tariff bill then pending before the caucus. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said:

I saw the President this afternoon, and he told me that he had no doubt of the constitutionality of the bill. He told me also that if the bill is passed by Congress he will sign it.

This statement has never been disputed, though published the next morning after the caucus in the Washington Post, an Administration paper. But I have other proofs than this. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], who supported this 15 per cent bill, in replying to the protest against his vote made by his constituents, used this language, still undisputed, which was published in the Indianapolis Journal, the leading Republican paper, of March 6:

I voted for the bill at the earnest solicitation of President McKinley and the leaders of the Republican party.

"Earnest solicitation!" To do what? Abandon our plain duty, mapped out by the President himself. Again, his colleague, Mr. BRICK, stated to his indignant constituents, in the same paper, this:

I say to you it—

The 15 per cent tariff bill—

is an Administration measure. You are standing by the President, you are making expansion easy and practicable, you are blessing the Puerto Rican people when you support this measure.

This interview has never been disputed. "Making expansion easy!" You are making "expansion easy and practicable" when you pervert the principles of our Constitution—indeed, its very words—which says that our tariff duties shall be levied uniform "throughout the United States." You must undermine the principles that have upheld this country for over a hundred years to make "expansion easy and practicable." We must abandon our "plain duty" to ourselves and to these people to make "expansion easy and practicable." We make "expansion easy and practicable" by stripping the Puerto Rican people of their natural right of free trade with all the world.

If we must rob these people of their liberty, if we must grind into powder the American Constitution, if we must break our promises to these people, if we must turn our backs upon our friends in need, as these people were, who willingly yielded their allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, who love our institutions and our flag, who are now a part of us, to "make expansion easy and practicable," may the God of heaven visit a prohibition on such an unpatriotic and un-American act. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But I introduce another witness. In a carefully-prepared interview, a column in length, in this same paper, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], the secretary of the Republican national machine for making Presidents against the will of the people, who, in voting for this measure, brought down the wrath of his constituents, to appease whom, said:

I realized throughout all much doubt. I felt justified in my course, supported as I was by a united party, with six exceptions, and under the leadership of the Executive, who is the head of our party.

This interview has never been disputed, and is published in the Indianapolis Journal, a Republican sheet, of March 6.

"Under the leadership of the Executive, who is the leader of his party," he says he supported this measure, and that, "with six exceptions," his party was unanimous. Mr. Chairman, the day will come when those "six exceptions" will be canonized by the American people. They are known. Their names are familiar to every household on the American continent. "Their fame is no more to be hemmed in by State lines than their patriotism is capable of being circumscribed within the same narrow limits." [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL], a leading Republican, was addressing the House on February 21, and used this language:

Now, I presume, the gentleman who is about to interrupt me [Mr. DALZELL] is prepared to say, as I am informed he has said to others, that the President is in favor of this bill. I do not dispute that, but I say that no longer ago than day before yesterday a representative of one of the great Republican papers of this country was sent to the President of the United States by his paper for the purpose of ascertaining the views of the President. The paper wanted to support the Presidential policy; they wanted to know whether they should continue editorially the support of the position the President had taken in his message; and the representative of that paper was assured at that time, no longer ago than day before yesterday, that the President was of the same opinion still and that the paper should go on as it had been doing.

Mr. DALZELL did not dispute this statement and has not to this good hour, so far as I know.

Now listen, gentlemen. This "great Republican paper" wanted to know February 19 last whether it should continue editorially the support of the position the President had taken in his message—that is, his free-trade or "plain-duty" policy—

and the representative of that paper was assured at that time, by the President, that the President was of the same opinion still and that the paper should go on as it had been doing.

That speech, Mr. Chairman, was delivered February 21. Now, let us study that. The newspaper wanted to know if they should continue to support his free-trade policy, his "plain-duty" policy,

and the President informed the great newspaper to continue parading before the American people his pretended position, his free-trade position, while at the same time the President was lobbying with the members of this House to carry through this House a measure imposing a tariff of 15 per cent.

Did the American people ever hear of such a humiliating, such an outrageous, such an unpatriotic and weak position taken by any President we have ever had? So weak he can not stand alone and do his "plain duty" with even six leaders of his party in this House and as many more in the Senate plus the Democratic party in Congress and 76,000,000 people, and all because the sugar and tobacco lords oppose his free-trade policy!

The able lawyer who opposed this bill as unconstitutional and otherwise wrong, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS], says he voted for the bill "at the request of the President" in an undisputed interview in the Washington Post of March 27, which I will insert in my remarks:

[Interview in Washington Post, March 27, 1900.]

VERMONT AFLAME FOR FREE TRADE.

Representative H. H. POWERS, who has returned from a week's trip to his home in Vermont, said yesterday that he was surprised at the sentiment for free trade prevailing in the Green Mountain State. "I heard talk in favor of free trade and in condemnation of the tariff everywhere I went," said he. "The Vermonters are ridiculing the idea of Puerto Rico not being a part of this country and under our Constitution. Many of the voters illustrate the absurdity of such a doctrine with quaint illustrations quite to the point."

"On what do they base their objections to a tariff?" he was asked. "Oh, they call up the proclamation made by General Miles," replied Judge POWERS. "They tell me that the islands came under our rule without resistance, and that it is a breach of faith for us now to set up a barrier and tell them that they are not a part of the United States. I do not suppose they care so much for the legal arguments of the case; they look at the matter from the standpoint of soundness and fair dealing."

"But it is generally believed that the people of New England are paying little attention to the Puerto Rican question, and care little whether there be tariff or free trade."

RESPECT FOR MCKINLEY'S POLICY.

"Well, as far as political support of their members of Congress is concerned," answered Judge POWERS, "the voters may not waver in their loyalty. I told my people that I was for free trade; they knew I had made a speech in favor of free trade. I explained that I voted for the tariff bill after it had been modified, and that I did so at the request of the President."

Mr. Chairman, let me read from the Constitution a passage that has not been read in the House during this session. Speaking of the President's duties, section 3, Article II, says:

He [President] shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

And what else? The Constitution says furthermore that "he shall take care that the laws are faithfully executed," which, by abandoning his "plain-duty" policy, he fails to do, because the law is, our duties must be uniform throughout the domain of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, he is sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and by the same provision of the Constitution he is required "from time to time" to recommend to Congress such "measures" as he shall "judge necessary and expedient" and at the same time give us information on the state of the Union, "our great Republic"—we find in his message, saying that it was "our plain duty"—his duty and the duty of Congress—to give to Cuba and Puerto Rico free trade.

Yet we find this same great magistrate, who is sworn to support the Constitution, lobbying against the very message which he has sent under the mandate of the Constitution to Congress, pushing through Congress a measure diametrically opposed to every proposition which he, in cold black ink, upheld by his Cabinet and his Secretary of War, Mr. Root, had previously recommended to Congress. But here is the reprehensibility of his position particularly: Congress as such does not find him saying that he has changed his views; that he finds it not to be his "plain duty" to do as suggested in his message, but to do something directly opposite to it.

Mr. Chairman, Congress is entitled to have his reasons for his change. There is no question that he has changed. The Speaker of this House, who administers the parliamentary law of this great body with such preeminent fairness, justice, and openheartedness as to commend him most kindly to everyone in this House, says, in an open letter, that he is "cooperating with the President" and two or three great Senators in supporting this measure that imposes upon these cyclone-swept people this tariff. I quote the distinguished Speaker's words:

What the Senate is going to do is problematical. It has its share of cowards. The Senate is always the body upon which the great interests concentrate their efforts to defeat proper legislation. But this fact remains, that I have the knowledge that I have done my simple duty, and have done it in consultation and in cooperation with the President of the United States, whose heart is quick to feel the afflictions of this little island; I have done it in conference with such men as ALLISON, FORAKER, and the earnest patriots of the Senate.

Then clearly the President abandoned, and early in the fight, his "plain duty."

Mr. Chairman, the President has said a great many beautiful things. He seems to say them because they are beautiful. He has said more beautiful things, he has been more of a Chesterfield

on more occasions, than any other man who ever occupied the White House. And then he is charming beyond expression to all of those who have the honor of being in his presence.

He has repeatedly said, "Our flag does not mean one thing here and another thing in Cuba or Puerto Rico." He uttered those words on August 25 before 20,000 Methodist people at Ocean Grove and elsewhere. If our flag means something different in Puerto Rico now than in 1899, why not give his reasons to Congress? Or at least let him hang himself on the hind end of a Pullman car, as he has often done, and tell the people that the American flag means something in Puerto Rico, something different from what it has always meant here, which is the protection to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, inalienable rights, and their complete protection by the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, the President, gifted in beautiful declamation, has said that "imperialism does not lurk in the minds of the American people." How many times has that sweet sentence fallen upon our willing ears! Yet, Mr. Chairman, the very thing that the Republican party, headed by the President, is doing now shows that imperialism not only lurks in America, but that it lurks about the precincts of Republican Congressional legislation, and that it means, as it does and will always mean, that humanity shall be controlled by the dictum of individuals and not by a written Constitution. But I must hurry on.

Mr. Chairman, I have proven the President has changed from his "plain-duty" policy, and I contend Congress is entitled to know his reasons. He has changed on his imperialism policy, and we are entitled to know his reasons from "time to time." But it may be he changes so often he has not the time. [Applause.] But instead of that we find, Mr. Chairman, to use the very significant, always interesting, language of my friend from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUCK] in that remarkable Republican caucus, "Now, look here: I want to know what the President wants done. I will not take any whispering here under broad-brimmed hats."

Mr. Chairman, he was right; and the American Congress wants to know what the President thinks about his "plain duty;" and if he has any fundamental reasons for changing his views, let him give them to Congress, and not whisper them around under the sombreros of the Republican party. The Constitution nowhere says, and never will say, thank God, that the President must give his views to the Republican party. It says his message must be given to the Congress of the United States; and in addition to that, to giving it to us regularly from time to time, he must do so from time to time as the exigencies of the case may require. Here is an opportunity at hand.

Mr. Chairman, the President has changed from the plain duty he owed Congress and himself as President, the people of Puerto Rico, and our country at large. He was reminded of the fact that he owed a plain duty to his party that placed him in the White House and turned Congress over to the Republicans that now control it. Clearly, he has put duty to party above duty to country. The sugar lords and tobacco kings representing the trusts, the friends and allies of him and his party, demanded that he abandon his plain duty and bend his knee, and he and his party have done so.

The people of Puerto Rico had free trade with Spain before we annexed this island to the United States. Spain has barred the people of Puerto Rico from her markets, and now we bar them, and yet they are part of us. Our forefathers said to King George they would no longer stand this very thing—that rather than longer remain slaves they would die. And now we are about to do for the people of Puerto Rico what we dare not and have no power to do with the people of the States of this Union and our old Territories.

Can we do this and longer say that ours is a land of the free and the home of the brave? Can we do this and say, as we have said in the past, and prove it, that our country is the asylum for the oppressed of all nations? Mr. Chairman, I was delighted during my recent illness to read the dulcet strains of my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], who in this House some twelve months ago said that the Puerto Ricans, when our Army marched into the confines of that little island, received us without bullets; that we greeted them with the American flag, the emblem of liberty and justice.

And, said the distinguished orator, the demonstration of these soon-to-be-reenslaved people was like "an old-fashioned Fourth of July celebration." [Great applause.] And in my heart of hearts, though writhing in pain, I asked myself the question, If our Army were to again go there, or if the American Congress was to go there, if the reception this good and brave people once gave our representatives would be an old-fashioned or a new-fashioned Fourth of July reception? [Applause.] And I asked myself another question, When will it be that these poor people, if the Republican party continues in power, have their Fourth of July celebration? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, methinks I know when. It will be when that unterrified, unbent, and unpurchasable leader and patriot, William J. Bryan, is in yonder White House as President of this Re-

public. When that occurs, as it will, then these poor people will meet, whether in summer or winter, in spring or fall, and make for themselves a day of celebration, and call it their "Fourth of July." For under the administration of our great leader deliverance will come to these soon-to-be-enslaved people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.
Mr. STOKES. I desire, Mr. Chairman, before taking the floor, to yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS] such time as he desires.

[Mr. MIERS of Indiana addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. STOKES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. HAUGEN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is anybody else who wants to be heard in general debate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana rose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides on page 31 that "the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry outside of the city of Washington may hereafter, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be granted leave of absence not to exceed 15 days in any one year."

That provision does justice, even though it may be but limited justice, to the employees mentioned. I rise more particularly now to call the attention of members of the House to the condition which prevails with reference to employees in all the Executive Departments here in the city of Washington.

This system has brought protests from all familiar with its operations and not interested as beneficiaries, and from the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] on account of the abuse of the sick-leave privileges granted to employees. His suggestions in 1897 on that subject are germane and appropriate now. Under the rules of the Executive Departments, employees in Washington who labor seven hours a day are granted a vacation leave of thirty days with pay, and in addition to that they are granted a sick-leave vacation of thirty additional days with pay.

Under the provisions of the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, contained in section 7, page 316, volume 30, United States Statutes at Large, 1897 to 1899, is found a law giving to the select Government clerks and employees in the Executive Departments at Washington special privileges and advantages.

These positions in Washington, with the large salaries paid, with their usual and reasonable burdens, are considered sinecures, and are sought after by thousands of good, industrious, and intelligent men and women from every State in the Union. Under these conditions no reasons exist why they should be singled out as special favorites of the Government and given benefits not accorded to other employees who labor with equal fidelity and efficiency and whose only misfortune seems to be that they are not residents of Washington and of the District of Columbia.

The oft-repeated sentiment, "Equal rights to all, special privileges to none," would seem to have an application here.

In 1897 the number of Department employees who availed themselves of the sick-leave privileges was astounding, and I understand that the same general abuse exists to-day, and the same amount of sickness prevails. We know that the climate of Washington is healthy, the air salubrious, and the water and the food not objectionable; and there is no condition that would produce the degree of sickness that is evinced by the number of clerks that are granted this sick-leave absence. Sixty per cent of the Government employees after receiving thirty days' leave of absence with pay availed themselves of this sick-leave privilege, as shown by this previous report. I believe that the members should protest against this system, especially when we know that some of the Departments are so far back in their work, and especially can this be said of the Pension Department.

The law now in force amended in part the act passed by the Fifty-second Congress, found in Statutes at Large, volume 27, page 715, which law is the first I have been able to find giving such exclusive privileges to Washington department employees. The former law gave to such of these clerks and employees as were specially ambitious to get pay without rendering services and who could make themselves believe that they were sick, either in fact or in imagination—this law of 1893 gave such the opportunity of getting ninety days each year, vacation and sick leave, with full pay. An abridgment of this privilege was ingrafted on the bill of March, 1898, and this allowance is now limited to sixty days for sick and vacation leaves.

The law as it exists, so far as applicable to this subject, provides that—

Hereafter it shall be the duty of the heads of the several Executive Departments, in the interest of the public service, to require of all clerks and other employees, of whatever grade or class, in their respective Departments,

not less than seven hours of labor each day, except Sundays and days declared public holidays by law or Executive order. *Provided further,* That the head of any Department may grant thirty days' annual leave with pay in any one year to each clerk or employee. *And provided further,* when a clerk or employee is personally ill, and when to limit the annual leave to thirty days in any one calendar year would work peculiar hardship, it may be extended, in the discretion of the head of the Department, with pay, not exceeding thirty days in any one case or in any one calendar year.

It will be seen how a provision like this may be abused by people upon whom the burdens of official duty do not sufficiently rest to bring efficiency to the public service.

Now, to show how the former law was abused, I desire to read from the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, General BINGHAM, chairman of the committee presenting the measure at that time, and on whose advocacy and on the report of whose committee the present law limiting to sixty days this privilege was enacted. He said:

To-day the Departments in Washington grant leaves of absence of thirty days with pay, which is called "vacation absence." It next takes up those cases of sick—sick because of contagious diseases in the family or individually sick—and may allow in such cases an additional thirty days. Besides that, when a case is specially meritorious, it is allowed thirty days more. You will find in the appendix to the report of the committee, on page 24, the correspondence with all of the Departments of the Government, wherein we have asked them to submit to what extent this leave-of-absence privilege has been carried, and the report shows in a table on page 24—and I need not go into details—the extent to which it has been carried.

There seems to have been a lack of care in the administration of this privilege under existing law. There has been a general acceptance, perhaps an unreasonable availing, on the part of subordinate officials of the Government, of the privileges of the law; but all we desire at the present time is to make this limitation of thirty days, as now provided by the law, and thirty days under specific restrictions, in meritorious cases, for the prevalence of obnoxious and contagious diseases in the families of the departmental employees, or where the clerk or subordinate is personally ill.

Leaves of absence.

Department or bureau.	Employees authorized.	Number in classified service who availed of sick leave in addition to 30 days' annual leave.	Average number of days of sick leave granted to each in preceding column.	Employees who were granted additional sick leave in "exceptional and meritorious" cases.	Average number of days of additional sick leave granted in each "exceptional and meritorious" case.
Department of State.....	79	41	9.12	7	36.43
Department of War.....	1,158	581	10.96	12	33.30
Department of the Treasury*.....	2,745	1,486	14.32	29	14.37
Post-Office Department.....	649	232	16.30	19	15.47
Department of Justice.....	131	40	10.66	4	16.25
Department of the Navy.....	401	227	13.20	17	20.35
Department of the Interior.....	3,410	2,383	14.76	119	19.79
Department of Agriculture.....	695	170	14.73	9	21.33
Department of Labor.....	104	42	13.48	1	33
Civil Service Commission.....	62	26	9.38	2	32.25
Fish Commission.....	183	79	9.43	1	32.50
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	125	29	20.89	5	19.40
Government Printing Office.....	3,087
National Museum.....	185	55	15.66	10	9.40
Bureau of International Exchanges.....	14	2	6
National Zoological Park.....	36	1	11
Astrophysical Observatory.....	5	2	1.62
Bureau of American Ethnology.....	21	4	15.75

* Does not include the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

And as the Government is generous not only in its compensation to its subordinate force, of seven hours of labor, but generous in a thirty-days' leave of absence, the twelfth of a year, generous in its recognition of physical distress in family, or disease or inability by sickness on the part of the subordinate to perform work, to the extent of thirty days more, we claim, as was exhibited to us in our every investigation, that the Departments of this Government are behind in their work; and the logical conclusion is that they are behind in their work because of the thirty days' leave of absence, one-twelfth of a year, to the entire subordinate force.

The exhibit will also show an exceedingly large percentage, in some cases running to 60 per cent, of the entire subordinate force of a Department on sick leave during the fiscal year.

This special Washingtonian system is not only an unjust discrimination against Government employees outside of the capital, but is an unjust discrimination against the faithful and conscientious employee here who will not feign illness to get the benefit of the sick leave.

The bill now before the House allowing a vacation of but fifteen days to the employees of the Department outside of Washington is certainly an indorsement of my views by the distinguished chairman in charge, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and of his committee reporting this bill, and emphasizes the inequalities in, and injustice of, this system.

Why is it that the mail carrier over the country can only secure fifteen days when the clerks and employees in Washington get sixty days with pay? Why is it that other employees of the Government all over the country, who are rendering equally efficient services, and in most instances for less pay, are limited to a vacation of fifteen days, when these are so specially favored in Wash-

ington with seven hours a day labor and sixty days vacation and sick-leave privileges?

I mention this matter now to call the attention of the members of the House to it, and to the great number of deserving, available, and patriotic people who are willing to take these places in Washington, and are willing to take these offices, rendering full services for the full pay accorded, and without having this sixty-day privilege of leave of absence each year with pay. I hope that the proper committee, having special information and special charge of this branch of the service, will permit a bill to be reported favorably, destroying this system, which encourages idleness and which promotes sickness in the District of Columbia.

I hope that some measure for the correction of this abuse will be presented to this House and passed, and then if those who are now in the service can not submit to the burden of a law which makes them work for at least eleven months in the year for twelve months' pay, and work seven hours a day, then their places will be filled by others who are willing to do so. I wanted to call attention to this matter, and this was an appropriate time. The gentleman in charge of this bill and his committee are not unreasonable in asking for a vacation leave of fifteen days to those outside of Washington, and this provision is more to be commended than the one that gives to Washington employees of the same and all other Departments sixty days' vacation. [Applause.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SPALDING].

[Mr. SPALDING addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that no one on the other side of the House desires to participate further in this debate, and as there is no one on this side who wishes to speak, I move, with the consent of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], that we proceed with the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule; and an agreement has been made between the gentleman and myself that the debate under the five-minute rule shall be confined strictly to the bill itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? If not, the Clerk will proceed to read the bill.

Mr. BALL. I understand the arrangement was that general debate should continue until 1 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But by unanimous consent we can dispense with that order.

Mr. BALL. I do not wish to participate in any debate, but I think it would be proper that no amendments be voted on to-day.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman will have his opportunity for further discussion under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BALL. I do not care to indulge in any discussion. My only concern is that some gentlemen interested in particular parts of this bill were under the impression that it would not be taken up to be voted on under the five-minute rule until to-morrow.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The matter was very clearly stated when the order was made in regard to general debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, debate in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union has been exhausted, and therefore the rule would be to proceed with the five-minute debate for the consideration of the bill by paragraphs. No unanimous consent is necessary. We are compelled to do it. There is nothing else to do. Of course we can not control the question as to whether amendments shall be offered or voted upon. If amendments are offered and a vote is called for, we can not help it. That is all.

Mr. BALL. I have no objection, personally, to proceeding with the consideration of the bill. But a number of gentlemen are absent, with the understanding that the general debate would be continued until 1 o'clock to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already directed the Clerk to proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of Forestry: One forester, who shall be chief of division, \$2,500; 1 superintendent of working plans, who shall be assistant chief of division, \$1,800; 1 clerk class 2, \$1,400; 1 clerk class 1, \$1,200; 1 clerk, \$900; 1 clerk, \$720; in all, \$8,620.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, relative to that paragraph or provision of the bill, What are the duties of the persons who are to be appointed under this provision?

Mr. WADSWORTH. This paragraph carries only the statutory salaries of the Division of Forestry, mostly expert foresters who are looking after the preservation of the forests of the country; teaching the preservation of them and the general questions relating to lumbering—what trees to cut and what should not be cut, etc.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Have they any duties in connection with the reservations which are set aside by Executive proclamation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They have not. Their duties are entirely different.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Has the United States any other forest reservations than those set aside by Executive proclamation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; the United States has not. But the gentleman is aware that there are forests all over the country, and this is for the purpose of teaching the proper method of preserving them.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And this is expert work?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And does not intend to allow supervision and control of the forest reservations?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Animal Quarantine Stations: To purchase, establish, and maintain quarantine stations, and to provide proper shelter and equipment for the care of neat cattle and domestic animals imported, at such ports as may be deemed necessary, \$50,000 (to be immediately available).

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the paragraph just read I wish to call the attention of this committee to the great need of this quarantine station. The Government has for many years occupied leased grounds at Garfield, N. J., for quarantine purposes. The Government erected and owns the buildings. These barns—or rather sheds—are in a neglected and tumble-down condition. The sanitary situation is simply horrible, endangering the health of the valuable stock compelled to be quarantined therein, and the necessity for this appropriation is apparent.

I wish to insert in the RECORD, for the benefit of the House and for the information of the country, a brief extract from the Country Gentleman relating to this matter and setting forth the conditions of these buildings.

The article referred to is as follows:

The first thing to attract attention was the frightful condition of the roads and the generally run-down appearance of the whole place. Samples of water from each well were secured in bottles by the inspectors for analysis, and almost every sample was of a dirty color, due, Mr. Miller said, to quicksand at the bottom of the wells. The water certainly looked unfit for use. Any breeder who at home is particularly careful to give his animals clear and pure water has every reason for complaint. This same water is believed to have caused scours in many animals recently, and owners were compelled to erect temporary boilers to sterilize it.

The wells in nearly all cases are directly alongside of barns—"barns" is a misnomer; they are simply sheds—and the drainage from the sheds can hardly escape the wells. The place is the last in the world one would select for a quarantine station. It is a series of hills and dales, with the cattle sheds on the former, the latter composed of swamps and brush 2 or 3 feet high. The writer saw cattle wading in mud, ankle deep. The yards back of the sheds, where the cattle range, slope abruptly, and at the bottom of nearly every one may be found stagnant pools of water where the cattle drink, unless tethered, which is not generally the case. The yards are usually close together, and being very hilly, the washings from one yard find their way into adjoining ones.

The manure is placed uncovered at the end of each shed, and much of it was in a steaming condition when seen. In many places manure was scattered over fields on the grounds. It was stated to our representative by good authority that after birth of cows was thrown into manure heaps and that much of the manure was sold to a farmer, living a short distance from quarantine, for fertilizer, and carted to him over the public highway, where cattle graze along the roadside. Cattle are placed in quarantine to ascertain if they have any infectious or contagious disease. During that period they should be looked on as suspected and treated as such. To dispose of offal in the manner stated is to leave animals open to possible infection from this source. Farmers are frequently told in bulletins issued by the United States Department of Agriculture to erect the best sanitary barns to insure the health of their animals and to look carefully after the excrement of the animals when disease is suspected. Does the Department practice what it preaches? The sheds for the accommodation of animals are ill lighted and the floors are almost on the ground.

One importer said he could not keep the stalls dry where the cattle stand, as the boards were so rotten they absorbed all the urine. The trenches back of the cattle for the reception of manure and urine were in a similar condition. If one pressed his foot in the ditch, the urine immediately appeared on the surface, and none seemed to run off at end of shed, for there was not a sufficient slant to gutter for it so to do. The only ventilation is through small windows above the heads of the cattle. These are dropped down on a little shelf, but no pure air reaches the cattle that stand so close to the side of the barn as to be constantly breathing their own breath. There was no ventilator for the carrying off of foul odors. In summer large doors at either end of the sheds might be thrown open as occasion demanded, but in cold weather, when closed, the air the cattle breathe must certainly be refreshing! Around many of the sheds and outside of doors were standing pools of discolored water. In some of the sloping yards where cattle grazed large stumps of trees were conspicuous, which are very dangerous if the cattle should ever happen to slip.

The property consists of 57 acres of about as poor land as could be selected for the purpose, although we are informed the selection was made by a cattle commission appointed by the United States Treasury Department, consisting of an editor of a Western live-stock paper and two prominent veterinarians. There are 22 cattle sheds, which will accommodate 500 to 600 animals, varying in size and holding from 18 to 60 animals each. Northeast of the grounds is the Passaic River. Along its banks are a number of manufactories, the refuse from which finds its way into the river. To the right of the superintendent's house is a small pond which empties into the Passaic and into which flows the water from the various pools on the grounds, thus affording another avenue for infection of cattle along the river banks.

The receiving and shipping station is situated on the northwestern part of the grounds, the outgoing cattle passing over the same platform as the incoming, instead of having two separate stations. This, too, is in very poor condition. There are two roadways leading from the platform, one for the passage of incoming animals, the other for outgoing; but we learn from an onlooker that the same passageway has been frequently used for both purposes. Another source of infection, if disease exists.

Importers, moreover, have had great difficulty in having animals examined promptly after arrival in port. They have been compelled sometimes, we are told, to wait days before the Government officials at quarantine would make an examination. In several cases, the story goes, they came to exam-

ine animals late in the afternoon, and informed owners that they could not work overtime, and made other remarks that were interpreted as being a strong bid for a "tip." On receiving it, the animals were speedily examined and forwarded to the quarantine station. One man is said to have recently paid \$30 and another \$10 to expedite delivery.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Entomological investigations: Promotion of economic entomology; investigating the history and habits of insects injurious and beneficial to agriculture, horticulture, and arboriculture; ascertaining the best means of destroying those found to be injurious; investigations in apiculture; purchase of chemicals, insecticide apparatus, and other materials, supplies, and instruments required in conducting such experiments and investigations; for the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere; freight and express charges, and necessary traveling expenses; preparing, illustrating, and publishing the results of the work of the division, \$20,000.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Idaho.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word "arboriculture," on line 13, page 13, as follows: "Including an investigation into the ravages of the codling moth, with a view of ascertaining the best method of its extermination."

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in order that the Department of Agriculture—and this particular branch of the Department—may investigate the habits, characteristics, and ravages of the codling moth, which has been so destructive to the fruit industry throughout the United States, and particularly the far Northwest. It is believed that a parasite has been discovered which will tend to destroy this pest and relieve the fruit growers from its ravages. Certain sections of the country are comparatively free from its destructive effects on account of the presence of this parasite to which I refer or for other reasons not yet thoroughly understood. Numbers of the States are conducting investigations along this line which are more or less successful, but it is believed that in order to complete the remedy a general investigation should be undertaken by the Government itself and through this division of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the evil complained of and which this amendment is intended to reach is one of far-reaching effect. It is the most destructive insect to apple and pear culture known to the United States. Its destructive work has brought about a loss to this country of many millions of dollars annually. Its general habits and character are fairly well understood, but I undertake to say that a thorough investigation by the Division of Entomology will result in such a knowledge of the subject as will result in great good to those who have suffered so severely from its work in the past.

We already know that it can be successfully attacked and its destructive results very materially lessened. This has been demonstrated by practical tests, particularly in the far West. I can conceive of no field where the work of the Division of Entomology can be more effective of good results than along this particular line. It may not be inopportune to say in this connection that the Department of Agriculture is to-day rendering better service in the interests of the people than ever before in its history. Its work is being felt and appreciated by those engaged in this great industry throughout the country, particularly in the arid regions of the West, which I have the honor to in part represent. My district, which embraces the State of Idaho, is rapidly coming to the front as a fruit-producing section. Thousands of acres are already planted, including nearly all the deciduous fruits known to the Temperate Zone.

Owing to the character of our soil and climate, which are both particularly favorable, we produce as fine apples as are raised anywhere in the world. Samples of this fruit have been sent to the Pomologist of the Department, who has skillfully and artistically imitated them in wax for the Paris Exposition, so that a Jonathan apple from Ada County, Idaho, will represent the United States at that great exposition as the most ideal apple of this variety ever produced.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, if the Government will assist us in this investigation, to the end that we may effectively combat this destructive insect, the time will come when the apple industry of the far Northwest will be one of the most important of the country. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment. On the contrary, I accept it, but suggest that it be inserted in line 13, after the word "injurious."

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. That is satisfactory to me.

The amendment was considered, and agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grass and forage-plant investigation and animal foods, Division of Agriculture: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations of grasses, forage plants, and animal foods; to employ local and special agents

and assistants; to collect and purchase seeds, roots, and specimens of valuable economic grasses and forage plants for investigation, experimental cultivation, and distribution, and for experiments and reports upon the best methods of extirpating Johnson and other noxious and destructive grasses; to purchase tools, materials, apparatus, and supplies; to pay freight, express charges, and traveling expenses, and labor required in conducting experiments; to prepare drawings and illustrations for circulars, reports, and bulletins; and the agricultural experiment stations are hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture in establishing and maintaining experimental grass stations, for determining the best methods of caring for and improving meadows and grazing lands, the use of different grasses and forage plants, and their adaptability to various soils and climates, the best native and foreign species for reclaiming overstocked ranges and pastures, for renovating worn-out lands, for binding drifting sands and washed lands, and for turfing lawns and pleasure grounds, and for solving the various forage problems presented in the several sections of our country. \$17,000: *Provided*, That \$6,000 of the amount hereby appropriated be used to purchase and collect seeds, roots, and specimens of valuable and economic grasses and forage plants, to be distributed to the various experiment stations in the several States and Territories, to be by them used, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, to ascertain their adaptability to the various soils and climates of the United States: *And provided further*, That not more than \$6,000 of the amount hereby appropriated shall be expended for salaries in the city of Washington, D. C.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 4, page 20, after the word "grasses," insert:
"And for experiments and reports upon the best methods of destroying prairie dogs."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is a fact well known to everybody who lives in the arid parts of the United States that prairie dogs destroy more grass than is destroyed by any other animal, and it is very necessary that there should be some experiments along the line indicated in this amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that amendment. It hardly belongs in that paragraph, but I have no objection to it.

Mr. HOPKINS. I should like to have that amendment again read. I remember reading Washington Irving on the prairie dog, when I was a boy, and I should like to know whether the dog is to be injured or not.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The intention of this amendment is to discover means for his destruction.

Mr. LACEY. What is the matter with the shotgun?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is not effective.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] asks that the amendment be again read. If there be no objection, it will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Agricultural experiment stations: To carry into effect the provisions of an act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act to establish agricultural experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto," and to enforce the execution thereof, \$780,000; \$33,000 of which sum shall be payable upon the order of the Secretary of Agriculture, to enable him to carry out the provisions of section 3 of said act of March 2, 1887, and \$12,000 of which sum may be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report to Congress upon the agricultural resources and capabilities of Alaska; and to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in said Territory, including the erection of buildings and all other expenses essential to the maintenance of such stations, of which sum \$5,000 shall be immediately available; and the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required by section 3 of said act of March 2, 1887; shall ascertain whether the expenditures under the appropriation hereby made are in accordance with the provisions of the said act, and shall make report thereon to Congress; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons as he may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and to incur such other expenses for office fixtures and supplies, stationery, traveling, freight, and express charges, illustration of the Experiment Station Record, bulletins and reports, as he may find essential in carrying out the objects of the above acts, and the sums apportioned to the several States shall be paid quarterly in advance.

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to furnish to such institutions or individuals as may care to buy them copies of the card index of agricultural literature prepared by the Office of Experiment Stations and charge for the same a price covering the additional expense involved in the preparation of these copies, and he is hereby authorized to apply the moneys received toward the expense of the preparation of the index. To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain an agricultural station in the Hawaiian Islands, including the erection of buildings, the printing (in the Hawaiian Islands), illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and all other expenses essential to the maintenance of said station, \$10,000, which sum shall be immediately available. To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report to Congress on the agricultural resources and capabilities of Porto Rico, with special reference to the selection of locations for agricultural experiment stations, and the determination of the character and extent of agricultural experiments immediately demanded by the condition of agriculture in that island, and to prepare, print, publish, and distribute in Porto Rico circulars of inquiry and bulletins of information in the English and Spanish languages, \$5,000, which sum shall be immediately available.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman if this establishes a separate head of the Agricultural Department in the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does this establish a separate department of agriculture there?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, no; simply an experiment station.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Under the general head?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under the general management of the Department.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I notice this paragraph carries an appropriation of some \$780,000 for the purpose of carrying into execution the provisions of the act of 1887, which is limited to the following purposes:

And in order to aid in acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects connected with agriculture and to promote scientific investigation and experiment respecting the principles and application of agricultural science, there shall be established, etc.

Now, it seems to me this is a very large sum of money. This appropriation is constantly increasing, and I should like to know from the chairman of the committee what the committee found upon investigation to justify this large appropriation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the gentleman will read a little further, he will see that the law provides that \$15,000 shall be annually distributed to each one of these stations, and that the lump sum of this appropriation has not been increased, excepting for the three new experimental stations—one in Alaska, one in the Hawaiian Islands, and one in Puerto Rico.

Mr. CORLISS. Is it not true that this appropriation has gradually and persistently increased in every Congress?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; it is the same as in the last Congress with the addition of Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Alaska was in the last bill.

Mr. CORLISS. This money is appropriated and given to the States?

Mr. WADSWORTH. To these different stations.

Mr. CORLISS. Is it distributed under the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is distributed under the authority given in that law which you have just quoted and appropriated for in this agricultural appropriation bill, and the money goes to the experiment stations, not to the State.

Mr. CORLISS. Does the chairman of the committee think that this appropriation is not excessive?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not think it is excessive. It is the same as it has been for the last few years.

Mr. STEELE. I want to ask the gentleman about Alaska, whether or not the experiments of last year seem to justify further experiments in Alaska?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In answer to the gentleman from Indiana, I will say that the gentlemen who visited that far-off territory reported some facts which seem to cast a shadow of doubt at least upon the utility of that station; but after consulting with the Secretary of Agriculture and talking the matter over with him, he mailed me a letter which I have here and which I will have the Clerk read, if the gentleman from Indiana desires it. If not, I will ask leave to print it in the RECORD, as it is quite long.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the request of the gentleman will be granted.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1900.

DEAR SIR: I beg leave to offer the following reasons for my request that \$15,000 be appropriated for the maintenance of the agricultural experiment stations in Alaska.

First, The success of our investigations, as far as they have gone, indicates that the agricultural possibilities of that vast region surpass the most sanguine expectations of the friends of the Territory.

The history of these investigations is briefly as follows: For thirty years after the acquisition of the Territory the Government did absolutely nothing to ascertain whether or not anything to support life could be grown there. On the theory that it was simply a vast ice box, in which no civilized person would want to live or could live, it was left severely alone. In 1897 Congress authorized this Department, at my request, to begin investigations in a tentative way. A commission was sent up to examine the country. Their report to Congress was sufficiently encouraging for Congress to direct a continuance of the work for 1898. That year the Department began actual experiments in growing grains and vegetables on a small scale, using for that purpose gardens tendered by citizens of Sitka and Skagway. These experiments are recorded in detail in last year's report to Congress. Briefly stated, the results were that barley and oats matured and produced grain of excellent quality and a superior article of fiber flax was grown, as were also all the common hardy vegetables.

Reservations of land for experimental purposes were made at Sitka and Kodiak and Kenai, Cook Inlet. On the strength of these results the last Congress increased the appropriation for these investigations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and the law directed the establishment and maintenance of experiment stations in Alaska. As this indicated the purpose of Congress to place the work on a permanent basis, plans were laid accordingly. A headquarters building was begun and partly completed, land was cleared, and experiments begun in the drainage and treatment of the soil. Experimental crops were grown at the stations at Sitka and Kenai, in Cook Inlet. The results were more successful than we had dared to hope. Eleven varieties of wheat matured a good quality of grain that will be valuable for hybridizing and for early maturing in lower latitudes, as did also a dozen kinds each of barley and oats. Both winter and spring rye matured; clovers sown the year before matured seed; fiber flax of fine quality was again produced, and so were all the common vegetables and buckwheat. Samples of the grain are in evidence at the Department, and speak for themselves. The report of these operations was transmitted to Congress some time ago.

It is evident the Territory has agricultural possibilities and the question now is how best to develop them. The appropriations have not been sufficient to begin work in the interior. For want of funds we have been obliged to confine our operations to the coast region. I now plan for the establishment of at least one experiment station in the interior the coming season with a view to ascertain what can be done in that vast region which, in its valleys and plains, contains probably not less than 100,000 square miles of land that will admit of the prosecution of agriculture in some form.

Besides the experiments carried on by our agents, reports were received from persons residing in the Territory, showing that successful attempts have been made in growing potatoes, turnips, cabbages, lettuce, and other vegetables in numerous localities along the coast and in the interior, and even in some places north of the Yukon River. Grasses and forage plants grow luxuriantly over large areas and already a considerable number of sheep and cattle are maintained in the Territory. The success of the reindeer experiments conducted by the Department of the Interior indicates that with the aid of this animal, useful for meat and work, even the northern portions of the Territory may develop considerable industries, as is the case in similar regions in Europe and Asia.

It is estimated that only about 5 per cent of the area in southeastern Alaska can be reduced to cultivation, but its very scarcity makes it all the more important that we should demonstrate to the people how to make the most of it. In the Kenai Peninsula and the Cook Inlet region there are thousands of square miles of land which can be converted into good farms, and the reports we have from the interior indicate that probably 30 or 40 per cent of the country can be utilized for farming or grazing.

Our headquarters station is located at Sitka, because it had to be located where we could reach it at all times of the year. Sitka is the seat of government; mails go there regularly. We can communicate with the men in charge at all times. It is important to locate the headquarters where they can be reached. The problems presented at Sitka in the subjugation of the land and the growing of crops are of such a nature that whatever succeeds there can succeed anywhere else in the coast region.

Secondly, this work deserves the support of Congress because it will aid materially in the development of the Territory. Alaska's mineral resources appear to be unbounded; we have not begun to measure them. In addition to this, its fur trade, its fisheries, and its wealth of timber are acknowledged to be valuable. It would aid and cheapen the cost of the development of these resources if the men who are engaged in the work can be fed from products grown in the Territory. The 100,000 people who in the near future will inhabit Alaska will be fed by San Francisco and Seattle, and the cost of their living increased by expensive transportation by sea and land unless we encourage them to produce their food stuffs themselves, if such a thing be possible.

That people can live in these latitudes and become important factors in national life is proved by the inhabitants of Norway, Sweden, and Finland. They have resided where they now live since the dawn of history, because they find agriculture possible there. Nature is no more rigorous and forbidding over a large area of Alaska than she is in these countries. If anything, she favors Alaska. I believe that the possibilities of farming in Alaska are greater in the same latitudes than in these countries, and I base my belief on geographical and meteorological data.

Comparing Finland with Alaska, I find that the northern boundary of both is latitude 70°, but while the southern boundary of Finland is 60°, the southern boundary of Alaska is 54° 30'. In 1895 Finland produced:

Wheat.....	bushels..	146,870
Barley.....	do.....	6,117,402
Flax.....	pounds..	3,561,615
Oats and barley, mixed.....	bushels..	449,537
Rye.....	do.....	13,274,842
Oats.....	do.....	18,811,830
Hemp.....	pounds..	1,466,682
Buckwheat.....	bushels..	82,581
Peas.....	do.....	425,250

During the same year Finland exported 22,750,000 pounds of butter and 400,000 pounds of cheese.

Finland has a population of 2,520,437 people. Meteorological observations, taken in like latitudes in Alaska and Finland, show that temperatures are higher in Alaska. So that there is every encouragement for the belief that Alaska will in the future produce food for the support of very large numbers of people.

Having made experimentation along the southern coast and learned what can be done there on a small scale, it is our intention to move northward and ascertain what can be done along and north of the Yukon River. Reports come to us incidentally that grains left on the ground by tourists have grown and matured north of the Yukon. Barley has ripened as far north as Fort Yukon in latitude 66° 45'; and on the Yukon volunteer wheat has been found ripe that had been scattered there by accident. Grains grown and ripened along the southern coast during the past year will be of great value in the scientific work of the Department and of our experiment stations, where cross fertilization is being carried on for the purpose of getting a multiplicity of varieties in order that grains may be found suitable for different conditions within the United States. The grains brought down from Alaska are exceedingly vigorous and will be valuable for seed use in our Northern States.

One of the great requirements in latitudes where spring wheat is now grown is a variety that will ripen before the hot, moist season of early July arrives, in which rust is developed. It is possible that some of our Alaska wheats, maturing rapidly there in almost perpetual sunshine, may meet this requirement; or, having early maturity impressed upon them, may be valuable in hybridization.

Experimentation along the line of reducing to cultivable condition, by underdraining, lands which now produce mosses, are being undertaken, and must be prosecuted throughout the Territory.

In view of the facts that the Territory is so extensive, and the interests involved so great, I respectfully urge that the sum of \$15,000 be appropriated for the work.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, yours,

JAMES WILSON, Secretary.

Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
Chairman Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives United States, Washington, D. C.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What I desired to ask was, Are the experimental stations provided for?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are. They were in the bill of last year.

Mr. HOPKINS. And they have proven the best of any investment you have made in that line.

Mr. STEELE. I happened to be in that country last year, Mr. Chairman, and I have very grave doubts of Alaska ever becoming

an agricultural country, or any part of it. At the same time, I defer to the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture; and if it is possible to find anything that will grow and mature up there that will be of advantage to those people, I will be glad of it. I want him to try it for another year.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I think the gentleman saw but a small portion of the territory in Alaska, and I doubt very much if his opinion is of very great value to this House in connection with the agricultural resources of Alaska. In any military matter I would defer to the gentleman's usually excellent judgment; but I have in my hand, and will not detain the House by reading it, a communication from Professor Georgeson, in charge of the experimental station work in Alaska during the last two years, in which he sets forth the agricultural possibilities of Alaska, and compares the territory with the Grand Duchy of Finland.

Finland contains something more than 140,000 square miles, or about one-third the area of Alaska, with a similar climate, within about the same parallels of latitude. Finland supports a population of about two millions and a half. It is an agricultural country, producing much more than is consumed. It is the opinion of Professor Georgeson, a Scandinavian, and entirely familiar with the agricultural and climatic conditions prevailing in northern Europe, that Alaska is capable of supporting a population of from twelve to fifteen millions. And inasmuch as Russian oppression is likely to drive a large number of Finlanders to seek new homes—I hope under our flag—and as immigration is apt to follow the same parallels of latitude, we may hope to attract a valuable and industrious population to our northern country. For these reasons I think it is important that the country should have these facts. I insert this communication in the RECORD, under the general leave already given:

FACTS CONCERNING ALASKA.

Alaska lies between latitudes 54° 30' and 70° north and between longitudes 132° and 168° west. It covers an area of 580,000 square miles. So far as agriculture has been tried in a systematic manner in this Territory, it has been a success. The Department of Agriculture matured no less than 11 varieties of wheat and about a dozen varieties each of barley and oats, as well as flax and buckwheat, and also produced all the common vegetables during the past year. This was at Sitka, in about latitude 57° 30'; but reports received by the Department from all over the Territory show that the hardy vegetables can be successfully grown everywhere. There are large and successful market gardens at Dawson, north of latitude 64°.

Barley has been ripened as far north as Fort Yukon, in latitude about 66° 45'. Volunteer wheat has been found ripe at places on the Yukon where it had been accidentally scattered. The whole of southwestern Alaska, embracing the Peninsula of Alaska and the adjoining islands, is covered with an abundance of grass and, as pointed out, cattle can live and in certain localities do live outdoors the year round on this natural pasturage. While it is true that Alaska is much more mountainous than Finland, it is also true that it is more than four times larger than Finland and contains an area of land as large as Finland which can be utilized for agricultural purposes in some form. It is further noted concerning Alaska that experiment stations have already been established at Sitka and at Kenai on the Kenai Peninsula.

That grains and vegetables have been grown with marked success at both of these places.

That the Government has erected a headquarters building at Sitka, with a view to the perpetuation of the work.

That the investments by the Government for the equipment of these stations, including buildings, work animals, and implements, so far amounts to something over \$6,000.

That this property, which has been transported there at great cost, should not be abandoned or given away.

That the Department is very desirous of establishing an experiment station during the coming summer somewhere on the Yukon River, with a view to testing the agricultural possibilities of that vast region.

That in order to do this work in a systematic and scientific way it is necessary to organize the service properly and to maintain it from year to year for at least six or eight years before it can be said with certainty what may be expected in that region.

That the distances in Alaska are very great. From Seattle to Skagway is about 1,100 miles; from Sitka to Kadiak about 800 miles; from Kadiak to Unalaska, 700 miles; from Unalaska to St. Michael, 750 miles. These distances are in straight lines across the open sea, and not along the coast lines. From St. Michael to Circle City is about 1,100 miles, up the Yukon River.

That Skagway, which is the northernmost point touched by pleasure steamers, which follow along the inland passage, is 200 miles east of the one hundred and forty-first meridian, where Alaska proper begins, and that, consequently, gentlemen who think they have seen Alaska and are prepared to pass judgment upon its possibilities when they have traveled along the inland passage and viewed the hillsides from the deck of a steamer, as a matter of fact have seen nothing of Alaska except the rocky promontories which are characteristic of southeastern Alaska. The Department does not maintain that southeastern Alaska is likely to be of any great importance agriculturally, although there is land enough to raise the food for all miners who will ever locate there.

Sitka was made the headquarters for the experiment stations because it was the seat of government. It was a place readily accessible the year round, whereas places in the interior or farther westward could not be reached at all times. The success of growing grains and vegetables and in raising live stock in Alaska are positive proof that the country has agricultural possibilities. Its resources in minerals and timber, its fisheries and fur trade, are certain to cause a large population to flow to the Territory, and it is a measure of sound political economy to encourage the development of agriculture in order to cheapen the living of those who go there and to give stability and permanence to the population.

FACTS CONCERNING FINLAND.

Area.—Finland has an area of 144,221 square miles. Of this 12 per cent consists of inland lakes.

Boundaries.—The southern boundary is in latitude 60; northern boundary, latitude 70. Alaska's southern boundary, 54° 30'; northern boundary, 70°. Latitude 60, the southern boundary of Finland, runs across Cook Inlet and the coast of the northernmost bend in the Gulf of Alaska, leaving all of southeastern Alaska and all of the peninsula of Alaska to the southward.

Population.—In 1895 the population of Finland was 2,520,437.
Crops.—In the year 1895 Finland had the following among its leading crops:
 Wheat.....bushels... 146,370
 Barley.....do..... 6,117,402
 Flax.....pounds... 3,561,615
 Oats and barley, mixed, grown for feed.....bushels... 449,537
 Rye.....do..... 13,254,342
 Oats.....do..... 18,811,839
 Hemp.....pounds... 1,466,682
 Buckwheat.....bushels... 82,581
 Pease.....do..... 425,250

Live stock in 1895.—Horses, 300,650; cattle, 2,308,183; sheep, 1,067,384; hogs, 197,356.
 For each thousand persons Finland had, in 1895, 119 horses, 559 head of cattle, and 423 sheep.

EXPORTS.

Oats.—For the five years 1891-1895, inclusive, Finland exported yearly, on an average, 1,306,200 bushels of oats. It appears that oats is the only grain they have exported.

Live stock.—During the same period of five years Finland exported a total of 20,837 horses, 62,628 cows and calves, 7,896 sheep, and 62,582 hogs.

Dairy products.—During the same period of five years Finland exported 113,743,216 pounds of butter, which is an average yearly export of 22,750,000 pounds, in round numbers. In the same period of five years the exports of cheese amounted to 1,972,185 pounds, or nearly 400,000 pounds as a yearly average. During the same period of five years Finland exported nearly 2,000,000 gallons of milk.

Meteorological data for Finland and Alaska.

Month.	Finland.			Alaska.			
	Mustiala, lat. 60° 49' N.	Kajana, lat. 64° 13' N.	Sodankyla, lat. 67° 24' N.	Skagway, lat. 59° 30' N.	Orcas, lat. 60° 45' N.	Fort Davidson, lat. 64° 50' N.	Kadiak, lat. 57° 45' N.
January.....	18.5	9.7	10.7	22.2	-----	-----	30
February.....	18.8	12.4	7.7	19.2	-----	-----	28.2
March.....	24.1	19.6	13.4	23.4	-----	7.1	32.6
April.....	34.7	32.3	23.9	41.4	-----	23.6	36.3
May.....	47.3	43.1	36.5	47.1	-----	45	43.2
June.....	57.9	55.9	45.5	54	51.1	57.2	49.5
July.....	61.9	60.8	55	61.4	61	60.3	54.7
August.....	59.2	56.8	50.5	57.1	57.1	55.2	55.2
September.....	60.7	46.7	42.9	50	49.2	39	50
October.....	40.4	35.2	33.4	35.7	35.5	30.5	42.3
November.....	28.9	23.7	16.7	-----	34.4	-----	34.7
December.....	22.3	17	4.1	-----	-----	-----	30.5

As yet we do not have records for places farther north than Camp Davidson, which corresponds to the settlement now called Eagle City, located on the border between Canada and Alaska, in latitude about 64° 50', or nearly the same as the latitude of Kajana, Finland.

Orcas is located in almost the same latitude as Mustiala, namely, about 60° 45'. We do not have records from the station for more than the past summer, but it will be seen that the temperatures for the six months, June to November, inclusive, run very closely with those of Mustiala. Skagway, which is at the head of Lynn Canal and the most northerly point that pleasure steamers touch, is in latitude about 59° 30'. It will be seen that the temperatures here also correspond very closely with those of southern Finland.

As for the temperature of the coast region, the average record for more than eighty years shows that it is mild the year round. As a matter of fact, the report of the special agent who has had these investigations in charge shows that cattle have run out for years at Kadiak both summer and winter without food or care of any kind. Kadiak is located in latitude about 57° 45', some 800 miles west of Sitka.

Mr. LLOYD. Has the gentleman any other information with reference to the capabilities of Alaska except that given by Professor Georgeson?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Oh, yes; I have, although I do not care to detain the House in the matter. I had a personal friend in the Cook Inlet country last summer. He was there for mining purposes, but he took seeds along, and raised the ordinary vegetables in his garden.

Mr. LLOYD. Is there any part of Alaska now engaged in agricultural pursuits?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. There are the Russian settlers in Cook Inlet country, who have been there a hundred years, and living there as agriculturists.

Mr. LLOYD. Have you any estimate of the amount of their products?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. No.

Mr. HOPKINS. They have eleven varieties of wheat in Alaska. They grow barley there, buckwheat, and grass, and everything of that kind is grown there for the sustenance of cattle, horses, and other kinds of live stock.

Mr. LLOYD. In that connection, I want to inquire if it is not a fact that all that is grown is grown on a very small tract of land, and nearly all grown on one tract of land?

Mr. HOPKINS. The area now under cultivation is not large; but it is not from the fact that the soil is not productive, but because of the sparseness of population. These experimental stations are placed there for the purpose of showing what developments can be made in the way of agriculture in that country. And, as the gentleman from Connecticut has said, it is three or four times as large as Finland; it is no farther north than Finland, and that country supports a population of between two and three millions of people. They raise there a large amount of all kinds of agricultural products. They have 2,393,000 cattle, more than 1,000,000 sheep, and nearly half a million horses, besides hogs and other live stock.

Now, this appropriation is to have an investigation of the subject made most carefully, to see whether this great area, that a great many people have thought heretofore was not susceptible of cultivation, can be cultivated as successfully as Finland; and, as the gentleman has said, instead of having a population of a few thousands, by proper cultivation and development of the resources of that land we can care for a population of 10,000,000 people.

Mr. STEELE. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is out of my time. The gentleman has been reading from a paper.

Mr. HOPKINS. I have not. I have been reading from nothing. I stated some facts that had come to my knowledge.

Mr. STEELE. He is reading from a paper that he has before him.

Mr. HOPKINS. I was stating a number of facts that have come to my knowledge from an investigation I have made upon this subject.

Mr. STEELE. Something that the gentleman has never given a moment's attention to until five minutes ago, probably. Now, the fact of the business is that I am a farmer. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOPKINS. No one will believe it.

Mr. STEELE. I know farming land when I see it. If I did not know more about it than Mr. Georgeson, who makes this report, or the gentleman from Connecticut, I would not claim to be a farmer. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I have been a farmer all my life.

Mr. STEELE. A Connecticut farmer. You are not in it. You want to go to the West or South.

Mr. LLOYD. I want to suggest to the gentleman that he lives in a different country from the gentleman who lives in New England.

Mr. STEELE. I am not yielding. The truth about it is that I visited the agricultural station to which reference has been made. It consists of the governor's garden or yard and a very few other very small lots or yards. The land cultivated there has been cleared, I suppose, about a hundred years, or in that neighborhood—ever since the traders went up there.

Never until they made the appropriation of two years ago did they attempt any agriculture. At Killisnoo we found a gentleman who catches herring for the oil, and about eleven months of the year he has nothing to do. He had a little patch of ground up against his house where he was raising pansies and a few other things more adapted to deep planting, that he planted in the fall, and they came up in the spring. He said that he thought each pansy cost about a dollar apiece. He had nothing else to do; he could not fish all the time. He amused himself raising pansies and a few other plants which he could plant in the fall.

There were a few yards in Sitka where this agricultural station is. In some little patches they were trying to raise oats or wheat. I know these when I see them. I saw specimens in the committee room on Agriculture supposed to be brought from up there. But I want an affidavit from the agent that these articles ever grew in that country before I will believe it, and yet when you examine the heads, you find that they are not matured. I am not deferring to the judgment of Mr. Jordan; I want the Secretary of Agriculture by experiment to find out that it is not an agricultural country. Now, gentlemen, do not decry me as a farmer; I am an excellent farmer and know how to farm.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What do you raise mostly?

Mr. STEELE. Corn and wheat, cattle, hogs; I pull stumps, drain my land, rotate crops, etc. I know all about it.

Mr. TALBERT. The gentleman will have hell raised up in Indiana, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEELE. Oh, no; they raise that down South. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana in the closing sentence of his remarks indicated the extent of his knowledge of farming—that is, he announced that he knows a farm when he sees it—he knows, of course, that a farm lies outdoors. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEELE. Not necessarily so. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order. Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It is inexpedient for Congressmen to inform the public what they do not know about agriculture. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. HOPKINS. Members of the committee will note, however, that all of the information that the gentleman from Indiana obtained was upon a pleasure trip, and he only visited one or two places in this country. Now, the statement that I made was that this large area of territory is as far south as Finland; and I find by examination of some statistics which I have before me that the southern boundary of Finland is 60° north, and the southern limit of Alaska is 54° and some minutes north.

I have just shown the production of Finland—that all sorts of agricultural products are raised there, that a population of between two and three millions of people are supported on an area

that is only about one-quarter of the area of Alaska; and it seems to me if they are as successful as is shown here, that we ought to be equally as successful in Alaska. The gentleman from Indiana, with all his knowledge of farming, does not dispute any facts relating to Finland. Why can not we develop this great territory of ours up there as well as Finland? It seems to me that if a tithe of the information that has been furnished here is correct, and I believe the whole of it to be correct, that it is a profitable investment for this Government to go on with these experiments.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Nutrition investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report upon the nutritive value of the various articles and commodities used for human food, with special suggestions of full, wholesome, and edible rations less wasteful and more economical than those in common use, \$15,000; and the agricultural experiment stations are hereby authorized to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out said investigations in such manner and to such extent as may be warranted by a due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States and Territories, and as may be mutually agreed upon; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to require said stations to report to him the results of any such investigations which they may carry out, whether in cooperation with said Secretary of Agriculture or otherwise.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 2, page 21, the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Division of Chemistry, to investigate the chemical composition of cotton seed and its economic uses, the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to include the expenses of chemical investigations, services of special agents, cost of apparatus and materials, necessary traveling expenses, and expert and other labor."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, that is subject to a point of order, and I will reserve the point of order. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that what he desires can be accomplished through the Division of Chemistry and nutrition investigation, on page 23. There is full power in the Secretary to investigate the subject of cotton seed.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, this section that has just been read only provides \$15,000 for all purposes, and the amendment which I sent up provides \$10,000 for the investigation of the economical uses of cotton-seed products.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think less than that would accomplish the purposes as thoroughly as it ought to be, and if not necessary, the use of it would not be made. It is well known to those acquainted with the cultivation and gathering of cotton that the cotton crop is more valuable and more important than any other one crop. Therefore it is more necessary that it should be so used and its uses so encouraged as to get the greatest amount of profit or value out of it.

There are more poor people in the South, more laborers, engaged in the cultivation of cotton, the picking of cotton, the preparation of it for market, than those engaged, perhaps, in connection with all other crops in the South combined. There is more money derived from foreign countries in connection with this crop than in connection with any other crop in the United States.

I know that something has been done along this line, but I do not think sufficient has been done. It is true that private individuals and companies have made sufficient and satisfactory investigations as to the food products of cotton seed; but the results of those investigations lack official confirmation, and by proper investigation of the food products of the cotton seed, we can extend the trade in those products with European and Asiatic countries.

Cotton-seed oil is a cheap substitute for many products of lard, butter, etc.; and if the nutritive properties and the harmlessness of these products were well known in Europe as well as in this country by means of official investigation, I have no doubt millions of dollars would be added to the value of the products of cotton seed in the United States.

I offer this amendment because this paragraph appropriates only \$15,000 for investigation of all kinds in this direction, and I do not think the field has been sufficiently covered. I believe the same amount of money could not be expended in any other way which would be likely to result in so great benefit to so great a number of people of so large a section of our country. I offer the amendment in good faith, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order, if the amendment is subject to a point of order, and let us have a vote upon it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the chemical composition of cotton seed has been a matter of investigation with the Department of Agriculture at Washington. There have been full investigations and full reports on the subject. We find as we go on with the work of the Department of Agriculture that we must consider that the Department at some time finishes a part of its work so as to take up new work. Not only has the Department at Washington investigated the chemical constituents of cotton seed for the purpose of determining what is the best fertilizer for cotton, but it has investigated the nutritive properties of cotton seed as an animal food, and full report has been made on that subject.

One of the most interesting pamphlets issued by the Department of Agriculture—quite a long one; I think about one hundred and twenty-odd pages—is on this subject, very full in every respect, giving the chemical composition of the seed, just exactly what it is worth as a fertilizer in comparison with commercial fertilizers of every sort, just exactly what it is worth as a component part of animal food for fattening cattle, and for various other purposes.

Now, in addition to that, the agricultural experiment stations of several Southern States have undertaken this work, and several letters have been received by me and others in relation to the work which they have done. The agricultural experiment station of my own State has made some very interesting investigations along that line. The work has been attended to about as fully as it could possibly be attended to from a scientific or chemical standpoint.

Now, it may be possible that a proviso to this bill, or a separate bill, directing a report from the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of showing the harmless qualities of cotton-seed products as a substance of human food might do some good. That, however, would not come within the scope of the gentleman's amendment.

But, sir, there never has been any dispute as to the absolute harmlessness or the nutritive qualities of cotton seed, either as forming part of various food products for animals or as a substitute for olive oil, butter, lard, and all that sort of thing; nor has there been any question as to its harmless and nutritive qualities as a raw animal food, as in the case of cotton-seed cake.

Mr. SIMS. Is it not a fact that a bill is now pending to tax oleomargarine or butterine, composed largely of cotton-seed oil, on the ground that this product is not good for human food—is unhealthy?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am glad the gentleman has asked this question, because it enables me to tell the House something which will be a matter of information to some members at least. There is a bill pending for the purpose indicated by the gentleman, but not a single advocate of that bill has dared at any time to advance the idea that cotton-seed oil is not an absolutely harmless and absolutely healthful product. So that the introduction of that bill does not imply what the gentleman supposes; it is not based upon any such reason as the unhealthfulness of cotton-seed oil. I am glad to be able to make this statement, because there may be some men in the House who may think that it is on such grounds that oleomargarine legislation is being urged. No one on cross-examination before the committee has ever dared to say that cotton-seed oil was unhealthy or not nutritious.

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. Do you think the investigation in this direction, with reference to the use of this product for human food, is sufficiently provided for without the amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The amendment would not accomplish that.

Mr. SIMS. But my question is, Do you think the investigation has gone sufficiently far to indicate the adaptability of this product for human consumption?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It indicates to every man who desires to learn the fact that cotton-seed oil is harmless—not only harmless as human food, but is nutritious, just as much as olive oil, or any other vegetable oil known to the world, and as healthful as any other human food.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the investigations already made along the line of this proposed investigation and in view of the fact that there are \$45,000 available, \$30,000 under the one head and \$15,000 under another, a portion of which may be used in the further pursuance of this investigation, I must insist upon the point of order.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Publications, Department of Agriculture: For the preparation, printing, illustration, publication, indexing, and distribution of documents, bulletins, and reports, \$85,000; of which sum \$37,500 shall be available for the preparation and printing of farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interest of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of two-thirds of which shall be delivered to, or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by, Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as each Senator, Representative, or Delegate shall direct: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Agriculture shall notify Senators and Representatives of the title and character of each such bulletin, and also of any other publication of the Department of Agriculture not sent to the folding rooms of the Senate and House, with the total number to which each Senator, Representative, and Delegate may be entitled for distribution; and on the face of the envelope inclosing said bulletins shall be printed the title of each bulletin contained therein: *Provided further,* That all such bulletins included in the quotas of Senators, Representatives, or Delegates not called for on or before the 30th day of June in each fiscal year shall revert to the Secretary of Agriculture, and be available to him, either for miscellaneous distribution or in making up Congressional quotas for the next fiscal year; for the pay of artists, draftsmen, and engravers, and of proof readers and indexers when

necessary; for the purchase of manuscript for publication, and of tools, instruments, and artists' materials; for printing proofs, charts, and maps; for drawings, engravings, photographs, paintings, lithographs, other illustrations, and electrotypes, and for traveling expenses when necessary; for labor, paper, envelopes, gum, twine, and other necessary materials; for the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$47,500; in all, \$85,000.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to this section. In line 6, on page 25, I move to strike out "eighty" and insert the words "one hundred and," so that it will read "\$105,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I rise to a question of order. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The section to which the gentleman refers has been read and a part of the preceding section, for the purchase and distribution of seeds.

Mr. LATIMER. No; the gentleman is mistaken. I asked the attention of the Chair immediately on the conclusion of the reading of the paragraph in question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I beg pardon, but I think a part of the succeeding section was also read—the paragraph headed "Purchase and distribution of valuable seed."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is mistaken. The Clerk had just completed the paragraph relating to the publications of the Department of Agriculture when the gentleman from South Carolina offered his amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to this section. In a word, I desire to increase the appropriation for farmers' bulletins by the amount of \$20,000; and in order that the section may be in harmony, I desire, in line 7, on page 25, to strike out the words "thirty-seven" and insert "fifty-seven," making the increase of \$20,000, as I have proposed.

In line 11 I moved to strike out the words "two-thirds" and insert in lieu thereof "four-fifths."

In line 1, on page 26, strike out the word "June" and insert the word "March."

In line 15, on the same page, strike out "eighty" and insert "one hundred and;" so as to read: "in all, \$105,000."

Mr. Chairman, this bill appropriates \$37,500 for the purpose of printing farmers' bulletins. One-third of these bulletins are allotted to the Secretary of Agriculture and two-thirds of them are for Congressional distribution. In other words, each member of the House has allotted to him about 5,000 bulletins to be sent to his constituents. There is hardly an agricultural district in this Union that has not more than 15,000 farmers in it. There are more than 100 bulletins on different subjects, every one of them of great interest to our farmers, and yet we are denied by this committee and this appropriation the right to have more than 5,000 bulletins, hardly enough to send one-third of our constituents one each.

Why this niggardly appropriation touching a matter of such great importance? This committee has in this bill appropriated \$780,000 for the experiment stations. Why spend this large sum of money in furnishing means to carry on experiments in farming? Why pay large sums of money in salaries to experts in agriculture and then refuse to print the results of these experiments? Mr. Chairman, it is this valuable information, obtained at such great cost to the Government, that the people want. Thousands of dollars are appropriated to maintain an army in Luzon for the purpose of plunder, murder, and to rob the poor Filipinos of liberty and their homes; but when we ask for the sum of \$20,000 for the purpose of printing farmers' bulletins and distributing them where they will be read and prove valuable to the great agricultural interest that feed the nation and furnish two-thirds of the exports to foreign countries and that enrich this nation, we meet the complaining lawyer, not with his usual claim that it is unconstitutional, but that it is a waste and that the people do not want the bulletins because they have not asked for them.

Mr. Chairman, the people do want them, and they expect, and have a right to expect, their representation in Congress to look out for their interest and not wait to be written to for what they want, but to send them every good and valuable thing that belongs to them or that they are entitled to. Mr. Chairman, I charge this committee with disrespect to a majority of this House, when they failed to write \$20,000 in the bill for increase in appropriation for farmers' bulletins. I canvassed this House with a petition to the Committee on Agriculture, asking that the appropriation for seed be increased by \$40,000; for bulletins, \$17,000; for agrostology, \$8,000; and 226 members signed that petition. I went before this committee and urged this increase in the different items. The committee wrote in the bill \$40,000 for seed and \$5,000 for agrostology, and the chairman admitted upon this floor this morning that this increase was allowed in compliance with that petition, and yet they denied the increase for bulletins.

Mr. Chairman, one member stood upon this floor and charged that members who signed that petition did not know what they

were signing; that seed was wanted and not bulletins. I hardly think in this great legislative body of intelligent men they will let such a statement be proven by the record when the vote has been taken. The fact is, the committee was opposed to any increase, but, thinking the increase for seed was popular, they put that in and ignored the bulletins. Now, gentlemen of this House, you who signed the request for this increase and you who believe it just to the farmers of this country, I call upon you to stand by this amendment. It has been submitted as you requested. The committee, as I have said, turned down 226 of us, and it is our turn now. Let us vote it in the bill and turn the committee down. I feel sure you will do it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to consume the time of the House. I have said about all I had to say, except that it is provided in this amendment that I have offered that on page 26, line 1, instead of "June," the word "March" shall be inserted. The object of this is that these bulletins, when unclaimed by members, may lapse to the Secretary of Agriculture, so that he may reallocate them to members of the House after the 31st day of March instead of the 30th of June.

Now, it is hoped that Congress will adjourn by the 15th of June. If we leave here by that time, these bulletins, under this bill, will not lapse to the members until the 30th of June. I ask that that change may be made, so that the members of the House may have the privilege of these bulletins which may lapse on account of members not taking them. All that any member has to do in order to retain his quota is to notify the Secretary of Agriculture that he desires his quota of bulletins, which can be held there. Without this notice, let them lapse on the 31st of March, to be redistributed by the Secretary.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina allow me to put a question to him?

Mr. LATIMER. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman contemplate asking for an additional appropriation by way of an amendment to the bill to provide for additional Yearbooks, increasing the number when that part of the bill is reached?

Mr. LATIMER. No, sir; this amendment that I have offered is simply in regard to agricultural bulletins.

Mr. BUTLER. I understood the gentleman to say that he intended also to ask for an increase in the appropriation for Yearbooks. Did I misunderstand the gentleman?

Mr. LATIMER. You did. I should be glad to vote for an increase in the Yearbooks and horse books, but that is not contemplated in this amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the motion to increase the appropriation by \$20,000 will not prevail. The amount appropriated in the bill is the amount that has been recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture, and supplies us with 5,000 bulletins each. Now, so far as the dissemination of useful agricultural information is concerned, that number is sufficient, and doubly so for the reason that wherever a bulletin is of particular interest in a district the local papers are very glad to take it up and publish it and scatter it broadcast over that district.

Mr. LATIMER. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. LATIMER. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks the Secretary of Agriculture has anything to do with the distribution of these bulletins? I ask him if that is not a thing that belongs to the members of this House, and if the Secretary did not say that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That may be so; but we must rely in a great many things upon his judgment. If you want to consider these bulletins as a part of our electioneering perquisites, 5,000 copies are only a drop in the bucket. I have thirty-five or forty thousand voters in my district. Is the House willing to give me thirty-five or forty thousand of these bulletins? The gentleman from South Carolina, I believe, has four or five thousand votes in his district. How are you going to arrange that inequality? Are you going to supply each member with a sufficient number, so that he can send one to every voter in his district? I see no good reason whatever for increasing this appropriation, and I do not think the gentleman from South Carolina has mentioned any good reason.

Mr. LATIMER. What was the statement which you made about the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I made the statement that the gentleman polls between four and five thousand votes in his district, whereas in my district there are between thirty-five and forty thousand votes, and that in order to attempt to furnish each member with the number requisite to supply each of his constituents there would be no end to it.

Mr. LATIMER. How often is it necessary to explain on this floor that when a man in the South receives a nomination for Congress at the primaries that settles the question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I never explained it before that I know of. Mr. LATIMER. It has been repeatedly explained.

Mr. SIMS. I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. SIMS. Why do you think the farmer who does not vote ought to be entitled to a bulletin?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is not the question before us. They want to supply every farmer who wants them. I only want the House to understand precisely what they are doing if they adopt the amendment offered. In that case I would need 35,000 or 40,000 bulletins to supply my district in accordance with the suggestions made by some gentlemen.

Mr. SIMS. A whole lot of the bulletins would go to the gentlemen who voted. No doubt they would send to those who did not vote.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If you had 35,000 bulletins, to whom would you send them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would send them to every voter in the district.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Do you think they would appreciate them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Ninety per cent of them would, as I represent an agricultural district.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If they would appreciate them, why not let them have them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the object of this publication bureau is to disseminate information upon subjects relating to agriculture. Now, I have been a member of this House for eight years, and I stand here and say that I have never during that time received a single request for an agricultural bulletin which I was not able to supply either out of my own quota or else by dropping a note to the Secretary of Agriculture and asking him to forward it. So much, then, for that. Now, as to the need of an increase of these bulletins. There is absolutely no need of it. The committee has granted every dollar for the publication of the agricultural bulletins which was asked for by the Secretary of Agriculture and by the Chief of the Division of Publication. Moreover, we have granted all we need for the purpose of distribution as proved by the experience of each one of you.

Now, as to this "canvass of the House" which was made by the gentleman from South Carolina, from what I understand from gentlemen upon this floor, and I know what seven or eight of them said to me, is this: That they understood the petition to be for an increase of the seed to be distributed by members. The committee has made an increase in the appropriation of \$40,000 for seed, which doubles the quota of each member. Nine-tenths of the gentlemen who signed that petition neither read it nor could they say they knew anything about it except they thought it was for an increase of seed. So far as I have been able to ascertain, no demand exists among our constituents for an increased number of the farmers' bulletin. If any member upon this floor has ever received a request for a farmers' bulletin which he could not supply from his own quota or from the Secretary of Agriculture, I would like that gentleman to rise and say so.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I will say to the gentleman I have had a number of requests that I have not been able to fill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Did not you send your bulletins out on request, or regardless of requests and generally? Have you received requests for bulletins that you have been unable to supply out of your own quota or get from the Department?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I have a number that I have not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, I wish you would give me the number of the farmers' bulletins that you want, and I will undertake to say that the Secretary of Agriculture will send them out to the party who makes the request.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Here are something like a hundred of these requests for farmers' bulletins in my district. There are several who are able to read, and they would be glad to read one or read the entire hundred if they could get them. We only ask for \$20,000 for the publication of these bulletins, and it is a mere drop in the bucket. When you come here with propositions affecting the commercial interests of the country, or the manufacturing interests of the country, you come here asking for commissions and appropriations conched in the hundreds of thousands or the millions and they get it, but when the farmers ask for a few thousand dollars they can not get it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am as much a farmer as the gentleman. Nearly every dollar I own in this world is invested in farming lands. I am totally dependent upon that; and so anything addressed to the farmer's interest would be as apt to meet my ear as that of anybody else. The practical point is, Do we need the bulletins for the purpose for which they are being published? Now, the gentleman says that perhaps every farmer in his district that can read would like a copy of each of the bulletins published by the Government. Where is that going to lead us? There are not only a hundred but there are more than three hundred bulletins published and to be published each year.

Now, there are 35,000 registered Democratic voters in my district, and I am said to have a district which has comparatively

few voters. Are you going to multiply the number of these bulletins, 35,000, multiplied by 200, so as to give each one of the voters a specimen of each of the farmers' bulletins published by the Government of the United States? If so, that would be 7,000,000 bulletins to each Congressional district. If you are not going to do that, where are you going to draw the line? The proper place is the line of the demand and supply of bulletins; and I say advisedly, after a service of eight years on the committee, that the demand for bulletins does meet the supply of them. I for one have never received a request I have not complied with by taking it out of my own quota or dropping a note to the Secretary of Agriculture, who has acknowledged the receipt and said, "We have sent Mr. Smith, at your request, Bulletin No. so-and-so."

Mr. MADDOX. Is it not a fact that there are two or three important bulletins that are out of print?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. There are.

Mr. MADDOX. My experience concurs with that of the gentleman from Mississippi, except in one or two instances where I have been obliged to inform them that these important bulletins are out of print.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; and I am glad the gentleman from Georgia called this up. I want to say that the Secretary of Agriculture has the power under the general law, which has been a law for a long while, to republish bulletins which have been exhausted, provided the republication does not cost over a certain amount of money; I have forgotten what that amount is.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it is a thousand dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; I think it is a thousand dollars for any one bulletin. We can always call upon the Secretary of Agriculture to republish a given bulletin if it comes within the appropriation. Congress can do this regardless of limit of cost.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman from Mississippi means a thousand copies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No; I mean a thousand dollars. The bulletins do not cost over 5 or 6 cents apiece.

Mr. MADDOX. I have several times had occasion to say to my constituents that such a bulletin was exhausted, but as a rule they are all furnished that are called for.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have been obliged to say on several occasions that a certain bulletin was exhausted, but afterwards I have been able to get it.

Mr. LATIMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. One further remark and I will yield to the gentleman. Now, Mr. Chairman, to show how important it is to legislate with a full knowledge by the committee investigating the matter in hand, and knowing what they are doing, I want to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LATIMER] offers an amendment to change the word "June," in line 1, page 26, to the word "March," under the impression that members of Congress are thereby assisted. He is so far from being right in that respect that he is exactly wrong. The law reads this way:

Provided further, That all such bulletins included in the quota of Senators, Representatives, or Delegates, not called for on or before the 30th day of June in each fiscal year shall revert to the Secretary of Agriculture.

So now he wants to change the word "June" to "March," so that if we do not get them out by the last of March they shall revert to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LATIMER. What does the Secretary do with them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No matter what he does with them. He will generally give them to your or my constituents or send them to people on our request; but if we keep them we can do that without the necessity of making a request. As far as I am concerned, my bulletins have not yet been sent out fully, and I do not want to be compelled to send them as early as March.

Mr. LATIMER. The gentleman desires to be fair—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly I do.

Mr. LATIMER. Will he look at the bottom of page 25 and see that it provides if they are not "called for" they shall revert; but can you not write a line to the Secretary saying that you reserve them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, yes; but practically the way we call for them is by addressing our franks and sending them to the Department, which sends them out. I do not want to have to write there and say, "Send up my bulletins to my house" or "my city address," and have them cumber up my room or my library. I want them to remain in the Department without useless cost to the Government until the 1st of July, and when I find out what are the important bulletins and who wants them, and what are the interesting portions of the literature published, have them sent out by the Department. I want to take my own time in distributing the bulletins, and in distributing precisely the bulletins that my constituents want. I do not want to be limited to the 30th of March, I want until the 30th of June.

Mr. LATIMER. Why can you not notify Mr. Hill, who has charge of the bulletins, that you reserve your quota of bulletins

and then serve notice on him, if you want them sent, when you get ready? The point I want to make is this, and the reason I offer my amendment is, that if you wait until the 30th day of June before the bulletins revert to the Secretary, the most of the members have gone home and it is too late to send them out for that session of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But they can go out under your direction after members of Congress have gone home.

Mr. LATIMER. Well, in March we are here to look after them, and a great many revert to the Secretary, and June is too late for the members to get them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It is not too late. I have been in Washington more Junes during the off years than I have been at home; but suppose you are at home, you do not cease distributing literature while at home. We make up our franks and send them to the Department, and the Department sends out literature with the franks just as much and just as well as if we are here.

Mr. STEELE. I ask that the gentleman be allowed to continue for five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman from Mississippi will allow me to say that he does not seem to understand as I do the proposition of the gentleman from South Carolina. I talked with the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture about this matter, and he stated that there were some members from the cities who do not dispose of or call for their quota of seeds and bulletins within the time required by law, and meanwhile the Department can not supply them to anyone else. He made the suggestion to me that if members were required, both as to seeds and bulletins, to notify the Department more promptly as to what they wished to have done with these articles, and if it were provided that in default of such notification within a limited time the articles would be forfeited, to be distributed by the Department, this business would be facilitated. This is the suggestion of the Department itself, not of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, of course I understand why the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture would desire to have our bulletins revert to the Department several months earlier than they now do. Of course I understand that it is in the nature of every Department of the Government, as it is in the nature of a court, to grow in its jurisdiction, to try to increase its control over matters and things. I understand, therefore, why the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture should desire that my bulletins and yours should be forfeited to the Department several months earlier than they are now forfeited. But I understand, also, that what we desire, in the interests of our constituents, is that we should keep control of these bulletins as long as may be.

Mr. SIMS. Why should not members send notice to the Department in good time if they do not require their seeds or documents?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That does not make any difference; I can not keep up with these "notices," nor can other members; we are too busy.

One word about the people who read these bulletins. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LATIMER] comes from a cotton district; so does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]; so do I. Now, in March the people in my part of the country are not reading farmers' bulletins; they are at work and very hard at work. It is when they have laid by their crop in the summer time and before cotton picking begins that the people do most of their agricultural reading. I would rather send my farmers' bulletins to my constituents in July and August than in March, April, or May, if I want them to be read.

Now, I want to make one other observation, in conclusion; and this is an important question in connection with the Department of Agriculture. There is not a single division or bureau of that Department upon which we could not expend advantageously \$1,000,000 each year. Take the Chemical Division, the Agrostological Division, the Publication Division, the Entomological Division, the Biological Division, the Weather Bureau, the Bureau of Animal Industry—there is not one of those upon which a million dollars a year might not be advantageously expended in forwarding the work of that particular division in such a way as to prove of immense advantage to the people and the world. But we must have some thought of symmetry and proportion in the expenditures of the Department.

If we undertook to do all that could be done by any one bureau or division of the Agricultural Department consistently with the good of the farming community in one year, we could take every dollar appropriated for the entire Agricultural Department and give it to that bureau or division alone, and we could with sufficient employment of force expend every dollar of it advantageously. But we must do our work, especially in scientific matters, slowly and gradually. We must put a certain amount of money at the behest of each bureau and keep it engaged on a given subject until it gets through with it, when it can be laid

aside and some other subject taken up. We have a long time in which to complete these various branches of work. So that when I take the position that we should not at a given time grant an enlarged appropriation for a particular bureau, I do not ignore the fact that an additional appropriation would perhaps result in some good.

We have in this bill increased the appropriations for agriculture alone a third of a million dollars. Since I have been on this committee we have increased the aggregate of this bill every year to a very large extent. We are trying to do the very best we can. The problem is how to be liberal and at the same time to be wise in the expenditure of money.

I yield a moment to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LATIMER].

Mr. LATIMER. I want to say a word on this question, and I want the House to hear what I say. The Secretary of Agriculture has been quoted here as to the number of these bulletins that we must print.

The Secretary of Agriculture recommended an appropriation of \$8,000 for the use of the Division of Agrostology. You ignored his request and reported only \$5,000. Now, the Secretary says that it would be a good idea to allow the bulletins to lapse on the 31st of March, and you say he would like it, but that you do not like the suggestion, and therefore you ignore him. You ignore him, in other words, when it does not suit you to adopt his suggestion; and when the suggestion pleases you, then you fall in with him and make the appropriations accordingly.

Now, I wish to say that this is a question—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think I can yield to the gentleman for a speech.

Mr. LATIMER. Just a word in this connection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No; let me answer the gentleman first. I have but a few moments remaining.

The gentleman from South Carolina says that on some subjects we join with the Secretary of Agriculture and on some others we ignore him. I plead guilty to that suggestion, and plead guilty to the fact that I stand in accord with nearly every man I ever knew in all my life on some things, but not on all things. Why, my friend joined me only last week or the week before in standing by the President in favor of free trade between Puerto Rico and other parts of the United States. [Laughter.] And yet I daresay that neither of us would stand by the President in many other things which he would recommend.

Now, when we reach the Division of Agrostology, the gentleman quotes the Secretary of Agriculture as asking for a larger appropriation; but when we reach the provision relating to the publication and distribution of these bulletins, there is quite a difference. In other words, you quote him for what he is worth on that question and I on this. The Secretary has asked for what we have given him for publication of bulletins, and we have granted him what he asked—nothing more and nothing less.

Mr. LATIMER. What I tried to say before, but the gentleman from Mississippi refused to allow me, was with reference to what the Secretary did request. The Secretary said that it was a question for the House and not for himself. It is for the House to determine the question as to these bulletins. It is for the House to determine how many bulletins may be printed. It is a question that affects each member of the House individually. The bulletins are allotted to us, and the extra appropriation asked for is to give each member a double quota instead of what he now gets.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I do not consider that these publications or distributions of any kind should affect members other than in a legitimate way. The object is not a personal one to the member. The object is to furnish information for the farmers as far and as fully as it is possible to do. Now, if the gentleman means to say that the use of these bulletins affects each member of the House in order to enable him to retain his seat in Congress or to secure his renomination or election to Congress, I scorn the use of the argument in that behalf. I do not think that gentlemen have the right to spend the public money with a view to their renomination or reelection. Public money expended in any one of the several Departments of the Government ought to rest solely upon the argument of the public good. I do not believe that it is the wish of any gentleman on this floor who deserves membership in this body to appropriate the public moneys to help himself, or for any purpose save the public good and in answer to a useful and beneficent demand.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'GRADY reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the Agricultural appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 292. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha G. D. Lyster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1593. An act granting an increase of pension to Clara H. Inch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2994. An act granting an increase of pension to Fanny F. Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3075. An act granting an increase of pension to Marie J. Blaisdell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1907. An act granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Paulding Meade—to the Committee on Pensions.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8063. An act to legalize and maintain the iron bridge across Pearl River at Rockport, Miss.;

H. R. 9713. An act permitting the building of a dam between Coon Rapids and the north limits of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., across the Mississippi River; and

H. R. 10311. An act to authorize the Shreveport and Red River Valley Railway Company to build and maintain a railway bridge across Red River at or near the town of Alexandria, in the parish of Rapides, State of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 2679. An act declaring certain trestles of the Washington County Railroad Company to be lawful structures.

REPRINT OF A BILL AND REPORT.

On motion of Mr. FOSS, by unanimous consent, it was ordered that the bill (H. R. 10450) making appropriation for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, and the report accompanying the same, No. 930, be reprinted for the use of the House; the report and views of the minority to be printed separately.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RIDGELY, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 162) providing for preliminary examination and survey of Burlington Bay, Lake County, Minn., will be changed from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

And then, on motion of Mr. WADSWORTH (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Paymaster-General, together with the draft of a bill, relating to allotments to enlisted men—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of increase of limit of cost for public building at Aberdeen, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for the post-office and court-house building at Norfolk, Va.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Chief of Engineers submitting a report on designs for a memorial bridge across the Potomac River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the Tennessee River between Bridgeport and Decatur—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of law and fact in case of the ship *Eunice*, Thomas Seal, master, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Quartermaster-General of the Army with reference to the purchase of land on Cushing's Island, Portland Harbor, Me.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10097) to authorize the Atlantic and Gulf Short Line Railroad Company to build, construct, and maintain railway bridges across the Ocmulgee and Oconee rivers, within the boundary lines of Irwin, Wilcox, Telfair, and Montgomery counties, in the State of Georgia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 953); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8921) to authorize the Butters Lumber Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Lumber River between the town of Boardman and the town of Fairbluff, in Columbus County, N. C., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 954); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8962) to authorize the New Orleans and Northwestern Railway Company, its successors and assigns, to build and maintain a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew, in the State of Louisiana, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 955); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9884) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 956); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4065) to remove the charge of desertion against David Edwards, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 957); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4142) to increase the pension of Katharine R. Prince; and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 10553) to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of the lives of miners in the Territories"—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MUDD (by request): A bill (H. R. 10554) to establish a representative form of government for the citizens of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 10555) authorizing a survey and estimate of cost of dredging a channel through the bar at mouth of Scuppernon River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 10556) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of West Virginia—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10557) to authorize the Ohio Valley Electric Railway Company to construct a bridge over the Big Sandy River from Kenova, W. Va., to Catlettsburg, Ky.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DE VRIES: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 229) providing for a preliminary survey of a ship canal from the city of Stockton to a suitable point on San Francisco Bay or other waterway, and so forth—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 230) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make a preliminary examination and survey for deepening the Buffalo River and Blackwell Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WATERS: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 37) for the printing of 20,000 copies of Bulletin No. 20 of the Division of Vegetable Physiology, United States Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A resolution (H. Res. 219) directing the Secretary of War to furnish information regarding the status of so-called "volunteer aids" attached to the United States Army in the Philippine Islands, and to inform the House of Representatives whether such "aids" are a great source of evil—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEVY: A resolution (H. Res. 220) directing the Commissioner-General of the United States to the Paris Exposition of 1900 to submit a detailed report of his expenditures, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 221) calling upon the Secretary of War for information regarding complaints against the operation of Army transports, purchase of commissary and quartermaster supplies, etc., in the Philippines; also authorizing the appointment by the Speaker of a committee to make such investigation as may be deemed necessary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 10558) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Alfred Robinson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROMWELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 10559) for the relief of Eliza C. C. Arnim—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 10560) granting an increase of pension to James Merrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 10561) for the benefit of D. N. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10562) granting a pension to Rev. S. S. Deering—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 10563) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 10564) granting an increase of pension to James R. Husted—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARSH: A bill (H. R. 10565) authorizing the disposing of subsistence stores—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY: A bill (H. R. 10566) to correct the military record of Thomas Insee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 10567) granting a pension to Mary L. Tweddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVILLE: A bill (H. R. 10568) granting an increase of pension to James R. Swim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 10569) for the relief of Rufus Neal—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10570) granting a pension to John Kinsie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 10571) for the relief of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. QUARLES: A bill (H. R. 10572) for the relief of the estate of Hugh L. Gallaher, deceased, late of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10573) for the relief of William Wheeler Hubbell—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10574) for the relief of Abraham Stover, Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 10575) granting an increase of pension to Augustus M. Dickson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10576) granting an increase of pension to William R. Blare—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10577) granting a pension to William Cash, alias Renfro—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: A bill (H. R. 10578) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10579) granting an increase of pension to Carol C. Krayenbuhl—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 10580) for the relief of L. J. Lawrence—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10581) granting a pension to Joseph B. McGahan, of Pulaski County, Ark.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10582) for the relief of A. C. Kerr, of Patterson Bluffs, Logan County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WISE: A bill (H. R. 10583) for the relief of James Mitchell, of Elizabeth City County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 10584) to grant an honorable discharge to Jacob Hahn, of the Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10585) for relief of Elvira M. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of the Philadelphia Hardware Association, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, for the promotion of exhibits in the Philadelphia museums, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Columbus (Ohio), Trades and Labor Assembly, protesting against the passage of House bills placing a tax on process butter—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petition of M. E. Sexton Post, No. 185, of Sextonville, Wis., and O. D. Chapman Post, No. 80, of Grays Mills, Wis., in favor of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the St. Louis Merchants' Exchange, in favor of a system of free public schools in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petitions of Captain Bauer Post, No. 447, of Berger, Mo., and Colonel Hassendeubel Post, No. 13, of St. Louis, Mo., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of J. B. English, J. P. Silas, R. W. Johnston, and A. T. Warneke, of Macon, Ga., favoring the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Resolution of Topeka (Kans.) Pressman's Union, favoring House bill No. 6872, to print the label of the Allied Printing Trades on publications of the Government—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, resolutions of the Columbus (Ohio) Trade and Labor Assembly, against sundry bills taxing oleomargarine and butterine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRENNER: Petition of Hiram Strong Post, No. 79, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Resolution of August Willich Post, No. 195, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Military Order of Loyal Legion, of Cincinnati, Ohio, recommending the purchase of additional ground for Fort Thomas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Cincinnati (Ohio) Police Relief Association, favoring the passage of the bill to equalize the salary of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Ohio Association of Local Fire Insurance Agents, of Columbus, Ohio, for certain modifications of the war-revenue tax relating to insurance—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of Samuel Gills's estate, State of Tennessee, praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, resolutions of James B. Campbell Post, No. 424, of Redwood, N. Y.; L. W. Shepard Post, No. 628, of Quincy, Ill.; Headquarters Post, No. 339, of Carlinville, Ill.; D. B. Sackett Post, No. 268, of Cape Vincent, N. Y., and Wisner Post, No. 70, of Badaxe, Mich., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: Petition of the Business Men's Association of East Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, for the promotion of exhibits in the Philadelphia museums, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of citizens of Holland, Nebr., to amend the present law in relation to the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Nebraska Federation of Woman's Clubs, in favor of a national park being made of the Calaveras grove of sequoias in the State of California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of W. P. Aylesworth and other citizens of Bethany, Nebr., against the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of F. E. Harrison and other druggists and citizens of Ridley Park, Pa., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. P. Rogers, for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of

Eddystone, Pa., for the passage of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of Estill Post, No. 71, and F. O. Spoon Post, No. 294, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a bill locating a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of the Business Men's Association of East Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, for the promotion of exhibits in the Philadelphia museums, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Middletown, R. I., urging the enactment of House bill 5475, known as the anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petitions of Good Templars Order, Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, Epworth League, Baptist Church, and Methodist Episcopal Church, of Burlington, Wis.; Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Congregational Church of Rochester and Racine, Wis., against the sale of intoxicants in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of druggists of Darlington, Evansville, and Janesville, Wis., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Monroe, Footville, and vicinity, State of Wisconsin, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of George G. Meade Post, No. 38, Grand Army of the Republic, of New York City, in favor of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petition of W. C. Elwood and other citizens of Troys, Kans., to amend the present law in relation to the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of Colonel William H. Moody Post, No. 155, of Pittsburg, Pa., Grand Army of the Republic, in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENNY: Petition of employees of the Baltimore (Md.) post-office, in favor of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DE VRIES: Papers to accompany House bill No. 277, relating to the claim of B. F. Myres, of Placer County, Cal.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of Ralston & Bare, of Weston, W. Va., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumery, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petition of Laura G. Trimble, publisher, of Whitewood, S. Dak., against the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of C. W. Gillman and others, of Milltown, S. Dak.; M. C. Hedman and 8 others, of Stockholm, S. Dak., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Papers to accompany House bill No. 317, to correct the military record of Stephen H. Borden—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Thirty-fourth Annual Encampment of the Department of Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, praying that the 12th of February be made a legal holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts stock fire insurance companies, praying for the repeal of the stamp act—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of a mass meeting of citizens of Charlestown, Mass., for the construction of gunboats and cruisers in the Charlestown Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of Platter Post, No. 82, of Aurora, Ind., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of J. Holliday Cline, of Athens, Ohio, for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Kingston, Ohio, and the Sailors and Soldiers' Department of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the State of Ohio, to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc., and in our insular possessions—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Petition of citizens of Kane County, Ill., urging the passage of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of Kearney Janeway Post, of New Brunswick, N. J., Grand Army of the Republic, in support of

House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the First Presbyterian Church of Metuchen, N. J., for the suppression of liquor selling in our new islands and in our Army—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of T. W. Roberts and others, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of H. F. Pierce and others, of Kellogg, Iowa, favoring the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petition of Dill Post, No. 463, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Gratiot and Orrville, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to John C. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Lieut. Hugh T. Reed—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Martin Dawson Company, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill No. 6246, known as the pure food and drug bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of A. H. Veeder, Franklin McVeagh & Co., W. M. Hoyt Company, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill No. 7667, to prevent false branding or marking of food and dairy products—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of M. W. Martin, of South Chicago, Ill., relating to civil-service appointments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Harvey Post, No. 724, of Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of H. J. Houghton and other druggists of Chicago, Ill., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumery, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Resolutions of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Columbus, Ohio, against the passage of the Grout, Tawney, and other bills to increase the tax on butterine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Papers in support of House bill for the relief of John Kinsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Rufus Neal—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE (by request): Petition of O. A. Honer Post, No. 70, of Rockville, Md., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Frostburg, Md., for public ownership of railroads, telegraphs, and telephones, and asking for the passage of Senate bill No. 1770, and against the passage of bill No. 1439—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of G. E. Small and others, for the construction of a levee on the east bank of the Mississippi River, from Drury's Landing to New Boston, State of Illinois—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of business men and citizens of Moline, Ill., expressing the need of a suitable harbor for Moline, on the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of Reynolds Post, No. 559, and G. W. Trafton Post, No. 239, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Rufus Aldrich and others, of Whiteside County, Ill., favoring House bill No. 5457, to abolish the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Moses Dillon and others of a committee of citizens of Sterling, Ill., for the construction of a lock in the dam to be built at Sterling in the feeder of the Hennepin Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of W. Hanna and others, of Albany, Ill., and citizens in the Mississippi Valley, in relation to the Gear bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Jacob Marguaredd and 9 others, of Monroeville, Ind., favoring the passage of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Maple Grove Christian Endeavor Society, of Lagrange, Ind., urging the passage of House bill No. 5457, prohibiting the sale of liquor in Army canteens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Petition of representative stockmen, at a meeting held at Yampa, Colo., and Cigar Makers' Union No. 129, of Denver, Colo., relating to the leasing of public lands, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Wild County, Colo., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 264, Carpenters and Joiners, of Boulder, Colo., favoring the passage of House bill No. 6882, relating to hours of labor on public works, and House bill No. 5450, for the protection of free labor against prison labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Pleasantville, Pa., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Petition of R. A. Pierce Post, No. 190, and C. L. Chandler Post, No. 143, Department of Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a bill locating a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, protest of citizens of Walnut Hill, Mass., against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of a mass meeting of citizens of Charlestown, Mass., for the construction of gunboats and cruisers in the Charlestown Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STARK: Petition of Post No. 17, Department of Nebraska, Grand Army of the Republic, in support of House bill No. 4742, to provide for the detail of active and retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military education in public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William Mills and 21 citizens of Beatrice, Nebr., and affidavit of Dr. G. L. Rowe, to accompany House bill for the relief of the said William Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: Resolution of G. R. Paul Post, No. 101, of Westwood, N. J., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of the Transvaal Committee of California, signed by L. K. P. Van Baggen and others, requesting Congress to take steps for immediate intervention between Great Britain and the South African Republic—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petition of citizens of Steele and Dodge counties, Minn., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TERRY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Joseph B. McGahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Methodist Episcopal Church, and Baptist Church of Busti, N. Y., and Union Grange, of Kennedy, N. Y., to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens and at military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Resolutions of the Columbus (Ohio) Trades and Labor Assembly, against increase of taxation on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of 55 citizens of Forest City, Pa., favoring the enactment of a clause in the Hawaiian constitution forbidding the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors and a prohibition of gambling and the opium trade—to the Committee on the Territories.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 10, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

AGES OF EMPLOYEES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th ultimo, a statement showing the ages and number of clerks, messengers, etc., in the Department, and also the number of those who are incapacitated for manual

labor, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

SCHOONER POLLY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the vessel schooner *Polly*, Benjamin Shillabar, master; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CUSHINGS ISLAND, MAINE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Quartermaster-General relative to a proposed amendment to the Army appropriation bill providing for the purchase of land on Cushings Island, Portland Harbor, Maine, to be used to erect additional batteries and for buildings for the troops thereon; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print 14,000 copies of the general summary entitled Review of the World's Commerce for the year 1899.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 77) authorizing the printing of a special edition of the Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture for 1899.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6959) to extend the provisions of an act entitled "An act granting increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases," approved January 5, 1893; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 2679) declaring certain trestles of the Washington County Railroad Company to be lawful structures;

A bill (H. R. 60) to create the northwestern division of the northern district of Georgia for judicial purposes and to fix the time and place for holding court therein;

A bill (H. R. 8063) to legalize and maintain the iron bridge across Pearl River, at Rockport, Miss.;

A bill (H. R. 9284) to attach the county of Foard, in the State of Texas, to the Fort Worth division of the northern district of Texas and providing that all process issued against defendants residing in said county shall be returned to Fort Worth;

A bill (H. R. 9713) permitting the building of a dam between Coon Rapids and the north limits of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., across the Mississippi River; and

A bill (H. R. 10311) to authorize the Shreveport and Red River Valley Railway Company to build and maintain a railway bridge across Red River at or near the town of Alexandria, in the parish of Rapides, State of Louisiana.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a memorial of the Central Trades and Labor Council of Rochester, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation regulating electrical wiring in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Groton, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation requiring the labeling of oleomargarine and all kindred dairy products; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Sydney Post, No. 41, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ithaca, N. Y., praying for the adoption of a certain amendment to Senate bill No. 1477, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Real Estate Board of Brokers of New York City, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reduction of stamp-tax duties imposed on mortgages, leases, rent receipts, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cuba, of the Woman's Christian Temperance